



The 2007/08

CORE FILES
Research Guide

Written by Andrew Brokos
Edited by Les Lynn

Resolved: The United States federal government should substantially increase its public health assistance to Sub-Saharan Africa.



Step One: Media Literacy

Policy debate rewards competitors who are knowledgeable about current events, and debaters and their coaches should expect the topic to change throughout the season in response to current events.

Fortunately, keeping up with current events is also a great way for beginning debaters to learn research skills, one of the most important tools they can take away from their debating experience. The information in this section will explain the easiest ways for beginning debaters to follow current events, analyze their implications for debate rounds, and recognize reliable versus unreliable sources.

Newspapers

Watching the national news will give debaters a superficial idea of what is going on in the world, which is better than nothing. Watching the local news will give debaters a superficial idea of what is going on in the local dog show circuit, which is probably not better than nothing. Watching CNN will provide some in-depth information and analysis of important issues, but viewers cannot choose their content: they must wait until the topics that interest them make an appearance. In short, there is simply no way to get the benefits of reading the newspaper without reading the newspaper.

Newspaper articles cover issues in more depth than most news programs, and readers can choose to focus on the articles that are of most interest to them. Newspapers vary in quality, but most UDL's are located in large cities, which means that the major paper in the home city of most UDL debaters will be a pretty good source of information.

Fortunately for those who do not have home delivery of their city's major paper, do not live in a city with an especially good newspaper, or simply want to diversify their sources (always a good idea), most of the best newspapers in the country can be read for free online at the following websites.

The New York Times: <http://www.nytimes.com/>

The Los Angeles Times: <http://www.latimes.com/>

The Washington Post: <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>

The Chicago Tribune: <http://www.chicagotribune.com/>

The Dallas Morning News: <http://www.dallasnews.com/>

Many papers also make one or two weeks' worth of archives available for free online. To access these archives, or in some cases even to read the day's news, visitors may have to register. For all of the papers listed above, this is completely free, and in most cases, the registered e-mail address will not receive unwanted advertisements or solicitations. In other words, it is well worth it to take a moment or two to register and gain access to all of this valuable, free information. Registering with the New York Times even gives users the option of having the day's headlines e-mailed to them every morning, an opportunity that debaters ought to exploit.



Diversity

Although they are well-regarded for their standards of journalistic integrity and objectivity, all of the above papers are sometimes accused of presenting a slightly liberal slant on the news. Those seeking to balance their research with a newspaper considered to be somewhat more conservative can visit The Washington Times at <http://www.washingtontimes.com/>. The Wall Street Journal is also considered a highly reputable paper with a conservative slant, but it is not available for free online.

Another way for debaters to diversify the perspective that they get on the news is to read papers from other countries, many of which are also available for free online. Some of the best British papers are

The Guardian: <http://www.guardian.co.uk/>

The Financial Times: <http://news.ft.com/home/us>

The best coverage of current events in Africa, of course, comes from African news sources such as the following:

African News Dimension: <http://www.andnetwork.com/> (comprehensive website covering news across the continent)

AllAfrica: <http://allafrica.com/> (internet news site compiling stories from news sources across Africa, with links to local news sources)

PanAfrican News Agency: <http://www.panapress.com/> (largest publisher of English-language Africa news)

For more internet resources relating to Sub-Saharan Africa, visit the excellent site **Africa South of the Sahara** at <http://www-sul.stanford.edu/depts/ssrg/africa/guide.html> and the **Internet Resources** page assembled by the Columbia University African Studies department: <http://www.columbia.edu/cu/lweb/indiv/africa/cuvl/>.

Interest Groups

Newspapers, even those described as having a liberal or conservative slant, strive to present objective, unopinionated accounts of the facts. While it is very helpful for debaters to know the facts about what is going on in the world, they are ultimately interested in arguments. Debaters need to know more than just what is happening; they need to know what people think about what is happening, and what those people are proposing to do about it.



One source of opinions on the news is the editorial pages of newspapers. In addition to featuring commentary by their own editorial staff, major newspapers such as the ones listed here often attract opinion pieces by leading experts and policymakers. These can prove especially valuable to debaters.

