### 1

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must be topical. To clarify – medicines are defined as “a substance or preparation used in treating disease”.

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/medicine>

**They don’t provide any definitions in the 1ac, so default to ours and don’t let them redefine in the 1ar as it moots my 1nc and makes them a moving target.**

#### Violation: Their solvency card doesn’t mention medicine a single time and only talks about living things and life forms, and not even how they treat any illnesses.

#### Vote neg for limits and ground: they justify reduction of IP protections for ANYTHING tangentially related to medicine, which explodes the neg prep burden and is completely unpredictable – you should use the precise wording of the topic as the KEY LIMIT on predictable affirmatives.

#### Two impacts:

#### 1 -- Fairness – Fairness is the only reason schools fund debate and why you want to win. That outweighs -- deciding any other argument in this debate cannot be disentangled from our inability to prepare for it -- any argument you think they’re winning is a link, not a reason to vote for them, since it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it. This means they don’t get to weigh the aff.

#### 2 – Research/education -- the neg loses any incentive to do targeted research when the prep burden is so high so debaters would resort to stale generics and lose topic specific education. That outweighs because we only have 2 months to debate the topic and covid/core of the topic is uniquely important to many debaters’ lives.

#### Paradigms:

#### Drop the debater: 1] to deter future abuse, 2] it’s their entire advocacy anyway.

#### Competing interps because reasonability is arbitrary and invites judge intervention.

#### No RVIs: 1] Illogical – you shouldn’t win for being fair, 2] baiting – the best theory debaters would read abusive advocacies to go for the RVI, 3] substance – any initiation of theory ensures the 2NR and 2AR are theory, crowding out substance.

#### Neg theory 1st – 1AC abuse shaped NC construction so if anything we did was bad it was just to get back in the game.

### 2

#### Interpretation: The affirmative must defend that the member nations of the WTO ought to reduce intellectual property protections for all medicine. The negative may not read plan inclusive counterplans.

#### Violation: The affirmative only defends biological elements

#### Vote neg for limits -- there are over 20,000[[1]](#footnote-1) different medicines, which means their interp justifies reducing any IP protection for any medicine, creating thousands of potential AFFs to prep out. This kills negative ground because different medicines can have different usage and situations that affect the debate and we lose all disads to general action.

#### Impact:

#### 1 -- Fairness -- an unlimited topic makes neg engagement impossible because there’d be tons of new AFFs to prep out every tournament. Uniquely kills small schools because they’d be unable to keep up with the prep burden.

#### Same paradigm issues

### 3

#### Capitalism is a system engendering massive violence and inevitable extinction – the foundational task is to find a way out – the Role of the Ballot is to endorse the best organizational tactics.

