### 1

#### Interpretation: If the affirmative defends anything other than [Insert Topicnization ought to reduce intellWorld tradecual property protections for medicines ] then they must provide a counter-solvency advocate for their specific advocacy in the 1AC. *(To clarify, you must have an author that states we should not do your aff, insofar as the aff is not a whole res phil aff)*

#### Violation:

#### Standards:

#### [1] Fairness – This is a litmus test to determining whether your aff is fair –

#### [A] Limits – there are infinite things you could defend outside the exact text of the resolution which pushes you to the limits of contestable arguments, even if your interp of the topic is better, the only way to verify if it’s substantively fair is proof of counter-arguments. Nobody knows your aff better than you, so if you can’t find an answer, I can’t be expected to. Our interp narrows out trivially true advocacies since counter-solvency advocates ensure equal division of ground for both sides. [B] Shiftiness-Having a counter-solvency advocate helps us conceptualize what their advocacy is and how it’s implemented. Intentionally ambiguous affirmatives we don’t know much about can’t spike out of DA’s and CP’s if they have an advocate that delineates these things.

#### [3] Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

#### [4] Drop the debater – key to normsetting, also detternce-deters them from future abuse

#### [5] Use competing interps – reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention since we don’t know your bs meter and collapses, youy use an offense-defense paradigm

#### [6] No RVI’s – a) illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair – it’s a litmus test for engaging in substance, b) topic ed – incentivizes affs to bait theory and read 2AR scripts which avoids substance

## 2

### 1NC - T-Reduce

#### 1] Interpretation - Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds 59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### 2] Violation – the plan waives intellectual property protections “during global public health emergencies”, which is an suspension – don’t let them get We Meets since their Plan defends a waiver during public health emergencies.

#### 3] Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech.

#### 4] TVA solves – permanently reduce COVID patents or read your aff whole rez

#### 5] Paradigm Issues –

#### a] Topicality is Drop the Debater – it’s a fundamental baseline for debate-ability.

#### b] Use Competing Interps – 1] Topicality is a yes/no question, you can’t be reasonably topical and 2] Reasonability invites arbitrary judge intervention and a race to the bottom of questionable argumentation.

#### c] No RVI’s - 1] Forces the 1NC to go all-in on Theory which kills substance education, 2] Encourages Baiting since the 1AC will purposely be abusive, and 3] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for not being abusive.

## 3

#### Expansion of medical access is a form of settler colonial biomedical onslaught – humanitarian promotions of health proliferate genocidal assimilation.

They either accept the drug – the state uses it as proof as to why western gov is superior

Or they don’t take it

And they use the stats as reason why they are savage and backwards and need the help of the state

Overwehlimg amt of alcholoism

Drunken ingenous

Demonstrate how theyre backwards

Klausen 13, Jimmy Casas. "Reservations on hospitality: contact and vulnerability in Kant and indigenous action." Hospitality and World Politics. Palgrave Macmillan, London, 2013. 197-221. (Associate Professor in the Instituto de Relações Internacionais at the Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro)//Elmer