Debaters can also find opinionated analysis of the news on the websites of interest groups. These organizations focus on lobbying the government on issues of importance to their members. While some are explicitly liberal or conservative, many at least claim to be non-partisan. This is *not* the same as being objective. Members of these organizations likely have strong opinions on the issues they address in their writing and are not afraid to voice them. A member of the American Civil Liberties Union, for example, may be a liberal or a conservative (though the former is more likely), but in any event is likely to be strongly opposed to any attempt by the government to violate civil liberties. As long as debaters keep such biases in mind, these interest groups are a valuable source for researching arguments about current events and how the government ought to respond to them.

The following groups largely support the Affirmative side of the topic:

Center for Global Development: <http://www.cgdev.org/>
Doctors Without Borders: <http://www.doctorswithoutborders.org/>
Partners in Health: <http://www.pih.org/home.html>
Global AIDS Alliance: <http://www.globalaidsalliance.org/>
Stop TB Partnership: <http://www.stoptb.org/>
Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy: <http://www.iatp.org/>
Center for American Progress: <http://www.americanprogress.org/>
Center for Health and Gender Equity: <http://www.genderhealth.org/>
Family Health International: <http://www.fhi.org/en/HIV/AIDS/Projects/index.htm>
Council of Foreign Relations: www.cfr.org/region/159/subsaharan_africa.html

The following groups largely support the Negative side of the topic:

Cato Institute: <http://www.cato.org/>
Heritage Foundation: <http://www.heritage.org/>
American Enterprise Institute: <http://www.aei.org/>
Population and Development Program: <http://popdev.hampshire.edu/>
Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute: <http://www.c-fam.org/>
Family Research Council: <http://www.frc.org/get.cfm?c=HOME>

Government Sources

Policy debate revolves around the policymaking process, and where better to get information about this process than from the policymaking bodies themselves? These resources may not be ideal for day-to-day news, as the information they provide is largely unfiltered. That is, while newspapers selectively report the most important and interesting business of government, government websites often contain detailed



information about even relatively trivial happenings. But when something important does happen in the halls of the Supreme Court or on the floor of Congress, debaters can get all the primary information they need, including floor speeches, the full text of legislation, and the full opinions of Supreme Court justices, from the websites associated with these institutions.

Congress: <http://thomas.loc.gov/>

The Supreme Court: <http://www.supremecourtus.gov/>

The President: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/>

US Agency for International Development: <http://www.usaid.gov>

Center for Disease Control: <http://www2a.cdc.gov/od/gharview/>

US Global AIDS Coordinator: <http://www.state.gov/s/gac/>

Bureau of African Affairs: <http://www.state.gov/p/af/>

President's Emergency Plan for AIDS Relief: <http://www.pepfar.gov/>

To make your search easier, the **Congressional Research Service** has compiled many government documents related to this year's topic in a document just for high school debaters and available at <http://www.gpoaccess.gov/serialset/cdocuments/debatetopic.html>.

International organizations that work on global public health will be useful as well. Consider the following sources:

World Health Organization: <http://www.who.int/en/>

United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs: <http://www.un.org/esa/desa/>

Global Fund to Fight AIDS, Tuberculosis, and Malaria: <http://www.theglobalfund.org/en/>

African Union: <http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/index/index.htm>

Reliability

Just because a source has an agenda does not mean that source is unreliable. As long as the author makes a legitimate attempt to get the facts right and makes clear that her opinions are opinions, then she can be considered a reliable source. But there is no shortage of truly unreliable information out there, especially on the internet. Some sources distort the facts to better support their arguments, in an attempt to be funny, or just because they did not do very good research themselves. There are some simple things debaters can do to avoid mistakenly using such bad information (and debaters should never deliberately use bad information!):

-Get a second opinion. If anything seems suspicious, readers can “fact check” a claim with a source that they know to be reliable. For example, a debater who finds a website that claims the current President is actually an alien from outer space impersonating George W. Bush can try to find an article in a reliable source, such as one of the newspapers listed above, that corroborates this story. The President being replaced by a space alien is a big story, so if the New York Times has not mentioned it, it probably did not happen.



-Look for other mistakes. If the source cites a “fact” that a debater knows to be wrong, she should consider the entire source to be highly suspect. Other mistakes also cast doubt on a source’s credibility. For example, an author who is not careful enough to avoid simple grammar and spelling mistakes has probably not researched her facts very carefully either.

