### 1

#### Text – Turtle Island ought to [reduce intellectual property protections for medicines]. Turtle Island should have jurisdictional control over the Plan.

#### The CP solves the Aff - "Everywhere land resists and refuses—whales that destroy ships, bees that refuse to work, bombed islands that reconstitute themselves. The land also resists in the form of people; Indigenous and Black peoples' resistance is the land's resistance. Indigenous and Black people continue to subvert legal and capitalist technologies as part of that resistance."1

1tag sauce from “A Third University Is Possible by La Paperson”, pp. X, slightly edited

Tinker 4 George" Tink" Tinker. "The stones shall cry out: Consciousness, rocks, and Indians." Wicazo Sa Review (2004): 105-125. (Professor of American Indian cultures and religious traditions @ Cliff School of Theology in Denver, member of the Osage nation)//Cut by CL//Re-cut by Elmer

**Did you know that trees talk?** Well they do.They talk to each other, and they’ll talk to you if you listen. Trouble is, **white people don’t listen**. They never learned to listen to the Indians, so I don’t I suppose they’ll listen to other voices in nature. But I have learned a lot from trees; sometimes about the weather, sometimes about animals, sometimes about the Great Spirit.1 When we talk with non-Indians about nature, there is really nothing you can say in universal Western concepts that is going to make a lot of sense. I think that Western people who come into an Indian environment and attempt to preach take along their own set of categories and use it to deal with Indian people they meet. Anthropologists, summarizing what they find in the Indian tradition, always calling us animists, and that view is accepted by a great many people in the field of religion. We are put in a cultural evolutionary framework, and then we are supposed to move from animism to some great abstract conception of one god.2 Science describes things at a level of abstraction, by leaving out of account a whole range of properties that they have (colour, beauty, consciousness . . . ). This is for many purposes a very useful procedure, but it does not follow that the properties with which science concerns itself are more real than those it leaves out.3 Did you know that rocks

talk? Well, they do. Yes, I am aware that this is an audacious claim—even for an American Indian—made in the context of late modernity (or even postmodernity, if you insist) and in the context of a world indelibly marked by the accomplishments of modern science. But the argument proposed for this essay is that rocks talk and have what we must call consciousness. And we must extend our discussion of rocks to trees—as Walking Buffalo asserts in the quote above—and to the rest of the created world around us. I want to open an exploration of the particular disjunction between the worldviews of American Indian and Euro-Western cultures with regard to Western scientific, religious, and commonsense knowledges. The Western world, long rooted in the evidential objectivity of science, distinguishes at least popularly between things that are alive and things that are inert, between the animate and the inanimate. Among those things that are alive, in turn, there is a consistent distinguishing between plants and animals and between human consciousness and the rest of existence in the world. To the contrary, American Indian peoples understand that all life forms not only have consciousness, but also have qualities that are either poorly developed or entirely lacking in humans.4 Curiously enough, while Western philosophy asserts universally that human beings have consciousness, there is currently no agreement whatsoever as to what that consciousness is and whether its qualities are to be identified through a process of scientific study (neurology, psychology, and so on) or through philosophical or theological reflection. Yet Western culture, the emergent world culture (in Immanuel Wallerstein’s useful parlance)5 of globalized capital and Western science, is equally sure that rocks certainly do not have consciousness. What, then, is the nature of these contrasting epistemological claims? Is the Indian worldview “merely” religious—with no value in fact?6 Is the Euro-Western scientific worldview a perception of reality that is equally a “mythological” system? Or is it to be understood as a singular truth-value that is incontrovertible? Allow me to begin with a personal reminiscence from the summer of 1986. R O C K S The Kanukamaoli artist was describing how he found the large rock boulders that he sculpted so beautifully into images of Kanukamaoli deity figures. These sculptures, the artist was quick to note, were never for sale and hence were not the source of his sustenance. Speaking to a diverse group of U.S. academics and Pacific Rim artists and scholars gathered at the East-West Center at the University of Hawaii, the man responded to a question by saying, “I don’t find them; they find me! I might be walking along the beach, and one would reach out and bite the heel of my foot.” This explanation resonated deeply with a young American Indian scholar (namely, myself) who was also a conference participant. In my response to the Kanukamaoli brother, I remembered having accompanied an older medicine man on an outing to gather rocks for a special purification ceremony (or sweat lodge, as it is sometimes called in English). “As we walked up an arroyo away from the pick-up,” I reported, “I began to notice some pretty nice rocks right away—just like the ones used regularly in these ceremonies. Why don’t we take these, I asked? The medicine man shook his head, said, ‘No, not those,’ and kept on walking. All the time we were getting further up the arroyo, and I knew who was going to have to carry all those rocks back to the truck. Finally, more than a quarter mile from the truck, the medicine man nodded and pointed to some rocks that looked just like the hundreds we had passed by along the way. ‘These have agreed to go with us,’ he said. ‘They will help us in our prayers.’” The lone British academic present, a professor of American studies at Oxford, immediately jumped in with the severe criticism, “That’s what is wrong with you people. You are so anthropocentric! You think that everything in the world works the way you do.” The critique was emotional rather than rational; it was rooted in nearly a week’s worth of frustrated attempts to communicate across cultural barriers as well as in a lifetime of immersion in a culture that thinks of itself as somehow universal and normative—and thus inherently superior—a position of intellectual fascism, however naïve. As he finished his short tirade, I rose to argue that exactly the opposite is actually the case. “I am sorry Professor W., but that comment cannot go unchallenged. You see, you are the ones who are actually anthropocentric. You believe that everything in the world works differently from yourselves.” Consciousness, Intelligence, and Evolution This claim of consciousness for rocks raises difficult questions for those rooted in the knowledge base of Western science. It raises questions, of course, about the type of consciousness that I intend to identify, given Western science's proclivity for ever more discrete cognitional categorization. But it also raises questions about theories of evolution and the dominance of notions of progress and development in contemporary discourse. [End Page 107] As an American Indian, first of all, I must confess that I am not yet a believer in the "fact" of evolution.7 I do not believe that we Osages evolved from monkeys. However, should it some day be actually proven beyond any doubt that Osages have descended from monkeys, I would be deeply honored to share such a respectable lineage—even though the only monkeys in North America arrived with the colonial occupation and settlement. At the same time, we Indians would continue to have deep concerns for the Euro-Western proclivity for understanding descent as a category of ascendancy leading to the anthropocentric privileging of the human mind. American Indians are deeply aware of our part in another family tree entirely—one predicated on interrelationship rather than on descent or hierarchy of any kind. As Osages, our closest living relatives in this world, for instance, are our brothers and sisters the buffalo and our sister corn, to both of whom I shall return in due course. And, of course, we cannot forget rocks. A principle objection to theories of evolutionary descent on the part of American Indian people, then, stems from this ubiquitous Indian notion of interrelationship and the respect that Indian people maintain for all life forms in our world, including rocks and trees. Rather than elevate human beings to the apex of an evolutionary ascendancy (i.e., Darwin's common descent), the lack of human privileging over these other life forms means that Indians understand that all life shares equal status and that value, personhood, and intelligence must be recognized in all life. If there is a hierarchy of beings in the Indian experience of the world, humans are found at the bottom rather than at the top, being the youngest and least wise of all living things. As Deloria reports: The primary focus of creation stories of many tribes placed human beings as among the last creatures who were created and as the youngest of the living families. We were given the ability to do many things but not specific wisdom about the world. So our job was to learn from other older beings and to pattern ourselves after their behavior. We were to gather knowledge, not dispense it.8 We Osage do seem to come close to agreeing with current cosmological (and, perforce, evolutionary) theories in one regard: we hold that rock is tsage, the oldest living being—for which reason some call the tsage "grandparents" or "beloved old ones." And we know these old ones to be repositories of great wisdom and balance. In this context it should be noted that notions of deep time are not intrinsically foreign to Indian peoples. Unlike that version of the Euro-Western story based on the Hebrew Bible and so highly touted by more conservative Christians, Indian accounts of the beginnings never postulate a temporally ascertainable date.9 But, like some creationists, we do take our stories seriously. [End Page 108] As the oldest and wisest of all life forms, then, rocks are to be deeply respected as a category but especially as persons. They are the source of all life on the planet, and they continue to generously give of themselves for maintaining all life—especially in the ceremony popularly called sweat lodge, or the ceremony of purification.10 And it is a particular kind of rock that has made itself available for use in making the sacred pipe that is foundational to so many Indian prayers and ceremonies. These sacred pipes (nonnionba wakon) are also living beings, constructions of stone (the bowl) and wood (the stem) that possess a life of their own just as the stones used in a purification ceremony are living relatives. Charles Red Corn makes this point abundantly clear in the opening of his novel, A Pipe for February. Faced with the dramatic changes brought about by colonial conquest at the turn of the last century, a group of Osage families decides to put away one of their clan ceremonial pipes, a process requiring a formal burial—a funeral. The wife of the nonhonzhinga (a ceremonial leader/elder/pipe keeper) sits holding the pipe during the ceremony: As his wife her position was to look after the Pipe. She held it cradled in her arms and close to her breasts and in her grief she rocked the Pipe as she would rock an infant and when the woman could no longer restrain herself she began wailing a prayer song for one who has died.11 What are we to think of this description? Are pipes or rocks alive?Do they have consciousness? Deloria again captures the sense of Indian knowledge and experience as he describes the lives of rocks and their relationship to human beings: "We are all relatives" when taken as a methodological tool for obtaining knowledge means that we observe the natural world by looking for relationships between various things in it. That is to say, everything in the natural world has relationships with every other thing and the total set of relationships makes up the natural world as we experience it. This concept is simply the relativity concept as applied to a universe that people experience as alive and not as dead or inert. Thus, Indians knew stones were the perfect beings because they were self-contained entities that had resolved their social relationships and possessed great knowledge about how every other entity, and every species, should live. Stones had mobility but they did not have to use it. Every other being had mobility and needed, in some specific manner, to use it in their relationships.12 [End Page 109]