Badiou ‘18

[Alain, former chair of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Superiure, professor of philosophy at The European Graduate School. Translated by David Broder. 07/30/2018. “The Neolithic, Capitalism, and Communism,” <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3948-the-neolithic-capitalism-and-communism>] pat Today, it has become commonplace to predict the end of the human race such as we know it. There are various reasons for such forecasts. According to a messianic kind of environmentalism, the excessive predations of a beastly humanity will soon bring about the end of life on Earth. Meanwhile, those who instead point to runaway technological advances prophesy, indiscriminately, the automation of all work by robots, grand developments in computing, automatically-generated art, plastic-coated killers, and the dangers of a super-human intelligence. Suddenly, we see the emergence of threatening categories like transhumanism and the post-human — or, their mirror image, a return to our animal state — depending on whether one prophesies on the basis of technological innovation or laments all the attacks on Mother Nature. For me, all such prophesies are just so much ideological noise, intended to obscure the real peril that humanity is today exposed to: that is to say, the impasse that globalised capitalism is leading us into. In fact, it is this form of society — and it alone — which permits the destructive exploitation of natural resources, precisely because it connects this exploitation to the boundless quest for private profit. The fact that so many species are endangered, that climate change cannot be controlled, that water is becoming like some rare treasure, is all a by-product of the merciless popition among billionaire predators. There is no other reason for the fact that scientific innovation is subject to the question of what technologies can sell, in an anarchic selection mechanism. Environmentalist preaching does sometimes use persuasive descriptions of what is going on — despite the exaggerations typical of the prophet. But most of the time this becomes mere propaganda, useful for those states who want to show their friendly face. Just as it is for the multinationals who would have us believe — to the greater benefit of their balance sheets — in the noble, fraternal, natural purity of the commodities they are trafficking. The fetishism of technology, and the unbroken series of "revolutions" in this domain — of which the "digital revolution" is the most in vogue — has constantly spread the beliefs both that this will take us to the paradise of a world without work — with robots to serve us, and us left to idle — and then, on the other hand, that digital "thought" will crush the human intellect. Today there is not one magazine that does not inform its astonished readers of the imminent "victory" of artificial over natural intelligence. But in most cases neither "nature" nor the "artificial" are properly or clearly defined. Since the origins of philosophy, the question of the real scope of the word "nature" has been constantly posed. "Nature" could mean the romantic reverie of evening sunsets, the atomic materialism of Lucretius (De natura rerum), the inner being of things, Spinoza’s Totality (Deus sive Natura), the objective underside of all culture, rural and peasant surroundings as counterposed to the suspicious artificiality of the towns ("the earth does not lie," as Marshal Pétain put it), biology as distinct from physics, cosmology as compared to the tiny location that is our planet, the invariance of centuries as compared to the frenzy of innovation, natural sexuality as compared to perversion… I am afraid that today "nature" most of all refers to the calm of the villa and the garden, the charm wild animals have for tourists, and the beach or the mountains where we can spend a nice summer. Who, then, can imagine man responsible for nature, when thus far he has just been a thinking flea on a secondary planet in an average solar system at the edge of one banal galaxy? Since its origins philosophy has also devoted a great deal of thought to Technology, or the Arts. The Greeks meditated on the dialectic of Techne and Physis — a dialectic within which they situated the human animal. They laid the ground for this animal to be seen as "a reed, the weakest of nature, but … a thinking reed." For Pascal, this meant that humanity was stronger than Nature and closer to God. A long time ago, they saw that the animal capable of mathematics would do great things to the order of materiality. Are these "robots" which they keep banging on about anything more than calculation in the form of a machine? Digits in motion? We know that they can count quicker than us, but it was we who invented them, precisely in order to fulfil this task. It would be stupid to look at a crane raising a concrete pillar up to some great height, use this to argue that man is incapable of the same feat, and then conclude by saying that some muscular, superhuman giant has emerged… Lightning-quick counting is not the sign of an insuperable "intelligence" either. Technological