Extra Topicality - Shell

#### **Interp – The affirmative may only claim offense from reduce intellectual property protections for medicines**

#### **Violation – they defend abolishing all intellectual property protections, not just the ones applicable to medicines**

Vote neg – on extra T. Two net benefits.

1. Predictability – allowing for the affirmative to gain offense from things outside the scope of the resolution destroys predictability uniquely and makes the affirmative a shifting target. An extra T affirmative can gain solvency from removing medical patents, removing copyright from all inventions, or abolishing the IPPs all togethers. These additions will be used to outweigh and undermine any DAs and CPs rooted in the topic literature.
2. Ground – Extra T arguments allow for the affirmative to steal negative ground. Advantage CPs are thrown out the window because the affirmative can already incorporate it in the affirmative. It also shifts the ground gone for, not all IPPs are created equal which renders more typical negative ground useless.

Extra T controls the internal link to accessibility because lack of stasis and impossible constraints make debate impossible and exacerbate inequity and access to resources for fair competition. These practices kill small schools and lay debaters through impossible research burdens and unpredictability. Accessibility is key to debate surviving and growing as an activity. Lack of unique perspectives from debaters and schools with diverse backgrounds leads to monopolizing and stagnant forms of education.

#### **TVA: defend abolition of medical patents.**

Cross apply paradigm issues.

**Voters**

1. **Fairness**: Fairness is a voter because debate is an activity that results in winners and losers. Equal access to the ballot is key to generate activism and ultimately gain educational benefits exclusive to debate. Fairness controls the I/L to education because if we don’t have equal access, we can’t debate.
2. **Education**: Education is a voter because debate is an educational activity, but fairness outweighs education because we can gain it in other forums.

#### Paradigm Issues

1. **Drop the Debater**:A loss deters future abuse
2. **No RVIs**
   1. The opponent shouldn’t win for being fair; Illogical to turn defensive counterinterps intro offensive voters
   2. Encourages debaters to be abusive and prep for T
   3. Because of the chilling effect, I wouldn’t initiate theory against abuse if I could lose
   4. Enables a return to substantive debate
3. **Competing Interps**
   1. Any brightline for reasonability is arbitrary, which forces unclear intervention
   2. Fosters a race to the top by promoting better norms
   3. Builds advocacy skills in theory debate

Framework

#### **The role of the ballot is to evaluate the desirability of the consequences of a topical plan. Prefer—**

[1] Weighability—scenarios can be weighed through impact calc, but resistance methods can’t vecause you can’t weigh opposition to structures of inequality—that freezes actions because there’s no way to decide between multiple actions

[2] Anything else is self serving and arbitrary because it’s not tied to the res—only the resolution is given to both debaters at the same time to prepare so their framework is not a stasis for preparation – outweighs because it’s a pre-req to clash

#### Evaluating consequences is good—creates meaningful discussion instead of hostile exchange

Bracey 06, Christopher A [Christopher Alan Bracey is an American law professor and former litigator. In 2017, he serves as a law professor at the George Washington University Law School and Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs at the George Washington University. He is a leading scholar on race, inequality, and the law.]. “The Cul De Sac of Race Preference Discourse.” SSRN Scholarly Paper. Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network, September 1, 2006. https://papers.ssrn.com/abstract=2018352.~Anop

Second, reducing conversation on race matters to an ideological contest allows opponents to elide inquiry into whether the results of a particular preference policy are desirable. Policy positions masquerading as principled ideological stances create the impression that a racial policy is not simply a choice among available alternatives, but the embodiment of some higher moral principle. Thus, the “principle” becomes an end in itself, without reference to outcomes. Consider the prevailing view of colorblindness in constitutional discourse. Colorblindness has come to be understood as the embodiment of what is morally just, independent of its actual effect upon the lives of racial minorities. This explains Justice Thomas’s belief in the “moral and constitutional equivalence” between Jim Crow laws and race preferences, *and his tragic assertion that “Government cannot make us equal [but] can only recognize, respect, and protect us as equal before the law.”281 For Thomas, there is no meaningful difference between laws designed to entrench racial subordination and those designed to alleviate conditions of oppression*. Critics may point out that colorblindness in practice has the effect of entrenching existing racial disparities in health, wealth, and society. But in framing the debate in purely ideological terms, opponents are able to avoid the contentious issue of outcomes and make viability determinations based exclusively on whether racially progressive measures exude fidelity to the ideological principle of colorblindness. Meaningful policy debate is replaced by ideological exchange, which further exacerbates hostilities and deepens the cycle of resentment.282

#### **That is the only egalitarian metric---anything else collapses cooperation on collective action crises and makes extinction inevitable**