#### Starting points matter – refuse the revitalization of Settler lifeworlds

Smith 18 Gola Smith 2018 “Indigenous Lifeworlds” [https://www.academia.edu/39219089/Indigenous\_Lifeworlds?auto=download](https://www.academia.edu/39219089/Indigenous_Lifeworlds?auto=download%5d//vikas) (Black and Native woman, Northern Virginia Community College, BA in Philosophy)//Vikas//Re-cut by Elmer

I plan to introduce a series of papers concerning the necessary stances Indigenous and Black activists – and their ‘allies’ 1 – must take. This issue forwards the basics of my stance and thoughts – as a Black and Indigenous woman – on Indigenous refusal and resurgence (in line with the concerns of Glen Coulthard with contemporary Indigenous and Settler activism).

"Many **proposals have been made to us to adopt** your laws, your religion, your manners and your customs. We would be better pleased with beholding the good effects of these doctrines in your own practices, than with hearing you talk about them". - Old Tassel, Chief of the Tsalagi (Cherokee) **For centuries we have been told by Settlers that our lives and stories are** merely tools of the Settler, **who insists on fueling his** new **futures with the essence of Indigenous life**. Time and time again, **the same story unfolds**: **one more** - seemingly benign - **policy for the Savage that implicitly affirms** the **Westphalian sovereignty**. **Indigenous life struggles to finds its place in an environment intoxicated** with stories and promises of progress. **Those of us on the Rez increasingly have nothing more to look at than** our **tribal land grants** from the Settler’s institutions as evidence of Indigenous antiquity. As Glen Coulthard reminds us, the **tools to resolve our grievances will never lie in** what he terms “**recognition**,”2 **but a** refusal of Settler sovereignty. Those who ask us to adopt **the tools of colonial institutions**, "**do not provide the tools** required **to protect us against the** unilateral construction of our rights.” **The Indigenous spirit** - or adanvdo - **can only be** vitalized **through** a politics of **resurgence that** refuses negotiation in its entirity. Our solution lies in our own communities through a “politics of authentic self-affirmation.” Coulthard forwards the Idle No More movement as evidence of such resurgence. **The Indigenous spirit is** “**reclaimed and revitalized**” **through** its blockades and refusals of Settler lifeworlds. Indigenous activists – even if in everyday conversation – relate to each other in their hatred of the Settler pipelines being built on Turtle Island. **This cannot be a site of negotiation.** More often than not, Indigenous scholars arguing in favor of incremental reforms that rely on a politics of recognition forget that the site at which our demands align **does** matter. The value in Indigenous activist movements (like Idle No More) lies not in their ability to affect Settler politics, but in the ability to refuse recognition altogether. Even if Indigenous politicians legislatively halted construction of the Dakota Access Pipeline, Indigenous life would not be benefited. This is because **the lifeworlds being built are not Indigenous lifeworlds**. They are Settler lifeworlds. **This is not to say the slew of legislative changes enacted by Indigenous politicians has not benefited communities**, **but to forward an** alternative orientation **for** our **politics**. I will offer a brief discussion of the “SURVIVE Act” to demonstrate my point. Even if funds are set aside for Indigenous tribes through the “SURVIVE Act” to “respond to the emotional, psychological, or physical needs of a victim of crime,” the question of when we can start building our own lifeworlds still remains. **What we need are not** more **Settler** criminal justice **systems because the discussion** of a “criminal justice system” **is** - itself – **mediated by the** destruction of our lifeworlds. Before we were colonized, the Tsalagi had peace towns for wrongdoers, nothing like the prisons now being built on Indigenous lands for wrongdoers. This shit is all wrong. Stop telling me what to do. Let Indigenous activists create solutions from the mobilization of our politics. Don’t make us touch your shit.