On the other hand and by contrast, the **governmental reach of public health initiatives** that would effect the improvement of isolated indigenous populations’ health **accords** with Kantian philanthropy – **with all the risks of violated freedom and smothered life** that entails. Public **health advocates** would **repair** the **disadvantaged morbidity profile of** isolated **indigenous groups through** a policy of initiating contact supported by the provision of modern **biomedical** health **care** services to ameliorate the epidemiological effects of contact. State-initiated contact without attendant health care has proved disastrous. Into the 1970s, FUNAI attempted to make friendly contact with isolated Indians. By relying on hired expert indigenous trackers, government contact expeditions located isolated groups and – demonstrating their interest in seeking commerce – enticed the latter with gifts of machetes and blankets. One FUNAI expedition to contact the Matis in 1978 resulted in high morbidity from pneumonia and other infectious diseases and killed one of every two Matis. 60 To correct such devastating policies, anthropologists Magdalena Hurtado, Kim Hill, Hillard Kaplan and Jane Lancaster have elaborated the following argument: Many anthropologists and indigenous-rights activists believe that uncontacted Indians should be left alone. These people are well-meaning, but they are wrong because they base their position on three incorrect assumptions. First, they assume that the Indians have chosen to remain isolated . . . . Those who oppose contact also assume that the Indians will inevitably be decimated by virgin-soil epidemics . . . . Finally, opponents of contact assume that isolated native groups will survive if not contacted. 61 However, even correcting for the fatal infelicities of past policy-driven, state-initiated contacts such as FUNAI’s, the preponderantly disadvantaged morbidity profile of such virgin-soil populations cannot be reduced by greater hospitality in the form of redoubled and more expert interventionary contacts. **Although public health efforts** like those advocated by Hurtado et al. **might reduce mortality**, highly **disease-vulnerable persons will still sicken** and will do so **through means that would pretend to foster life by actively disregarding how the people subject to these external machinations might** determine their own needs and **value their own health**. Isolated **indigenes’** biological **lives** would be **simultaneously fostered and risked**, while their free **personhood would count as nothing** morally–culturally. In short, there are serious political costs to be weighed in such an intervention. Because of – and not in spite of – their philanthropy, public health interventions of the type that Hurtado et al. advocate extend the reach of governmentality much more intrusively than land rights policies. Besides deciding on behalf of peoples in regard to the interpretation of their acts of self-quarantine, the advocated **public health policies surgically insert apparatuses of biomedicine directly into the contacted peoples’ living being**. Such policies thereby **displace** **indigenous norms of health and native cultural strategies** of living on with the norms and overall strategy embedded in the culture of scientific and clinical biomedicine. Though the pretence is that such acts demonstrate the hospitality of the wider national or global society, such health policy interventions cannot simply make a presentation for possible society; rather, qua philanthropy they initiate contact, which, because of the high degree of vulnerability of those contacted, must needs lead to the proliferation of contacts. It is not a hospitable policy of fostering life that Hurtado et al. support, not merely possible commerce but an obsessive philanthropy of biomedical life support and literally **unavoidable onslaught of commerce**, possibly forevermore. Most startlingly, such public health interventions presume as universal a standard of life that could certainly vary while retaining meaning and value. The anthropologist Tess Lea describes this universalising interventionary compulsion in withering words: When you are a helping bureau-professional, the **compulsion to** do something to **fix** the problems of **target populations** – those deemed as suffering from unequal and preventable conditions – exceeds all other impulses . . . . ‘They’ need our greater commitment. The idea that life might be lived differently with value and meaning or that ‘need’ might be conceived differently from the way in which we **calculate** it **through** our **interventionary lens**, becomes impossible to imagine. 62 Hurtado et al. assume that health professionals and policy makers must hospitably confer biomedically acquired immunity on heretofore isolated and now contacted virgin soil populations. Fostering indigenous lives by **imposing** an **alien conception of immunity**, they would inhospitably **destroy alternate strategies of living on**. Seeing through their interventionary lens, Hurtado et al. themselves become arbiters of successful and unsuccessful forms of life: they presume that self-quarantine cannot itself serve as an effective cultural strategy to immunise living bodies. Thus, ironically perhaps, these anthropologists choose biology above culture by seeing each from a standpoint authorised by the culture of biomedicine. From their interventionary lens and against Canguilhem’s admonition above, self-quarantine appears to be a failed strategy for living on because the immunity it would confer is imperfect or incomplete. Likewise, condoning self-isolation is imperfect or incomplete hospitality as against their more perfect interventionary hospitality in the name of life. Authorising themselves to make these judgements, they enact an altogether different collapse of morality into nature than the Kantian collapse I reconstruct above. Whereas Kant’s collapse of minimalism into abstentionism and moral duty into nature’s constraints opens hospitality and therefore strategies for living on, this other collapse binds moralising conceptions of ‘health’ to the biomedically conceived body. Yet if, according to Canguilhem, for humans especially, ‘health is precisely a certain latitude, a certain play in the norms of life and behavior’, 63 then it seems that the ‘**health’ that supposedly hospitable**, though strictly philanthropic, ‘life’-fostering interventionary contact **would impose** on the exuberance of self-quarantining **indigenous peoples** is **a sickness unto** that other perpetual peace Kant mentions: **death**.

