# NC vs HWL MT

## Theory

#### Interpretation: The aff must disclose the plan text and advantages 30 minutes before the round

#### Violation: They didn’t

#### Standards:

#### 1] Prep Skew – 4 minutes of prep is not enough to put together a coherent 1nc or update generics – 30 minutes is necessary to learn a little about the affirmative and piece together what 1nc positions apply and cut and research their applications to the affirmative

#### 2] Quality of Education – plan text disclosure discourages cheap shot affs. If the aff isn’t inherent or easily defeated by 20 minutes of research, the case should lose – this will answer the 1AR’s claim about innovation – with 30 minutes of prep, there’s still an incentive to find a new strategic, well justified aff, but no incentive to cut a horrible, incoherent aff that the neg can’t check against the broader literature.

#### 3] Evidence ethics - 4 minutes of prep isn't sufficient to read through multiple articles which lets them get away evidence ethics violation. Evidence ethics first, it controls the internal link to fairness and education cuz debate would just devolve into who could read the most miscut evidence.

#### Voters:

#### 1] Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity

#### 2] Education is a voter because it’s the reason schools fund debate, we wouldn’t have debate without it

#### Drop the debater

#### 1] Rectify time spent on theory

#### 2] Deter future abuse

#### Competing interps

#### 1] Reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention

#### 2] Reasonability creates a race to the bottom where people try to find out how abusive they can be

#### No RVIs

#### 1] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance

#### 2] They chill abuse checking

#### 3] Incentivizes people to bait theory then win the RVI

## Case:

#### Interpretation: Debaters must provide some form of author qualifications on every card they read.

#### Violations: The screenshots below

#### Standards:

#### A: Clash creates a race to the bottom in terms of evidence where low quality evidence is permissible allowing for debaters to site random people jumping to illogical conclusions and we have to be ready to respond even if the argument is categorically false, kills fairness since the round will always be skewed in their favor, kills education since clash is the only reason we learn in round.

#### B: Evidence ethics, theres no way for us to know if we can trust the evidence, and proper evidence is constitutive of debate since all strong positions especially policy oriented are based on good evidence. Evidence ethics is independently a vote since we can’t debate without proper evidence.

#### Extend Voters

#### COVID patent waivers don’t solve – technology transfer difficult, supplies limited due to US restrictions, and mRNA never produced at scale before

Tabarrok 21 Tabarrok, Alex. "Patents Are Not The Problem! - Marginal REVOLUTION." Marginal REVOLUTION. N.p., 2021. Web. 9 Aug. 2021. Alex Tabarrok is Bartley J. Madden Chair in Economics at the Mercatus Center and a professor of economics at George Mason University. Along with Tyler Cowen, he is the co-author of the popular economics blog Marginal Revolution and co-founder of Marginal Revolution University. He is the author of [numerous academic papers](https://mason.gmu.edu/~atabarro/TabarrokCV.pdf) in the fields of law and economics, criminology, regulatory policy, voting theory and other areas in political economy. He is co-author with Tyler of [Modern Principles of Economics](https://marginalrevolution.com/our-textbook), a widely used introductory textbook. He gave a [TED talk](https://www.ted.com/talks/alex_tabarrok_foresees_economic_growth) in 2009. His articles have appeared in the New York Times, the Washington Post, the Wall Street Journal, and many other publications.