transhumanism plays the same old tune — an inexhaustible theme of horror and sci-fi movies — of the creator overwhelmed by his own creation. It does so either thrilled about the advent of the superman — something we have been expecting ever since Nietzsche — or fearing him and taking refuge under the skirt of Gaia, Mother Nature. Let’s put things in a bit more perspective. For four or five millennia, humanity has been organised by the triad of private property — which concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of very narrow oligarchies; the family, in which fortunes are transmitted via inheritance; and the state, which protects both property and the family by armed force. This triad defined our species’ Neolithic age, and we are still at this point — we could even say, now more than ever. Capitalism is the contemporary form of the Neolithic. Its enslavement of technology in the interests of competition, profit and concentrating capital only raises to their fullest extension the monstrous inequalities, the social absurdities, the murderous wars, and the damaging ideologies that have always accompanied the deployment of new technology under the reign of class hierarchy throughout history. We should be clear that technological inventions were the preliminary conditions of the arrival of the Neolithic age, and by no means its result. If we consider our species’ fate, we see that sedentary agriculture, the domestication of cattle and horses, pottery, bronze, metallic weapons, writing, nationalities, monumental architecture, and the monotheist religions are inventions at least as important as the airplane or the smartphone. Throughout history, whatever has been human has always, by definition, been artificial. If that had not existed, there would not have been Neolithic humanity — the humanity we know — but a permanent close proximity with animal life; something which did indeed exist, in the form of small nomadic groups, for around 200,000 years. A fearful and obscurantist primitivism has its roots in the fallacious concept of "primitive communism." Today we can see this cult of the ancient societies in which babies, men, women and the elderly supposedly lived in fraternity, without anything artificial, and indeed lived in common with the mice, the frogs, and the bears. Ultimately, all this is nothing but ridiculous reactionary propaganda. For everything suggests that the societies in question were extremely violent. After all, even their most basic survival needs were constantly under threat. To speak fearfully of the victory of the artificial over the nature, of robot over man, is today an untenable regression, something truly absurd. It is easy enough to answer such fears, such prophesies. For judged by this standard, even a simple axe, or a domesticated horse, not to mention a papyrus covered in symbols, is an exemplary case of the post- or trans-human. Even an abacus allows quicker calculation than the fingers of the human hand. Today we need neither a return to primitivism, or fear of the "ravages" the advent of technology might bring. Nor is there any use in morbid fascination for the science-fiction of all-conquering robots. The urgent task we face is the methodical search for a way out of the Neolithic order. This latter has lasted for millennia, valuing only competition and hierarchy and tolerating the poverty of billions of human beings. It must be surpassed at all cost. Except, that is, the cost of the high-tech wars so well known to the Neolithic age, in the lineage of the wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, with their tens of millions of dead. And this time it could be a lot more. The problem is not technology, or nature. The problem is how to organise societies at a global scale. We need to posit that a non-Neolithic way of organising society is possible. This means no private ownership of that which ought to be held in common, namely the production of all the necessities of human life. It means no inherited power or concentration of wealth. No separate state to protect oligarchies. No hierarchical division of labour. No nations, and no closed and hostile identities. A collective organisation of everything that is in the collective interest. All this has a name, indeed a fine one: communism. Capitalism is but the final phase of the restrictions that the Neolithic form of society has imposed on human life. It is the final stage of the Neolithic. Humanity, that fine animal, must make one last push to break out of a condition in which 5,000 years of inventions served a handful of people. For almost two centuries — since Marx, anyway — we have known that we have to begin the new age. An age of technologies incredible for all of us, of tasks distributed equally among all of us, of the sharing of everything, and education that affirms the genius of all. May this new communism everywhere and on every question stand up against the morbid survival of capitalism. This capitalism, this seeming "modernity," represents a Neolithic world that has in fact been going on for five millennia. And that means that it is old — far too old.

