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### 1NC – T

#### Interpretation: “medicines” is a generic bare plural. The aff may not defend WTO member nations reducing intellectual property protections for a subset of medicines.

#### The upward entailment test and adverb test determine the genericity of a bare plural

Leslie and Lerner 16 [Sarah-Jane Leslie, Ph.D., Princeton, 2007. Dean of the Graduate School and Class of 1943 Professor of Philosophy. Served as the vice dean for faculty development in the Office of the Dean of the Faculty, director of the Program in Linguistics, and founding director of the Program in Cognitive Science at Princeton University. Adam Lerner, PhD Philosophy, Postgraduate Research Associate, Princeton 2018. From 2018, Assistant Professor/Faculty Fellow in the Center for Bioethics at New York University. Member of the [Princeton Social Neuroscience Lab](http://psnlab.princeton.edu/).] “Generic Generalizations.” Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy. April 24, 2016. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/> TG

1. Generics and Logical Form

In English, generics can be expressed using a variety of syntactic forms: bare plurals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), indefinite singulars (e.g., “a tiger is striped”), and definite singulars (“the tiger is striped”). However, none of these syntactic forms is dedicated to expressing generic claims; each can also be used to express existential and/or specific claims. Further, some generics express what appear to be generalizations over individuals (e.g., “tigers are striped”), while others appear to predicate properties directly of the kind (e.g., “dodos are extinct”). These facts and others give rise to a number of questions concerning the logical forms of generic statements.

1.1 Isolating the Generic Interpretation

Consider the following pairs of sentences:

(1)a.Tigers are striped.

b.Tigers are on the front lawn.

(2)a.A tiger is striped.

b.A tiger is on the front lawn.

(3)a.The tiger is striped.

b.The tiger is on the front lawn.

The sentence pairs above are prima facie syntactically parallel—both are subject-predicate sentences whose subjects consist of the same common noun coupled with the same, or no, article. However, the interpretation of first sentence of each pair is intuitively quite different from the interpretation of the second sentence in the pair. In the second sentences, we are talking about some particular tigers: a group of tigers in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), some individual tiger in ([2b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex2b)), and some unique salient or familiar tiger in ([3b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex3b))—a beloved pet, perhaps. In the first sentences, however, we are saying something general. There is/are no particular tiger or tigers that we are talking about.

The second sentences of the pairs receive what is called an existential interpretation. The hallmark of the existential interpretation of a sentence containing a bare plural or an indefinite singular is that it may be paraphrased with “some” with little or no change in meaning; hence the terminology “existential reading”. The application of the term “existential interpretation” is perhaps less appropriate when applied to the definite singular, but it is intended there to cover interpretation of the definite singular as referring to a unique contextually salient/familiar particular individual, not to a kind.

There are some tests that are helpful in distinguishing these two readings. For example, the existential interpretation is upward entailing, meaning that the statement will always remain true if we replace the subject term with a more inclusive term. Consider our examples above. In ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)), we can replace “tiger” with “animal” salva veritate, but in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) we cannot. If “tigers are on the lawn” is true, then “animals are on the lawn” must be true. However, “tigers are striped” is true, yet “animals are striped” is false. ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) does not entail that animals are striped, but ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) entails that animals are on the front lawn (Lawler 1973; Laca 1990; Krifka et al. 1995).

Another test concerns whether we can insert an adverb of quantification with minimal change of meaning (Krifka et al. 1995). For example, inserting “usually” in the sentences in ([1a](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1a)) (e.g., “tigers are usually striped”) produces only a small change in meaning, while inserting “usually” in ([1b](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/generics/#ex1b)) dramatically alters the meaning of the sentence (e.g., “tigers are usually on the front lawn”). (For generics such as “mosquitoes carry malaria”, the adverb “sometimes” is perhaps better used than “usually” to mark off the generic reading.)

#### It applies to “medicines” – 1] upward entailment test – “reduce intellectual property protections for medicines” doesn’t entail reducing protections for aids, because it doesn’t prove that we should derestrict other beneficial tech

#### Violation – they only reduce patents for medicines based on Indigenous knowledge

#### Vote neg:

#### 1] Limits – you can pick anything from COVID vaccines to HIV/AIDS to random biotech to insulin treatments and there’s no universal disad since each one has a different function and implication for health, tech, and relations – explodes neg prep and leads to random medicine of the week affs which makes cutting stable neg links impossible. PICs don’t solve – it’s absurd to say neg potential abuse justifies the aff being flat out not T, which leads to a race towards abuse. Limits key to reciprocal engagement since they create a caselist for neg prep.

#### 2] TVA – read the aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff.

#### 3] Precision o/w – anything else justifies the aff arbitrarily jettisoning words in the resolution at their whim which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.

### 1NC – CP

#### **CP: Member nations of the WTO ought to**

#### **implement a “take and pay” approach for patents, where companies must pay indigenous communities a majority of profits they receive** from patents for medicines based on Indigenous knowledge.

* grant indigenous communities immunity from IP protections for indigenous medicine

DeCamp 7 (Matthew Wayne DeCamp -- Department of Philosophy @ Duke University, “GLOBAL HEALTH: A NORMATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND GLOBAL DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE”, <https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/193/D_DeCamp_Matthew_Wayne_a_052007.pdf?sequence=1>, pg. 342, 25 April 2007, EmmieeM)

Compensatory Liability (Reichman, 1994, Reichman, 2000, Reichman and Lewis, 2005). Compensatory liability is a “take and pay” approach whereby an individual could use intellectual property without permission so long as they compensate those from whom the “property” was taken.  While compensatory liability itself sounds as if it could turn the present system of exclusive property rights upside down, Reichman generally discusses its potential successes in a more narrow sense (not as replacing patents).  Real issues arise regarding the terms and amounts of the compensation necessary under such a regime; Reichman suggests a royalty rate somewhere between 3 and 9%.  According to Reichman, compensatory liability is • Uniquely beneficial for all countries’ “subpatentable” innovations (e.g.,, incremental innovations that are valuable but might not meet the “non‐ obvious” standard of a full patent) or incremental innovation (Reichman, 2000); and,   • Well positioned to encourage local innovation and traditional knowledge (TK) in developing countries without the social costs of traditional exclusive patent rights.  This would place TK in a semi‐commons that could not be freely appropriated without compensation (Reichman and Lewis, 2005 354). Compensatory liability is therefore a useful option to consider, and as I note below, one of the most conducive to capacity building and changing the distribution of intellectual property “rights” worldwide.

#### Compensatory liability protects indigenous communities and developing countries, by forcing companies who patent traditional knowledge to pay royalties to those communities

DeCamp 7 (Matthew Wayne DeCamp -- Department of Philosophy @ Duke University, “GLOBAL HEALTH: A NORMATIVE ANALYSIS OF INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY RIGHTS AND GLOBAL DISTRIBUTIVE JUSTICE”, <https://dukespace.lib.duke.edu/dspace/bitstream/handle/10161/193/D_DeCamp_Matthew_Wayne_a_052007.pdf?sequence=1>, pgs. 361-362, 25 April 2007, EmmieeM)

Compensatory Liability. The last example of a strategy that warrants some consideration whether or not global IPRs undergo substantial revision or modification is the compensatory liability scheme (Reichman, 1994).  This scheme solves at least one problem of interest to the present discussion in a way that is perhaps unique, thus warranting further consideration The first is the concern over traditional knowledge.  “Traditional knowledge” generally refers to long‐standing traditions or practices of particular communities.  For example, artemisinin, just described as an effective component of malaria treatment, comes from the Chinese wormwood plant that has been used for centuries by the Chinese for the treatment of fever.  Understanding this long‐standing use presents a quandary: On the one hand, this knowledge of Chinese wormwood could be part of the public domain, meaning that it cannot be appropriated and examined for its clinical effectiveness (one part of which is artemisinin for malaria).  This could mean that no incentive would exist to develop artemisinin.  On the other hand, this knowledge could be fully appropriated by someone from a developing country, who uses this knowledge to discover artemisinin and develop it into a drug for malaria that those in China now must (re)purchase.  Often, this situation is what people mean when they say “biopiracy.”  This would suggest that the local community, whose knowledge was used in discovering the artemisin, does not receive any of the benefits from this discovery.

