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#### **Genocidal settlement is** a structure, not an event meaning ontological logic of elimination is an everyday manifestation that defines settler identity.

Rifkin 14, Mark. Settler common sense: Queerness and everyday colonialism in the American renaissance. U of Minnesota Press, 2014. (Associate Professor of English & WGS at UNC-Greensboro)//Elmer

If nineteenth-century American literary studies tends to focus on the ways Indians enter the narrative frame and the kinds of meanings and associa- tions they bear, recent **attempts to theorize settler colonialism** have sought to **shift attention from its effects** on Indigenous subjects **to** its **implications for nonnative political attachments**, forms of inhabitance, **and modes of being**, illuminating and tracking the pervasive operation of **settlement as a system**. In Settler Colonialism and the Transformation of Anthropology, Patrick Wolfe argues, “Settler colonies were (are) premised on the elimination of native societies. The split tensing reflects a determinate feature of settler colonization. The colonizers come to stay—invasion is **a structure not an event**” (2).6 He suggests that a “**logic** **of elimination” drives settler** governance and **sociality**, describing “the settler-colonial will” as “a historical force that ultimately derives from the primal drive to expansion that is generally glossed as capitalism” (167), and in “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native,” he observes that “elimination is an organizing principle of settler-colonial society rather than a one-off (and superceded) occurrence” (388). Rather than being superseded after an initial moment/ period of conquest, colonization persists since “the logic of elimination marks a return whereby the native repressed continues to structure settler- colonial society” (390). In Aileen Moreton-Robinson’s work, whiteness func- tions as the central way of understanding the domination and displacement of Indigenous peoples by nonnatives.7 In “Writing Off Indigenous Sover- eignty,” she argues, “As a regime of power, patriarchal white sovereignty operates ideologically, materially and discursively to reproduce and main- tain its investment in the nation as a white possession” (88), and in “Writ- ing Off Treaties,” she suggests, “**At an ontological level** the **structure of subjective possession** **occurs through** the **imposition of one’s will-to-be on the thing which is perceived to lack will,** thus it is open to being possessed,” such that “possession . . . forms part of **the ontological structure of white subjectivity**” (83–84). For Jodi Byrd, the deployment of Indianness as a mobile figure works as the principal mode of U.S. settler colonialism. She observes that “colonization and racialization . . . have often been conflated,” in ways that “tend to be sited along the axis of inclusion/exclusion” and that “misdirect and cloud attention from the underlying structures of settler colonialism” (xxiii, xvii). She argues that settlement works through the translation of indigeneity as Indianness, casting place-based political collec- tivities as (racialized) populations subject to U.S. jurisdiction and manage- ment: “the Indian is left nowhere and everywhere within the ontological premises through which U.S. empire orients, imagines, and critiques itself ”; “**ideas of** Indians and **Indianness** have **served as the ontological ground through which U.S. settler colonialism enacts itself** ” (xix).

#### That results in land exploitation and ecocide – specifically manifests in knowledge institutions making forefronting Settler Colonialism a prior question.

**Paperson 17** la paperson or K. Wayne Yang, June 2017, “A Third University is Possible” (an associate professor of ethnic studies at the University of California, San Diego)//Elmer

Land is the prime concern of settler colonialism, contexts in which the colonizer comes to a “new” place not only to seize and exploit but to stay, making that “new” place his permanent home. Settler colonialism thus complicates the center–periphery model that was classically used to describe colonialism, wherein an imperial center, the “metropole,” dominates distant colonies, the “periphery.” Typically, one thinks of European colonization of Africa, India, the Caribbean, the Pacific Islands, in terms of external colonialism, also called exploitation colonialism, where land and human beings are recast as natural resources for primitive accumulation: coltan, petroleum, diamonds, water, salt, seeds, genetic material, chattel. Theories named as “settler colonial studies” had a resurgence beginning around 2006.[2] However, the analysis of settler colonialism is actually not new, only often ignored within Western critiques of empire.[3] The critical literatures of the colonized have long positioned the violence of settlement as a prime feature in colonial life as well as in global arrangements of power. We can see this in Franz Fanon’s foundational critiques of colonialism. Whereas Fanon’s work is often generalized for its diagnoses of anti/colonial violence and the racialized psychoses of colonization upon colonized and colonizer, Fanon is also talking about settlement as the particular feature of French colonization in Algeria. For Fanon, the violence of French colonization in Algeria arises from settlement as a spatial immediacy of empire: the geospatial collapse of metropole and colony into the same time and place. On the “selfsame land” are spatialized white immunity and racialized violation, non-Native desires for freedom, Black life, and Indigenous relations.[4] Settler colonialism is too often thought of as “what happened” to Indigenous people. This kind of thinking confines the experiences of Indigenous people, their critiques of settler colonialism, their decolonial imaginations, to an unwarranted historicizing parochialism, as if settler colonialism were a past event that “happened to” Native peoples and not generalizable to non-Natives. Actually, settler colonialism is something that “happened for” settlers. Indeed, it is happening for them/us right now. Wa Thiong’o’s question of how instead of why directs us to think of land tenancy laws, debt, and the privatization of land as settler colonial technologies that enable the “eventful” history of plunder and disappearance. Property law is a settler colonial technology. The weapons that enforce it, the knowledge institutions that legitimize it, the financial institutions that operationalize it, are also technologies. Like all technologies, they evolve and spread. Recasting land as property means severing Indigenous peoples from land. This separation, what Hortense Spillers describes as “the loss of Indigenous name/land**”** for Africans-turned-chattel, recasts Black Indigenous people as black bodies for biopolitical disposal: who will be moved where, who will be murdered how, who will be machinery for what, and who will be made property for whom.[5] In the alienation of land from life, alienable rights are produced: the right to own (property), the right to law (protection through legitimated violence), the right to govern (supremacist sovereignty), the right to have rights (humanity). In a word, what is produced is whiteness. Moreover, it is not just human beings who are refigured in the schism. Land and nonhumans become alienable properties, a move that first alienates land from its own sovereign life. Thus we can speak of the various technologies required to create and maintain these separations, these alienations: Black from Indigenous, human from nonhuman, land from life.[6] “How?” is a question you ask if you are concerned with the mechanisms, not just the motives, of colonization. Instead of settler colonialism as an ideology, or as a history, you might consider settler colonialism as a set of technologies —a frame that could help you to forecast colonial next operations and to plot decolonial directions. This chapter proceeds with the following insights. (1) The settler–native– slave triad does not describe identities. The triad—an analytic mainstay of settler colonial studies—digs a pitfall of identity that not only chills collaborations but also implies that the racial will be the solution. (2) Technologies are trafficked. Technologies generate patterns of social relations to land. Technologies mutate, and so do these relationships. Colonial technologies travel. In tracing technologies’ past and future trajectories, we can connect how settler colonial and antiblack technologies circulate in transnational arenas. (3) Land—not just people—is the biopolitical target.[7] The examples are many: fracking, biopiracy, damming of rivers and flooding of valleys, the carcasses of pigs that die from the feed additive ractopamine and are allowable for harvest by the U.S. Food and Drug Administration. The subjugation of land and nonhuman life to deathlike states in order to support “human” life is a “biopolitics” well beyond the Foucauldian conception of biopolitical as governmentality or the neoliberal disciplining of modern, bourgeois, “human” subject. (4) (Y)our task is to theorize in the break, that is, to refuse the master narrative that technology is loyal to the master, that (y)our theory has a Eurocentric origin. Black studies, Indigenous studies, and Othered studies have already made their breaks with Foucault (over biopolitics), with Deleuze and Guatarri (over assemblages and machines), and with Marx (over life and primitive accumulation). (5) Even when they are dangerous, understanding technologies provides us some pathways for decolonizing work. We can identify projects of collaboration on decolonial technologies. Colonizing mechanisms are evolving into new forms, and they might be subverted toward decolonizing operations. The Settler–Native–Slave Triad Does Not Describe Identities One of the main interventions of settler colonial studies has been to insist that the patterning of social relations is shaped by colonialism’s thirst for land and thus is shaped to fit modes of empire. Because colonialism is a perverted affair, our relationships are also warped into complicitous arrangements of violation, trespass, and collusion with its mechanisms. For Fanon, the psychosis of colonialism arises from the patterning of violence into the binary relationship between the immune humanity of the white settler and the impugned humanity of the native. For Fanon, the supremacist “right” to create settler space that is immune from violence, and the “right” to abuse the body of the Native to maintain white immunity, this is the spatial and fleshy immediacy of settler colonialism. Furthermore, the “humanity” of the settler is constructed upon his agency over the land and nature. As Maldonado- Torres explains, “I think, therefore I am” is actually an articulation of “I conquer, therefore I am,” a sense of identity posited upon the harnessing of nature and its “natural” people.[8] This creates a host of post+colonial problems that have come to define modernity. Because the humanity of the settler is predicated on his ability to “write the world,” to make history upon and over the natural world, the colonized is instructed to make her claim to humanity by similarly acting on the world or, more precisely, acting in his. Indeed, for Fanon, it is the perverse ontology of settler becomings—becoming landowner or becoming property, becoming killable or becoming a killer—and the mutual implication of tortured and torturer that mark the psychosis of colonialism. This problem of modernity and colonial psychosis is echoed in Jack Forbes’s writings: Columbus was a wétiko. He was mentally ill or insane, the carrier of a terribly contagious psychological disease, the wétiko psychosis. . . . The wétiko psychosis, and the problems it creates, have inspired many resistance movements and efforts at reform or revolution. Unfortunately, most of these efforts have failed because they have never diagnosed the wétiko.[9] Under Western modernity, becoming “free” means becoming a colonizer, and because of this, “the central contradiction of modernity is freedom.”[10] Critiques of settler colonialism, therefore, do not offer just another “type” of colonialism to add to the literature but a mode of analysis that has repercussions for any diagnosis of coloniality and for understanding the modern conditions of freedom. By modern conditions of freedom, I mean that Western freedom is a product of colonial modernity, and I mean that such freedom comes with conditions, with strings attached, most manifest as terms of unfreedom for nonhumans. As Cindi Mayweather says, “your freedom’s in a bind.”[11]