#### The plan is a colonialist revision that re-packages the WTO as a legitimate organization that can overcome its insidious past towards a future of equal free trade—that decks class consciousness.

Gilbert 19 [Geoff Gilbert is a Professor of Law in the School of Law and Human Rights Centre at the University of Essex. He was Head of Department between 2000-2003 and 2011-13. In 2012, he was appointed a Professorial Visiting Fellow at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. He was Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Refugee Law from 2002-15 and is co-Editor-in-Chief as of September 2019; he also sits on the Advisory Board., “Free trade” is today’s imperialism by the 1 percent, 1-13-2019,No Publication,https://www.bilaterals.org/?free-trade-is-today-s-imperialism, 8-21-2021 amrita]

Free Trade Imperialism: **Continuing the Unequal Trade of Colonialism With mass global South resistance to colonialism increasing in the early 1900s and intensifying in the aftermath of the world wars, global North corporations and governments no longer needed colonialism.** From their perspective, moving toward the international economic model that would become free trade was much more cost-effective. As the US sociologist Johanna Bockman writes of US government and business elites in the aftermath of the second world war, **“[They] supported neither free trade nor globalization imagined as a level playing field with flows moving evenly around the globe. Instead, they supported the international neocolonial system through the [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)], while using the rhetoric of free trade and modernization to support US national interests.”** Roughly 70 years after the global North created the post-second world war international order, global North corporations continue to own and control a disproportionate amount of the most profitable industries in the global economy. Though many US commentators warn of the rise of Brazil, Russia, India and China, US corporations, in 2013, still had leading positions in 18 of the 25 most profitable industries. Moreover**, US corporations are dominant in the most profitable advanced industries, including banking and financial services, aerospace and defense, chemicals, computer hardware and software, insurance, pharmaceuticals, heavy machinery, and oil and gas.** While the US has roughly 5 percent of the world’s population and 25 percent of the global share of gross domestic product, US corporations likely control far more than 25 percent of the profit-producing capital in the world. **These profits are concentrated among the shareholders of multinationals incorporated in the US, which, according to one estimate, are at least 85 percent owned by US citizens. These profits are not being shared with vast majority of people in the world, most of whom do not own any wealth, let alone shares in corporations.** Global North and US multinational dominance of the world economy is not an accident, as global North governments and multinationals have used the international institutions they created following the second world war to continue to dominate the world economy. **These institutions include the United Nations; the GATT, which has since become the World Trade Organization (WTO); the International Monetary Fund (IMF); and the World Bank. The WTO is the main international institution that makes and enforces trade policies. The core GATT/WTO principles are “non-discrimination” and “national treatment.**” Non-discrimination means that countries will not use their trade policies to discriminate between goods that are produced in different foreign countries. National treatment means that countries will not use their trade policies to favor products produced in their own country over products produced in any other country. As described above, global North countries used their trade policies to promote the products of the corporations based in their countries for centuries. **The free trade principles of non-discrimination and national treatment deny the ability of any country to use those same policies today. This allows global North corporations to ensure that global South governments will not create policies that can help their own corporations develop the wealth they need to compete**. **Additionally, since the GATT/WTO free trade framework facilitates continued global North corporate control over advanced industries, global North corporations are far more likely to develop the high-tech industries of the future, as they own the profits from today’s advanced industries which they can invest in research and development.**

#### This is unsustainable and causes extinction – multiple intertwined crises make collapse inevitable which means its try-or-die – we got charts.

von Weizsäcker and Wijkman ‘17

Ernest Ulrich von Weizsäcker, Professor and Director of the United Nation Centre for Science and Technology for Development, Founder and President of the Wuppertal Institute, Member of the German Bundestag, chairing the Committees on Globalization and the Environment, Dean of the graduate School of Environmental Science and Management at the University of California, appointed Co-Chair of UNEP’s International Resource Panel, Anders Wijkman, chairman of the Swedish Association of Recycling Industries, member of the Board of the Swedish Development Authority (SIDA), appointed chair of the Swedish Cross-Party Committee on Environmental Objectives, member of the European Parliament, Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations and Policy Director of UNDP, Secretary General of the Swedish Red Cross and Director General of the Swedish Agency for Research Cooperation with Developing Countries, Member of the Swedish Royal Academy of Sciences, the World Future Council and the International Resource Panel, 2017 (“Come On! Capitalism, Short-termism, Population and the Destruction of the Planet – A Report to the Club”, November 11th, Available Online via Subscription to Springer, Accessed 03-20-2018)