-Look for qualifications. Most articles will give the author’s qualifications at the beginning or the end of the piece. If the author is an expert *in the field that her article discusses*, then she is probably reliable. However, a highly qualified lawyer analyzing statistics may not be the most reliable source, not because she is an unintelligent person, but because she may not be trained in how to analyze statistics (then again, maybe she is, but if the article is about statistics and the author’s background in statistics is not mentioned in her qualifications, then she probably does not have much of a background in statistics.)

-When in doubt, throw it out. Debaters can always make arguments in their own words. The purpose of evidence is to add the weight of expert opinion to these arguments. Evidence from questionable sources, then, is not very valuable, because there is no weight behind it. The argument may still be true, but the debater might as well make it in her own words as read a piece of evidence from a questionable source. In a worst case scenario, debaters could even lose a round based on unethical use of evidence if they are citing false “facts” from unreliable sources. Thus, it is best simply to avoid using sources whose credibility is in doubt.

Stories to Watch

Although almost every major news story could affect a debate in some way, it is especially important for debaters to keep an eye on certain stories. While others will undoubtedly appear throughout the season, there are many issues related to public health and/or Sub-Saharan Africa that are already making headlines every day and will continue to do so:

PEPFAR Reauthorization- PEPFAR was first authorized as a 5-year program beginning in 2003, which means that it is due for reauthorization during the 2007/08 debate season. PEPFAR is popular and successful, so there is little danger that it will not continue, but debaters will need to know what new funds are authorized and what changes, if any, are made to the program. The White House released a one-page flier detailing the changes President Bush has requested, including a doubling of the program’s funding to \$30 billion over the next five years:

<http://www.pepfar.gov/documents/organization/88695.pdf>.

Farm Bill Reauthorization- Also up for reauthorization this year is the Farm Bill, a collection of legislation that supports the US agricultural sector and determines the nation’s agricultural policy for the next five years. Although most of the bill will address strictly domestic considerations, it also governs the availability and distribution of overseas food aid. Thus, the future of the Farm Bill may affect that case.



African Union- In early July, the members of the African Union met in Accra, Ghana to discuss a move towards greater unity. They ultimately voted against the immediate formation of a United States of Africa, but the unity debate continues to be a hot topic and debaters should pay attention to recent developments. They should also be aware of the AU's major policy actions, including its peacekeeping presence in Sudan.

Darfur- The conflict in the Darfur region of Sudan has made more headlines in recent years than any other happening on the African continent. At the time of this writing, Sudan has just agreed to UN-backed peace talks, but that is no guarantee that the killing will stop any time soon. Some Affirmative cases will doubtless interact with Sudan in one or another, and anything new that the African Union or the US does in the region could affect the uniqueness or link debates on a number of disadvantages.

Zimbabwe- This southern African nation is home to one of the least popular leaders in the world, Robert Mugabe. Though his country is experiencing an economic crisis, including hyper-inflation and food shortages, Mugabe is expected to strong-arm his way into re-election. His future could have important implications, particularly for the Food Aid Affirmative and the Corruption Disadvantage.

War in Iraq- Though not in Africa, Iraq looms large over virtually everything the US does these days. Developments in the war will affect everything from the amount of money available for foreign aid to the US' soft power and the popularity of President Bush.

President Bush's popularity, political capital, and agenda- In many debate circuits, disadvantages relating to the popularity and political strength, or capital, of the President are part of most Negative strategies. Thus, debaters must be aware of the items currently on the President's agenda. With Democrats now in control of Congress and his final term as president coming to an end, Bush will be looking to push his agenda largely through executive orders and regulations. This is likely to include action on immigration, energy security, education, and the environment, although the reauthorization of PEPFAR is also a priority. Debaters will need to know the arguments for and against each of these proposals as well as the likelihood of their passing in the status quo. They will also need to be aware of new presidential initiatives that emerge throughout the season.



Step Two: Background Reading

It takes more than knowledge of current events, Harms areas, and Disadvantage links to do well at debate. Understanding the arguments that win debate rounds requires understanding the history and context of many topics. A number of these topics are listed below, along with questions about each topic and some resources to help debaters get started on their research. In this exercise, debaters should research answers to each of the questions, but instead of simply writing the answer, they should “cut” a piece of evidence that contains the answer, remembering to provide a full citation for each “card”.

Politics

1. What is the Sahara? What does Sub-Saharan mean?
2. Find a list of all of the countries commonly thought to fall within the region of Sub-Saharan Africa.
3. What is the African Union? How is it different from the old Organization of African States?
4. What is the United States of Africa and which leader proposed the idea?

