# 1NC vs Lorax

## Disclosure

#### Interpretation: At all TOC bid distributing tournaments in elimination rounds, debaters must disclose their aff they are reading or say new aff at least 15 mins before the round

#### Violation – I sent them an email – they ignored it --

#### A] Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students with less resources

**B] Engagement it’s the only way we can properly engage in round and it’s only fair if you know my NC then you at least give the aff so we can have an educational debate**

**C] They have infinite prep as affirmative and should to allow for neg engagement since they could be reading literally anything – its about what they justify which is infinite abuse**

**Fairness is the strongest internal link to education making it a voter**

**Education is the portable impact of debate so vote off it**

**Competing interpretations over reasonability**

1. **Reasonability invites judge intervention**
2. **Reasonability exploits judges’ personal biases – i.e. shells checking racist practices would be voted against by racist judges when asked to gut check interps**

**Drop the debater – we weren’t able to engage in the 1AC – dropping them for disclosure is the same as dropping their aff**

#### No RVIs – its not logical to win for being fair or having good practices

## T

#### Interp: Affirmative debaters must defend the hypothetical implementation of a policy action that would enact the whole or subset of the resolution

#### Resolved reflects policy passage before a legislative body.

Parcher 01 (Jeff, Fmr. Debate Coach at Georgetown University, February, <http://www.ndtceda.com/archives/200102/0790.html>)

Pardon me if I turn to a source besides Bill. American Heritage Dictionary: Resolve: 1. To make a firm decision about. 2. To decide or express by formal vote. 3. To separate something into constituent parts See Syns at \*analyze\* (emphasis in orginal) 4. Find a solution to. See Syns at \*Solve\* (emphasis in original) 5. To dispel: resolve a doubt. - n 1. Frimness of purpose; resolution. 2. A determination or decision.  (2) The very nature of the word "resolution" makes it a question. American Heritage: A course of action determined or decided on. A formal statemnt of a deciion, as by a legislature. (3) The resolution is obviously a question. Any other conclusion is utterly inconcievable. Why? Context. The debate community empowers a topic committee to write a topic for ALTERNATE side debating. The committee is not a random group of people coming together to "reserve" themselves about some issue. There is context - they are empowered by a community to do something. In their deliberations, the topic community attempts to craft a resolution which can be ANSWERED in either direction. They focus on issues likeground and fairness because they know the resolution will serve as the basis for debate which will be resolved by determining the policy desireablility of that resolution. That's not only what they do, but it's what we REQUIRE them to do. We don't just send the topic committee somewhere to adopt their own group resolution. It's not the end point of a resolution adopted by a body - it's the prelimanary wording of a resolution sent to others to be answered or decided upon. (4) Further context: the word resolved is used to emphasis the fact that it's policy debate. Resolved comes from the adoption of resolutions by legislative bodies. A resolution is either adopted or it is not. It's a question before a legislative body. Should this statement be adopted or not. (5) The very terms 'affirmative' and 'negative' support my view. One affirms a resolution. Affirmative and negative are the equivalents of 'yes' or 'no' - which, of course, are answers to a question.

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### 1] Determining semantics comes before other standards: It’s the only stasis point we know before the round so it controls the internal link to engagement, and there’s no way to use ground if debaters aren’t prepared to defend it.

#### 2] They can avoid clash by taking non-controversial principles like “killing innocent people is wrong” and just defending those instead of defending doing something about those issues.

#### 3] Policy Education – under their interp we don’t learn policy making skills because they don’t defend a policy. We access their forms of education in our interp because they could’ve paired it with a topical plan OR read it on the negative

#### 4] By not defending a specific policy the 1AR can shift away from all negative offense destroying education and fairness

#### Education is a voter because it’s the reason why schools fund debate and gives us skills outside of round like researching.

#### Fairness is a voter because it acts as a bright line that controls the internal link to education – without a certain level of fairness debate is impossible

#### No RVIs – a) Winning for proving you are fair for debate is illogical b) Chills checking abuse which incentivizes further abuse

#### DTD – DTA doesn’t make sense for T because it indites their advocacy - the round is already skewed from the beginning and dropping the debater is the only way to rectify abuse and discourage being un-topical

#### T is an issue of C/I over reasonability – it’s a question about whether they were topical or not, that’s a binary. You can’t be topical enough because that invites arbitrary judge intervention based on preference rather than argumentation and encourages a race to the bottom in which debaters will exploit a judge’s tolerance for questionable argumentation.

