## 1nc

### T – oceans

#### Interp: The ocean is the water, Living and nonliving elements , the substrate beneath , ocean-atmosphere and the ocean-island atmospheres

Evans and South, 04(Nathan and Joeli, MarineAffairs Programme at University of the South Pacific ,“The Pacific Islands Regional Ocean Policy: The Quest for Good Ocean Governance”, Ocean Yearbook, Volume 18, HeinOnline)

For the purpose of this Policy, the "region" includes that part of the Pa- cific Ocean over which the island countries and territories (Pacific Island communities), that are members of the organisations comprising the Council of Regional Organisations of the Pacific (CROP) are found. As such, the extent of the region includes not only the area within the 200 nautical mile Exclusive Economic Zone (EEZ) boundaries circum- scribing these island countries, but also the ocean areas and coastal areas that encompass the extent of the marine ecosystems that support the region.¶ The "ocean" is defined to include the waters of the ocean, the living and nonliving elements within, the substrate beneath and the ocean-atmosphere and ocean-island interfaces.

#### Violation – the plan developed below the ocean – this is the most basic level of cheating

#### Unpredictable – justifies any aff – no ocean means no predictability

#### Limits – infinifte development affs are justified

### t - its

#### Interpretation: the resolution mandates federal ownership of the ocean development

#### “Its” is a possessive pronoun showing ownership

Supreme Court of Oklahoma 34

(Swindall v. State Election Board, 168 Okla. 97, Lexis)//BB

However, I view another phase of the act which is not considered in the majority opinion. It is my opinion that the expression, "its nominees," should have been construed by this court. Had this court so construed those words, it would have assisted the State Election Board in the furtherance of its ministerial duties, and would have set to rest the immediate question. It is my theory that the correct interpretation to place upon those words, "its nominees," is to the effect that those words do not mean all the nominees of any particular party. The word "its" is the possessive case, or the possessive adjective of "it", meaning of or belonging to it. Webster's International Dictionary. In other words, the expression, "its nominees," as applied to the Republican party, means nominees of it (the Republican party). The words, "nominees" of the "Republican party," do not and necessarily cannot mean all the nominees of the Republican party. Those words, however, do mean more than one nominee. It seems reasonable to conclude, in the absence of an expression like "all of its nominees," or words of similar import, that it was not the intent of the Legislature to make those words, "its nominees," all inclusive. It seems to me that a fair and reasonable interpretation would be that those words support and embrace the thought expressed by the New York statute, to wit, that it is the intention of the candidate to support generally at the next general election the nominees of the party from which he seeks his nomination, or that it is his intention to support a majority of the candidates of that party.

#### Ocean development is utilization of ocean resources

**Japanese Institute of Navigation, 98** (“Ocean Engineering Research Committee”, <http://members.j-navigation.org/e-committee/Ocean.htm>)

Discussions of "Ocean Engineering" are inseparable from "Ocean Development." What is ocean development? Professor Kiyomitsu Fujii of the University of Tokyo defines ocean development in his book as using oceans for mankind, while preserving the beauty of nature. In the light of its significance and meaning, the term "Ocean Development" is not necessarily a new term. Ocean development is broadly classified into three aspects: (1) Utilization of ocean resources, (2) Utilization of ocean spaces, and (3) Utilization of ocean energy. ¶ Among these, development of marine resources has long been established as fishery science and technology, and shipping, naval architecture and port/harbour construction are covered by the category of using ocean spaces, which have grown into industries in Japan. When the Committee initiated its activities, however, the real concept that caught attention was a new type of ocean development, which was outside the coverage that conventional terms had implied.¶ Special technologies are required for developing oceans, and an academic field is necessary to provide a base to construct such special technologies in systematic and organic ways. This academic field is Ocean Engineering. Dr. Tadayoshi Sasaki of the Tokyo Fisheries University stated that "Ocean Engineering" is the integration of several fields in which diverse approaches are to be taken for the ocean environment, unlike individual engineering fields in a traditional sense.

#### Violation – the aff incentives private sector development or exploration – it doesn’t mandate federal development or exploration

#### The industry would possess and maintain the development projects – that violates the core meaning of “its”

Appelate Court of Illinois 80

(“Hulett v. Central Illinois Light Co.,” 83 Ill. App. 3d 195, Lexis)//BB

The plaintiff responded to the motion for summary judgment to the effect that as to who owned or controlled the wires is immaterial, since CILCO was required to maintain and inspect all electric supply lines carrying its electricity and had failed to do so. In support of this contention the plaintiff relies upon Illinois Commerce Commission General Order 160 -- Revised, and effective as of June 1, 1963, which provides as follows:¶ "9. General Maintenance Requirements.¶ Each public utility operating a system of power or communication lines shall maintain *its* [italics in original] system of lines in such condition as will enable it to furnish safe, adequate and dependable service.¶ Power and communication lines and their associated equipment shall comply with the provisions of this General Order when placed in service, and shall thereafter by systematically inspected, and when necessary, be subjected to tests to determine their fitness for the service required of them, and for conditions of safety. Any defects revealed by such inspections and tests which could cause or create an unsafe condition, shall be promptly corrected. If such corrections are not immediately undertaken, a record of the condition found shall be made in the proper plant office of the utility. Defective lines or their associated equipment shall be placed in good operating condition, or otherwise effectively disconnected or removed." (Emphasis added.)¶ The purport of the trial judge's order is to this court clear in that a question of law is presented, namely, whether or not the Commerce Commission General Order 160 places a duty upon CILCO to maintain, repair and inspect the electrical lines in question, even though they are not and never have been owned or controlled by the power company. We note, however, that the plaintiff attempts to challenge the sufficiency of the Volk affidavit which denies ownership or control of the lines by CILCO. It is the plaintiff's argument that the affidavit referred to records as to premises located at 821 Tremont Township, Tremont, Illinois, and that the described premises have not been established as the place where the plaintiff was injured. We find no merit in this contention since it is [198] patently clear from the record that there was no concern on the part of the trial court or the parties to this action concerning the Volk affidavit or where the plaintiff was injured. It should be noted that the plaintiff did not file a counteraffidavit and consequently admitted that CILCO did not own or control the electrical line. (See Carruthers v. B. C. Christopher & Co. (1974), 57 Ill. 2d 376, 313 N.E.2d 457.) To raise on appeal the question of ownership appears to be an effort on the part of the plaintiff to obfuscate the true issue, to-wit, the meaning and effect of General Order 160.¶ We have set forth the pertinent provisions of the order and attention should be directed to the word its located in the first paragraph and which we have emphasized. The word its as used is a pronoun and is being used in its possessive form. By the use of the word it is clear that each public utility system shall maintain the power lines which it owns.

#### Voting issue –

#### Precision – the only way to provide a meaningful limit on the topic is to define it through court decisions – any other limit creates an arbitrary literature base and nullifies the benefit of any education

#### Limits – absent a restriction on the mechanism of the aff, any small adjustment to federal law becomes topical – dozens of incentives and regulation bodies remove any functional limits to the topic because small affs could just change the solvency mechanism every round

### private sector prizes cp

#### The United States federal government should institute a substantial monetary prize incentive for the purpose of sub seabed disposal of waste.

#### The counterplan is plan-minus – the private sector owns the project which severs “its”

Harrold 11 – Esq., brief to the Supreme Court of Indiana

(Dennis, “HAIRE v. PARKER, 2011 IN S. Ct. Briefs LEXIS 350,” Lexis)//BB

However, simply stating that Haspin Acres is released cannot afford enough protection because - under Indiana's law of agency or various theories of derivative liability - Haspin Acres would nevertheless face significant liability exposure for the negligent acts of its agents and affiliates. Under the doctrine of respondeat superior, a principal is liable for the negligent acts of his agent. See Comer-Marquardt v. A-l Glassworks, LLC, 806 N.E.2d 883, 887 (Ind. Ct. App. 2004). This explains the use of the language: "its officers, trustees, employees and agents, meet [15] officials, promoters, sponsors, motorcycle riders, mechanics and pit crew." (App. 26) Haspin Acres included this list of possible agents and affiliates to further reduce liability exposure. This list of categories is controlled by the possessive "its", referring to Haspin Acres. Thus, each category is subject to the same possessive. Therefore, the entities released are Haspin Acres and "its officers", "its .. . trustees", "its .. . employees and agents", "its .. . riders", etc. (App. 26) The effect of the possessive "its" controls the entire list, including "riders". The express provision states "its . . . riders," not all riders.

#### Prizes solve and stream line public-private partnerships– solves better in the long term

Gustetic ’12, Prizes and Challenges Program Executive NASA

Jenn, “Government as a Catalyst: Prizes for Tech Innovation”, http://www.pocg.com/blog/archives/736

At this year’s South by South West Interactive (SXSWi) conference, I’m pleased to be moderating a panel on the role of government and prizes in stimulating technology innovation and providing public services. Federal agencies have recently been given the authority by Congress to sponsor competitions for individuals, groups, and companies to develop new ideas and technology innovations for a chance to win potentially lucrative prizes. These competitions can range from new mobile outreach technologies to web-based data analytics tools to even vehicle-to-vehicle communications; the government is looking for breakthrough technologies from the minds of the most creative and forward thinking Americans.¶ The panel will highlight some of the coolest prizes for technology development that the government has been involved in to date, including the DOT’s Connected Vehicle Challenge, the VA’s industry competition and blue button projects, and NASA’s centennial challenges. Additionally we will explore what role the government should be playing in these activities moving forward by looking at some prizes where the government did not have a role.¶ Here’s a sneak preview about what you’ll hear if you come spend an hour with us. We believe prizes matter for many reasons, but we’ll focus on four during the session:¶ They work. How can we be so sure? You’ll hear about a series of prizes from NASA, VA, and DOT that demonstrate the value of government sponsored prizes.¶ They complement other innovation methods. There are many ways to stimulate technology development and many actors are involved in doing so. It doesn’t happen very often however that government gets a BRAND NEW way to stimulate innovation—and prizes are just that. Prizes are a new way for government to stimulate technology development that compliments other, traditional methods for innovation. We’ll give some interesting examples of where prizes work with other innovation methods in government to create some really cool results.¶ They're becoming a way of doing business. If government is spending money and doing business this way, entrepreneurs and industry alike should be paying attention. Imagine a world where as much money flows through an organization through prizes as it does through contracts. Now that’s big business.¶ They're exposing different roles for Government. Government does not always need to have a role for prizes to work however. The question no longer is CAN government have a role, but SHOULD they. The private sector is increasingly involved in activities that affect the public good and people WANT to get engaged in the public good. We believe this may create room for the public sector to disengage or interesting public-private partnerships to form. We’ll talk about some instances where this is happening.

