# Speech 1NC Grapevine Rd 4 vs Westwood 9-11 12AM

## 1

#### interp: debaters must not post the full text of the cards in the cite box but must upload an open source document with the full text.

#### Violation- ss

A screenshot of a computer

Description automatically generated

#### Vote for Pre-round prep: prep becomes atrocious when you don’t make your tags bold and just throw up massive amounts of text on the wiki page which makes it nearly impossible to locate certain arguments.

## 2

#### Interp – The aff must specify the influence and decision-making powers of tribal authorities over implementation of the plan in tribal lands in a delineated text in the 1AC.

#### Violation – they dotn

#### Ambiguity is a tool for settlers to define the terms of engagement with tribes. The liberal intentions of the 1AC don’t matter—absent defined standards, the policies will reproduce colonial domination.

Steinman ’12 Steinman, Erich. “Settler Colonial Power and the American Indian Sovereignty Movement: Forms of Domination, Strategies of Transformation.” American Journal of Sociology Vol. 117, No. 4, January 2012, <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/662708>. PeteZ

A traditional definition of "sovereignty" is: "The supreme, absolute, and uncontrollable power by which any independent state is governed."' 3 Questions regarding the sovereign rights of tribes are often the starting point of any federal Indian law issue. Although the whole of federal Indian law is quite complex,14 the essence of tribal sovereignty is simply the extent to which a tribe can attend to its own affairs and control its own cultural, societal, and economic development free from outside restraints. Under the current legal and political regimes, the extent of tribal control is ambiguous. The Handbook of Federal Indian Law lists three "fundamental principles" that demonstrate the anomalous and restricted nature of tribal sovereignty: (1) Indian tribes possess all the powers of a sovereign state; (2) conquest renders the tribes subject, however, to the legislative authority of the United States and terminates the tribes' external sovereign powers, but does not affect the internal sovereign powers of the tribes; and (3) these powers are subject to qualification by treaties and congressional legislation.' 5 Cohen's three principles demonstrate the dichotomy between internal and external sovereignty16 that pervades the concept of tribal sovereignty. Tribes are supposedly full sovereigns with respect to their own internal affairs and interests. At the same time, however, the United States government has completely extinguished their external sovereign powers.17 This state of affairs might not be problematic if defined standards for maintaining the relationship between the tribal and federal governments existed and the relationship were based upon the consent of the tribes. The history of tribal-federal relations demonstrates, however, that neither standards nor consent exist, and that the relationship is uncertain at best. Tribal-federal relations have periodically oscillated between two diametrically opposed views on the status of Indian Tribes. At one end of the spectrum is the belief that tribes are independent political communities and should control their own development.'8 At the other end lies the belief that the tribal system should be dismantled and individual Indians should be assimilated into the greater American society.19 While these views appear to be in extreme conflict, their implementation produces very similar results. The United States government dominates the tribal-federal relationship, allowing it to manipulate the situation to protect federal interests. The following historical background will demonstrate how the lack of definition and consent in the relationship promotes federal dominance.

#### Vote neg—

#### 1 – Critical Education – The policymaking process is not innocent. Force them to study how their practice of fiat can *itself* reproduce settler colonialism. For tribes, these details are life and death.

#### 2 – Ground – Tribal sovereignty is the first question in any debate about policies that affect natives – avoiding it is unfair, irresponsible, and bad for education.

#### 3 – Presumption – If their framing is right, then the state will always manipulate its policies to screw over tribes – you should presume no sovereignty.

#### 4 – CX doesn’t check: (A) My interp forces them to research these issues before round. (B) I can’t prep a strat against their aff until CX. (C) Footnoting DA—reduces crucial issues of sovereignty to a mere afterthought. (D) Specifying sovereignty should be the default—I shouldn’t have to ask.

#### Fairness is a voter and comes first –

#### A] debate’s a game that requires effective competition and negation, which makes their offense inevitable, it internal link turns clash and engagement.

#### B] Can’t weigh the aff—it’s just as likely that they’re winning it because we weren’t able to effectively prepare to defeat it.

#### C] Inescapable – the AC conforms to every norm of debate – speed, speech times, ballots – proves they value playing the game and isolating fairness as the one bad rule is arbitrary.

#### D] Probability – ballots can’t shape our subjectivity or create broad political change but can rectify in-round skews.

#### Education – it’s the only portable impact to debate

#### CI – a) brightlines are arbitrary and self-serving which doesn’t set good norms b) it collapses since weighing between brightlines rely on offense defense

#### DOD – a) it’s the only way to may up for time spent on theory b) it’s the only way to deter future abuse

#### No RVI’s- a) logic – you shouldn’t win for being fair b) clash – people go all in on theory which decks substance engagement c) chilling effect – people will be too scared to read theory because RVI’s encourage baiting theory

#### 1NC theory first - 1] Abuse was self-inflicted- They started the chain of abuse and forced me down this strategy 2] Norming- We have more speeches to norm over whether it’s a good idea since the shell was read earlier. Norming outweighs A] Constutivism- It’s the constitutive purpose of theory debating B] Sequencing- it’s a pre-requisite to actualizing any other voter like fairness or education

## 3

#### The litmus test for ethics is certainty and non-arbitrariness – blurry guidelines for ethics allows agents to inconsistently understand morality or arbitrarily opt out which renders ethics useless since it can’t serve as a guide to action.

#### Thus, the meta-ethic is practical reason.

#### 1] Empirical Uncertainty – only intrinsic and a priori truths like 1+1=2 are certain for agents – relying on the empirics is incoherent because different agents have different interpretations.