#### Biomedicine itself is invested in colonial exploitation through testing done on indigenous communities to biopiracy and stealing indigenous knowledge.

Bio medicine – modern medicine

Modern medicine is from natural resources taken way from indigenous ppls – leads to increased colonialsm

Bio medicine is tested on the indigenous populations – HIV drugs were tested in sourth Africa – targeted on these groupds

Lift Mode 17 3-10-2017 "Pharmaceutical Colonialism” <https://medium.com/@liftmode/pharmaceutical-colonialism-3-ways-that-western-medicine-takes-from-indigenous-communities-3a9339b4f24f> (We at Liftmode.com are a team of professionals from a variety of backgrounds, dedicated to the mission of providing the highest quality and highest purity nutritional health supplements on the market. We look specifically for the latest and most promising research in the fields of cognition enhancement, neuroscience and alternative health supplements, and develop commercial strategies to bring these technologies to the marketplace.)//Elmer

Does **modern medicine take from rural communities**? At first, this seems outrageous. However, on closer inspection, we find three main methods of poaching: **stealing indigenous knowledge**, ‘**biopiracy’**, and the sale of pharmaceuticals at exorbitant prices. Another example includes **using** **developing countries** and rural populations **as test subjects in unethical clinical trials** — for example on **AIDS patients in South Africa**.[1] This article examines three methods that Western medicine takes from rural communities. We also examine the emerging new forms of medicine and how many people are beginning to appreciate the medical knowledge of different cultures around the world. Traditional knowledge and culture is threatened by the expansive natural of the pharmaceutical industry 1. Pharmaceutical colonialism: Stealing Indigenous Knowledge First and foremost, what has been taken from indigenous communities for the last roughly 600 years is traditional knowledge about medicinal plants. It is interesting that the **major advancements in Western medicine** **coincide** very closely **to escalating global colonialism** by Western countries. It’s difficult to estimate the exact percentage of **modern drugs** that were **originally based on traditional plant sources**, because of the complex evolution of Western laboratory-made medicine. However, this percentage is known to be very high. In fact, a 2006 paper by Dr. A Gurib-Fakim states: “Natural products and their derivatives represent **more than 50%** of all the drugs in clinical use in the world. Higher plants contribute no less than 25% of the total.”[2] The extent to which traditional knowledge permeates through Western medicine is too broad to explain fully in a small article like this. We’d need to write an entire book to cover the full content! So, we will just take a look at one example below. How the West takes Indigenous knowledge: **Anti-Malaria Drugs** Mosquitoes are, by far, the world’s most dangerous animals, spreading a number of diseases including Dengue fever, Zika virus, and malaria. According to the World Health Organization, nearly half of the world’s population is at risk of malaria. In 2015, over 210 million people became infected with malaria, and a staggering 429 000 people died from the blood parasite.[3] To combat the infectious disease, scientists have developed two major classes of anti-malarial drugs. These are both based on indigenous knowledge of plant medicine: Mosquitos kill more people than any other animal every year 1. Quinine Quinine is extracted from the bark of the cinchona tree, native to South America. Contrary to propaganda by the Spanish inquisitors, which is still used in modern medicine today, Westerners did not ‘discover’ the cinchona tree. Indigenous Peruvian cultures had been using the bark of the cinchona tree for hundreds, possibly thousands, of years before the arrival of the colonial forces from the North. They crushed it up and mixed it with water to ‘relieve shivering’ — a major sign of the feverish symptoms of malaria.