A compensatory liability regime, for Reichman, solves this problem in a unique way: Under compensatory liability’s “take now, pay later” approach, individuals can temporarily appropriate the public domain “traditional knowledge,” but they are bound to pay royalties back based on the commercial success of what is developed.  Certain difficulties remain (such as how to distribute the royalty to a community), and this solution might not satisfy those who take biopiracy so seriously that they would reject any (even temporary) appropriation, it certainly seems more reasonable than the options of non‐development or complete appropriation (Reichman and Lewis, 2005).18

This potential solution to, or at least mitigation of, biopiracy is important in so far as it is one of the few reforms that appears to explicitly recognize the capacity building aspect of the third distributive problem (ownership of IPRs).  It also recognizes that the way to deal with the unequal distribution of IPRs is not necessarily to increase ownership of IPRs themselves, because they are only a symptom of a broader problem.   On my view, this makes compensatory liability – or other reforms like it – take on increasing import. Whether such a compensatory liability regime will prove feasible is a difficult, and open, question.19

### 1NC – DA

#### The Debt Ceiling expansion gives Democrats two months to finalize and pass Biden’s spending package – every moment is necessary to resolve intraparty disputes

Cochrane 10/7 Cochrane, Emily. 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. "Senate Leaders Agree to Vote on Short-Term Debt Ceiling Increase." N.Y. Times, 7 Oct. 2021, www.nytimes.com/2021/10/07/us/politics/debt-ceiling-senate.html.

Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, announced that he reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to raise the federal borrowing limit through early December. “We have reached agreement to extend the debt ceiling through early December, and it’s our hope that we can get this done as soon as today.” “Republican and Democratic members and staff negotiated through the night in good faith. The pathway our Democratic colleagues have accepted will spare the American people any near-term crisis.” Video player loading Senator Chuck Schumer of New York, the majority leader, announced that he reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to raise the federal borrowing limit through early December.CreditCredit...T.J. Kirkpatrick for The New York Times Oct. 7, 2021Updated 3:17 p.m. ET WASHINGTON — Top Senate Democrats and Republicans said on Thursday that they had struck a deal to allow the debt ceiling to be raised through early December, temporarily staving off the threat of a first-ever default on the national debt after the G.O.P. agreed to temporarily drop its blockade of an increase. Senator Chuck Schumer, Democrat of New York and the majority leader, announced that he had reached an agreement with Senator Mitch McConnell of Kentucky, the minority leader, to clear the way for a vote as early as Thursday on a short-term extension, with potentially as few as 11 days left before a possible default. The movement came the day after Mr. McConnell partly backed down from his refusal to allow any such increase to move forward, offering a temporary reprieve as political pressure mounted to avoid being blamed for a fiscal calamity. “It’s our hope that we can get this done as soon as today,” Mr. Schumer said on Thursday morning on the Senate floor. But one day after Mr. McConnell indicated that Republicans would stand aside and allow the short-term increase to advance, he and his top deputies were laboring on Thursday to ensure his members will put aside their objections and clear the path for a vote. “We gotta see if the deal is done,” President Biden told reporters during a trip to Illinois. “I’m not sure of that yet.” The agreed-upon bill would boost the legal debt cap by $480 billion, which the Treasury Department estimates would be enough to allow the government to continue borrowing through at least Dec. 3. The current debt limit was reinstated at $28.4 trillion on Aug. 1, and the Treasury Department has been using so-called extraordinary measures to delay a breach of the borrowing cap since then. The agency estimated that the government would no longer be able to pay all of its bills by Oct. 18, once those fiscal accounting maneuvers were exhausted. Without congressional action before then, economists and lawmakers have warned of catastrophic economic consequences, including the U.S. government having to choose between making payments on the interest on its debt or sending out Social Security checks and other crucial assistance. The legislation under consideration on Thursday did not offer a hard deadline for when cash would run out, and it would not restart the Treasury Department’s ability to employ extraordinary measures, such as curbing certain government investments, a Treasury official said. Some Republicans said they thought the set dollar figure would ensure the limit would not be reached again until at least January. The actual “X-date” will be determined by tax revenues that the government receives and expenditures that it must make near the end of the year. Making such projections has been especially difficult this year because the pandemic relief programs that are in place have made it harder to predict when money is coming and going. “There is no way to predict with any precision exactly how much you would need to increase the debt limit by to get to a certain date,” said Shai Akabas, the director of economic policy at the Bipartisan Policy Center, an independent think tank. But in aiming for Dec. 3, the deal may position the next debt limit fight to overlap once again with negotiations over avoiding a government shutdown, as funding is set to lapse on that same day if Congress does not approve new spending legislation beforehand. Democrats hope nearly two additional months will give them space to focus on finalizing and enacting most of President Biden’s domestic agenda, including hammering out an array of intraparty disagreements over an expansive multi-trillion-dollar social safety net and climate change package. In raising the prospect of a stopgap extension on Wednesday, Mr. McConnell had said that Republicans would allow Democrats to use normal procedures to consider it. But that commitment appeared in doubt on Thursday afternoon, as Republicans privately objected and leaders toiled to line up the votes needed. Should even one senator demand a recorded vote, at least 10 Republicans would be needed to join every Democrat to muster the 60 votes needed to move the bill forward. Image The movement on debt ceiling negotiations came the day after Senator Mitch McConnell backed down partially from his refusal to allow any such increase to move forward. Credit...T.J. Kirkpatrick for The New York Times “We’re having conversations with our members and kind of figuring out where people are, but, as you might expect, this is not an easy one to whip,,” said Senator John Thune of South Dakota, the No. 2 Republican. He added that, “in the end we’ll be there, but it will be a painful birthing process.” Some Republicans were wary of angering their base by allowing the bill to move forward, especially after former President Donald J. Trump issued a statement on Wednesday that attacked Mr. McConnell for “folding to the Democrats.” Mr. Trump seemed to be pressuring Republicans to force a showdown in the face of a looming default, saying that Mr. McConnell had “all of the cards with the debt ceiling, it’s time to play the hand.” Even if Republicans clear the way to allow the measure to pass, it does nothing to address the crux of the partisan stalemate over the debt. Most notably, Republicans have not dropped their demand that Democrats ultimately use an arcane and time-consuming budget process known as reconciliation to lift the debt ceiling into next year. Democrats are currently using that process to steer around Republican opposition and push through a sprawling domestic package that would address climate change, expand the social safety net with more health care and education benefits, and increase taxes on the wealthy and corporations. “The pathway our Democratic colleagues have accepted will spare the American people any near-term crisis,” Mr. McConnell said on the Senate floor. The extension, he added, also means “there’ll be no question they’ll have plenty of time” to use the reconciliation process to approve a long-term increase.