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

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.

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 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

**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 higher 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.

### 1NC – OFF

#### Infrastructure will pass now – negotiations are working and Dems have a new sense of urgency.

**Edmondson and Cochrane 10/24**[Catie Edmondson and Emily Cochrane, Catie Edmondson is a reporter in the Washington bureau of The New York Times, covering Congress. Emily Cochrane is a correspondent based in Washington. She has covered Congress since late 2018, focusing on the annual debate over government funding and economic legislation, ranging from emergency pandemic relief to infrastructure. 10-24-2021, accessed on 10-26-2021, The New York Times, "Biden Meets With Manchin and Schumer to Iron Out Spending Bill", <https://www.nytimes.com/2021/10/24/us/politics/biden-manchin-schumer-spending-bill.html>] Adam

WASHINGTON — President Biden huddled with key Democrats on Sunday to iron out crucial spending and tax provisions as they raced to wrap up their expansive social safety net legislation before his appearance at a U.N. climate summit next week.

Speaker Nancy Pelosi of California said Democrats were close to completing the bill, displaying confidence that the negotiations over issues like paid leave, tax increases and Medicare benefits that have bedeviled the party for months would soon end.

“We have 90 percent of the bill agreed to and written. We just have some of the last decisions to be made,” Ms. Pelosi said on CNN’s “State of the Union,” adding that she hoped to pass an infrastructure bill that had already cleared the Senate and have a deal in hand on the social policy bill by the end of the week. “We’re pretty much there now.”

Her comments came as Mr. Biden met with Senators Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, and Joe Manchin III of West Virginia, one of the critical centrist holdouts on the budget bill. The White House called the breakfast at Mr. Biden’s Wilmington home a “productive discussion.”

For weeks, intraparty divisions over the scope and size of their marquee [domestic policy plan](https://archive.md/o/1WmiR/https:/www.nytimes.com/live/2021/10/26/us/biden-spending-bill-deal) have delayed an agreement on how to trim the initial $3.5 trillion blueprint Democrats passed this year. In order to bypass united Republican opposition and pass the final bill, Democrats are using an arcane budget process known as reconciliation, which shields fiscal legislation from a filibuster but would require every Senate Democrat to unite behind the plan in the evenly divided chamber. The party’s margins in the House are not much more forgiving.

Facing opposition over the $3.5 trillion price tag, White House and party leaders are coalescing around a cost of up to $2 trillion over 10 years. They have spent days negotiating primarily with Mr. Manchin and Senator Kyrsten Sinema, Democrat of Arizona and another centrist holdout.

House Democratic leaders hope to advance both a compromise reconciliation package and the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure package. Liberals have so far balked at voting on the bipartisan deal until the more expansive domestic policy package — which is expected to address climate change, public education and health care — is agreed upon.

But Democrats are facing a new sense of urgency to finish the legislation before Mr. Biden’s trip to a major United Nations climate change conference, where he [hopes to point to the bill](https://archive.md/o/1WmiR/https:/www.nytimes.com/2021/10/15/climate/biden-clean-energy-manchin.html) as proof that the United States is serious about leading the effort to fight global warming.

“The president looked us in the eye, and he said: ‘I need this before I go and represent the United States in Glasgow. American prestige is on the line,’” Representative Ro Khanna, a California Democrat who met with Mr. Biden last week at the White House, said on “Fox News Sunday.”

Democrats are also increasingly eager to deliver the bipartisan legislation to Mr. Biden’s desk before elections for governor in Virginia and New Jersey on Nov. 2, to show voters the party is making good on its promise to deliver sweeping social change. And a number of transportation programs will lapse at the end of the month without congressional action on either a stopgap extension or passage of the infrastructure bill, leading to possible furloughs.

#### Pushing a WTO treaty takes time, energy, and political capital away from domestic legislation – big pharma and EU allies

**Bhadrakumar 5/9** M K Bhadrakumar is a former Indian diplomat. "Biden’s talk of vaccine IP waiver is political theater." Asia Times, May 9, 2021, asiatimes.com/2021/05/bidens-talk-of-vaccine-ip-waiver-is-political-theater.