[4] Unlike traditional Chinese knowledge, which has survived until modern times, the ancient knowledge of South America cultures was almost completely destroyed by colonial forces. This makes tracing the historical use of the cinchona tree more difficult.[5] After the inquisition of most traditional cultures in South America, the cinchona bark was brought back to Western Europe and was hailed as one of the most exciting discoveries of modern medicine. The success of cinchona bark in Europe created a massive industry, initially run by the Spanish, but which was later overtaken by French and English industrialists.[6] It’s important to know that the ‘traditional’ use of cinchona bark in 18th century Europe was in exactly the same method as its original use in indigenous societies: crushing up the barking and mixing it with water. The chemical compound quinine was first extracted from cinchona bark in 1820 by two Frenchmen: Pierre Joseph Pelletier and Joseph Caventou. This allowed purified quinine to replace traditional cinchona extracts.[7] Interestingly, Western scientists have since discovered that cinchona bark actually contains several active components, which function in a synergistic relationship to kill the malaria parasite.[8] In modern times, a number of quinine-based drugs have been developed, with varying success. The issue becomes complex here because, while these drugs were developed by Western scientists using modern technological laboratories, if it hadn’t been for the original indigenous knowledge, these compounds could not have been developed at all. The quinine derivatives include Chloroquine, Pyrimethamine, and Mefloquine. Chloroquine was used as a spray along with DDT in the WHO’s malaria eradication plan (the efficacy and usefulness of this are still under debate: numerous countries that were sprayed with these chemicals soon developed strains of malaria that were resistant to the drugs).[9] 60411828 - workers are fogging for dengue control. mosquito borne diseases of zika virus. Quinine-based drugs were used in sprays to combat malaria around the world 2. Artemisinin **Artemisinin** is an active compound found in traditional Chinese medicine called Qinghao Su (sweet wormwood). This traditional Chinese medicine has been **used to treat fevers** for over a thousand years. It is currently still extracted from plant sources, the majority of which are grown in China, Vietnam and East Africa. Once the full-grown plants are harvested, the chemical is extracted, leaving the pure artemisinin at a highly variable market price of between $120 — $1200 per kilogram.[10] It’s interesting that the artemisinin-based drug combinations (ACTs) are the most expensive anti-malarial treatments available. This is despite the fact that it is one of the few malarial medications that are still mostly plant-based. However, **Western pharmaceutical** companies are now **developing synthetic** forms of **artemisinin**. The new forms of artemsinin are genetically engineered and have intellectual property rights attached, potentially bringing in big revenues for the companies involved. The proponents of the synthetic form of artemisinin claim that the synthetic form will be able to be sold for cheaper than the natural form. However, the average import price of natural artemsisin to India over the last ten years was around $370 per kilo — a fair amount cheaper than the price that the pharmaceutical companies are pushing for.