### midterms da

#### The GOP will win control of both chambers because of turnout edge—no policies coming now will reverse it

Walsh, 7-16-14---CNN Senior Congressional Producer

Deirdre, “Need any more proof Congress is done legislating?” CNN, <http://www.cnn.com/2014/07/16/politics/congress-done/> --BR

If it wasn't already clear that Congress is done legislating this year, the scene inside and outside the Capitol on Wednesday illustrated that the midterm elections are in full swing. Just before the House Rules Committee began authorizing the Republican lawsuit against President Barack Obama, House Democrats gathered on the East Front steps just below the room where that hearing was to take place to unveil their "middle class jump start" agenda. With their dueling messages, they hoped to energize their respective political bases and propel supporters to the polls in November. The GOP decision to sue Obama over delaying the Obamacare employer mandate puts the politically-charged health care law -- an issue that motivates the most ardent GOP voters -- front and center. House Democrats argued in offering their middle class initiative that Republican priorities in Congress were skewed toward wealthy special interests at the expense of working families. Standing in front of sizable red white and blue convention-style placards with the phrases "Women Succeed," "Affordable Education" and "Make it in America," House Democratic Caucus Chairman Xavier Becerra tried to contrast the two political parties. "You can either sue the president of the United States, or you can do your job here at the House of Representatives and pass laws that help the middle class and working families," the California Democrat said. Citing the GOP lawsuit as a factor affecting the midterms, House Democratic Leader Nancy Pelosi in a Wednesday interview in the Washington Post set an ambitious goal of picking up 25 seats in the House. Democrats would need to take back 17 seats to regain control, a feat most Democrats concede isn't likely, especially in the sixth year of Obama's presidency. That's when a president's party historically loses seats. Midterm focus for Democrats: Women Congressional Democrats on both sides of the Capitol are directing much of their message toward women, who they view as the critical voting bloc. Obama won re-election in 2012 with support from 55% of women compared to 44% for GOP nominee Mitt Romney. In an off-year congressional election, Democrats know they can't expect the same turnout. But they're talking about child care, contraception coverage, and education to maximize their chances. Democrats unveiled their "100 Day Action plan" on Wednesday, pledging to hold votes on bills focusing on women, if they win back the House. Those measures would be targeted at raising the minimum wage, ensuring equal pay for equal work, and boosting access to early childhood education. "Our agenda for women and families is 'When Women Succeed, America Succeeds,'" Pelosi said. This is not just the title of our agenda. This is a statement of absolute fact. And our agenda presents a stark contrast to what the Republicans have done to roll back women's rights and limit women's opportunities." Women's work: The GOP's glass ceiling Dems in the Senate In the Senate, Democrats seized on the Supreme Court's big Obamacare decision last month that employers of some for-profit companies were not required to provide insurance plans that covered contraception if they opposed on religious grounds. A Democratic bill to reverse that decision was blocked this week. But the Democratic narrative on the Supreme Court fits with what many in the party have labeled a Republican "war on women." Pelosi and other Democrats emphasized that decision was made by "five men" who were effectively dictating whether or not women could get access to contraceptives. 'Over and over again' "This is 2014, not 1914. Most Americans thought this was settled long, long ago. But for some reason, Republicans keep dragging us back here - over and over and over again," Sen. Elizabeth Warren of Massachusetts said. But the GOP is positioned well to retake control of the Senate in November, and top Republican leaders recognized that the issue could damage their standing among women if they didn't respond.

#### **Diversity drop-off because of a lack of environmental progress dooms the Dems—the aff is a rallying cry that produces widespread minority turnout**

Gonzalez 14 – Director of NAACP national voter fund

(Antonio, “Communities of color and the environment”, 2/6/14, <http://augustafreepress.com/blog-communities-color-environment/>, HW)

At first, there wasn’t much polling on how Latinos or African Americans would vote on environmental issues or whether they would vote for candidates based on environmental records. Little money was being spent on minority voter persuasion regarding environmental issues — odd, given the disproportionate impact environmental issues have had on minority and poor communities and how easy it would have been to make that case. Never mind that census data made it clear that in many states, minorities would soon be in the majority or in election-significant numbers and therefore worth long-term investment. For 10 years, minorities have repeatedly proved themselves reliable voters for health, environment and infrastructure investment initiatives and for candidates who support them. Across the spectrum of issues, Latinos and African Americans vote in higher percentages that their white counterparts for environmental initiatives and for green candidates. Beyond consistent pro-environment voting, African American, Latino and other organizations now include environment and environmental health-related issues. Some polls indicate that minority voters’ concern about climate change is almost double that of whites. Minority-rights-focused organizations now invest in environmental staff; training young environmental scientists, conducting their own research on climate issues; fighting for their fair share of the green jobs market; and playing an important role in solar energy investments in their communities. Despite these pro-environment voter statistics and community environmental programs, year-round investment in educating and turning minority voters into permanent climate/environment voters still lags behind investments in other demographics. While large-scale voter registration efforts always materialize during major election cycles, few leave a permanent infrastructure behind. And with few exceptions, none are focused on creating permanent active environment voters. While there have been advancements in strengthening relationships between environmental and civil rights organizations, creating a vibrant, diversified climate or environmental voter constituency requires continual investment in voter registration and education. Environment and climate issues are key concerns for both minority and youth voters. Give them a green reason to vote and they will turn out.

#### Reversing diversity drop-off is the Democrats’ only hope for maintaining the Senate

Cillizza, 7-16-14---writes a politics blog & covers the White House for the Washington Post

Chris Cillizza, “The 2014 electorate is going to be whiter than it was in 2012. Here are the Senate races where it matters.” <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/07/16/the-2014-electorate-is-going-to-be-whiter-than-it-was-in-2012-here-are-the-senate-races-where-it-matters/>. –BR

Everyone knows that the 2014 electorate will be whiter than the 2012 electorate -- and that that change should favor Republicans. But, no one -- at least that we've seen -- has done a race-by-race analysis of what that less diverse electorate looks like in the states that will decide the Senate majority this fall. Until now. The chart below, created by Republican lobbyist Bruce Mehlman, looks at how much less diverse the 2014 electorate could be than the 2012 electorate in 10 of the most competitive Senate races in the country. The diversity dropoffs in Kentucky and New Hampshire might seem major but are not all that important electorally speaking because neither state has a terribly diverse electorate. Kentucky is almost 88 percent white while New Hampshire is 94 percent white. Alaska is a bit of its own special case. The state is 67 percent white but more than 14 percent Native American. Eight percent of people identify as a member of two (or more races.) North Carolina and Colorado may actually be the most interesting --and, for Democrats, worrisome -- states in Mehlman's chart. In each state the non-white vote dropped by more than 13 percent between the 2012 presidential and 2010 midterm elections. In North Carolina, especially, where non-white votes accounted for almost 31 percent of the electorate in 2012, a similar drop-off in the diversity of the electorate in 2014 could be the difference between winning and losing for Sen. Kay Hagan. The chart speaks to the fundamental challenge at the heart of Senate Democrats' attempts to hold onto control of the chamber this fall. They must find ways to approximate -- if not duplicate -- presidential turnout among non-white voters. That's a difficult (and expensive) proposition -- but not an impossible one. As Mehlman notes, the 2013 governor's race in Virginia -- won by Democrat Terry McAuliffe -- proves it can be done. In 2012, the Virginia electorate was 70 percent white, 20 percent black and five percent Hispanic. The following year, the Virginia electorate was 72 percent white, 20 percent black and four percent Hispanic. That's pretty damn close. Now, a single off-year gubernatorial election is not the same thing as a dozen or so competitive federal races in a midterm election. But, if you are looking for how Democrats keep their majority, it's by keeping the diversity drop-off between 2012 and 2014 smaller than it was between 2012 and 2010.

#### GOP senate key to Asia Pivot—gridlock can’t stop it

Keck 4/22/14—Managing Editor of The Diplomat where he authors The Pacific Realist blog. He also writes a monthly column for The National Interest. Previously, he worked as Deputy Editor of e-International Relations and has interned at the Center for a New American Security and in the U.S. Congress, where he worked on defense issues.

[Zachary Keck, “The Midterm Elections and the Asia Pivot: The Republican Party taking the Senate in the 2014 elections could be a boon for the Asia Pivot.” The Diplomat, April 22, 2014, <http://thediplomat.com/2014/04/the-midterm-elections-and-the-asia-pivot/>] FAS

There is a [growing sense](http://fivethirtyeight.com/features/fivethirtyeight-senate-forecast/) in the [United States that](http://cookpolitical.com/senate/charts/race-ratings) when voters go to the polls this November, the Republican Party will win enough Senate seats to control both houses of Congress. This would potentially introduce more gridlock into an already dysfunctional American political system. But it needn’t be all doom and gloom for U.S. foreign policy, including in the Asia-Pacific. In fact, the Republicans wrestling control of the Senate from the Democrats this November could be a boon for the U.S. Asia pivot. This is true for at least three reasons. First, with little prospect of getting any of his domestic agenda through Congress, President Barack Obama will naturally focus his attention on foreign affairs. Presidents in general have a tendency to focus more attention on foreign policy during their second term, and this effect is magnified if the other party controls the legislature. And for good reason: U.S. presidents have far more latitude to take unilateral action in the realm of foreign affairs than in domestic policy. Additionally, the 2016 presidential election will consume much of the country’s media’s attention on domestic matters. It’s only when acting on the world stage that the president will still be able to stand taller in the media’s eyes than the candidates running to for legislative office. Second, should the Democrats get pummeled in the midterm elections this year, President Obama is likely to make some personnel changes in the White House and cabinet. For instance, after the Republican Party incurred losses in the 2006 midterms, then-President George W. Bush quickly moved to replace Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld with the less partisan (at least in that era) Robert Gates. Obama [followed suit by making key personnel](http://www.nytimes.com/2010/12/24/us/politics/24obama.html?_r=0) changes after the Democrats “shellacking” in the 2010 midterm elections. Should the Democrats face a similar fate in the 2014 midterm elections, Obama is also likely to make notable personnel changes. Other aides, particular former Clinton aides, are likely to leave the administration early in order to start vying for spots on Hillary Clinton’s presumed presidential campaign. Many of these changes are likely to be with domestic advisors given that domestic issues are certain to decide this year’s elections. Even so, many nominally domestic positions—such as Treasury and Commerce Secretary—have important implications for U.S. policy in Asia. Moreover, some of the post-election changes are likely be foreign policy and defense positions, which bodes well for Asia given the appalling lack of Asia expertise among Obama’s current senior advisors. But the most important way a Republican victory in November will help the Asia Pivot is that the GOP in Congress are actually more favorable to the pivot than are members of Obama’s own party. For example, Congressional opposition to granting President Trade Promotional Authority — which is key to getting the Trans-Pacific Partnership ratified — is largely from Democratic legislators. Similarly, it is the Democrats who are largely in favor of the defense budget cuts that threaten to undermine America’s military posture in Asia. If Republicans do prevail in November, President Obama will naturally want to find ways to bridge the very wide partisan gap between them. Asia offers the perfect issue area to begin reaching across the aisle. The Republicans would have every incentive to reciprocate the President’s outreach. After all, by giving them control of the entire Legislative Branch, American voters will be expecting some results from the GOP before they would be ostensibly be ready to elect them to the White House in 2016. A Republican failure to achieve anything between 2014 and 2016 would risk putting the GOP in the same dilemma they faced in the 1996 and 2012 presidential elections. Working with the president to pass the TPP and strengthen America’s military’s posture in Asia would be ideal ways for the GOP to deliver results without violating their principles. Thus, while the president will work tirelessly between now and November to help the Democrats retain the Senate, he should also prepare for failure by having a major outreach initiative to Congressional Republicans ready on day one. This initiative should be Asia-centric.