#### The impact is settler fascism which results in micro-fascist violence – the CP’s grounded normativity solves.

Jokic 19, Dallas. Fascism and Settler Colonialism in Canada. Diss. Queen's University (Canada), 2019. (Graduate Student in the Department of Philosophy @ Queen’s University)//Cut by Shae//Re-cut by Elmer

Conclusion: Indigenous Resurgence as Anti-Fascism While all liberal capitalist states play a role in creating the conditions for fascism, I hope to have explicated the specific ways in which the settler colonial state of Canada does. **Fascism** in settler colonial states must be thought of as a consequence, and perhaps even an extension of**, the logic of colonialism**, even as it may push against the laws and norms of settler colonial states. In a state like Canada in which fascism has not yet taken on a molar form (at least not on a state level), approaches to understanding and opposing fascism must be attentive to molecular microfascisms and the political and social conditions that cultivate them. Understanding fascism not as a unified ideology or political philosophy that is consistent across time and space, but rather as clusters of tendencies and affects, allows us to identify fascism before it takes over a state and to understand the relationship between fascism and the status quo. In the Canadian context, microfascisms are produced in and around institutions of state violence **like police forces, the military, border agencies, and prisons**, as well as in state practices surrounding property and land. Not only do these practices and the use of (white) settlers for territorial fortification create a racialized conception of land, **they implicitly encourage individual acts of settler violence against Indigenous people** that serve to reinforce the white national identity of Canada. This white national identity continues to be reproduced and re-inscribed by everyday practices that can be traced back to the eliminationist and replacement-centered logic of the settler state. These processes serve the function of producing a Canadian nation that is racialized as white. Interestingly, the replacement central to the Canadian nation has been mirrored by fascist claims that articulate a fear that white people in Canada are being replaced. Since fascism in Canada is intimately related to the context of Canadian settler colonialism, anti-fascist strategies in Canada cannot simply be an import of European anti-fascist strategies. Any anti-fascist movements that leave the settler state outside the reach of their criticism leave themselves vulnerable to the fascistic tendencies inherent in the settler state, and in particular, settler nationalism. Anti-fascist movements in Canada must not only contest settler colonialism, they must follow the lead of Indigenous practices of resurgence and resistance.1 Indigenous scholars and activists have articulated different relationships we can have to the land, to each other, and to the non-human world. These approaches, though not always explicitly anti-fascist – that is, not always oriented primarily in opposition to fascism – are non-fascist in the ethical sense Foucault describes, and provide an alternative to practices that cultivate microfascisms.2 Anti-fascism should **not simply be opposed to settler colonialism** in the molar sense or take the form of Manichean opposition to the state. Indigenous resurgence is characterized not as a purely oppositional attitude towards the settler state but as a “turn away” from **settler state** and society **and towards “Indigenous institutions, values and ethics of interdependency**, cycles of change, balance, struggle, and rootedness.”3 Corey Snelgrove, Jeff Corntassel, and Rita Dhamoon write, “Indigenous resurgence is ultimately about reframing the conversation around decolonization in order to re-center and re-invigorate Indigenous nationhood.”4 Indigenous resurgence not only contests the settler state and nation, which as we have seen cultivate microfascisms, they also provide non-fascist ways of living and relating to other human beings, the land, and the rest of the more-than-human world. In stark contrast to the racialized conceptions of land fortified by Lockean notions of cultivation and productivity, many Indigenous nations ~~view~~ [understand] the land as valuable not just as a resource, but as a teacher, and something we find ourselves in meaningful relationship with. Instead of viewing land as a terra nullius that is claimed by a racially pure nation through labour, Leanne Betasamosake Simpson retells the Michi Saagiig Nishnaabeg story of a child learning to harvest sap and make maple syrup. The child is not explicitly taught by adults around them, they learn by following the direction of the land itself; the child “learned both from the land and with the land.”5 Land is not just a blank space to be made productive, nor is it an exclusive ground for racial purity. By following the lead of Indigenous peoples and nations as they work to “reclaim and regenerate [their] relational, place-based existence,” we can not only undercut the affective power that racialized and capitalist conceptions of the land suggest, we can contest and turn away from the racist colonial basis of the settler property regime.6 Supporting Indigenous nations in their self-determination is another area in which we can work to undermine the basis of settler colonialism. Indigenous and settler models of nationalism are not just competing claims of nationalism but entirely different conceptions of the nation. While settler nationalism in Canada is implicitly racialized in opposition to Indigenous peoples and other racialized peoples, Indigenous nationhood is not necessarily conceptualized according to race or blood.7 Simpson argues that the senses of nationhood invoked by Indigenous resurgence are entirely different from those invoked by European settlers. She writes, “I am not a nation state…To me, Indigenous nationhood is a radical and complete overturning of the nation-state’s political formation.”8 As opposed to the racially exclusionary models of nationhood characteristic of the (settler) nation-state, Simpson considers her Kina Gchi Nishnaabeg-ogamig to be “based on a series of radiating responsibilities” linking humans and nonhumans together “**in the absence of coercion, hierarchy, or authoritarian power**” and instead forming “relationships based **on deep reciprocity, respect, non-interference, self-determination and freedom.”**9 Instead of simply being aimed at destroying the settler state, practices of Indigenous resurgence and nationhood offer alternatives to colonial and fascist conceptions of people, land, and the more-than-human world. The type of political activism that is required in order to oppose fascism cannot simply be against fascism or even against the structure of the state. The imagining of a future without fascism that does not involve Indigenous resurgence reaffirms the colonial basis of the settler state and engages in what Tuck and Yang call “settler futurity.”10 Instead of acquiescing to visions of a non-fascist future that denounce all kind of conceptions of nations or meaningful connections to land, anti-fascists should pay attention to the political principle that Coulthard and Simpson call “grounded normativity.” Grounded normativity draws on various Indigenous traditions and approaches towards the land and social organizations in order to provide a place-based model of political and ethical action. Coulthard and Simpson write, Grounded normativity houses and reproduces the practices and procedures, based on deep reciprocity, that are inherently informed by an intimate relationship to place. Grounded normativity teaches us how to live our lives in relation to other people and nonhuman life forms in a **profoundly nonauthoritarian, nondominating, nonexploitative manner**….Our relationship to the land itself generates the processes, practices, and knowledges that inform our political systems, and through which we practice solidarity.11 For those of us that are settlers, grounded normativity involves following the lead not just of “Indigenous people” as an imagined monolithic group, but rather the specific Indigenous nations, peoples, and tribes that live and have lived on the lands we find ourselves in.12 We should follow the lead of Indigenous political practices that offer decolonial alternatives to the racialized conceptions of space, love of violence and authoritarianism, and false victimization characteristic of fascism. Not only does this make us accountable to addressing the injustice of settler colonialism itself, it is the only way to attack fascism at its roots, which are deeply intertwined with Canadian settler society. Understanding the connection between fascism and settler colonialism should not be a simply scholarly project, but should motivate and inform place-based and decolonial anti-fascist action.