1.1 Introduction: The World in Disarray We all know that the world is in crisis. Science tells us that almost half of the top soils on earth have been depleted in the last 150 years1 ; nearly 90% of fish stocks are either overfished or fully fished.2 Climate stability is in real danger (Sects. 1.5 and 3.7); and the earth is now in the sixth mass extinction period in history.3 Perhaps the most accurate account of the ecological situation is the 2012 ‘Imperative to act’,4 launched by all the 18 recipients (till 2012) of the Blue Planet Prize, including Gro Harlem Brundtland, James Hansen, Amory Lovins, James Lovelock and Susan Solomon. Its key message reads, ‘The human ability to do has vastly outstripped the ability to understand. As a result, civilization is faced with a perfect storm of problems, driven by overpopulation, overconsumption by the rich, the use of environmentally malign technologies and gross inequalities’. And further, ‘The rapidly deteriorating biophysical situation is barely recognized by a global society infected by the irrational belief that physical economies can grow forever’. 1.1.1 Different Types of Crisis and a Feeling of Helplessness The crisis is not cyclical but growing. And it is not limited to the nature around us. There are also a social crisis, a political and a cultural crisis, a moral crisis, as well as a crisis of democracy, of ideologies and of the capitalist system. The crisis also consists of deepened poverty in many countries and the loss of jobs for a considerable part of the population worldwide. Billions of people have reached a state of mind where they don’t trust their government anymore.5 Seen from a geographic point of view, symptoms of crisis are found nearly everywhere. The ‘Arab Spring’ was followed by a series of wars and civil wars, serious human rights violations and many millions of refugees. The internal situation is not better in Eritrea, South Sudan, Somalia, Yemen or Honduras. Venezuela and Argentina, once among the richer states of the world, face huge economic challenges, and neighbouring Brazil has gone through many years of recession and political turmoil. Russia and several East European countries are struggling with major economic and political problems in their post-communist phase. Japan finds it difficult to overcome decadelong stagnation, and to deal with the 2011 tsunami and ensuing nuclear disaster. And the temporary economic upswing several African countries have enjoyed lost its dynamism as soon as the prices of mineral resources collapsed, and partly due to very unusual droughts. Land grabbing is plaguing much of Africa, but also other parts of the world, leading to involuntary dislocations of millions of people and the related problems with refugees both within countries and abroad.6 The response of governments has been concentrated, at worst, on managing their own political image, and at best to treat the symptoms of the crisis, not the cause. The problem is that the political class in the whole world is strongly influenced by investors and by powerful private companies. This indicates that the current crisis is also a crisis of global capitalism. Since the 1980s, capitalism has moved from furthering the economic development of countries, regions and the world towards maximizing profits, and then to a large extent profits from speculation. In addition, the capitalism unleashed since 1980 in the Anglo-Saxon world, and since 1990 worldwide, is mainly financial. This trend was supported by excessive deregulation and liberalization of the economy (see Sect. 2.4). The term ‘shareholder value’ popped up in the business pages of the media worldwide, as if that was now the new epiphany and guardrail for all economic action. In reality, it served to narrow business down to short-term gains, often at the expense of social and ecological values. The myth of shareholder value has been effectively debunked in a recent book by Lynn Stout.7 A different, if related, feature of ‘disarray’ is the rise of aggressive, mostly rightwing movements against globalization in OECD countries, often referred to as populism. These have become overt through Brexit and the Trump victory in the United States. As Fareed Zakaria observes, ‘Trump is part of a broad populist
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upsurge running through the Western world.

#### Vote negative for proletarian internationalism- only an organized global revolutionary struggle can overcome the destruction of capitalism.

Anastasi et al, 18 (editorial collective of Viewpoint Magazine, a militant research collective working to dialectically bring theory and practice into dialogue by studying cycles of struggle. Alphabetically, members of the editorial collective are as follows: Andrew Anastasi, graduate student in Sociology at CUNY; Cinzia Arruzza, Associate Professor of Philosophy at the New School for Social Research; Robert Cavooris, UC Santa Cruz graduate student and union representative, History of Consciousness Department; Maya Andrea Gonzalez, communist and revolutionary feminist in the Bay Area, graduate student in the Department of History of Consciousness at UC Santa Cruz; Asad Haider, Assistant Professor of Philosophy @ The New School, founding editor of Viewpoint Magazine, PhD in History of Consciousness Department @ UC Santa Cruz; Shuja Haider, widely-published writer and musician based in Brooklyn; Bue Rübner Hansen, writer and activist researcher in the Britain, Barcelona, and in migrant and refugee solidarity movements, PhD from Queen Mary University; Patrick King, graduate student at UC Santa Cruz; Rosa Lee, communist organizer and member of the Viewpoint editorial collective; Ben Mabie, managing editor at Viewpoint and editorial assistant at Verso Books, UCSC graduate; Sarah Mason, member of the Viewpoint editorial collective; Liz Mason-Deese, Assistant Professor, Department of Geography and Geoinformation Science, George Mason University; Dave Mesing, PhD student in Philosophy @ Villanova University; Magally Miranda-Alcazar, Eugene Cota-Robles Fellow and a Ford Foundation Predoctoral Fellow, PhD student in Chicana/o Studies @ UCLA; B.A. from the University of California, Santa Cruz (magna cum laude) with a double major in Community Studies and Feminist Studies, and has been published in The Nation, Verso and the New Left Review; Salar Mohandesi, Assistant Professor of History @ Bowdoin; Gavin Mueller, Lecturer in Media Studies at the University of Amsterdam, former contributing editor @ Jacobin; Evan Calder Williams, writer, translater, and artist, teaches theory at the Center for Curatorial Studies at Bard College and film production at Cooper Union, PhD in Literature from the University of California Santa Cruz and was a Fulbright Fellow in Italy for his research on cinema, industry, and revolt. “Internationalism against Imperialism,” *Viewpoint Magazine*, Issue 6, February 1, 2018, <https://www.viewpointmag.com/2018/02/01/internationalism-against-imperialism/>)

