# 1st off

**Interp: The aff must disclose the plan text and the advantage 30 minutes before round**

**Violation:**

**They didn’t, they didn’t even put their contact info on the wiki**

**1] Evidence Ethics – Disclosure is the only way to verify that cards aren’t miscut or highlighted or bracketed unethically. That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat**

**2] Depth of clash – allows debaters to have specific researched objections to the 1AC evidence – that leads to better ev comparison – o/ws because thinking on your feet is non-unique; we still have to do that for responses and CX**

**3] Reciprocity – they get infinite pre-round prep to write the 1AC and we get none to research it**

**4] Education – a) their model incentivizes terrible “one-and-done” affs that are intellectually bankrupt and decrease education – proves they just want the ballot; b) o/ws claims of innovation because innovation is only valuable if the ideas are valuable.**

**5] trigger warnings- exempt**

**Its jv ld we are no longer novices, better norms should be happening**

**Voters are education – it’s why schools fund debate – and fairness – that’s a threshold issue because otherwise you have no obligation to fairly evaluate their arguments**

**Paradigm issues**

**DTD**

**1] Actual abuse - I had to alter my strat to run theory**

**2] Deters future abuse – norm-setting**

**3] DTA is DTD – it’s the 1AC**

**4] At minimum if we’re winning any part of the shell they can’t weigh case; A] lack of preround prep means their truth claims are untested which you should presume them false; B] 1AR extensions look stronger than they really are b/c they kept me from cutting specific evidence to challenge their link chain – that’s a reason why new affs are bad, not why the 1AC is true –no “try or die” 2AR**

#### Competing interps: Reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm.

#### No RVIs – a] illogical, you don’t win for proving that you meet the burden of being fair, logic outweighs since it’s a prerequisite for evaluating any other argument, b] RVIs incentivize baiting theory and prepping it out which leads to maximally abusive practices.

# 2nd off

**WTO consensus on fishing subsidies likely now but requires negotiations- consensus is key to solving overfishing- the brink is now.**

**Koop 21** [Fermin; Argentine journalist specializing in the environment with experience across diverse publications; “WTO Inches Towards a Deal to End Harmful Fishing Subsidies,” Maritime-Executive; 7/30/21;<https://www.maritime-executive.com/editorials/wto-inches-towards-a-deal-to-end-harmful-fishing-subsidies>] Justin