## FW

#### Value Criterion for this round is Maximizing Expected Well Being-This means we look to improve the lives of the most amount of people

#### Utilitarianism is the only moral philosophy available to governments

Goodin 95 – Professor of Philosophy at the Research School of the Social Sciences at the Australian National University (Robert E., Cambridge University Press, “Utilitarianism As a Public Philosophy” pg 63)

My larger argument turns on the proposition that there is something special about the situation of public officials that makes utilitarianism more plausible for them (or, more precisely, makes them adopt a form of utilitarianism that we would find more acceptable) than private individuals. Before proceeding with that larger argument, I must therefore say what it is that is so special about public officials and their situations that makes it both more necessary and more desirable for them to adopt a more credible form of utilitarianism. Consider, first the argument from necessity. Public officials are obliged to make their choices under uncertainty, and uncertainty of a very special sort at that. All choices-public and private alike- are made under some degree of uncertainty, of course. But in the nature of things, private individuals will usually have more complete information on the peculiarities of their own circumstances and on the ramifications that alternative possible choices might have for them. Public officials, in contrast, at **relatively poorly informed as to the effects that their choices will have on individuals, one by one**. What they typically do know are generalities: averages and aggregates. They know what will happen most often to most people as a result of their various possible choices. But that is all. That is enough to allow public policy makers to use the utilitarian calculus – if they want to use it at all – to choose general rules of conduct. Knowing aggregates and averages, they can proceed to calculate the utility payoffs from adopting each alternative possible general rule. But they cannot be sure what the payoff will be to any given individual or on any particular occasion. Their knowledge of generalities, aggregates and averages is just not sufficiently fine-grained for that.

**Resolved denotes a proposal to be enacted by law**   
**Words and Phrases 1964** Permanent Edition   
Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “**to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;**” It is of **similar** force **to the word “enact,”** which is **defined** by Bouvier **as** meaning “**to establish by law**”.

#### Ought means should

Merriam Webster, No Date – Merriam Webster’s Learner’s Dictionary, “ought”, <http://www.learnersdictionary.com/definition/ought>  
ought /ˈɑːt/ verb  
Learner's definition of OUGHT [modal verb] 1 ◊ Ought is almost always followed by to and the infinitive form of a verb. The phrase ought to has the same meaning as should and is used in the same ways, but it is less common and somewhat more formal. The negative forms ought not and oughtn't are often used without a following to. — used to indicate what is expected They ought to be here by now. You ought to be able to read this book. There ought to be a gas station on the way. 2 — used to say or suggest what should be done You ought to get some rest. That leak ought to be fixed. You ought to do your homework.

#### Affirm means to support the resolution.

**Merriam-Webster 18:** Merriam-Webster. [Dictionary] "Affirm." *Merriam-Webster*, 2018. EL

to show or express a strong belief in or dedication to (something, such as an important idea)

#### means comparitive worlds is the only ROB that a policy action affirmative can support

## Innovation

#### Any IP reduction sets a precedent which destroys future innovation

Ossowski 5/10 Yaël Ossowski. [Yaël Ossowski (@YaelOss) is deputy director of the Consumer Choice Center, a global consumer advocacy group.] “We Don’t Need to Lift Patents to Make Vaccines More Accessible.” Thedispatch.com, The Dispatch, 10 May 2021, thedispatch.com/p/we-dont-need-to-lift-patents-to-make. Accessed 28 Aug. 2021.

