

No vets? Sadface.

GMO patents

This is a dumb bill. No expert solvency advocate, so no one's really talking about the proposal. Just proposal-adjacent issues, and quasi-ethical evidence-stretching.

Srebnick--1st AFF

Silly acrostic intro. I mean, I guess I can imagine a senator doing this. And then Colbert/Bee/Oliver mocking him or her relentlessly.

G--move to organic

M--prices go down--the opposite of GMO isn't organic as you seem to think (no ev here)
O--back to organics 12m can't afford. Obesity costs 190Billion. Link between increasing organics and cut backs in obesity. This acronym is really only two things!

Lots of missing links here connecting arguments

Answering a question saying "that's why I went down this whole slippery slope"--that's almost always a fallacy. Policy slopes are rarely slippery.

Thanks for kicking off, though.

Bevard--1st NEG

Patents=promise.

Resp to Harms (but the Harm hasn't been argued yet): 6/13 NPR Monsanto will never sue a farmer for accidentally drifting.

So your thesis is that multinational agri-giants need love too?

DA: Undermining patents undermines innovation.

(This is legit logically. On the one hand, it'd be better to have an expert saying so. But you can't because this is a dumb bill without an expert solvency advocate, therefore, no one's talking about, therefore, nothing's written about it, therefore nothing can be quoted on it, therefore why are we debating this? You bear some responsibility, since you proposed the docket with it on top. Although it's a team effort, and all the bills are dumb in the same way.)

Wang--2nd AFF

Avoid "came up here" cliché. Just say "tells us."

Response to DA. These patents are different, so it won't hurt other innovators and GMO patents are bad. (No ev here though--assuming harms from GMOs.)

Thinkprogress: causing suicides every day in India. This is overselling your evidence. It might be a part of the reason.

Cohen--2nd NEG

Generic intro. Avoid "came up here" cliché.

Resp. to Harms or DA (maybe?): smaller companies are doing it, they aren't evil, they

Small "Mom & Pop" GMO researchers? Really? I'd need an example of this to believe it.

Not great refutation--not on key points.

Burstein--3rd AFF

Man, intro is so wrong. GMO oranges is the only way Florida's citrus industry can survive greening. I really wish you had made this speech about citrus.

Everybody, can we cut it out with the Center for Research on Globalization? Sketchy truther site.

Harms: Big GMOs own most of the patents, can charge whatever they want.

Pretty standard.

Kara--3rd NEG

Harms--only domestic, so no overseas harms. Thanks for going no-intro. Unless you have a good one, it's better to just get to it.

Small companies won't have patents either. Impt. for biotech companies, including small. This has been made by Cohen.

I wish someone were just talking about the effect of the legislation: this research won't be done at all. Monsanto won't steal anything from small companies or universities because nothing will be done. Is there anything bad in a world without GMO research? I'd think so.

I also think we're using the word "monopoly" pretty loosely.

Seider--4th AFF

History can be good as an intro, but I don't get the analogy. And you seem to say D.E.I. wasn't that bad?

Harms--it's about limiting access to crops.

We need to see what's happening to know if it's innovative.

Harms--Patents block innovation from global poor.

Natural selection coming from GMO seeds? Sounds made-up rather than from a source.

Jurassic Parky.

You did filibuster Burstein. Points off for that, too.

Honestly, amendments are either fixing typos or just a plea for attention. That was the latter.

Wakefield--4th NEG

Why did you call Monsanto “he”? I heard it that way, anyway. Roundup isn’t the name of the GM seeds. That’s just a retail product. It’s “Roundup Ready” soybeans etc.

What do you mean when you say “without using innovation”?

Is literally no one going to say that GMO innovations are either good for us or bad for us? Is it all about market effects/fairness?

Cimerberg--5th AFF

Silly intro. Not a fan, but the room wanted it.

Kinda weird to go AFF after you with an amendment said the bill should be changed.

Harms: Prevents harvesting “innovation”.

Harms: Investigated 500 farmers. Favor monopolies.

Too fast for Congress. But still really clear.

“Make history and don’t make excuses.” Please.

Bevard embarrassed you in cross-ex.

