#### IPR favors corporations who homogenize agricultural lands in developing countries which tanks biodiversity.

PAMUN ’21 [“Pamun XVII Research Report-question of intellectual property and biodiversity”, <http://asp-edu.net/pamun/pamun2013/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/OK_EDITED_-UNCTAD-biodiversity-and-IP-1.pdf?fbclid=IwAR3_dQdDKRb9SrA8P8eRAEl85COpgb9v0N4UFkGO3ccgQ9c39GD_q7Dfqdg>, AK]

The TRIPS agreement is intended to provide private IPRs on any products, be they biogenetic resources or not, in order to ensure that trade goes smoothly and corporate interests are protected internationally. In the process, the agreement provides exclusive control of plant varieties to corporations and individuals that they have patented. The privatization of IPRs as a result of the TRIPS agreement has caused commercial and industrial interests to control the resources of developing countries that are rich in biodiversity, leading to biological uniformity and in turn biodiversity loss (explained below). Besides, these private commercial interests are encroaching upon common indigenous and local community knowledge, which is another negative impact of the TRIPS agreement. The present IPR legislation causes biological uniformity because of growing private commercial interests, which directly causes biodiversity loss. Countries that extend IPRs to plant varieties will be establishing an IPR system where few corporations and individuals prohibit others from making or using the protected variety or any product containing protected genetic information, and push its production for profits. Farmers will be faced with production restrictions, while scientists will be faced with research restrictions. All in all, the present IPR legislation not only discourages the growth of new and different plant varieties, but it also restricts researchers from freely using the genetic information for research into diseases or for making new and more effective plant varieties. Hence, this reduces the availability of biodiversity and leads to the homogenization of agricultural production and plant use systems. For example, Monsanto, an agrochemical and agricultural biotechnology corporation that is facing a surge of lawsuits, is also accused of biological uniformity. It owns such a large portion of the world's cotton seed supply that cotton farmers are not given access to non-GM cotton seeds. These farmers are also not allowed to save, reuse, or even study the seeds due to biotech IPR laws, greatly hindering natural diversity. During the last few years, biodiversity has been lost at an unprecedented rate throughout the world in every ecosystem. According to the FAO, about 75% of the genetic diversity found in agricultural crops has been lost over the last century, and this phenomenon continues. It is imperative that we conserve agricultural biodiversity: higher biodiversity of agricultural crops helps increase yield stability and soil fertility and gives species the ability to adapt to changing conditions. High agricultural biodiversity also helps protect our health by ensuring sustainable production in medicinal plant use systems. Agricultural biodiversity loss and the present IPR legislation are inextricably tied. IPRs continue to homogenise agricultural production and medicinal plant use systems and could reduce crop variety development. Our health and our environment is negatively affected, and it is of utmost importance to conserve our agricultural biodiversity.

#### Local farmers are outcompeted—local agriculture and the knowledge to maintain it is dying out which exacerbates bio loss.

Goodman ’09 [Seeds of hunger: intellectual property rights on seeds and the human rights response; May 20009, <https://www.ideaspaz.org/tools/download/47066>, AK]

IPRs are only granted to genetically uniform seeds and so promote the cultivation of monocultures. By rewarding standardization and homogeneity, the IP system erodes biodiversity. If the agricultural sector of a given country is increasingly dominated by large monoculture farms, smaller farmers may no longer be able to earn enough to survive because of their inability to compete. This in turn fuels the downward cycle of biodiversity loss as the conservation and development of locally adapted seeds and plants, as well as the knowledge required to maintain them, is not renewed. Planting monocultures is the leading cause of the depletion of local plant varieties and renders production more vulnerable: thousands of acres planted with identical seed can be lost to a single disease or pest. Catastrophes which illustrate the dangers of genetic uniformity have already occurred, including the US corn leaf blight of the 1970s, which decimated about 15 percent of the US maize crop and caused an estimated US$2 billion in losses.30 Through accelerating contamination of the environment, most monocultures are dependent on chemical herbicides and pesticides because they lack the genetic variety that protects crops. Planting monocultures often results in massive increases of agro-chemical use. This is especially true of GM monocultures, over 80 percent of which have been modified to withstand specific types of herbicide that kill most other plants in the field.31 The herbicides are developed by the same companies that produce GM-seed and are sold as a package. Arguably, it is precisely to augment herbicide use (and thus their profit margins), that biotechnology companies promote the use of their herbicide-resistant seeds. The toxins contained in these chemicals have harmful effects for the farmers that use them and can contaminate the air, rivers and other water sources far beyond the farm.32 In addition, intensive, pesticide-based agricultural methods tend to deplete the long-term productive capacity of land and thus endanger the right to food of future generations. As noted in Text Box 4 on page 12, the realization of the right to food also requires food to be free from adverse substances.