Khan 18 (Risalat, activist and entrepreneur from Bangladesh passionate about addressing climate change, biodiversity loss, and other existential challenges. He was featured by The Guardian as one of the “young climate campaigners to watch” (2015). As a campaigner with the global civic movement Avaaz (2014-17), Risalat was part of a small core team that spearheaded the largest climate marches in history with a turnout of over 800,000 across 2,000 cities. After fighting for the Paris Agreement, Risalat led a campaign joined by over a million people to stop the Rampal coal plant in Bangladesh to protect the Sundarbans World Heritage forest, and elicited criticism of the plant from Crédit Agricolé through targeted advocacy. Currently, Risalat is pursuing an MPA in Environmental Science and Policy at Columbia University as a SIPA Environmental Fellow, “5 reasons why we need to start talking about existential risks,” https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2018/01/5-reasons-start-talking-existential-risks-extinction-moriori/)

*Infinite* future *possibilities* I find the story of the Moriori profound. It teaches me two lessons. Firstly, that human culture is *far from immutable*. That we can struggle against our baser instincts. That *we can master them and rise to unprecedented challenges*. Secondly, that even this does not make us masters of our own destiny. We can make visionary choices, but the future can still surprise us. This is a humbling realization. Because *faced with an uncertain future, the only wise thing we can do is prepare* for possibilities. Standing at the launch pad of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, the possibilities seem endless. They range from an era of abundance to the end of humanity, and everything in between. How do we navigate such a wide and divergent spectrum? I am an optimist. From my bubble of privilege, life feels like a rollercoaster ride full of ever more impressive wonders, even as I try to fight the many social injustices that still blight us. However, the accelerating pace of change amid uncertainty elicits one fundamental observation. Among the infinite future possibilities*, only one outcome is truly irreversible: extinction*. Concerns about extinction are often dismissed as *apocalyptic alarmism*. Sometimes, they are. But repeating that mankind is still here after 70 years of existential warning about nuclear warfare is a *straw man argument*. *The fact that a 1000-year flood has not happened does not negate its possibility*. And there have been *far too many nuclear near-misses to rest easy.* As the World Economic Forum’s Annual Meeting in Davos discusses how to create a shared future in a fractured world, here are five reasons why the possibility of existential risks should raise the stakes of conversation: 1. *Extinction is the rule, not the exception* More than 99.9% of all the species that ever existed are gone. *Deep time is unfathomable* to the human brain. But if one cares to take a tour of the billions of years of life’s history, we find a litany of forgotten species. And we have only discovered a mere fraction of the extinct species that once roamed the planet. In the speck of time since the first humans evolved, more than 99.9% of all the distinct human cultures that have ever existed are extinct. Each hunter-gatherer tribe had its own mythologies, traditions and norms. They wiped each other out, or coalesced into larger formations following the agricultural revolution. However, as major civilizations emerged, even those that reached incredible heights, such as the Egyptians and the Romans, eventually collapsed. It is only in the very recent past that we became a truly global civilization. Our interconnectedness continues to grow rapidly. “Stand or fall, we are the last civilization”, as Ricken Patel, the founder of the global civic movement Avaaz, put it. 2. Environmental pressures can drive extinction More than 15,000 scientists just issued a ‘warning to humanity’. They called on us to reduce our impact on the biosphere, 25 years after their first such appeal. The warning notes that we are far outstripping the capacity of our planet in all but one measure of ozone depletion, including emissions, biodiversity, freshwater availability and more. The scientists, not a crowd known to overstate facts, conclude: “soon it will be too late to shift course away from our failing trajectory, and time is running out”. In his 2005 book Collapse, Jared Diamond charts the history of past societies. He makes the case that overpopulation and resource use beyond the carrying capacity have often been important, if not the only, drivers of collapse. Even though we are making important incremental progress in battles such as climate change, we must still achieve tremendous step changes in our response to several major environmental crises. We must do this even while the world’s population continues to grow. These pressures are bound to exert great stress on our global civilization. 3. Superintelligence: unplanned obsolescence? Imagine a monkey society that foresaw the ascendance of humans. Fearing a loss of status and power, it decided to kill the proverbial Adam and Eve. It crafted the most ingenious plan it could: starve the humans by taking away all their bananas. Foolproof plan, right? This story describes the fundamental difficulty with superintelligence. A superintelligent being may always do something entirely different from what we, with our mere mortal intelligence, can foresee. In his 2014 book Superintelligence, Swedish philosopher Nick Bostrom presents the challenge in thought-provoking detail, and advises caution. *Bostrom cites a survey of industry experts that projected a 50% chance of the development of artificial superintelligence by 2050*, *and a 90% chance by 2075*. The latter date is within the life expectancy of many alive today. Visionaries like Stephen Hawking and Elon Musk have warned of the existential risks from artificial superintelligence. Their opposite camp includes Larry Page and Mark Zuckerberg. But on an issue that concerns the future of humanity, is it really wise to ignore the guy who explained the nature of space to us and another guy who just put a reusable rocket in it? 4. Technology: known knowns and unknown unknowns Many fundamentally disruptive technologies are coming of age, from bioengineering to quantum computing, 3-D printing, robotics, nanotechnology and more. Lord Martin Rees describes potential existential challenges from some of these technologies, such as a bioengineered pandemic, in his book Our Final Century. Imagine if North Korea, feeling secure in its isolation, could release a virulent strain of Ebola, engineered to be airborne. Would it do it? Would ISIS? Projecting decades forward, we will likely develop capabilities that are unthinkable even now. The unknown unknowns of our technological path are profoundly humbling. 5. 'The Trump Factor' Despite our scientific ingenuity, we are still a confused and confusing species. Think back to two years ago, and how you thought the world worked then. Has that not been upended by the election of Donald Trump as US President, and everything that has happened since? The mix of billions of messy humans will forever be unpredictable. When the combustible forces described above are added to this melee, we find ourselves on a tightrope. What choices must we now make now to create a shared future, in which we are not at perpetual risk of destroying ourselves? Common enemy to common cause Throughout history, we have rallied against the ‘other’. Tribes have overpowered tribes, empires have conquered rivals. Even today, our fiercest displays of unity typically happen at wartime. We give our lives for our motherland and defend nationalistic pride like a wounded lion. But like the early Morioris, we 21st-century citizens find ourselves on an *increasingly unstable island*. We may have a violent past, but *we have no more dangerous enemy than ourselves*. Our task is to find our own Nunuku’s Law. Our own shared contract, based on equity, would help us navigate safely. It would ensure a future that unleashes the full potential of our still-budding human civilization, in all its diversity. We cannot do this unless we are *humbly grounded in the possibility of our own destruction*. *Survival is life’s primal instinct*. In the absence of a common enemy, we must find common cause in survival. Our future may depend on whether we realize this.