The challenge of reactivating an effective proletarian internationalism is made even more urgent by the aggressive rise of right-wing nationalisms, which have taken a range of organizational and ideological guises. The clarified ideological form of this rightward shift is an emboldened “possessive nationalism” in the North, which revolves around restrictive immigration and trade policies, as responses to the perceived erosion of territorial logics of sovereignty, and the hybridization of the ethno-national community.10 Any prolonged combat against these nativist impulses – especially as they seep into social-democratic or left-liberal parties in Europe and the United States – will need to reinforce the link between migration and imperialism, the former in many ways constituting the reflux of the latter. Here we might center the rich legacy and actuality of migrant struggles for communist politics, and how questions of mobility, control, and dispossession are now at the core of imperialist dynamics. The political and social, informal and formal spaces of migration remain an open field for investigation. As Etienne Balibar noted over 40 years ago, “the concrete knowledge of the causes and effects of immigration is a two-way guiding thread towards an understanding of imperialism,” a methodological linkage which “renders internationalism, more than ever, the very condition of struggles for workers’ liberation.”11 This raises the practical necessity of reconsidering the tactical repertoire and strategic horizons of anti-imperialism. The nearly two-decades-long “War on Terror” – a euphemism for a war on human welfare in the Middle East and a war against Muslims at home – has proven to be a difficult nub for anti-war and anti-militarist activism in “the belly of the beast,” particularly as U.S. violence, amidst ever-shallower domestic hegemony, takes forms other than that of U.S. boots on the ground. The fading – or destruction – of the anti-war movement after 2005, following massive demonstrations against the invasion of Iraq which featured considerable grassroots mobilization, is a critical episode to reflect upon. The ubiquity of manned and unmanned aerial bombardment, the diffuse and often cloaked nature of counterinsurgency operations, the multiplication of U.S. proxies, and dense financial ties have rendered the military conflicts of U.S. empire, perhaps the most visible manifestation of imperialism, an asymmetrical yet constant presence. Any sustained fight against it must be coordinated around several fronts. Recent experiences of mass protest show that a powerful anti-war movement, if it is to reappear, would do so in an altered shape and in close relation to other insurgent forces in society, an extension of their discursive and strategic reach. The high level of organized resistance to militarized border security and repressive immigration policies, the environmentalist/anti-extractivist campaigns around Standing Rock and elsewhere, and the nascent coalitions and activist milieus that have been fortified through the International Women’s Strike initiatives (resonant with calls from Latin America for a new feminist international) indicate a real potential to build a “popular anti-imperialism” from grounded social struggles, connecting the sites of contestation across neo-colonial and imperial frontiers. One can see how this changes the aims and targets of alter-globalization movements, exemplified in the militancy of summit-hopping demos that directly confront leading economic and financial bodies, or in the parallel institution-building and transnational networking of civil society organizations involved in the World Social Forums.12 A more adequate approach to questions of coordination and solidarity across borders would have to probe how political organization is tied to material practices of translation, and recognize that even localized concerns often involve the commonalities and divisions of the global labor force.13 The mutations of class struggle, where the wage-earning proletariat has given way to more diverse social alliances and associations of what Göran Therborn calls the “plebeian strata” or “popular classes,” has provided glimpses of what anti-imperialist mobilization could look like: new strategies of threading upsurges of disruption, combination, and antagonism as they extend over an unstable terrain.14 Today, it is necessary to re-situate the concept and question of imperialism. We agree with Lenin when we recognize that no revolution, even a national one, is possible without grasping the effects of imperialism on any local articulation of the working class. And we further agree that, of course, no national revolution would be sufficient for the goal of communism. In short, we see imperialism as both an obstacle to and enemy of internationalism and we in turn view internationalism as a position to be composed in working class struggle itself. Thus, at the risk of simplifying our approach, we propose that to examine imperialism today is to bring it into the realm of class composition. This can involve no disavowal of the complicated history of Marxism and popular struggle with regard to imperialism, nor a simple repetition of any one of its moments. In our sixth issue of Viewpoint, we instead seek out the possibility of an encounter, bringing together historical accounts, artefacts of struggle, and theoretical interventions past and present. Thus we neither “endorse” all of the positions represented here nor reject those that might be absent from this issue, which is a situated engagement with the problem of opposing imperialism from within American empire; we are proud to offer these contributions as material for the long-term work of thinking and struggling against imperialism in the 21st century.