PO skipping a motion. I don’t see why you think you have plenty of time. Chiding the chamber for two AFFs in a row isn’t really necessary. It happens. But I wish you *would* discourage in-house recesses. The obvious way to go is to just move on to the third bill.

Mileusnic--5th NEG

Negating a bill that hurts Monsanto by saying GMOs are dangerous? Not following this, let’s say, counterintuitive take on the bill.

Increase availability and use of GM foods. How? OK, so everyone uses existing GMO foods since patents are removed. I get it. I think you should make more of the distinction between Roundup Ready etc. current products being everywhere.

“I’m OK with GM foods.” Huh.

Bayer--6th AFF

“Impacts of affirmation have prevailed.” Doesn’t fill me with confidence.

Ethical and moral problems. Here’s an admission of slippery slope again. Getting rid of “natural patents.” Or “national patents.”

Another great cross-ex by Bevard.

Lin--6th NEG

Innovation won't be preserved. Patents protect innovation. But what's the cost of this innovation? No one is impacting this with an actual societal good that would be foregone. Golden rice? Greening-proof oranges? Wiping out Zika mosquitos? Anything? Meta-analysis--GMOs have increased yields 40%. At least that's one actual good. You admit that this doesn't touch new machinery, so . . . sorry, that just doesn't make sense to me.

Good answer on innovation to Cimerberg.

There are many difficult things that can get messed up as P.O. but messing up the basic get-a-second-then-vote is not good. I usually give the PO more credit than other judges, but winning a five-way election means you need to be perfect. (These mistakes would be forgivable if we had to beg someone to preside, in other words.)

Shivan--7th AFF

H: Large corporations increase child labor. I need a card here that makes the link directly to really buy this. This is a very small-room debate type of speech: high-speed monotone. Instead of spreading yourself thin against everyone on the NEG, better to focus on Bevard and Lin.

Fonseca--7th NEG

Bad faith mis-reading of what Bayer said in your intro.
Whoa, you're singing my song--no expert solvency advocate=no AFF.
But I'd go further: A great nation doesn't make policy based on a single person's uninformed hunch. Well, in mid-January it will. But up until then.
(Of course neither questioner goes for it. Because how could they?)
OK to weigh small farmers vs. everyone else.
That's a good speech.

Curry--8th AFF

I think if you're going to claim biographical cred, you really need to show that in your speech instead of giving generic Congress points.
Monsanto sues--we're so far beyond that now.
I didn't get the invent-first distinction.

Too fast for Congress.
I thought you were getting to Fonseca.

In prelims, Aditya Dhar compared this to doing homework that everyone else gets to copy the morning it's due. That's a great analogy that would make the NEG case snap into focus for judges who might be missing it. (Neither side is doing much in the way of analogy, which is unfortunate.)

At half-time, Bevard, Fonseca, and Lin have most of my attention.

Medical Device

This is a dumb, dumb bill. Again, there's no expert solvency advocate. So it's not surprising there are only a few AFFs here. Still, someone's passing on the opportunity to be a hero and a shot at the top 6 (but not 1st) by not throwing themselves on this grenade.

Still think the Vets bill is less dumb than this. But still dumb.

Thought: What would be great is when you guys get the bills a week ahead you decide via intertube on amendments to make the debate debatable. There's an amendment I could get behind.

Or tournament directors could just learn what an expert solvency advocate is and ensure there is one.

1st AFF--Shivan

This is the kind of speech you needed to give. (In addition to the chamber needing it.)

H: increased deductibles for insurance

ADV: Earlier treatment saves \$, need coverage

"Insures that all our constituents have equal access to health care." No, not close to that. At all. But, again, thanks for kicking off.

1st NEG--Seider

DA: Will just fuel Mylan profits. Yep. We're gonna be hearing this point rephrased 7-10 times.

DA: Increases sky-high costs. Great response to Lin's counterplan (which as you note is NEG, really) and Cimerberg, too.

2nd AFF--Bayer

I didn't get the line of questions to Seider.

Intrinsically part of poverty.

Helping any diabetic will prevent future diabetics. This is a big stretch, seems to me. I'd like to see something that says treating parents for any lifestyle disease prevents their kids from getting it. That would be a redemptive card for AFF. Might be out there.

Ignoring Seider's points about incentive failures in the market.

