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#### interp - the aff must defend member nations of the WTO reduce intellectual property protections. To clarify - member nations must be governments that are members of the WTO. Any w/m is either Extra-T since it includes actors who engage in "rhetorical decol" like you or scholars or it's Effects-T since the starting poitn is you in this round through rhetoric that then causes a material reduction which is the effect of the advocacy “Resolved” means to enact by law.

Words & Phrases ’64

(Words and Phrases; 1964; Permanent Edition)

Definition of the word “resolve,” given by Webster is “to express an opinion or determination by resolution or vote; as ‘it was resolved by the legislature;” It is of similar force to the word “enact,” which is defined by Bouvier as meaning “to establish by law”.

#### [4] Standards to Prefer:

#### First - Fairness – radically re-contextualizing the resolution lets them defend any method tangentially related to the topic exploding Limits, which erases neg ground via perms and renders research burdens untenable by eviscerating predictable limits. Procedural questions come first – debate is a game and it makes no sense to skew a competitive activity as it requires effective negation which incentivizes argument refinement, but skewed burdens deck pedagogical engagement.

#### Second - Clash – picking any grounds for debate precludes the only common point of engagement, which obviates preround research and incentivizes retreat from controversy by eliminating any effective clash. Only the process of negation distinguishes debate and discussion by necessitating iterative testing and effective engagement, but an absence of constant refinement dooms revolutionary potential.

#### Third – SSD – their model that allows them to side-step the topic on both the Aff and Neg hurts debate as a site of role experimentation – choosing to individually engage both sides solves argument refinement and self-reflexivity breeding constantly evolving methodology which is key to activist resistance BUT side-stepping it ingrains ideological dogmatism by imposing artificial lines in the sand for what not to experiment replicating imperial ideologies about exclusion.

#### Fourth – Topic Education – nitty gritty debates on details of medicine and health policy is key to knowledge generation of constructive strategies to solve oppression.

Galea 18, Sandro. Healthier: Fifty thoughts on the foundations of population health. Oxford University Press, 2017. (Professor of Public Health at Boston University)//Elmer

How should we in academic public health engage with the issue of racism, at both interpersonal and structural levels? How might we best mitigate its effects? I suggest four possible approaches. First, we must tackle racism at the community level. In this capacity, some of us may choose to express solidarity with affected groups, participating in public shows of support. Such actions ensure that the issue of racism moves to the forefront of the public debate and stays there. Indeed, peaceful public statements of concern about a pressing social issue always have a place in an open society, and our responsibility to make these statements is not in any way inconsistent with our role as members of an academic community. Given that we are members of this community, my second suggestion relates to how our scholarship may pave the way for progress on this issue. The work of **knowledge generation** can help **inform acute social needs**, developing **constructive strategies** to help solve the urgent problems of our time—problems such as racism. This nudges us toward a scholarship of consequence, where we aim to shed light on the root causes of racial divides and the link between racism and the health of the public. To do this, **we must prioritize our research questions** accordingly. By focusing on what matters most, and orienting our scholarship toward areas of inquiry that tackle the foundational drivers of population health, we stand to make a real difference in creating a fairer, less racially fraught society. Third, we are charged at our various institutions with **fostering an education environment that both teaches** the foundations of our field and prepares students to engage with evolving issues of contemporary **public health** importance. That calls for an education that is **dynamic** and **reflexive**, but also one that is encouraging and respectful of the **sharing of ideas.** Such an academic climate does much to advance the goals of engendering **mutual understanding and identifying solutions** grounded in diversity of experience, opinion, and perspective. It is not enough to merely acknowledge disparities; we need to engage in difficult, sometimes uncomfortable discussions about these issues in order to understand one another and improve the often unacceptable conditions our scholarship makes all too apparent to us. Finally, insofar as public health centers around shaping the conditions that make people health, and insofar as those conditions depend on the introduction of health in all sectors, we need to work toward a health conversation that extends well beyond the walls of academia. This agitates for an engagement with the public conversation around the issue of racism wherever the conversation may arise. Public health’s unique perspective, informed by its scholarship, is well positioned to influence how we understand racism and its consequences for the well-being of populations. By clarifying the links between racism and health by making them unignorable in the public debate, we can then begin to advance solutions. Needless to say, racism and hate of any kind are intolerable, even when we do not take into account their health consequences. But health, as a universal aspiration, can serve as a clarifying lens for action, elevating the importance of creating a society free of racism, where health will no longer be determined by the color of a person’s skin. The actions of a committed, activist public health will go far toward bringing this about.

#### TVA – read this aff but defend a policy action

#### Engaging institutions is necessary especially in the face of settler colonialism – political change is an iterative process that can hold settlers accountable. The move away from institutions means the aff can’t solve.

Davis et al 17—Associate Professor, Indigenous Studies, Trent University, \*Associate Professor, Sociology McMaster University, and \*\*Associate Professor, Social Work University of Regina [Lynne Davis, Jeff Denis, and Raven Sinclair, 2017, Pathways of settler decolonization, Settler Colonial Studies, 7:4, 393-397, DOI: 10.1080/2201473X.2016.1243085, Accessed through the Wake Forest Library] AMarb

In addition to interdisciplinarity, the papers also share a concern to move from analysis toward action. Scholars such as Macoun and Strakosch,1 and Snelgrove, Dhamoon and Corntassel2 have warned against an abdication of responsibility by settler activists because the structural nature of settler colonialism would seem to defy a transformed future. In assessing the strengths and limitations of settler colonial theory, Macoun and Strakosch challenge those who use settler colonial theory (SCT) to realize its transformative opportunities while acting consciously to counter limitations identified by various critics. They caution against a stance of inevitability of settler colonialism that would risk delegitimizing Indigenous resistance, and they worry about re-inscribing settler academics’ political and intellectual authority to the detriment of Indigenous voices. At the same time, they note the contribution of SCT in providing a theoretical language to understand colonialism as a continuing force in the present, including an analysis of how both conservative and progressive settler movements may detract from Indigenous political challenges to the state, thus problematizing settler efforts at reconciliation and decolonization. They identify as one of its strengths the ability of SCT to provide non-Indigenous people with ‘a better account of ourselves’, 3 and to generate new conversations and alliances between Indigenous and non-Indigenous peoples. Snelgrove, Dhamoon and Corntassel warn that SCT’s rapid ascendancy in the academy could overshadow Indigenous Studies and the voices of Indigenous peoples. They argue that: without centering Indigenous peoples’ articulations, without deploying a relational approach to settler colonial power, and without paying attention to the conditions and contingencies of settler colonialism, studies of settler colonialism and practices of solidarity run the risk of reifying (and possibly replicating) settler colonial as well as other modes of domination.4 In their view, Indigenous resistance and resurgence must remain central in discussions of changing relationships: Theorists of Indigenous resurgence, such as Taiaiake Alfred and Leanne Simpson, among others, also express the possibility for settler society listening, learning, and acting […] in accordance with and for what is being articulated [by Indigenous people]; Indigenous resurgence is ultimately about reframing the conversation around decolonization in order to re-center and reinvigorate Indigenous nationhood. Macoun and Strakosch, and Snelgrove, Dhamoon and Corntassel gesture towards action by settler society to follow the lead of resurgence theorists in transforming settler colonialism, despite the structural, relational and affective challenges of anti-colonial struggle, in order to ‘reinvigorate Indigenous nationhood’ The authors in this volume examine pathways to settler decolonization, analyzing the uneven terrain of settler efforts and experiences through the lenses of SCT, Indigenous scholars and grassroots communities, and specific disciplinary analyses. While SCT has been criticized for its inability to theorize a decolonial future, this volume interrogates what happens when settlers engage with and seek to transform the system. What does such action look like? What challenges, complexities and barriers are faced? What are the stumbling blocks? And what opportunities and possibilities emerge? The articles in this volume all note the need for settlers to transform our/their relations with the land and with Indigenous peoples, while recognizing the structural and psychological challenges of applying these principles in practice. It is one thing to care about the environment, and quite another to reorient one’s lifestyle around sustainable practices and the health of local ecosystems. It is one thing to feel a connection to a place, and another to accept the notion of ‘non-human agency’. 6 Likewise, it is easier for settlers to advocate for the return of land to Indigenous peoples ‘over there’ rather than right where settlers and settler states and corporations (claim to) own property.7 Transforming social relations is not just a matter of befriending Indigenous people; it means developing long-term relations of accountability, engaging in meaningful dialogue, and respecting Indigenous laws and jurisdiction. Learning to transform relationships in these ways – and to transform self-understandings and thinking and feeling patterns or ‘settler common sense’ 8 – is an ongoing process; it is not linear, but rather iterative, occurring in what Hiller in this volume calls ‘upward and downward spirals’. Moreover, settlers’ anti-colonial learning (and unlearning) does not simply precede action; it occurs through action, through meaningful relationships with Indigenous peoples and with other engaged settlers, and through experimentation with activism of various sorts. The Nehiyawak (Cree) refer to this relational and iterative social justice-focused process as kisāhkīwewin: love in action. Several papers in this volume also address the role of emotions in settler decolonization. While critical self-reflection is essential to this process, and while emotions such as guilt, shame and indignation can help motivate settlers to change their ways and support Indigenous resurgence (as Bacon shows in one of the articles collected here), it is equally important not to treat ‘unsettling the settler within’ 9 as an end in itself; rather than dwelling in discomfort, the point of unsettlement is to be a springboard to action that benefits Indigenous peoples. A related point of tension (or contention) is whether decolonization is in the interests of settlers. Boudreau (in this volume) argues that deep decolonizing solidarities must not be based on self-interest; decolonization for settlers entails sacrifice, or giving up power and privilege. This may be true and, therefore, if it is believed that there is nothing in it for settlers, why would they ever pursue it? Although decolonization may not be in settlers’ short-term economic or political interests, it may fulfill a humanistic, ethical and moral commitment. Moreover, decolonization may be in virtually everyone’s long-term interest, particularly if Indigenous resurgence assists in combatting climate change, ever-growing economic inequality, and other political and social problems. As Tuck and Yang make clear, decolonization is not a metaphor for other social justice projects.10 Nevertheless, settler colonialism does intersect with other systems of oppression, and decolonization would be incomplete without also tackling racism, capitalism and heterosexism.11