On the other hand, Biden, whose political life of half a century was largely spent in the US Congress, is well aware of the **awesome clout** of the pharmaceutical companies in American politics. From that lobby’s perspective, the patent waiver “amounts to the expropriation of the property of the pharmaceutical companies whose innovation and financial investments made the development of Covid-19 vaccines possible in the first place,” as a senior scholar at the Johns Hopkins Center for Health Security puts it. The US pharmaceutical industry and congressional Republicans have already **gone on the offensiv**e blasting Biden’s announcement, saying it undermines incentives for American innovation. Besides, the argument goes, even with the patent waiver, vaccine manufacturing is a complex process and is not like simply flipping a switch. Senator Richard Burr, the top Republican on the US Senate Health Committee, denounced Biden’s decision. “Intellectual property protections are part of the reason we have these life-saving products,” he said. “Stripping these protections only ensures we won’t have the vaccines or treatments we need when the next pandemic occurs.” The Republican senators backed by Republican Study Committee chairman Jim Banks propose to introduce legislation to block the move. Clearly, Biden would rather **spend his political capital on getting the necessary legislation through Congress to advance his domestic reform agenda rather than spend time and energy to take on the pharmaceutical industry** to burnish his image as a good Samaritan on the world stage. Conceivably, Biden could be counting on the “text-based negotiations” at the WTO **dragging on for months, if not years**, without reaching anywhere. The US support for the waiver could even be a tactic to persuade pharmaceutical firms to back less drastic steps like sharing technology and expanding joint ventures to boost global production quickly. So far Covid-19 vaccines have been distributed primarily to the wealthy countries that developed them, while the pandemic sweeps through poorer ones such as India, and the real goal is, after all, expanded vaccine distribution. Biden is well aware that there will be **huge opposition** to the TRIPS waiver from the United States’ **European allies as well**. The British press has reported that the UK has been in closed-door talks at the World Trade Organization in recent months along with the likes of Australia, Canada, Japan, Norway, Singapore, the European Union and the US, who all opposed the idea.

#### Quickly secures the vulnerable grid.

Carney 21 [Chris, August 6; Senior Policy Advisor at Nossaman LLC, former US Representative, Former Professor of Political Science at Penn State University; JD Supra, “The US Senate Infrastructure Bill: Securing Our Electrical Grid Through P3s and Grants,” https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/the-us-senate-infrastructure-bill-4989100/]

As we begin to better understand the main components of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act that the US Senate is working to pass this week, it is clear that public-private partnerships ("P3s") are a favored funding mechanism of lawmakers to help offset high costs associated with major infrastructure projects in communities. And while past infrastructure bills have used P3s for more conventional projects, the current bill also calls for P3s to help pay for protecting the US electric grid from cyberattacks. Responding to the increasing number of cyberattacks on our nation’s infrastructure, and given the fragile physical condition of our electrical grid, the Senate included provisions to help state, local and tribal entities harden electrical grids for which they are responsible.

Section 40121, Enhancing Grid Security Through Public-Private Partnerships, calls for not only physical protections of electrical grids, but also for enhancing cyber-resilience. This section seeks to encourage the various federal, state and local regulatory authorities, as well as industry participants to engage in a program that audits and assesses the physical security and cybersecurity of utilities, conducts threat assessments to identify and mitigate vulnerabilities, and provides cybersecurity training to utilities. Further, the section calls for strengthening supply chain security, protecting “defense critical” electrical infrastructure and buttressing against a constant barrage of cyberattacks on the grid. In determining the nature of the partnership arrangement, the size of the utility and the area served will be considered, with priority going to utilities with fewer available resources.

Section 40122 compliments the previous section as it seeks to incentivize testing of cybersecurity products meant to be used in the energy sector, including SCADA systems, and to find ways to mitigate any vulnerabilities identified by the testing. Intended as a voluntary program, utilities would be offered technical assistance and databases of vulnerabilities and best practices would be created. Section 40123 incentivizes investment in advanced cybersecurity technology to strengthen the security and resiliency of grid systems through rate adjustments that would be studied and approved by the Secretary of Energy and other relevant Commissions, Councils and Associations.

Lastly, Section 40124, a long sought-after package of cybersecurity grants for state, local and tribal entities is included in the bill. This section adds language that would enable state, local and tribal bodies to apply for funds to upgrade aging computer equipment and software, particularly related to utilities, as they face growing threats of ransomware, denial of service and other cyberattacks. However, under Section 40126, cybersecurity grants may be tied to meeting various security standards established by the Secretary of Homeland Security, and/or submission of a cybersecurity plan by a grant applicant that shows “maturity” in understanding the cyber threat they face and a sophisticated approach to utilizing the grant.

While the final outcome of the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act may still be weeks or months away, inclusion of these provisions not only demonstrates a positive step forward for the application of federal P3s and grants generally, they also show that Congress recognizes the seriousness of the cyber threats our electrical grids face. Hopefully, through judicious application of both public-private partnerships and grants, the nation can quickly secure its infrastructure from cyberattacks.

#### Grid vulnerabilities spark nuclear war.

Klare 19 [Michael; November; Professor Emeritus of Peace and World Security Studies at Hampshire College; Arms Control Association, “Cyber Battles, Nuclear Outcomes? Dangerous New Pathways to Escalation,” https://www.armscontrol.org/act/2019-11/features/cyber-battles-nuclear-outcomes-dangerous-new-pathways-escalation]

Yet another pathway to escalation could arise from a cascading series of cyberstrikes and counterstrikes against vital national infrastructure rather than on military targets. All major powers, along with Iran and North Korea, have developed and deployed cyberweapons designed to disrupt and destroy major elements of an adversary’s key economic systems, such as power grids, financial systems, and transportation networks. As noted, Russia has infiltrated the U.S. electrical grid, and it is widely believed that the United States has done the same in Russia.12 The Pentagon has also devised a plan known as “Nitro Zeus,” intended to immobilize the entire Iranian economy and so force it to capitulate to U.S. demands or, if that approach failed, to pave the way for a crippling air and missile attack.13

The danger here is that economic attacks of this sort, if undertaken during a period of tension and crisis, could lead to an escalating series of tit-for-tat attacks against ever more vital elements of an adversary’s critical infrastructure, producing widespread chaos and harm and eventually leading one side to initiate kinetic attacks on critical military targets, risking the slippery slope to nuclear conflict. For example, a Russian cyberattack on the U.S. power grid could trigger U.S. attacks on Russian energy and financial systems, causing widespread disorder in both countries and generating an impulse for even more devastating attacks. At some point, such attacks “could lead to major conflict and possibly nuclear war.”14

### 1NC – OFF

#### Counterplan text: during pandemics The member nations of the WTO should impose a mandatory lockdown until there is no more than one new case per day per 100,000 people after which local officials will modulate lockdown levels based on local case numbers. Governments should compensate both individual workers and small businesses that suffer substantial or irreparable economic loss as a result of lockdowns.