#### **Pivot is to key to prevent Asia wars**

Lohman 13 – MA in Foreign Affairs @ UVA (Walter, “Honoring America’s Superpower Responsibilities,” http://www.heritage.org/research/lecture/2013/06/honoring-americas-superpower-responsibilities)

When you withdraw from the world, either by imposing trade barriers or drawing down military commitments, you lose your ability to influence events.¶ Those considering an Asia with less American presence have to ask themselves whether freedom would do as well without us. In fact, proponents of American withdrawal have to ask themselves a more important question: Whether they have responsibility for anyone’s well-being but their own!¶ Times are, indeed, changing in Asia. Power is shifting. I have traveled to Asia quite a bit—easily 50 times over the course of my career. I’ve seen the change first-hand. One thing that is not changing is that the U.S. is the one “indispensable” ingredient for continued peace, prosperity, and freedom around the world. Everyone I talk to in Asia tells me that. They must be talking to President Obama, too, because he’s also used the word “indispensable” to describe America’s role in the world.¶ Of course, these countries want access to our markets and our capital. But on the diplomatic side, it is also the case that the U.S. is the closest thing in Asia to an honest broker. And because if anything, nationalist tensions in Asia are only growing, this is not going to change anytime soon. Sure, there are South Koreans who would rather not have American troops in their country. But they are not the majority. And they like us a whole heck of a lot more than they like the prospect of another invasion. They like us a lot better than they like the Japanese. Imagine how the Koreans feel about the prospect of Japan acquiring nuclear weapons to defend itself. That’s what they would have to do without the benefit of the American nuclear deterrent.

#### **Causes extinction—outweighs other scenarios**

Mead 10 **(**Mead, senior fellow @ the Council on Foreign Relations, 2010 Walter, American Interest, “Obama in Asia”, http://blogs.the-american-interest.com/wrm/2010/11/09/obama-in-asia/)

The decision to go to Asia is one that all thinking Americans can and should support regardless of either party or ideological affiliation.  East and South Asia are the places where the 21st century, for better or for worse, will most likely be shaped; economic growth, environmental progress, the destiny of democracy and success against terror are all at stake here.  American objectives in this region are clear.  While convincing China that its best interests are not served by a rash, Kaiser Wilhelm-like dash for supremacy in the region, the US does not want either to isolate or contain China.  We want a strong, rich, open and free China in an Asia that is also strong, rich, open and free.  Our destiny is inextricably linked with Asia’s; Asian success will make America stronger, richer and more secure.  Asia’s failures will reverberate over here, threatening our prosperity, our security and perhaps even our survival. The world’s two most mutually hostile nuclear states, India and Pakistan, are in Asia.  The two states most likely to threaten others with nukes, North Korea and aspiring rogue nuclear power Iran, are there.  The two superpowers with a billion plus people are in Asia as well.  This is where the world’s fastest growing economies are.  It is where the worst environmental problems exist.  It is the home of the world’s largest democracy, the world’s most populous Islamic country (Indonesia — which is also among the most democratic and pluralistic of Islamic countries), and the world’s most rapidly rising non-democratic power as well.  Asia holds more oil resources than any other continent; the world’s most important and most threatened trade routes lie off its shores.  East Asia, South Asia, Central Asia (where American and NATO forces are fighting the Taliban) and West Asia (home among others to Saudi Arabia, Israel, Turkey and Iraq) are the theaters in the world today that most directly engage America’s vital interests and where our armed forces are most directly involved.  The world’s most explosive territorial disputes are in Asia as well, with islands (and the surrounding mineral and fishery resources) bitterly disputed between countries like Russia, the two Koreas, Japan, China (both from Beijing and Taipei), and Vietnam.  From the streets of Jerusalem to the beaches of Taiwan the world’s most intractable political problems are found on the Asian landmass and its surrounding seas. Whether you view the world in terms of geopolitical security, environmental sustainability, economic growth or the march of democracy, Asia is at the center of your concerns.  That is the overwhelming reality of world politics today, and that reality is what President Obama’s trip is intended to address.

### Solvency

#### No plan = no solvency – you can vote negative on presumption and give us double thirties ☺

### boid

#### Biodiversity loss is irrelevant- species will adapt

Willis ‘9

[Kathy J. Willis, Long-Term Ecology Laboratory, Oxford University Centre for the Environment and Department of Biology, University of Bergen. Shonil A. Bhagwat, Long-Term Ecology Laboratory, Oxford University Centre for the Environment. “Biodiversity and Climate Change.” Science 6 November 2009: Vol. 326 no. 5954 pp. 806-807. ETB]

Another complexity, however, is the impact of climate change on already highly altered fragmented landscapes outside of protected areas. Over 75% of the Earth's terrestrial biomes now show evidence of alteration as a result of human residence and land use ([10](http://www.sciencemag.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/content/326/5954/806.full?sid=9a26dd19-f70d-4840-b971-26e78917d71a#ref-10)). Yet, recent case studies suggest that even in a highly fragmented landscape, all is not lost for biodiversity. ¶ It has long been assumed that in a fragmented landscape, the fragment size and its isolation are important factors in determining species persistence; the smaller and more isolated the fragment, the lower its occupancy. Yet few worldwide studies have attempted to quantify this relation. Prugh et al. ([11](http://www.sciencemag.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/content/326/5954/806.full?sid=9a26dd19-f70d-4840-b971-26e78917d71a#ref-11)) compiled and analyzed raw data from previous research on the occurrence of 785 animal species in >12,000 discrete habitat fragments on six continents. In many cases, fragment size and isolation were poor predictors of occupancy. The quality of the matrix surrounding the fragment had a greater influence on persistence: When the matrix provided conditions suitable to live and reproduce, fragment size and isolation were less important and species were able to persist. ¶ This ability of species to persist in what would appear to be a highly undesirable and fragmented landscape has also been recently demonstrated in West Africa. In a census on the presence of 972 forest butterflies over the past 16 years, Larsen found that despite an 87% reduction in forest cover, 97% of all species ever recorded in the area are still present ([12](http://www.sciencemag.org.proxy.lib.uiowa.edu/content/326/5954/806.full?sid=9a26dd19-f70d-4840-b971-26e78917d71a#ref-12)). For reasons that are not entirely clear, these butterfly species appear to be able to survive in the remaining primary and secondary forest fragments and disturbed lands in the West African rainforest. However, presence or absence does not take into account lag effects of declining populations; a more worrying interpretation is therefore that the full effects of fragmentation will only be seen in future years.

#### Species loss won’t snowball or threaten human life

Moore ‘98

(Senior Fellow – Hoover Institute, Climate of Fear, Pg. 99)

Nevertheless, the loss of a class of living being does not typically threaten other species. Most animals and plants can derive their nutrients or receive the other benefits provided by a particular species from more than a single source. If it were true that the extinction of a single species would produce a cascade of losses, then the massive extinctions of the past should have wiped out all life. Evolution forces various life forms to adjust to change. A few may not make the adaptation but others will mutate to meet the new conditions. Although a particular chain of DNA may be eliminated through the loss of a species, other animals or plants adapting to the same environment often produce similar genetic solutions with like proteins. It is almost impossible to imagine a single species that, if eliminated, would threaten us humans.

#### Not key to ecosystem stability

Sasaki and Lauenroth, 11

\* Graduate School of Life Sciences, Tohoku University. PhD from the Graduate School of Agricultural and Life Sciences, The University of Tokyo. Member of the Ecological Society of Japan, and Winner of the Best Poster Prize in 2007 and 2008 at the Annual Meeting of Ecological Society of Japan (section: Plant Community and Species Diversity) – AND \*\* Professor at the Department of Botany at the University of Wyoming. PhD in Range Science from the University of Colorado (1/11/11, Dr. Takehiro Sasaki and Dr. William K. Lauenroth, “Dominant species, rather than diversity, regulates temporal stability of plant communities,” *Oecologia*, 166(3):761-8 CS)

We found a significant negative relationship between temporal stability and species richness, number of rare species, and relative abundance of rare species (Fig. 2a, d, h). This is counter to the growing body of empirical evidence that suggests that the temporal stability of communities increases with diversity (Tilman 1999; Cottingham et al. 2001; Valone and Hoffman 2003; Tilman et al. 2006). Many theoretical studies have focused on the portfolio and covariance effects (see ‘‘Materials and methods’’) in demonstrating how increased diversity can confer increased temporal stability (Tilman 1999; Yachi and Loreau 1999; Hughes and Roughgarden 2000). However, we found no significant relationships between summed variances and species richness and number of rare species (Fig. 3a, b), and we found significant positive relationships between summed covariances and species richness and number of rare spe- cies (Fig. 3e, f). Neither the portfolio nor the covariance effect contributed significantly to temporal stability in our communities. Rare species that generally exhibit greater temporal fluctuations than common species should more often exhibit years of zero abundance than common species because of their small population sizes (Lande 1993; Valone and Schutzenhofer 2007), resulting in synchrony in response to high interannual variability in rainfall. This probably dampened the expected stabilizing effect of species richness on temporal stability (Yachi and Loreau 1999). Valone and Barber (2008) also showed that covariances between most pairs of species in natural communities were more often positive than negative, potentially because of shared responses of coexisting species to fluctuations in a common resource base, pos- sibly driven by climatic fluctuations. Moreover, the rela- tionship between summed abundance and species richness was not significant (Fig. 3i), suggesting that overyielding was not important in our communities. A previous study has indicated that functional diversity is a good predictor of the overyielding effect of species richness (Griffin et al. 2009). Our findings suggest that, although we do not know the explicit mechanism, the lack of change in functional diversity, despite the increase in species rich- ness resulting from the removal of dominant species, might explain the absence of an overyielding effect. Thus, there were no operational stabilizing effects of greater diversity; rather, greater species richness supported by an increase in the number of rare species destabilized the communities.

#### Diseases

#### No impact to disease – they either burn out or don’t spread

Posner 05

(Richard A, judge on the U.S. Court of Appeals, Seventh Circuit, and senior lecturer at the University of Chicago Law School, Winter. “Catastrophe: the dozen most significant catastrophic risks and what we can do about them.” http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi\_kmske/is\_3\_11/ai\_n29167514/pg\_2?tag=content;col1)

Yet the fact that Homo sapiens has managed to survive every disease to assail it in the 200,000 years or so of its existence is a source of genuine comfort, at least if the focus is on extinction events. There have been enormously destructive plagues, such as the Black Death, smallpox, and now AIDS, but none has come close to destroying the entire human race. There is a biological reason. Natural selection favors germs of limited lethality; they are fitter in an evolutionary sense because their genes are more likely to be spread if the germs do not kill their hosts too quickly. The AIDS virus is an example of a lethal virus, wholly natural, that by lying dormant yet infectious in its host for years maximizes its spread. Yet there is no danger that AIDS will destroy the entire human race. The likelihood of a natural pandemic that would cause the extinction of the human race is probably even less today than in the past (except in prehistoric times, when people lived in small, scattered bands, which would have limited the spread of disease), despite wider human contacts that make it more difficult to localize an infectious disease. The reason is improvements in medical science. But the comfort is a small one. Pandemics can still impose enormous losses and resist prevention and cure: the lesson of the AIDS pandemic. And there is always a lust time.

### Nuclear Terrorism

#### ASEAN is neg card

### Russia Relations

#### US-Russian relations are cyclical- prevents full relations collapse

Xing ‘12

[Li Xing, director for Russian studies at the School of Political Science and International Studies at Beijing Normal University. Interviewed by Ling Yi at the Global Times.

<http://www.globaltimes.cn/DesktopModules/DnnForge%20-%20NewsArticles/Print.aspx?tabid=99&tabmoduleid=94&articleId=709170&moduleId=405&PortalID=0> ETB]

Russia-US relations are constantly cyclical. As the US presidential election is coming this fall, the Obama campaign wants to show a tough attitude on Russia, which explains the finger-pointing about Russia's election earlier this year. But this will improve after the US election.