#### TVA is terminal defense – proves our models aren’t mutually exclusive - any response to the substance of the TVA is offense for us because it proves our model allows for clear contestation. Form over Content doesn’t take it out since we don’t restrict Form, just the substantive burden of the Aff.

#### Prefer Competing Interpretations – reasonability is arbitrary and causes a race to the bottom. This means reject Aff Impact Turns predicated on their theory since we weren’t able to adequately prepare for it.

### 2

#### Strong current IP guarantees causes massive Pharma innovation.

Stevens and Ezell 20 Philip Stevens and Stephen Ezell 2-3-2020 "Delinkage Debunked: Why Replacing Patents With Prizes for Drug Development Won’t Work" <https://itif.org/publications/2020/02/03/delinkage-debunked-why-replacing-patents-prizes-drug-development-wont-work> (Philip founded Geneva Network in 2015. His main research interests are the intersection of intellectual property, trade, and health policy. Formerly he was an official at the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) in Geneva, where he worked in its Global Challenges Division on a range of IP and health issues. Prior to his time with WIPO, Philip worked as director of policy for International Policy Network, a UK-based think tank, as well as holding research positions with the Adam Smith Institute and Reform, both in London. He has also worked as a political risk consultant and a management consultant. He is a regular columnist in a wide range of international newspapers and has published a number of academic studies. He holds degrees from the London School of Economics and Durham University (UK).)//Elmer

The **Current System** Has **Produced a Tremendous Amount of Life-Sciences Innovation** The frontier for biomedical innovation is seemingly limitless, and the challenges remain numerous—whether it comes to diseases that afflict millions, such as cancer or malaria, or the estimated 7,000 rare diseases that afflict fewer than 200,000 patients.24 And while certainly citizens in developed and developing nations confront differing health challenges, those challenges are increasingly converging. For instance, as of this year, analysts expect that **noncommunicable** diseases such as cardiovascular disease and diabetes will account for 70 percent of natural fatalities **in developing countries**.25 Citizens of low- and middle-income countries bear 80 percent of the world’s death burden from cardiovascular disease.26 Forty-six percent of Africans over 25 suffer from hypertension, more than anywhere else in the world. Similarly, 85 percent of the disease burden of cervical cancer is borne by individuals living in low- and middle-income countries.27 To develop treatments or cures for these conditions, novel biomedical innovation **will be needed from everywhere**. Yet tremendous progress has been made in recent decades. To tackle these challenges, the global pharmaceutical industry invested over **$1.36 trillion in R&D** in the decade from 2007 to 2016—and it’s expected that annual R&D investment by the global pharmaceutical industry will reach $181 billion by 2022.28 In no small part due to that investment, **943 new active substances have been introduced** globally over the prior 25 years.29 The U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA) has approved more than **500 new medicines since 2000** alone. And these medicines are getting to more individuals: Global medicine use **in 2020 will reach 4.5 trillion doses**, up 24 percent from 2015.30 Moreover, there are an estimated 7,000 new medicines under development globally (about half of them in the United States), with 74 percent being potentially first in class, meaning they use a new and unique mechanism of action for treating a medical condition.31 In the United States, over 85 percent of all drugs sold are generics (only 10 percent of U.S. prescriptions are filled by brand-name drugs).32 And while some assert that biotechnology companies focus too often on “me-too” drugs that compete with other treatments already on the market, the reality is many drugs currently under development are meant to tackle some of the **world’s most intractable diseases**, **including cancer and Alzheimer’s**.33 Moreover, such arguments miss that many of the drugs developed in recent years have in fact been first of their kind. For instance, in 2014, the FDA approved **41 new medicines** (at that point, the most since 1996) many of which were first-in-class medicines.34 In that year, 28 of the 41 drugs approved were considered biologic or specialty agents, and 41 percent of medicines approved were intended to treat rare diseases.35 Yet even when a new drug isn’t first of its kind, it can still produce benefits for patients, both through **enhanced clinical efficacy** (for instance, taking the treatment as a pill rather than an injection, with a superior dosing regimen, **or better treatment** for some individuals who don’t respond well to the original drug) and by generating competition that exerts downward price pressures. For example, a patient needing a cholesterol drug has a host of statins from which to choose, which is important because some statins produce harmful side effects for some patients. Similarly, patients with osteoporosis can choose from Actonel, Boniva, or Fosomax. Or take for example Hepatitis C, which until recently was an incurable disease eventually requiring a liver transplant for many patients. In 2013, a revolutionary new treatment called Solvadi was released that boosted cure rates to 90 percent. This was followed in 2014 by an improved treatment called Harvoni, which cures the Hepatitis C variant left untouched by Solvadi. Since then, an astonishing six new treatments for the disease have received FDA approval, opening up a wide range of treatment options that take into account patients’ liver and kidney status, co-infections, potential drug interactions, previous treatment failures, and the genotype of HCV virus.36 “If you have to have Hepatitis C, now is the time to have it,” as Douglas Dieterich, a liver specialist at the Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai Hospital in New York, told the Financial Times. “We have these marvellous drugs we can treat you with right now, without side effects,” he added. “And this time next year, we’ll have another round of drugs available.”37 Moreover, the financial potential of this new product category has led to multiple competing products entering the market in quick succession, in turn placing downward pressure on prices.38 As Geoffrey Dusheiko and Charles Gore write in The Lancet, “The market has done its work for HCV treatments: after competing antiviral regimens entered the market, competition and innovative price negotiations have driven costs down from the initially high list prices in developed countries.”39 As noted previously, opponents of the current market- and IP-based system contend patents enable their holders to exploit a (temporary) market monopoly by inflating prices many multiples beyond the marginal cost of production. But rather than a conventional neoclassical analysis, an analysis based on “innovation economics” finds it is exactly this “distortion” that is required for innovation to progress. As William Baumol has pointed out, “Prices above marginal costs and price discrimination become the norm rather than the exception because … without such deviations from behaviour in the perfectly competitive model, innovation outlays and other unavoidable and repeated sunk outlays cannot be recouped.”40 Or, as the U.S. Congressional Office of Technology Assessment found, “Pharmaceutical R&D is a risky investment; therefore, high financial returns are necessary **to induce companies to invest** in researching new chemical entities.”41 This is also why, in 2018, the U.S. Congressional Budget Office estimated that because of high failure rates, biopharmaceutical **companies would need to earn a 61.8 percent rate of return on their successful new drug R&D projects in order to match a 4.8 percent after-tax rate of return on their investment**s.42 Indeed, **it’s the ability to recoup fixed costs, not just marginal** costs, through mechanisms such as patent protection that lies at the heart of all innovation-based industries and indeed all innovation and related economic progress. If companies could not find a way to pay for their R&D costs, and could only charge for the costs of producing the compound, **there would be no new drugs developed**, just as there would be no new products developed in any industry. Innovating in the life sciences remains expensive, risky, difficult, and uncertain. Just 1 in 5,000 drug candidates make it all the way from discovery to market.43 A 2018 study by the Deloitte Center for Health Solutions, “Unlocking R&D productivity: Measuring the return from pharmaceutical innovation 2018,” found that “the average cost to develop an asset [an innovative life-sciences drug] including the cost of failure, has increased in six out of eight years,” and that the average cost to create a new drug has risen to $2.8 billion.44 Related research has found the development of new drugs requires years of painstaking, risky, and expensive research that, for a new pharmaceutical compound, takes an average of 11.5 to 15 years of research, development, and clinical trials, at a cost of $1.7 billion to $**3.2 billion**.45 IP rights—including patents, copyrights, and data exclusivity protections—give innovators, whether in the life sciences or other sectors, the **confidence** to undertake the risky and expensive process of innovation, secure in the knowledge they’ll be able to capture a share of the gains from their efforts. And these gains are often only a small fraction of the true value created. For instance, Yale University economist William Nordhaus estimated inventors capture just 4 percent of the total social gains from their innovations; the rest spill over to other companies and society as a whole.46 Without adequate IP protection, private investors would never find it viable to fund advanced research because lower-cost copiers would be in a position to undercut the legitimate prices (and profits) of innovators, even while still generating substantial profits on their own.47 As the report “Wealth, Health and International Trade in the 21st Century” concludes, “Conferring robust intellectual property rights is, in the pharmaceutical and other technological-development contexts, **in the global public’s long-term interests.** Without adequate mechanisms for directly and indirectly securing the private and public funding of medicines and vaccines, research and development communities across the world will lose future benefits that would far outweigh the development costs involved.”48 Put simply, the current market- and IP-based life-sciences innovation system is producing life-changing biomedical innovation. As Jack Scannell, a senior fellow at Oxford University’s Center for the Advancement of Sustainable Medical Innovation has explained, “I would guess that one can buy today, at rock bottom generic prices, a set of small-molecule drugs that has greater medical utility than the entire set available to anyone, anywhere, at any price in 1995.” He continued, “Nearly all the generic medicine chest was created by firms who invested in R&D to win future profits that they tried pretty hard to maximize; short-term financial gain building a long-term common good.”49 For example, on September 14, 2017, the FDA approved Mvasi, the first biosimilar for Roche’s Avastin, a breakthrough anticancer drug when it came out in the mid-1990s for lung, cervical, and colorectal cancer.50 In other words, a medicine to treat forms of cancer that barely existed 20 years ago is now available as a generic drug today. It’s this dynamic that enables us to imagine a situation wherein drugs to treat diseases that aren’t available anywhere at any price today (for instance, treatments for Alzheimer’s or Parkinson’s) might be available as generics in 20 years. But that will only be the case if we preserve (and improve where possible) a life-sciences innovation system that is generally working. The current system does not require wholesale replacement by a prize-based system that—notwithstanding a meaningful success here or there—has produced nowhere near a similar level of novel biomedical innovation.