#### Only the lockdown solves- it curbs Disease spread until the vaccine

Osterholm, 20 -- Regents Professor and Director of the Center for Infectious Disease Research and Policy at the University of Minnesota

[Michael T. and Mark Olshaker, writer and documentary filmmaker, "America Needs to Lock Down Again," Foreign Affairs, 9-16-20, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2020-09-16/coronavirus-america-needs-lock-down-again, accessed 10-29-20]

In our essay “Chronicle of a Pandemic Foretold,” for the July/August issue of Foreign Affairs, we described the struggle against COVID-19 in terms of a baseball game and estimated that the United States was in about the third inning of a nine-inning contest. At this point, however, it may be more helpful to shift to an altogether different analogy. The unfolding story of the pandemic is a three-act play, in which the country is now midway through the second act.

The first act saw the disease spread from China to the rest of the world and to a woefully unprepared United States. The second witnessed Americans tire of restrictions and effectively surrender to the pandemic. Infection rates across the country soared during the summer and will likely rise again in the autumn as schools and universities reopen. To truly get the novel coronavirus under control, the United States must do what it has not done so far: impose real and stringent lockdowns across the country for roughly two months. Controlling the spread of the disease in this way will save lives ahead of the eventual end of this drama in the pandemic’s final act—the arrival of a safe, effective vaccine.

THE CURTAIN RISES

Act I opened in late 2019 with the emergence in China of a novel coronavirus that spread throughout much of the world with breathtaking speed and effect. Nations and regions faced the challenge in different ways and with varying levels of success. After a horrendous start, for example, Italy managed to get transmission substantially under control by imposing a near-complete shutdown of the northern part of the country. In the United States, both New York City and New York State saw catastrophic levels of infection that overwhelmed the entire health-care system. It is difficult to forget the images of refrigerated trailers sitting outside hospital emergency rooms to accommodate the dead. But under the leadership of Governor Andrew Cuomo—and thanks to a coordinated state public health response—New York locked down to get the number of cases to a manageable level and then maintain the low numbers, turning a disaster into a model for the rest of the United States.

The issue of testing loomed over Act I. Some Asian nations that had experience with SARS began widespread testing of possible cases early and therefore were able to do contact tracing and largely control viral transmission. The United States did not do that. The White House denied the potential seriousness of the coronavirus (allegedly in a bid to prevent “panic”), while the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) developed a test for national use that was faulty, leaving the virus difficult to track and making case isolation and contact tracing ineffective as a means to control transmission. That forced the country onto a much more disruptive path: an attempt to control and mitigate the virus’s effects through a national lockdown of all nonessential personnel.

The price was steep, with millions of jobs lost, schools closed, and all public events and gatherings officially canceled. In mid-April, the United States was seeing 32,000 new cases a day. But a month later, that figure had dropped to 22,000 and Americans felt they had turned a corner, that the pandemic was subsiding and the battle was won.

THE DISTANT PEAK

Act II of this drama began around Memorial Day weekend in late May. Pandemic fatigue had set in. Americans seemed to collectively declare, “We’re done,” taking any decrease in daily case counts or deaths as a sign that the virus had been curtailed. The warm-weather months drew people into social settings, and the White House and a host of pundits encouraged this natural yearning to get back to business—and leisure—as usual. The administration and its allies posited a zero-sum choice between continuing to slow transmission of the disease and saving the economy. In fact, the country had the fire only under limited control, and if you stop fighting a fire at that point, it will naturally flare up again and continue to burn.

By July 20, with people resuming socializing in large groups, the country’s daily new case count shot up to more than 66,000. It should be noted that the many protests that followed the death of George Floyd in late May did not contribute much to the spread since the demonstrations occurred outdoors, where the virus rapidly dissipates in the air. The spring weekend beach gatherings of young people, by contrast, led to more serious transmissions because revelers often ended up indoors, particularly in close and crowded confines such as bars and houses.

The rate of daily new cases dipped to a little over 42,000 by the end of August, largely because of major containment efforts in California, Florida, Georgia, and Texas. As encouraging as that was on the face of it, the United States was still seeing about 1,000 COVID-19-related deaths per day, hardly a victory by any standard. Americans can expect these crests and troughs in new infections to continue, with each successive peak higher than the one before, until either an effective vaccine becomes widely available or herd immunity is established in the population through person-to-person transmission.

Herd immunity is often discussed but widely misunderstood. Each infectious disease has a different threshold for what percentage of a given population must be immune before the rate of transmission begins to drop. For a highly infectious agent transmitted through the air, such as measles, that percentage can be as high as 95 percent. For COVID-19, most public health infectious disease experts estimate it to be between 50 and 70 percent. One theory holds that the best way to approach the virus is to try to achieve herd immunity as quickly as possible through natural infection so everything can get back to normal, while protecting the older and most vulnerable people. This is the method seemingly employed by Sweden. Its transmission and mortality rates were significantly higher than those of neighboring Denmark and Norway, but the country does not appear to be substantially closer to reaching herd immunity than its Scandinavian neighbors, all of which are still far short of the threshold. Moreover, there is emerging evidence that exposure to the virus may confer only temporary immunity, possibly as brief as several months. And achieving herd immunity—if that is even possible—would only slow transmission, not halt it.

By the most liberal estimates, only about ten to 12 percent of the U.S. population has been infected thus far and, as Sweden’s experience has shown, reaching the threshold will be a long-drawn-out process that could result in the deaths of more than two million Americans. As it is, with about four percent of the world’s population, the United States has racked up about a quarter of all confirmed COVID-19 fatalities. The country failed to protect vulnerable populations, as witnessed in the many outbreaks in nursing homes and extended-care facilities. The virus has also taken a toll on young and healthy individuals; even some with mild or asymptomatic variants of the disease have become “long haulers,” who experience a range of symptoms, including chronic fatigue and cardiac and respiratory issues, weeks or months after getting infected.

SHUT IT DOWN

Herd immunity is a distant and unrealistic prospect, but Americans still have the opportunity to mitigate the suffering and death caused by the disease. The reality is that the only way for the United States to get through Act II with low levels of morbidity and mortality is through more complete lockdowns than were previously implemented in areas with high incidence of infection. Currently, the upper Midwest is the “hottest” area in the country for community-wide transmission, but other areas will see increasing case totals deeper into the fall. The aim at this point, quite simply, should be to cut transmission of the virus as much as possible until the creation and distribution of an effective vaccine.

Such lockdowns should last six to eight weeks with a goal of reaching no more than one new case per day per 100,000 people. This low rate is necessary for testing and contact tracing to have any meaningful effect. Once that rate is achieved, however, local officials will be able to adjust lockdown measures more accurately and with the flexibility the pandemic demands. If the White House and federal government will not lead, which is unfortunately likely under the current administration, the governors of each state, in coordination with their neighboring states, must take the initiative themselves. Some might think this is unrealistic, but New York has been able to maintain this low rate of new infections for the past three months.

Stringent lockdowns, of course, would depend on the continued labor of essential workers, a category we estimate to be no more than 35 percent of the workforce and possibly less. What about other workers? As part of its broader anti-COVID-19 strategy, the federal and state governments should compensate both individual workers and small businesses that suffer substantial or irreparable economic loss as a result of lockdowns. Such support negates the false choice between public and economic health. If carried out successfully, the near-complete shutdowns would be not open-ended but limited in time. And the government has the means to prop up adversely affected workers and businesses. As Minneapolis Federal Reserve Bank President Neel Kashkari outlined in an op-ed in The New York Times cowritten with one of us (Osterholm), this fiscal obligation could be covered by the money most Americans who have not lost income are saving by not spending as much during the pandemic—the personal savings rate of Americans has grown from eight percent in January to 20 percent in August. Domestic savings can fund investment in the national economy, a concept that should work equally well in other developed nations. Banks, whose holdings have been boosted by the additional savings, could loan the money necessary for protecting jobs and businesses; Americans would essentially be repaying themselves rather than taking the more traditional route of incurring foreign debt. We believe many people would support a more robust lockdown if they understood that they would not suffer financially. Such a subsidy will actually save money in the long term by preserving jobs and small businesses.