### FW

**Mills 09: we outweigh under their framework anyway but ROTB must come first because cap is the root cause of all inequities and structural violence.**

**Conseq is fine – extinction first to preserve future generations//infinite magnitude**

### CASE

#### Turn: WTO are the modern imperialist tools of the US – only the alt can solve for all of their case because it doesn’t act through a settlerist and imperialist entity.

Banerjee 9 (Subhabrata Bobby, Director of Research at the School of Business, University of Western Sydney, HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION AND VOICES OF RESISTANCE: TOWARDS A THEORY OF THE TRANSLOCAL, REARTIKULACIJA #9, 2009, <http://www.reartikulacija.org/?p=612/)> SVVV [] brackets are for exclusionist language

Old patterns of imperialism can be seen in the dominance of neoliberal policies in today’s global political economy. Transnational corporations often wield power over [developing] countries through their enticements of foreign investment and their threats to withhold or relocate their investments. In return for foreign investments and jobs, corporations are able to extract from impoverished and often corrupt [developing] governments tax concessions, energy and water subsidies, minimal environmental legislation, minerals and natural resources, a compliant labor force and the creation of Special Economic Zones (SEZ) which are essentially states of exception where the law is suspended in order for the business of economic extraction to continue. Thus, rather than marking the death of the nation-state as some theorists of globalization like to argue, the global economy is premised precisely on a system of nation-states. Neoliberal globalization can be seen as a marker for the final hegemonic triumph of the state mode of production. The nation-state then is a fundamental building block of globalization, in the working of transnational corporations, in the setting-up of a global financial system, in the institution of policies that determine the mobility of labor, and in the creation of the multi-state institutions such as the UN, IMF, World Bank, NAFTA and WTO. The unprecedented scale of government intervention in response to the global financial crisis in Europe, North America, Asia and Australia has been such that neoconservative circles have invoked the specter of socialism and the fears of the emergence of a state-run economy. Whether the financial crisis is indeed a reflection of the crisis in capitalism that could result in long-term re-engagement of the state in economic production or whether it will be business as usual remains to be seen, especially now that Germany, France and the United States appear to be coming out of recession. Imperial formations in the contemporary political economy are more “efficient” in the sense that formal colonies no longer need to be governed. Imperialism has learned to manage things better by using the elites of the former colonies to do the governing, and the structural power of supranational institutions like the World Trade Organization, World Bank and International Monetary Fund and markets to do much of the imperial work. I