#### The most efficacious mainstream drugs come from Indigenous Knowledge – empirics are on our side.

King 91 Stephen King September 1991 "The Source of Our Cures: A new pharmaceutical company wants to provide reciprocal benefits and recognize the value of indigenous" <https://www.culturalsurvival.org/publications/cultural-survival-quarterly/source-our-cures-new-pharmaceutical-company-wants-provide> //Elmer

**FOR 500 YEARS**, SINCE THE People of South America encountered Europeans on their soil, **the global pharmacopoeia** has been **enriched by a number of important plant-derived medicines discovered and utilized by indigenous people**. The skeletal **muscle relaxant d-tubocurarine** is derived from an Amazonian arrow poison better known as curare, Chonodendron tomentosum. The **antimalarial drug quinine**, obtained from the bark of the several species on Cinchona trees, was first called "Indian fever bark" by the Europeans until the name "Jesuit fever bark" became more popular. Quinidine, also produced from the bark of Cinchona species, is now used as an antiarrhythmic for people with cardiac problems. An important amoebocide and emetic drug **emetine**, obtained from the roots of Cephalis ipecacuana, was utilized by indigenous people in Brazil **to treat dysentery**. One of the world's most important local anesthetics, cocaine is derived from the leaves of Erthroxylum coca and is still used today as medicine by thousands of people in the Andean region of South America. **Pilocarpine**, a drug **used to treat glaucoma**, is derived from the plant Pilocarpups jaborandi and was utilized by indigenous people in Brazil as medicine. These are only a few examples of the mainstream drugs that have been developed based on the - acknowledged - traditional wisdom of indigenous people. Roughly **74 percent of the 121** **plant-derived compounds** currently **used in the global pharmacopoeia** h**ave been discovered through research based on** ethnobotanical information on the **use** of plants **by indigenous people**. It is well known that tropical forest ecosystems contain a tremendous diversity of plant species. Estimates cite a minimum of 250,000 flowering plant species worldwide, at least 90,000 of which are found in the neotropics. Fewer than one percent of these plants have been investigated even superficially for potential pharmacological activity. A surprisingly large proportion of this plant biodiversity is classified, utilized, and actively managed by indigenous and local people of tropical regions. Tropical forest people have a profound knowledge about the utility, of plants found in their environment - an observation confirmed by ethnobotanical and ethnopharmacological research in the past decade (see references). At the same time interdisciplinary research by anthropologists, ecologists, geographers, and tropical agrnomists has shown that indigenous people and rural inhabitants of the neotropics have been - and continue to - actively managing plant genetic resources in their environment (Balee and Posey 1989; Irvine 1987; Denevan and Padoch 1988; Posey 1985); plants used as medicine are often moved and maintained as cultivated or wild/cultivated medical resources.

#### **Chinese Tribal Medicine proves Compatibility and our Innovation Links.**

Erstling 8, Jay. "Using patent to protect traditional knowledge." Tex. Wesleyan L. Rev. 15 (2008): 295. https://open.mitchellhamline.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1187&context=facsch (Professor of Law, William Mitchell College of Law, St. Paul, Minnesota.)//Elmer

Advantages of Affirmative Protection Despite the above-mentioned limitations and challenges, **patents have a place in a TK protection system**. A **prime example is** the use of patents to protect **Traditional Chinese Medicine**. The practice of Traditional Chinese Medicine dates back to the beginning of Chinese history. At its most basic, it is "a systematic practice of distinguishing among various illness-causing imbalances of qi. [It] achieves health by restoring a patient's internal yin-yang equilibrium via herbal remedies and physical manipulation."1'69 Traditional Chinese Medicine is of **enormous importance** not only **to** the **Chinese**-**and** the **world's healthcare systems**, but also to the Chinese economy. 170 It is no surprise, therefore, that the Chinese Government has made it a policy to encourage the patenting of innovative Traditional Chinese Medicinal products. Although most developing countries tend to find disfavor with the **TRIPS** Agreement, the Agreement has proven to be a **boon to** the **protection of T**raditional **C**hinese **M**edicine. Prior to the adoption of Article 27.1 of the TRIPS Agreement, which required China to make patents available "for any inventions, whether products or processes, in all fields of technology . . . " the Chinese Patent Law171 did not protect Traditional Chinese Medicine. Since the Law's amendment, there has been a significant **uptake in patent activity**, particularly related to Traditional Chinese Medicine-based pharmaceuticals, and many supporters of Traditional Chinese Medicine believe that **this** activity has **served to incentivize investment in T**raditional **C**hinese **M**edicine, **increase** the **T**raditional **C**hinese **M**edicine **knowledge base**, and transform Traditional Chinese Medicine into a major global export asset. 172 Since 1992, when the Patent Law was amended, applicants have filed patent applications with the State Intellectual Property Office of China (SIPO) at a rate of 1,400 cases a year, 173 but they have not limited their activity to China alone; they have also filed applications in countries such as Germany, Japan, the United Kingdom, and the United States. Moreover, patent holders have begun to enforce the rights they have been granted. For example, in February 2007, China Business News reported that a Chinese patentee Traditional Chinese Medicine manufacturer won the first Traditional Chinese Medicine infringement case against another Chinese company. The patentee was awarded an injunction prohibiting the infringing company from selling the infringing products as well as damages. 174 The **promotion** of Traditional Chinese Medicine has **led to** the establishment of organizations such as the Shanghai Innovative Research Center of Traditional Chinese Medicine (**SIRC**), 75 **which** in turn has further encouraged patent protection for TK. Founded in 2000 with support from the Chinese Ministry of Science and Technology and the Shanghai Municipal Government, SIRC **seeks to modernize T**raditional **C**hinese **M**edicine **and innovate drug discovery** "**by integrating modern life science, chemistry, and information technology** with [Traditional Chinese Medicine]"1 76 -just the right formula to maximize patenting potential. 177 Although the patent system may not be suited to all types of TK, using patents to protect Traditional Chinese Medicine seems to have achieved some success in encouraging new innovation and invention. Communities working to advance other areas of innovative TK may do well to follow China's example.