#### State-based IR reinforces civilizing humanism – all difference is cast as savagely primitive: either tameable for assimilation or wild enough to demand elimination.

King 17, Hayden. "The erasure of Indigenous thought in foreign policy." OpenCanada. org 31 (2017). (Gchi'mnissing Anishinaabe writer and educator based in the Faculty of Arts @ Ryerson University in Toronto)//Cut by Shae//Re-cut by Elmer

Foreign policy, but in whose national interest? For those studying and working in foreign policy, there are certainly debates over what constitutes the definition of the field. In Canada, there are debates about what counts as foreign policy (defence, security, trade, peacekeeping) and also how to approach those subjects (from liberal frameworks, realist, even some critical lenses). In his textbook on foreign policy Kim Nossal notes that the field is inherently divisive, emerging from “the interplay of conflicting interests, divergent objectives, contending perceptions, and different prescriptions about the most appropriate course of action.” Yet despite these divisive debates, there is **near universal acceptance of** two core assumptions: the legitimacy of the Canadian **state** itself as the primary actor in foreign policy and the concept of the national interest, which the field of foreign policy strives to serve. This is no surprise, really, considering these assumptions are underwritten and supported by every domestic institution — from Canada’s constitutional sources, to the cultural organizations that currently promulgate the fantasy of Canada as 150 years of glowing hearts, or decisions of the Supreme Court that reflect on the “assertion of Crown sovereignty” without ever explaining how that sovereignty was obtained. But for critical Indigenous scholars, these assumptions are myths that form not a legitimate state in the community of nations, but rather **a violent settler colony**. Between 1921 and 1923, after many years of resistance to the young countries, Canada and the United States were steadily encroaching into Haudenosaunee territory and governance. Cayuga Chief Deskaheh, also known as Levi General, travelled to London, England, to appeal to King George on the matter. (He wasn’t the first or last to appeal to a King or Queen; Anishinaabe leader Shingwaukonse actively attempted to, post-War of 1812, and Chief Theresa Spence did so in 2013, among many others). But when King George refused him, Deskaheh turned to the Geneva-based League of Nations, seeking a seat for the Haudenosaunee. With his efforts undermined by English officials there too, he returned home but was stopped at the U.S.-Canada border and turned away by Canadian border guards. He spent his final days in Rochester, New York. Before his death he made one last plea to ordinary Canadians and Americans for justice: “Do you believe — really believe — that all peoples are entitled to equal protection of international law now that you are so strong? Do you believe — really believe — that treaty pledges should be kept? Think these questions over and answer them to yourselves…We have little territory left — just enough to live and die on [because] the governments of Washington and Ottawa have a silent partnership of policy. It is aimed to break up every tribe of red men so as to dominate every acre of their territory.” (His plea is documented in Rick Monture’s We Share Our Matters.) The last two sentences of this quote are an apt description of modern settler colonialism, nearly 100 years before scholars identified the process. For anthropologist Patrick Wolfe, there is a distinction between colonialism, which eventually ends when the invaders leave, and settler colonialism, where they don’t. While in the former [colonial] formulation the Indigenous population is **often transformed to labour for colonial extraction**, in the latter, the settler colony attempts to liquidate all remnants of the previous (Indigenous) societies to legitimize its permanent presence. Deskaheh was speaking in the North American context, Wolfe in the Australian, but the phenomenon can be seen elsewhere, from Aotearoa/New Zealand to Palestine/Israel. Common strategies in this liquidation are as follows: physical extermination; oppressive Indian legislation designed to contain; the creation of reserves/reservations/settlements, residential or boarding schools; discrimination aimed specifically at women; and eventually legal absorption into state apparatuses and assimilation. While the genocidal nature of settler colonialism may not appear as physical violence today (though we do still have plenty of that), the underlying motivation to expunge threats to settler sovereignty endures. But where the specific harms of the field of foreign policy come into greater focus are in crafting a common sense around what counts as a legitimate politics of the international. Consider the core concepts of the field, or at least the discipline of IR that foregrounds foreign policy. I think it’s fair to say most traditional perspectives view the international system as an **anarchic environment where self-interested and (mostly) rational states compete against each other for power**. Or, in contrast, they may cooperate. For foundational IR scholar Hedley Bull, this simple formulation is “the supreme normative principal of the political organization of mankind.” I don’t need to elaborate on these concepts for this audience. But, what about political communities that do not resemble a state, that eschew coercive notions of exclusive sovereignty, that are bound by obligations and responsibilities to the land and thus do not recognize an anarchic world, political communities that do not start and end with men? The discipline of IR, as well as practice of foreign policy, effectively casts Indigenous peoples as primitive (or at least inferior), **sanctions the theft of their lands, and then forecloses the possibility of resurgent political communities**. At a fundamental level the perpetuation of this conceptual galaxy denies opportunities for Indigenous expressions of liberation — whether the case is the Six Nations of the Grand River, whose demands for a seat at the League of Nations in 1922 were rejected, or the current Canadian government demands that the articulation of international Indigenous rights not challenge territorial integrity or state sovereignty (this is true generally but seen clearly with the United Nation’s Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples). Such a denial is also expressed in the unequivocal support of the state of Israel at the expense of Palestinian existence, or the collaboration with a Honduran government that suppresses Indigenous communities and murders activists like Berta Cáceres. I am talking about more than denying liberation. By continuing to enforce the view of humanity as **a set of political states**, with Europe at the centre of the planet – as Chickasaw lawyer James Youngblood Henderson once pointed out in his deconstruction of the familiar Mercator world map – foreign policy actively contributes to the erasure of **Indigenous political difference conceptually as well as Indigenous bodies physicall**y. (Not to mention non-Indigenous but racialized political communities and bodies, too.) Thus, Canadian foreign policy is a foreign policy that normalizes and affirms settler colonialism. This is the primary national interest. And so, foreign policy is itself a manifestation of settler colonialism.