Bibliography

- “About the African Union.” *African Union*. 11 Sep 2007. <http://www.africa-union.org/root/au/AboutAu/au_in_a_nutshell_en.htm>.
- “Exploring Africa.” *Michigan State University*. 11 Sep 2007. <<http://exploringafrica.matrix.msu.edu/students/events/africaunion.php>>.
- “Sub-Saharan Africa.” *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 4 Sep 2007, 00:58 UTC. Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 11 Sep 2007. <http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Sub-Saharan_Africa&oldid=157051550>.
- Tshiyembe, Mwayila. “Would a United States of Africa Work?” *Le Monde Diplomatique*. Sep 2000. <<http://mondediplo.com/2000/09/12africa>>.

History

1. Name some of the kingdoms and empires that existed in Sub-Saharan Africa prior to colonialism.
2. What is colonialism? Which countries had colonies in Sub-Saharan Africa?
3. When did the United States begin importing slaves from Africa? When did Congress make it illegal to import slaves?

Bibliography



"African slave trade." *Wikipedia, The Free Encyclopedia*. 10 Sep 2007, 22:47 UTC.
Wikimedia Foundation, Inc. 11 Sep 2007
<http://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=African_slave_trade&oldid=157027884>.
Rodney, Walter. *How Europe Underdeveloped Africa*. Howard University Press. 1974.

AIDS

1. What was the average life expectancy in Sub-Saharan Africa in 1970? What is it now? What are thought to be the causes of this change?
2. What does HIV stand for? What does AIDS stand for? When did the disease first appear?
3. What does ARV stand for? What are ARVs?

Bibliography

AVERT. "HIV/AIDS in Africa." <<http://www.avert.org/aidsinafrica.htm>>.
Barnett, Tony. *AIDS in Africa: Its Present and Future Impact*. London: Bellhaven Press 1992.
Cook, Nicholas. (2006). AIDS IN AFRICA, 2006,
<<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/67156.pdf>>.
World Health Organization. "WHO Issues New Healthy Life Expectancy Rankings." 4 June 2000. <<http://www.who.int/inf-pr-2000/en/pr2000-life.html>>.

Infectious Diseases

1. Besides AIDS, which infections diseases kill the most people in Sub-Saharan Africa?
2. What are some examples of viral hemorrhagic fevers? Why are they of great concern to the public health community?
3. What is DOTS?
4. What are mosquito nets? How do they promote public health?
5. What is DDT? How can it promote public health? Why is it controversial?

Bibliography

Bieron, Joseph and Dinan, Frank. "To Spray or Not to Spray." SUNY Buffalo. 11 Sep 2007.
<<http://ublib.buffalo.edu/libraries/projects/cases/ddt/ddt.html>>.
Cook, Nicholas. *AIDS in Africa*. 2006. <<http://fpc.state.gov/documents/organization/67156.pdf>>.
Rotberg, Robert. *Africa: Progress and Problems—AIDS and Health Issues*. Mason Crest



Publishers. 2007.

World Health Organization. "Haemorrhagic Fevers, Viral". 10 Sep 2007.

< http://www.who.int/topics/haemorrhagic_fevers_viral/en/>.

World Health Organization. "The Five Elements of DOTS." 10 Sep 2007.

<<http://www.who.int/tb/dots/en/>>.

US Aid

1. What does USAID stand for?
2. What percent of the federal budget is spent on foreign aid? About how much money does the US spend on aid to Africa each year?
3. What are some reasons why the US is concerned about health issues in Africa?
4. What is PEPFAR?
5. What is the ABC policy? Why is it controversial?
6. What is the Mexico City policy (also called the Gag Rule)? Why is it controversial?

Bibliography

Access Denied. "The Global Gag Rule." 11 Sep 2007. <<http://www.globalgagrule.org/>>.

Office of the Global AIDS Coordinator. "PEPFAR." 4 Sep 2007. <<http://www.pepfar.gov/>>.

USAID. "USAID." 3 Sep 2007. <<http://www.usaid.gov/>>.



Step Three: Improving the Core Files

The Core Files are not perfect, and even if they were, there would still be some value to updating them with independent research. More important than the strength of an argument in its own right is the depth of a debater's understanding of that argument, and no matter how well a debater may understand an argument researched by someone else, she will always be more familiar with those that she found herself. Researching forces debaters to go through a very valuable process of thinking about their evidence in context and learning the warrants for their arguments inside and out. This portion of the Research Guide will help students to recognize ways that they can improve upon existing Core Files arguments with independent research.