#### **R&D’s key to innovation – otherwise, future pandemics.**

Marjanovic et al. ’20 (Sonja; Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge; May 2020; “How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis”; RAND; <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html>; Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

As key actors in the healthcare innovation landscape, pharmaceutical and life sciences companies have been called on to **develop** medicines, vaccines and diagnostics for pressing public health challenges. The COVID-19 crisis is one such challenge, but there are many others. For example, MERS, SARS, Ebola, Zika and avian and swine flu are also **infectious diseases** that represent public health threats. Infectious agents such as anthrax, smallpox and tularemia could present threats in a **bioterrorism context**.1 The general threat to public health that is posed by **antimicrobial resistance** is also well-recognised as an area **in need of pharmaceutical innovation**. Innovating in response to these challenges does not always align well with pharmaceutical industry commercial models, shareholder expectations and competition within the industry. However, the expertise, networks and infrastructure that industry has within its reach, as well as public expectations and the moral imperative, make pharmaceutical companies and the wider life sciences sector an **indispensable partner** in the search for solutions that save lives. This perspective argues for the need to establish more sustainable and scalable ways of incentivising pharmaceutical innovation in response to infectious disease threats to public health. It considers both past and current examples of efforts to mobilise pharmaceutical innovation in high commercial risk areas, including in the context of current efforts to respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In global pandemic crises like COVID-19, the urgency and scale of the crisis – as well as the spotlight placed on pharmaceutical companies – mean that contributing to the search for effective medicines, vaccines or diagnostics is **essential** for socially responsible companies in the sector. 2 It is therefore unsurprising that we are seeing industry-wide efforts unfold at unprecedented scale and pace. Whereas there is always scope for more activity, industry is currently **contributing in a variety of ways**. Examples include pharmaceutical companies donating existing compounds to assess their utility in the fight against COVID19; screening existing compound libraries in-house or with partners to see if they can be repurposed; accelerating trials for potentially effective medicine or vaccine candidates; and in some cases rapidly accelerating in-house research and development to discover new treatments or vaccine agents and develop diagnostics tests.3,4 Pharmaceutical companies are collaborating with each other in some of these efforts and participating in global R&D partnerships (such as the Innovative Medicines Initiative effort to accelerate the development of potential therapies for COVID-19) and supporting national efforts to expand diagnosis and testing capacity and ensure affordable and ready access to potential solutions.3,5,6 The **primary purpose** of such innovation is to benefit patients and wider population health. Although there are also reputational benefits from involvement that can be realised across the industry, there are likely to be relatively few companies that are ‘commercial’ winners. Those who might gain substantial revenues will be under pressure not to be seen as profiting from the pandemic. In the United Kingdom for example, GSK has stated that it does not expect to profit from its COVID-19 related activities and that any gains will be invested in supporting research and long-term pandemic preparedness, as well as in developing products that would be affordable in the world’s poorest countries.7 Similarly, in the United States AbbVie has waived intellectual property rights for an existing combination product that is being tested for therapeutic potential against COVID-19, which would support affordability and allow for a supply of generics.8,9 Johnson & Johnson has stated that its potential vaccine – which is expected to begin trials – will be available on a not-for-profit basis during the pandemic.10 Pharma is mobilising substantial efforts to rise to the COVID-19 challenge at hand. However, we need to consider **how** pharmaceutical **innovation** for **responding to emerging** infectious diseases can best be enabled beyond the current crisis. Many **public health threats (including** those associated with other infectious diseases, bioterrorism agents and antimicrobial resistance) **are urgently in need** of pharmaceutical innovation, even if their impacts are not as visible to society as COVID-19 is in the immediate term. The pharmaceutical industry has responded to previous public health emergencies associated with infectious disease in recent times – for example those associated with Ebola and Zika outbreaks.11 However, it has done so to a lesser scale than for COVID-19 and with contributions from fewer companies. Similarly, levels of activity in response to the threat of antimicrobial resistance are still low.12 There are **important policy questions** as to whether – and how – industry could engage with such public health threats to an even greater extent under **improved innovation conditions.**

#### Evolving superbugs trigger extinction.

Srivatsa ’17 (Kadiyali; specialist in pediatric intensive and critical care medicine in the UK. Invented the bacterial identification tool ‘MAYA’; 1-12-2017; "Superbug Pandemics and How to Prevent Them", American Interest; https://www.the-american-interest.com/2017/01/12/superbug-pandemics-and-how-to-prevent-them/, Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

It is by now no secret that the human species is locked in a race of its own making with “superbugs.” Indeed, if popular science fiction is a measure of awareness, the theme has pervaded English-language literature from Michael Crichton’s 1969 Andromeda Strain all the way to Emily St. John Mandel’s 2014 Station Eleven and beyond. By a combination of massive inadvertence and what can only be called stupidity, we must now invent new and effective antibiotics faster than deadly bacteria evolve—and regrettably, they are rapidly doing so with our help. I do not exclude the possibility that bad actors might deliberately engineer deadly superbugs.1 But even if that does not happen, humanity faces an existential threat largely of its own making in the absence of malign intentions. As threats go, this one is entirely predictable. The concept of a “black swan,” Nassim Nicholas Taleb’s term for low-probability but high-impact events, has become widely known in recent years. Taleb did not invent the concept; he only gave it a catchy name to help mainly business executives who know little of statistics or probability. Many have embraced the “black swan” label the way children embrace holiday gifts, which are often bobbles of little value, except to them. But the threat of inadvertent pandemics is not a “black swan” because its probability is not low. If one likes catchy labels, it better fits the term “gray rhino,” which, explains Michele Wucker, is a high-probability, high-impact event that people manage to ignore anyway for a raft of social-psychological reasons.2 A pandemic is a quintessential gray rhino, for it is no longer a matter of if but of when it will challenge us—and of how prepared we are to deal with it when it happens. We have certainly been warned. The curse we have created was understood as a possibility from the very outset, when seventy years ago Sir Alexander Fleming, the discoverer of penicillin, predicted antibiotic resistance. When interviewed for a 2015 article, “The Most Predictable Disaster in the History of the Human Race,” Bill Gates pointed out that one of the costliest disasters of the 20th century, worse even than World War I, was the Spanish Flu pandemic of 1918-19. As the author of the article, Ezra Klein, put it: “No one can say we weren’t warned. And warned. And warned. A pandemic disease is the most predictable catastrophe in the history of the human race, if only because it has happened to the human race so many, many times before.”3 Even with effective new medicines, if we can devise them, we must contain outbreaks of bacterial disease fast, lest they get out of control. In other words, we have a social-organizational challenge before us as well as a strictly medical one. That means getting sufficient amounts of medicine into the right hands and in the right places, but it also means educating people and enabling them to communicate with each other to prevent any outbreak from spreading widely. Responsible governments and cooperative organizations have options in that regard, but even individuals can contribute something. To that end, as a medical doctor I have created a computer app that promises to be useful in that regard—of which more in a moment. But first let us review the situation, for while it has become well known to many people, there is a general resistance to acknowledging the severity and imminence of the danger. What Are the Problems? Bacteria are among the oldest living things on the planet. They are masters of survival and can be found everywhere. Billions of them live on and in every one of us, many of them helping our bodies to run smoothly and stay healthy. Most bacteria that are not helpful to us are at least harmless, but some are not. They invade our cells, spread quickly, and cause havoc that we refer to generically as disease. Millions of people used to die every year as a result of bacterial infections, until we developed antibiotics. These wonder drugs revolutionized medicine, but one can have too much of a good thing. Doctors have used antibiotics recklessly, prescribing them for just about everything, and in the process helped to create strains of bacteria that are resistant to the medicines we have. We even give antibiotics to cattle that are not sick and use them to fatten chickens. Companies large and small still mindlessly market antimicrobial products for hands and home, claiming that they kill bacteria and viruses. They do more harm than good because the low concentrations of antimicrobials that these products contain tend to kill friendly bacteria (not viruses at all), and so clear the way for the mass multiplication of surviving unfriendly bacteria. Perhaps even worse, hospitals have deployed antimicrobial products on an industrial scale for a long time now, the result being a sharp rise in iatrogenic bacterial illnesses. Overuse of antibiotics and commercial products containing them has helped superbugs to evolve. We now increasingly face microorganisms that cannot be killed by antibiotics, antifungals, antivirals, or any other chemical weapon we throw at them. Pandemics are the major risk we run as a result, but it is not the only one. Overuse of antibiotics by doctors, homemakers, and hospital managers could mean that, in the not-too-distant future, something as simple as a minor cut could again become life-threatening if it becomes infected. Few non-medical professionals are aware that antibiotics are the foundation on which nearly all of modern medicine rests. Cancer therapy, organ transplants, surgeries minor and major, and even childbirth all rely on antibiotics to prevent infections. If infections become untreatable we stand to lose most of the medical advances we have made over the past fifty years.