The alternatives to serious lockdowns are insufficient. In areas where the disease is still rampant, masks and physical distancing alone will not get the job done. Business as usual for another six to eight months—until an effective vaccine is widely available—will send current rates of transmission even higher, especially as schools and colleges reopen. By the middle of September, some universities had already canceled in-person classes owing to widespread transmission on campus. Consider how much pain, suffering, and death Americans have endured so far, with no more than ten to 12 percent of the population infected. The next phase could be overwhelming and make Americans look back with nostalgia at the time when new infection rates were still under 100,000 per day.

A DIFFICULT DENOUEMENT

The final act will begin when—and if—one vaccine or more becomes broadly available. A vaccine will eventually bring this long drama to an end, but it will raise a whole new set of questions. Will enough Americans be willing to take it, given our national schizophrenic view of vaccines and science in general? How effective will a vaccine be, and how long will it confer immunity? What will the rules be for approving the vaccine, in the United States and the rest of the world? Who should, or will, get it first? There has been little official or public discussion about answers to these important questions.

It would be dangerous if a possible vaccine became politicized, either to achieve power, prestige, and influence for the country that produces it or to gain partisan advantage within the United States. Many in the public health sphere are afraid that a vaccine will be made available for use before it has been demonstrated to be safe and effective. Never before has the authority and confidence in U.S. government scientific institutions been so undermined by real or perceived political pressure from the White House. At the beginning of September, the CDC directed localities to prepare for the distribution of a vaccine in two months, at the beginning of November, right around the time of the presidential election. One possible mechanism for this expedited rollout would require the president to direct the Food and Drug Administration or the secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services to grant Emergency Use Authorization for a vaccine candidate that looks promising but has not been through the entire validating process.

There is indeed an inescapable tension between wanting a vaccine as soon as possible to prevent further transmission of the disease (and the resulting illnesses and deaths) and taking the necessary time to produce a safe vaccine, whose efficacy and effects on people of various ages and health situations are well understood. But public health and political officials should be extremely wary of any attempt to grant Emergency Use Authorization to a vaccine that hasn’t completed phase three trials, the final and most rigorous stage in which the product is tested over a broad range of thousands of subjects. In most instances in which such authorization is granted, it is for extremely sick or even dying patients. In this case, it would be granted to administer a vaccine to healthy people before the formula is perfected and before any potential negative effects have been documented. In 1955, one company’s production of the original Salk polio vaccine turned out to be defective, causing 40,000 cases of polio. Ten children died. In 1976, a rush to produce a vaccine against a perceived threat of swine flu left approximately 450 recipients with Guillain-Barré Syndrome paralysis.

One of the key reasons for a full phase three review, which includes at least 30,000 test subjects in a double-blind administration (meaning neither the subject nor the administrator knows who has been given the vaccine and who has been given a placebo), is to determine the vaccine’s impact and effects, positive and negative, on a range of different risk groups. What might be safe and effective for young adults, for example, might be ineffective or even harmful for seniors or those with certain underlying conditions. It is also possible that the effect on children could be different or unpredictable. These results will probably take months to sort out. Even more troubling, present plans do not call for either children or the elderly to be included in the phase three test group. Moreover, the first vaccines for this virus probably won’t be home runs (to go back to baseball analogies for a moment) like the smallpox, polio, and measles vaccines. They are more likely to be singles and doubles like the annual influenza vaccine, which in a good year is about 50 percent effective. Americans won’t be going back to the “old normal” anytime soon.

The best outcome in Act III will be the development and distribution of the vaccine as quickly and widely as possible, without shortcuts on safety or testing for effectiveness. The U.S. government should establish and publicize the criteria by which a vaccine will be considered ready for wide-scale public use as well as make clear which groups of people will receive the vaccine first. A proven safe and effective vaccine should first be given to physicians, hospital personnel, and first responders; then to essential workers with underlying risks for serious disease; and after that, to children so that they can stay in school.

But right now, the United States should just be trying to get through the rest of Act II—the coronavirus winter—and hold out until the arrival of a vaccine-enabled spring. It must impose severe lockdowns to truly curb the spread of the disease. New York has shown it can be done. It remains to be seen whether the rest of the country possesses the collective grit and determination to follow suit. A happy ending to this drama will very much be determined by how Americans decide to craft the rest of this current act.

## Case

### 1NC – AT: Framing

#### Top-Level on Util:

#### 1] Framing Issue – If we win our reps are good and that our ethical orientations come apriori, that means that we just have to win a risk of a link to prove that the plan is unethical.

#### 2] Equality – Util is bad and not neutral.

Mignolo 7, Walter D. "The de-colonial option and the meaning of identity in politics." (2007). (Professor at Duke)//Elmer

The rhetoric of modernity (from the Christian mission since the sixteenth century, to the secular Civilizing mission, to development and modernization after WWII) occluded—under its triumphant rhetoric of salvation and the good life for all—**the perpetuation of** the logic of **coloniality**, that is, of massive appropriation of land (and today of natural resources), massive exploitation of labor (from open slavery from the sixteenth to the eighteenth century, to disguised slavery, up to the twenty first century), and the **dispensability of human lives** from the massive killing of people in the Inca and Aztec domains to the twenty million plus people from Saint Petersburg to the Ukraine during WWII killed in the so called Eastern Front.4 Unfortunately, not all the massive killings have been recorded with the **same value and the same visibility**. The unspoken criteria for the value of human lives is an obvious sign (from a de-colonial interpretation) of the hidden imperial identity politics: that is, the value of human lives to which the life of the enunciator belongs becomes the **measuring stick** to evaluate other human lives who do not have the intellectual option and institutional power to tell the story and to classify events according to a ranking of human lives; that is, according to a racist classification.5

#### 3] Calculability – Settler Colonialism is unable to be calculated on a utilitarian or a consequentialist metric – it is both a spiritual and cultural genocide that leads to a psychological and emotional genocide that can’t be accounted for by body count.

#### 4] Psychiatric Colonialism – Native Bodies are scientifically considered to have “dampened pain and pain signaling” meaning their pain is considered and evaluated differently to justify colonial actions that “won’t hurt as much” – means their starting point is violent.

#### 5] Ontology Outweighs - They can’t win any of their impacts in a word where they have conceded the libidinal economy and ontology which serves as a filter for their impacts.