Marked

Such high-level ties are always based on mutual interests. Russia has to expand economic cooperation with the US and the White House needs the Kremlin's support on international security issues such as Iran and Syria.

## 2nc

### 2nc – ov/solvency wall

#### Counterplan solves 100% of the case and doesn’t link to the net benefit – prizes create a model for Darwinian innovation that create the most economically viable projects. This makes rapid growth of private development and public partnerships, which builds a model for long term development. That’s Gustetic 12’

#### Inducement prizes are effective and don’t trade off with other policies

#### Spurs economic growth and investment

Thomas Kalil 12/2006—Special Assistant to the Chancellor for Science and Technology at UC Berkeley “Prizes for Technological Innovation” The Hamilton Project-The Brookings Institution-an American think tank http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2006/12/healthcare%20kalil/200612kalil.pdf

Science, technology, and innovation are central to America’s continued economic growth. As policy analysts and economists have long recognized, private sector ﬁrms and the government play essential and complementary roles in innovation,including the development of new technology. Broadly speaking, the government creates an institutional setting and sponsors a knowledge base that makes innovation possible, whereasprivate sector ﬁrms take the lead on deciding what innovative new products and servicesshould actually be produced. Government efforts to promote research and development (R&D) rest on three pillars: funding, intellectual property rights, and education. First, the federal government uses grants, contracts, andappropriations to fund research efforts by private institutions, academic institutions, national labo- ratories, and other federally funded facilities; and uses tax incentives to encourage private ﬁrms to carry out R&D.Second, the federal government legislates and enforces intellectual property rights, such as those embodied in patents and trade secrets, so that private sector innovators have less reason to fear that other ﬁrms will copy their discoveries in the short term. Third, federal and state govern- ments support higher education, which helps create the workforce that is needed for research-intensive science and engineering ﬁrms. Nordhaus (2004) estimates that innovators them- selves captured only 2.2 percent of the total value of their innovations during the period 1948–2001. The balance of the social beneﬁt goes to other pro- ducers and to consumers of products that use the new invention. Even with publicly funded scientiﬁc discovery, patents, tax incentives, and other public support for science and technology, the innovators’ beneﬁts from innovation are only a small fraction of the broader social beneﬁts. Clearly, the private sector invests less in R&D than is justiﬁed by the beneﬁts for society as a whole. This paper proposes greater use ofinducement prizes, an old but currently underutilized public policy tool that stimulates technological innovation. Inducement prizes encourage efforts by contestants to accomplish a particular goal (NAE 1999). They are different from recognition prizes,such as the Nobel Prize, that reward researchers for past achievement. Inducement prizes are similar in spir- it to advance market commitments (AMCs): Under AMCs,governments commit to buy a given quan- tity of a product or service that meets prespeciﬁed performance goals. Inducement prizes and AMCs are policy tools that help to blend the best of public purpose and the creativity, energy, and passion of private sector entrepreneurial teams.Inducement prizes are not new. In 1714, in response to several shipwrecks that had resulted from inac- curate longitude measurements, the British Parlia- ment established a prize for the precise determina- tion of a ship’s longitude (Sobel 1996). In 1795, a prize was offered for a method of food preservation that would be usable by Napoleon’s military forces (Scotchmer 2004). In the early twentieth century, many advances in aviation such as faster speed, greater distance, and new technologies were driven by prizes sponsored by aeronautical societies, news- papers, mail companies, and interested individuals (Schroeder 2004). After frequent use between the eighteenth and ear- ly twentieth centuries, prize competitions largely fell out of use as a means to stimulate technologi- cal innovation. They have enjoyed a renaissance in recent years, however, attributable in part to the success of the Ansari X PRIZE. In 1996, Peter Diamandis established the X PRIZE to “promote the development and ﬂight of spaceships able to provide low-cost commercial transport of humans into space.” The X PRIZE Foundation offered a ten million dollar prize to the team that, without government support, developed a craft that could successfully send the pilot and two passengers (or equivalent weight) to a suborbital altitude of at least one hundred kilometers, and then repeat the ﬂight within two weeks. Aerospace designer Burt Rut- tan and his team at Scaled Composites, backed by Microsoft cofounder Paul Allen, won the prize on October 4, 2004, with the SpaceShipOne (Miller 2005). The X PRIZE Foundation is now sponsor- ing the X PRIZE Cup, which will eventually award prizes for spaceships that are faster, cheaper, safer, and can travel higher. In addition, the X PRIZE Foundation recently announced a ten million dol- lar prize for inexpensive and rapid sequencing of the human genome, and is exploring new prizes in areas such as high-mileage autos, education, space, the environment, nanotechnology, medicine, and social entrepreneurship.1 The proposal for a more widespread use of inducement prizes is in no way intended as a substitute for a more comprehensive and robust public sci- ence and technology policy. For example, the main- stream agenda recently set forth by the National Academies deserves and is beginning to receive serious consideration by policymakers (National Academies 2005).2 Inducement prizes can be a useful complement to, and under some circumstances may have advantages over, traditional funding mechanisms:

#### Empirical data

Williams ’12, PhD in economics from Harvard

Heidi, “Innovation Inducement Prizes: Connecting Research to Policy”, MIT Economics, http://economics.mit.edu/files/7823

Two recent papers have looked deeper into the historical record to construct counterfactual¶ analyses in order to assess the effectiveness of prizes in spurring innovation:¶ Brunt, Lerner, and Nicholas (in press) and Nicholas (2010).¶ Brunt, Lerner, and Nicholas (in press) collect a novel data set in order to analyze¶ innovation inducement prizes awarded by the Royal Agricultural Society of¶ England (RASE) between 1839 and 1939. The goal of RASE was to encourage¶ scientists to apply their skills to improving agricultural technologies. Starting in¶ 1839, RASE held annual prize competitions. One year in advance of the competitions,¶ RASE announced which technological areas would be targeted as well as¶ the number and value of prizes to be awarded in each area; judges authorized¶ payment of awards, or withheld them if the criteria for winning were not met,¶ and were also given discretion to award additional ex post prizes. These competitions¶ awarded substantial monetary prizes (in excess of 1 million pounds in current¶ prices) as well as prestigious but nonpecuniary medals. Between 1839 and¶ 1939, 15,032 inventions competed for these prizes and a total of 1,986 awards were¶ made.¶ To examine the question of whether these prizes encouraged innovation, the authors¶ assemble data on all applications for (and grants of) British patents from¶ 1839 to 1939, matched to information on competition entrants, prize winners, and¶ prize schedules (that is, the preannounced targeted technological areas as well as the¶ number and value of prizes). Following previous work, they also collect information¶ on whether renewal fees were paid for granted patents as a proxy for the quality¶ of patents (since inventors should be more willing to pay renewal fees for more¶ valuable patents; see Schankerman & Pakes, 1986).¶ Using this data, the authors present a number of empirical results. First, they find¶ that the RASE contests attracted large numbers of entrants. This is true for both¶ pecuniary and nonpecuniary prizes, with the largest entry effects arising from the¶ nonpecuniary RASE gold medal. Second, they find that prizes are associated with¶ 29 Dava Sobel’s 1996 book (Sobel, 1996) on the Longitude prize, mentioned in the introduction, could¶ similarly be described as an (extended) case study, but one that is not focused on providing a counterfactual¶ analysis.¶ 30 See http://www.oecd.org/dataoecd/8/48/42237166.pdf (last accessed January 29, 2012).¶ Journal of Policy Analysis and Management DOI: 10.1002/pam¶ Published on behalf of the Association for Public Policy Analysis and Management¶ 20 / Innovation Inducement Prizes¶ “real” changes in contemporaneous patenting activity in the technological areas¶ targeted by the RASE contests. This result suggests that RASE prizes were spurring¶ not only the entry of technologies into RASE contests, but actually spurring the¶ development of new technologies (asmeasured by patents) that would not otherwise¶ have been developed. Importantly, the induced innovation seems to be composed¶ of “high quality” inventions as measured by the renewal fee metric described above.¶ Within the sample of high-quality patents as defined by this measure, the authors¶ find that a doubling in monetary prize value is associated with a 4 percent increase¶ in contemporaneous patents, and that an additional medal is associated with a 20¶ to 21 percent increase in contemporaneous patents.¶ In a second recent paper, Nicholas (2010) examines a similar research question in¶ the context of Japan’s Meiji era—during which patents were introduced in Japan (in¶ 1885) and a large number of mostly nonpecuniary prizes were awarded (by 1911,¶ 1.2million prizes were awarded at 8,503 competitions). Using amethodology similar¶ in spirit to that in Brunt, Lerner, and Nicholas (in press), he finds evidence that¶ prizes increased patent outcomes on the order of 30 percent.¶ To summarize, both studies suggest prize awards—including nonpecuniary prize¶ awards—can encourage not only entry into prize contests, but also real innovation,¶ as proxied by patenting activity. Although the results of these studies clearly do not¶ imply that prizes will successfully spur innovation in all cases, they are suggestive¶ that the types of prizes that have been implemented in the past can be successful on¶ this metric.

#### They are empirically effective and avoid bureaucracy—and they’re popular with the public

Alex Schroeder 12/2004 Colorado School of Mines. Div. of Economics and Business Independence Institute “The Application and Administration of Inducement Prizes in Technology—The Technological Implications of Prizes”

The Technological Implications of Prizes Both recognition and inducement prizes seek to reward an individual or team for a breakthrough in a given field. These prizes have the option of rewarding advances in traditional thinking or the development of non- traditional thinking. This freedom plays a major advantage when weighing the potential methods employed to attain a prize. The vast audience that a prize competition allows for increases the possibility of non-traditional ideas to be proven more effective. Specifically, inducement prizes sidestep the bureaucratic approval often necessary to gain grant and project funding. Since prizes do not discriminate against the ideas that are involved in achieving a certain technological breakthrough a new methodology is free to gain otherwise unlikely exposure. These new ideas often spark public inter- est and media attention creating yet another benefit of prizes. Twenty-five percent of all Americans had personally viewed the Spirit of St. Louis in the year immediately following Charles Lindbergh’s Trans-Atlantic flight. Given the state of personal transportation in 1927 as compared to now, this is a staggering number. Prizes in technology have shown to inspire the public much in the same way the NCAA Tournament does for college basketball. As of July 2004, the X Prize1 had regis- tered 3 billion print impressions of its name in newspapers, journals, and web sites.2 This number has undoubtedly increased significantly after Burt Rutan claimed the X Prize in October. Prizes have historically been very effective at drawing public sentiment to a technology. An increase in public sentiment means a sequential increase in technology visibility and proliferation. This is evidenced by the way that the country latched on to information technology in the development of Silicon Valley.