For the last year and a half I have been shouting from the rooftops, “invest in capacity, build more factories, shore up the supply lines, spend billions to save trillions.” Fortunately, some [boffins in the Biden administration](https://twitter.com/AmbassadorTai/status/1390021205974003720?s=20) have found a better way, “the US supports the waiver of IP protections on COVID-19 vaccines to help end the pandemic.” Waive IP protections. So simple. Why didn’t I think of that??? Patents are not the problem. All of the vaccine manufacturers are trying to increase supply as quickly as possible. Billions of doses are being produced–more than ever before in the history of the world. Licenses are widely available. AstraZeneca have licensed their vaccine for production with [manufactures around the world](https://www.astrazeneca.com/what-science-can-do/topics/technologies/pushing-boundaries-to-deliver-covid-19-vaccine-accross-the-globe.html), including in India, Brazil, Mexico, Argentina, China and South Africa. J&J’s vaccine has been licensed for production by multiple firms in the United States as well as with firms in Spain, South Africa and France. Sputnik has been licensed for production by firms in India, China, South Korea, Brazil and pending EMA approval with firms in Germany and France. Sinopharm has been licensed in the UAE, Egypt and Bangladesh. Novavax has licensed its vaccine for production in South Korea, India, and Japan and it is desperate to find other licensees but technology transfer isn’t easy and there are [limited supplies of raw materials](https://endpts.com/as-fears-mount-over-jj-and-astrazeneca-novavax-enters-a-shaky-spotlight/): Virtually overnight, [Novavax] set up a network of outside manufacturers more ambitious than one outside executive said he’s ever seen, but they struggled at times to transfer their technology there amid pandemic travel restrictions. They were kicked out of one factory by the same government that’s bankrolled their effort. Competing with larger competitors, they’ve found themselves short on raw materials as diverse as Chilean tree bark and bioreactor bags. They signed a deal with India’s Serum Institute to produce many of their COVAX doses but now face the realistic chance that even when Serum gets to full capacity — and they are behind — India’s government, dealing with the world’s worst active outbreak, won’t let the shots leave the country. [Plastic bags are a bigger bottleneck than patents](https://www.news18.com/news/opinion/single-use-plastic-bioreactor-bags-to-filters-why-india-needs-them-from-us-for-covid-vaccines-3681092.html). The US embargo on vaccine supplies to India was precisely that the Biden administration used the DPA to prioritize things like bioreactor bags and filters to US suppliers and that meant that India’s Serum Institute was having trouble getting its production lines ready for Novavax. CureVac, [another potential mRNA vaccine](https://www.reuters.com/business/healthcare-pharmaceuticals/curevac-says-mass-vaccine-rollout-thrown-into-doubt-by-us-restrictions-2021-05-04/), is also finding it difficult to find supplies due to US restrictions (which means supplies are short everywhere). As [Derek Lowe said](https://blogs.sciencemag.org/pipeline/archives/2021/04/22/a-look-at-novavax): Abolishing patents will not provide more shaker bags or more Chilean tree bark, nor provide more of the key filtration materials needed for production. These processes have a lot of potential choke points and rate-limiting steps in them, and there is no wand that will wave that complexity away. Technology transfer has been difficult for AstraZeneca–which is one reason they have had production difficulties–and their vaccine uses relatively well understood technology. The mRNA technology is new and has never before been used to produce at scale. Pfizer and Moderna had to build factories and distribution systems from scratch. There are no mRNA factories idling on the sidelines. If there were, Moderna or Pfizer would be happy to license since they are producing in their own factories 24 hours a day, seven days a week (monopolies restrict supply, remember?). Why do you think China hasn’t [yet produced](https://www.scmp.com/news/china/politics/article/3128998/revolutionary-mrna-vaccines-made-chinese-firms-will-be-ready) an mRNA vaccine? Hint: it isn’t fear about violating IP. Moreover, even Moderna and Pfizer don’t yet fully understand their production technology, they are learning by doing every single day. Moderna has said that they won’t enforce their patents during the pandemic but no one has stepped up to produce because no one else can. The US trade representative’s announcement is virtue signaling to the anti-market left and will do little to nothing to increase supply. What can we do to increase supply? Sorry, there is no quick and cheap solution. We must spend. Trump’s Operation Warp Speed spent on the order of $15 billion. If we want more, [we need to spend more and on similar scale](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/371/6534/1107). The Biden administration paid $269 million to Merck to retool its factories to make the J&J vaccine. That was a good start. We could also offer Pfizer and Moderna say $100 a dose to produce in excess of their current production and maybe with those resources there is more they could do. South Africa and India and every other country in the world should offer the same (India hasn’t even approved the Pfizer vaccine and they are complaining about IP!??) We should ease up on the DPA and invest more in the supply chain–let’s get CureVac and the Serum Institute what they need. We should work like hell to find a s[ubstitute for Chilean tree bark](https://www.theatlantic.com/science/archive/2020/10/single-tree-species-may-hold-key-coronavirus-vaccine/616792/). See [my piece in Science](https://science.sciencemag.org/content/371/6534/1107) co-authored with Michael Kremer et. al. for more ideas. (Note also that these ideas are better at dealing with current supply constraints and they also increase the incentive to produce future vaccines, unlike shortsighted patent abrogation.) Bottom line is that producing more takes real resources not waving magic patent wands. You may have gathered that I am angry. I am indeed angry that the people in power think they can solve real problems on the cheap and at someone else’s expense. This is not serious. I am also angry that they are sending the wrong message about business, profits and capitalism. So let me end on positive note. Like the Apollo program and Dunkirk, the creation of the mRNA vaccines by Pfizer and Moderna should be lauded with Nobel prizes and major movies. Churchill called the rescue at Dunkirk a “miracle of deliverance,” well the miracle of Moderna will rescue many more. Not only was a vaccine designed in under a year, an entirely new production process was set up to produce billions of doses to rescue the world. The creation of the mRNA vaccines was a triumph of science, logistics, and management and it was done at a speed that I had thought [possible only for past generations](https://patrickcollison.com/fast). I am grateful that greatness is still within our civilization’s grasp.