#### On Goodin –

#### A] Commits the is-ought fallacy. Just because governments use util doesn’t mean that’s how it ought to be

#### B] Governments have consistently passed anti native policies for hundreds of years which means we shouldn’t base their ethical calculus when it comes to settler colonialism

#### On Moen –

#### 1] Masochism Objection- Masochists desire and act towards pain which proves there are exceptions

#### 2] Empirically Denied- The fact that we don’t do whatever makes us happy all the time due to external forces proves it isn’t intrinsic

#### 3] Timmermann Objection- There are cases where we reject pleasure because there would be too much for it i.e. strong sensual stimulation, intense food, being tickled, etc.

### 1NC – AT: Advantage

#### Expectation of decreased market demand shifts funding away from R&D

Scherer ‘1 [F.M. Scherer](http://content.healthaffairs.org/search?author1=F.M.+Scherer&sortspec=date&submit=Submit), Health Affairs, The Link Between Gross Profitability And Pharmaceutical R&D Spending,  September 2001 vol. 20 no. 5 216-220, http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/20/5/216.long

Second, the profits earned by a company serve as a source of funds to support R&D investments, and some managers are known to set R&D budgets using rules of thumb emphasizing an indicator of current cash flow or sales. To be sure, as recent experience in biotechnology shows, funds for R&D can also be raised through new capital issues. Prior tests of the hypothesis of internally generated funds have yielded mixed results. For most well-established corporations, R&D spending is not greatly dependent upon internal cash flow, but small high-tech enterprises—before the 1990s venture capital boom—and the research-intensive pharmaceutical industry were probable exceptions.[2](http://content.healthaffairs.org/content/20/5/216.long#ref-2) Third, managers’ expectations of future profit opportunities, which are tempered, inter alia, by contemporary market conditions, can exert a demand-pull influence on R&D investments

#### There is 0 evidence that indicates post plan pharmaceutical companies will innovate into new diseases – even if IP hurts innovation, they have no reverse causal evidence indicating that translates into innovations into new sectors OR Even with evergreening, pharma will still research pandemic interventions because it’s profitable – proven by COVID

#### No IL to agriculture – your evidence assumes a collapse of the pharma industry which you don’t have an internal link to

#### IP reductions aren’t enough alt causes to vaccine production outweigh

**Bolle and Obstfeld 21** [Monica de Bolle and Maurice Obstfeld, VIEW SHARING OPTIONS Monica de Bolle, senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics since January 2017, is adjunct lecturer and former director for Latin American studies and emerging markets at the School of Advanced International Studies at Johns Hopkins University. De Bolle was nonresident senior fellow at the Institute between March 2015 and January 2017. Maurice Obstfeld has been nonresident senior fellow at the Peterson Institute for International Economics since February 2019. He is the Class of 1958 Professor of Economics and former chair of the department of economics (1998–2001) at the University of California, Berkeley. He previously taught at Harvard University (1989–90), the University of Pennsylvania (1986–89), and Columbia University (1979–86). Obstfeld served at the International Monetary Fund (IMF) as economic counsellor and director of the research department (2015–18) and as a member of the US President's Council of Economic Advisors (2014–15). Obstfeld was an honorary adviser to the Bank of Japan's Institute of Monetary and Economic Studies (2002–14) and has consulted and taught at the IMF, the World Bank, and numerous central banks around the world. 5-12-2021, accessed on 9-12-2021, PIIE, "Waiving patent and intellectual property protections is not a panacea for global vaccine distribution", <https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economic-issues-watch/waiving-patent-and-intellectual-property-protections-not>] Adam

Navigating the procedural obstacles to get WTO agreement on a streamlined mechanism for suspending IP protections is not as easy as it would seem. It is already possible to waive protections in the 1994 WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS). But the WTO's track record suggests that roadblocks may lie ahead in expanding the scope of its waiver procedure.

Since August 2003, the WTO has explicitly allowed emergency departures from the TRIPS agreement, enabling countries with manufacturing capacity to suspend IP protections to produce life-saving drugs and vaccines, not just for domestic use but also for export to countries that lack manufacturing capacity of their own. However, the process of negotiating the August 2003 decision—which created a temporary procedure for export waivers—took 14 months, and it was not until January 2017 that two-thirds of WTO members had[ratified](https://www.ip-watch.org/2017/01/23/official-trips-health-amendment-effect-first-ever-wto-agreement/) it as a formal amendment to the TRIPS agreement.

Because of this painful negotiation process, the bureaucratic procedures for exercising IP flexibility are so cumbersome that there are very few instances of its use. The best known (though not very successful) example occurred with Canadian exports of an AIDS treatment to [Rwanda](https://www.asil.org/insights/volume/11/issue/28/canadian-made-drugs-rwanda-first-application-wto-waiver-patents-and#_edn1) in 2007. Complicating matters further has been the opposition of some major countries to revisiting the issue, as well as the likely need for WTO members to revise their domestic legal frameworks to accommodate patent waivers. These factors make it clear that renewed negotiations within the WTO are unlikely to yield results with the speed that the current health emergency demands or result in a meaningfully better framework. Recognizing the likely difficulty of negotiations, WTO Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala has suggested a December 3, 2021 [deadline](https://www.washingtonpost.com/us-policy/2021/05/06/biden-patent-waiver-developing-world-long-road/) for completion—but like past initial deadlines in this space, this one could well prove overoptimistic.

The second, and arguably more intractable, challenge is technical: Even if they overcome IP obstacles and get permission to produce vaccines, less prosperous countries lack the know-how, facilities, and trained personnel to produce them. Despite the abysmal decades-long record of vaccine distribution in those countries, existing TRIPS flexibilities have done nothing to improve the situation. A smoother IP waiver process might help, but only as a component of a [broader effort.](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6291766/)

True, patent protection is the main obstacle to creation of generic small-molecule drugs, which chemists can synthesize. But other major obstacles exist for vaccines, which are biologics. For the latter category of drugs, an identical product requires an identical production technology, with most steps categorized as hard-to-replicate trade secrets rather than patentable innovations. Thus, Moderna [announced](https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/statement-moderna-intellectual-property-matters-during-covid-19) in October 2020 that it would not enforce its COVID-19-related patents during the pandemic. But this step, however laudable, is of limited immediate help to would-be producers of a "generic" version of the Moderna vaccine. Without precisely replicating all steps of Moderna's production process, including the many quality controls, a generic version would have untested immunogenicity (the ability to induce the body to generate an immune response) and thus would require extensive clinical trials before release. Production glitches—such as those that afflicted the Janssen/Johnson & Johnson vaccine in the United States—could prompt widespread vaccine skepticism, damaging pandemic control efforts.

The replication hurdle is especially high for the new and more sophisticated messenger ribonucleic acid (mRNA) vaccines, which have proven most effective against SARS-CoV-2 (the virus that causes COVID-19) and which are likely to provide the most adaptable platforms for the vaccines of the future. The genetic vaccines produced by Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna require considerable technical knowledge and [sophisticated techniques](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/health/pfizer-coronavirus-vaccine.html) to generate a version of the viral spike protein that elicits a strong immune response.[1](https://www.piie.com/blogs/realtime-economic-issues-watch/waiving-patent-and-intellectual-property-protections-not" \l "_ftn1" \o ") Therefore, from a biological standpoint, patent and IP waivers alone cannot resolve the existing lack of capacity in most countries to produce genetic vaccines at scale locally.