### 2

### 3

#### Climate Patents and Innovation high now and solving Warming but COVID waiver sets a dangerous precedent for appropriations - the mere threat is sufficient is enough to kill investment.

Brand 5-26, Melissa. “Trips Ip Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors.” IPWatchdog.com | Patents & Patent Law, 26 May 2021, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964/. //sid

The biotech industry is making remarkable advancestowards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course [we dispute this notion](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/04/19/waiving-ip-rights-during-times-of-covid-a-false-good-idea/id=132399/)), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) [Katherine Tai](https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/05/tai-says-united-states-will-back-india-southafrica-proposal-waive-ip-rights-trips/id=133224/) was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties. The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder. A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensationand no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all. Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so. In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass**,** reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietaryknow-how to global competitors. While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary internationalcollaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company. Necessary Investment Could Diminish Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation [raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone](https://www.bio.org/sites/default/files/2021-04/Climate%20Report_FINAL.pdf). If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to investat the current and required levels**.**

#### Climate Patents are critical to solving Warming – only way to stimulate Renewable Energy Technology Investment.

Aberdeen 20 Arielle Aberdeen October 2020 "Patents to climate rescue: how intellectual property rights are fundamental to the development of renewable energy" <https://www.4ipcouncil.com/application/files/4516/0399/1622/Intellectual_Property_and_Renewable_Energy.pdf> (Caribbean Attorney-at-Law with extensive experience in legal research and writing.)//Elmer