#### Disease perpetuates colonialism – it disproportionately hurts Indigenous people.

Ostler 20 Jeffrey Ostler 4-29-2020 "Disease Has Never Been Just Disease for Native Americans" <https://www.theatlantic.com/ideas/archive/2020/04/disease-has-never-been-just-disease-native-americans/610852/> (Beekman Professor of Northwest and Pacific History at the University of Oregon.)//Elmer

As the death toll from COVID-19 mounts, **people of color are** clearly **at greater risk** than others. Among **the most vulnerable are Native** Americans. To understand **how dire** the **COVID**-19 situation **is** becoming for these communities, consider the situation unfolding for the **Navajo Nation**, a people with homelands in Arizona, New Mexico, and Utah. As of April 23, **1,360 infections and 52 deaths** had been reported among the Navajo Reservation’s 170,000 people, a **mortality rate of 30 per 100,000**. Only six states have a higher per capita toll. The spread of COVID-19 is **reminiscent of previous disease outbreaks that have ravaged Native American communities**. Many of those outbreaks resulted in catastrophic loss of life, far greater than even the worst-case scenarios for COVID-19. Even the 1918–19 flu pandemic, in which an estimated 650,000 Americans died (0.6 percent of the 1920 population of 106 million), pales in comparison to the losses Native Americans have suffered from disease. Until recently, histories of disease and Native Americans have emphasized “virgin-soil epidemics.” According to this theory, popularized in Jared Diamond’s Guns, Germs, and Steel, when Europeans arrived in the Western Hemisphere, they brought diseases (particularly measles and smallpox) that indigenous people had never experienced. Because they had no immunity to these diseases, so the theory goes, the resulting epidemics took the lives of 70 percent or more of the Native population throughout the Americas. New research, however, provides a much more complicated picture of disease in American Indian history. This research shows that virgin-soil epidemics were not as common as previously believed and shifts the focus to how **diseases repeatedly attacked Native communities** in the decades and **centuries after Europeans first arrived**. Post-contact diseases were **crippling** not so much because indigenous people lacked immunity, but **because** the **conditions** **created by** European and U.S. **colonialism made Native communities vulnerable**. The virgin-soil-epidemic hypothesis was valuable in countering earlier theories that attributed Native American population decline to racial inferiority, but its singular emphasis on biological difference implied that population collapses were nothing more than historical accidents. By stressing the importance of social conditions created by human decisions and actions, the new scholarship provides a far more disturbing picture. It also helps us understand the problems facing Native communities today as they battle the novel coronavirus. Virgin-soil epidemics undoubtedly occurred. In 1633, for example, a smallpox epidemic struck Native communities in New England, reducing the Mohegan and Pequot populations from a combined total of 16,000 to just 3,000. The epidemic spread to the Haudenosaunee in New York, but no farther west than that. Smallpox did not hit communities in the Ohio Valley and Great Lakes until 1756–57, a century or more after initial contact with Europeans. When it did, it was because Native fighters, recruited to fight for the French against the British during the Seven Years’ War, had contracted the virus in the east and infected their communities when they returned home. Lack of immunity mattered, but it was the disruption resulting from war that promoted smallpox’s spread. Smallpox did not arrive in the Southeast until 1696, a century and a half after the Hernando de Soto expedition. It was once thought that de Soto’s men carried smallpox, but this view reflected the flawed assumption that Europeans were always infected with smallpox and always contagious. De Soto’s expedition did cause disease to erupt in Native communities, but the reason was that the expedition’s violent warfare led to outbreaks of pathogens such as dysentery, which was already present in the Americas. When smallpox finally hit the Southeast, it spread rapidly from Virginia to East Texas across networks created by an English trade in Native captives for enslavement in their coastal and West Indies colonies. Raiding, capturing, and transporting human bodies created pathways for the smallpox virus. To make matters worse, those bodies were already weakened by war and its companions—malnutrition, exposure, and lack of palliative care. By the end of the 18th century, most Native communities in what would eventually become the United States had been exposed to smallpox. Nevertheless, as smallpox recurred in the 19th century, its impact correlated not with a lack of prior exposure, but with the presence of adverse social conditions. These same conditions would also make Native communities susceptible to a host of other diseases, including cholera, typhus, malaria, dysentery, tuberculosis, scrofula, and alcoholism. Native vulnerability had—and has—nothing to do with racial inferiority or, since those initial incidents, lack of immunity; rather, it has everything to do with concrete policies pursued by the United States government, its states, and its citizens. Consider the impact of the Indian Removal Act. Formally adopted in 1830, this policy called for the relocation of Native peoples east of the Mississippi River to “Indian Territory” (what would eventually become Oklahoma and Kansas). Most everyone has heard of the Cherokee Trail of Tears, but it is seldom considered a U.S.-caused health crisis. The expulsion of the Cherokee from their homeland in Georgia, North Carolina, and Tennessee had three phases. In the first, the U.S. Army forcibly evicted Cherokees from their homes and held them for several months in concentration camps with inadequate shelter, insufficient food, and no source of clean water. The camps became death traps. Of the 16,000 people held in them, about 2,000 died from dysentery, whooping cough, measles, and “fevers” (probably malaria). In the second phase, the journey west, an additional 1,500 perished, as people, already sick and further weakened by malnutrition, trauma, and exposure, succumbed to multiple pathogens. In the months after reaching Oklahoma—the third phase—an additional 500 died from similar causes. The death toll was 4,000, or 25 percent of the original 16,000 forced from their homes. Although the Cherokee Trail of Tears is the most well known, there were dozens of other such forced removals. Creeks, Seminoles, Chickasaws, Choctaws, Senecas, Wyandots, Potawatomis, Sauks and Mesquakies, Ojibwes, Ottawas, Miamis, Kickapoos, Poncas, Modocs, Kalapuyas, and Takelmas represent only a partial list of nations that suffered trails of tears. Not all experienced the same mortality as the Cherokee, but many did, and for some, the toll was even higher. The allied Sauks and Mesquakies were forced to move four times from their villages in western Illinois—once to central Iowa, once to western Iowa, once to Kansas, and finally to Oklahoma. In 1832, the time of the first expulsion, the Sauks and Mesquakies numbered 6,000. By 1869, when they were finally sent to Oklahoma, their population was only 900, a staggering loss of 85 percent. Year after year, unrelenting diseases, including an outbreak of smallpox in 1851, took many lives. Low fertility and infant mortality, the result of malnutrition, sickness, and trauma, hindered population replacement. The Sauk and Mesquakie catastrophe was not an accident. It was a direct and foreseeable consequence of decisions made by the United States and its citizens to dispossess Native people of desirable lands and shove them someplace else. Navajos (Dinés, as they refer to themselves in their language) were also evicted from their homelands. In the winter of 1863–64, the U.S. Army pursued scorched-earth tactics—destroying their peach trees and cornfields—to drive them to a barren reservation at Bosque Redondo, on the Pecos River in New Mexico. On the 250-mile forced march, known as the Long Walk, several hundred of the 8,000 to 9,000 Dinés died en route. Over the next four years, Dinés lost as many as 2,500 of their people to disease and starvation. In their darkest hour, though, Diné leaders successfully prevailed on government officials to release them from their prison and return home. But even though their population has grown over time, the legacies of the Long Walk remain. The Diné historian Jennifer Denetdale observes that “severe poverty, addiction, suicide and crime on reservations all have their roots in the Long Walk.” As cases of COVID-19 began to appear on the Navajo Reservation in late March, tribal President Jonathan Nez spoke to his people on Facebook. Summoning memories of the Long Walk, he “called on citizens to help one another,” reminding them “that’s when the best came out of many of our ancestors, helping each other out, carrying the load for the elders, carrying the children for our mothers.” “Now it’s our turn,” he said, “to think of our future, our children, our grandchildren.” Ongoing colonialism makes fighting COVID-19 a challenge. Although the Navajo are a sovereign nation with resources of their own, Dinés have a high incidence of conditions—diabetes, hypertension, and lung disease—that increase their susceptibility to becoming severely ill from the coronavirus. Lack of access to clean water makes hand-washing difficult. Many people cannot afford food, hand sanitizer, and other necessities. And there is an acute shortage of hospital beds and medical personnel. Many public officials, health experts, and journalists are drawing attention to the disproportionate impact of COVID-19 on communities of color. Even so, large segments of America are indifferent, if not outright hostile, to recognizing these disparities and the inequities underlying them. Native Americans are visible to the general public far more often as sports mascots than as actual communities. The Trump administration initially resisted providing any relief to tribal nations in the $2 trillion stimulus package passed in early April, and although the legislation ultimately appropriated $10 billion to tribal governments, the Treasury Department, tasked with distributing these funds, has failed to disburse them. According to New Mexico Senator Tom Udall, Treasury Department officials “don’t know how to interact in the appropriate way with tribes and they’re just not getting the job done.” Countering the invisibility of Native peoples, of course, means greater awareness of how COVID-19 is affecting them and enhanced efforts to provide resources to help them combat the current outbreak. It also means creating a deeper understanding of the history of American Indians and disease. Although the virgin-soil-epidemic hypothesis may have been well intentioned, its focus on the brief, if horrific, moment of initial contact consigns disease safely to the distant past and provides colonizers with an alibi. **Indigenous communities are fighting more than a virus**. They are **contending with the ongoing legacy of centuries of violence and dispossession.**