A full 14 months into the pandemic, nearly half of Americans who are eligible have received at least one vaccine dose. The end is in sight, and we have innovation to thank. And so, as our economy reopens and restrictions are being lifted, attention is turning to hard-hit nations like India and Brazil, currently experiencing skyrocketing case numbers. The question, then, is how to boost vaccinations abroad. The New York Times notes that India’s outbreak is causing the country to restrict export of its own vaccines, which could hurt Africa in particular, since those nations are relying on Indian vaccines. In the face of pressure to use every tool available to boost vaccinations abroad, the Biden administration announced last week that it supported a proposal to waive patent protections on the COVID vaccines. This measure, which is called a TRIPS Waiver (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) and was put forth last fall at the World Trade Organization by India and South Africa, would be far more than just a temporary fix for more shots. If the waiver is triggered, it would ostensibly nullify IP protections on COVID vaccines, allowing countries and companies to copy the formulas developed by private vaccine firms in hopes of making their own, with no guarantee of success or safety. The coalition backing Biden’s pledge includes Doctors Without Borders, Human Rights Watch, and World Health Organization Secretary-General Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, who first backed this effort in 2020 before any coronavirus vaccine was approved. Intellectual property rights are protections that help foster innovation and provide legal certainty to innovators so that they can profit from and fund their efforts. A weakening of IP rules would actively hurt the most vulnerable—the same people that groups who support the IP waiver are nominally trying to help. The power to issue the waiver comes from a section in the 1995 treaty that created the World Trade Organization, meant to protect intellectual property among global trade partners. While a COVID vaccine waiver would be the most substantial one to date, similar efforts have been attempted on both HIV/AIDS medicines and generic drugs, the latter the only other successful case. The **push for a waiver ignores that many companies have voluntarily pledged to sell their vaccines at cost** or even offered to share information with other firms. Moderna, for its part, has stated it will not enforce the IP rights on its mRNA vaccine during the pandemic and will hand over any research to those who can scale up production. The developers of the Oxford-AstraZeneca vaccine have pledged to sell it at cost until the pandemic is over. Further, this measure would have far-reaching implications. Supporters claim that because COVID represents such a global threat and because Western governments have poured billions in to securing and helping produce vaccines, low and middle-income countries should be relieved of the burden of purchasing them. But rich countries are already donating vaccines to the World Health Organization’s COVAX program, which gifts countries vaccines free of charge. There are a few reasons that a TRIPS waiver is unlikely to be the most efficient solution. The vaccines require specialized knowledge to develop and produce these vaccines, and the mRNA vaccines require cold storage. As economist Alex Tabarrok has pointed out, vaccine makers have been scouring the globe for adequate vaccine facilities but fallen short. It seems implausible that any of this could be achieved outside the traditional procurement contracts we’ve seen in the European Union and the U.S. What is more likely is an increase of botched and unsafe vaccines that would be risky for vulnerable populations, as philanthropist Bill Gates has claimed in his opposition to the waiver. If the cost of researching and producing a COVID vaccine is truly $1 billion as is claimed, with no guarantee of success, there are relatively few biotechnology or pharmaceutical companies that can stomach that cost. And distribution would be an entirely different story. If Biden’s administration wants to help vulnerable nations, there is an easier way: release the tens of millions of doses of AstraZeneca vaccines sitting dormant in warehouses, which the FDA has not yet approved, and begin exporting our vaccine surplus to the most hard-hit countries. That’s precisely why the COVAX initiative was created, and why the U.S. should support it. Meanwhile, let’s also look at the future implications of moving now to restrict IP protections for the very companies that have delivered the life-saving vaccines that will get us out of our current pandemic. BioNTech, the German company headed by the husband-wife team of Uğur Şahin and Özlem Türeci that partnered with Pfizer for trials and distribution of their mRNA vaccine, was originally founded to use mRNA to cure cancer. Before the pandemic, they took on massive debt and scrambled to fund their research. Once the pandemic began, they pivoted their operations and produced one of the first mRNA COVID vaccines, which hundreds of millions of people have received. With billions in sales to governments and millions in direct private investment, we can expect the now-flourishing BioNTech to be at the forefront of mRNA cancer research, which could give us a cure. The same is true of many orphan and rare diseases that do not otherwise receive major funding. Would this have been possible without intellectual property protections? If we want to be able to confront and end this pandemic, we will continue to need innovation from both the vaccine makers and producers who make this possible. Granting a one-time waiver will create a precedent of nullifying IP rights for a host of other medicines, which would greatly endanger future innovation and millions of potential patients. Especially in the face of morphing COVID variants, we need all incentives on the table to protect us against the next phase of the virus. Rather than seeking to tear down those who have delivered the miracle of quick, cheap, and effective vaccines, we need to support their innovations and provide supplies to countries who need them. Symbolic gestures that will have drastic consequences, especially on the most vulnerable, just aren’t up to the task.