A final challenge is that vaccine supply chains are intricate and global in scope. Different stages of vaccine manufacturing are spread across different parts of the globe, with various countries supplying key inputs and equipment. Patent and IP waivers cannot resolve export restrictions that these countries may decide to impose—and in fact have imposed—throughout the pandemic. Nor can poor countries with production waivers easily integrate into global supply chains. At the moment, current production capacity and quality standards continue to constrain global supply.

#### No impact to diseases –

#### A] Synthetic Vaccines solve.

**Jain 12** [Kewal K. Jain, Consultant in biotechnology and pharmaceutical medicine. Research in cell/gene therapy, neuroprotection, and nanobiotechnology. Reviewer, research grant applications for government agencies in Canada, USA (US Army) and Europe (European Commission, the Netherlands, Austria, Finland, Estonia and UK). Chairman of the Scientific Advisory Board, Genometrica Ltd, Lugano, Switzerland. Member of Board of Managers of Progenitor Cell Therapy 2006-2010, until takeover of the company by NeoStem Inc. Member Editorial Board, Nanomedicine, published by Future Medicine. Member Editorial Board, Technology in Cancer Research and Treatment, Adenine Press. Member International Advisory Board, Medical Principles & Practice, Karger. Consultant in Neurology Senior Associate editor, MedLink Corporation, San Diego, California. 08-16-2012, accessed on 9-11-2021, PubMed Central (PMC), "Synthetic Biology and Personalized Medicine", <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5586729/>] Adam

Conventional vaccine strategies mainly focus on live-attenuated vaccines, inactivated microorganisms, and subunits thereof comprising purified components or recombinant proteins formulated with adjuvants. The development of new vaccines is limited by several drawbacks, including risks associated with the use of attenuated pathogens, along with difficulties altering vaccine target specificity. Synthetic biology-based vaccines aim to overcome some of these drawbacks and enable economic and rapid chemical synthesis of DNA encoding the immunogens designed in silico as well as their efficient assembly with delivery systems to obtain vectored vaccines [[30](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/341794#ref30)]. Altogether, synthetic biology can help develop improved vaccine candidates in considerably less time compared to conventional approaches. Some examples are given in the following sections.

Peptide Nanoparticle-Based Vaccines

A biocompatible as well as biodegradable nanoparticle has been designed by computer modeling, which self-assembles from single polypeptide chains to produce a structure with isohedral symmetry and a diameter of ∼16 nm [[31](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/341794#ref31)]. These peptide nanoparticles are multifunctional with high binding affinity and specificity. They can be customized to a high functional density. This platform was used to design and produce a prototypic malaria vaccine that can repetitively display a tandem repeat of the B cell immunodominant repeat epitope of the circumsporozoite protein of rodent malaria parasite Plasmodium berghei [[32](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/341794#ref32)]. Administered without an adjuvant, this vaccine conferred a long-lasting antibody response against B cell epitope and protected mice against malarial parasite for up to 6 months.

Liposome-Based Synthetic Vaccines

The use of liposomes has been proposed as artificial microbes for vaccination as they can be genetically programmed to produce specific antigens at will [[33](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/341794#ref33)]. Studies in mice with such vaccines showed that antigen-expressing immunostimulatory liposomes (AnExILs) elicited higher specific humoral immune responses against the produced antigens than control vaccines. AnExILs can be used as a synthetic biology platform to construct DNA-based vaccines, which combines antigen production, adjuvants and delivery in one system, offering several advantages over existing vaccine formulations. This system can be easily altered for other antigens by simply changing the DNA template and carries no risk of infection by attenuated pathogens.

Reverse Vaccines against Microbial Pathogens

Availability of complete genome sequences, high throughput technologies and synthetic biology has enabled reverse vaccinology (RV). Availability of sequence data from different specimens of the same species of a pathogen provides an opportunity to select novel vaccine candidates. Thus the empiric approach to vaccine development is being replaced by vaccine design. The RV approach is one of the most powerful examples of biotechnology applied to the field of vaccinology for identifying new protein-based vaccines.

RV combines the availability of genomic data, the analyzing capabilities of new bioinformatic tools and the application of high throughput expression. Purification systems can be combined with serological screening assays for a coordinated screening process of the entire genomic repertoire of bacterial, viral or parasitic pathogens. The application of RV to Neisseria meningitidis serogroup B represents the first success of this novel approach. This approach can be easily applied to any pathogen [[34](https://www.karger.com/Article/Fulltext/341794#ref34)].

#### B] List of supply shortages that IP can’t solve

[Laurie Garrett 21, (Columnist at Foreign Policy and former senior fellow for global health at the Council on Foreign Relations). 5/7/21, Stopping Drug Patents Has Stopped Pandemics Before, Foreign Policy, <https://foreignpolicy.com/2021/05/07/stopping-drug-patents-pandemics-coronavirus-hiv-aids/>] Justin

The vaccines aren’t easy to make. Manufacturing errors in a Maryland Emergent BioSolutions factory caused an 86 percent plummet in Johnson & Johnson vaccine supplies in early April. Complex steps in the process of isolating, purifying, preserving, storing, and delivering COVID-19 immunizations are each error-prone and require long lists of specialized chemicals and machinery.

The world is in the grips now of pipette tips shortages—used to suck out chemicals and viral samples from test tubes in key steps of vaccine making. Syringes are in short supply, prompting vaccinators to toss vaccine supplies for lack of means to administer them. The sterile containers used to hold vaccines are running out. From the earliest days of the 2020 pandemic, the sorts of protective gear and machinery vaccine researchers and makers require have been in short supply, exacerbated by trade tensions between the United States and China. Swabs used for COVID-19 testing and all aspects of equipment cleaning in sterile conditions are held up in a grotesque family dispute in Maine. There aren’t enough centrifuge tubes made worldwide to spin down cell samples. Moderna and Pfizer are constantly scrambling to find the ingredients used to make the microscopic fatty balls, called liposomes, that house the mRNA molecules and carry them safely into the bloodstream. Even the nucleic acids used to construct mRNA and a long list of special enzymes used to purify those samples are in horribly short supply, largely because their use overlaps with the manufacture of COVID-19 tests. Because such delicate chemicals and proteins must be handled at deep-freeze temperatures and transported swiftly for immediate use, the entire supply chain is vulnerable to the simplest of catastrophes: weather at an airport, a car crash that blocks truck traffic, power outages, or competition for cargo space.

Although waiving TRIPS requirements on COVID-19 vaccines is a spectacular, historic gesture, would-be generic makers worldwide will soon discover their efforts are stymied not by patents but for want of Avanti Polar Lipids’ liposome ingredients, Flexsafe RM special bags to hold liquid vaccines in bulk, phosphate-buffered saline solution, Distearoylphosphatidylcholine for liposome-making, 5’ cap for mRNA made by TriLink BioTechnologies, RNA polymerases—the list goes on, and on, and on. As the number of would-be vaccine makers grows, so will demand for thousands of such items, putting pressure on companies that are, in many cases, mom-and-pop operations. Worse, pressure on supplies critical for COVID-19 vaccine making is already resulting in a production loss of vital medicines for other diseases.