#### 2) Indigenous groups’ biological resources are patented which causes cultural erasure

McGonigle ’16 [Patenting nature or protecting culture? Ethnopharmacology and indigenous intellectual property rights, *Journal of Law and the Biosciences*, Volume 3, Issue 1, April 2016, Pages 217–226, <https://academic.oup.com/jlb/article/3/1/217/1751287>, AK]

According to the World Health Organization's estimate, approximately 85 per cent of the people on the planet still depend on plants for their primary health care.[33](javascript:;) Moreover, the traditional medicine industry that markets natural products and over-the-counter herbal remedies in developed countries is an attractive market sector for pharmaceutical companies and savvy entrepreneurs. It is now estimated to be worth over $60 billion.[34](javascript:;) But international law provides poor resources for the protection of claims to the exclusivity of indigenous TEK and ethnomedical knowledge. Most of the current international law affecting indigenous knowledge and intellectual property was produced as a consequence of the CBD, which was enacted following the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit in 1992, and has since been signed by almost 200 countries—though not the USA—making it one of the world's most subscribed to international treaties in history.[35](javascript:;) The three core goals of the convention were the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of resources, and fair and equitable sharing of benefits. The main outcome of this agreement has been the regulation of ‘genetic resources’[36](javascript:;) and the establishment of benefit-sharing provisions across the globe. Since the CBD was promulgated, a further host of trade-related IPR agreements (TRIPs) were signed.[37](javascript:;) The TRIPs agreements, initially negotiated at the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade in 1994, were conceived as an expansion of the CBD, clarifying the minimum standards for regulating IPR for World Trade Organization (WTO) member states.[38](javascript:;)For ethnopharmacology researchers, the overall consequences of these treaties are the nationalization of TEK and a country-by-country regulation of the flow of traditional knowledge—including genetic resources such as bioactive plants and their extracts—out of countries in the global South.[39](javascript:;) However, current international IPR law allows researchers and companies to claim IPR, such as patents, over biological resources, and/or traditional knowledge even if they have been only ‘slightly modified’ from their initial forms.[40](javascript:;) Furthermore, ‘TRIPs treats the genetic components of organisms, as well as genetically altered varieties of living organisms, as ordinary commodities subject to private ownership and standardized rules of transnational commerce’.[41](javascript:;) Most salient is the fact that pursuant to the CBD, so-called genetic resources are ‘nationalized’, and inscribed as the sovereign property of states, so individual countries retain legal and territorial control over biological resources and indigenous knowledge located within their borders.[42](javascript:;) For many of the traditional societies of the global South, however, this legal claim may be considered to be enacting ‘econocolonialism’, a position at odds with local ideas of ‘nature’, specific local ‘ontologies’, or many indigenous peoples’ belief that plants are ‘imbued with the power of God’, or local spirits.[43](javascript:;) As such, indigenous people may believe these entities to be beyond the territory of the state and not for sale on the global market.[44](javascript:;) In the 1990s, activists responded to the work of corporations negotiating trade contracts for access to the biological resources of developing countries using the term ‘bio-piracy’ to describe the illegitimately deemed, and sometimes illegal, resource extraction that such companies engaged in.[45](javascript:;) Since the 1990s, commercial drug development from natural products has subsided significantly. Today most ethnopharmacology research is conducted within academic institutions.[46](javascript:;) For practicing ethnopharmacologists, sufficient modifications of a plant substance or traditional therapy for legal proprietorship are rather simple. This may be as little as an alteration to the chemical structure of the active compound of a medicine, a small inventive step, or the use of a semi-synthetic chemical analog, a slightly modified version of the original compound.[47](javascript:;) Perhaps, the most notable example of this kind of proprietorial move occurred in the case of the indigenous peasant farmers of rural Mexico (Oaxaca), who cultivated barbasco yams and sold them for use in the burgeoning Mexican pharmaceutical industry.[48](javascript:;) The barbasco yam (Dioscorea mexicana), also simply called the Mexican yam, produces the steroid compound diosgenin, which is a precursor for the synthesis of the female sex hormone, progesterone. These yams were instrumental in the development of the female contraceptive pill during the 1970s and 1980s. Peasants’ expert ecological know-how became publicly recognized through their central role in the bioscience development of Mexico, but in the 1990s, developments in synthetic chemistry made the wild yams redundant as a source, cutting out the peasants from the commercial networks and eliminating their role in the industry altogether.[49](javascript:;) In this case, the drug product that the indigenous peasant farmers helped to produce ultimately led to their exclusion from downstream benefits. Rather than affording protection to indigenous knowledge and contribution, the law allows companies to cut off any rights of the bearers of the indigenous knowledge that initially made the development possible. The current international regime favors the interests of commercial parties that can develop a synthetic alternative.