#### Prizes are key to technological innovation and federal agencies have authority

Porter, reporter for the Wall Street Journal, 6/19/2014 (Caroline, “Innovation Contests With Cash Prizes Attract More 'Average Joes'” Wall Street Journal http://online.wsj.com/articles/innovation-contests-with-cash-prizes-attract-more-average-joes-1403151163)//JSutter

Government and private foundations increasingly are using prize money to allow even Average Joes to help find outside-the-box solutions to complex problems, according to a report set to be released Thursday. From a search for new technology to thwart robocallers to a bid to boost the number of college graduates living in cities, solutions to public problems are more often being sought from open contests in addition to more traditional methods, such as contracts with experts and consultants. Results from "citizen solvers" so far are promising, with more than 350 government and philanthropic prizes awarded since 2010. Among the 2009 winners was a Maine engineer who created a more durable and flexible astronaut glove for NASA. The median purse for the government prizes has jumped to about $10,000 in 2013 from about $2,000 in 2010, according to the report, which was funded by Bloomberg Philanthropies and the Case, Joyce, Knight, Kresge and Rockefeller foundations. While only two federal contests boasted prizes of more than $100,000 in 2010, the number jumped to 13 in 2012 and nine in 2013, the report said. "The big takeaway is that challenges and prizes are no longer an exotic innovation strategy, but rather they are becoming mainstream," said Jesse Goldhammer, co-author of the report and a consultant with an innovation arm of Deloitte Consulting LLP. "Innovation is not just you go into a corner and come out with a fresh, new idea. We're really starting to see it as something you cultivate from beginning to end." The report, which details specific strategies to make the prizes work, breaks down the different goals of prizes into six categories, ranging from developing prototypes to raising public awareness of key issues. The America Competes Reauthorization Act of 2010, which gave federal agencies broader powers to use prizes, opened the door for the boom, Obama administration officials said. More than 50 agencies have used contests, said Cristin Dorgelo, the assistant director for Grand Challenges at the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy. "It's high leverage on the dollar," she said. "You're only paying for success." In the philanthropic world, the use of competitions to award grant money remains a fairly new concept, according to Patrick Rooney, a professor of economics and philanthropic studies at the Indiana University Lilly Family School of Philanthropy. "The motivation for these prizes is trying to break out of the same-old, same-old model, and introduce and induce new actors into the field," said Mr. Rooney, who added that the extra publicity doesn't hurt either. Private companies are using contests, too. In 2006, the [Netflix](http://quotes.wsj.com/NFLX) [NFLX -2.48%](http://quotes.wsj.com/NFLX) Prize offered $1 million to anyone who could formulate algorithms that accurately could guess user preferences for movie choices. Three years later, with more than 40,000 teams' submissions, Netflix Inc. awarded the prize to a team of seven researchers from four countries. [International Business Machines](http://quotes.wsj.com/IBM) Corp. [IBM -0.26%](http://quotes.wsj.com/IBM) received about 400 applications from 43 countries for its 2014 Watson Mobile Developer Challenge that asked contest participants to devise apps by using its cloud-based computing technology. "The challenge itself is a vehicle we have found to be extremely productive at achieving a desired result but doing so in a much more efficient fashion," said Stephen Gold, vice president of IBM Watson Group. Donald Coolidge, chief executive of Majestyk Apps, spent several months working late nights and weekends on a soft, cuddly toy known as FANG that learns along with the child playing with it. His team was one of the three final winners. "We all felt our ideas were validated by winning," he said. "The thing we heard most was, 'I want one and when does it come out?' "

### 2nc – spill over

#### Prizes spill over to create new industries

Hendrix ’14, Director for emerging issues and research at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

Michael, “The Power of Prizes”, http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Power%20of%20Prizes\_0.pdf

Prizes don’t emerge from vacuums. They act as leverage to encourage ¶ capital to be invested according to measurable benchmarks. Quite often ¶ these funds begin dispersed across public and private sectors and are only ¶ brought together once a prize is announced and teams form to compete.25 ¶ as we saw with the ansari XPrize, these investments often exceed the size ¶ of the cash prize and go on to craft brand new industries.26 a successful ¶ prize contest will generate spillover benefits in publicity and prestige that ¶ overwhelm the value of the prize itself.¶ The prominent, democratic nature of prizes can stimulate a high degree ¶ of competition, often from surprising corners. Contestants range from ¶ companies and academics to entrepreneurs and garage-bound tinkerers. ¶ sponsors are able to tap into these diverse pools of creativity and reserves of ¶ fresh ideas that they may not have been able to previously identify. as bill Joy ¶ of intel famously remarked, “no matter who you are, most of the smartest ¶ people work for someone else.”27 Prizes are a mechanism for widening the ¶ talent pool in pursuit of solutions.¶ Prizes then are marked by boldness and tempered by reality, while avoiding ¶ the prescriptive focus that marks grant programs. no wonder the solutions ¶ are often just as unexpected as those in pursuit of them.

#### The technology from prizes become commercialized- here’s some examples

Hendrix ’14, Director for emerging issues and research at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

Michael, “The Power of Prizes”, http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Power%20of%20Prizes\_0.pdf

Return on investment is a central part of fostering sustained innovation. To¶ that point, Peter Diamandis of XPRIZE estimates that innovation contests¶ return somewhere between 10 and 40 times their initial investment.44¶ Moreover, a recent report on Shell’s Springboard Prize, a contest for finding¶ innovative business ideas in low carbon technology, found that it boasted¶ a return on investment of between 200% and 900%, if return is measured¶ according to the spending and investment by competitors and the expense of¶ managing the competition.45 Still, it remains unclear what causes this variation¶ in return, and there is much work to be done to comprehensively catalogue¶ the costs versus the gains for prizes throughout history. Only 23% of the prize¶ sponsors surveyed by McKinsey annually evaluated the impact of their prizes.46¶ Moreover, we need to ask just how much investment is being undertaken in¶ industries that use prizes beyond what would have been the average.¶ As for whether prizes can kick-start the formation of a new industry, we¶ need only refer to the previously cited example of XPRIZE (though there¶ are others). With the advent of Virgin Galactic after Burt Rutan’s successful¶ space flights, additional firms have moved into the space tourism market to¶ compete for what has gone from being a nonexistent market to a projected¶ $1 billion industry by 2022.47 Private investors have already poured well more¶ than $1.5 billion into the industry48, and Rutan’s company, Scaled Composites,¶ was later sold to aerospace and defense firm Northrop Grumman.49¶ Prizes can also rejuvenate existing markets and industries. The Super Efficient¶ Refrigerator Program (SERP) offered a $30 million prize in 1992 as a golden¶ carrot incentivizing the creation of a highly efficient, CFC-free refrigerator¶ design.50 A year later, Whirlpool was announced as the winner for making a¶ design that was over 25% more efficient than what federal standards required¶ then. Similarly designed refrigerators now make up a third of the U.S. market,¶ and each consumes half as much electricity as typical units did prior to 1993.51¶ While numerous anecdotes are available on the ability of prizes to jump-start¶ industry creation or rejuvenation, there is little research available that offers a¶ systematic account of market creation or the consumer benefit derived from it.¶ U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation | 1 1¶ Similarly, no comprehensive study exists of the spillover effects from prizes.¶ And again, the example of Whirlpool’s successful refrigerator design applies.¶ The company created a system known as ExacTrack to monitor the sales of its¶ efficient refrigerators, in keeping with the SERP program’s requirement that¶ contestants be able to track 25% of the units sold and shipped.¶ The system proved highly successful not just for Whirlpool but also for the¶ utility companies that were partly sponsoring the SERP program, as they now¶ had a mechanism to monitor appliance location and energy usage as well as¶ “provide critical data to identify regional markets, identify behavior in those¶ markets, and identify sales.”52 DuPont also gained in reputation from the¶ successful flight of the Gossamer Albatross; in fact, it went on to back other¶ solar-powered flights due to the success of its original sponsorship.53

#### Others sectors transform goals

Luciano Kay 5/17/2012—Postdoctoral Scholar with the Center for Nanotechnology in Society at University of California Santa Barbara (CNS-UCSB) and a Research Associate with The Georgia Tech Program in Science, Technology and Innovation Policy (STIP), Georgia Tech. “Opportunities and Challenges in the Use of Innovation Prizes as a Government Policy Instrument” supported in part by the U.S. National Science Foundation under Grant Number SBE-0965103

There are at least two areas in which prizes are more likely to present advantages over other incentive mechanisms for S&T policies. Prizes can accelerate the development and/or commercialization of existing technologies that are held back for diverse reasons and help to leverage public money with external ideas, collaborative efforts, and the participation of diverse individuals and organizations (including companies, universities, NGOs and others generally not involved with the prize technologies) and the public. To be effective, however, prizes have to: target speciﬁc technological problems for which the achievement of a solution will be unequivocal, veriﬁable, and visible to the judges, the competitors and the public; address issues that can be tackled with the base technologies that are generally available to all entrants and within a reasonable development lead time given by the prize deadline; and, balance both cash rewards with other non-monetary incentives that are also important for entrants (Kay 2011b, 2011a). Prizes as a policy instrument have additional effects when they serve the goals of S&T policies. The announcement of a prize with a concrete technological target generally induces converging problem-solving efforts of entrants, their partners, and collaborators. But, increasing promotional efforts of the prize sponsor and prize entry requirements that are easier to meet can also attract and allow the participation of individuals and organizations motivated for reasons other than the cash purse or the achievement of the prize challenge. This is because being involved with the prize offers these entrants the opportunity to learn and gain experience with technology development, focus other personal or organizational efforts, or create a commercial enterprise based on the prize technologies, for example. Through this aggregate of problem-solving efforts, other diverse undertakings of the participants, and the emerging network of interactions, entrants can access funding, collabora- tors, partnerships, customers, and other valuable in-kind resources. Over time, prizes with widespread and vibrant participation can even become a self-sustaining community in the ﬁeld (Kay 2011b)

#### Normal means is that prizes get used by all

Hendrix ’14, Director for emerging issues and research at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

Michael, “The Power of Prizes”, http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Power%20of%20Prizes\_0.pdf

Prizes, once available, must be public and open to all. This increases the¶ odds of success and, as The Economist notes, “can inspire solutions that are¶ hard to find in industry.”58 There can be particular criteria for entrance, but¶ only insofar as they do not deny the potential for a relatively large number¶ of participants. Quite¶ often the exclusion¶ is self-enforced due¶ to the risk and costs¶ being borne by the¶ contestants.59¶ Successful prizes clearly¶ specify the terms of¶ the reward and make a¶ credible commitment¶ to follow through.¶ There must be no¶ ambiguity on the prize,¶ as it helps contestants¶ to weigh their chances¶ against the amount¶ of time and money they will spend in pursuit.60 This, in turn, encourages the¶ leveraging of further investment and offers a valuable signal of performance¶ for contestants.61

### 2nc – cp solves investment

#### Prizes lead to 10X the amount of investment the plan does

Kalil ‘6, Expert on technology and innovation policy, and Deputy Director for Policy for the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy

Thomas, “Prizes for Technological Innovation”, Brookings Institute, http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/papers/2006/12/healthcare%20kalil/200612kalil.pdf

4. Under some circumstances, prizes can stimulate¶ philanthropic and private sector investment that¶ is greater than the cash value of the prize. For¶ example, the ten million dollar Ansari X PRIZE¶ was financed by a one million dollar insurance¶ policy, and the X PRIZE Foundation reports¶ that the prize stimulated at least one hundred¶ million dollars in private sector investment¶ (Diamandis 2006). This leverage can come from¶ a number of different sources. Companies may¶ be willing to cosponsor a competition or invest¶ heavily to win it because of the publicity and the¶ potential enhancement of their brand or reputation.¶ Private, corporate dollars that are currently¶ being devoted to sponsorship of America’s Cup¶ or other sports events might shift to support¶ prizes or teams. Wealthy individuals are willing¶ to spend tens of millions of dollars to sponsor¶ competitions or bankroll individual teams simply¶ because they wish to be associated with the¶ potentially historical nature of the prize. Most¶ areas of science and technology are unlikely to¶ attract media, corporate, or philanthropic interest,¶ however.¶ 5. Prizes can attract teams with fresh ideas who¶ would never do business with the federal government¶ because of procurement regulations¶ (e.g., accounting and reporting requirements)¶ that they may find burdensome. This effect is¶ important because, as Baumol (2004, p. 5) notes,¶ “the independent innovator and the independent¶ entrepreneur have tended to account for¶ most of the true, fundamentally novel innovations.¶ In the list of the important innovative¶ breakthroughs of the twentieth century, a substantial¶ number, if not the majority, turn out to¶ be derived from these sources rather than from¶ the laboratories of giant business enterprises.”¶ As examples of small-firm innovations, Baumol¶ cites the airplane, air conditioning, the electronic¶ spreadsheet, FM radio, the high-resolution¶ CAT scanner, and the microprocessor.