[11] **Artemisinin farming** **sustains** the **livelihoods of** an estimated **100’000 farmers.** With **synthetic derivatives** being developed this **puts** the **livelihoods** of the farmers and their families **at risk of poverty** (estimated to be around 3–5 times the number of people as the farmers themselves).[12] The ironic and disturbing thing about the whole situation is that the artemisinin farmers themselves are the ones who are most at risk of contracting malaria. In effect, they stand to not only have their incomes stripped by Western pharmaceutical companies but also to become physically dependent on the products of those very companies. [13] 16118463 - portrait of a burmese woman with thanaka powdered face working in farm Farmers livelihoods are threatened by the use of synthetic chemicals 2. ‘**Biopiracy’** — **stealing natural resources and plants** The idea that modern medicine might be a form of colonialism seems at first to be quite outrageous! However, on closer inspection, it’s quite clear that a few nations continue to play the role of ‘missionary’, helping to save people in the ‘developing world’.[14] In some cases, though, the role of the ‘missionary’ becomes a little less clear. The second way that Western medicine takes from indigenous communities is something called ‘Biopiracy’. This is similar to the method we described above, however, in this case, what is taken is not knowledge but the actual plants and resources themselves. In biopiracy actions, plants and natural resources are stolen entirely from indigenous communities and are then used to develop drugs and medicines in the West. The indigenous communities benefit nothing from the theft of their resources. **Medicines** developed from **stolen** materials **are** often **sold back** to the very people from whom the original plant-sources were stolen — **at exorbitant prices**. Examples of medications that face biopiracy charges include: A **drug for diabetes developed** in the UK **from a Libyan plant**, Artemisia judaica A medicine for **immunosuppression** developed by GlaxoSmithKline which is **derived from** a **chemical found in termite hills** in Gambia An HIV treatment taken from bacteria found in central Uganda Antibiotic drugs developed from amoebas found in Mauritius and Venezuela Anti-diarrhea vaccines developed from Egyptian bacteria [15] According to Beth Burrows, president of Washington-based Edmond’s Institute: “Times have changed. It is no longer acceptable for the great white explorer to trawl across Africa or South America taking what they want for their own commercial benefit. It is no more than a new form of colonial pillaging. As there are internationally recognized rights for oil, so there should be for indigenous plants and knowledge.”[16] In an ideal world, knowledge and resources would be shared equitably. Both the indigenous cultures and the modern world would benefit from the sharing of knowledge and medicinal plants, which could leave the world a much better place. However, this is not the case in today’s world. More and more, we see evidence of **pharmaceutical companies using rural communities as customers and guinea-pigs for medicine** that was originally sourced from local knowledge.[17] Traditional medicine is pushed off the market and indigenous knowledge is ‘dumbed down’ through development programs. This forces the majority of the world to have to work through cartel-like pharmaceutical corporations who extract unbelievably large sums of money from people, which we’ll look at below.[18] 21736635 - shanty house in bangkok water canals along the river bank, thailand Those who benefit the least from pharmaceutical colonialism are the ones who need healthcare the most