More Recent Evidence

Some arguments are very time-dependent. That is, they are true at some times but not at others. The claim, "President Bush's popularity is at an all-time high" may be true this week, but by next week his poll numbers may have dropped. The claim, "Feeding the hungry is a moral obligation," may be true or false, but in any case its truth is not time-dependent. If torture is wrong now, then it was wrong a month ago and five hundred years ago.

A debater reading months-old evidence about the President's popularity is wasting her time. Thus, it is important for debaters to identify time-dependent arguments in their files so that they can update them before competitions. As a general rule, arguments that describe the *status quo*, such as Uniqueness and Inherency, are most likely to be time-dependent.

Following are some examples of time-dependent arguments from the Core Files:

Generics Multilateralism Harms- The evidence in the 1AC is mostly specific to generic antiretrovirals, so replacing with more recent but more generic evidence may not be a good idea. However, the question of whether the US is perceived as pursuing a unilateral or multilateral foreign policy is time-dependent and debaters should be aware of how this may change over the course of the year. A controversial new policy action by the US, for example a decision to invade Iran or North Korea, might create so much resentment that the plan could not overcome it. On the other hand, a decision to withdraw troops from Iraq could boost the US' credibility and eliminate the need for the plan, at least with regard to the problem of unilateralism.

China Disadvantage Uniqueness- The Uniqueness evidence in the shell argues, among other things, that relations between the US and China are fairly good now. The two nations have differing approaches to global hotspots such as North Korea and the Sudan, however, and while they have been working to reconcile these differences, a crisis in one of those regions could rapidly deteriorate US-China relations. Debaters should continue to monitor the state of relations between these two superpowers throughout the season.



African Unity Disadvantage Uniqueness- Unity is a hot but controversial topic among African leaders right now. Some leaders, such as Muammar al-Gaddafi of Libya, are strongly in favor, while others, such as Thabo Mbeki of South Africa, are strongly opposed. If one of these influential leaders were to change his stance or become more or less politically prominent, this could affect the prospects for greater African unity for better or for worse, and debaters would need to know about it.

African Unity Counterplan Solvency- The Sankore evidence argues that African leaders and the African Union specifically have been shamefully negligent with regard to public health. One of the Negative's arguments is that the counterplan encourages the AU to take much needed action to promote the health of the continent. If the AU were to undertake a major new health initiative, that might prevent the Negative from claiming this net benefit.

Where to Find It

Cutting more recent evidence to support existing Core Files arguments is a natural extension of the basic research all debaters should be doing anyway to keep up with current events. That means that majority of this evidence can come directly from the newspaper or an update provided by an interest group website. At the very least, current events research should 'tip off' debaters to important arguments for which they will need to do a more targeted search. For more information on conducting current events research, see Step One of this guide.

More Reliable Source

A second way to improve upon existing evidence is to find a better source who makes the same claim. In some cases, the source for an argument simply may not be an expert in relevant subject matter. One example is a journalist or staff writer for a newspaper. This individual is likely to be relatively intelligent and well-informed about the issue on which she is writing, but nonetheless her knowledge of the topic pales in comparison to someone who has spent her professional life studying it. In other words, evidence from an expert in terrorism that indicates another attack is inevitable would be more compelling, on balance, than the same argument made by a staff writer for the New York Times. Bear in mind that other factors, such as the quality of the warrants used to support the claim, may still make the New York Times evidence on-balance better. However, all other things being equal, an expert source is preferable to a non-expert, or 'lay person', source.

Another factor to consider is a source's potential bias. Evidence from a member of the Bush administration arguing that PEPFAR works fine now may be biased, since the author has a political interest in defending her boss' decisions.

It is important to recognize, however, that an opinion does not necessarily mean a bias. The Executive Director of the Center for Health and Gender Equity is likely to argue strongly in favor of promoting women's rights overseas, but to say that she is biased because she is the head CHANGE is to reverse cause and effect. More probably, she was already a strong believer in women's rights, and that is why he



took a job as head of the CHANGE. In other words, she formed her opinion based on the quality of the arguments, not because of some financial or other interest that she has in promoting women's rights.