#### Patents are incompatible with indigenous knowledge

Goodman ’09 [Seeds of hunger: intellectual property rights on seeds and the human rights response; May 20009, <https://www.ideaspaz.org/tools/download/47066>, AK]

Permitting IPRs on genetic resources encourages biopiracy. Indigenous knowledge of the potential uses of a particular plant or genetic resource is invaluable to bioprospectors seeking to develop, for example, new medicines or drought-resistant crops. However, neither patents nor PBRs oblige the right-holder to recognize or remunerate the source of the knowledge or resources. If an indigenous group did want to use IPRs to protect its knowledge from biopiracy, it might not succeed. To obtain a patent, the claimant must show that there is an identifiable inventor. This almost immediately dismisses the knowledge systems and innovations of indigenous peoples as well as those of farmers because they innovate communally, over long periods of time. PBRs require that plant varieties be distinct, “clearly distinguishable from any other variety whose existence is a matter of common knowledge.”35 Again, this disqualifies communally developed varieties.

#### Indigenous sovereignty is k2 preserving biodiversity

[Swiderska](https://theconversation.com/profiles/krystyna-swiderska-835004) ’20 [PhD Candidate in Biocultural Heritage, Coventry University, “Protecting indigenous cultures is crucial for saving the world’s biodiversity”, February 14, 2020, <https://theconversation.com/protecting-indigenous-cultures-is-crucial-for-saving-the-worlds-biodiversity-123716>, AK]

Species are being lost at about [a thousand times](https://conbio.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1111/cobi.12380?referrer_access_token=mT385M6z9KzlDHVXbDNU_4ta6bR2k8jH0KrdpFOxC64oBmIveKeKByr-DrQymuL0ZBZ4T8iEBY7-1Np7yuAtoYR1HaSiLs6fafd9ZzlEDanC2n70sx9-w3v8Xd7VMaxQauYrBrc6k71oYBSMleJTwA%3D%3D) the natural rate of extinction. This is faster than at any other period in human history. Ecosystems — the vital systems on which all life depends — are being degraded across the globe. This crisis of biodiversity loss is finally getting some attention. But its connection to another loss – that of indigenous cultures – is rarely mentioned. From animals to insects and plants, biodiversity loss cannot be effectively addressed without tackling the rapid disappearance of indigenous cultures. The two are inextricably linked. Indigenous peoples have conserved biodiversity for millennia. They have created much of the world’s agricultural biodiversity, including thousands of crop varieties, livestock breeds and unique landscapes. These practices continue today in many of their territories, creating new varieties of crops and livestock that are often more resilient than modern equivalents. So it is unsurprising that the rich diversity of nature is declining [less rapidly](https://ipbes.net/sites/default/files/inline/files/ipbes_global_assessment_report_summary_for_policymakers.pdf) on indigenous peoples’ lands than in other areas. This clearly shows that the world’s [370 million to 500 million](https://en.unesco.org/indigenous-peoples) indigenous people play a critical role in conserving biodiversity. This is backed up by extensive research. According to [several studies](https://www.umanitoba.ca/institutes/natural_resources/canadaresearchchair/EA2000.pdf), traditional ecological knowledge is effective in conserving biodiversity and regulating sustainable resource use, including hunting, wild harvesting, fishing, farming and pastoralism, a form of animal husbandry. Living in harmony with nature is a fundamental part of indigenous peoples’ core values and beliefs. Similar ecological values and worldviews can be seen across indigenous cultures, from southern China to the Americas. Among [Andean peoples](https://pubs.iied.org/14670IIED/), for example, the world is divided into three parts: the human and domesticated; the wild (species, ecosystems, water); and the sacred and ancestral. Rather than focusing on economic development, their goal is holistic wellbeing, which is achieved through balance between these three worlds. Yet across the world, indigenous cultures and practices are being eroded by modernisation, commercial development pressures, lack of secure rights to land and resources, migration and lack of cultural education. As a result, many are struggling to save their unique cultures, knowledge systems and identities from extinction. This is despite [growing recognition](https://www.unenvironment.org/news-and-stories/story/indigenous-rights-solution) that they hold the key to solving many of today’s environmental problems. [Up to 80%](https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBIODIVERSITY/Resources/RoleofIndigenousPeoplesinBiodiversityConservation.pdf) of biodiversity is located on indigenous peoples’ lands, while at least [a quarter](https://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTBIODIVERSITY/Resources/RoleofIndigenousPeoplesinBiodiversityConservation.pdf) of all land is traditionally owned or managed by indigenous peoples. Evidently, these cultures need to be protected. This should be part and parcel of broader tactics to conserve biodiversity. New biodiversity targets, for example, must protect indigenous cultures.