#### Vote negative to endorse a cartography of refusal

Day

Material form as the alternative

Can fiat it to an extent

Days arg is that recognition is imp

Assumption that intellectual property

Authority to recognize intellectual property in the first place

Smooth tactic

We are going to reduce intellectual property

Refuse the authority of the settler state

Idle no more

Black hammer

Stole vaccines that were going to be discarded in virginia

Day 15 Iyko, Associate Professor of English. Chair, Critical Social Thought. “Being or Nothingness: Indigeneity, Antiblackness, and Settler Colonial Critique.” Source: Critical Ethnic Studies, Vol. 1, No. 2 (Fall 2015), pp. 102-121 //Elmer

And so the potential relations that Wilderson sets up through a critique of sovereignty are at best irrelevant or at worse false in Sexton’s absolute claim that slavery stands alone as the “threshold of the political world.”45 I suggest that this wavering relation/nonrelation of antiblackness and Indigeneity exhibited in Wilderson’s and Sexton’s work reveal the problem in any totalizing approach to the heterogeneous constitution of racial difference in settler colonies. Beyond this inconsistency, the liberal multiculturalist agenda that Wilderson and Sexton project into Indigenous sovereignty willfully evacuates any Indigenous refusal of a colonial politics of recognition. Among other broad strokes, Sexton states, “as a rule, Native Studies reproduces the dominant liberal political narrative of emancipation and enfranchisement.”46 This provides a basis for Wilderson’s assertion that Indigenous sovereignty engages in a liberal politics of state legitimation through recognition because “treaties are forms of articulation” that buttress “the interlocutory life of America as a coherent (albeit genocidal) idea.”47 But such a depoliticized liberal project is frankly incompatible with Indigenous activism and scholarship that emerges from Native studies in North America. The main argument in Glen Sean Coulthard’s book Red Skin, White Masks is to categorically reject “the liberal recognition-based approach to Indigenous selfdetermination.”48 **This is not** a politics of **legitimizing** Indigenous nations **through state recognition** **but** rather **one of refusal**, a refusal to be **recognized and** thus **interpellated by the settler colonial nation-state**. Drawing on Fanon, Coulthard describes the “necessity on the part of the oppressed to ‘turn away’ from their other-oriented master-dependency, and to instead struggle for freedom on their own terms and in accordance with their own values.”49 It is also difficult to reconcile the depoliticized narrative of “resurgence and recovery” that Wilderson and Sexton attribute to Indigenous sovereignty in the face of **Idle No More**, the anticapitalist Indigenous sovereignty movement in Canada whose national railway and **highway** **blockades** have seriously **destabilized** the **expropriation of natural resources** for the global market. These are examples that Coulthard describes as “**direct action**” rather tjhan negotiation—in other words, antagonism, not conflict resolution: The [blockades] are a crucial act of negation insofar as they seek to impede or block the flow of resources currently being transported to international markets from oil and gas fields, refineries, lumber mills, mining operations, and hydroelectric facilities located on the dispossessed lands of Indigenous nations. These modes of direct action . . . seek to have **a negative impact on** the economic **infrastructure** that is **core to** the **colonial accumulation of capital in settler-political economies** like Canada’s.50 **These tactics are** part of what Audra Simpson calls a “**cartography of refusal” that “negates the authority of the other’s gaze**.”51 It is **impossible to frame** the **blockade movement**, which has become the greatest threat to Canada’s resource agenda,52 **as a struggle for “enfranchisement**.” **Idle No More is** not in “conflict” with the Canadian nation-state; it is in **a struggle against the very premise of settler colonial capitalism** that requires the elimination of Indigenous peoples. As Coulthard states unambiguously, “For Indigenous nations to live, capitalism must die.”

#### Reject Reformism or Plan Focus - Challenging the 1AC’s colonialist framework of interpretation is a prior question to whether or not the Aff is a good idea

We cant view the plan as intrncially good or bad

We need to look to structural affects

When we fail to analyze alternatives

It causes serial policy failure

Wee never understand context

Plan focus good we reufse to ackoelege the histial accumulations

Delori

College apps – blank line to indicate race and that was used to discritmnate against miniorty backrgoudns

They said color lines bad and got rid of it

Race based admissions scholarnhips to comminites of color because no longer had the line

The reform ignored the historical context for what hey could be used

Fail to address underlying assumptions that exist

Reform is never undeerstoof or chnaglnged

Never contest western thinking

Weighing the aff foenst make sense

Because epistemology affects the way

Henry kinsinger – realism the US should act in its own interest

Advocate we don’t go into afganitaan – early 80’s – we should get out because afgan is draining American influence