### Pharmaceuticals

#### Government programs with the private sector solve disease

Kremer 2K, Senior Fellow at the Brookings Institution

Michael, “A Better Way to Spur Medical Research and Development”, Cato, http://object.cato.org/sites/cato.org/files/serials/files/regulation/2000/7/kremer.pdf

Potential Sponsors Recently, two institutions that traditionally¶ have taken a centralized, statist, approach to r&d¶ have begun exploring market-oriented approaches.¶ World Bank president James Wolfensohn said recently¶ that his institution plans to create a $1 billion loan fund to¶ help countries purchase specified vaccines if and when¶ they are developed (Financial Times, February 2, 2000). It is¶ not clear whether the Wolfensohn proposal will pass¶ through the organization’s internal bureaucracy and win¶ board approval.¶ The U.S. government, which sponsored the ill-fated¶ usaid effort to find a malaria vaccine, is now considering¶ a more market-oriented approach. Private firms, rather than¶ government bureaucracies, would make research decisions,¶ knowing that they would be paid only if they develop effective¶ vaccines. Specifically, the Clinton administration’s budget¶ proposal would match every dollar of qualifying vaccine¶ sales with a dollar of tax credit, effectively doubling the¶ incentive to develop vaccines for neglected diseases. A qualifying¶ vaccine would have to attack an infectious disease that¶ kills at least one million people a year and would have to be¶ approved by the fda. To qualify for the tax credit, sales¶ would have to be made to approved nonprofit organizations¶ or international institutions. The program’s matching¶ feature could encourage the funding of vaccine purchases by¶ nonprofit organizations, international institutions, and the¶ governments of developing countries. The cost of the program¶ would be capped at $1 billion and it would run from¶ 2002 through 2010, but it could be extended for 10 years if¶ no vaccine has been developed in that time.¶ Private foundations could also play a major role in creating¶ markets for new vaccines. Because foundations have¶ more continuity of leadership, they can more easily make¶ credible commitments to purchase new vaccines. (The¶ Gates Foundation, for example, has $22 billion in assets; one¶ of its main priorities is to provide vaccines for developing¶ countries.) U.S. law requires private foundations to spend¶ at least 5 percent of their assets annually. A U.S. foundation¶ could spend 5 percent of its assets annually on grants to¶ expand the use of existing vaccines and to fund vaccine¶ research, while using some of its principal to back a pledge¶ to purchase and distribute effective new vaccines, if and¶ when they are developed.¶ CONCLUSION¶ the united states currently supports r&d through¶ the granting of patents and government-funded research.¶ It is time to consider supplementing these mechanisms. In¶ particular, programs to help create markets for malaria,¶ tuberculosis, and aids vaccines could harness the resources¶ and expertise of the private sector in the fight against the¶ world’s worst infectious diseases while avoiding the inefficiencies¶ associated with many government programs.¶ Commitments to buy large quantities of vaccines could¶ lead to the development and delivery of effective vaccines at¶ low cost, saving millions of lives. Taxpayers would pay nothing¶ unless and until those vaccines have been developed.

### Innovation/STEM

#### Prizes solve- most effective, ensure best performance, and incentivize innovation

Hendrix 1-14-14, Director of Emerging Issues & Research U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

Michael, “The Power of Prizes”, U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation, http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/library/2014/01/power-prizes

Prizes have existed since the dawn of man. As modern civilization grew, they become a tool for incentivizing progress. Yet, it was only in the past few centuries that we came to view prizes as some of the most effective—and overlooked—tools for incentivizing breakthrough solutions.¶ Prizes are wrapped up in a quest for prosperity and economic growth, which in turn depends on the development of new ways of working, living, and thinking—in short, innovation. We need ways to incorporate more market gain into the personal incentive to innovate. Intellectual property does so by rewarding innovators with ownership of their work and a share of its value over time. Prizes also act as incentives by bringing forward a share of future gains from innovation into the present while releasing ownership of the work to the public.¶ What sets prizes apart is that they are applied to opportunities, both large and small, where a breakthrough seems within reach with just the right “kick.” By blending public aims with private initiative, prizes are able to “tap a primitive urge to win, and to be seen winning,” in order to make great things happen.1¶ ¶ By better understanding innovation prizes, we will begin to see why they may be more needed now than ever before.¶ WHAT’S THE HISTORY OF PRIZES?¶ ¶ Homer’s Illiad sets out one of the first descriptions of prizes in history. We see Achilles atop a funeral pyre, calling on his men to compete in honor of Patroclus, whose death he would glorify through sport. He proclaimed prizes of gold and horses, and “once Achilles finished speaking, swift charioteers rushed into action,” for they were “keen to win.” ¶ We may be long past the time of Greek myth, but in more modern history, we have seen prizes spur action in surprising ways, none more so than with the great European contests of the 18th and 19th centuries. Over the course of the 18th century alone, prizes funded more than twice as many scientific efforts than were paid for by grants.2 And things were just getting started. William Masters and Benoit Delbecq write that “the early 20th century saw an even greater burst of prizes for breakthroughs in transportation and civil aviation, financed by newspapers and others.”3¶ Yet, these gains were short lived. A rising tide of government largesse in the wake of the Second World War soon swamped prize funding and relegated it to obscurity. Moreover, increasing amounts of research money were going to large-scale projects in the national security sphere that had little need for the publicity that prizes brought. It was not until the late 1970s that private funding of research and development (R&D) began to break away and rise above the levels of federal support.4¶ By the 2000s, large amounts of private capital were available to a growing range of innovative endeavors, proving to be a fertile ground for the further development of XPRIZE and others. Foundations were established to channel research funds toward social goods. Moreover, governments were searching for new ways to fund applied research beyond the simple grant-making framework. ¶ Prizes are an idea whose time has come again.¶ WHAT ARE PRIZES, EXACTLY?¶ ¶ Prizes encourage innovative activity in pursuit of relevant problems. Sponsors articulate the challenge and the terms of success, and the innovator assumes the cost and risks while enjoying relative freedom in finding a solution. What matters most of all is that anyone can compete and win—the only thing that matters is performance.¶ Why compete? The biggest lesson from across centuries of contests is that people strive for attention as much as they do for the money. If it weren’t for both non-monetary and monetary incentives working in union, we wouldn’t see, for instance, the contestants of XPRIZE spending more than ten times the sum of the prize purse in order to claim it.5 Prize monies mostly serve to get innovators to the point of action—to meet their “natural investment threshold.”6¶ The democratic nature of prizes can stimulate a high degree of competition, often from surprising corners. Contestants range from companies and academics to entrepreneurs and garage-bound tinkerers. Sponsors are able to tap into these diverse pools of creativity and reserves of fresh ideas that they may not have been able to previously identify. As Bill Joy of Intel famously remarked, “No matter who you are, most of the smartest people work for someone else.”7¶ ¶ Prizes then are marked by boldness and tempered by reality, while avoiding the prescriptive focus that marks grant programs.8 No wonder the solutions are often just as unexpected as those in pursuit of them.9¶ ¶ ARE PRIZES SUCCESSFUL?¶ ¶ Prizes infuse the spirit of competition into efforts bent on addressing market failures and adding to public knowledge. Problems that were once ignored are given new life within a market-driven framework. Or consider the spillover effects alone. The human-powered Gossamer Albatross, which won the Kremer Prize in 1979 for its flight across the English Channel, helped demonstrate and lead to the adoption of Dupont’s Kevlar composite and many other now-vital synthetic products.10¶ A recent study offers the most substantive case for prizes leading to innovation. It reviews nearly 2,000 prizes awarded by the Royal Agricultural Society of England (RASE) over a one-hundred-year period, from 1839 to 1939.11 Those who won the prizes were much more likely to receive and renew patents, and doubling the prize purse led to upwards of a 33% increase in patented innovations. Even those who lost their contests cumulatively received more than 13,000 patents. As one British journal remarked in 1867 about the RASE prizes, “It is indisputable that these competitive trials have done, and are doing, much to raise agricultural engineering to the highest standards of efficiency and economy.”12¶ A more recent study of the crowdsourcing platform Innocentive found that its community of problem-solvers succeeded in winning 30% of the prizes on offer. These were hundreds of problems that quite often had stymied the research labs of leading companies and nonprofits.13 According to Innocentive, roughly 85% of the 1,700 external-facing challenges that it measured were successful, with credit going to their methodology and approach.14WHAT’S THE MARKET?¶ ¶ The market for innovation prizes has grown dramatically over the past decade. Yet, it is surprisingly difficult to know for certain just how large the space is.¶ McKinsey’s 2009 report on philanthropic prizes boasts the most accurate (if not the most up-to-date) data yet. According to the consultancy, the current prize sector is sized somewhere between $1 billion and $2 billion, with cumulative prize pursues having tripled during the 2000s to $375 million.15 Viewed over the span of the past four decades, prizes have enjoyed a 15-fold growth in value—much of these funds are from the private sector.¶ Since the time of McKinsey’s report, there has been a massive rise in the government use of prizes, particularly with the U.S. Congress’s passage of the America COMPETES Reauthorization Act in 2009.16 Whereas in previous years only NASA and the Department of Defense enjoyed the authority to commission and implement prizes, now every federal agency can assume the lead role in sponsoring a prize.17¶ While the public sector has moved more energetically into the prize space, traditional approaches toward incentivizing innovation have remained. Prizes continue to function as a compliment to other funding mechanisms, such as grants, and incentive structures, such as patents.¶ WHAT’S NEXT?¶ Much of the low-hanging fruit of innovation has already been plucked, particularly for prizes. The challenges that remain fall into two categories: the complex problems requiring large, cross-disciplinary teams, and those pushing for discrete, small-scale advances that are primed for crowdsourced solutions.¶ No matter the realm in which prizes are applied in the years to come, the most remarkable advance may well be how normal or obscure they become. That may pose challenges for creating publicity, but it will do wonders for establishing prizes within an institutional framework for spurring innovation.¶ We will likely see a greater trend in the outsourcing of research and development as companies look to balance scarce resources with greater needs for innovation. Similarly, we will see more reasons for the growth in public-private partnerships as agencies attempt to leverage greater investment and outsource key activities.¶ It is in the private sector where we will see a diverse range of prize structures and applications arise. There’s a much wider variety of applications and actors in the private marketplace, all while the increasing scope of technological gain increases the reward from innovation.¶ SO WHAT?¶ ¶ Prizes have long been more potential than reality. With a well-informed application to the most pressing challenges in innovation, prizes may soon become a more common way to incentivize our most inquiring minds. What makes prizes so compelling today is that while we live on the innovation frontier with vast possibilities ahead, all we clearly see is a present humbled by the past. Where moon shots once lit up our skies, we’re left gazing down at our smartphone’s soft glow. Prizes open the imagination to what is unseen.