#### Globalization and urbanization amplifies impacts – we are in closer contact to diseases

Schelske ’20 [“Why managing biodiversity risk is critical for the global economy”; Natural Assets & ESG Research Lead, Swiss Re Institute & **Bernd Wilke**, Senior Risk Manager; September 23 2020; <https://www.swissre.com/risk-knowledge/mitigating-climate-risk/managing-biodiversity-risk-is-critical-for-global-economy.html>, AK]

Biodiversity and ecosystem strength are particularly poignant in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. In fact, coronavirus could be a sentinel. All over the world, humans and animals are coming into closer contact than ever before. One of the largest potential reservoirs of future zoonotic diseases is in the rainforests of our world. And with deforestation we are making swift inroads into habitats. New roads are bringing greater connectivity to areas previously cut off. In the past, if a new disease was encountered somewhere remote it might have been days before an infected person reached the next tribe. Human expansion into wildlife areas, soaring globalisation and urbanisation, and risky nutrition patterns altogether have led to high-speed routes for future pandemics directly into our major cities. Conversely, making smart use of nature could help increase our resilience during future epidemic or pandemics. Schelske notes, "Sustainable exploration of nature can help us detect new medicine for current or future diseases. We have also seen that proximity and access to green areas in urban neighbourhoods has proven extremely important for mental health during the current pandemic." Like nothing else, the COVID-19 pandemic has created a sense of urgency around maintaining the healthy balance between humans and nature. As we all become increasingly aware of environmental changes, we will have a better foundation of understanding the costs of disrupting this delicate balance and putting a price on this in the future. Acting on this information is key to building a more sustainable and resilient future that benefits everyone.

#### Biodiversity loss accelerates extinction cascades

#### Vandette ’18 [Biodiversity loss can cause snowball extinction effect, <https://www.earth.com/news/biodiversity-loss-extinction-effect/>, 2-9-18, AK]

Biodiversity loss can cause a snowball effect where the extinction of one species leads to the extinction of others. This effect is known as an extinction cascade because one extinction can cause more due to the gap in the ecosystem. Now, new research has found that extinction cascades have a higher likelihood of happening in areas where the loss of a species can’t be substituted by any others at the same level of the food chain. In other words, no other species can fill the empty slot. Researchers from the [University of Exeter](https://www.exeter.ac.uk/) conducted the study, and their findings show that even if one species loss doesn’t snowball into a cascade effect, the loss of biodiversity creates a higher risk of extinctions. “Interactions between species are important for ecosystem (a community of interacting species) stability,” said Dirk Sanders, an author of the study. “And because species are interconnected through multiple interactions, an impact on one species can affect others as well.” This new study shows that loss of one species through human activities isn’t the only concern, but that one species loss could lead to more. The researchers wanted to see if more complex food webs provided a buffer against extinction cascades. “It has been predicted that more complex food webs will be less vulnerable to extinction cascades because there is a greater chance that other species can step in and buffer against the effects of species loss,” said Sanders. “In our experiment, we used communities of plants and insects to test this prediction.” For the study, the researchers removed a species of wasp from their plant and insect ecosystem. The loss of the wasps led to other species’ loss. The results showed that smaller webs were more acutely affected compared to complex food webs. “Our results demonstrate that biodiversity loss can increase the vulnerability of ecosystems to secondary extinctions which, when they occur, can then lead to further simplification causing run-away extinction cascades,” said Sanders. It’s a dangerous snowball effect that could wreak havoc on crucial ecosystems. This study shows the necessity of preserving biodiversity and trying to reduce the instances of species loss during a time when extinction is peaking higher than ever.

#### Bio loss is linear

Elrich ’88 [Professor of Biological Sciences, Stanford University, Stanford, California, The Loss of Diversity Causes and Consequences, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK219310/>, AK]

In most cases, numerous genetically diverse populations are necessary to ensure the persistence of a species in the face of inevitable environmental changes that occur naturally. The existence of many populations spreads the risk so that unfavorable conditions in one or a few habitats do not threaten the entire species. And the presence of abundant genetic variation within a species (virtually assured if its populations are living in different geographic areas) increases its potential for successfully evolving in response to long-term environmental changes. Today, this genetic diversity within species is declining precipitously over much of Earth's land surface—an unheralded loss of one of humanity's most vital resources. That resource is largely irreplaceable. Along with fossil fuels, rich soils, ancient groundwater, and mineral deposits, genetic diversity is part of the inheritance of capital that *Homo sapiens*is rapidly squandering. What then will happen if the current decimation of organic diversity continues? Crop yields will be more difficult to maintain in the face of climatic change, soil erosion, loss of dependable water supplies, decline of pollinators, and ever more serious assaults by pests. Conversion of productive land to wasteland will accelerate; deserts will continue their seemingly inexorable expansion. Air pollution will increase, and local climates will become harsher. Humanity will have to forego many of the direct economic benefits it might have withdrawn from Earth's once well-stocked genetic library. It might, for example, miss out on a cure for cancer; but that will make little difference. As ecosystem services falter, mortality from respiratory and epidemic disease, natural disasters, and especially famine will lower life expectancies to the point where cancer (largely a disease of the elderly) will be unimportant. Humanity will bring upon itself consequences depressingly similar to those expected from a nuclear winter (Ehrlich, 1984). Barring a nuclear conflict, it appears that civilization will disappear some time before the end of the next century—not with a bang but a whimper.