#### 2] Solipsism – contingent circumstances such as utility are uncertain – I can never know what another agents feels or thinks which means its nonverifiable but practical reason is universal and applies to all agents. Outweighs since it would be escapable since people could say they don’t experience the same.

#### 3] Infinite Regress – certainty must answer “why” because it would otherwise allow agents to infinitely question why it’s true – other frameworks allow agents to question every part of it, but questioning reason concedes its authority which proves its inescapable.

#### Practical reason is universalizable – its incoherent to claim that 1+1=2 for me, but not for everyone else.

#### Thus, the standard and ROB is consistency with universalizable maxims – only intentions matter.

#### Prefer Additionally –

#### 1] Performativity – when you enter debate, you presume that you will be free in round because of reciprocally enforced constraints which means objections are impossible and should be ignored on face.

#### 2] Ideal Theory Good – a] Sequencing – we need an ideal world to envision to work towards so only ideal theory can guide action b] Relativity Problem – We can’t assign universal obligation since non-ideal theory commits us to understanding individual circumstances which is radically different for each person

#### 3] Consistent action through egalitarian recognition of humanity solves oppression – viewing others through equal personhood along with adoption of principles of universality are key to mutual recognition.

**Mills 18** Charles W. Mills. “Black Radical Kantianism.” Res Philosophica, Vol. 95, No. 1, January 2018, pp. 1–33 https:// doi.org/ 10.11612/ resphil.1622 SJCP//JG

So the common theme is the demand for equal recognition, equal dignity, equal respect, equal personhood, in a white-supremacist world where disrespect rather than respect is the norm, the default mode, for blacks. A racesensitive Kantianism not merely purged of Kant’s own racism but attuned (in a way nominally color-blind Kantianism is not) to these racially demarcated particularities for the different sub-sections of the human population— a black radical Kantianism—will thus understand the need to “universalize” the categorical imperative in a very different way to register the crucial differences between those socially recognized as persons and those socially recognized as sub-persons. I suggest that we divide the different moral relations involved into two categories based on whether one is a member of the privileged race, the R1s, or the subordinated race, the R2s. That gives us the following six-way breakdown: (1) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to oneself, (2) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to one’s fellow-R1s, (3) one’s duty as an R1 to give respect to R2s, (4) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to oneself, (5) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to one’s fellow-R2s, and (6) one’s duty as an R2 to give respect to R1s. Historically, each of these will have been affected by race (as racism), leaving an ideological and psychological legacy, habits of disrespect, that will shape the “inclinations” most likely to be determinative and most imperatively to be resisted. Instead of (what could be graphically thought of as) “horizontal” relations of reciprocal and symmetrical race-indifferent respect among equal raceless persons, the R1s will have historically respected themselves and each other as R1s, while “vertically” looking down on, disrespecting, R2s as inferiors. In turn, the R2s will have been required to show racial deference to the R1s, looking up to them as R2s, and—having most probably internalized their lower ontological status—will have been prone to regard both themselves and their fellows with racial contempt.

#### 4] Freedom implies an innate right to determine the course of your actions. In the state of nature, power controls this. Absent of a public authority, rights violations are inevitable. Thus we need an omni-lateral will.

Varden 10“A Kantian Conception of Free Speech” by Helga Varden Chapter from: “Freedom of Expression in a Diverse World” edited by Deirdre Golash 2010

“The first important distinction between Kant and much contemporary liberal thought issues from Kant’s argument that it is not in principle possible for individuals to realize right in the state of nature. Kant explicitly rejects the common assumption in liberal theories of his time as well as today that virtuous private individuals can interact in ways reconcilable both with one another’s right to freedom and their corresponding innate and acquired private rights. All the details of this argument are beyond the scope of this paper. It suffices to say that ideal **problems of assurance and indeterminacy** regarding the specification, application and enforcement of the principles of private right to actual interactions **lead Kant to conclude that rightful interaction is** in principle **impossible in the state of nature**.5 **Kant argues that** only a public authority can solve these problems in a way reconcilable with everyone’s right to freedom. This is why we find Kant starting his discussion of public right with this claim: however well disposed and right-loving men might be, **it** still **lies a priori** in the rational idea of such a condition (one that is not rightful) **that before a public law**ful condition **is established individual[s]** human beings... **can never be secure against violence from one another, since each has her own right to do what seems right and good to her and not be dependent upon another’s opinion** about this (6: 312).6 There are no rightful obligations **in the state of nature**, since in this condition **might** (‘violence’, or arbitrary judgments and ‘opinion’ about ‘what seems right and good’) **rather than right** (freedom under law) **ultimately governs interactions.** According to Kant, therefore, **only** the establishment of **a public authority can enable interaction in ways reconcilable with each person’s innate right to freedom**. Moreover, only a public authority can ensure interaction consistent with what Kant argues are our innate rights (to bodily integrity and honor) and our acquired rights (to private prop- erty, contract and status relations). The reason is that only the public authority can solve the problems of assurance and indeterminacy without violating anyone’s right to freedom. The public authority can solve these problems **because it** represents the will of all and yet the will of no one in particular. Because the public authority is representative in this way – by being “united a priori ” or by being an “omnilateral” will (6: 263) – it can **regulate[s] on behalf of everyone rather than on behalf of anyone in particular.** For these reasons, civil society is seen as the only means through which our interactions can become subject to universal laws that restrict everyone’s freedom reciprocally rather than as subject to anyone’s arbitrary choices.” (46-47)

#### 5] Ethics First – a) begs the question as to why we should adopt their role of the ballot b) means we function on the basis of unjustified assumptions – although things may seem true or good, we should always make sure from the normative level to ensure we verify the truth value of every complexity in their epistemology claims.