After more than 20 years of negotiations, the World Trade Organization (WTO) has **moved a step closer to an agreement on ending harmful fishing subsidies**. The deal would set **new rules for the global fishing industry and limit government funding that contributes to unsustainable fishing** and the **depletion of global fish stocks**. In a meeting with government ministers and heads of national delegations, WTO members vowed to finish the **negotiations before the WTO’s Twelfth Ministerial Conference (MC12) in late November**, and to empower their delegations in **Geneva to do so**. Members also said the negotiating text currently on the table can be used as the basis to strike a **final agreement**. “It’s been a successful day,” WTO chief Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala told **reporters** at the close of the meeting. “In 20 years of negotiations, this is the closest we have ever come towards reaching an outcome – a high-quality outcome that would contribute to building a sustainable blue economy. I feel new hope.” The talks’ chair, Santiago Wills, was also upbeat: “I believe that the answers today have given us the ingredients to reach a successful conclusion. Members now want to move to text-based negotiations. Twenty years has been long enough. If we continue [negotiating] for another 20 years, there won’t be any fish left.” Negotiators at the WTO had been tasked with eliminating subsidies for illegal, unreported and unregulated (IUU) fishing and prohibiting certain subsidies that contribute to overcapacity and overfishing. Talks have been going on since 2001 but differences between governments have hindered progress. 2020 had been set as a deadline to strike an agreement, but talks were delayed due to Covid-19 restrictions and the US presidential elections. A deadline was then set for this July, which was again missed. Now, Okonjo-Iweala, appointed as head of the WTO in March, aims to reach an **agreement** by year-end in what will be a key test for the **organization’s credibility, with members deadlocked on other fronts**. “In international **negotiations of this type only two things are relevant**. The nitty-gritty to make sure everybody is on the same page, and the spirit that prevails. If Ngozi and Wills reflected correctly what happened in the meeting, we can say there’s cautious optimism over an agreement,” Remi Parmentier, director of environmental consultancy The Varda Group, told China Dialogue Ocean. A potential agreement At the meeting, ministers discussed an **eight-page draft agreement, which lists a range of subsidy bans and some conditions for exemptions for poorer countries, all of which are yet to be finalised**. While some delegations like the EU were positive, several ministers expressed reservations over the content of the text. “Clearly, it will lead to capacity constraints for developing countries, while advanced nations will continue to grant subsidies,” Indian trade minister Piyush Goyal said at the meeting, regarding one part of the text. Pakistan described the draft as “regressive and unbalanced,” while the African coalition said “significant gaps” remain. Countries’ differences were acknowledged by Ngozi and Wills at the meeting. Nevertheless, they remain optimistic and said the issues would be resolved once countries move into text-based negotiations. The agreement on fishing subsidies will require a consensus among all member states, according to WTO rules. The draft deal essentially proposes three categories of prohibited subsidies; those that support IUU fishing, affect overfished stocks, or lead to overcapacity and overfishing. While this may sound simple, the political, economic and cultural complexities represent real challenges. One of the main issues has been the demand for developing countries and the poorest nations to receive so-called special and differential treatment. While this is widely accepted for the poorest countries, demands from self-identified developing countries to be exempt from subsidy constraints has proven to be difficult to accept. Many of the major fishing nations are considered developing countries by the WTO, including China, which has one of the world’s biggest fishing fleets. China’s minister of commerce, Wang Wentao, expressed China’s “support for the conclusion of [fishing subsidies] negotiations before the end of MC12.” Speaking at the meeting on 15 July, Wang stressed that concluding the negotiations would represent a major contribution from the WTO to the United Nations’ 2030 Sustainable Development Goals. “As a developing country and a major fishing power, China will take on obligations commensurate with our level of development," he said. At the meeting, Wang also introduced China’s emphasis on green development in future policies on fishing subsidies and its “zero-tolerance” policy towards IUU. Isabel Jarrett, manager of The Pew Charitable Trusts’ project to end harmful fisheries subsidies, told China Dialogue Ocean that an agreement “with too many loopholes” would undermine the WTO’s sustainability goals. The final text has to ensure that governments aren’t allowed to subsidize “irresponsible practices that can hurt fish populations,” she added. The scale of the problem Subsidies **paid to the global fishing industry amount** to around $35 **billion** per year (228 billion yuan). Of this, $20 billion is given in **forms that enhance the capacity of large fishing fleets**, such as **fuel subsidies and tax exemption** programmes, according to the European Parliament’s Committee on Fisheries. In 2018, the world’s top 10 providers of harmful fisheries subsidies gave out $15.4 billion in total, according to a report by Oceana. The EU, as a bloc, provided $2 billion, ranking third behind China and Japan. Research by Pew has found that eliminating all harmful subsidies could help **fish populations recover**. Specifically, it would result in an **increase of 12.5 percent in global fish biomass by 2050**, which translates into nearly **35 million metric tonnes of** **fish** – almost three times Africa’s entire **fish consumption in a single year**. The **need for progress on an agreement has gained new urgency** during the last few years, as the world’s fish populations have **continued to fall below sustainable levels**. Around 60 percent of assessed stocks are fully exploited and **30 percent are overexploited**, according to the latest figures from the UN Food and Agriculture Organization. The **termination** of harmful subsidies, which is embedded in the UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), would be seen as **key progress on ocean sustainability ahead of this year’s UN biodiversity conference in Kunming**, scheduled for October, and the COP26 climate summit in Glasgow in November. “This is the year that the agreement has to be delivered. The WTO chief has made positive pronouncements of an agreement this year. There’s light at the end of this 20-year tunnel. The alternative of being in the tunnel shadows is a depressing prospect at the time ocean life is declining,” Peter Thomson,?UN special envoy for the ocean, said in a recent webinar.