### Modeling

#### Prizes solve modeling- here’s the data

Hendrix ’14, Director for emerging issues and research at the U.S. Chamber of Commerce Foundation

Michael, “The Power of Prizes”, http://www.uschamberfoundation.org/sites/default/files/Power%20of%20Prizes\_0.pdf

Governments in other countries are getting in on the act, including Canada’s¶ nearly $100 million prize for agricultural innovations and the United Kingdom’s¶ $1.5 million Big Green Challenge for reducing carbon emissions.80 The¶ European Commission has developed a massive €80 billion research and¶ innovation funding program known as Horizon 2020, in which prizes will play¶ a significant role. The Scottish government created the annual Saltire Prize¶ in 2007, awarding millions of Scottish pounds every year for a wide range of¶ business and technological innovations; in fact, the fund’s design is modeled¶ after the XPRIZE.81 And beginning in 2004, the European Satellite Navigation¶ Competition has rewarded more than 170 teams out of more than 3,500¶ registrants for its innovative ideas to improve global satellite navigation¶ systems.82 Even on a cross-national scale, the Gates Foundation’s five-nation¶ strong, $1.5 billion advance market commitment (AMC) for pneumococcal¶ vaccines—where the sponsors agree to subsidize the first large orders—has¶ accelerated vaccine production and rollout since its announcement in 2007.83, 84¶ Many more could be mentioned, especially from across Asia, but the point¶ remains that prizes are growing well outside the borders of the United States.

### Solves ptx

#### The COMPETES act has generated bipartisan support for prize programs

Jeffrey L. Furman Boston University & NBER 21 June 2012 paper prepared for the NBER Innovation Policy & the Economy Workshop Washington, DC April 2012 “The America COMPETES Acts: The Future of U.S. Physical Science & Engineering Research?—Abstract”

The America COMPETES legislation, including the initial America COMPETES Act of 2007 (ACA 2007) and America COMPETES Reauthorization Act of 2010 (ACA 2010), was one of the prominent bipartisan legislative achievements of the past decade and was seen as having the potential to be the most notable science and innovation policy initiative of the new millennium. The aims of the COMPETES Acts were to substantially increase the extent of Federal funding for physical science and engineering research in the United States and to improve the country’s research infrastructure and STEM capabilities in these areas. This paper contributes to early evaluation of the America COMPETES Acts (ACA) by providing an overview of the history and goals of these Acts and by tracking the subsequent Federal funding and implementation of the associated ACA programs. The analysis documents that the tangible outputs of the COMPETES Acts are modest relative to the expectations expressed at the time of each act’s signing. Indeed, a substantial fraction of the funds authorized by the 2007 and 2010 Acts was not appropriated by Congress and many of the programs specified by those acts have either failed to materialize or have done so at funding levels much lower than those initially authorized by Congress.  A number of notable programs and initiatives have, however, been created with the support of the ACA (including the Advanced Research Projects Agency – Energy and the federal prize authority) and some of the agencies affected have been able to implement programs consistent with the spirit of the Acts, even in face of funding limitations. In addition, a tenuous but consistent bipartisan consensus that may have been energized by the COMPETES legislation has enabled such programs to avoid the spending cuts experienced by many non-defense-related federal programs.

#### Avoids politics- The COMPETES Act energized a bipartisan consensus that separates prize programs from other programs- it was seen as having the potential to be the biggest innovation policy of the millennium- that’s Furman

#### Privatization avoids politics – perceived as cheaper

Primack 11 – Analyst @ Fortune

(Dan, “Why Obama can't save infrastructure,” http://fortune.com/2011/02/17/why-obama-cant-save-infrastructure/)//BB

At the same time, private investment firms are clamoring to fill the void.¶ Nearly $80 billion has been raised by U.S.-based private equity infrastructure funds since 2003, and another $30 billion currently is being raised to focus on North American projects, according to market research firm Preqin. Each of one those dollars would be leveraged with bank debt, and none of that includes the billions more available from public pension systems and foreign infrastructure companies.¶ For example, Highstar Capital last year signed a 50-year lease and concession agreement to operate the Port of Baltimore’s Seagirt Marine Terminal. The prior year, private equity firm The Carlyle Group signed a 35-year lease to redevelop, operate and maintain Connecticut’s 23 highway service areas. And in 2005, an Australian and Spanish company teamed up to lease The Chicago Skyway for $1.83 billion. That same tandem later acquired rights to the Indiana toll road.¶ But those are exceptions to the America’s transportation infrastructure rule, which says that everything should be government-owned and operated. It’s a rule grounded in fears that private investors will put profits over safety, plus a hefty dose of inertia.¶ Well, it’s time for us to get over it.¶ First, we’ve already established that our current system isn’t working. Again, $2.2 trillion in infrastructure needs. And if you haven’t seen a crumbling or rusted out bridge somewhere, then you haven’t been looking.¶ Second, it’s counter-intuitive to think that a private investment firm wouldn’t do everything in its power to make its transportation assets safe and efficient. Toll roads, airports and the like are volume businesses. One giant accident, and the return on investment could be irreparably harmed. This isn’t to say that all of these projects will be successful — there have been fiascos, like with Chicago’s parking system — but this is no longer a choice between private and public funding. It’s a choice between private funding and woefully insufficient funding.¶ Third, local governments have the ability to structure these leases any way they see fit. For example, the Chicago Skyway deal includes an annual engineering checkup, and the private owners are obligated to make any recommended repairs. This also goes for pricing. In a failed privatization deal for the Pennsylvania Turnpike, prospective buyers agreed to certain parameters on future toll increases.¶ Most importantly, infrastructure privatization provides a solution to the current standoff between Obama and House Republicans — by providing for investment to repair and maintain existing infrastructure, without requiring tax increases or enabling parochial pork.

## 1nr

### UQ Wall

#### GOP will win the senate and is quote “well positioned to take control of the chamber” but its close, they have the turnout edge and the decision to sue Obama has motivated the GOP base—turnout is key, that’s Walsh.

#### GOP holds the edge in midterm elections– 2 biggest election models proves

Cillizza 8/27/14 (Chris, Political Reporter for the Washington Post, “All of the election models are starting to converge. And they are all pointing to a Republican Senate.”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/08/27/all-of-the-election-models-are-starting-to-converge-and-they-are-all-pointing-to-a-republican-senate/>, accessed 8/28/14, BCG)

Over the past few days, two of three big election models -- the Post's and the New York Times' -- have updated their predictions about the likelihood of Republicans taking the Senate majority in 69 days. And, the predictions are remarkably similar.¶ First, the Post's Election Lab, run by George Washington University professor John Sides, gives Republicans a 58 percent chance of winning the six seats they need to be in the majority come 2015. Writes Sides: "The Republicans are very likely to control at least 48 seats after the elections, including Georgia. With just three seats out of the [six] discussed above, they would take control of the Senate. That’s why we still see them as having a better than 50:50 chance to do it."¶ Leo, the New York Times' Senate model, shows Republicans with a 67 percent chance of taking the majority. Writes the Upshot's Josh Katz:

#### Early republican lead in key states give the edge to the GOP

Cillizza 8/11/14 (Chris, Political Reporter for the Washington Post, “Republicans chances of winning Senate majority continue to brighten”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/blogs/the-fix/wp/2014/08/11/republicans-chances-of-winning-senate-majority-continue-to-brighten/>, accessed 8/29/14, BCG)

These past seven days typified the fates of the two parties this election cycle. Democrats have been hit by retirements in tough states — Montana, West Virginia, South Dakota and, to a lesser extent, Iowa — and Republicans haven’t nominated the sort of extreme candidates who lack broader appeal in a general election.¶ Those realities — along with a national playing field in which a handful of incumbent Democrats are defending Republican-leaning seats in places where President Obama is deeply unpopular — have made a GOP takeover a better-than-50/50 proposition.

#### We control momentum—it’s *sweeping* for the GOP

Murphy 7/7/14 (Bill Murphy | July 07, 2014, staff writer, Momentum: Politico Predicts A Republican Senate Majorityhttp://www.nrsc.org/blog/politico-predicts-a-republican-senate-majority)-AG

The forecast is sunny for the GOP. Yesterday, Politico predicted a Republican Senate Majority: With four months until Election Day, Republicans are as close to winning the Senate as they’ve been since losing it in 2006. That is quite the opposite from what the pundits were predicting a year ago. Outside of the states Romney carried in 2012, Republican chances were basically written off. Now Republican momentum is sweeping into Colorado where Cory Gardner is giving Mark Udall fits in Colorado. In Michigan, Terri Lynn Land's has polled ahead of Democrat Gary Peters in several polls. And even in blue states like Minnesota, Mike McFadden is making Democrats sweat. It's because of the Republicans impressive candidates: They’ve landed top recruits to take on first-term senators in New Hampshire and Colorado, nominated credible female candidates in open-seat contests in Michigan and Iowa, protected all of their incumbents from tea party challenges and thwarted more conservative candidates that could have hurt the GOP’s chances in states like North Carolina and Georgia. Obamacare's terrible approval numbers -- which all of the Democrats voted for -- has only added to the GOP's prospects in November. It's almost as if President Obama has given up on keeping the Senate. His unilateral regulations on CO2 cause the most harm in states most likely to flip. Republicans are taking advantage of the president's failures by expanding the electoral map. Montana, South Dakota, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Arkansas have long looked like wins for the GOP, but a new crop of states is coming into play. Democrats are on defense. Republicans have an opportunity to score big in the fall.

#### Try or die—absent new wins, Obama will drag down the Democrats

Cilizza 7/13 – Political analyst for the Washington Post (Chris, “What’s the American political landscape looking like?”, <http://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/whats-the-american-political-landscape-looking-like/2014/07/13/ab025ca2-0a9f-11e4-b8e5-d0de80767fc2_story.html>, HW)

3. Obama is likely to be a drag on his party this fall. Nothing is set in stone, but Obama’s job-approval numbers — and his numbers specifically on handling the economy — are in the low to mid-40s. What history tells us is that a president’s approval numbers are among a handful of factors that correlate rather closely to the fate of his party in a midterm election. Since 1944, presidents with approval ratings lower than 50 percent have seen their party lose an average of 36 House seats, according to data from Gallup. Obama’s low numbers nationally are even more of a problem when it comes to Democratic efforts to retain control of the Senate; many of the battleground states — Louisiana, Arkansas, Alaska and North Carolina — are even less inclined to approve of how he is handling his job than the nation as a whole.

#### They conceded it’s a *turnout* election, not a swing-voters election—the GOP has an overwhelming turnout edge—outweighs snapshot Democratic optimism

Tomasky, 14—MA in PoliSci @ NYU, lifelong journalist/author, special Newsweek correspondent

Michael, “Here’s What Happens When the GOP Takes Over the Senate,” 4-30, The Daily Beast, <http://www.thedailybeast.com/articles/2014/04/30/here-s-what-happens-when-the-gop-takes-over-the-senate.html> --BR

Democrats have been feeling a wee bit better lately about this November. The Affordable Care Act is looking stronger. Southern incumbents like Mark Pryor and Mary Landrieu have seen some friendlier poll numbers. But the fact remains that the GOP has a decent to good shot at taking the Senate this fall. A brand new Washington Post/ABC poll splashed a little cold water across Democratic faces. It finds Obama’s approval at an all-time low in Post polls. More ominously, Republican respondents said they were planning on voting in far greater numbers than did Democrats. So this is a reality Democrats and liberals, like it or not, have to think about.