**Climate change is** the **most pressing** global **challenge** and with the international commitment to reduce greenhouse gas emissions under the Paris Agreement,1 there **needs to be a global energy revolution** and transition.2 This is where **innovative technology can help** meet the challenge of reducing our dependency on finite natural capital resources. The development and deployment of innovative technology play a pivotal role in enabling us to replace fossil fuel use with more sustainable energy solutions. **Patents** have **facilitated** the **development of such innovative technologies** thus far **and** will **continue to be the catalyst for this transition**. Patents are among a group of intellectual property rights (‘IPRs’). 3 These are private and exclusive rights given for the protection of different types of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies, as they encourage innovation, drive the investment into new areas and allow for the successful commercialisation of intellectual creations. IPRs are the cornerstone of developed and knowledge-based economies. Empirical evidence has shown that a **strong IPRs** system **influences** both the **development and diffusion of technology**. Alternatively, **weak IPRs** protection has been shown to **reduce** **innovation**, **reduce investment** and prevent firms from entering certain markets.4 Once patent protection has been sought and granted, it gives a time-limited and exclusive rights to the creator of an invention. This allows the inventor or patentor the ability to restrict others from using, selling, or making the new invented product or process. Thereby allowing a timelimited monopoly on the exploitation of the invention in the geographical area where it is protected. During the patent application procedure, the patentor must make sufficient public disclosure of the invention. This will allow others to see, understand and improve upon it, thereby spurring continuous innovation. Therefore, the patent system through providing this economic incentive is a successful tool which has encouraged the development and the dissemination of technology. Patents like all IPRs are key instruments in the global innovation ecosystem.5 When developing innovative technology, patents play a role throughout the “technological life cycle”,6 as shown in Figure 1. This lifecycle involves the invention, research and development (‘R&D’), market development and commercial diffusion. Patents are most effective when sought at the R&D stage. Once a patent has been granted, it becomes an asset which can then be used to7: Gain Market Access: Patents can create market advantages; to develop and secure market position; to gain more freedom to operate within a sector and reduce risks of infringing on other patents; protect inventions from being copied, and removes delaying by innovative firms to release new or improved technology and encourage the expansion of their markets. Negotiation leverage: Patents can build a strong brand or company reputation which can enhance the company’s negotiation power and allow for the creation of equal partnerships. Funding: Patents can generate funding and revenue streams for companies. Having a strong patent portfolio especially in small businesses or start-ups can be used to leverage investor funding; while also be a source of revenue for companies through licensing fees, sales, tax incentives, collateral for loans and access to grants and subsidies. Strategic value: Patents can be used to build “synergistic partnerships”8 through which collaboration on R&D and other partnerships; be used to improve in-house R&D and build and/ or develop more products. As such, obtaining and managing patent as part of a patent and broader IPRs strategy are key tools for business success, especially within highly innovative and technology-driven industries.9 Renewable Energy: The Basics Renewable energy is derived from natural unlimited sources which produce little to no harmful greenhouse gases and other pollutants. 10 Innovative renewable energy technologies (‘RETs’) have created the ability to tap into these sources and convert them to energy which can then be stored, distributed, and consumed at a competitive cost. RETs have developed into a technology ecosystem which consists of alternative energy production, energy conservation and green transportation.11 For energy production, RETs have been developed to generate energy from six main sources. These are: Wind energy: Technology, via off-shore and/or on-shore wind turbines, harnesses the energy produced by the wind. Solar energy: Technology either through concentrated solar power (‘CSP’)and solar photovoltaic (‘PV’) harnesses the energy produced by the sun. Hydropower: Technology either through large-scale or small-scale hydropower plants, captures energy from flowing water. Bioenergy: Technology is used to convert organic material into energy either through burning to produce heat or power or through converting it to a liquid biofuel. Geothermal: Technology is used to capture the energy from the heat produced in the earth’s core. Ocean/Tidal energy: Technology is used to capture the energy produced from waves, tides, salinity gradient energy and ocean thermal energy conversion. Out of these six sources, the wind, solar and hydropower energy sectors are the biggest, the most developed and the most widely used. While geothermal and ocean energy sources are used in a more limited capacity. In particular, the RETs in ocean energy is still at its infancy and thus presents an opportunity for future innovation and commercialisation. Renewable energy is the fastest-growing energy source, with the electricity sector showing the fastest energy transition. 12 In 2016, renewable energy accounted for 12% of final global energy consumption and in 2018, a milestone was reached with renewables being used to generate 26% of global electricity. The source of this energy has been driven by renewable hydropower, as shown in Figure 2, with wind and solar energy trailing behind in energy production. However, the International Energy Agency (‘IRENA’) forecasts that Solar PV will lead RETs to increase capacity in the upcoming years. 13 This rise in renewable energy is due to the increased investment into the sector and the development, diffusion and deployment of innovative RETs. For the period between 2010 and 2019, there were 2.6 trillion US dollars invested in renewable energy. 14 The majority of which being focused on solar energy. 15 This investment has surpassed the investment made into the traditional fossil fuel energy 16 and has been heavily driven by the private sector. 17 The International Energy Agency recent report showed that its members increased the public budgets for energy technology R&D, with the biggest increase in the low-carbon sectors.18 The geographic sources of this investment shown in Figure 3, reveals that the European Union, the United States and Japan are part of the largest investors. This reflects the historic involvement these countries have had in the renewable energy arena and the development of RETs. However, there is now the emergence of China, India and Brazil as large investors in this field. This trend in investment has also coincided with the increase in patenting technology in renewable energy compared to fossil fuels.19 Reports from the World Intellectual Property Office (WIPO), have shown that there has been a **steady increase in patent filing rates in RETs since the mid-1990s**.20 This increase has occurred in the four major renewable sectors, 21 where RETs patents applications were growing steadily from 2005 until reaching a peak in 2013.22 Post-2013, there has been a slight decline in patent filings, which can indicate a maturing of sectors and deployment of technologies.23 Each renewable energy sector is at a different stage of maturity and thus there is a variation of patent ownership. The wind sector is the most mature and consequently has the highest intellectual property ownership and patent grants compared to that of the biofuel sector. 24 IRENA also provides a comprehensive and interactive database for RETs patents. As seen in Figure 4 below, they have collected patent data from the major patent filing jurisdiction25 which shows the breakdown of the patents per type. This information reveals that there is a dominance of patent filings focused on solar technology. This data corresponds to the focus of the investment in renewable energy into solar energy. Upon closer look at the data, the geographic source of these patents shows that RETs patents have been concentrated in a few developed OECD countries and China. This also corresponds to the source of investment shown in Figure 3 and reflects the historical concentration of RETs innovation within these countries. 26 The latest WIPO report for 2019, which looks at the data for PCT patent applications, shows that 76 % of all PCT patent application came from the United States, Germany, Japan, the Republic of Korea and China.27 China is the newest entry into the top ten list and has made one of the largest jumps to become one of the biggest RETs patent filers at the PCT. This geographic data is also mirrored by IRENA’s statistics, as shown in Figure 5 below. This data also reflects China’s emerging renewable dominance. China is heavily **investing in solar energy** **technology** and has filed numerous patents in this area and the underlying technologies.28 The successful flow of investment in this sector can only **occur in** the **presence of a strong IPRs system** and protection. Government policies and initiatives to improve the **patent system** can be used to promote the development of RETs and drive private capital and investment into this area.29 This direct **effect on RETs** through policies was **shown in** the United States with the ‘**Green Tech Pilot Program’**.30 This was a special accelerated patent application procedure developed by the United States Patent and Trademark Office for inventions falling under the green technology category. This program ran from 2009-2011 and led to a boost in RETs patent applications, with the office issuing 1062 RETs patents from the programme. Other jurisdictions, such as the European Union and China have used policy and incentives to promote the development of RETs and the advancement of their renewable energy sector. In particular, the European Union and China began the renewable energy path at different starting points but are now both dominant players in this area.

#### Warming causes Extinction

Kareiva 18, Peter, and Valerie Carranza. "Existential risk due to ecosystem collapse: Nature strikes back." Futures 102 (2018): 39-50. (Ph.D. in ecology and applied mathematics from Cornell University, director of the Institute of the Environment and Sustainability at UCLA, Pritzker Distinguished Professor in Environment & Sustainability at UCLA)//Re-cut by Elmer