#### Negate –

#### 1] IP rights are necessary for subject formation – creators are isolated and properly conceived under IP which is a sequencing question to understanding the function of agency.

Kanning 12 [Michael A. Kanning (Graduate School at University of South Florida). “A Philosophical Analysis of Intellectual Property: In Defense of Instrumentalism”. A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts Department of Philosophy College of Arts and Sciences University of South Florida. January 2012. Accessed 8/22/21. <https://digitalcommons.usf.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=5290&context=etd> //Xu]

As noted previously in my discussion of the utilitarian justification, determining precisely how to maximize something like innovation or creative expression through the use of intellectual property is a difficult and complicated task. I have argued that this difficulty was not sufficient grounds to reject the utilitarian or instrumentalist accounts as a foundation. Much to the contrary, for the instrumentalist, this empirical task is the most important project in the analysis and development of intellectual property policies. One way to proceed in this analysis would be to engage in a kind of armchair economics, speculating about what motivates people to create, and then speculating about how institutions and rewards can be arranged to help encourage creative efforts. But this method is decidedly unempirical. Nonetheless, something like this is what is usually offered as a utilitarian justification - that intellectual property rights reward people who engage in costly and risky creative efforts. Without such a system of reward, we would not have as much creativity and innovation in the world. This is taken as an axiomatic truth. I do not intend to argue that this is false, only that is needs to be proven. The instrumentalist is committed to an empiricism that necessitates a more scientific and well-documented analysis about what best facilitates creative and innovative processes. This task cannot be taken up here. In fact, as Merges noted, there is much work already done in this area, but the verdict is still out. What can be done here is a brief conceptual analysis of the things that make up the creative process, broadly conceived. Most prominent in the rhetoric of intellectual property law is the concept of creator who serves as the ultimate or efficient cause of some new thing. As an illustration of this, recall that most of the classical justifications covered in Chapter 1 centered around a solitary creator, conceived of as a laborer (in Lockean theory), or as an self-contained individual or personality (in the Kantian and Hegelian theories). Creators, whether inventors, authors, artists or innovators, are isolated and identified, granted ownership rights and rewarded. If we are to have an ideally-functioning set of intellectual property laws that best achieve their established ends, it is important that creators are properly conceived of. A clear notion of the creative entity will allow us to ensure that whatever incentives or pecuniary rewards are distributed are done so in a way that best achieves the goals of the intellectual property system.

#### 2] The aff encourages free riding- that treats people as ­means to an end and takes advantage of their efforts which violates the principle of humanity

**Van Dyke 18** Raymond Van Dyke, 7-17-2018, "The Categorical Imperative for Innovation and Patenting," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2018/07/17/categorical-imperative-innovation-patenting/id=99178/> SJ//DA recut SJKS

Also, **allowing the free taking of ideas, content and valuable data, i.e., the fruits of individual intellectual endeavor**, would disrupt capitalism in a radical way. **The resulting more secretive approach in support of the above free-riding Statement** would be akin to a Communist environment **where the State owned everything and the citizen owned nothing, i.e., the people “consented” to this. It is, accordingly, manifestly clear that no reasonable and supportable Categorical Imperative can be made for the unwarranted theft of property, whether tangible or intangible,** apart from legitimate exigencies.

#### NCC – anything else allows them to concede all our framework interactions and just go for 4 minutes of turns against our NC which o/w since phil is the only thing unique to LD Debate and time is the only quantifiable metric of abuse

## 4

#### Biden’s infrastructure bill will pass through reconciliation but absolute Dem Unity is key.

* Turns Structural Violence

Pramuk and Ranck 8-25 Jacob Pramuk and Thomas Franck 8-25-2021 "Here’s what happens next as Democrats try to pass Biden’s multitrillion-dollar economic plans" <https://www.cnbc.com/2021/08/25/what-happens-next-with-biden-infrastructure-budget-bills-in-congress.html> (Staff Reporter at CNBC)//Elmer

WASHINGTON — **House Democrats just patched up a party fracture** **to take a critical step forward with a mammoth economic agenda**. But the **path ahead could get trickier** as party leaders try to thread a legislative needle to pass more than $4 trillion in new spending. **In** the **coming weeks**, **Democrats** **aim to approve** a $1 trillion bipartisan **infrastructure** plan and up to $3.5 trillion in investments in social programs. Passing both **will require a heavy lift**, as leaders will need to **satisfy** **competing demands of centrists** wary of spending **and progressives** who want to reimagine government’s role in American households. The House is leaving Washington **until Sept. 20** after taking key steps toward pushing through the sprawling economic plans. The chamber on Tuesday approved a $3.5 trillion budget resolution and advanced the infrastructure bill, as House Speaker Nancy Pelosi, D-Calif., promised centrist Democrats to take up the bipartisan plan by Sept. 27. The Senate already passed the infrastructure legislation, so **a final House vote would send it to Biden’s desk for his** signature. Now that both chambers have passed the budget measure, **Democrats can move without Republicans** to push through their spending plan **via reconciliation**. Party leaders want committees to write their pieces of the bill by Sept. 15 before budget committees package them into one massive measure that can move through Congress. Committees could start marking up legislation in early September. Party leaders **face a challenge** in coming up with a bill that will satisfy centrists who want to trim back the $3.5 trillion price tag and progressives who consider it the minimum Congress should spend. As **one defection in the Senate** — **and four in the House** — **would sink legislation,** **Democrats have to satisfy a diverse range of views** to pass their agenda. “We write a bill with the Senate because it’s no use doing a bill that’s not going to pass the Senate, in the interest of getting things done,” Pelosi told reporters on Wednesday. Given the magnitude of the legislation, passing it quickly could prove difficult. To appease congressional progressives who have prioritized passage of the budget bill, Democrats could move to pass both proposals at about the same time. While Pelosi gave a Sept. 27 target date to approve the infrastructure plan, the commitment is not binding. Still, she noted Wednesday that Congress needs to pass the bill before surface transportation spending authorization expires Sept. 30. “We have long had an eye to having the infrastructure bill on the President’s desk by the October 1, the effective date of the legislation,” she wrote in a separate letter to Democrats on Wednesday. Democrats say the bills combined will provide a jolt to the economy and a lifeline for households. Supporters of the Democratic spending plan, including Pelosi and Senate Budget Committee Chair Bernie Sanders, I-Vt., have cast it as the biggest expansion of the U.S. social safety net in decades. “This is a truly historic opportunity to pass the **most transformative** and consequential **legislation for families** in a century, and will stand alongside the New Deal and Great Society as pillars of **economic security**,” Pelosi wrote to colleagues Wednesday. The plan would **expand Medicare**, **paid leave** and child care, extend enhanced household tax credits and encourage **green energy adoption**, **while hiking taxes on corporations and the wealthy**. Democrats hope to sell a wave of new support for families as they campaign to keep control of Congress in next year’s midterms. Those elections, though, have helped to generate staunch opposition on the other side of the aisle. The GOP has cited the trillions in new spending and the proposed reversal of some of its 2017 tax cuts in trying to take down the Democratic budget bill. Republicans and some Democrats have in recent weeks said that another $4.5 trillion in fiscal stimulus could not only boost economic growth but have the adverse effect of fueling inflation.