AFFCASE

#### **The pharmaceutical industry is more powerful than you think – they’ll privatize the modern nation-state before losing their patents**

#### **Preciado 08. Paul Preciado (Spanish philosopher, queer theorist, and king), 2008, “Testo Junkie,” translated by Bruce Benderson, I have a pdf, if you need it, sean!**

#### **Contemporary biodrag activism is confronted, fifty years after Agnes, with a new set of violent neoliberal economic and politic strategies, including the privatization of the health system, government deregulation, deep cuts in social spending, and the militarization of social life. In the present context, it’s possible to imagine (at least) two tracks of development for the pharmacopornographic economy in the face of which different modes of activism could be articulated. The first is the preservation of theological-humanist political states that regulate the action of the neoliberal (meaning free trade, either democratic or totalitarian in the context of globalization) pharmacopornographic economy. Current pharmacopornographic corporations would function as free market tentacles inside contemporary nation-states (which would continue to see themselves as sovereign and patriarchal) and would negotiate with them to determine the directives for the production, use, and consumption of chemical prostheses and semiotic gender and sex codes. The second transformation is one into an abstract deterritorialized nation-state of the pharmacopornographic industry. We could also be witnessing a process of privatization of contemporary nation-states, which would be progressively absorbed by the pharmacopornographic industry. This would be the strategy employed by the pharmacopornographic companies to escape pre-1970s regulations imposed by states (to avoid the gradual transformation of pharmaceutical patents into generics, the more or less severe regulation of the production and distribution of pornographic audiovisual material, and attempts to abolish prostitution), as these companies engage in the political direction of new national entities (via the FDA; the International Monetary Fund; the European Union; and the governments of the United States, China, or India) and purchase state institutions (for example, the Department of Health or Department of Justice or the prison-industrial complex) and put them to work to their benefit, refilling such archaic institutions with new content whose only objective would be increasing consumption and pharmacopornographic profits.**

#### 

#### The 1AC’s analysis of colonial capitalism to demand resistance to research results in nothing but reductionist knowledge production which reduces the nuances of class differences and collapses the complexities created by racial capitalism down to a settler/indigenous binary which creates ineffective resistance by fracturing solidarity and collective bonds between workers.