#### Republicans will win the Senate back now—Democratic candidates can’t keep up

Hohmann 7/6/14(By JAMES HOHMANN, political correspondent, Politico, 7/6/14 http://www.politico.com/story/2014/07/2014-senate-elections-republicans-108584.html#ixzz37VrZCQGM)-AG

With four months until Election Day, Republicans are as close to winning the Senate as they’ve been since losing it in 2006. Six months ago, the GOP path to the majority was narrower: Republicans essentially had to sweep seven races in states Barack Obama lost in 2012 but where Democrats currently hold seats. Unlikely, in other words. Now Republicans have more options. They’ve landed top recruits to take on first-term senators in New Hampshire and Colorado, nominated credible female candidates in open-seat contests in Michigan and Iowa, protected all of their incumbents from tea party challenges and thwarted more conservative candidates that could have hurt the GOP’s chances in states like North Carolina and Georgia. With the general election field all but set, Republicans are looking to turn the midterms into a national referendum on Obama. Democrats want the focus to be squarely on the candidates, and they’re spending the typically quiet summer months trying to define Republican hopefuls as unlikeable and extreme. Obama’s approval rating continues to hover around his all-time lows, especially in the GOP-leaning states that will decide control of the upper chamber. Obamacare is not as toxic now as during the disastrous HealthCare.gov rollout, but it undeniably remains a drag on Democrats. The jury is still out on the economy: The Commerce Department announced a 2.9 percent decline in first-quarter gross domestic product late last month, but then the Labor Department reported last week that the unemployment rate in June had dropped to 6.1 percent. Republicans are expected to pick up seats in South Dakota, West Virginia and Montana, where longtime Democratic incumbents are retiring or have already resigned. From there, they need to net three more seats to take control of the chamber. Fifty-five senators currently caucus with Democrats, 45 with Republicans.

### Link Wall - enviro

#### **The plan delivers a massive win for the Democrats—our Gonzalez evidence says the plan gives the Democratic base a reason to turn out, particularly women, youth, Latino and African-American voters. Our Calizza evidence from this month cites empirical data proving that the only scenario for the Democrats winning back the Senate is reversing diversity drop-off**

#### Environmental policies are a wedge issue that drives up Democratic turnout among diverse voters that would otherwise stay home

Myers 5/22 – Freelance Journalist

(Drew, “REPORTERS NOTEBOOK: GOLIATH V GOLIATH MATCH-UP AS ‘GREEN’ BILLIONAIRE TAKES ON THE KOCH BROTHERS”, <http://dmnewsi.com/2014/05/22/reporters-notebook-goliath-v-goliath-match-up-as-green-billionaire-takes-on-the-koch-brothers/>, HW)

GOP candidates in the NextGen cross hairs — Scott in Florida, Terri Lynn Land in Michigan, Scott Brown in New Hampshire and Cory Gardner in Colorado — hew closely to the “Republican troglodyte brand,” Lehane argued. “They are anti-immigrant, anti-women, anti-science,” he said. “It’s a tough brand to win elections around.” The group said that climate can be successfully used as a wedge issue — Lehane framed it as a moral clash between “right and wrong” — to boost turnout among Democratic voting groups that tend not to show up in midterm election years, specifically young voters, Hispanics and African-Americans. As in the Virginia governor’s race last year — when Steyer spent nearly $8 million on a campaign to disqualify GOP nominee Ken Cuccinelli with a combination of TV, mail and field operations — the efforts will extend beyond the TV airwaves and include what they call “nano-targeting” to tailor messaging to discrete voting groups. “We are not some super PAC that’s going to come in, throw up some ads and leave,” Lehane said. “You can come into these states and really run a total campaign.”

#### Thumpers and link defense don’t take out our link—multiple polls prove environmental policy is the key determining factor in minority turnout

Abdullah 10 – Reporter for New America Media

(Khalil, “Latinos, African Americans Willing to Pay More to Slow Climate Change”, <http://newamericamedia.org/2010/04/latinos-african-americans-willing-to-pay-more-to-slow-climate-change.php>, HW)

Latino and African-American communities in the United States increasingly share similar views on the negative impact of climate change and call for government support for a green economy, according to two recently released polls. Polls say these results may be factors determining which candidates get these ethnic votes in the mid-term November elections. Among Nevada’s Latinos, for example, 93 percent of Republicans said, “take action now” on climate change, a higher rate even than the state’s Latino independents (89 percent) and Democrats (88 percent). In Florida, 80 percent of Latino voters said the issue of climate change would affect their decision of who to vote for in the U.S. Senate race. In Nevada and Colorado, 67 and 58 percent, respectively, made the same assertion. The Latino poll was conducted by the National Latino Coalition on Climate Change (NLCCC) on the views of Latino voters in Colorado, Florida, and Nevada; the poll on African-American voters in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and South Carolina was conducted by the Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies. While jobs and the economy are still leading concerns among the two ethnic groups, when asked what came closest to their view about whether “efforts to reduce global warming by switching to clean energy … will create new American jobs, “ 64 percent of Colorado’s Latino voters, 66 percent of Florida’s, and 72 percent of Nevada’s agreed. David Bositis, the Joint Center’s veteran pollster on African-American voting patterns, said that while the economy is still the top issue for black voters, climate change is in importance. Bositis said the African Americans surveyed - in Arkansas, Indiana, Missouri, and South Carolina -- tend to be more conservative and less financially well off than their counterparts in more affluent states. As a result, Bositis said the most important finding was the stated willingness to pay higher electric utility bills if electricity generators had to charge more for cleaner but more expensive fuels or technologies that would ameliorate global warming. Those with higher incomes were willing to pay more, yet the data were remarkably strong even among low-income African Americans surveyed. “Solid majorities in all four states - between 55 percent in South Carolina and 64 percent in Indiana - are willing to pay an additional ten dollars a month to fight global warming,” he said. The survey of Latinos also showed their willingness to pay more. Latinos also showed a heightened awareness linking droughts and extreme weather events with climate change. Frank Stewart, a member of the Joint Center’s Commission to Engage African Americans on Climate Change and president of the American Association of Blacks in Energy, an organization representing 1,800 senior executives in the energy business, said the debate among African American and Latino constituencies about whether climate change is real is all but over. “We’re no longer looking at the science,” Stewart said. At issue, he argued, is for communities to become more knowledgeable about climate change in order to make informed decisions about the transformations that will be necessary in the energy field. The economic cost of facing climate change is not the sole rationale for demanding immediate action. “There is a very, very clear link between our climate and our health,” said Dr. George Benjamin, executive director, American Public Health Commission and also a member of the Joint Center’s Commission. He said the effects of climate change can have disproportionate adverse health consequences for African Americans and Latinos who have higher rates of asthma and other medical conditions. Benjamin also cited the link between income status and health, mentioning a 1995 Chicago heat wave that left 600 people dead. Many of the dead were low-income African-American elderly, some of whom did not turn on their air conditioning for fear of being unable to pay a higher bill. Today, Benjamin said 22 percent of Latinos live below the poverty level. Four percent don’t have health insurance, making them and other low-income Americans less able to financially deal with the effects of toxic ecologies that can lead to “tragedy happening in our urban settings.” While financial reform proposals have ascended to the media limelight since the passage of healthcare reform legislation, the on-going Congressional debate over the best mechanisms -- like cap and trade -- to lower carbon emissions, may yet affect November’s races. Rafael Fantauzzi, vice-chair of NLCC and president of the National Puerto Rican Coalition, Inc., said pollsters of the Latino voters already knew that immigration was critically important to that community in determining support for November’s political candidates, so views on that topic were not sought. However, he said the intersection of today’s leading issues can play out at the ballot box. For instance, he said that 48.5 percent of Puerto Ricans are living below the poverty line and, due to the lack of jobs on the island, many are migrating to Florida, New York, Connecticut, or Illinois. Because they are American citizens, they can vote in those states, an impact he said was already seen in the 2008 election when Puerto Rican voters in and around Orlando tipped Florida for President Barack Obama. “Latinos are involved in every issue that affects them,” Fantauzzi said, and, on climate change, “they definitely want to see something done.”

#### Critical demographics put environmental issues as a top concern – the link only goes one way because they trust the Dems more to deal with it

Zogby 12 – Political analyst for Forbes

(John, “After Sandy, Poll Shows GOP Faces Growing Environmental Divide with Voters”, <http://www.forbes.com/sites/johnzogby/2012/11/14/after-sandy-poll-shows-gop-faces-growing-environmental-divide-with-voters/>, HW)

Superstorm Sandy is fueling concerns about climate change and how it’s inflating the costs and risks of extreme weather, according to a new post-election poll from Zogby Analytics. The poll shows key voting groups in the 2012 election – Hispanics, women, young voters – are among those most concerned with confronting climate change now and protecting America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources. These results show the dramatic impact 2012′s extreme weather has had across party lines, with half of Republicans, 73 percent of independents and 82 percent of Democrats saying they’re worried about the growing cost and risks of extreme weather disasters fueled by climate change. It’s a major change from our December 2009 poll, which showed two-thirds of Republicans and nearly half of political independents saying they were ‘not at all concerned’ about global climate change and global warming. The political climate has shifted and members of Congress need to catch up with their constituents. Among the poll’s findings: Two-thirds of voters (65 percent) say elected officials should take steps now to reduce the impact of climate change on future generations, while just 27 percent say we should wait for more evidence. A strong majority (57 percent) says climate change is adding to the severity of recent extreme weather such as Superstorm Sandy and the summer droughts. Concern is even deeper among key demographics, with 75 percent of Hispanics, 67 percent of African Americans, 65 percent of women, and 65 percent of voters 25-34 agreeing that climate change is fueling America’s extreme weather. Seven in ten voters (69 percent) are greatly or somewhat worried about the growing cost and risks of extreme weather disasters fueled by climate change. Six in ten (58 percent) of Tea Party sympathizers are greatly or somewhat worried, showing a connection between climate action and fiscal responsibility. Three times as many voters say the government is doing too little to protect America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources (44 percent) as say it’s doing too much (14 percent). Asked to pick the highest priority to help solve America’s energy challenges, twice as many voters select renewable energy like wind and solar power (38 percent) than any other choice. Independents favor wind and solar over fossil fuels by a 4-to-1 margin – 48 percent pick renewable energy while just 12 percent select the Keystone XL tar sands pipeline and only 11 percent prioritize more oil and gas drilling on America’s public lands. Two thirds of voters (67 percent) say they’re very or somewhat concerned that political donations by oil, gas and coal industries are influencing politicians in Washington to approve policies that benefit their corporations. The oil and gas industry alone made $59 million in political contributions in the 2012 election cycle and has spent another $104 million on lobbying so far in 2012, according to the Center for Responsive Politics. When asked which political party they trust more to protect America’s air, water, wildlife and other natural resources, twice as many voters choose Democrats (44 percent) than pick Republicans (24 percent). But independents are up for grabs, with 54 percent answering neither/not sure.

#### Steyer will throw his monetary influence behind climate voting motivation

Bartels 5/22 – Political Analyst for the Denver Post

(Lynn, “Climate change guru Tom Steyer donates big bucks to help Mark Udall”, <http://www.denverpost.com/news/ci_25817273/climate-change-guru-tom-steyer-donates-big-bucks>, HW)

Steyer, a retired hedge fund manager from California billed as a "green billionaire," founded NextGen Climate Action. He said Thursday he is donating $50 million to the super PAC to target seven Democrat races nationwide, including Udall's, and the group is expected to raise at least another $50 million. "NextGen Climate will use climate as a wedge issue, both to motivate voter turnout with the rising electorate and to demonstrate that being anti-science will hurt our opponents among persuadable voters," Steyer's group said in a news release.