**Plan requires TRIPs negotiations.**

**Holman 18** [Christopher; 9/21/18; Professor at the University of Missouri-Kansas City School of Law, where his primary research focus lies at the intersection of intellectual property and biotechnology; “*Why Follow-On Pharmaceutical Innovations Should Be Eligible For Patent Protection*,” Intellectual property watch,<https://www.ip-watch.org/2018/09/21/follow-pharmaceutical-innovations-eligible-patent-protection/>] Justin

Compatibility with TRIPS The heightened requirements of patentability proposed in the Guidelines not only pose a threat to important follow-on pharmaceutical innovation, but if they were to be adopted could constitute noncompliance with certain international treaties, including in particular the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (“TRIPS Agreement”), which the 164 Members of the World Trade Organization (WTO) have agreed to abide by. The TRIPS Agreement requires WTO Members to provide certain minimum levels of protection for patentable inventions, thus placing substantive limitations on the ability of WTO Members to raise the bar for patentability. The TRIPS Agreement in no way sanctions subject matter-specific heightened requirements of patentability; to the contrary, the antidiscrimination provision in the TRIPS Agreement affirmatively precludes such measures. Unfortunately, this point is all too often lost in discussions of international and domestic patent policy.

**Negotiations on IPR require tradeoffs- empirics prove.**

DC = DEVELOPING COUNTRY

NET = NET EXPORTER OF TECH (advanced countries)

TNC = Trade Negotiations Committee

Anell = Lars Anell the Chair of the TRIPS negotiations

**Marcellin 16** Marcellin, Sherry (Professor, London School of Economics). The political economy of pharmaceutical patents: US sectional interests and the African Group at the WTO. Routledge, 2016. SJMS

**Regarding the provisions in the section on patents, including that on exclusions from patentability, another DC negotiator maintained that the stipulations should reflect ‘a well-balanced system’** (ibid: 3). **Ironically however, he proceeded to categorise the texts as ‘reasonably satisfactory’, contending that a positive attitude of his delegation towards them would depend to a large extent on progress in other areas of the negotiation** (ibid). **This was the second time in the negotiations that a DC delegate made such an obvious attempt to concede in TRIPS while seeking bargains in other negotiating areas, suggesting that the real access-to-medicines implications of patents were not fully appreciated by all such participants** (Abbott 2002: 43–4); and that such participants may have understood that the negotiations would not have culminated in their favour. **Immediately after the April TNC of 1989 a similarly affiliated participant had also affirmed that if some participants were to be required to make sacrifices in the area of IPRs, there should be a readiness to make such sacrifices for their benefit in agriculture, natural resources or other negotiating groups** (MTN.GNG/NG11/13: 5).10 **This first declaration could be construed as a signal of a prejudged outcome that disfavoured DCs.** Towards the end of this session **another DC participant, supported by several others, pointed out that some other delegations had very high ambitions in the area of TRIPS** and that the time had come **to review the subject matter in the context of the Uruguay Round negotiations as a whole**, particularly **in relation to what was being offered in the more traditional areas of the GATT** (ibid: 12). **At these final stages in the negotiations, DCs were actively seeking trade-offs in other areas in return for agreeing to IPRs in the manner in which the NETs had anticipated** (Adede 2003: 30 and Matthews 2002: 109). **Anell’s informal consultations** and his proposed bilateral bargaining strategies **worked in tandem to consolidate the weakening position of DCs propagated during the April TNC meeting** in 1989. **Anell ended this final session by sharing concerns expressed about the need for results in all areas of the UR, explicitly urging delegations to manufacture consensus through concessionary bargaining. The effects would later be seen in Dunkel’s ‘Draft Final Acts Embodying the Results of the Uruguay Round of Multilateral Trade Negotiations’.**11

**That collapses biodiversity.**

**Osmanski 20** [Stephanie; Freelance Journaler, Writer at GreenMatters; “How Does Overfishing Affect Biodiversity? Let's Do a Deep Dive,” GreenMatters; 12/29/20;<https://www.greenmatters.com/p/how-overfishing-affects-biodiversity>] Justin