Following are some examples of Core Files arguments that might benefit from evidence from a different source:

Food Aid Negative- The first piece of evidence in the Morality Harms 1NC Frontline comes from Garrett Hardin, a professor of biology. While his knowledge of agriculture may make him qualified to speak about the science of food aid, he is not a philosopher and may not be as qualified as Affirmative authors to speak about the moral issues involved. However, this is how the Negative is using him to make the argument that absolute equality of distribution is not a moral imperative. Finding a moral philosopher who makes the same argument would help the Negative refute the Food Aid case's powerful moral imperative.

Female Condom Negative- Several of the Negative's cards in both the Overpopulation Harms and Solvency 1NC Frontlines are from sources with a possible religious bias. The Catholic church generally opposes birth control, and so sources like the Catholic Family and Human Rights Institute and Gracie Hsu of the Family Research Council have a political and religious interest in arguing that overpopulation is not a problem. If it were, the case for birth control would be stronger, and their interest in opposing birth control may bias their views on population growth. Experts in the field of demography or biology would be both less biased and more qualified to make the same arguments.

Imperialism Disadvantage Answers- Several of the cards in the Affirmative's 2AC frontline come from a source called the Independent Task Force on US Policy Toward Africa. This was a working group assembled by a policy think tank for the explicit purpose of determining how the US could best pursue its own interests in Africa. The Task Force was not charged with considering whether the US should be pursuing economic and military goals in Africa in the first place. This was essentially taken as a given, so it is no surprise that the Task Force argues in favor of pursuing such interests. A foreign policy scholar examining the topic with less of a preconceived agenda would have a more objective perspective and be a more reliable source.

African Unity Disadvantage Uniqueness- The Negative's argument that the African Union is addressing health issues comes from the AU's own commissioner for social affairs. Bience Gawanas is the top health official for the AU, so while it could be argued that she would know better than anyone else, she also has a vested interest in defending the organization and its health policy. The argument would be stronger if the Negative could find evidence from an objective observer not affiliated with the AU who also felt the organization was addressing Africa's public health issues in the status quo.

Where to Find It

Though far from perfect, print sources such as books, magazines, and newspapers are much more likely to be reliable than are internet sources. Most of these publications include an "About the Author" section at the beginning or end of the piece that detail the author's qualifications. Many also contain Endnotes or



a Bibliography that references other works on the same topic. Debaters who are looking for a more qualified source that makes the same argument as a source they have now can check to see if the current author has cited any other sources that would be worth exploring.

Although websites are less likely to be professionally edited and fact-checked than are print sources, there are still plenty of reliable sources of information. The safest bet is to stick with sources that have ‘name recognition’, such as CNN or the United Nations. Some internet sources may contain Endnotes or Bibliographies that reference other authors, but many websites also have a “Links” section that connects researchers to like-minded sources and organizations. If a debater is looking to find a more reliable source for an argument she got off of the internet, she should check to see which other sites the original author links on her website.

Different Warrants

Warrants, or the reasons that an author gives to support her claims, are the backbone of evidence. When they first begin their careers, many debaters prefer evidence that is highly rhetorical; that is, they love to read cards that make strongly worded claims. More sophisticated debaters recognize, however, that the best evidence is that which offers strong warrants to support the central claims. Debaters seeking to improve Core Files arguments, then, would do well to seek out evidence that contains different, stronger warrants than those they currently use.

Following are some examples of Core Files arguments that might benefit from evidence with different warrants:

Female Condom Negative- The Hartmann evidence in the Overpopulation Harms 1NC Frontline makes reference to “recent research” that indicates that population growth has sometimes been good for the African environment. However, Hartmann herself does not cite any examples of this or examine the reasons for why it may have occurred. Negatives could make this argument by stronger by tracking down the research Hartmann cites (she references the names of the authors in the quote) and seeing what those individuals had to say.

China Disadvantage Impacts- The Eland evidence indicates that “a US policy of coexistence... might avoid a future catastrophic war or even a nuclear conflagration,” but he does not go into detail about how such a conflict might arise or how better US-China relations might avert it. Negatives may wish to research a particular scenario, for instance conflict over Taiwan, that could end in nuclear war if relations between the US and China were not strong.

African Unity Disadvantage Uniqueness- The Gawanas evidence is included to demonstrate that the African Union (AU) is currently working on public health issues. However, Gawanas mostly cites pledges and resolutions that the AU and its members have made rather than policies they’ve implemented or results they’ve achieved. In other words, she talks more about what they’ve promised to do than about what they’ve actually done. Evidence detailing successful AU public health policies would make this argument stronger.