Pacifict and anti war ppl also said to get out

The end results are motivate

Respresenations and thoughts

Deloria Jr. 99 – Member of the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe and Professor at University of Colorado Boulder  
(Vine, also Former Executive Director for the National Congress of American Indians and former Professor of Political Science and Law at the University of Arizona, For This Land: Writing on Religion in America, p. 101-7)//Elmer  
If there were any serious concern about liberation, we would see thousands of people simply walk away from the vast economic, political, and intellectual machine we call Western civilization and refuse to be enticed to participate in it any longer. Liberation is not a difficult task when one no longer finds value in a set of institutions or beliefs. We are liberated from the burden of Santa Claus and the moral demand to be "good" when, as maturing adolescents, we reject the concept of Santa Claus. Thereafter we have no sense of guilt in late November that we have not behaved properly during the year, and no fear that a lump of coal rather than a gift will await us Christmas morning. In the same manner, we are freed and liberated once we realize the insanity and fantasy of the present manner of interpreting our experiences in the world. Liberation, in its most fundamental sense, requires a **rejection of everything we have been taught** and its replacement by only those things we have experienced as having values. But this replacement only begins the task of liberation. For the history of Western thinking in the past eight centuries **has been one of replacement of ideas** within a framework that has remained **basically unchanged** for nearly two millenia. Challenging this framework of interpretation means a rearrangement of our **manner of perceiving the world**, and it involves a reexamination of the body of human knowledge and its structural reconstruction into a new format, Such a task appears to be far from the struggles of the present. It seems abstract and meaningless in the face of contemporary suffering. And it suggests that people can be made to change their oppressive activity by intellectual reorientation alone. All these questions arise, however, because of the fundamental orientation of Western peoples toward the world. We assume that we know the structure of reality and must only make certain minor adjustments in the machinery that operates it in order to bring our institutions into line. Immediate suffering is thus placed in juxtaposition with abstract metaphysical conceptions of the world and, because we can see immediate suffering, **we feel impelled to change conditions quickly** to relieve tensions, never coming to **understand how the basic attitude toward life** and its derivative attitudes toward minority groups **continues to dominate** the goals and activities that appear designed to create reforms, Numerous examples can be cited to show that **our efforts to bring justice** into the world **have been short-circuited** by the passage of events, and that those efforts are unsuccessful because we have failed to consider the **basic framework within which we pose questions, analyze alternatives, and suggest solutions**. Consider the examples from our immediate past. In the early sixties college application forms included **a blank line** on which all prospective students were required **to indicate** their **race**. Such information was used to discriminate against those of a minority background, and so **reformers demanded** that the **question be dropped**. By the time all colleges had been forced to eliminate questions concerning the race of applicants, the Civil Rights Movement had so sensitized those involved in higher education that scholarships were made available in great numbers to people of minority races. **There was no way,** however, **to allocate** such **scholarships** **because college officials could no longer determine the racial background** of students on the basis of their applications for admission. Much of the impetus for **low-cost housing** in the cities was based upon the premise that in the twentieth century people should not have to live in hovels but that adequate housing should be constructed for them. Yet in the course of **tearing down** slums and building new housing projects, low-income housing areas were eliminated. The **construction cost** of the new projects **made** it necessary to charge hi**gher rentals**. **Former residents** of the lowincome areas **could not afford to live** in the new housing, so they moved to other parts of the city and created exactly the same conditions that had originally provoked the demand for low-rent housing. Government schools had a very difficult time teaching American Indian children the English language. (One reason was the assumption of teachers that all languages had Latin roots, and their inability to adapt the programs when they discovered that Indian languages were not so derived.) Hence programs in bilingual teaching methods were authorized that would use the native language to teach the children English, an underhanded way of eliminating the native language. Between the time that bilingual programs were conceived and the time that they were finally funded, other programs that concentrated on adequate housing had an unexpected effect on the educational process. Hundreds of new houses were built in agency towns, and Indians moved from remote areas of the different reservations into those towns where they could get good housing. Since they were primarily younger couples with young children, the housing development meant that most Indian children were now growing up in the agency communities and were learning English as a first language. Thus the bilingual programs, which began as a means of teaching English as a second language, became the method designed to preserve the native vernacular by teaching it as a second language to students who had grown up speaking English. Example after example could be cited, each testifying to the devastating effect of a general attitude toward the world that underlies the Western approach to human knowledge. The basis of this attitude is the assumption that the world operates in certain predetermined ways, that it operates continuously under certain natural laws, and that the nature of every species is homogeneous, with few real deviations.

#### The Aff relegates indigenous possibility to reservation, accelerating death-making – only an orientation of refusal as generative can solve. This the ROTB is to reject systems of settler colonialism.