#### Infrastructure and reconciliation are the priority now. they’ll pass by new deadline

Alemany 10/12 [Jacqueline Alemany and Theodoric Meyer, "The new deadline to pass Biden's agenda is coming up fast", 10/12/21, https://www.washingtonpost.com/politics/2021/10/13/new-deadline-pass-biden-agenda-is-coming-up-fast/]

New deadline, old problems: Less than two weeks after House Democrats missed a deadline to hold a vote on the infrastructure bill, the party is staring down another one.

House Speaker Nancy Pelosi and Senate Majority Leader Chuck Schumer say they’re aiming to pass the $1.2 trillion infrastructure bill and a larger package stuffed full of Democrats’ child care, health care and climate change priorities by Oct. 31, when a short-term extension of highway funding is set to run out.

Coincidentally, Oct. 31 is the day before the much-anticipated United Nations climate summit kicks off in Glasgow, where administration officials are eager to show off legislation that would establish credibility in negotiations with foreign governments. White House press secretary Jen Psaki told reporters last month that Biden expected the reconciliation bill — much of which is focused on fighting climate change — would “move forward in advance of that.”

(Asked about it on Tuesday, Psaki said Biden would tout the administration's commitment to combating climate change in Glasgow “regardless of where the package stands.”)

And two days later, Virginians will head to the polls to elect a new governor in a contest lawmakers and the White House are watching closely. Former Democratic Gov. Terry McAuliffe has implored Democrats in Washington to pass the infrastructure bill by Election Day.

The 18-day sprint

Can Democrats really pass two massive bills in the next 18 days?

“Yes,” Rep. Gerry Connolly (D-Va.) told The Early yesterday evening. “Will it is a different matter. But can it? Yeah. We’re experts at coming right up against the edge and pulling a miracle.”

#### Pushing a WTO waiver 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 offensive 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.

#### Infrastructure package is sufficient, necessary, and the last opportunity to solve climate change – extinction

Leber 10/7 Leber, Rebecca. Rebecca Leber covers climate change for Vox. Before joining Vox, she was an environmental reporter at Mother Jones, where her investigations exposed government corruption and fossil fuel industry disinformation. She has worked as a staff writer at Grist, The New Republic, and ThinkProgress. A dozen more outlets have published her work over her decade as a climate journalist. "A last chance for US climate action: Democrats’ Build Back Better and infrastructure bills." Vox, 7 Oct. 2021, www.vox.com/22685920/democrats-infrastructure-build-back-better-climate-change.

The United States — the largest carbon polluter in history — is closer than it’s ever been to taking sweeping and lasting action on the climate crisis. The bad news is that if Democrats can’t pull it off, they may never get another opportunity like this — and the planet certainly won’t. Democratic leaders are trying to pass two major pieces of legislation — the $1 trillion bipartisan infrastructure bill and the up to $3.5 trillion Build Back Better Act — that they say can slash US pollution by up to 45 percent in the coming decade. In the outlined Build Back Better Act, Congress would flex its power to transform the electricity sector so that it runs on mostly clean energy, steer the transportation sector toward electric vehicles, and finally take action on methane pollution, one of the most harmful greenhouse gases. But there have been many recent moments when the precarious dealmaking in Congress seemed close to falling apart. One of the biggest sticking points has been with West Virginia Sen. Joe Manchin, who has questioned the party’s approach to passing both bills simultaneously. “What’s the urgency that we have?” Manchin asked on CNN’s State of the Union in late September. In part because of Manchin’s opposition, even progressive leaders have begun to manage expectations, signaling the ultimate bill will be less ambitious. Sen. Bernie Sanders of Vermont suggested that the $3.5 trillion figure would see some “give and take.” The package is likely to shrink to $2.3 trillion or less, the New York Times reported on Wednesday. So what is the urgency? Democrats only have one year before midterm elections could take away their narrow majorities in the House and Senate. That would leave them powerless to pass any legislation without help from Republicans. At the same time, the planet faces a rapidly closing window to avert the worst catastrophes of global warming. Every fraction of a degree will translate into lives and livelihoods lost. The world can’t afford another decade of American inaction, and what Congress does next will help determine the future of the climate. A last chance for Democrats Historically, the president’s party loses seats in Congress in midterm elections. Next November, Democrats could lose their narrow control of Congress if they lose even one Senate seat or more than a few House seats. “The middle of that Venn diagram — when we have leaders who care about science and we still have that window of opportunity — is now,” said Lena Moffitt, campaign director at the climate advocacy group Evergreen Action. Democrats in Congress are also relying on a roughly once-a-year process, known as budget reconciliation, to try and push the Build Back Better Act through the Senate. Reconciliation allows them to pass a budget with a simple majority, instead of the 60 votes that are usually required in the Senate. There might not be time or political will to make a similar move in 2022. And some Democrats remain unwilling to eliminate the Senate filibuster, which is the other way they could pass progressive policies. In short, if the historical pattern holds, Democrats may not get another chance under President Biden — or even this decade — to take serious action on climate. Some Republicans have been hinting at taking climate change more seriously, but much of the party’s leadership continues to downplay and deny climate science. The next time the US has an opening like this, climate change will likely be dramatically worse — and that much harder to stop. A flooded street of shops at night reflecting the lights in the water. Hurricane Ida caused record flooding in New Jersey in September. Climate change is already intensifying extreme weather such as tropical storms and heat waves. Anadolu Agency via Getty Images The best chance for the global climate Climate scientists have warned that once the atmosphere warms more than 1.5 degrees Celsius, we will live in a drastically changed world. If countries, corporations, and individuals don’t take immediate action to reduce pollution, the world may hit that grim milestone in just 10 years. Over the long term, if the world continues on its current polluting path, the world will warm more than double that amount, risking catastrophes humanity has never had to confront. The window to chart a new course is rapidly closing. And the world’s “last, best chance” to take decisive collective action is less than a month away, as John Kerry, who serves as President Biden’s climate envoy, has said. In early November, world governments will gather in Glasgow for the United Nations climate conference, COP26. Following up on the Paris climate accord, countries will pledge more ambitious pollution targets and tackle the challenge of financing a worldwide transition to clean energy. The US bears the most responsibility of any country for global warming, having released 20 percent of the world’s greenhouse pollution since 1850. Today, the country ranks second in emissions behind China. But the US also has the power to magnify its impact if it leads by example, or if it flexes its influence on the global economic system, for example by affecting global prices of fossil fuels by ending government subsidies. Climate experts say progress at the COP26 conference depends on the United States proving it can do its part, for symbolic as well as practical reasons. This is the first year the US officially returns to global negotiations after former President Donald Trump withdrew the country from the Paris climate accord. Now, Biden has to lead by example by showing that the country can swiftly change direction for good, demonstrating progress on its national pledge of cutting emissions 50 to 52 percent by 2030. “There is this sense of exhaustion about how long is it going to take for one of the biggest emitters in the world to do its fair share,” said Rachel Cleetus, the clean energy policy director at the Union of Concerned Scientists. It’s unclear whether Congress will deliver on climate-change legislation by the time the international community meets in Glasgow. But any steps forward would send “a very important signal that can really help catalyze more ambition from other countries,” Cleetus said.

### 1NC – K

#### Regulating intellectual property participates in a scarcity logic that re-affirms a broader market ownership over information – that consolidates neoliberal control through a shift to private protections, even if the individual act of the aff is good

Soderberg 1 [Johan, BA from Falmouth College of the Arts. “Copyleft vs Copyright: A Marxist Critique” https://firstmonday.org/article/view/938/860]

"The contradiction that lies at the heart of the political economy of intellectual property is between the low to non-existent marginal cost of reproduction of knowledge and its treatment as scarce property" [23].

This contradiction [24], May demonstrates, is concealed by information capitalists whose interests are best served if ideas are treated as analogous to scarce, material property [25]. The privatisation of cultural expressions corresponds to the enclosure of public land in the fifteenth to eighteenth century.

As then, the new enclosure is concerned with creating conditions for excludability. Lawrence Lessig lists four methods to direct the behaviour of the individual to comply with property regulation: social norms, markets, architecture (including technology and code), and law. "Constraints work together, though they function differently and the effect of each is distinct. Norms constrain through the stigma that a community imposes; markets constrain through the price that they extract; architectures constrain through the physical burdens they impose; and law constrains through the punishment it threatens" [26].

Several new national laws have been passed in recent years on intellectual property rights. In the U.S. the Digital Millennium Copyright Act was passed in 1998 and has been imitated by legislation in Europe. The European Patent Office circumvented scheduled political decisions to be taken by European governments, and decreed a regulation that authorises patent claims to computer programmes [27]. These national laws were implemented under the direction of what is known as the Uruguay Round agreements [28], established by the World Trade Organisation (WTO). As a part of the bargain came the treaty of Trade Related Intellectual Property (TRIP), and its importance lies in two respects: "as an extension of the rights accorded to the owners of intellectual property and as part of the extension of a property-based market liberalism into new areas of social interaction, previously outside market relations" [29]. Simply by coordinating national regulations on a global level the net of intellectual property is tightened. TRIP was backed by American and European pharmacy companies and entertainment industries, and unsuccessfully opposed by the developing nations and northern civil society.

Despite the rigged debate on intellectual property in the mainstream media [30], the rhetoric of 'piracy' has not transformed social norms to any greater extent. The failure to curb copying is linked with the low costs and low risks for individuals to copy, i.e. the non-existent constriction of the market. However, Bettig remarks "The initial period following the introduction of a new communications medium often involves a temporary loss of control by copyright owners over the use of their property" [31].

Similarly, Lessig warns against the false reliance, common among hackers, that information technology is inherently anarchistic. The industry is determined to re-design hardware and software to command compliance with the intellectual property regime. "Code can, and will, displace law as the primary defence of intellectual property in cyberspace" [32]. It is predominantly this struggle that I now will attend to.

#### Capitalism is quickly reaching its ecological, structural, and psychological limits and causes near-term extinction – laundry list.

Robinson 16 (William, Professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. His most recent book is Global Capitalism and the Crisis of Humanity. | “Sadistic Capitalism: Six Urgent Matters for Humanity in Global Crisis” in *Truth-out*, April 12, 2016. <http://www.truth-out.org/opinion/item/35596-sadistic-capitalism-six-urgent-matters-for-humanity-in-global-crisis> )//tbrooks

The "luxury shanty town" in South Africa is a fitting metaphor for global capitalism as a whole. Faced with a stagnant global economy, elites have managed to turn war, structural violence and inequality into opportunities for capital, pleasure and entertainment. It is hard not to conclude that unchecked capitalism has become what I term "sadistic capitalism," in which the suffering and deprivation generated by capitalism become a source of aesthetic pleasure, leisure and entertainment for others. I recently had the opportunity to travel through several countries in Latin America, the Middle East, North Africa, East Asia and throughout North America. I was on sabbatical to research what the global crisis looks like on the ground around the world. Everywhere I went, social polarization and political tensions have reached explosive dimensions. Where is the crisis headed, what are the possible outcomes and what does it tell us about global capitalism and resistance? This crisis is not like earlier structural crises of world capitalism, such as in the 1930s or 1970s. This one is fast becoming systemic. The crisis of humanity shares aspects of earlier structural crises of world capitalism, but there are six novel, interrelated dimensions to the current moment that I highlight here, in broad strokes, as the "big picture" context in which countries and peoples around the world are experiencing a descent into chaos and uncertainty. 1) The level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented in the face of out-of-control, over-accumulated capital. In January 2016, the development agency Oxfam [published a follow-up](https://www.oxfam.org/en/pressroom/pressreleases/2016-01-18/62-people-own-same-half-world-reveals-oxfam-davos-report) to its report on global inequality that had been released the previous year. According to the new report, now just 62 billionaires -- down from 80 identified by the agency in its January 2015 report -- control as much wealth as one half of the world's population, and the top 1% owns more wealth than the other 99% combined. Beyond the transnational capitalist class and the upper echelons of the global power bloc, the richest 20 percent of humanity owns some 95 percent of the world's wealth, while the bottom 80 percent has to make do with just 5 percent. This 20-80 divide of global society into haves and the have-nots is the new global social apartheid. It is evident not just between rich and poor countries, but within each country, North and South, with the rise of new affluent high-consumption sectors alongside the downward mobility, "precariatization," destabilization and expulsion of majorities. Escalating inequalities fuel capitalism's chronic problem of over-accumulation: The transnational capitalist class cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to stagnation in the world economy. The signs of an impending depression are everywhere. The front page of the February 20 issue of The Economist read, "[The World Economy: Out of Ammo?](http://www.economist.com/news/leaders/21693204-central-bankers-are-running-down-their-arsenal-other-options-exist-stimulate)" Extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge to dominant groups. They strive to purchase the loyalty of that 20 percent, while at the same time dividing the 80 percent, co-opting some into a hegemonic bloc and repressing the rest. Alongside the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression is heightened dissemination through the culture industries and corporate marketing strategies that depoliticize through consumerist fantasies and the manipulation of desire. As "Trumpism" in the United States so well illustrates, another strategy of co-optation is the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled toward scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. Scapegoated communities are under siege, such as the Rohingya in Myanmar, the Muslim minority in India, the Kurds in Turkey, southern African immigrants in South Africa, and Syrian and Iraqi refugees and other immigrants in Europe. As with its 20th century predecessor, 21st century fascism hinges on such manipulation of social anxiety at a time of acute capitalist crisis. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend to projects of 21st century fascism. 2) The system is fast reaching the ecological limits to its reproduction. We have reached several tipping points in what environmental scientists refer to as nine crucial "planetary boundaries." [We have already exceeded these boundaries in three areas](http://www.amazon.com/Ecological-Rift-Capitalisms-War-Earth/dp/1583672184/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1460153228&sr=8-1&keywords=the+ecological+rift) -- climate change, the nitrogen cycle and diversity loss. There have been five previous mass extinctions in earth's history. While all these were due to natural causes, for the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system. We have entered what Paul Crutzen, the Dutch environmental scientist and Nobel Prize winner, termed the Anthropocene -- a new age in which humans have transformed up to half of the world's surface. We are altering the composition of the atmosphere and acidifying the oceans at a rate that undermines the conditions for life. The ecological dimensions of global crisis cannot be understated. "We are deciding, without quite meaning to, which evolutionary pathways will remain open and which will forever be closed," observes Elizabeth Kolbert in her best seller, [The Sixth Extinction](http://www.amazon.com/Sixth-Extinction-Unnatural-History/dp/1250062187/ref=sr_1_1?s=books&ie=UTF8&qid=1457393458&sr=1-1&keywords=the+sixth+extinction). "No other creature has ever managed this ... The Sixth Extinction will continue to determine the course of life long after everything people have written and painted and built has been ground into dust." [Capitalism cannot be held solely responsible](http://www.amazon.com/Collapse-Societies-Choose-Succeed-Revised/dp/0143117009/ref=sr_1_1?ie=UTF8&qid=1460153265&sr=8-1&keywords=collapse+book). The human-nature contradiction has deep roots in civilization itself. The ancient Sumerian empires, for example, collapsed after the population over-salinated their crop soil. The Mayan city-state network collapsed about AD 900 due to deforestation. And the former Soviet Union wrecked havoc on the environment. However, given capital's implacable impulse to accumulate profit and its accelerated commodification of nature, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system. "Green capitalism" appears as an oxymoron, as sadistic capitalism's attempt to turn the ecological crisis into a profit-making opportunity, along with the conversion of poverty into a tourist attraction. 3) The sheer magnitude of the means of violence is unprecedented, as is the concentrated control over the means of global communications and the production and circulation of knowledge, symbols and images. We have seen the spread of frightening new systems of social control and repression that have brought us into the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control. This real-life Orwellian world is in a sense more perturbing than that described by George Orwell in his iconic novel 1984. In that fictional world, people were compelled to give their obedience to the state ("Big Brother") in exchange for a quiet existence with guarantees of employment, housing and other social necessities. Now, however, the corporate and political powers that be force obedience even as the means of survival are denied to the vast majority. Global apartheid involves the creation of "green zones" that are cordoned off in each locale around the world where elites are insulated through new systems of spatial reorganization, social control and policing. "Green zone" refers to the nearly impenetrable area in central Baghdad that US occupation forces established in the wake of the 2003 invasion of Iraq. The command center of the occupation and select Iraqi elite inside that green zone were protected from the violence and chaos that engulfed the country. Urban areas around the world are now green zoned through gentrification, gated communities, surveillance systems, and state and private violence. Inside the world's green zones, privileged strata avail themselves of privatized social services, consumption and entertainment. They can work and communicate through internet and satellite sealed off under the protection of armies of soldiers, police and private security forces. Green zoning takes on distinct forms in each locality. In Palestine, I witnessed such zoning in the form of Israeli military checkpoints, Jewish settler-only roads and the apartheid wall. In Mexico City, the most exclusive residential areas in the upscale Santa Fe District are accessible only by helicopter and private gated roads. In Johannesburg, a surreal drive through the exclusive Sandton City area reveals rows of mansions that appear as military compounds, with private armed towers and electrical and barbed-wire fences. In Cairo, I toured satellite cities ringing the impoverished center and inner suburbs where the country's elite could live out their aspirations and fantasies. They sport gated residential complexes with spotless green lawns, private leisure and shopping centers and English-language international schools under the protection of military checkpoints and private security police. In other cities, green zoning is subtler but no less effective. In Los Angeles, where I live, the freeway system now has an express lane reserved for those that can pay an exorbitant toll. On this lane, the privileged speed by, while the rest remain one lane over, stuck in the city's notorious bumper-to-bumper traffic -- or even worse, in notoriously underfunded and underdeveloped public transportation, where it may take half a day to get to and from work. There is no barrier separating this express lane from the others. However, a near-invisible closed surveillance system monitors every movement. If a vehicle without authorization shifts into the exclusive lane, it is instantly recorded by this surveillance system and a heavy fine is imposed on the driver, under threat of impoundment, while freeway police patrols are ubiquitous. Outside of the global green zones, warfare and police containment have become normalized and sanitized for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. "Militainment" -- portraying and even glamorizing war and violence as entertaining spectacles through Hollywood films and television police shows, computer games and corporate "news" channels -- may be the epitome of sadistic capitalism. It desensitizes, bringing about complacency and indifference. In between the green zones and outright warfare are prison industrial complexes, immigrant and refugee repression and control systems, the criminalization of outcast communities and capitalist schooling. The omnipresent media and cultural apparatuses of the corporate economy, in particular, aim to colonize the mind -- to undermine the ability to think critically and outside the dominant worldview. A neofascist culture emerges through militarism, extreme masculinization, racism and racist mobilizations against scapegoats. 4) We are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism. Capitalism is like riding a bicycle: When you stop pedaling the bicycle, you fall over. If the capitalist system stops expanding outward, it enters crisis and faces collapse. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion -- from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. Meanwhile, the privatization of education, health care, utilities, basic services and public land are turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital's control into "spaces of capital." Even poverty has been turned into a commodity. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? With the limits to expansion comes a turn toward militarized accumulation -- making wars of endless destruction and reconstruction and expanding the militarization of social and political institutions so as to continue to generate new opportunities for accumulation in the face of stagnation. 5) There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a "planet of slums," alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins and subject to these sophisticated systems of social control and destruction. Global capitalism has no direct use for surplus humanity. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of 21st century slavery possible. These systems include prison labor, the forced recruitment of miners at gunpoint by warlords contracted by global corporations to dig up valuable minerals in the Congo, sweatshops and exploited immigrant communities (including the rising tide of immigrant female caregivers for affluent populations). Furthermore, the global working class is experiencing accelerated "precariatization." The "new precariat" refers to the proletariat that faces capital under today's unstable and precarious labor relations -- informalization, casualization, part-time, temp, immigrant and contract labor. As communities are uprooted everywhere, there is a rising reserve army of immigrant labor. The global working class is becoming divided into citizen and immigrant workers. The latter are particularly attractive to transnational capital, as the lack of citizenship rights makes them particularly vulnerable, and therefore, exploitable. The challenge for dominant groups is how to contain the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity, the immigrant workforce and the precariat. How can they contain the explosive contradictions of this system? The 21st century megacities become the battlegrounds between mass resistance movements and the new systems of mass repression. Some populations in these cities (and also in abandoned countryside) are at risk of genocide, such as those in Gaza, zones in Somalia and Congo, and swaths of Iraq and Syria. 6) There is a disjuncture between a globalizing economy and a nation-state-based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and do not wield enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on runaway transnational capital. In the wake of the 2008 financial collapse, for instance, the governments of the G-8 and G-20 were unable to impose transnational regulation on the global financial system, despite a series of emergency summits to discuss such regulation.

#### The alternative is to engage in anticapitalism, an act of radical resistance grounded in grassroots movements. Anticapitalism does not represent an unattainable utopia but challenges common myths about capitalism as a whole.

Rogers 14 (Chris Rogers, author, *Capitalism and Its Alternatives: A Critical Introduction*, Zed Books, 2014. ProQuest Ebook Central, <https://ebookcentral-proquest-com.proxy.lib.umich.edu/lib/umichigan/detail.action?docID=1758713>.) AM

*A note on terminology* The book will draw on four core concepts. The first of these is capitalism. The term capitalism is used throughout the book to refer to the prevailing form of social organization. While acknowledging that the ways in which capitalism operates and the implications of these operations are contested, this book defines capital­ ism in terms of one commonly accepted distinguishing feature: that capitalism is a system that organizes the production, distribution and exchange of goods, on the basis of private property, with a view to realizing profit and therefore increasing wealth. The second term is alternative capitalism, which is used to describe a system where the capitalistic relationship between state and market is re-regulated, but not fundamentally reformed, in order to try to produce optimal social and economic outcomes. The aim of an alternative capitalism is to maximize wealth and profit by introducing a different structure of rules to govern capitalism. The third concept is that of an alternative to capitalism. An alternative to capitalism is distinct from capitalism because it places an emphasis on social and civic goals, rather than purely focusing on pecuniary gain. In contrast to capitalism, an alternative to capitalism is founded on collective or community property rights, rather than individual property rights, although the form and extent of collective or community property rights may vary. Where the book is referring to either an alternative capitalism or an alternative to capitalism, it uses the form ‘alternative (to) capitalism’. The final concept the book uses is anti-capitalism. It uses the term anti-capitalism to refer to the act of resisting capitalism, whether this occurs by attempting to influence the state, taking control of the state, or actions taken independently or outside of the state. An individual who pursues or wishes to pursue an alternative to capitalism can therefore be described as an anti-capitalist.

Traditions of Resistance   
In its consideration of capitalism and its alternatives, this book accepts that it is possible to perceive capitalism and its con­ sequences in different ways. Furthermore, it acknowledges that the way in which capitalism and its consequences are perceived will have a fundamental impact on whether people deem capitalism to be desirable, whether they would prefer an alternative capitalism or an alternative to capitalism, and therefore whether they believe that it is important and worthwhile engaging in resistance to capitalism through the social act of anti-capitalism. However, the central argument of this book is that **capitalism displays intrinsic tendencies towards crisis that make an alternative to capitalism desirable, and so justifies anti-capitalist action**. In doing so, it argues that capitalism is a product of social interaction between people, and that it is remade or resisted through our social action. This ­emphasis on social constitution challenges common assertions about the inevitability of capitalist logic, and in the process shows that the prospect of realizing an alternative to capitalism is more than wishful thinking. In its discussions of alternatives to capitalism, however, this book guards against thinking of alternative forms of social organization as outcomes or utopias. Rather, it shows how various forms of alternative social and economic organization have shown a tendency to degenerate over time, or to reproduce injustices of capitalist social relations. It therefore suggests that **alternatives to capitalism should be thought of as processes that need to be continually made and remade if they are not to degenerate or reproduce the injustices of capitalist social relations, and if desirable outcomes are to be realized**. Reflecting the book’s emphasis on the social constitution of economy and society, it rejects ‘top-down’ attempts to impose an alternative to capitalism by political means, and argues that anticapitalist action should take a ‘bottom-up’ form, which requires democratic and pluralistic experimentation with different models of social and economic organization to expand the space in which non-capitalist activity takes place.

The arguments of the book therefore fit with a long tradition of anti-capitalist resistance. One of the most well-known instances of this kind of resistance was the insurrections of 1968, typified by the student revolts in Paris in May of that year. However, as Michael Watts (2001: 167) noted, the events of 1968 were far more than a local phenomenon; over seventy countries ‘had major student ­ actions during that year [and between] October 1967 and July 1968 there were over 2000 incidents worldwide of student protest alone’. Furthermore, it was not just students engaged in the act of protest, the act of anti-capitalism. According to Watts’ (ibid.: 167) study, ‘if one were to add the related worker and other nonstudent demonstrations each country in the world would, on average, have had over 20 “incidents” over the nine-month period’. Nor was the substance of the protest uniform; 1968 had what Watts (ibid.: 171– 2) has described as its Eastern, Western and Southern moments. In the first, typified by the Prague Spring and the Cultural Revolution in China, the focus of protests was anti-bureaucratic, and directed against the ‘Old Left’ and the corruption people perceived in it. In the second, typified by student protests in Paris and Berkeley, the focus of protests was opposition to consumerism and the pursuit of civil and social rights. In the third, the focus was the rejection of authority in the first generation of independent states in Africa and Latin America, where military dictatorship had displaced democratic rule.

Luc Boltanski (2002: 6) also highlights the diversity of the 1968 movement by distinguishing between its social and artistic critiques, where the former focused on inequality and poverty stemming from capitalism, and the latter on liberation, individual autonomy and authenticity. Michael Löwy (2002: 95) links this distinction between the social and artistic critique of capitalism to romanticism, which he defines as ‘rebellion against modern capitalist society, in the name of past or premodern social and cultural values, as a protest against the modern disenchantment of the world’. Therefore, the significance of 1968 can be seen not just across space, but also as a reflection of long-established traditions of resistance to prevailing social, political and economic forms or organization. On such readings, the events of 1968 can be interpreted as a demonstration of long-standing anti-capitalist feeling that rested on a critique of the world we live in and the injustices it creates, and in turn motivated action in order to try to address them.

## Case

### Framing

#### Existential threats outweigh:

#### A] Even the most conservative estimates prove reducing existential risk outweighs all other impacts, regardless of probability – actively prioritize our calculus since you are cognitively biased against it

Whittlestone 17 – (Jess Whittlestone, PhD in Behavioural Science and has worked as a policy consultant for government, specialising in security and foreign policy. She also has experience as a freelance journalist for a number of online magazines, including Quartz, Vox, and Aeon. Before her PhD, she studied Maths and Philosophy at Oxford, and played a key role in developing 80,000 Hours' coaching process and research. Currently, Jess is a Postdoctoral Research Associate at the Leverhulme Centre for the Future of Intelligence at Cambridge, “The Long-Term Future”, Effective Altruism, 11-16-17, Available Online at <https://www.effectivealtruism.org/articles/cause-profile-long-run-future/>, accessed 12-4-18, HKR-AM)

The number of people alive today pales in comparison to the number who could exist in the future. It may therefore be extremely important to ensure that human civilization flourishes far into the future, enjoying fulfilling lives free of suffering.

There are a number of ways we might work to ensure a positive future for humanity. We could work to better understand and prevent extinction risks - catastrophic events that have the potential to destroy all life on this planet.[1] We may want to focus on the broader category of existential risks- events that could dramatically and irreversibly curtail humanity’s potential.[2] Or we might focus on increasing the chance that the lives of our descendants are positive in other ways: for example, improving democracy or the ability of institutions to make good decisions.

Attempts to shape the long-term future seem highly neglected relative to the problems we face today. There are fewer incentives to address longer-term problems, and they can also be harder for us to take seriously.

It is, of course, hard to be certain about the impact of our actions on the very long-term future. However, it does seem that there are things we can do - and given the vast scale we are talking about, these actions could therefore have an enormous impact in expectation.

This profile sets out why you might want to focus your altruistic efforts on the long-term future - and why you might not. You may be particularly inclined to focus on this if you think we face serious existential threats in the next century, and if you’re comfortable accepting a reasonable amount of uncertainty about the impact you are having, especially in the short-term.

The case for the long-term future as a target of altruism

The case for focusing on the long-term future can be summarised as follows:

The long-term future has enormous potential for good or evil: our descendants could live for billions or trillions of years, and have very high-quality lives;

It seems likely there are things we can do today that will affect the long-term future in non-negligible ways;

Possible ways of shaping the long-term future are currently highly neglected by individuals and society;

Given points 1 to 3 above, actions aimed at shaping the long-term future seem to have extremely high expected value, higher than any actions aiming for more near-term benefits.

Below we discuss each part of this argument in more detail.

The long-term future has enormous potential

Civilisation could continue for a billion years, until the Earth becomes uninhabitable.[3] It’s hard to say how likely this is, but it certainly seems plausible - and putting less than, say, a 1% chance on this possibility seems overconfident.[4] You may disagree that 1% is a reasonable lower bound here, but changing the figure by an order of magnitude or two would still yield an extremely impressive result. And even if civilisation only survives for another million years, that still amounts to another ~50,000 generations of people, i.e. trillions of future lives.[5]

If our descendants survive for long enough, then they are likely to advance in ways we cannot currently imagine - even someone living a few hundred years ago could not possibly have imagined the technological advances we’ve made today. It is possible they might even develop technology enabling them to reach and colonise planets outside our solar system, and survive well beyond a billion years.[6]

Let’s say that if we survive until the end of the Earth’s lifespan, there is a 1% chance of space colonisation. This would make the overall probability of survival beyond Earth 1 in 10,000 (1% chance of surviving to a billion years, multiplied by a 1% chance of surviving further given that). This sounds incredibly low, but suppose that space colonisation could allow our descendants to survive up to 100 trillion years[7]. This suggests we could have up to 1/10,000 x 100 trillion years = 10 billion expected years of civilisation ahead of us.

If we expect life in the future to be, on average, about as good as the present, then this would make the whole of the future about 100 million times more important than everything that has happened in the last 100 years. In fact, it seems like there could be more people in the future with better lives than those living today: economic, social, and technological progress could enable us to cure diseases, lift people out of poverty, and better solve other problems. It also seems possible that people in the future will be more altruistic than people alive today[8] - which also makes it more likely that they will be motivated to create a happy and valuable world.

However, it’s precisely because of this enormous potential that it’s so important to ensure that things go as well as possible. The loss of potential would be enormous if we end up on a negative trajectory. It could result in a great deal of suffering or the end of life.[9] And just as the potential to solve many of the world’s problems is growing, threats seem to be growing too. In particular, advanced technologies and increasing interconnectedness pose great risks.[10]

There are things we can do today that could affect the long-term future

There are a number of things we could work on today that seem likely to influence the long-term future:

Reducing extinction risks: We could reduce the risk of catastrophic climate change by putting in place laws and regulations to cut carbon emissions. We could reduce the risks from new technologies by investing in research to ensure their safety. Alternatively, we could work to improve global cooperation so that we are better able to deal with unforeseen risks that might arise.

Changing the values of a civilisation: Values tend to be stable in societies,[11] so attempts to shift values, whilst difficult, could have long-lasting effects. Some forms of value change, like increasing altruism, seem robustly good, and may be a way of realizing the very best possible futures. However, spreading poorly considered values could be harmful.

Reducing suffering risks: Historically, technological advances have enabled great welfare improvements (e.g. through modern agriculture and medicine), but also some of the greatest sources of present-day suffering (e.g. factory farming). To prevent the worst risks from new technologies, we could improve global cooperation and work on specific problems like preventing worst-case outcomes from artificial intelligence.

“Speeding up” development: Boosting technological innovation or scientific progress could have a lasting “speed up” effect on the entire future, making all future benefits happen slightly earlier than they otherwise would have. Curing a disease just a few years earlier could save millions of lives, for example. (That said, it’s not clear whether speeding up development is good or bad for existential risk - developing new technologies faster might help us to mitigate certain threats, but pose new risks of their own.)

Ripple effects of our ordinary actions: Improvements in health not only benefit individuals directly but allow them to be more economically successful, meaning that society and other individuals have to invest less in supporting them. In aggregate, this could easily have substantial knock-on effects on the productivity of society, which could affect the future.

Other ways we might create positive trajectory changes: These include improving education, science, and political systems.

Paul Christiano also points out that even if opportunities to shape the long-term future with any degree of certainty do not exist today, they may well exist in the future. Investing in our own current capacity could have an indirect but large impact by improving our ability to take such opportunities when they do arise. Similarly, we can do research today to learn more about how we might be able to impact the long-term future.

The long-term future is neglected, especially relative to its importance

Attempts to shape the long-term future are neglected by individuals, organisations and governments.

One reason is that there is little incentive to focus on far-off, uncertain issues compared to more certain, immediate ones. As 80,000 Hours put it, “Future generations matter, but they can’t vote, they can’t buy things, they can’t stand up for their interests.”

Problems faced by future generations are also more uncertain and more abstract, making it harder for us to care about them. There is a well-established phenomenon called temporal discounting, which means that we tend to give less weight to outcomes that are far in the future. This may explain our tendency to neglect long-term risks and problems. For example, it’s a large part of why we seem to have such difficulty tackling climate change.

Generally, there are diminishing returns to additional work in an area. This means that the neglectedness of the long-term future makes it more likely to be high impact.

Efforts to shape the long-term future could be extremely high in expected value

Even if the chance of our actions influencing the long-term trajectory of humanity is relatively low, there are extremely large potential benefits, which mean that these actions could still have a very high expected value. For example, decreasing the probability of human extinction by just one in a million could result in an additional 1,000 to 10,000 expected years of civilisation (using earlier assumptions).[12]

Compare this to actions we could take to improve the lives of people alive today, without looking at longer-run effects. A dramatic victory such as curing the most common and deadly diseases, or ending all war, might only make the current time period (~100 years) about twice as good as otherwise.[13] Though this seems like an enormous success, given the calculations above, decreasing the probability of human extinction would be 10 or 100 times better in expectation.

We might want to adjust this naive estimate downwards slightly, however, given uncertainty about some of the assumptions that go into it - we could be wrong about the probability of humanity surviving far into the future, or about the value of the future (if we think that future flourishing might have diminishing value, for example.) However, even if we think these estimates should be adjusted downwards substantially, we might very conservatively imagine that reducing the likelihood of existential risk by one in a million only equates to 100 expected years of civilization. This still suggests that the value of working to reduce existential risk is comparable to the value of the biggest victories we could imagine in the current time period - and so well worth taking seriously.

#### [b] Gateway issue - we need to be alive to assign value and debate competing moral theories- extinction literally ends the debate on “ought” [c] moral theories were formulated prior to the Anthropocene and human capacity for collective death so they cannot be relied on in situations of existential risk [d] no coherent moral theory can allow for extinction because it means the end of value

#### War worsens structural inequalities – a] takes away valuable resources to combat issues like economic and social injustice b] war falls the hardest on those who can’t protect themselves – especially nuclear war c] those who fight war are more likely to be worse off socially – aff ballot actively consigns the oppressed to fight for the state d] war kills everyone – death means we literally cannot fight injustice

### AT: Biocolonialism

#### Their rotb just indicates there’s an imperative to take legal action to resolve appropriation but that 1. Doesn’t preclude the importance of other impacts 2. Relies on a consequential calculus to prove why the obligation exists 3. Is arbitrary and impact justified

#### Reps don’t shape reality – justifying a policy in 2 ways is still the same policy – leads to endless abstraction

#### 2] Don’t let them weigh the sum total of their impact—they only get to weigh the unique amount solved by the affirmative. Filter the debate through scope of solvency—there’s no impact to root cause if they don’t solve it

#### 3] No performative or methodological offense, only offense from the plan—reject it cuz it explodes predictable limits, spiking out of neg ground making any discussion qualitatively worse. Also increases power disparities since the aff can just criticize something about the status quo or affirm “resistance movements” – causes the judge to have to make a call about whose resistance or perfomance is better which is violent and recreates the same power hierarchies they’re critiquing. 1AC as a policy action is different because it causes offense defense cards and arguments as opposed to just “we support indigenous communities so vote for the aff”

#### The 1AC is a presentation of sentimental politics which promises that empathetic identification will reshape not only debate, but the world and actualize an ethics of care. That produces pain as a prophylactic from our violence toward otherness reliant on an economy of victimization.