### 4

#### Stop it – this is a procedural – you lose- non indigenous setcol is violent and makes debate exclusive which is a prereq to engagement

Brough ‘17

Taylor Brough <https://resistanceanddebate.wordpress.com/2017/03/23/open-letter-to-non-black-native-people-in-debate/> (won CEDA in 2016, debated for Vermont)//Elmer

I am here preoccupied with our enunciative capacities in debate—with what I perceive “Native debate,” and specifically non-Black Native debaters, to be doing in service of Settler/Master (mis)recognition, what the consequences of such doing might be, and what it might mean to push against the disciplining force of recognition in debate. The ontological fact of genocide/sovereignty as a dual positioning for Native people, coupled with academia’s push to identify ourselves at the site of (coherent and recognizable) trauma (what Wilderson terms “intra-human conflicts”), has led Native thought in debate, broadly, to do three related things: 1) prioritize the coherent discussion of sovereign loss over one of genocide and its incoherence, 2) articulate ourselves as always in conversation with (read: traumatized by) the Settler, 3) distance ourselves from a Black/Red conversation or from Black/Red theorizing. These three moves are all antiblack in addition to being an insidious manifestation of the genocide that structures half of our (non?)being. Depressingly, if we were to historicize “Native debate,” we would have to begin with a litany of non-Native debaters reading “Give Back the Land,” offering sovereignty as a solution to a tragic history of genocide that relegates Native people to phobic/phillic objects of the past whose futures are in the hands of those Settlers who bravely dare to talk about them. The terrain in which everyone can become Native—or at least become an advocate for Natives—is a cleared landscape produced by genocide but also, significantly, produced by antiblack slavery. This history of non-Native debaters’ representations of sovereignty, land repatriation, and treaty rights as the only solution to genocide also reaches into the present. What is most disturbing to me about this ongoing history is that we have yet to tie virtually any debate round to actual, material land repatriation, sovereign gains, or the upholding of treaty rights. These material gains involve labor from Native people organizing at the grassroots level, not an academic labor from Settlers. Debate arguments do not facilitate sovereign benefits for Native peoples. Further, the struggle for sovereignty itself does not overcome or solve genocide. The removal of the Hunkpapa Lakota Oyate and their relatives at the Oceti Sakowin camp at Standing Rock should be proof enough of this—sovereignty as a politic is often met with, rather than resolving, genocidal violence. Non-Black Native people in debate have performed a similar land-based politic. Native debate has become so associated with words like “land,” “sovereignty,” “space,” “place,” “treaty rights,” and others, that it is almost impossible to theorize Native debate absent sovereignty as a grammar that marks our existence. So both non-Native debaters (who claim to advocate for Native peoples’ sovereignty) and Native debaters (who claim to advocate for something that usually falls into the grammar of sovereignty) are talking in essentially the same register, with incredibly limited slippage towards genocide as a vector of violence. And, for Native people, like non-Natives, debate arguments do not and cannot facilitate the material elements of decolonization that these land-based arguments frequently rely upon. Sovereign gains don’t happen in debate rounds, but for some reason the (mis)recognition of Native enunciation as sovereignty persists, in that the word “land” harkens to Native debate in almost every instance, that almost every debate involving Native people reading perceptibly “Native” arguments includes a discussion of “treaties” or “sovereignty” or “land-based pedagogy” or “spatiality.” What other reason could this be than a structure of desire around recognition from the Settler/Master? If we really follow the history of how “Nativeness” has been misrepresented in debate by Settlers, it becomes clear that much of contemporary Native debate, strangely (or as I argue, not so strangely), mimics these misrepresentations. Of course, debate is an economy of (mis)recognition. That “Native” becomes coextensive with “land” in debate is no accident. It is an enunciation that has been evoked prior to the involvement of any Native debaters or coaches. And it is reiterated by non-Black Native debaters with increasing certainty about the truthiness of Native relationships to the land. Systematically absent from this conversation, of course, is a discussion of genocide. I have gestured above towards the ways that the desire for recognition from the Settler/Master motivates this conceptual move towards the register of sovereignty. As Wilderson writes, “The crowding out, or disavowal, of the genocide modality [by the sovereign modality] allows the Settler/’Savage’ struggle to appear as a conflict rather than as an antagonism. This has therapeutic value for both the ‘Savage’ and the Settler: the mind can grasp the fight, conceptually put it into words. To say, ‘You stole my land and pilfered and appropriated my culture’ and then produce books, articles, and films that travel back and forth along the vectors of those conceptually coherent accusations is less threatening to the integrity of the ego, than to say,- ‘You culled me down from 19 million to 250,000.’”[4] This gesture towards conceptual coherence and therapeutic value is why there is a celebrated and ongoing association between “land” and “Native” in both non-Native argumentation and in arguments made by Native people. It is why we cannot theorize about Native debate absent the contingent register of sovereignty. I am hesitant to claim that sovereignty should be completely abandoned as an analytic for obvious reasons—I think Wilderson also gives credit to indigenous conceptions of sovereignty, what it unseats, and how it operates, while still articulating a critique of sovereignty unrivaled by much of Native studies. I am not interested in suggesting that all Native people ignore our peoples’ land relationships or histories of broken treaties as politic throughout the United States or the world. I agree with Qwo-Li Driskill’s suggestion, alongside similar ones from other Native theorists, that sovereignty must be re-theorized significantly rather than echoing the propertied enterprise that confers legibility to state formations. Regardless of my reluctance to disavow the potential for sovereignty as a politic outside debate rounds, I think it is obvious that sovereignty in its terms in debate—as a recognized and fundamentally “Native” utterance—is genocidal and anti-Black. Broadly, my argument is that genocide is an undertheorized arm of an antagonism that halfway positions Native people, and that the basis of such undertheorization is the desire to be (mis)recognized as nearly-Human by the Settler. This claim invites an investigation of the context of (mis)recognition in debate and what is particular about debate itself with regard to Wilderson’s theory of position.

### 5

#### The standard is maximizing expected wellbeing – that means act hedonism.

#### 1] Util is key to debates about IP.

Kar 19 [Mohit; Writer at the Original Position; “Utilitarianism in the Context of Intellectual Property,” The Original Position; 9/18/19; <https://originalpositionnluj.wordpress.com/2019/09/18/utilitarianism-in-the-context-of-intellectual-property/>] Justin

Jeremy Bentham is known as the founder of modern utilitarianism. He believed in production of the greatest possible quantity of happiness, on the part of those whose interest is in view. With regards to intellectual property, he had opined that inventors and authors should be given absolute privilege over their work, which would ensure they get remunerated duly for their work, thus leading to further creative actions being taken by them. In this article, the author will make an analysis of the utilitarian theory as proposed by Jeremy Bentham and its interplay with Intellectual Property.