The Aff is a mode of decolonization

McKittrick 15 **(**Katherine KcKittrick, Queen’s University, “Sylvia Wynter: On Being Human as Praxis”, <https://books.google.com/books/about/Sylvia_Wynter.html?id=Dj1zBgAAQBAJ&printsec=frontcover&source=kp_read_button#v=onepage&q&f=false>, 2015)

Following in the steps of Frantz Fanon, Humberto Maturana, and Francisco Varela, Sylvia Wynter’s works have been pursuing a cognitive shift that in this essay I characterize as decolonial. Why decolonial? Why not postmodern or postcolonial? Wynter’s work has consistently called into question whether the “post”—in poststructural, postmodernity, postcolonial—is a useful conceptual frame, thus putting it aside in order to understand, instead, how particular epistemologies are unthinkable and/or unarticulated within hegemonic Western categories of knowledge and philosophy of knowing. Wynter is a radical thinker. She powerfully explores the roots of Western and colonial knowledge systems and uncovers the otherwise veiled link between racial, gendered, and sexual belonging, differential ways of knowing and imagining the world, and the overarching governing codes that have created, maintained, and normalized practices of exclusion. She is not looking to change or supersede epistemic categories and established knowledge, but rather seeks to undo the systems through which knowledge and knowing are constituted. At the same time, Wynter is not proposing to contribute to and comfortably participate in a system of knowledge that left her out of humanity (as a black / C aribbean woman), but rather delink herself from this very system of knowledge in order to engage in epistemic disobedience. Under the rules of the epistemic canon, and according to its racial mandates, if you have been classified in / as difference, then you are required to submit and assimilate to the canon or remain outside. Wynter does not follow either of these pathways. She instead engages what I call the decolonial option, a practice of rethinking and unraveling dominant worldviews that have been opened up by Indigenous and black and Caribbean thinkers since the sixteenth century in América (with accent) and the Caribbean. The decolonial option does not simply protest the contents of imperial coloniality; it demands a delinking of oneself from the knowledge systems we take for granted (and can profit from) and practicing epistemic disobedience. Wynter’s decolonial project calls into question the concept of the Human and its epistemological underpinnings.1 Her work draws on the research of Chilean scientist, philosopher, and intellectual Humberto Maturana (in collaboration in an early stage with Francisco Varela) and black and Caribbean intellectuals and social theorists. Wynter draws on Maturana’s insights, in particular his work on autopoiesis, which uncovers the interconnectedness of “seeing” the world and “knowing” the world: specifically, he shows that what is seen with the eyes does not represent the world outside the living organism; rather, it is the living organism that fabricates an image of the world through the internal / neurological processing of information. Thus, Maturana made the connection between the ways in which human beings construct their world and their criteria of truth and objectivity and noticed how their / our nervous system processes and responds to information. It is across both neurobiological cognition and decolonial practices that Sylvia Wynter’s work and her intellectual disobedience emerge. Wynter suggests that if we accept that epistemology gives us the principles and rules of knowing through which the Human and Humanity are understood, we are trapped in a knowledge system that fails to notice that the stories of what it means to be Human—specifically origin stories that explain who / w hat we are—are, in fact, narratively constructed. Wynter’s commentaries on Man1, Man2, and the making of the Human should thus be understood alongside historical and epistemological epochs (medieval, classical) that present humanness through intelligible cosmogonies that, as Denise da Silva argues in this collection, require a juridical- economic colonial presence. To study “Man” or “Humanity” is therefore to study a narrativization that has been produced with the very instruments (or categories) that we study with. In short, it is precisely the practice of accepting the principles and rules of knowing that produces narratives that naturalize, for example, evolution and dysselection and thus biocentric Human origin stories. It follows that we fail to notice that evolution, dysselection, and biocentricity are origin stories with an ontological effect. Put simply: we tend to believe our cosmogonies as natural truth(s); this belief system is calcified by our commitment to this belief system; the schema self-replicates, as we continually invest in its systemic belief qualities. In this way, Wynter’s writings on the Human and who/what we are are reflective of Maturana’s autopoietics. Wynter refuses to embrace the entity of the Human independently of the epistemic categories and concepts that created it by suggesting instead that our conceptualizations of the Human are produced within an autopoietic system. The problem of the Human is thus not identity- based per se but in the enunciations of what it means to be Human—enunciations that are concocted and circulated by those who most convincingly (and powerfully) imagine the “right” or “noble” or “moral” characteristics of Human and in this project their own image-experience of the Human into the sphere of Universal Humanness. The