Berlant 98

(Lauren, Department of English, University of Chicago, “Poor Eliza,” *American Literature*, Vol. 70, No. 3, *No More Separate Spheres!* (Sep., 1998), Duke University Press, pg. 635-668)

What distinguishes these critical texts are the startling ways they struggle to encounter the Uncle Tom form without reproducing it, declining to pay the inheritance tax. The postsentimental does not involve an aesthetic disruption to the contract sentimentality makes between its texts and readers -that proper reading will lead to better feeling and therefore to a better self. What changes is the place of repetition in this contract, a crisis frequently thematized in formal aesthetic and generational terms. In its traditional and political modalities, the sentimental promises that in a just world a consensus will already exist about what constitutes uplift, amelioration, and emancipation, those horizons toward which empathy powerfully directs itself. Identification with suffering, the ethical response to the sentimental plot, leads to its repetition in the audience and thus to a generally held view about what transformations would bring the good life into being. This presumption, that the terms of consent are trans- historical once true feeling is shared, explains in part why emotions, especially painful ones, are so central to the world-building aspects of sentimental alliance. Postsentimental texts withdraw from the contract that presumes consent to the conventionally desired outcomes of identification and empathy. The desire for unconflictedness might very well motivate the sacrifice of surprising ideas to the norms of the world against which this rhetoric is being deployed. What, if anything, then, can be built from the very different knowledge/experience of subaltern pain? What can memory do to create conditions for freedom and justice without reconfirming the terms of ordinary subordination? More than a critique of feeling as such, the postsentimental modality also challenges what literature and storytelling have come to stand for in the creation of sentimental national subjects across an almost two-century span. Three moments in this genealogy, which differ as much from each other as from the credulous citation of Uncle Tom's Cabin we saw in The King and I and Dimples, will mark here some potential within the arsenal that counters the repetition compulsions of sentimentality. This essay began with a famous passage from James Baldwin's "Everybody's Protest Novel," a much-cited essay about Uncle Tom's Cabin that is rarely read in the strong sense because its powerful language of rageful truth-telling would shame in advance any desire to make claims for the tactical efficacy of suffering and mourning in the struggle to transform the United States into a postracist nation. I cited Baldwin's text to open this piece not to endorse its absolute truth but to figure its frustrated opposition to the sentimental optimism that equates the formal achievement of empathy on a mass scale with the general project of democracy. Baldwin's special contribution to what sentimentality can mean has been lost in the social-problem machinery of mass society, in which the production of tears where anger or nothing might have been became more urgent with the coming to cultural dominance of the Holocaust and trauma as models for having and remembering collective social experience.20 Currently, as in traditional sentimentality, the authenticity of overwhelming pain that can be textually performed and shared is disseminated as a prophylactic against the reproduction of a shocking and numbing mass violence. Baldwin asserts that the overvaluation of such redemptive feeling is precisely a condition of that violence**.** Baldwin's encounter with Stowe in this essay comes amidst a general wave of protest novels, social-problem films, and film noir in the U.S. after World War Two: Gentleman's Agreement, The Postman Always Rings Twice, The Best Years of Our Lives. Films like these, he says, "emerge for what they are: a mirror of our confusion, dishonesty, panic, trapped and immobilized in the sunlit prison of the American dream." They cut the complexity of human motives and self-understanding "down to size" by preferring "a lie more palatable than the truth" about the social and material effects the liberal pedagogy of optimism has, or doesn't have, on "man's" capacity to produce a world of authentic truth, justice, and freedom.21 Indeed, "truth" is the keyword for Baldwin. He defines it as "a devotion to the human being, his freedom and fulfillment: freedom which cannot be legislated, fulfillment which cannot be charted."22 In contrast, Stowe's totalitarian religiosity, her insistence that subjects "bargain" for heavenly redemption with their own physical and spiritual mortification, merely and violently confirms the fundamental abjection of all persons, especially the black ones who wear the dark night of the soul out where all can see it. Additionally, Baldwin argues that Uncle Tom's Cabin instantiates a tradition of locating the destiny of the nation in a false model of the individual soul, one imagined as free of ambivalence, aggression, or contradiction. By "human being" Baldwin means to repudiate stock identities as such, arguing that their stark simplicity confirms the very fantasies and institutions against which the sentimental is ostensibly being mobilized. This national-liberal refusal of complexity is what he elsewhere calls "the price of the ticket" for membership in the American dream.23 As the Uncle Tom films suggest, whites need blacks to "dance" for them so that they might continue disavowing the costs or ghosts of whiteness, which involve religious traditions of self-loathing and cultural traditions confusing happiness with analgesia. The conventional reading of "Everybody's Protest Novel" sees it as a violent rejection of the sentimental.24 It is associated with the feminine (Little Women), with hollow and dishonest capacities of feeling, with an aversion to the real pain that real experience brings. "Causes, as we know, are notoriously bloodthirsty," he writes.25 The politico-sentimental novel uses suffering vampirically to simplify the subject, thereby making the injunction to empathy safe for the subject. Of course there is more to the story. Baldwin bewails the senti- mentality of Richard Wright's Native Son because Bigger Thomas is not the homeopathic Other to Uncle Tom after all, but one of his "children," the heir to his negative legacy.26 Both Tom and Thomas live in a simple relation to violence and die knowing only slightly more than they did before they were sacrificed to a white ideal of the soul's simple purity, its emptiness. This addiction to the formula of redemption through violent simplification persists with a "terrible power": it confirms that U.S. minorities are constituted as Others even to themselves through attachment to the most hateful, objectified, cartoon-like versions of their identities, and that the shamed subcultures of America really are, in some way, fully expressed by the overpresence of the stereotypical image.

#### Their compensation fails card is in the context of drug trials, not patents which doesn’t apply and assumes noncompliance which doesn’t assume fiat – also just 2 lines and doesn’t have a warrants

#### Circumvention-

#### 1] Blood quantum DA – settler states are the actors of the plan so they have jurisdiction over what is and isn’t Indigenous Knowledge – its really to trace back medicines to any possible Indigenous roots which incentivizes nations to say substances and knowledge “aren’t native enough” which decks aff solvency AND perpetuates a form of cultural genocide

#### 2] Companies could claim it’s not indigenous knowledge – technically any plant was found first by an indigenous person and there’s nothing in the plan that mandates that indigenous communities would be the ones making the call as to what makes medicine indigenous

#### 3] Plan still leaves trademarks, copyrights, etc. on things that are indigenous knowledge so companies would circumvent by shifting to that – hold them to the text of the plan since none of their ev says patents are key

#### 4] Removing patents just makes all applications of IP functionally generics – that GREENLIGHTS corporations to appropriate them and doesn’t do anything to protect knowledge beyond slightly decreasing profit incentives – the plan does nothing to detach IP from capital

#### No developing country competition – even if they aren’t barred from plant based generics through patents, there are massive disparities in R&D capabilities and pharmaceutical industry size that allow the global north to dominate

#### Aff presumes that it will somehow terminate the right to indigenous knowledge whereas in reality, settlers claim to have a right to everything indigenous – the aff tries to make it seem as if we’ve gotten over the point of IP for some medicines, while largely leaving the structure of settler colonialism and biocolonialism intact – independently, the aff is worse since it makes it seem like the state has done something good for indigenous people when nothing has actually changed, causing cruel optimism

#### Joint statement is 1. Answered by our CP which cites Indigenous groups utilizing patents to protect their knowledge 2. Relies on Indigenous legal systems to protect knowledge which can only deter settler appropriation if its codified in settler law 3. Homogenization

#### Spillover from the held ev is nonsense – explain how the plan or its reps – also don’t largely change legal forums and if they do both cps do as well