#### Democrat Senators in Big Pharma’s pocket derails the Plan.

Sirota 8-23 David Sirota 8-23-2021 "Dem Obstructionists Are Bankrolled By Pharma And Oil" <https://www.dailyposter.com/dem-obstructionists-are-bankrolled-by-pharma-and-oil/> (an American journalist, columnist at The Guardian, and editor for Jacobin. He is also a political commentator and radio host based in Denver. He is a nationally syndicated newspaper columnist, political spokesperson, and blogger)//Elmer

The **small group of conservative Democratic lawmakers** that has been **threatening to** help Republicans **halt** **Democrats’ budget package** have **raked in more than $3 million from donors in the pharmaceutical** and fossil fuel **industries** that could see reduced profits if the plan passes. As the House reconvenes today to tackle the budget reconciliation process, nine Democrats legislators have been promising to kill their party’s $3.5 trillion budget bill until Congress first passes a separate, smaller infrastructure spending measure, which has garnered some Republican support and which some environmental advocates say would exacerbate the climate crisis. Indeed, an ExxonMobil lobbyist was recently caught on tape saying the company had worked to strip climate measures out of the infrastructure bill. “**We will vote against a budget resolution** if the infrastructure package isn’t brought up first,” Democratic **Rep**. Josh **Gottheimer** **told** the Washington Post this weekend, **though** the American Prospect reported on Sunday that “**several**” of the **legislators** now **indicated they could back down**. **In the narrowly divided House**, **obstructionism from these** conservative Democrats **could decouple the infrastructure** and budget **measures** from one another. Many believe that would kill the latter by letting conservative Democrats in the Senate such as Kyrsten Sinema (D-Ariz.) and Joe Manchin (D-W.Va.) get the infrastructure bill they want without having to provide the votes necessary to enact the much larger and more progressive budget measure. “If we were to pass the bipartisan [infrastructure] bill first, then we lose leverage,” Democratic Rep. Ritchie Torres (NY) told the Wall Street Journal. Along with Gottheimer, the eight other Democrats who have threatened to obstruct the budget bill are Carolyn Bordeaux (Ga.), Ed Case (Hawaii), Jim Costa (Calif.), Henry Cuellar (Texas), Jared Golden (Maine), Vicente Gonzalez (Texas), Kurt Schrader (Ore.), and Filemon Vela (TX). The U.S. Chamber of Commerce — Washington’s most powerful corporate lobby group — has been airing digital ads thanking the nine Democrats for their maneuvers. Eight of the nine Democrats represent congressional districts won by President Joe Biden, who supports the reconciliation package. Big Pharma’s Big Allies The reconciliation bill is still being negotiated, and many Democratic lawmakers — including those in key swing districts — are pushing for it to include long-promised legislation to allow Medicare to use its enormous purchasing power to negotiate lower prices for prescription drugs. The **pharmaceutical industry** has **aggressively lobbied against the initiative**, which the Congressional Budget Office has estimated would save Medicare $345 billion in medicine costs. The nine House Democrats threatening to derail the reconciliation bill have raked in nearly $1.2 million from donors in the pharmaceutical and health products industries, according to data compiled by OpenSecrets. Among them are two of the Democratic Party’s **top recipients of health care industry money**: **Gottheimer** ($228,186) **and Schrader** ($614,830). Schrader’s third biggest career donor is Pfizer’s political action committee, and his former chief of staff is now a registered lobbyist for the Pharmaceutical Researchers and Manufacturers Association, the pharmaceutical industry’s main lobbying group. Both Gottheimer and Schrader signed a letter earlier this year slamming Democratic leaders’ legislation to lower prescription drug prices. Eight out of the nine Democrats threatening to kill the budget bill also declined to sponsor Democrats’ standalone legislation to let Medicare negotiate lower drug prices. In the Senate, Sinema’s renewed threat to vote down a final reconciliation bill came after she received $519,000 from donors in the pharmaceutical and health products industries.