#### Turn – COVID waiver would lead to more vaccine skepticism, lower production, and energy taken away from other initiatives

Wilson 21 Wilson, Simon. Why Joe Biden’s Big Pharma patent grab is a terrible idea, Moneyweek.com. N.p., 2021. Web. 30 Aug. 2021. Simon Wilson is the head of Journalism Europe and Americas at BBC World Service.

What’s happened? Earlier this month the US surprised the global community – and stunned investors in drugs companies – by backing the temporary suspension of some globally agreed rules covering intellectual-property (IP) protections for Covid-19 vaccines. A waiver of World Trade Organisation (WTO) rules to help tackle the Covid-19-emergency was first proposed by India and South Africa last October, covering patents not just for vaccines, but also diagnostic tools and therapeutic treatments. Both countries have a large manufacturing sector making generic (off-patent) pharmaceuticals. The US is not signed up to a broader waiver of that kin, but its support for a narrower waiver on vaccine patents is a surprise. Why’s that? Because the US has a vast and powerful pharmaceutical sector and Washington has a long history of opposition to public-health measures that affect intellectual property rights. In 1996, it even threatened sanctions against Brazil for weakening patent laws to improve access to life-saving Aids drugs. Still, there’s no guarantee that a patent waiver – that is, a temporary suspension of certain rules set out in the WTO’s Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (Trips) agreement – will actually happen. Until earlier this month, the idea had gained little traction, with the US, EU (notably Germany), UK and Japan all opposed. But US support makes it far more likely that some kind of waiver will be agreed. What’s the case for a waiver? The hope is that the waiver will encourage a wider and more geographically diverse production base, as well as encouraging international co-operation. And also that the prospect of a waiver will encourage pharmaceutical companies to enter into more voluntary arrangements and non-exclusive licensing to enable the transfer of technology in a controlled and transparent way. The lesson of the Aids pandemic is that patents “stymie accessible treatment, cost lives, and offer little bona fide enhancement of innovation”, says Laurie Garrett in Foreign Policy. What’s the case against? First, that waiving patents on Covid-19 vaccines would not actually speed up global production or get more shots into arms. Second, that doing so would have damaging long-term effects on future innovation. To take the first, it’s not IP issues that lie behind vaccine supply issues, it’s a range of factors including shortages of critical raw materials, a lack of production facilities and the technology and expertise to manufacture them. We know vaccine patents are not the bottleneck to making more vaccines because “there are no factories capable of producing Covid-19 vaccines sitting idle because they don’t have a patent”, says Matthew Lesh on CapX. Moderna announced last October that it would not be enforcing its own patents – yet there is no generic non-Moderna production. Why not? Because it’s too hard to copy given the obstacles. Pfizer’s vaccine, for example, requires 280 components from 86 suppliers in 19 countries, from glass vials to lipids to special plastics. And AstraZeneca, having established a global supply network with more than 20 partners across 15 countries, ran out of engineers qualified to transfer its technology. Moreover, waiving patents will increase competition for scarce ingredients, with the risk that less efficient and less expert manufacturers would hinder the ability of existing producers to ramp up capacity. And there’s an obvious issue with safety – and the knock-on effects on global confidence in Covid-vaccines as a whole. And the long-term consequences? Security of property rights underpins the whole pharmaceutical sector, which is driven by massive – and massively high-risk – upfront investment in research and development. Weakening or waiving those rights would inevitably discourage companies from investing in future innovation. That would make the world less safe and more vulnerable to the next pandemic threat – and could conceivably even disincentivise investment in pharmaceuticals more broadly. Biden’s “bewildering” support for this is “the single worst presidential economic decision since Nixon’s wage-and-price controls”, says The Wall Street Journal – destroying tens of billions of dollars in US intellectual property and surrendering America’s advantage in biotech, a key growth industry. Certainly, when the next pandemic hits, the world will want the pharmaceutical industry to once again “drop everything and work like hell to make vaccines”, says Tom Chivers on Unherd. “Maybe waiving IP rights will have no impact on their willingness to do that next time, but if there’s even a small chance that it will, it seems a bad bet.” Will it happen? Any agreement will need the backing of all 164 WTO members, and will take weeks or months to secure. Meanwhile, many poor countries have jabbed less than 1% of their populations, 44% of vaccine doses have gone to Europe and North America, and Covid-19 is raging in south Asia and Latin America – and all the while new variants are raising the risk-level globally. Investors are worried about a fall in pharma profits, says The Economist, but the danger – in terms of both health and economy – is far broader than that. If protracted negotiations at the WTO “suck energy away from other initiatives to transfer technology and increase vaccine supplies, that would really be something to fear”. Far more useful than waiving patents, says The Washington Post, would be a concerted effort by Western governments to share their vaccine surpluses, and by Western pharma firms to strike more licensing deals and “share manufacturing know-how, experienced personnel, quality control methods, oversight and raw materials”.