Human is therefore the product of a particular epistemology, yet it appears to be (and is accepted as) a naturally independent entity existing in the world. Implicit in this epistemological framework are the worldviews of those who have been cast as non- Human or less-than- Human: Frantz Fanon’s les damnés, imperial constructs who can only be understood as the difference outside. Les damnés are the anthropos in relation to humanitas as humanitas is defined by those who conceive of themselves as Human. Here, clearly, imperial epistemologies emerge alongside the widespread coloniality of knowledge: Christian theology, secular philosophy, and sciences that were formed and shaped under European geographic monarchies and n ation-s tates (which also provided the unification of Western knowledge systems in six modern / i mperial languages grounded in Greek and Latin). This is the belief system that Wynter’s work unveils: the naturalization of and thus a steadfast belief in modes of thinking—the principles and rules of knowing—that calcify a commitment to an epistemological tract that profits from replicating itself. By unveiling this system, she draws attention to the conditions through which the epistemologies of les damnés are made. The epistemologies of les damnés do not seek to arrive at a perfect or true definition of the Human, for there is no Human “out there” beyond the Western imperial concept of Man/Human from the Renaissance on. Sylvia Wynter’s decolonial project understands that the European Renaissance stamped a concept of Man that brought together the colonization of time, the colonization of space, and the perfection of geometric forms that have been immortalized in the famous Vitruvian Man, drawn by Leonardo de Vinci circa 1487–1490. The correlations in this image between the Human body and the universe hide the fact that the body depicted and the experience upon which Leonardo was relying was a Greco- Roman concept of the human figure. The complicity between colonization of time (specifically detaching Man / Human from a Christian medieval idea of human dependency from God) and the colonization of space (specifically the emergence of “Indians” in the European consciousness coupled with the image of Africans, as descendants of Ham, already embedded in the consciousness of European Christians) prompted a system of categories to emerge: derived from Greek and Latin, this system disqualified Africans from Humanness (thus rendering them appropriate for enslavement) and excluded Indians from the proportions, rationality, and knowledge of God. Wynter’s writings demonstrate that Western epistemology built itself on a concept of Human and Humanity that, in turn, served to legitimate the epistemic foundation that created it. That is, Human and Humanity were created as the enunciated that projects and propels to universality the local image of the enunciator. The enunciator assumes, and thus postulates, that his concept of Human and Humanity is valid for every human being on the planet. However, once the universality of the Human has been postulated— and we encounter this formulation in many official documents telling us that humans are “all born equal”—hierarchies are needed and put into place to establish differences between all who were “born equal.” Indeed, after we are born, we inhabit a world made of inequality. The discourse that “we are all born equal” is inflected with practices of inequity that shape how we live in the world differentially. The mirage of totality—of epistemic totality that is laden with seeming egalitarian open-mindedness entrenched in our various birthrights—is the trap that Wynter has not only recognized but also struggled against. Columbus’s arrival in the Americas in 1492 and other voyages outside of Europe are landmarks of the moment in which the concepts of Man and of Human became one and the same and, at the same time, came to be understood in relation to race and racism. The epistemology from which Indians were observed and described was, of course, not the epistemology of the Indians. And, given that the arrival of Columbus and his contemporaries did not, in fact, correspond to the worldview of the Indians (and the rest of the non-E uropean world), New World subjects did not imagine that they were being classified by a structure of knowledge that will soon become both hegemonic and dominant. With this in mind, racism and epistemology become part of the package whose point of reference is Man- as- Human—a reference point that corresponds to Wynter’s project to move “beyond Man, toward the Human,” which can be found across her works. By uncoupling Man (the Vitruvian Man) as a model of Humanity, the point is not to find the true and objective definition of “what is Human,” but to show that such projects are filled with an imperial bend, a will to objectivity and truth—a truth that, as Maturana explains, bolsters the belief system that supports such an epistemology. The year 1492 is, for many, a turning point in the history of the world. Sylvia Wynter and many black intellectuals (such as C. L. R. James, George Lamming, Wilson Harris, Aimé Césaire, Frantz Fanon, and so forth) draw attention to the significance of plantations and palenques and kilombos, colonization, nationalism and independence, gender, and the state in relation to fifteenth-century global
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#### Also, the role of the ballot is to determine the best policy option. Scenario analysis is valuable – it enhances creativity, deconstructs epistemic biases, and teaches advocacy skills.