According to utilitarians, the main purpose of property rights is the maximization of common well-being.[i] According to Jeremy Bentham, the common well-being here mentioned is the good for the greatest number of people in a population. He defined the principle of utility as carrying an object of production of maximum happiness in a given time in a particular society.[ii]

The wealth of a society consists of the cumulative wealth of each of its individual members. The most effective way to increase individual wealth is to leave the management of wealth to the individual himself, since – between the individual and the government – it is the individual who can best manage his own wealth. The society gains benefits because the increase in individual wealth is also the increase of collective wealth. Sharing this wealth is managed by the government, through taxes. Bentham argued that the value of outcome of a society is positive if the total quantity of pleasure gained by each individual under its influence is greater than the total quantity of pain.[iii] Thus, Bentham put stress on the happiness and wealth of individuals in a society.

Jeremy Bentham’s utilitarianism advocates the maximization of common well-being and the proper use of resources available. To show us a practical point of view, he criticized the kind of trade strategies where a country prevents the purchase of cheaper products from another country only to protect its market. In his opinion, to pay more for a product that can be manufactured elsewhere with the same quality standards only to favor the national industry is a waste of resources.[iv] Bentham believed that trade barriers to foreign imports cannot increase trade and commerce in a particular country.[v] He termed it as a necessary evil which would give rise to monopolies and lower the quality of production.[vi]

Transposing this theory to intellectual property rights, for the maximization of common welfare to be made, the legislators should strike a balance between, the monopoly of rights to stimulate creation and giving access to the population to inventions. Bentham defended the idea of ​​a limited period of protection for patents and he believed in the absolute privilege of the inventor, so that the latter can recover the amounts invested during the inventive process, while being paid for his creative activity.[vii] The right must also help the inventor since without any laws to protect him; any third party could copy his invention and thus enjoy his work without any compensation being granted. The logic to defend the monopoly stems from the fact that, without the latter, the inventor would not be encouraged to put his product or invention on the market. In this case, it would be the society that would have lost wealth which could have been added to the common well-being. In the name of enriching common well-being, Bentham stresses the importance of patents in a society and even argues that their concession should be a free service offered to inventors.[viii]

The contemporary version of this theory has been presented to us by William Landes and Richard Posner in two separate works, one on copyright and the other on trademark law.[ix] Economic analysis of intellectual property rights presented by these two authors demonstrates that the protection of intellectual property may be too expensive for society and it limits the use of products. If we extrapolate a little, this contemporary utilitarian vision can assert that the products by intellectuals should be easily copied since the copies of a product do not prevent the use of the same product by several people.

William Landes and Richard Posner consider the creative process as divided into two parts.[x] If we use a book as an example, its production is split between the part comprising author’s time and effort plus publishing costs, and the second part includes publication and distribution costs of the book. Generally, it is the first of these two elements that demands the most investment. The second will be more or less expensive, depending on the quantity of copies that will be produced. When the work is complete, its reproduction does not require any investment at the creative level. Hence, they stated that striking a correct balance between access and incentives is one of the central problems of copyright law.[xi] In this way, as already mentioned, the lack of remuneration of creators for the exploitation of their works may have as a consequence the diminution of the cultural wealth of a society, given that the creators will not have the desire to continue to create unless paid. It is important to note that the lack of protection conferred by copyright would not change this problem. In a society where copyright protection does not exist, a book could be easily copied without the act of copying being considered an offense. When the contemporary utilitarian vision is applied, it indicates that the benefits that they bring to a society are: It makes it easier for consumers to choose the product which has the qualities corresponding most to its needs. Since consumers already know the brand, they should not search among a whole range of products available on the market; It encourages producers to maintain good quality of their products, because consumers associate the product quality with the brand attached to it; It improves the language. Landes and Posner believe that the brands create new words that end up being incorporated in the lexicon of the language.[xii]

Suppose the utilitarian theory – that of Bentham, or Posner’ and Landes’ – would be applied to intellectual property as it stands today: the benefits that would be brought to society by this analysis would be the incentive for creativity, the optimization of production and the disappearance or diminution of similar inventions made by different individuals.

Among these three advantages, we can consider the incentive to creation as the most important. In this case, the monopoly guaranteed by intellectual property stimulates creation in a society and, especially with regard to patents; inventions will bring more happiness and pleasure to society in general. This justifying argument is in harmony with Bentham’s utilitarianism. The problem here is that no one really knows what kind of invention would bring more or less happiness or pleasure to the society. Moreover, the term “monopoly concession” for patents, trademarks and copyright is not based on any empirical or objective study and is rather random.

Optimization of production sees ownership monopolies intellectual property as a “service” to society since data from sale indicates the products for which the company has the most need. This approach could even justify increasing the period of protection of intellectual property products. The logic here is that the decrease in the protection period or even the removal of the protection would deprive the producers of information that enables them to optimize their production. Thereby, the withdrawal or diminution of protection could even be considered harmful to society. However, if we do not impose limitations to this theory, the result could be a disparity of investments in intellectual property over investments in other areas, such as education and health, as well as in general research activities.

CONCLUSION

Utilitarianism, as it stands today, is intimately linked to the information obtained from the use of intellectual property monopolies. The goal is to avoid duplication of production. The problem in this case is that in a society which values ​​and encourages the production of new patents and new technologies, the plethora of patents complicates the process. This finding is based on the fact that new inventions normally rely on existing patents and the production of a new patented product will require a large number of licenses before it can begin. As Richard Posner said in his blog: ‘Patents are a source of great social costs, and only occasionally of commensurate benefits. Most firms do not actually want patents; for those firms, the costs involved in obtaining licenses from patentees are not offset by the prospect of obtaining license fees on their own patents.’

#### Outweighs –

#### A] Most articles about IP are written through util – means other frameworks can never engage with core questions of the lit and decks predictability – equal topic lit means fair ground.

#### B] TJFs first – substance begs the question of a framework being good for debate

#### 2] Extinction first –

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

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

#### C] Moral obligation – allowing people to die is unethical and should be prevented because it creates ethics towards other people

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

#### E] Moral uncertainty – if we’re unsure about which interpretation of the world is true – we ought to preserve the world to keep debating about it

### Case

#### Toplevel- nowhere in the aff does it say IP furthers racial cap. It’s not intrinsic to patents. The Role of the Ballot and Judge is to vote for the better debater – any artificial constraint or goal arbitrarily brackets out different potentialities of what debate could be turning the Judge into a gatekeeper of ideologies and foreclose radical new ways of engaging the world.

#### Consequences matter and should be used to evaluate ethical actions -

#### 1] Objective and Verifiable – material consequences as a metric are key to analyze where different groups interests converge since their effects are all felt by many different groups – key to coalitionary actions that break down oppressive structure.

#### Their emphasis on a “decolonization of the mind” is a settler move to innocence—this flips the case.

Tuck and Yang, 12 Eve Tuck and K. Wayne Yang, State University of New York at New Paltz; University of California, San Diego; “Decolonization is not a metaphor,” *Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education & Society*, Vol. 1., No. 1, 2012, pg. 19 //bghs-ms

Fanon told us in 1963 that decolonizing the mind is the first step, not the only step toward overthrowing colonial regimes. Yet we wonder whether another settler move to innocence is to focus on decolonizing the mind, or the cultivation of critical consciousness, as if it were the sole activity of decolonization; to allow conscientization to stand in for the more uncomfortable task of relinquishing stolen land. We agree that curricula, literature, and pedagogy can be crafted to aid people in learning to see settler colonialism, to articulate critiques of settler epistemology, and set aside settler histories and values in search of ethics that reject domination and exploitation; this is not unimportant work. However, the front-loading of critical consciousness building can waylay decolonization, even though the experience of teaching and learning to be critical of settler colonialism can be so powerful it can feel like it is indeed making change. Until stolen land is relinquished, critical consciousness does not translate into action that disrupts settler colonialism. So, we respectfully disagree with George Clinton and Funkadelic (1970) and En Vogue (1992) when they assert that if you “free your mind, the rest (your ass) will follow.”