Three out of seven people — about 260 million worldwide — rely on seafood as their primary source of protein, which means the environmental and health impacts of fishing are more **relevant than ever**. In fact, overfishing is becoming a **huge problem**; Conservation.org reports that one-third of the world’s wild-caught fisheries are **depleted as a direct result of overfishing, pollution, and climate change**. As fish populations decline, farmed fisheries have started supplying most of our seafood, which is often plagued with additives, growth hormones, genetically modified organisms, and even food dye. However, overfishing results in other issues, too — mainly, **environmental issues. Overfishing significantly** **affects biodiversity**, which in turn, changes the ecosystem. Keep reading to find out more on how overfishing contributes to biodiversity. What is overfishing? Overfishing refers to **non-sustainable practices of fishing** that result in the depletion of fish species. In layman’s terms, overfishing happens when fishermen catch **fish faster than the fish can reproduce**. Long ago, when fishing relied on more natural methods (instinct, word-of-mouth, and guesswork), fishing practices were more natural and therefore, sustainable. But due to modern technology, fishermen now get significant help from high-tech machinery that can detect and track schools of fish, enable fishermen to explore new areas of water they had not been able to access before, and also embark in deeper waters. According to the United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO), over 70 percent of the world’s fisheries are **“fully exploited,” “over exploited,” or “significantly depleted” as a direct result of overfishing**. What is biodiversity? Biodiversity refers to the variety of life on Earth, referring to our planet’s vast number of biological species and organisms. It's heavily impacted when certain species cease to exist, or become threatened at a rate that is faster than that species can reproduce. Ultimately, the number of plants, animals, and microorganism species on Earth determines biodiversity. According to Global Issues, varying genes in each of these species also contributes to more biodiversity. If ecosystems or species become threatened or cease to exist, biodiversity decreases — and ultimately, all walks of life are impacted — because of the degrading food chain and other necessary biological processes. How does overfishing affect biodiversity? Overfishing impacts biodiversity in more ways than one — per Marine Science Today, overfishing **alters** the food chain. If a **certain species is wiped out due to overfishing, the animals that rely on that species as a food source could starve**, or might resort to eating other species of fish, thus altering the ecosystem and food chain as a whole. On the other end of the spectrum, the population generally **consumed by the extinct species would grow disproportionately**, often making way for an influx of pests. Overfishing creates a **domino effect that impacts all living organisms**, therefore significantly affecting biodiversity. Why is biodiversity important? Biodiversity is necessary, because every organism plays a role in the eco-system. If one species is **compromised**, biodiversity becomes compromised as a whole: the food **chain, ecosystems, and more**. The more biodiversity there is on this planet, the more productive ecosystems are, contributing to a greater availability of biological resources. Apart from food, biodiversity impacts medicinal resources, wood products, and ornamental plants. Biodiversity also helps ecosystems recover in cases of disaster. If a weather event threatens natural disasters, healthy, biodiverse ecosystems have a better chance of bouncing back. It also ensures protection of water resources, soil formation, nutrient storage and recycling, and the necessary breakdown of pollution. Why is marine biodiversity is important to humans? Aside from assuring food security, marine biodiversity also provides social and socioeconomic benefits. Socioeconomically, many areas of the world rely on fisheries to survive. If fishermen cannot sell seafood, fisheries cannot purchase fish, and these ways of life are forced out of business. A side effect of that would be that so many populations that rely on fisheries would be out of their main source of protein. Biodiversity also brings many social benefits to human populations: the opportunities to research and educate about fisheries, natural habitats, ecosystems, and various species. It also increases tourism and recreational activities, while having a lasting cultural impact, too — if specific populations rely on a species for food, loss of that population would affect that population’s culture and food supply. Marine biodiversity is incredibly important — let's take a stand against overfishing to ensure it doesn't plague eco-systems and human populations alike. TBH, might be best to go fish-free. instead.