Barma et al ‘16 – [May 2016, [Advance Publication Online on 11/6/15], Naazneen Barma, PhD in Political Science from UC-Berkeley, Assistant Professor of National Security Affairs at the Naval Postgraduate School, Brent Durbin, PhD in Political Science from UC-Berkeley, Professor of Government at Smith College, Eric Lorber, JD from UPenn and PhD in Political Science from Duke, Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher, Rachel Whitlark, PhD in Political Science from GWU, Post-Doctoral Research Fellow with the Project on Managing the Atom and International Security Program within the Belfer Center for Science and International Affairs at Harvard, “‘Imagine a World in Which’: Using Scenarios in Political Science,” International Studies Perspectives 17 (2), pp. 1-19, <http://www.naazneenbarma.com/uploads/2/9/6/9/29695681/using_scenarios_in_political_science_isp_2015.pdf>]

What Are Scenarios and Why Use Them in Political Science? Scenario analysis is perceived most commonly as a technique for examining the robustness of strategy. It can immerse decision makers in future states that go beyond conventional extrapolations of current trends, preparing them to take advantage of unexpected opportunities and to protect themselves from adverse exogenous shocks. The global petroleum company Shell, a pioneer of the technique, characterizes scenario analysis as the art of considering “what if” questions about possible future worlds. Scenario analysis is thus typically seen as serving the purposes of corporate planning or as a policy tool to be used in combination with simulations of decision making. Yet scenario analysis is not inherently limited to these uses. This section provides a brief overview of the practice of scenario analysis and the motivations underpinning its uses. It then makes a case for the utility of the technique for political science scholarship and describes how the scenarios deployed at NEFPC were created. The Art of Scenario Analysis We characterize scenario analysis as the art of juxtaposing current trends in unexpected combinations in order to articulate surprising and yet plausible futures, often referred to as “alternative worlds.” Scenarios are thus explicitly not forecasts or projections based on linear extrapolations of contemporary patterns, and they are not hypothesis-based expert predictions. Nor should they be equated with simulations, which are best characterized as functional representations of real institutions or decision-making processes (Asal 2005). Instead, they are depictions of possible future states of the world, offered together with a narrative of the driving causal forces and potential exogenous shocks that could lead to those futures. Good scenarios thus rely on explicit causal propositions that, independent of one another, are plausible—yet, when combined, suggest surprising and sometimes controversial future worlds. For example, few predicted the dramatic fall in oil prices toward the end of 2014. Yet independent driving forces, such as the shale gas revolution in the United States, China’s slowing economic growth, and declining conflict in major Middle Eastern oil producers such as Libya, were all recognized secular trends that—combined with OPEC’s decision not to take concerted action as prices began to decline—came together in an unexpected way. While scenario analysis played a role in war gaming and strategic planning during the Cold War, the real antecedents of the contemporary practice are found in corporate futures studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s (Raskin et al. 2005). Scenario analysis was essentially initiated at Royal Dutch Shell in 1965, with the realization that the usual forecasting techniques and models were not capturing the rapidly changing environment in which the company operated (Wack 1985; Schwartz 1991). In particular, it had become evident that straight-line extrapolations of past global trends were inadequate for anticipating the evolving business environment. Shell-style scenario planning “helped break the habit, ingrained in most corporate planning, of assuming that the future will look much like the present” (Wilkinson and Kupers 2013, 4). Using scenario thinking, Shell anticipated the possibility of two Arab-induced oil shocks in the 1970s and hence was able to position itself for major disruptions in the global petroleum sector. Building on its corporate roots, scenario analysis has become a standard policymaking tool. For example, the Project on Forward Engagement advocates linking systematic foresight, which it defines as the disciplined analysis of alternative futures, to planning and feedback loops to better equip the United States to meet contemporary governance challenges (Fuerth 2011). Another prominent application of scenario thinking is found in the National Intelligence Council’s series of Global Trends reports, issued every four years to aid policymakers in anticipating and planning for future challenges. These reports present a handful of “alternative worlds” approximately twenty years into the future, carefully constructed on the basis of emerging global trends, risks, and opportunities, and intended to stimulate thinking about geopolitical change and its effects.4 As with corporate scenario analysis, the technique can be used in foreign policymaking for long-range general planning purposes as well as for anticipating and coping with more narrow and immediate challenges. An example of the latter is the German Marshall Fund’s EuroFutures project, which uses four scenarios to map the potential consequences of the Euro-area financial crisis (German Marshall Fund 2013). Several features make scenario analysis particularly useful for policymaking. Long-term global trends across a number of different realms—social, technological, environmental, economic, and political—combine in often-unexpected ways to produce unforeseen challenges. Yet the ability of decision makers to imagine, let alone prepare for, discontinuities in the policy realm is constrained by their existing mental models and maps. This limitation is exacerbated by well-known cognitive bias tendencies such as groupthink and confirmation bias (Jervis 1976; Janis 1982; Tetlock 2005). The power of scenarios lies in their ability to help individuals break out of conventional modes of thinking and analysis by introducing unusual combinations of trends and deliberate discontinuities in narratives about the future. Imagining alternative future worlds through a structured analytical process enables policymakers to envision and thereby adapt to something altogether different from the known present. Designing Scenarios for Political Science Inquiry The characteristics of scenario analysis that commend its use to policymakers also make it well suited to helping political scientists generate and develop policy-relevant research programs.