#### Top-Level – the Aff solves none of the Case – card zero has a medicine key warrant – ask yourself which evidence is medicine-specific - this zaps the Aff solvency to zero – the amount of biopiracy stays the same since they’ll either just 1] continue bioprospecting with the same intensity, but for agriculture and food, not medicine or 2] patent food, then claim its medicinal properties which circumvents the plan.

#### Multiple Alt causes to the Aff – crops, cosmetics, food.

Silva 20 [Daniella Silva (reporter for NBC News focusing on the economic recovery and its effect on families, as well as immigration). “Biopiracy: the largely lawless plundering of Earth’s genetic wealth”. Landscape News. 15 December 2020. Accessed 8/26/21. <https://news.globallandscapesforum.org/48905/biopiracy-the-largely-lawless-plundering-of-earths-genetic-wealth/> //Xu+Elmer]

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

#### We’ll impact turn their rhetorical decol- COLONIALITY IS NOT A METAPHOR, NOT A JOINT STRUGGLE FOR HUMAN RIGHTS, AND NOT A FIGHT AGAINST WHITENESS – IT CANNOT BE INCORPORATED OR ENCAPSULTED INTO SOME NOW FORM OF SCHOLARSHIP – YOU CANNOT DO DECOL BY VOTING AFFIRMATIVE AT A HIGHSCHOOL DEBATE TOURNAMENT – THERE IS NO WAY TO GRAFT THE STRUGGLE INTO THIS SPACE, AND THEIR ATTEMPT TO DO SO ONLY DECENTERS DECOLONIALITY
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Our goal in this article is to remind readers what is unsettling about decolonization. Decolonization brings about the repatriation of Indigenous land and life; it is not a metaphor for other things we want to do to improve our societies and schools. The easy adoption of decolonizing discourse by educational advocacy and scholarship, evidenced by the increasing number of calls to “decolonize our schools,” or use “decolonizing methods,” or, “decolonize student thinking”, turns decolonization into a metaphor. As important as their goals may be, social justice, critical methodologies, or approaches that decenter settler perspectives have objectives that may be incommensurable with decolonization. Because settler colonialism is built upon an entangled triad structure of settler-native-slave, the decolonial desires of white, nonwhite, immigrant, postcolonial, and oppressed people, can similarly be entangled in resettlement, reoccupation, and reinhabitation that actually further settler colonialism. The metaphorization of decolonization makes possible a set of evasions, or “settler moves to innocence”, that problematically attempt to reconcile settler guilt and complicity, and rescue settler futurity. In this article, we analyze multiple settler moves towards innocence in order to forward “an ethic of incommensurability” that recognizes what is distinct and what is sovereign for project(s) of decolonization in relation to human and civil rights based social justice projects. We also point to unsettling themes within transnational/Third World decolonizations, abolition, and critical spaceplace pedagogies, which challenge the coalescence of social justice endeavors, making room for more meaningful potential alliances. Keywords: decolonization, settler colonialism, settler moves to innocence, incommensurability, Indigenous land, decolonizing education 2 E. Tuck & K.W. Yang Decolonization, which sets out to change the order of the world, is, obviously, a program of complete disorder. But it cannot come as a result of magical practices, nor of a natural shock, nor of a friendly understanding. Decolonization, as we know, is a historical process: that is to say it cannot be understood, it cannot become intelligible nor clear to itself except in the exact measure that we can discern the movements which give it historical form and content. -Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 1963, p. 36 Let us admit it, the settler knows perfectly well that no phraseology can be a substitute for reality. -Franz Fanon, The Wretched of the Earth, 1963, p. 45 Introduction For the past several years we have been working, in our writing and teaching, to bring attention to how settler colonialism has shaped schooling and educational research in the United States and other settler colonial nation-states. These are two distinct but overlapping tasks, the first concerned with how the invisibilized dynamics of settler colonialism mark the organization, governance, curricula, and assessment of compulsory learning, the other concerned with how settler perspectives and worldviews get to count as knowledge and research and how these perspectives - repackaged as data and findings - are activated in order to rationalize and maintain unfair social structures. We are doing this work alongside many others who - somewhat relentlessly, in writings, meetings, courses, and activism - don’t allow the real and symbolic violences of settler colonialism to be overlooked. Alongside this work, we have been thinking about what decolonization means, what it wants and requires. One trend we have noticed, with growing apprehension, is the ease with which the language of decolonization has been superficially adopted into education and other social sciences, supplanting prior ways of talking about social justice, critical methodologies, or approaches which decenter settler perspectives. Decolonization, which we assert is a distinct project from other civil and human rights-based social justice projects, is far too often subsumed into the directives of these projects, with no regard for how decolonization wants something different than those forms of justice. Settler scholars swap out prior civil and human rights based terms, seemingly to signal both an awareness of the significance of Indigenous and decolonizing theorizations of schooling and educational research, and to include Indigenous peoples on the list of considerations - as an additional special (ethnic) group or class. At a conference on educational research, it is not uncommon to hear speakers refer, almost casually, to the need to “decolonize our schools,” or use “decolonizing methods,” or “decolonize student thinking.” Yet, we have observed a startling number of these discussions make no mention of Indigenous peoples, our/their1 struggles for the recognition of our/their sovereignty, or the contributions of Indigenous intellectuals and activists to theories and frameworks of decolonization. Further, there is often little recognition given to the immediate context of settler colonialism on the North American lands where many of these conferences take place. Of course, dressing up in the language of decolonization is not as offensive as “Navajo print” underwear sold at a clothing chain store (Gaynor, 2012) and other appropriations of Indigenous cultures and materials that occur so frequently. Yet, this kind of inclusion is a form of enclosure, dangerous in how it domesticates decolonization. It is also a foreclosure, limiting in how it recapitulates dominant theories of social change. On the occasion of the inaugural issue of Decolonization: Indigeneity, Education, & Society, we want to be sure to clarify that decolonization is not a metaphor. When metaphor invades decolonization, it kills the very possibility of decolonization; it recenters whiteness, it resettles theory, it extends innocence to the settler, it entertains a settler future. Decolonize (a verb) and decolonization (a noun) cannot easily be grafted onto pre-existing discourses/frameworks, even if they are critical, even if they are anti-racist, even if they are justice frameworks. The easy absorption, adoption, and transposing of decolonization is yet another form of settler appropriation. When we write about decolonization, we are not offering it as a metaphor; it is not an approximation of other experiences of oppression. Decolonization is not a swappable term for other things we want to do to improve our societies and schools. Decolonization doesn’t have a synonym. Our goal in this essay is to remind readers what is unsettling about decolonization - what is unsettling and what should be unsettling. Clearly, we are advocates for the analysis of settler colonialism within education and education research and we position the work of Indigenous thinkers as central in unlocking the confounding aspects of public schooling. We, at least in part, want others to join us in these efforts, so that settler colonial structuring and Indigenous critiques of that structuring are no longer rendered invisible. Yet, this joining cannot be too easy, too open, too settled. Solidarity is an uneasy, reserved, and unsettled matter that neither reconciles present grievances nor forecloses future conflict. There are parts of the decolonization project that are not easily absorbed by human rights or civil rights based approaches to educational equity. In this essay, we think about what decolonization wants. There is a long and bumbled history of non-Indigenous peoples making moves to alleviate the impacts of colonization. The too-easy adoption of decolonizing discourse (making decolonization a metaphor) is just one part of that history and it taps into pre-existing tropes that get in the way of more meaningful potential alliances. We think of the enactment of these tropes as a series of moves to innocence (Malwhinney, 1998), which problematically attempt to reconcile settler guilt and complicity, and rescue settler futurity. Here, to explain why decolonization is and requires more than a metaphor, we discuss some of these moves to innocence: 1 As an Indigenous scholar and a settler/trespasser/scholar writing together, we have used forward slashes to reflect our discrepant positionings in our pronouns throughout this essay. 4 E. Tuck & K.W. Yang i. Settler nativism ii. Fantasizing adoption iii. Colonial equivocation iv. Conscientization v. At risk-ing / Asterisk-ing Indigenous peoples vi. Re-occupation and urban homesteading Such moves ultimately represent settler fantasies of easier paths to reconciliation. Actually, we argue, attending to what is irreconcilable within settler colonial relations and what is incommensurable between decolonizing projects and other social justice projects will help to reduce the frustration of attempts at solidarity; but the attention won’t get anyone off the hook from the hard, unsettling work of decolonization. Thus, we also include a discussion of interruptions that unsettle innocence and recognize incommensurability.