Brenna **Bhandar 16**, Senior Lecturer in Law at SOAS, “Acts and Omissions: Framing Settler Colonialism in Palestine Studies, <http://www.jadaliyya.com/pages/index/23569/acts-and-omissions_framing-settler-colonialism-in->

The forging of a **new academic field** of settler colonial studies risks potentially creating **unnecessary binaries** between studies of **colonialism** and **settler-colonialism**. It is clear that techniques of colonial dispossession traveled throughout networks of **trade** and leisure established during and throughout the **British Empire**. Such tools include the **surveillance** and **criminalization** of colonized populations, **land appropriation**, resource **extraction**, the perversion or indeed, attempted **erasure**, of native legal systems, and **control** over the mobility and **political citizenship** of colonized populations. English colonial administrators and freelance entrepreneurs traveled, during the nineteenth century, between the Indian subcontinent, Australia, Canada, New Zealand, the Caribbean, the United States, the African continent, and of course the United Kingdom. They imported and exported the legal and political infrastructures required for colonial modes of expropriation. With the advent of the Mandate system, Palestine became another scene of exchange and implementation of European colonial modes of governance tested elsewhere. While many scholars have revealed the formative influence of European models of nationalism and colonial ideology on early Zionist movements (Raz-Krakotzkin 2007; Lloyd 2012), the detailed work of excavating the way in which the political and legal techniques of dispossession travelled between different colonial sites remains underexplored. (Although see Lowe, 2014 an Saldaña-Portillo 2016 for exemplary exceptions to this claim). Another binary inherent to the **settler colonial analytic** is that between the **colonizer and colonized**. While adopting a settler colonial framework is critical to analyzing Israel’s modus operandi as a colonial power, there is a need to contextualize Israel’s settler colonial project within the **particular class and racial differences** inside **Israel and amongst Palestinians**. Ella Shohat’s critical work on the racial hierarchy within Israel’s settler society is a strong example that highlights the historical marginalization of the Mizrahim, Jews of Arab origin. Racialized immigrants occupy both the position of settler in relation to Indigenous communities and the subaltern in relation to the dominant place of the white European settler. Some scholars in North America, and **particularly in Hawai’i** have grasped how the racialization of **particular immigrant communities** in **settler states complicates the settler colonial framework**. On the other hand, a settler colonial framework must also contend with the **emerging class differences** in Palestinian society exacerbated by the impact of the Oslo Accords. This is especially relevant when contending with the question of how Palestinians can challenge the logic of the Oslo process while the Palestinian Authority, adhering to a fundamental neoliberal agenda (Hanieh 2013), remains intact. The Palestinian Authority continues to formulate Palestinian liberation in terms of truncated statehood on small sections of Palestinian land and celebrates symbolic acts such as raising the Palestinian flag at the United Nations while prospects of Palestinian sovereignty over land continue to diminish daily. Sadly, the PA’s focus continues to be building a neoliberal state apparatus as a way to “convince” Israel and international donors that Palestinians are able to run their affairs. For all intents and purposes, Israel has succeeded in outsourcing its military occupation to a segment of Palestinians - this is evident in the relatively large budgets of the security forces of the PA and the continued security coordination with Israel. In our view, such differences within both the settler society and the colonized need to be brought out and fully incorporated into the settler colonial analytical framework. Racially inscribed dispossession and the capitalist modes of accumulation that subtend expropriative practices have developed in **spatially** and **temporally differentiated** ways in the colonies, as elaborated by scores of post-colonial theorists. In other words, capitalist development in the colonies has not mirrored the transition from feudal economies to capitalist ones in Europe. The terms “postcolonial capitalism” and “racial capitalism” both denote ways of understanding capitalist forms of dispossession that profit from, **and reinforce class hierarchies**, **patriarchal** **formations**, and **racist ideologies** lodged in **colonial imaginaries** that persist into the present. **These terms do not neatly fit into a settler-colonial framework** and yet are critical to understanding the political-economic, juridical and social complexities across various sites of inquiry. **Forcing them into a single analytical category risks losing this richness and undermining forms of political solidarity across colonized spaces.** Darwish’s masterful poem, “The Red Indian’s Penultimate Speech to the White Man” begins with an epigram from the Duwamish Chief Seattle. The dispossession of native land that Columbus’ ill-fated voyage inaugurated, binds together the fates of Native Americans and Palestinians, who resist colonial dominance over land, time, history, memory, and place. As Chief Seattle asserts, “there is no Death here, there is only the change of worlds.” We in turn are looking for our own counter-narration, a language to explain the ongoing violence of dispossession in multiple contexts. We are reminded of the words of Mike Krebs and Dana Olwan: We want to build solidarity without reproducing and enacting the same colonial logics and asymmetric relationships of power on which settler colonialisms hinge. **We believe that our futures are connected** and that we are especially powerful when **we enact solidarity** **by words and actions**. **To expect solidarity, we must be willing to give it, share it, and maintain it**. **To do otherwise is to risk producing solidarity on the very colonial terms that our movements seek to challenge and undo.**