Kara--2nd NEG

Avoid "comes up here" cliché. (Twice in this speech.) It's not entirely a joke to say Congress can solve diabetes. It is to say we could solve it with this bill.

DA: Insurance companies have jack up prices. (Here's rehash #1.) So they'll jack up prices here when we give them a blank check.

S: No one even knows how to negotiate prices.

S/DA: Double-charging via ACA?

You and Lin seem to say the ACA is negotiating prices. Don't see how that's true. ACA backs private insurance.

Curry--3rd AFF

Opening line aimed at judges? It should be. Honestly, though, the alternative is to have a short debate on the VA.

H: Secondary impacts of diabetes also expensive.

"Impactful" isn't a word. For people who aren't barbarians, anyway.

ADV: Blood sugar testing will reduce costs (from secondary effects of diabetes).

PR answer to Bevard is probably the best you can do on a hopeless point.

Wang--3rd NEG

Avoid "come/came up here" cliché.

Treating doesn't apply if you don't know. Disagree.

DA: Long-lasting insulin is just an expensive placebo.

Solv: Insurance that takes funding from ACA will hurt insurance companies. God, will no one say PEOTUS Trump has sworn to kill the ACA? So maybe this is a DA.

Very quiet in cross-ex. Sound kind of disgusted by Shivan's questions.

Wakefield--4th AFF

Shkreli wasn't Mylan's CEO. (It's the daughter of WV senator Joe Manchin.)

I'm out of sympathy for AFF speakers now.

You're assuming there are other products for the US to go to. But there's only one Epi-Pen. It's a patented design. There's another injector, but it apparently doesn't work as well.

Srebnick--4th NEG

DA: Not a means-tested program. Here's more rehash on the incentive/market failure point.

Lots of wasteful loopholes, carried interest, retirement. This is almost an AFF. You could say, "so what if it's wasteful? We waste way more not saving lives!"

Syringes point is actually an AFF Harm/response to DA. You're saying that it sucks, but there's really no alternative to paying what Mylan wants.

Bevard's point isn't a point of order, really. But it's well said and true.

Bevard--5th NEG

How does an old drug go from generic to innovator? That's counterintuitive. Need more explanation. The "innovator drug" as a term of art is interesting. Better than "utility patents."

Isn't everything talking about Medicaid, which would be a small slice of this bill?

I'd rather you'd have made the point you raised in cross-ex. It'd be rehash, but you'd say it more clearly than everyone else. And it's the only real impact here. (In addition to no ESA.)

You asked about sketchy use of evidence during a break. I can't ask to see it unless someone challenges it in the round in a speech or in questions. And direct cross-ex blows for that kind of lie detection, since there are only two questioners. Though if a skeptical debater got 30 seconds, it could lead to legal drama-style meltdowns of the guilty.

But let's be clear: I'd love to have a debate about evidence ethics be the hinge in a national-level final round. That'd be just what Congress needs.

Lin--5th AFF

Sorry about the art attack. You recovered well.

H: It's too important not to overlook the obvious probs. Need quantification.

Only real argument=\$. You're saying this only covers people without insurance, but the bill literally says it requires negotiations with insurance companies. (Whole other NEG there.)

Burstein is right on the politics. You lost your cool, too.

Cohen--6th NEG

Don't say "solvency". Think in debate terms. But speak regular English.

Someone said Trump in a round. And made a Trump joke! This is a good point on funding going away.

No way T.J. actually said that. Dude was smart and eloquent.

Especially don't say "counterplan." Politicians don't talk like that.

Mileusnic--6th AFF

We look now to "epic men". Can I get an "and women"? Or is that so pre-apocalypse?

H: Prices always going to be high.

RtoDA: So DA is non-unique.

Counterplans are wishful thinking. Apply politics to this point--GOP leadership won't go for this--since everyone else is.

Don't go overtime.

Serious prefacing there, Seider.

Burstein--7th NEG

Bland intro.

Won't treat untested or save any money. This is rehash of a much earlier point.

Nice use of actual legislation as counter. Should be done more often. There's no way the other bill does the "exact same thing," though, as you tell Mileusnick.

Cimerberg--7th AFF

Not hearing about much beyond rehash here. Well delivered, though. Lots of rhetoric at the end.