#### LBL now

## DA If time

#### Congress won’t withdraw the US from the WTO now, but more unfair trade practices abroad causes widespread backlash that ends involvement, Johnson 20

[Keith Johnson, a senior staff writer at Foreign Policy, 05-07-2020, “U.S. Effort to Depart WTO Gathers Momentum,” Foreign Policy, https://foreignpolicy.com/2020/05/27/world-trade-organization-united-states-departure-china/]/Kankee

Frustration with hyperglobalization, China’s “economic imperialism,” and a seemingly broken world trading system is boiling over into serious calls for the United States to withdraw from the World Trade Organization (WTO)—which would have potentially disastrous implications for the country if carried out. For the first time since 2005, lawmakers from both parties and both houses of Congress are pushing to pull the United States out of the trading body it helped create and which was the culmination of decades of postwar efforts to boost free trade and economic integration. By law, the United States has a chance to vote every five years on staying inside the WTO, but staying on board was such a no-brainer in recent years that no such resolution was even presented. But this year—powered by a rise in economic nationalism, growing concern about China, and frustration with two decades of paralysis at the WTO—the knives on Capitol Hill are out, to the delight of some of the trade hard-liners in the White House. “The WTO has been a disaster for the United States,” said Rep. Peter DeFazio, an Oregon Democrat, who introduced House legislation to withdraw this month. “No trade regime can last when it no longer serves the people of the countries who are part of it,” said Sen. Josh Hawley, a Missouri Republican, in a recent Senate floor speech after introducing his own resolution to leave. “Our interests and those of the WTO diverged long ago.” It’s doubtful that the measures could secure enough votes for passage in either chamber, and a tight legislative calendar makes the push for withdrawal doubly hard to pull off. But the rush for the exit is still a serious indication of deep and growing dissatisfaction with how global trade has evolved, highlighted by the vulnerability of cross-border supply chains that have begun to come apart under the stress of the COVID-19 pandemic. If the United States were to pull out of the system it helped build, the implications would be dire. Other countries would be able to discriminate against U.S. goods and services with no limits. Tariffs would almost certainly rise and export markets shrink. Meanwhile, others like China and the European Union would increasingly be in a position to write the rules of the future economy, from data protection and privacy to intellectual property and state subsidies. “We’d have no rights, and we’d lose a seat at the table,” said Wendy Cutler, a former U.S. trade negotiator now at the Asia Society. Why the big push now? For years, different aspects of the global trading system have stirred concern and at times anger in the United States and other countries; the WTO has essentially been stuck in place since the collapse of its last big negotiating round in 2008. For years, economists have debated the impact of the so-called “China shock” on U.S. jobs and manufacturing, and some evidence has shown that the competition from low-wage Chinese labor and the rapid movement of U.S. companies offshore hit the U.S. middle class harder than many economists expected. For years, Republicans have railed against international organizations—from the WTO to the International Criminal Court—that they see as encroaching on U.S. sovereignty. Now, all those forces have come together in a kind of imperfect storm.