#### Biopiracy makes up 40% of pharmaceuticals and generates billions in profits – Big Pharma hates the aff and lashes out.

Singh et al 14 [R. D. Singh\*, S.K. Mody, H. B. Patel, Sarita Devi, C.M. Modi and D.R. Kamani (Department of Pharmacology & Toxicology, College of Veterinary Science & Animal Husbandry, Sardarkrushinagar, Dantiwada Agricultural University). “PHARMACEUTICAL BIOPIRACY AND PROTECTION OF TRADITIONAL KNOWLEDGE”. International Journal of Research and Development in Pharmacy and Life Sciences. January 23, 2014. Accessed 8/27/21. <https://web.archive.org/web/20200730105348/https://www.omicsonline.org/open-access/pharmaceutical-biopiracy-and-protection-of-traditional-knowledge-.pdf> //Xu + Elmer]

Pharmaceutical bio-prospecting has been sharply criticized for what has become known as ‘biopiracy’ in which large international pharmaceutical corporations make use of local indigenous or traditional knowledge, without acknowledging that it is indigenous intellectual property. Thus, profits have accrued solely to the pharmaceutical companies and indigenous peoples received little or nothing in return [6]. The pharmaceutical industry has had a long and fruitful relationship with biodiversity. Large pharmaceutical companies generate close to USD 250 billion annually from drugs directly derived from biodiversity. In 2010, the natural products mix in the pharmaceutical industry was estimated to be 40%. Currently, 62% of cancer drugs approved by the US Food and Drug Administration come from, or are modeled based on, natural products. In 2010, more than 40% of all the new chemical entities were obtained from natural sources. Nearly 48% of drugs in the clinical phase are derived from plants. Drugs currently in the pipeline that are derived from natural sources are mostly cancer and antiinfective medicines. These two therapeutic areas account for 56% of all drugs of natural origin in clinical trials [7] . Collaborations between pharmaceutical companies and the countries supplying the indigenous knowledge and medicinal resources could offer an important new revenue source for impoverished developing countries. Therefore, efforts to establish fair and equitable partnerships between the pharmaceutical industry and the developing countries areimperative to ensure sustainable, mutually beneficial relationships [8] .

#### Infrastructure solves existential climate change – spill-over.

USA Today 7-20 [7-20-2021 "Climate change is at 'code red' status for the planet, and inaction is no longer an option". Editorial Board @ USA Today. Accessed 8/30/21. <https://www.usatoday.com/story/opinion/todaysdebate/2021/07/20/climate-change-biden-infrastructure-bill-good-start/7877118002/> //Recut Xu from Elmer]

Not long ago, climate change for many Americans was like a distant bell. News of starving polar bears or melting glaciers was tragic and disturbing, but other worldly. Not any more. Top climate scientists from around the world warned of a "code red for humanity" in a report issued Monday that says severe, human-caused global warming is become unassailable. Proof of the findings by the United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is a now a factor of daily life. Due to intense heat waves and drought, 107 wildfires – including the largest ever in California – are now raging across the West, consuming 2.3 million acres. Earlier this summer, hundreds of people died in unprecedented triple-digit heat in Oregon, Washington and western Canada, when a "heat dome" of enormous proportions settled over the region for days. Some victims brought by stretcher into crowded hospital wards had body temperatures so high, their nervous systems had shut down. People collapsed trying to make their way to cooling shelters. Heat-trapping greenhouse gases Scientists say the event was almost certainly made worse and more intransigent by human-caused climate change. They attribute it to a combination of warming Arctic temperatures and a growing accumulation of heat-trapping greenhouse gases caused by the burning of fossil fuels. The consequences of what mankind has done to the atmosphere are now inescapable. Periods of extreme heat are projected to double in the lower 48 states by 2100. Heat deaths are far outpacing every other form of weather killer in a 30-year average. A persistent megadrought in America's West continues to create tinder-dry conditions that augur another devastating wildfire season. And scientists say warming oceans are fueling ever more powerful storms, evidenced by Elsa and the early arrival of hurricane season this year. Increasingly severe weather is causing an estimated $100 billion in damage to the United States every year. "It is honestly surreal to see your projections manifesting themselves in real time, with all the suffering that accompanies them. It is heartbreaking," said climate scientist Katharine Hayhoe. Rising seas from global warming Investigators are still trying to determine what led to the collapse of a Miami-area condominium that left more than 100 dead or missing. But one concerning factor is the corrosive effect on reinforced steel structures of encroaching saltwater, made worse in Florida by a foot of rising seas from global warming since the 1900s. The clock is ticking for planet Earth. While the U.N. report concludes some level of severe climate change is now unavoidable, there is still a window of time when far more catastrophic events can be mitigated. But mankind must act soon to curb the release of heat-trapping gases. Global temperature has risen nearly 2 degrees Fahrenheit since the pre-industrial era of the late 19th century. Scientists warn that in a decade, it could surpass a 2.7-degree increase. That's enough warming to cause catastrophic climate changes. After a brief decline in global greenhouse gas emissions during the pandemic, pollution is on the rise. Years that could have been devoted to addressing the crisis were wasted during a feckless period of inaction by the Trump administration. Congress must act Joe Biden won the presidency promising broad new policies to cut America's greenhouse gas emissions. But Congress needs to act on those ideas this year. Democrats cannot risk losing narrow control of one or both chambers of Congress in the 2022 elections to a Republican Party too long resistant to meaningful action on the climate. So what's at issue? A trillion dollar infrastructure bill negotiated between Biden and a group of centrist senators (including 10 Republicans) is a start. In addition to repairing bridges, roads and rails, it would improve access by the nation's power infrastructure to renewable energy sources, cap millions of abandoned oil and gas wells spewing greenhouse gases, and harden structures against climate change. It also offers tax credits for the purchase of electric vehicles and funds the construction of charging stations. (The nation's largest source of climate pollution are gas-powered vehicles.) Senate approval could come very soon. Much more is needed if the nation is going to reach Biden's necessary goal of cutting U.S. climate pollution in half from 2005 levels by 2030. His ideas worth considering include a federal clean electricity standard for utilities, federal investments and tax credits to promote renewable energy, and tens of billions of dollars in clean energy research and development, including into ways of extracting greenhouse gases from the skies. Another idea worth considering is a fully refundable carbon tax. The vehicle for these additional proposals would be a second infrastructure bill. And if Republicans balk at the cost of such vital investment, Biden is rightly proposing to pass this package through a process known as budget reconciliation, which allows bills to clear the Senate with a simple majority vote. These are drastic legislative steps. But drastic times call for them. And when Biden attends a U.N. climate conference in November, he can use American progress on climate change as a mean of persuading others to follow our lead. Further delay is not an option.