#### C] Disease doesn’t cause extinction

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja is an infectious-disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh. Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race? June 17, 2016. https://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/]

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

#### No Food Wars –

#### A] No food wars – no causal evidence, only maybe true for the poorest countries, and government responses solve the impact

Rosengrant 13 [Mark W. Rosegrant, Director of the Environment and Production Technology Division at the International Food Policy Research Institute, et al., 2013, “The Future of the Global Food Economy: Scenarios for Supply, Demand, and Prices,” in Food Security and Sociopolitical Stability, p. 39-40]

The food price spikes in the late 2000s caught the world’s attention, particularly when sharp increases in food and fuel prices in 2008 coincided with street demonstrations and riots in many countries. For 2008 and the two preceding years, researchers identified a significant number of countries (totaling 54) with protests during what was called the global food crisis (Benson et al. 2008). Violent protests occurred in 21 countries, and nonviolent protests occurred in 44 countries. Both types of protest took place in 11 countries. In a separate analysis, developing countries with low government effectiveness experienced more food price protests between 2007 and 2008 than countries with high government effectiveness (World Bank 201la). Although the incidence of violent protests was much higher in countries with less capable governance, many factors could be causing or contributing to these protests, such as government response tactics, rather than the initial food price spike. Data on food riots and food prices have tracked together in recent years. Agricultural commodity prices started strengthening in international markets in 2006. In the latter half of 2007, as prices continued to rise, two or fewer food price riots per month were recorded (based on World Food Programme data, as reported in Brinkman and Hendrix 2011). As prices peaked and remained high during mid-2008, the number of riots increased dramatically, with a cumulative total of 84 by August 2008. Subsequently, both prices and the monthly number of protests declined. Several researchers have studied the connection between food price shocks and conflict, finding at least some relationship between food prices and conflict. According to Dell et al. (2008), higher food prices lead to income declines and an increase in political instability, but only for poor countries. Researchers also found a positive and significant relationship between weather shocks (affecting food availability, prices, and real income) and the probability of suffering government repression or a civil war (Besley and Persson 2009). Arezki and Bruckner (2011) evaluated a constructed food price index and political variables, including data on riots and anti-government demonstrations and measures of civil unrest. Using data from 61 countries over the period 1970 to 2007, they found a direct connection between food price shocks and an increased likelihood of civil conflict, including riots and demonstrations. Other researchers have broadened the analysis by considering government responses or underlying policies that affect local prices, and consequently influence outcomes and the linkage between food price shocks and conflict. Carter and Bates (2012) evaluated data from 30 developing countries for the time period 1961 to 2001, concluding that when governments mitigate the impact of food price shocks on urban consumers, the apparent relationship between food price shocks and civil war disappears. Moreover, when the urban consumers can expect a favorable response, the protests only serve as a motivation for a policy response rather than as a prelude to something more serious, such as violent demonstrations or even civil war. Many in the international development community see war and conflict as a development issue, with a war or conflict severely damaging the local economy, which in turn leads to forced migration and dislocation, and ultimately acute food insecurity. Brinkman and Hendrix (2011) ask if it could be the other way around, with food insecurity causing conflict. Their answer, based on a review of the literature, is "a highly qualified yes," especially for intrastate conflict. The primary reason is that insecurity itself heightens the risk of democratic breakdown and civil conflict. The linkage connecting food insecurity to conflict is contingent on levels of economic development (a stronger linkage for poorer countries), existing political institutions, and other factors. The researchers say establishing causation directly is elusive, considering a lack of evidence for explaining individual behavior. The debate over cause and effect is ongoing. Policies can nevertheless be implemented to reduce price variability. Less costly forms of stabilization, at least in terms of government outlays, include reducing import tariffs (and quotas) to lower prices and restricting exports to increase food availability. However, these types of policy responses, while perhaps helping an individual country's consumers in the short run, can lead to increased international price volatility, with potential for disproportionate adverse impacts on other countries that also may be experiencing food insecurity.

#### B] Their studies are bad

Demarest 15 [Leila Demarest, PhD Researcher at the Centre for Research on Peace and Development. Food price rises and political instability: Problematizing a complex relationship. The European Journal of Development Research, Vol. 27, No. 5, p. 650-671]

6. Conclusions and Way Forward While some progress has been made in improving our understanding of the linkages between rising food prices and conflict, several important gaps remain. Firstly, notions of conflict and political instability are often used interchangeably, while these concepts and the relationships between them remain to some extent vague. The ‘food riot’ concept in particular leads to confusion. Although it is popularly seen as a violent rise of the masses, in reality, many peaceful events are gathered under this term, while violence is often committed by the state rather than by hungry consumers. The term also presupposes that food is the central issue at hand, which does not necessarily have to be the case. Many misunderstanding arise from the second gap identified in this paper: the uncritical data gathering based on international news reports. Not only are these remarkably inconsistent, they also make use of classifications which are not scientifically investigated. Finally, causal mechanisms in the relationship between rising food prices and conflict often remain assumptions in the literature and lack empirical foundation. Three crosscutting avenues for improvement therefore exist: better concept definitions, better data gathering, and more focus on contexts. Clearly defined concepts and categorizations of conflict and instability are a necessary foundation for research on the linkages between rising food prices and conflict. For (food) protests in particular, purposeful categorizations require an enhanced insight in the events that took place on the ground. Local news sources for data gathering can prove to be more reliable than Western (English) media to accomplish this. Event descriptions are also likely to be more detailed in local sources, which allows for a first-hand qualitative analysis of causes and context. As international food prices are likely to remain high, improving our understanding of the causal mechanisms which can lead to conflict remains crucial. We can draw important lessons from the literature on poverty and conflict, resource scarcity and conflict, and regime transition in Africa. The causal role of economic factors alone has continuously been questioned, and ‘context’ or prevailing political, economic, and social factors play a crucial role in the conflict outcome. The argument that adverse economic shocks seem more of a trigger to conflict rather than an important cause is not particularly remarkable in itself. Yet while many authors acknowledge this, the focus often remains on the trigger. Resource scarcity, climate change, population growth, or food insecurity often remain the starting point of analyses, with researchers consequently tracing the divergent (theoretical) possibilities for conflict. In the end, most admit that these factors do not automatically lead to conflict everywhere, and stress the importance of context. Because the theoretical possibilities for conflict are so large, however, the context factor remains rather understudied with as most agreed upon notions that elements of ‘grievance’ and ‘collective action’ are required. It is hence important to focus more on the ‘contexts’ that can lead to conflict and, in doing so, to make the distinction between different forms of conflict. This also implies a data collection exercise. Contextual data are currently collected at the aggregate, national level, and only on a yearly basis, which can lead to spurious relations. While the use of these variables is increasingly questioned in civil war studies, we can also doubt their strength in the study of highly localized, one-time events such as riots. I particularly make the case for ‘bringing politics back in’. The policies taken by the government are crucial in the violent escalation of social conflict (e.g. accommodation versus repression), but the only variable currently in use to explain state behaviour seems to be the country-level regime type variable (Polity IV or Freedom House), which is also used with regards to highly localized conflicts. Other ways in which politics matter, can be the strength of the political opposition. The Muslim Brotherhood in Egypt, for example, was probably better organized than other opposition groups to make use of economic unrest.

#### The global health inequality impact is about all IPR not just medicines which means the aff doesn’t solve