King 17, Tiffany Lethabo. "Humans involved: Lurking in the lines of posthumanist flight." Critical Ethnic Studies 3.1 (2017): 162-185. (Assistant Professor of Women’s, Gender and Sexuality Studies at Georgia State)//GZ but re-cut by Elmer

Within Native feminist theorizing, ethnographic refusal can be traced to Audra Simpson’s 2007 article, “On Ethnographic Refusal.” In this seminal work, Simpson reflects on and gains inspiration from the tradition of refusal practiced by the people of Kahnawake.14 Simpson shares that Kahnawake refusals are at the core and spirit of her own ethnographic and ethical practices of refusal. I was interested in the larger picture, in the discursive, material and moral territory that was simultaneously historical and contemporary (this “national” space) and the ways in which *Kahnawakero:non*, the “people of Kahnawake,” had *refused* the authority of the state at almost every turn. The ways in which their formation of the initial membership code (now replaced by a lineage code and board of elders to implement the code and determine cases) was refused; the ways in which their interactions with border guards at the international boundary line were predicated upon a refusal; how refusal worked in everyday encounters to enunciate repeatedly to ourselves and to outsiders that “this is who we are, this is who you are, these are my rights.”15 Because Simpson was concerned with applying the political and everyday modes of Kahnawake refusal, she attended to the “collective limit” established by her and her Kahnawake participants.16 The collective limit was relationally and ethically determined by what was shared but more importantly by what was not shared. Simpson’s ability to discern the collective limit could only be achieved through a form of relational knowledge production that regards and cares for the other. Simpson recounts how one of her participants forced her to recognize a collective limit. Approaching and then arriving at the limit, Simpson experiences the following: And although I pushed him, hoping that there might be something explicit said from the space of his exclusion— or more explicit than he gave me— it was enough that he said what he said. “Enough” is certainly enough. “Enough,” I realised, was when I reached the limit of my own return and our collective arrival. Can I do this and still come home; what am I revealing here and why? Where will this get us? Who benefits from this and why? And “enough” was when they shut down (or told me to turn off the recorder), or told me outright funny things like “nobody seems to know”— when everybody *does* know and talks about it *all the time*. Dominion then has to be exercised over these representations, and that was determined when enough was said. The ethnographic limit then, was reached not just when it would cause harm (or extreme discomfort)—the limit was arrived at when the representation would bite all of us and compromise the *representational* territory that we have gained for ourselves in the past 100 years.17 Extending her discussion of ethnographic refusal beyond the bounds of ethnographic concerns, Simpson also ponders whether this enactment of refusal can be applied to theoretical work. Simpson outright poses a question: “What is theoretically generative about these refusals?”18 The question that Simpson asks in 2007 is clarified by Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang in the 2014 essay “R- Words: Refusing Research.” Arguing that modes of refusal extended into the theoretical and methodological terrains of knowledge production are productive and necessary, Tuck and Yang state: For the purposes of our discussion, the most important insight to draw from Simpson’s article is her emphasis that refusals are not subtractive, but are theoretically generative, expansive. Refusal is not just a “no,” but a redirection to ideas otherwise unacknowledged or unquestioned. Unlike a settler colonial configuration of knowledge that is petulantly exasperated and resentful of limits, a methodology of refusal regards limits on knowledge as productive, as indeed a good thing.19 In line with Simpson’s intervention, Tuck and Yang posit that “refusal itself could be developed into both method and theory.”20 For Tuck and Yang, a generative practice of refusal and a decolonial and abolitionist tradition is making Western thought “turn back upon itself as settler colonial knowledge, as opposed to universal, liberal, or neutral knowledge without horizon.”21 In fact, the coauthors suggest “making the settler colonial metanarrative the object of . . . research.”22 What this move effectively does is question the uninterrogated assumptions and exposes the violent particularities of the metanarrative. Scrutiny as a practice of refusal also slows down or perhaps halts the momentum of the machinery that allows, as Tuck and Yang argue, “knowledge to facilitate interdictions on Indigenous and Black life.”23

## Case