#### If consequences are coherent, it O/W under their FW –

#### 1] specificity – all policies

#### 2] Objectivity – body count is the most objective way to calculate impacts because comparing suffering is unethical

#### 3] Forecloses future improvement – we can never improve society because our impact is irreversible

#### 4] Turns suffering – mass death causes suffering because people can’t get access to resources and basic necessities

#### 5] archair philosophy

#### 6] adaptability – shfitn legal

#### 7] consent

#### Infrastructure materially improves conditions for natives – laundry list.

Westney 8/2 [I do not endorse the problematic language – it should be unhiglighted anyway. Andrew Westney, 8-2-2021, "Infrastructure Bill Targets Tribes With Roads, Enviro Spending," No Publication, <https://www.law360.com/articles/1408969/infrastructure-bill-targets-tribes-with-roads-enviro-spending>] srey

The Bipartisan Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, which was released late Sunday, includes $550 billion in new spending on highways and railways, airports and ports, public transit, road safety, broadband, power grids and clean water infrastructure, among other areas.

The bill's provisions include spending almost $3 billion over the next five years through the Tribal Transportation Program, specifying funds for high priority infrastructure projects, and directing $100 million toward fixing bridges in Indian Country as part of an overall $351 billion surface transportation program.

The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services' Indian Health Service will receive $3.5 billion over five years to pay for "domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians," such as smaller sewer projects and septic tanks. The legislation would put aside up to $105 million of the funding for IHS to operate the program, with that money not accessible to tribes applying for funds.

The legislation also includes $270 million over five years for road maintenance under the authority of the Bureau of Indian Affairs and would create a new Office of Tribal Government Affairs at the U.S. Department of Transportation, led by an assistant secretary named by the president, to develop policies and rules to help tribes take better advantage of transportation self-governance programs.

## 5

#### Role of the ballot is to determine whether the resolution is a true or false statement –

#### Reject their framing on inclusion – a) other ROBs open the door for personal lives of debaters to factor into decisions and compare who is more oppressed which causes violence in a space where some people go to escape. b) Anything can function under truth testing insofar as it proves the resolution either true or false. Specific role of the ballots exclude all offense besides those that follow from their framework which shuts out people without the technical skill or resources to prep for it.

#### The ballot asks you to either vote aff or neg based on the given resolution a) Five dictionaries[[1]](#footnote-1) define to negate as to deny the truth of and affirm[[2]](#footnote-2) as to prove true which means its intrinsic to the nature of the activity b) the purpose of debate is the acquisition of knowledge in pursuit of truth – a resolutional focus is key to depth of exploration which o/w on specificity. It’s a jurisdictional issue since it questions whether the judge should go outside the scope of the game. I denied the truth of the resolution because I don’t think it’s true which means I’ve met my burden.

#### Nothing leaves this round other than the result on the ballot which means even if there is a higher purpose, it doesn’t change anything, and you should just write whatever is important on the ballot and vote for me. Answering this triggers constitutivism since the win is necessary for your scholarship which means rules inside of the game matter otherwise negate on presumption.

#### Negate –

#### 1] member[[3]](#footnote-3) is “a part or organ of the body, especially a limb” but an organ can’t have obligations

#### 2] of[[4]](#footnote-4) is to “expressing an age” but the rez doesn’t delineate a length of time

#### 3] the[[5]](#footnote-5) is “denoting a disease or affliction” but the WTO isn’t a disease

#### 4] to[[6]](#footnote-6) is to “expressing motion in the direction of (a particular location)” but the rez doesn’t have a location

#### 5] reduce[[7]](#footnote-7) is to “(of a person) lose weight, typically by dieting” but IP doesn’t have a body to lose weight.

#### 6] for[[8]](#footnote-8) is “in place of” but medicines aren’t replacing IP.

#### 7] medicine[[9]](#footnote-9) is “(especially among some North American Indian peoples) a spell, charm, or fetish believed to have healing, protective, or other power” but you can’t have IP for a spell.

# AC

### ROB

#### 1] debate has no impact on subjectivity

#### a] Systems- the 1AC says institutions create social realities that replicate violence but in-round discourse does nothing to alter conditions.

#### b] Spillover- they are missing an internal link as to why they need the ballot or why the reading of the aff forwards change. Empirically denied – judges vote on setcol all the time and nothing happens.

#### c] Competition- debate is the wrong forum for change and competition moots any ethical value of the aff. Winning rounds just makes it seem like you want to win and a loss is internalized as a technical mistake.