will describe three modes of management that enable accumulation by dispossession: management by extraction, management by exclusion and management by expulsion. Management by extraction arises from the ‘endowment curse’ and is an all too familiar discourse for millions of people in the Third World living and dying because of the oil curse and the minerals curse. Extraction of oil and minerals in many parts of the world is almost always accompanied by violence, environmental destruction, dispossession and death (Banerjee, 2008). Transnational oil companies, governments, private security forces are all key actors in these zones of violence and the communities most affected by this violence are forced to give up their sovereignty, autonomy, and tradition in exchange for modernity and economic development which continue to elude them. Shell in Nigeria, Chevron in Ecuador, Rio Tinto in Papua, Barrick in Peru and Argentina, Newmont Mining in Peru, Vedanta Resources in India and the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico are but a few of the more well publicized cases of the endowment curse. The market, state and international economic and financial institutions are inextricably involved in management by extraction. The Chiapas region of Mexico for example, produces 54% of Mexico’s hydroelectric energy, 21% of its oil, and 47% of its natural gas also contains the country’s most impoverished people where 36% of the population do not have running water and 35% do not have electricity. There are 7 hotel beds for every 1000 tourists and 0.3 hospital beds for every 1000 locals. In one of the country’s richest regions in terms of natural resources and a source of wealth for the rest of the country, 71.6% of the indigenous population in the region suffers from malnutrition and 14,500 people die every year from treatable diseases (Banerjee, 2008). Transnational corporations extract wealth from Chiapas by mining their land, felling their forests, and selling a tourist experience at the expense of local communities who have the misfortune of ‘inhabiting’ the region. In 1994 thousands of Chiapians rose up against the Mexican government in an armed insurrection and temporarily took over the regional capital of San Cristobal. The Mexican government responded with military action and after a series of violent conflicts offered a ‘conditional pardon’ to the rebels. The market was not particularly sympathetic to the plight of the Zapatistas either. In a memo titled ‘Mexico – Political Update’ , the Chase Manhattan Bank, a major financer of the Mexican government concluded that the ‘government will need to eliminate the Zapatistas to demonstrate their effective control of the national territory and security policy’. Thus, international finance and infrastructure is a key requirement for ‘development’ to occur in ‘underdeveloped’ areas, of which governments must demonstrate ‘effective control and security’, which means certain communities need to be ‘eliminated’. Management by exclusion arises from the ‘democracy curse’ and is another practice that is commonly used to govern the political economy. During the negotiations leading up to the Kyoto protocol one of the tasks allocated to a policy group was to develop a global forest policy to offset greenhouse gas emissions. Conscious of the fallout from the protests that accompanied the 1999 World Trade Organization meetings at Seattle and similar protests at the World Economic Forum at Davos, Genoa and Melbourne, the organizers were careful to be seen to be inclusive and invited green groups, unions, community organizations, apart from corporations, policy makers and scientists. However, in their quest to come up with a global forest policy they omitted to invite a key stakeholder group: representatives of millions of people who actually live in the forest, mainly Indigenous tribes. The forest dwelling tribes held their own climate change summit and proclaimed their own resolution at the International Indigenous Forum on Climate Change: ‘The measures to mitigate climate change currently being negotiated are based on a worldview of territory that reduces forests, lands, seas and sacred sites to only their carbon absorption capacity. This world-view and its practices adversely affect the lives of Indigenous Peoples and violate our fundamental rights and liberties, particularly, our right to recuperate, maintain, control and administer our territories which are consecrated and established in instruments of the United Nations’ (IIFC, 2000). For indigenous people who inhabit the region, forests are not just carbon sinks - forests are their food, livelihood, source of medicine, housing, culture, society, polity and economy. Global trade and environmental policies are often made without taking into account the violence and dispossession of Indigenous communities that result from these policies. It becomes meaningless to debate issues of forest rights when there are no forests left. Dispossession of local communities also highlights both the failure of the market and state where ‘citizens’ of democratic states do not have the right to determine their future.

#### 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

#### THUS: Double bind – either they’re non topical and you vote on the T, or they defend increased access to settlerist biomedicine and perf con themselves.

#### AND Their link chain from chen 13 to geib 18 makes no sense – it talks about biopiracy and then somehow links this to worldwide biodiversity loss – theres no spill over from reduction of ip, it wont solve biodiversity loss due to climate change. Theres close to null probability here we o/w.

#### Even if you don’t buy that, we don’t cause any of the structural violence impacts in the 1ac because we dismantle cap and intellectual property altogether which solves 10x better than they ever could.

#### Read vats ’20 it talks about decolonization as a method to solve – it says nothing about working through imperialist and settlerist state entities to bring indigenous change – this guts all aff solvency

1. https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/fda-basics/fact-sheet-fda-glance [↑](#footnote-ref-1)