**Biodiversity loss causes extinction.**

**Torres 19** [Phil; Affiliate Scholar at the Institute for Ethics and Emerging Technologies, Founder of the X-Risks Institute, Writer Appearing in Skeptic, Free Inquiry, Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, Salon, Truthout, Erkenntnis, Metaphilosophy; “Biodiversity Loss: An Existential Risk Comparable To Climate Change,” Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists; 4/11/16;<https://thebulletin.org/2016/04/biodiversity-loss-an-existential-risk-comparable-to-climate-change/>] Justin

Catastrophic consequences for civilization. The consequences of this rapid pruning of the evolutionary tree of life extend beyond the obvious. There could be surprising effects of biodiversity loss that scientists are unable to fully anticipate in advance. For example, prior research has shown that localized ecosystems can undergo **abrupt** and **irreversible** shifts when they reach a **tipping point**. According to a 2012 paper published in Nature, there are reasons for thinking that we may be **approach**ing a **tipping point** of this sort in the **global** ecosystem, beyond which the consequences could be **catastrophic for civilization**.

As the authors write, a **planetary-scale transition** could precipitate “**substantial losses** of ecosystem services **required to sustain the human population**.” An ecosystem service is any ecological process that benefits humanity, such as food production and crop pollination. If the global ecosystem were to cross a tipping point and substantial ecosystem services were lost, the results could be “**widespread social unrest**, **economic instability**, and **loss of human life**.” According to Missouri Botanical Garden ecologist Adam Smith, one of the paper’s co-authors, this could occur in a matter of decades—far more quickly than most of the expected consequences of climate change, yet equally destructive.

**Biod**iversity loss is a **“threat multiplier”** that, by pushing societies to the brink of collapse, will **exacerbate existing conflicts** and introduce entirely new struggles between state and non-state actors. Indeed, it could even fuel the rise of **terrorism**. (After all, climate change has been linked to the emergence of ISIS in Syria, and multiple high-ranking US officials, such as former US Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel and CIA director John Brennan, have affirmed that climate change and terrorism are connected.)

The reality is that we are entering the sixth mass extinction in the 3.8-billion-year history of life on Earth, and the impact of this event could be felt by civilization “in as little as three human lifetimes,” as the aforementioned 2012 Nature paper notes. Furthermore, the widespread decline of biological populations could plausibly initiate a dramatic transformation of the global ecosystem on an even faster timescale: perhaps a single human lifetime.

The unavoidable conclusion is that **biod**iversity loss constitutes an **existential threat** in its own right. As such, it ought to be considered **along**side **climate change** and nuclear weapons as one of the **most significant contemporary risks** to **human prosperity and survival**.

# 3rd off

#### Interp: Debaters must disclose round reports on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season. Round reports disclose which positions (AC, NC, K, T, Theory, etc.) were read/gone for in every speech.

#### Violation: screenshot in the doc – they have none, they didn’t even create a page

#### Standards:

#### 1] Level Playing Field – big schools can go around and collect flows but independents are left in the dark so round reports are key for them to prep- they give you an idea of overall what layers debaters like going for so you can best prepare your strategy against them. Accessibility first and independent voter – it's an impact multiplier.

#### 2] Strategy Education – round reports help novices understand the context in which positions are read by good debaters and help with brainstorming potential args– helps compensate for kids who can't afford coaches to prep out affs.

#### 3] Pre-round prep – NC’s gives especially give an idea of what type of debater someone is – they could go for NC theory every round– otherwise I enter every round unknowing whereas you have an idea of what you want to go for from the start – key to good clash

#### Votes

#### Fairness is a voter cuz it skews the debate

#### [1] DTD on disclosure –

#### a) disclosure cannot be drop the argument because it would just drop you because you’re the norm

#### b) deterrence, also dropping them is key now because it’s the beginning of the season which is key to norms creation

#### [2] No RVI on disclosure –

#### a) prevents people from checking back for bad disclosure – means we never get better wikis because they’re afraid to lose off the RVI

#### b) they know that people will read disclosure on them so they prep a counterinterp just to win off the RVI – leads to infinitely abusive norms

#### [4] CI –

#### 1] reasonability is arbitrary – impossible to know what is reasonable until you establish a brightline

#### 2] bites judge intervention cuz they have to gut check what they think is good

#### 3] reasonability collapses cuz u use offense defense to evaluate offense under the BL

#### 4] norms – you can sidestep norms by selectively choosing a different brightline you meet every round.

No 1AR theory –

# Case