#### 2] commodification da

#### 3)Pluralism DA-

#### 4)Materialism DA-

#### 5) doesn’t spec – a] engagibility b] exportabiltiy

#### Reject pre-fiat offense

#### 1[] resolvalbity

#### 2] psychic violence

#### 3] clash

#### 4] time skew

#### They said its consequentialist – that fails

#### a) induction circular

#### b) Black Swan Paradox-

#### c) Prediction Paradox-

#### d) Action Theory-

### the extinction link

#### Our Extinction Narratives aren’t white-washed – ignorance of deaths is a form of geographic privilege since it assumes racial neutrality , 2] The neg is not white vulnerability – it is against Settler Desires since it dismantles systems of exploitation that cause environmental destruction 3] Relies on Psychoanalysis since they need to win settlers have a libidinal investment into those narratives – reject it – not justified in the 1AC and 1AR is too late – non-falsifiable and impossible to verify reasoning for every person since they all have different drives and desires

## Offense

#### Naturally occruign processes cant be patented

Bouhassira 15 [Note – the OCR didn’t work for some of the letters. Eric E. Bouhassira (Ingeborg and Ira Leon Rennert Professor of Stem Cell Biology and Regenerative Medicine @ Albert Einstein College of Medicine). “Gene Patents” in The SAGE Encyclopedia of Stem Cell Research. 2015. <https://books.google.com/books?id=LoiECgAAQBAJ&pg=PA431&lpg=PA431&dq=The+result+of+these+debates+may+ultimately+influence+the+biotech+industry,+because+many+drugs+developed+by+biotechnology+companies+start+out+as+naturally&source=bl&ots=MOZsD9QBHn&sig=ACfU3U1JiUsrZnGNUwJI28kWBA1lEN_mzw&hl=en&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi3tMb--dzyAhWHAZ0JHapwA00Q6AF6BAgyEAM#v=onepage&q&f=false> //Xu]

The landmark unanimous U.S. Supreme Court ruling of 2013 stated that naturally occurring genes are no longer patentable. The case was brought by the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and the Public Patent Foundation against Myriad Genetics. The company used a breast and ovarian cancer test that detects mutations in the genes BRCA1 and BRCA2. The court found that these genes are extracted from human bodies and therefore are not patentable. Proponents of gene patents, on the other hand, argued that once a gene is extracted from the body and manipulated, it quali?es as a composition of matter, which can be patented legally. The Supreme Court rul- ing applies to hundreds of other patented genes linked to a wide variety of diseases, such as can- cer, muscular dystrophy, Alzheimer’s, and many others. The ruling applies not only to patents on human genes but also to patents on microbial, plant, and animal genes. Arti?cial or synthetic DNA, however, can still be patented. The creation of an arti?cial form of DNA can be patented, even though its creation still involves genes; that is, although organiza- tions cannot patent genes with the same sequences found in nature, they may patent edited forms of genes, also known as complementary DNA, or CDNA. Unlike naturally occurring DNA, comple- mentary DNA is synthetic and cannot be used for diagnostic tests. It is used, however, to produce protein-based drugs.

#### Legality DB

#### Corners corporations – other methods

#### No ip means anyone can take – that includes corporations

#### Bioprospecting is still bad – that was the last 1ac it says that it should be transferred for policy outcomes but what does that mean

#### Legal teams means that they can claim to be indegenou s- they have huge legal teams

#### Legal terms claim that its original cuz they patent the specific medin not the biological process

#### Agriculture is a solvency deficit – the aff only applies to medicine – it still allows corporations to biopirate – the solvency advocate should clue you in.

Silva 20 [Daniella Silva (reporter for NBC News focusing on the economic recovery and its effect on families, as well as immigration). “Biopiracy: the largely lawless plundering of Earth’s genetic wealth”. Landscape News. 15 December 2020. <https://news.globallandscapesforum.org/48905/biopiracy-the-largely-lawless-plundering-of-earths-genetic-wealth/> //Xu+Elmer]

Commercialization of genetic resources is a booming business. From drugs and cosmetics to teas and genetically modified crops, plant and animal materials are ubiquitous in consumer markets. Many of these products are aggressively protected by patents that profess the products’ “novelty” and “innovativeness.” But these products are arguably neither new nor innovative, as their use of genetic resources has been developed based on existent traditional knowledge of the natural world, often held among Indigenous groups and rural farmers. Yet, these traditional knowledge holders are rarely compensated for their role in producing and safeguarding the biodiversity from which the patent-holders profit. This phenomenon is known as biopiracy. The term biopiracy was coined in the early 1990s by Pat Mooney, founder of ETC Group – an organization which works to protect the world’s most vulnerable people from socioeconomic and environmental impacts of new technologies – to describe the theft or misappropriation of genetic resources and traditional knowledge through the intellectual property system. It also encompasses unauthorized and uncompensated collection of genetic resources for commercial purposes. One of the most widely cited examples of biopiracy is that of U.S. multinational corporation W.R. Grace’s 1994 patent for a neem tree seed extract used in their antifungal spray, Neemex. Although the company claimed its patent was the product of a unique invention, neem extracts had been used by rural farmers in India for more than 2,000 years in insect repellants, soaps and contraceptives. After years of activists and farmers fighting the patent, it was overturned by the Environmental Protection Organization (EPO) in 2000 due to “lack of novelty and innovative step.” While the neem patent was overturned, it is often difficult to legislate against biopiracy as the term has no single legal definition, and regulations around it differ by region. This ambiguity leaves plenty of room for countless cases of companies patenting everything from gene sequences to crop varieties to human cell lines without fairly compensating the countries and communities of origin. It’s not that the intellectual property system is invalid, notes Susan Bragdon, director of Seeds For All and policy advisor at Oxfam Novib. But when it comes to traditional knowledge holders and Indigenous rights, “the patent and intellectual property system wasn’t designed to provide benefits to communities,” she says. Critics of the current patent system, including Mooney, believe that current intellectual property regimes threaten Indigenous rights, favor monopolies over biodiversity and increase social inequities because they allow powerful people and groups to own the most basic building blocks of life. The specter of colonialism Biopiracy is historically rooted in colonialism. Top commodities like sugar, pepper, quinine and coffee were all taken from formerly colonized countries via Western trading companies that plundered local ecologies for profit. Today, environmental activists like the prolific Indian author and researcher Vandana Shiva have argued that patenting genetic material or other components of living organisms is comparable to “the second coming of Columbus” because of how it has reinforced colonial power dynamics between the Global North and South. “90 percent of genetic resources are in the South and 90 percent of patents are in the North,” noted Green Member of European Parliament Sandrine Bélier in an interview with EurActive. Another parallel Shiva draws between biopiracy and colonialism is in the way that pirated seed resources are used to create forced crop monopolies. In her book, “Biopiracy: the plunder of nature and knowledge,” Shiva cites how Monsanto took steps to flood the Indian marketplace with patented cotton seeds in the early 2000s, which resulted in a cotton monopoly that sent many farmers into debt because of the steep price increases and royalties Monsanto charged for their special seeds. Such categorical rules over a market also prevent local farmers from saving and sharing seeds to propagate diverse crops that are well adapted to microclimates and specific conditions, as they have often done for centuries. “There is a fundamental clash between the idea of (Western) technological progress and the idea that no one group or individual has a ‘right’ to monopolize genetic resources,” says Manuel Ruiz Muller, director and principal researcher of the Peruvian Society for Environmental Law (SPDA). “Cultural and human rights often collide with economic rights and intellectual rights.” Toward fair access and benefit sharing The key question is: how can humans share in the use of the Earth’s genetic resources while protecting the rights of smaller actors like developing governments, local communities and Indigenous people? While there are many pieces of legislation dealing with biopiracy and intellectual property rights, the U.N. Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Nagoya Protocol on access and benefit sharing have been especially influential. The Nagoya Protocol is an international legal framework under the CBD that aims for fair benefit sharing of profits associated with use of genetic resources. It obliges governments and the private sector to establish transparent, mutually agreed-upon terms for how benefits from the use of genetic resources will be shared. But the current framework is riddled with pitfalls. In 25 years, few access and benefits contracts – which legally dictate fair and equitable sharing of benefits from genetic resources – have come about as a result of the Nagoya Protocol, and those that have often result in trivial profits flowing back to traditional knowledge holders, according to an article from Intellectual Property Watch. Access and benefits contracts for genetic materials do not always result in a direct commercial application, and even when they do, the percentage of benefits that flow back to communities can be as low as 0.1 percent of total corporate profits, according to an article from Trade for Development News. “You’ve noticed the piles of money pouring into the coffers of Indigenous peoples and peasants around the world because of access and benefits agreements, right?” Mooney asks with sarcasm. “Of course not. It’s virtually nothing.” Some experts including professor of international governance at the University of Leeds, Graham Dutfield, argue that ending biopiracy would require ceding political space to Indigenous and marginalized groups so that they are on more equal footing to negotiate benefit sharing. But even when political goodwill is present, there are many practical barriers to successful access and benefits regimes. It is possible to have multiple traditional knowledge holders across different countries for the same herbal medicine, for example. In such situations, it is not clear with whom pharmaceutical companies hoping to develop a drug should negotiate benefits or how those benefits will be shared with diverse cultural groups. “I think access and benefit sharing hasn’t proven to be a good mechanism to reward and incentivize communities that are shepherding and managing biodiversity,” says Bragdon. “There haven’t been sufficient benefits to halt the erosion of biodiversity. I think it’s been highly problematic.” Digital Dilemma Additionally, access and benefits agreements often interpret genetic resources as physical matter, which ignores the modern reality of digital DNA and cloud storage. Researchers can freely access many gene banks without agreeing to disclose potential commercial applications or share benefits resulting from their work. “The issue [with biopiracy] today is that companies and private actors can take out patents on digital sequences of DNA – it’s not just about the physical seeds,” says Mooney. “We see companies sucking up all the genetic information they can and storing it on their proprietary clouds.” There are talks of including digital sequencing information (DSI) – disembodied pieces of genetic code – in the CBD, meaning researchers and companies would have to pay to use and copy gene bank information. But the move has been met with resistance. A 2018 article in Science magazine argues that including DSI in an international agreement against biopiracy could “stifle research, hamper the fight against disease outbreaks, and even jeopardize food safety.” Both Mooney and Ruiz Muller are skeptical of these claims. “The critique is misplaced and has to be nuanced substantially,” says Ruiz Muller. The current CBD and Nagoya Protocol have a transactional approach to access and benefit sharing in which two parties negotiate a contract for the use of a particular genetic resource. Under such a system, he argues that including “natural information” – a better term for DSI – in a new framework could negatively impact research; it could lead to countries racing to claim sole jurisdiction over certain pieces of widespread genetic resources and actively competing against one another for contracts.

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

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

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

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

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

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

1. <http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/negate>, <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.thefreedictionary.com/negate>, <http://www.vocabulary.com/dictionary/negate>, <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/negate> [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. *Dictionary.com – maintain as true, Merriam Webster – to say that something is true, Vocabulary.com – to affirm something is to confirm that it is true, Oxford dictionaries – accept the validity of, Thefreedictionary – assert to be true* [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
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