#### The standard is maximized expected well-being.

#### 1] Fission proves personal identity is reductionist – psychological continuity doesn’t exist.

**Olson summarizes** –Eric T. Olson, professor of philosophy at the University of Sheffield ("Personal Identity", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2017 Edition), <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/identity-personal/>, Accessed 10/12/17)

A more serious worry for psychological-continuity views is that **you could be psychologically continuous with two past or future people at once. If your cerebrum—the upper part of the brain largely responsible for mental features—were transplanted, the recipient would be psychologically continuous with you by anyone’s lights** (even though there would also be important psychological differences). The psychological-continuity view implies that she would be you. If we destroyed one of your cerebral hemispheres, the resulting being would also be psychologically continuous with you. (Hemispherectomy—even the removal of the left hemisphere, which controls speech—is considered a drastic but acceptable treatment for otherwise-inoperable brain tumors: see Rigterink 1980.) What if we did both at once, destroying one hemisphere and transplanting the other? Then too, the one who got the transplanted hemisphere would be psychologically continuous with you, and would be you according to the psychological-continuity view. **But now suppose that both hemispheres are transplanted, each into a different empty head**. (We needn’t pretend, as some authors do, that the hemispheres are exactly alike.) **The two recipients—call them Lefty and Righty—will each be psychologically continuous with you**. The psychological-continuity view as we have stated it implies that any future being who is psychologically continuous with you must be you. **It follows that you are Lefty and** also that you are **Righty. But that cannot be: if you and Lefty are one and you and Righty are one, Lefty and Righty cannot be two**. And yet they are. To put the point another way, **suppose Lefty is hungry at a time when Righty isn’t**. If you are Lefty, you are hungry at that time. If you are Righty, you aren’t. **If you are Lefty and Righty, you are both hungry and not hungry at once: a contradiction**.

#### That proves util – if persons are not a continuous unit then distribution among them is irrelevant – we just maximize good experiences since only experiences are morally evaluable – other theories err by presuming the person is a separate entity.

#### 2] No intent-foresight distinction— f we foresee a consequence, then it becomes part of our deliberation which makes it intrinsic to our action since we intend it to happen.

#### That means their framework collapses to util because we have to weigh foreseen violations of

#### 3] Only consequentialism explains degrees of wrongness—if I break a promise to meet up for lunch, that is not as bad as breaking a promise to take a dying person to the hospital. Only the consequences of breaking the promise explain why the second one is much worse than the first.

#### 4] No act-omission distinction – We are responsible for intentional omissions because we actively choose not to act—we intend and act upon omissions.

#### That means util because only aggregation can make our actions more ethical than if we omitted.

#### 5] Util is a lexical pre-requisite to any other framework: Threats to bodily security and life preclude the ability for moral actors to effectively utilize and act upon other moral theories since they are in a constant state of crisis that inhibit the ideal moral conditions which other theories presuppose – so, util comes first and my offense outweighs theirs under their own framework.

#### 6] Use epistemic modesty for evaluating the framework debate: that means compare the probability of the framework times the magnitude of the impact under a framework. Prefer:

#### A] Substantively true since it maximizes the probability of achieving net most moral value—beating a framework acts as mitigation to their impacts but the strength of that mitigation is contingent.

#### B] Clash—disincentives debaters from going all in for framework which means we get the ideal balance between topic ed and phil ed—it’s important to talk about contention-level offense

#### 7] ethical frameworks must be theoretically legitimate. Any standard is an interpretation of the word ought-thus framework is functionally a topicality argument about how to define the terms of the resolution. Prefer my interpretation for ground--debaters are guaranteed access to ground to engage under util – ie Aff gets plans and advantages, while Neg gets disads and counterplans. Additionally, anything can function as a util impact as long as an external benefit is articulated, so all your offense applies. Other frameworks deny 1 side the ability to engage the other on both the impact level and the link level.