#### Empirics prove lower profit margins harms future innovation – R&D investments solve the aff by supplying drugs globally

Roberts 6-25 [James M. Roberts, Research Fellow For Economic Freedom and Growth at the Heritage Foundation with a master’s degree in international and development economics from Yale University, 6-25-2021, "Biden’s OK of Global Theft of America’s Intellectual Property Is Wrong, Dangerous," Heritage Foundation, <https://www.heritage.org/public-health/commentary/bidens-ok-global-theft-americas-intellectual-property-wrong-dangerous>]/Kankee

Mr. Biden wants to waive the World Trade Organization’s “Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights” (TRIPS) agreement for U.S. vaccines and let foreign countries issue “compulsory licenses“ allowing their domestic pharmaceutical companies to manufacture the medicines without adequately compensating the companies that invented them. Practically speaking, countries such as India and South Africa are unlikely to manufacture the vaccines. They lack an advanced infrastructure for cold supply-chain distribution and many other crucial resources required by these products’ capital-intensive, state-of-the-art manufacturing process. But the Biden policy is bad for many other reasons. Developing breakthrough medications takes tremendous ingenuity and immense financial investments. It’s an extraordinarily high-risk endeavor, and the prospect of making a profit is what convinces private companies to undertake those risks. Signaling that the United States will not fight to defend their intellectual property rights actively undermines innovation and manufacturing in American health care and medicines. It also erodes patient protections by undermining quality control. Foreign companies may take the president’s policy as a green light to produce reverse-engineered, counterfeit substitutes. Already there are reports of ineffective and even dangerous counterfeit COVID-19 vaccines being sold around the world. Those pushing to break U.S. pharmaceutical patents say they want to do so for altruistic reasons. Consequently, they also insist that the prices for the medications be set far below their actual value. But history shows us that forcing private companies to provide vaccines at an “affordable price,” regardless of the cost to the companies, actually impedes the manufacture of high-quality vaccines. Moreover, it inhibits the future development of vaccines needed to meet as-yet-unknown diseases. Washington first imposed vaccine price controls as part of Hillary Clinton’s 1993 healthcare-for-all crusade. As the Wall Street Journal later noted, it was a body blow to the U.S. vaccine industry. Ironically, government-decreed prices left the companies unable to produce enough vaccines to meet Mrs. Clinton’s admittedly admirable goal of universal immunization of children. Since then, U.S. firms have largely eschewed the vaccine market because they could not recoup their R&D and manufacturing costs and earn enough profit to fund future innovation. Ultimately, compulsory licensing legalizes the theft of intellectual property. Recognizing this, senators from both sides of the aisle have joined with other government officials and industry leaders to call on the administration to reverse this bad decision. The U.S. patent protection system has served the nation well since its founding. It is and has been a bulwark of American prosperity, but the strength of that protection has been weakening in the past few decades. Compulsory licensing contributes to the erosion of that protection. As the U.S. and the rest of the world emerge from the pandemic, it is clear that more innovative medicines and vaccines will be needed for future protection from viruses and other emerging biological threats. The best way to prevent and treat those new diseases is to ensure that private American pharmaceutical companies continue their innovative research and vaccine production. That way, U.S.-manufactured vaccines can be made available to all Americans quickly. And governments can subsidize their export and sale to other countries far more effectively and less expensively than through compulsory licensing schemes. Meanwhile, let’s hope Mr. Biden listens to the more reasonable and less-agenda driven voices in this debate and reverses course on the TRIPS waiver.

#### Disease causes extinction — defense is wrong

Piers Millett 17, Consultant for the World Health Organization, PhD in International Relations and Affairs, University of Bradford, Andrew Snyder-Beattie, “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity”, Health Security, Vol 15(4), <http://online.liebertpub.com/doi/pdfplus/10.1089/hs.2017.0028>

Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world’s population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to remote populations, overcome rare genetic resistances, and evade detection, cures, and countermeasures. Even evolution itself may work in humanity’s favor: Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off, and so evolutionary pressures could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they do not rule the possibility out entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of species going extinct due to disease—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 There are also historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include native American tribes exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and theWestern Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population). In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But many diseases are proof of principle that each worst-case attribute can be realized independently. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, natural evolution would be an unlikely source for pathogens with the highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach. But advances in biotechnology might allow the creation of diseases that combine such traits. Recent controversy has already emerged over a number of scientific experiments that resulted in viruses with enhanced transmissibility, lethality, and/or the ability to overcome therapeutics.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-2