In summary, six of the nine proposed planetary boundaries (phosphorous, nitrogen, biodiversity, land use, atmospheric aerosol loading, and chemical pollution) are unlikely to be associated with existential risks. They all correspond to a degraded environment, but in our assessment do not represent existential risks. However, the three remaining boundaries (**climate change**, global **freshwater** cycle, **and** ocean **acidification**) do **pose existential risks**. This is **because of** intrinsic **positive feedback loops**, substantial lag times between system change and experiencing the consequences of that change, and the fact these different boundaries interact with one another in ways that yield surprises. In addition, climate, freshwater, and ocean acidification are all **directly connected to** the provision of **food and water**, and **shortages** of food and water can **create conflict** and social unrest. Climate change has a long history of disrupting civilizations and sometimes precipitating the collapse of cultures or mass emigrations (McMichael, 2017). For example, the 12th century drought in the North American Southwest is held responsible for the collapse of the Anasazi pueblo culture. More recently, the infamous potato famine of 1846–1849 and the large migration of Irish to the U.S. can be traced to a combination of factors, one of which was climate. Specifically, 1846 was an unusually warm and moist year in Ireland, providing the climatic conditions favorable to the fungus that caused the potato blight. As is so often the case, poor government had a role as well—as the British government forbade the import of grains from outside Britain (imports that could have helped to redress the ravaged potato yields). Climate change intersects with freshwater resources because it is expected to exacerbate drought and water scarcity, as well as flooding. Climate change can even impair water quality because it is associated with heavy rains that overwhelm sewage treatment facilities, or because it results in higher concentrations of pollutants in groundwater as a result of enhanced evaporation and reduced groundwater recharge. **Ample clean water** is not a luxury—it **is essential for human survival**. Consequently, cities, regions and nations that lack clean freshwater are vulnerable to social disruption and disease. Finally, ocean acidification is linked to climate change because it is driven by CO2 emissions just as global warming is. With close to 20% of the world’s protein coming from oceans (FAO, 2016), the potential for severe impacts due to acidification is obvious. Less obvious, but perhaps more insidious, is the interaction between climate change and the loss of oyster and coral reefs due to acidification. Acidification is known to interfere with oyster reef building and coral reefs. Climate change also increases storm frequency and severity. Coral reefs and oyster reefs provide protection from storm surge because they reduce wave energy (Spalding et al., 2014). If these reefs are lost due to acidification at the same time as storms become more severe and sea level rises, coastal communities will be exposed to unprecedented storm surge—and may be ravaged by recurrent storms. A key feature of the risk associated with climate change is that mean annual temperature and mean annual rainfall are not the variables of interest. Rather it is extreme episodic events that place nations and entire regions of the world at risk. These extreme events are by definition “rare” (once every hundred years), and changes in their likelihood are challenging to detect because of their rarity, but are exactly the manifestations of climate change that we must get better at anticipating (Diffenbaugh et al., 2017). Society will have a hard time responding to shorter intervals between rare extreme events because in the lifespan of an individual human, a person might experience as few as two or three extreme events. How likely is it that you would notice a change in the interval between events that are separated by decades, especially given that the interval is not regular but varies stochastically? A concrete example of this dilemma can be found in the past and expected future changes in storm-related flooding of New York City. The highly disruptive flooding of New York City associated with Hurricane Sandy represented a flood height that occurred once every 500 years in the 18th century, and that occurs now once every 25 years, but is expected to occur once every 5 years by 2050 (Garner et al., 2017). This change in frequency of extreme floods has profound implications for the measures New York City should take to protect its infrastructure and its population, yet because of the stochastic nature of such events, this shift in flood frequency is an elevated risk that will go unnoticed by most people. 4. The combination of positive feedback loops and societal inertia is fertile ground for global environmental catastrophes **Humans** are remarkably ingenious, and **have adapted** to crises **throughout** their **history**. Our doom has been repeatedly predicted, only to be averted by innovation (Ridley, 2011). **However**, the many **stories** **of** human ingenuity **successfully** **addressing** **existential risks** such as global famine or extreme air pollution **represent** environmental c**hallenges that are** largely **linear**, have immediate consequences, **and operate without positive feedbacks**. For example, the fact that food is in short supply does not increase the rate at which humans consume food—thereby increasing the shortage. Similarly, massive air pollution episodes such as the London fog of 1952 that killed 12,000 people did not make future air pollution events more likely. In fact it was just the opposite—the London fog sent such a clear message that Britain quickly enacted pollution control measures (Stradling, 2016). Food shortages, air pollution, water pollution, etc. send immediate signals to society of harm, which then trigger a negative feedback of society seeking to reduce the harm. In contrast, today’s great environmental crisis of climate change may cause some harm but there are generally long time delays between rising CO2 concentrations and damage to humans. The consequence of these delays are an absence of urgency; thus although 70% of Americans believe global warming is happening, only 40% think it will harm them (http://climatecommunication.yale.edu/visualizations-data/ycom-us-2016/). Secondly, unlike past environmental challenges, **the Earth’s climate system is rife with positive feedback loops**. In particular, as CO2 increases and the climate warms, that **very warming can cause more CO2 release** which further increases global warming, and then more CO2, and so on. Table 2 summarizes the best documented positive feedback loops for the Earth’s climate system. These feedbacks can be neatly categorized into carbon cycle, biogeochemical, biogeophysical, cloud, ice-albedo, and water vapor feedbacks. As important as it is to understand these feedbacks individually, it is even more essential to study the interactive nature of these feedbacks. Modeling studies show that when interactions among feedback loops are included, uncertainty increases dramatically and there is a heightened potential for perturbations to be magnified (e.g., Cox, Betts, Jones, Spall, & Totterdell, 2000; Hajima, Tachiiri, Ito, & Kawamiya, 2014; Knutti & Rugenstein, 2015; Rosenfeld, Sherwood, Wood, & Donner, 2014). This produces a wide range of future scenarios. Positive feedbacks in the carbon cycle involves the enhancement of future carbon contributions to the atmosphere due to some initial increase in atmospheric CO2. This happens because as CO2 accumulates, it reduces the efficiency in which oceans and terrestrial ecosystems sequester carbon, which in return feeds back to exacerbate climate change (Friedlingstein et al., 2001). Warming can also increase the rate at which organic matter decays and carbon is released into the atmosphere, thereby causing more warming (Melillo et al., 2017). Increases in food shortages and lack of water is also of major concern when biogeophysical feedback mechanisms perpetuate drought conditions. The underlying mechanism here is that losses in vegetation increases the surface albedo, which suppresses rainfall, and thus enhances future vegetation loss and more suppression of rainfall—thereby initiating or prolonging a drought (Chamey, Stone, & Quirk, 1975). To top it off, overgrazing depletes the soil, leading to augmented vegetation loss (Anderies, Janssen, & Walker, 2002). Climate change often also increases the risk of forest fires, as a result of higher temperatures and persistent drought conditions. The expectation is that **forest fires will become more frequent** and severe with climate warming and drought (Scholze, Knorr, Arnell, & Prentice, 2006), a trend for which we have already seen evidence (Allen et al., 2010). Tragically, the increased severity and risk of Southern California wildfires recently predicted by climate scientists (Jin et al., 2015), was realized in December 2017, with the largest fire in the history of California (the “Thomas fire” that burned 282,000 acres, https://www.vox.com/2017/12/27/16822180/thomas-fire-california-largest-wildfire). This **catastrophic fire** embodies the sorts of positive feedbacks and interacting factors that **could catch humanity off-guard and produce a** true **apocalyptic event.** Record-breaking rains produced an extraordinary flush of new vegetation, that then dried out as record heat waves and dry conditions took hold, coupled with stronger than normal winds, and ignition. Of course the record-fire released CO2 into the atmosphere, thereby contributing to future warming. Out of all types of feedbacks, water vapor and the ice-albedo feedbacks are the most clearly understood mechanisms. Losses in reflective snow and ice cover drive up surface temperatures, leading to even more melting of snow and ice cover—this is known as the ice-albedo feedback (Curry, Schramm, & Ebert, 1995). As snow and ice continue to melt at a more rapid pace, millions of people may be displaced by flooding risks as a consequence of sea level rise near coastal communities (Biermann & Boas, 2010; Myers, 2002; Nicholls et al., 2011). The water vapor feedback operates when warmer atmospheric conditions strengthen the saturation vapor pressure, which creates a warming effect given water vapor’s strong greenhouse gas properties (Manabe & Wetherald, 1967). Global warming tends to increase cloud formation because warmer temperatures lead to more evaporation of water into the atmosphere, and warmer temperature also allows the atmosphere to hold more water. The key question is whether this increase in clouds associated with global warming will result in a positive feedback loop (more warming) or a negative feedback loop (less warming). For decades, scientists have sought to answer this question and understand the net role clouds play in future climate projections (Schneider et al., 2017). Clouds are complex because they both have a cooling (reflecting incoming solar radiation) and warming (absorbing incoming solar radiation) effect (Lashof, DeAngelo, Saleska, & Harte, 1997). The type of cloud, altitude, and optical properties combine to determine how these countervailing effects balance out. Although still under debate, it appears that in most circumstances the cloud feedback is likely positive (Boucher et al., 2013). For example, models and observations show that increasing greenhouse gas concentrations reduces the low-level cloud fraction in the Northeast Pacific at decadal time scales. This then has a positive feedback effect and enhances climate warming since less solar radiation is reflected by the atmosphere (Clement, Burgman, & Norris, 2009). The key lesson from the long list of potentially positive feedbacks and their interactions is that **runaway climate change,** and runaway perturbations have to be taken as a serious possibility. Table 2 is just a snapshot of the type of feedbacks that have been identified (see Supplementary material for a more thorough explanation of positive feedback loops). However, this list is not exhaustive and the possibility of undiscovered positive feedbacks **portends** even greater **existential risks**. The many environmental crises humankind has previously averted (famine, ozone depletion, London fog, water pollution, etc.) were averted because of political will based on solid scientific understanding. We cannot count on complete scientific understanding when it comes to positive feedback loops and climate change.