Where to Find It

There is no easy answer to how to find evidence with better warrants than those in the Core Files. After all, if we had one, those arguments would already be in the Core Files! Some of the passages above contain suggestions about where to find evidence relevant to that particular topic. As a general rule, longer sources are more likely to contain multiple, strong warrants for their claims than are shorter ones. So, articles from academic journals will be more helpful than newspaper articles, and books may turn out to be the most helpful.



Step Four: Researching a New Position

The most rewarding research projects are those where students conduct the whole process, from beginning to end, themselves and produce an entirely new argument of their own creation. Provided that the debater already has some basic research skills and does not undertake a project that is too complex, this does not have to be as difficult as it may sound.

This portion of the Research Guide will walk debaters through the creation of a new disadvantage that will be usable against the Generics Affirmative or any other case that might hurt the pharmaceutical industry, particularly its intellectual property rights.

Researching the Pharmaceutical Industry

Summary- The pharmaceutical industry operates similarly, in many respects, to the music industry. In both cases, large companies with billions of dollars in capital seek out hot prospects in which to invest in the hopes of finding the next Viagra or the next Kanye West. But for every blockbuster drug or superstar artist they discover, they will invest in hundreds, if not thousands, of other prospects that never make it big or even show a profit.

That means that when a pharmaceutical or music company does have a hot commodity, they have to make a big profit on it to pay for all of the dead-ends in which they invested along the way. Did you ever wonder why CD's cost only pennies to manufacture but sell for \$15-\$20? In no small part, it because you are also paying for all of the less successful music that the producer is also supporting. The profits from the company's biggest hits become the capital for the next round of investing that will hopefully produce the next big star.

The same is true for the pharmaceutical industry. Once a company develops, perfects, and tests a drug, they can often mass produce it for less than a dollar a dose. Yet these drugs often sell for 50 to 100 times that price. This is because production is not the expensive part of drug development. Rather, the consumer is paying for all the research and development that went into not just this drug but all the failed drugs with which the company experimented along the way. And once again, the profits from this sale will be reinvested into the next round of drug trials, which just might produce a cure for cancer or AIDS.

This disadvantage argues that when the Affirmative play hurts the pharmaceutical industry or its ability to profit from its drugs, it hurts future innovation. Allowing the producers of generic pharmaceuticals to violate patent laws and mass produce drugs for which they did not spend any money researching and developing discourages the major firms from investing in future innovation. In other words, if they suspect that competitors will be allowed to undercut them with generic versions of their drug, then they will not invest in future research and development, and thus the world will never see badly needed new medicines.



A more thorough analysis of pharmaceutical research and development can be found in this article:

Congressional Budget Office. "Research and Development in the Pharmaceutical Industry." October 2006. <http://www.cbo.gov/ftpdocs/76xx/doc7615/10-02-DrugR-D.pdf>

Uniqueness- If the Negative is going to argue that the plan will undermine the incentive for pharmaceuticals companies to research and develop new drugs, then they will need to prove that those companies are innovating new drugs now. After all, the plan can not stop something that if it is not happening now.

Given that this is a time-dependent argument, recent periodicals such as newspapers and business publications are likely to produce the best evidence. Here is an example of an industry publication arguing that the pharmaceutical industry is currently investing in drugs to fight diseases such as AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria in Africa:

VFA. "R&D Pharmaceutical Industry committed to improving health in Africa." 5/31/07
http://www.legalaffairs.org/issues/March-April-2003/feature_marapr03_kerr.msp

And here is another article that is somewhat dated but that makes claims about the current state of pharmaceutical research:

Jones, Stacey. "Leading Pharmaceutical Companies to Quadruple Number of New Medicines Launched Annually, According to New Accenture Research." 3/9/00.
http://accenture.tekgroup.com/article_display.cfm?article_id=3589

Link- Ultimately, the Negative needs to draw a line between the Affirmative plan and a decrease in pharmaceutical research and development. To do this, they will need to demonstrate the plan either hurts the pharmaceutical industry financially or prevents them from profiting from their innovations in the future. Against the Generics Affirmative, the Negative will argue that buying generic drugs will hurt the intellectual property rights of the drug companies, cutting down on both their current profits and their expectation of future profits from other drugs in which they might invest. In other words, why would a drug company choose to invest in researching a new antiretroviral if they suspected that, after investing hundreds of millions of dollars, they would not be allowed to sell their product at a profit?

Evidentiary support for this claim can be found in the following articles:

"Innovation Vs. Access" in Journal of Young Investigators. August 2007.
<http://www.jyi.org/features/ft.php?id=467>

Simons, Bright. "Drug Patents Don't Kill Poor Patients" in *OhMyNews*. 6/4/07.
http://english.ohmynews.com/articleview/article_view.asp?no=364868&rel_no=1

Acemoglu, Daron and Linn, Joshua. "Market Size in Innovation." April 2004.
<http://econ-www.mit.edu/files/293>



Impact- So far, the Negative has collected evidence indicating that the pharmaceutical industry is investing in research and development for new drugs in the status quo but that the plan would undermine that research. Now, they need an impact, a reason why pharmaceutical innovation is important.

There are several options. This article contends that research is key to preventing a SARS epidemic:

Bandow, Doug. “Healers Under Siege” in the *National Review Online*, July 11, 2003.
<http://www.nationalreview.com/comment/comment-bandow071103.asp>

This article claims that the health of the pharmaceutical industry is important to the health of the US economy:

“Pharmaceutical Industry Plays Big Role in American Economy.” *Aggie Daily*. 8/23/04.
<http://newsarchive.tamu.edu/article.php?articleid=19689&month=8&year=2004>

This transcript of a television news broadcast suggests that weaker patent laws lead to deadly counterfeit drugs:

Fell, Nicola. “Growing Concern Over Fake Drug Production” in *The World Today*.
6/5/07. <http://www.abc.net.au/worldtoday/content/2007/s1942992.htm>.

And the VFA article mentioned under Uniqueness also outlines a possible impact for people in Sub-Saharan Africa with disease like HIV/AIDS and tuberculosis:

VFA. “R&D Pharmaceutical Industry committed to improving health in Africa.” 5/31/07
http://www.legalaffairs.org/issues/March-April-2003/feature_marapr03_kerr.msp

Researching Answers to a Pharmaceutical Industry Disadvantage

Even if they do not choose to research and develop a Pharmaceutical Industry disadvantage themselves, debaters who argue for the Generics Affirmative should be prepared to answer such a position.

Answering Uniqueness- To attack uniqueness, Affirmatives will need to argue that pharmaceutical companies are not innovating new drugs in the status quo. This book argues that in fact, most of the research done by drug companies these days is “me-too” research, or knock-offs and slight improvements on existing drugs rather than new compounds for diseases like TB or AIDS:

Angell, Marcia. *The Truth About the Drug Companies*. New York: Random House, 2004.

For those unable to find the book, this article summarizes some of Angell’s key points:



Whitney, Jake. "Pharmaceutical Sales 101: Me-Too Drugs" in *Guernica*. February 2006.
http://www.guernicamag.com/features/111/me_too_drugs/

Answering the Link- There is the most potential for a complex debate at the link level of this disadvantage. A well-researched and well-informed Affirmative can make very specific, potentially devastating arguments about the nature of pharmaceutical research and the contributions of the African market to their profit base. For a start, the "For the Sake of Innovation?" section of this article contends that the pharmaceutical industry has multiple sources of research funding and will not be undercut by generic ARVs:

Parker, Stephanie. "Big Pharma and Big Profits" in *Africa Action*. Aug 3 2007.
<http://www.africaaction.org/resources/page.php?op=read&documentid=2509&type=6&issues=1>

This article argues that developing countries like those in Sub-Saharan Africa are such a small part of the pharmaceutical market that a differential pricing scheme, where drugs cost more in wealthy countries than in poor countries, would not undermine the profit incentive for future research:

Siddiqi, Ahmad. "Patents and Pharmaceutical Drugs" in *Intellectual Property Law*.
Spring 2005. <http://surj.stanford.edu/2005/pdfs/Ahmad.pdf>.

Answering the Impact- The Negative has some flexibility with regard to what kind of impact they want to argue, but regardless this is not the Affirmative's best option for answering this disadvantage. The Affirmative would need to win that the innovation of new pharmaceuticals is either bad or at least not particularly helpful, and that will be a very difficult argument to win. At best, the Affirmative may be able to argue that the impact will not be as bad as the Negative claims, but that will depend on the chosen scenario. If the Affirmative wants to win this debate, they will need to do it at the uniqueness of link level.