### Case

#### Extinction outweighs

MacAskill 14 [William, Oxford Philosopher and youngest tenured philosopher in the world, Normative Uncertainty, 2014]

The human race might go extinct from a number of causes: asteroids, supervolcanoes, runaway climate change, pandemics, nuclear war, and the development and use of dangerous new technologies such as synthetic biology, all pose risks (even if very small) to the continued survival of the human race.184 And different moral views give opposing answers to question of whether this would be a good or a bad thing. It might seem obvious that human extinction would be a very bad thing, both because of the loss of potential future lives, and because of the loss of the scientific and artistic progress that we would make in the future. But the issue is at least unclear. The continuation of the human race would be a mixed bag: inevitably, it would involve both upsides and downsides. And if one regards it as much more important to avoid bad things happening than to promote good things happening then one could plausibly regard human extinction as a good thing.For example, one might regard the prevention of bads as being in general more important that the promotion of goods, as defended historically by G. E. Moore,185 and more recently by Thomas Hurka.186 One could weight the prevention of suffering as being much more important that the promotion of happiness. Or one could weight the prevention of objective bads, such as war and genocide, as being much more important than the promotion of objective goods, such as scientific and artistic progress. If the human race continues its future will inevitably involve suffering as well as happiness, and objective bads as well as objective goods. So, if one weights the bads sufficiently heavily against the goods, or if one is sufficiently pessimistic about humanity’s ability to achieve good outcomes, then one will regard human extinction as a good thing.187 However, even if we believe in a moral view according to which human extinction would be a good thing, we still have strong reason to prevent near-term human extinction. To see this, we must note three points. First, we should note that the extinction of the human race is an extremely high stakes moral issue. Humanity could be around for a very long time: if humans survive as long as the median mammal species, we will last another two million years. On this estimate, the number of humans in existence in the The future, given that we don’t go extinct any time soon, would be 2×10^14. So if it is good to bring new people into existence, then it’s very good to prevent human extinction. Second, human extinction is by its nature an irreversible scenario. If we continue to exist, then we always have the option of letting ourselves go extinct in the future (or, perhaps more realistically, of considerably reducing population size). But if we go extinct, then we can’t magically bring ourselves back into existence at a later date. Third, we should expect ourselves to progress, morally, over the next few centuries, as we have progressed in the past. So we should expect that in a few centuries’ time we will have better evidence about how to evaluate human extinction than we currently have. Given these three factors, it would be better to prevent the near-term extinction of the human race, even if we thought that the extinction of the human race would actually be a very good thing. To make this concrete, I’ll give the following simple but illustrative model. Suppose that we have 0.8 credence that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 0.2 certain that it’s a good thing to produce new people; and the degree to which it is good to produce new people, if it is good, is the same as the degree to which it is bad to produce new people, if it is bad. That is, I’m supposing, for simplicity, that we know that one new life has one unit of value; we just don’t know whether that unit is positive or negative. And let’s use our estimate of 2×10^14 people who would exist in the future, if we avoid near-term human extinction. Given our stipulated credences, the expected benefit of letting the human race go extinct now would be (.8-.2)×(2×10^14) = 1.2×(10^14). Suppose that, if we let the human race continue and did research for 300 years, we would know for certain whether or not additional people are of positive or negative value. If so, then with the credences above we should think it 80% likely that we will find out that it is a bad thing to produce new people, and 20% likely that we will find out that it’s a good thing to produce new people. So there’s an 80% chance of a loss of 3×(10^10) (because of the delay of letting the human race go extinct), the expected value of which is 2.4×(10^10). But there’s also a 20% chance of a gain of 2×(10^14), the expected value of which is 4×(10^13). That is, in expected value terms, the cost of waiting for a few hundred years is vanishingly small compared with the benefit of keeping one’s options open while one gains new information.

Cause immense violence

Just one part of a larger system

Semantics are possible

Permis negastes – negate means to deny the truth of

We agree with most of their framing – so them introducing it isnt offense – just saying it matters. The CP also does most of that

A2: