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### T-REDUCE

#### Interpretation: “reduce” indicates permanency. The aff may not defend suspensions on intellectual property rights

#### Reduce indicates permanency – it’s distinct from “suspend” Prefer our evidence – legal and should o/w all other definitions. This is the only legal interpretation of reduce in the court system which means that it applies to all legal implementations of the plan

Reynolds 59 – Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13]  The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Violation –they violate because COVID-19 patent waivers are temporary – hold the line – don’t let them shift out by saying that they defend permanency, they should’ve specced that in the 1ac and their advantages say nothing about the permanent benefits of having waivers – we read blue here

1AC Feldman 3 Robin Feldman 2-11-2019 "‘One-and-done’ for new drugs could cut patent thickets and boost generic competition" <https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/11/drug-patent-protection-one-done/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law, Albert Abramson ’54 Distinguished Professor of Law Chair, and Director of the Center for Innovation)//SidK + Elmer

I believe that one period of protection **should be enough**. We should make the legal changes necessary to prevent companies **from building patent walls** and piling up mountains of rights. This could be accomplished **by a “one-and-done” approach** for patent protection. Under it, a drug would receive just one period of exclusivity, and no more. The choice of which “one” could be left entirely in the hands of the pharmaceutical company, with the election made when the FDA approves the drug. Perhaps development of the drug went swiftly and smoothly, so the remaining life of one of the drug’s patents is of greatest value. Perhaps development languished, so designation as an orphan drug or some other benefit would bring greater reward. The choice would be up to the company itself, based on its own calculation of the maximum benefit. The result, however, is that a pharmaceutical company chooses whether its period of exclusivity would be a patent, an orphan drug designation, a period of data exclusivity (in which no generic is allowed to use the original drug’s safety and effectiveness data), or something else — but **not all of the above** and more. Consider Suboxone, a combination of buprenorphine and naloxone for treating opioid addiction. The drug’s maker has extended its protection cliff eight times, including obtaining an orphan drug designation, which is intended for drugs that serve only a small number of patients. The drug’s first period of exclusivity ended in 2005, but with the additions its protection now lasts until 2024. That makes almost two additional decades in which the public has borne the burden of monopoly pricing, and access to the medicine may have been constrained. Implementing a one-and-done approach in conjunction with FDA approval underscores the fact that these problems and solutions are designed for pharmaceuticals, not for all types of technologies. That way, one-and-done could be implemented through legislative changes to the FDA’s drug approval system, and would apply to patents granted going forward. One-and-done would apply to both patents and exclusivities. A more limited approach, a baby step if you will, would be to invigorate the existing patent obviousness doctrine as a way to cut back on patent tinkering. Obviousness, one of the five standards for patent eligibility, says that inventions that are obvious to an expert or the general public can’t be patented. Either by congressional clarification or judicial interpretation, many pile-on patents could be eliminated with a ruling that the core concept of the additional patent is nothing more than the original formulation. Anything else is merely an obvious adaptation of the core invention, modified with existing technology. As such, the patent would fail for being perfectly obvious. Even without congressional action, a more vigorous and robust application of the existing obviousness doctrine could significantly improve the problem of piled-up patents and patent walls. Pharmaceutical companies have become adept at maneuvering through the system of patent and non-patent rights to create mountains of rights that can be applied, one after another. This behavior lets drug companies keep competitors out of the market and beat them back when they get there. We shouldn’t be surprised at this. Pharmaceutical companies are profit-making entities, after all, that face pressure from their shareholders to produce ever-better results. If we want to change the system, we must change the incentives driving the system. And right now, the incentives for creating patent walls are just too great.

#### Vote neg –

#### 1–Limits–they can cherry-pick from multiple timeframes which means that a)they shift out of multiple DAs by saying the patents will be gone by thenwhichmoots neg offence and b) non-permanency kills NCs and Ks because they can just delink in the 1ar and forces us to start over c) this links to fairness and ed because we can’t have proper educative clash and they moot offence

#### 2–Predictability–Not following the resolution legally allows them to come upwith whatever plan they want and a) that destroys our ability to predictbecause they can just go with something random and there is no way we canprep for that before the first tourney on the topic

#### Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity with a winner and aloser–Force them to answer as to why it’s a competition. Education is a voter because schools, educational institutions, pay for it.No RVIs because its illogical–you wouldn’t win chess for playing properly–Prefer logic for it’s a litmus test for other argumentsPrefer competing interps because a) reasonability is a race to the bottompushing the limits on how much abuse is justifiable b) reasonability is subjectiveand invites judge intervention Drop the debater cuz T is constitutive of the whole aff

### Legislation Counterplan

#### Text: The FDA should fast track approval of new drugs along with The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines by implementing a one-and-done approach for patent protection.

#### Counterplan solves the aff – CP = yellow

1AC Feldman 3 Robin Feldman 2-11-2019 "‘One-and-done’ for new drugs could cut patent thickets and boost generic competition" <https://www.statnews.com/2019/02/11/drug-patent-protection-one-done/> (Arthur J. Goldberg Distinguished Professor of Law, Albert Abramson ’54 Distinguished Professor of Law Chair, and Director of the Center for Innovation)//SidK + Elmer

I believe that one period of protection **should be enough**. We should make the legal changes necessary to prevent companies **from building patent walls** and piling up mountains of rights. This could be accomplished **by a “one-and-done” approach** for patent protection. Under it, a drug would receive just one period of exclusivity, and no more. The choice of which “one” could be left entirely in the hands of the pharmaceutical company, with the election made when the FDA approves the drug. Perhaps development of the drug went swiftly and smoothly, so the remaining life of one of the drug’s patents is of greatest value. Perhaps development languished, so designation as an orphan drug or some other benefit would bring greater reward. The choice would be up to the company itself, based on its own calculation of the maximum benefit. The result, however, is that a pharmaceutical company chooses whether its period of exclusivity would be a patent, an orphan drug designation, a period of data exclusivity (in which no generic is allowed to use the original drug’s safety and effectiveness data), or something else — but **not all of the above** and more. Consider Suboxone, a combination of buprenorphine and naloxone for treating opioid addiction. The drug’s maker has extended its protection cliff eight times, including obtaining an orphan drug designation, which is intended for drugs that serve only a small number of patients. The drug’s first period of exclusivity ended in 2005, but with the additions its protection now lasts until 2024. That makes almost two additional decades in which the public has borne the burden of monopoly pricing, and access to the medicine may have been constrained. Implementing a one-and-done approach in conjunction with FDA approval underscores the fact that these problems and solutions are designed for pharmaceuticals, not for all types of technologies. That way, one-and-done could be implemented through legislative changes to the FDA’s drug approval system, and would apply to patents granted going forward. One-and-done would apply to both patents and exclusivities. A more limited approach, a baby step if you will, would be to invigorate the existing patent obviousness doctrine as a way to cut back on patent tinkering. Obviousness, one of the five standards for patent eligibility, says that inventions that are obvious to an expert or the general public can’t be patented. Either by congressional clarification or judicial interpretation, many pile-on patents could be eliminated with a ruling that the core concept of the additional patent is nothing more than the original formulation. Anything else is merely an obvious adaptation of the core invention, modified with existing technology. As such, the patent would fail for being perfectly obvious. Even without congressional action, a more vigorous and robust application of the existing obviousness doctrine could significantly improve the problem of piled-up patents and patent walls. Pharmaceutical companies have become adept at maneuvering through the system of patent and non-patent rights to create mountains of rights that can be applied, one after another. This behavior lets drug companies keep competitors out of the market and beat them back when they get there. We shouldn’t be surprised at this. Pharmaceutical companies are profit-making entities, after all, that face pressure from their shareholders to produce ever-better results. If we want to change the system, we must change the incentives driving the system. And right now, the incentives for creating patent walls are just too great.

### Heg K

#### The World War II order is the rise of multilateral organizations that seek to maintain a structural grasp on the world to maintain profit and stability all under the backdrop of capitalism accumulation, dispossession, global imperialism, and forced economic agreements that decimate the global south – the post war LIO creation by Woods is not one of peace and prosperity but one of racial capitalism and genocide

Jayati Ghosh 15 7-1-2015 Monthly Review Monthly Review https://monthlyreview.org/2015/07/01/the-creation-of-the-next-imperialism/ Accessed 8-29-2021 CSUF JmB Loyola

The early theorists of imperialism, including V.I. Lenin and Nikolai Bukharin, took the existence of colonial structures for granted. Obviously, the national liberation movements of the twentieth century, the disintegration of colonial power in the second half of the century, and the resulting lack of direct political control changed the landscape in terms of how dominance could be exercised. Just after the Second World War, in the Bretton Woods period, the undisputed dominance of the United States in the capitalist world order played a central role in ensuring that many of the earlier requirements were met through a combination of global policing and economic rules of the game set by the hegemonic leader. By the closing decades of the late twentieth century and the opening decades of the twenty-first, however, the world had become much more complex geopolitically and economically. The United States had become the sole superpower, but one enfeebled by over-extension (as the wars in Iraq and the subsequent inability to control events across the Arab world showed clearly) and its own increasing economic dependence on capital inflows from across the world. Competitive threats from Western Europe and Japan were short-lived due to rampant internal contradictions in both, but the emergence of new powers in the developing world, and in particular the economic rise of China, created a more complex global dynamic. The growing power of multinational corporations was accompanied by the increased diversity of their countries of origin (though major multinationals—the top 200 or even the top 500—remained highly concentrated in geographic as well as economic terms). Technological changes that enabled production relocation along with the vertical disintegration of production led to the emergence of value chains in which the operating requirements of multinational corporations became somewhat different. Insofar as imperialism is about the struggle over and capture of economic territory (which must be broadly defined to include not just geographical territory such as land and natural resources, but also the creation of new markets, sources of labor, and forms of surplus transfer such as are reflected in intellectual property), these changes have created distant demands upon imperialist structures and processes. In the absence of a world state, and in a much more complex and constantly changing politico-economic environment, how can capital (which is increasingly global in orientation) generate the superstructures through which the transfers of value are ensured and the investment risks are moderated and contained? It will be argued that there has been an endeavor to resolve this by refashioning the global institutional architecture in ways that operate to increase the conditions of “stability” for large capital while increasing its bargaining power vis-à-vis working people and citizens, as well as nation-states and even smaller capitalist enterprises. International Trade Agreements The past two decades have witnessed an explosion in the treaties, agreements, and other mechanisms whereby global capital imposes rules, regulations, and modes of behavior upon governments and their citizenry. It is true that the post-Second World War international financial system created by the Bretton Woods agreement also specified rules for member countries, and the conditionalities imposed by the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and the World Bank also severely limited the autonomy of countries that were forced to turn to them for assistance. But the recent proliferation of trade agreements (multilateral, regional, and bilateral), investment treaties, and more comprehensive economic partnership agreements impose such a plethora of conditions that Bretton Woods agreements and World Bank and IMF policies almost pale in significance. What is more significant is that these rules operate even for countries that are not in the positions of debtor-supplicants to international financial institutions, and so they require all countries to restrict their policies in ways that are directly related to the possibilities of generating autonomous development in periphery countries. Consider how the multilateral trading system has evolved. Earlier Rounds of GATT (the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs) recognized Special & Differential Treatment (S&D) for developing countries, which required less than full reciprocity and were couched in developmental terms. The Uruguay Round (signed off in 1994) moved to a single-tier system of rights and obligations, under which developing countries have to implement fully all the rules and commitments, with flexibility only in longer transition periods. This was seen as quid pro quo for market access in agriculture and textiles, sectors that were highly protected in the developed countries. But this affected the possibilities of autonomous development in the periphery by constraining the policy choices open to them, and denying them some of the most important instruments that had been used by the current capitalist core in its own industrialization and development process. For example, the Agreement on Trade-Related Investment Measures (TRIMS) does not allow practices like local content specifications to increase linkages between foreign investors and local manufacturers, or foreign exchange balancing requirements or restrictions on foreign exchange use by foreign investors. The Agreement on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) allows for the concentration and privatization of knowledge, and additionally severely restricts reverse engineering and other forms of imitative innovation that have historically been used for industrialization. It has forced the extension of patent life in many countries, allows patenting of life forms, and puts the burden of proof on the defendant. The Agreement on Subsidies and Countervailing Measures (SCM) prohibits subsidies that depend upon the use of domestic over imported goods or are conditional on export performance. Ongoing negotiations in the World Trade Organization (WTO) on Non-Agricultural Market Access (NAMA) are currently based on requiring much deeper tariff cuts in developing countries, which will further deprive them of a crucial trade measure that can support infant industry. The Agreement on Agriculture (AoA) contained fine print that effectively allowed developed countries to continue with massive subsidization and protection of their own agriculture and agri-businesses, but it prevents developing countries from doing even a small fraction of this. Most developing countries are allowed only 10 percent de minimis support, unlike most developed countries that have to ensure only a 36 percent reduction of certain subsidies and limit some others, while maintaining and even increasing the rest. Developing countries (like India) that attempt to provide some protection to farmers to ensure food security are coming up against this constraint, because according to the AoA, even in developing countries all such subsidies are measured in relation to 1986–1988 prices, not current prices! Instead of recognizing the ridiculous nature of this clause, the developed countries are resisting any change and have only agreed to provide a Peace Clause for a limited period to certain countries. However, if the WTO has created rigidities and constraints on policy space in developing countries, the many Regional Trade Agreements (RTAs) that have been signed in the past two decades are often even worse on this front. There are nearly 400 such agreements in operation, and they have become more comprehensive over the past twenty years. Most (especially North-South agreements) tend to be either “WTO-plus,” i.e., they augment provisions already covered by the multilateral trading regime, or “WTO-extra,” i.e., contain provisions that go beyond current WTO agreements. Thus they often require reductions of actually applied tariffs, rather than of “bound” tariff rates (the GATT limit rate that cannot be exceeded without permitting retaliation). They demand more deregulation in services trade. They typically require more stringent enforcement requirements of intellectual property rights (IPRs) such as: reducing exemptions (e.g., allowing compulsory licensing only for emergencies); preventing parallel imports; extending IPRs to areas like life forms, counterfeiting, and piracy; extending exclusive rights to test data (e.g., in pharmaceuticals); and making IPR provisions more detailed and prescriptive. They have been known to forbid technology and knowledge transfer demands or conditions on the nationality of senior personnel, extending provisions to taxes and charges. They also enter into a range of areas that the WTO still leaves open to individual countries’ policy choices, such as competition policy, rules on investment and capital movement, government procurement, environmental standards, and even labor mobility. Further, unlike the WTO, most RTAs do not provide exceptions to countries in the case of serious balance-of-payments and external financial difficulties. In addition, there are the Bilateral Investment Treaties (BITs), of which there are more than 4,000 in operation in the world at present. These are about protecting and promoting private investment, of all types, and effectively privileging the rights of investors over the rights of citizens in the host country. There is typically a very broad, asset-based definition of investment that includes Foreign Direct Investment, some types of portfolio investment in equities, real estate, and even IPRs! There is also a very strong and expansive view on what constitutes “expropriation” for which compensation can be demanded—not just nationalization of assets but all sorts of rules and regulations (even those for environmental protection or labor protection) as well as taxation have been interpreted as “expropriation.” All this matters greatly because BITs and increasingly RTAs are subject to dispute settlement mechanisms, both between states and between an investor and a state, that tend to be highly arbitrary, opaque, not open to public scrutiny, and generally pro-investor in their judgments. Since they are legally based on “equal” treatment of legal persons with no primacy for human rights, they have become known for their pro-investor bias, partly due to the incentive structure for arbitrators, and partly because the system is designed to provide supplementary guarantees to investors, rather than making them respect host countries’ laws and regulations. The significance of these treaties and binding legal arrangements is so important for large capital today that new agreements are being lobbied for, which further push the boundaries in terms of constraining regulation and inhibiting measures and policies that would ensure the social and economic rights of citizens. Thus the Obama administration in the United States has joined with Republicans in Congress, with whom otherwise there is great antipathy, to push for fast-track negotiating authority in order to conclude two major trade agreements: the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP) and the Trans-Atlantic Trade and Investment Partnership (T-TIP). The goal is to use such forced, fast-track trade agreements to put into place rules that will ensure the continuing dominance of the economies of the triad, making it all the more difficult for emerging nations to catch up, while also securing the power of the mega-multinational corporations with their headquarters in the core economies. Rules Governing International Finance and Debt Restructuring The rules governing international finance and debt are now generally recognized to work in ways that reinforce the unequal global power relations between large capital and people across the world. Nowhere is this more evident than in the rules and legal structures governing sovereign debt. The lack of any coherent system to deal with debt default and to enable the viable restructuring of sovereign debt has led to situations in which countries and their populations are bled over years and even decades, merely to service debt generated in the past and through the piling up of earlier loans at ever-higher interest rates. Austerity measures that reduce public spending on social essentials are forced upon unwilling societies on the basis of supposedly “technocratic” notions that are, in fact, deeply ideological and elite-serving. Developing countries have known this for some time, but this is now also being experienced by some developed countries such as crisis-ridden economies of the European periphery. Countries that somehow manage to restructure some of their debt, or that unilaterally decide to renege on some patently unfair debt taken on in the past, are punished through complex and unbalanced legal systems. These do not even accord to entire populations the minimum conditions of debt workout that are routinely extended to private and corporate debtors within national systems. And here too, the arbitrations and other legal proceedings tend to be excessively biased towards investors and show little recognition of the minimum rights of the citizenry in affected countries. The fact that legal systems and other institutional structures in the core countries tend to support such biases, and investors in general, reinforces the point that this is another way in which contemporary imperialism is expressed. This is starkly shown by the travails that the government of Argentina currently faces in U.S. courts in lawsuits brought by financial vulture funds. This situation has its origins in the 1990s, when the government of Carlos Menem fixed the Argentine peso at the value of one U.S. dollar, through a currency board arrangement that restricted base money supply to the amount of external reserves, and then sought to increase its spending through the buildup of external debt. This was obviously an unsustainable strategy, which exploded in a financial crisis in 2001, bringing on a major devaluation of the currency and a default on around $100 billion of external debt. In 2005, the government of Nestor Kirchner, which had then managed to revive the economy to some extent, offered its creditors debt swaps that significantly restructured the debts. Since Argentine bonds were trading at a fraction of their face value in the secondary market anyway, this deal, which reduced the value of the debt by nearly 75 percent, was acceptable to most of the multinational banks and other creditors. (Since unpaid interest is added on to the principal and compounded, the actual face value of the debt in such cases is typically much more than the amount originally borrowed.) Indeed, creditors holding 93 percent of government bonds participated in the debt swaps of 2005 and 2010. However, a tiny minority of creditors held out and refused to accept the negotiated settlement. These then sold their holdings to hedge funds (in this case known as “vulture funds,” which are funds that take on distressed assets in the hope of recouping a higher value from them), including NML Capital, a subsidiary of Elliot Capital Management, which is run by U.S. billionaire and major Republican party donor Paul Singer. This fund bought Argentine bonds at around 20 percent of the face value in 2008. It has pursued the case both legally and physically: hiring mercenaries to detain and try to seize an Argentine ship where it was docked off the coast of Ghana; and grabbing the Argentine presidential plane from an airport as “collateral” for its supposed holding of debt. NML Capital and another vulture fund, Aurelius Capital Management LP, have fought a case in a New York district court, demanding full payment on their debt, valued at around $1.5 billion. (This would amount to a return of more than 1,600 percent on the initial investment made by these vulture funds.) In 2012, U.S. District Judge for the Southern District of New York Thomas Griesa ruled in favor of the hedge funds, and an appeal by the Argentine government was then dismissed by the U.S. Supreme Court. The judgement was based on a peculiar and unprecedented interpretation of the pari passu (equal treatment) clause, which holds that all bondholders must be treated alike, meaning that a sovereign debtor must make full payment on a defaulted claim if it makes any payments on restructured bonds. So if the bondholders who agreed to restructure 93 percent of the Argentine debt were paid according to their agreement, then the other resisting bondholders would also have to be paid the full value of their debts. The ruling also insisted that any third party—including banks facilitating such transactions—that attempts to pay these bondholders would be held in contempt of court. This effectively disabled Argentina from repaying debt to other bondholders (who had already received around 90 percent of their dues), unless it also pays the holdouts in full, thereby forcing the country into technical default. Interestingly, this judgement made a mockery of all debt renegotiation agreements, since there would be no incentive for any creditor to accept less than full value of the debt if some other creditor will be paid in full. No credit system can function or has ever functioned with zero default. The possibility of default is embedded into credit contracts through the interest rate, with interest rate spreads operating as the market estimate of the probability of a default. So those who are seen as less likely to be able to repay are forced to pay higher interest rates, in both formal and informal credit transactions. A creditor who has been demanding and receiving a higher interest rate based on this probability cannot then demand full repayment as a right, since the contract reflected that very likelihood. So the ruling actually negates the basic principles upon which all credit markets function. Another extraordinary feature of the U.S. court judgment is the requirement that banks involved in handling the payments made to Argentine bondholders must turn over information to holdout bondholders on all the assets that the Argentine government holds worldwide. This is a major violation of banking secrecy laws everywhere, including in the United States. Even Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg, who sits on the U.S. Supreme Court, the body that decided this case, was constrained to ask: “By what authorization does a court in the United States become a ‘clearinghouse for information’ about any and all property held by Argentina abroad?” This also severely erodes sovereign immunity, which can even have adverse effects on the United States and may be illegal under other U.S. laws. In fact, this judgement was also in contradiction to the United States’ own bankruptcy laws under Chapter 9 and Chapter 11. Yet the U.S. government has actually pressured Argentina to meet these ridiculous requirements. It therefore provides one more example of how institutional arrangements have taken the form of legally binding constraints that generally privilege the interests of large capital over all other concerns. New Forms of “Economic Territory” One of the intriguing aspects of recent capitalist dynamism has been its ability to create new forms of economic territory, and to bring them within the ambit of capitalist economic relations—and therefore also subject to imperialist contestation. Two of the more prominent new forms of economic territory that are increasingly significant as arenas for imperialist penetration and competition today are the basic amenities and social services that were earlier seen to be the sole preserve of public provision and the generation and distribution of knowledge. A major feature of our times is the privatization of much of what was earlier generally accepted as the basic responsibility of public provision, such as amenities like electricity, water, essential transport infrastructure, and social services such as health, sanitation, and education. Of course, the fact that these were seen as public duties does not mean that they were fulfilled. Indeed, expanding public provision and enabling wider (and ideally universal) access to good quality amenities and infrastructure has only come about historically as the result of prolonged mass struggles and social and political mobilization. And issues of inequality in such provision have always existed. Nevertheless, the fact that provision is no longer necessarily in the public domain, and that private providers are increasingly seen as the norm, has opened up huge new markets for potentially profit-making activity. This may have been a crucial way of maintaining markets and effective demand given the saturation of markets in many mature economies and the inadequate growth of markets in poorer societies. The prying open of such markets has occurred through a combination of inadequate and reduced public delivery (the expansion of the global bottled water industry, for example, is a result of the failure of public delivery of potable water), as well as changes in economic policies and regulatory structures that not only enable but actively encourage private investment in these areas. And these changes in turn have been pushed by global institutions—the formal organizations such as the Bretton Woods institutions and the WTO through its various agreements, as well as more informal but increasingly influential bodies such as the World Economic Forum. This is a more complicated playing out of the imperialistic drive for control over economic territory than can be expressed through purely national mechanisms, but that does not make it any less consequential. Another new form of economic territory that is increasingly subject to imperialist struggle relates to the control of knowledge generation and dissemination. The privatization of knowledge and its growing concentration, through the proliferation and enforcement of IPRs, have become significant barriers to technology transfer and social recognition of traditional knowledge that would be necessary for any kind of economic diversification as well as greater economic justice. They also matter greatly in determining the relative power of profits over people within countries as well as between countries. This is clearly evident in terms of access to medicines (even essential and life-saving drugs) and crucial technologies for food cultivation. But it is also very much the case with respect to industrial technologies as well as the transfer of critical knowledge required for mitigating and coping with adverse environmental changes that themselves result from the production systems created by global capitalism. The national and international institutional structures that should provide checks and balances to the privatization of knowledge, and ensure that knowledge production and dissemination are not subservient to a small elite but directed towards social goals, are not just more fragile and less effective in recent times, but in effect work in the opposite direction. New Global Forms of Capitalist Organization The rise of the multinational enterprise as the dominant and defining feature of global capitalism is arguably one of the most significant processes of the past century. Yet this too was remarkably presaged by Lenin and Bukharin a century ago. As Bukharin noted, vertical integration of production tends to be combined with geographical disintegration of production processes. There is going on a continuous process of binding together the various branches of production, a process of transforming them into one single organization. This expresses itself, first of all, in the form of combined enterprises, i.e., enterprises combining the production of raw materials and manufactured goods, the production of manufactured goods with that of unfinished products, etc., which process can and does absorb the most diverse branches of production, since under the prevailing division of labour in our times every branch depends upon the other to a larger or lesser degree, directly or indirectly.1 This he saw as operating in tandem with “the growing internationalisation of economic life,” in which competition and centralization of capital are reproduced on a world scale.2 Yet he was obviously not able to anticipate the sheer extent to which this would occur. The technological changes of the past half century, particularly the advances in shipping and container technology that dramatically reduced transport costs and time involved, as well as the information technology revolution that enabled a much more detailed breakdown of production into specific tasks that could easily be physically separated, were both critical in this. Together they enabled the emergence of global value chains, which are typically led by large multinational corporations, and involve regional and global networks of both competing and cooperating firms. The large corporation here is not necessarily in direct control of all operations—and indeed, the ability to transfer control over production as well as the risks associated with production to lower ends of the value chain is an important element in increasing the profitability of such activities. This adds a greater intensity to the exploitation that can be unleashed by such global firms. Because they are less dependent upon workers and resources in any one location, they can use competition across suppliers to push down their prices and conditions of production, and are less burdened by regulatory processes that would seek to reduce some of their market power. These changes in production organization combine with other incentives to create what has been called a “downsize and distribute” model that is driving more of the global production chain investment by multinational corporations. The focus in many developed and developing countries on judging the performance of companies by “shareholder value” has created incentives for cost reduction and short-termist behavior that greatly exceed similar tendencies in the past. The lead firms are therefore subject to the discipline of financial markets that demand rapid profits, forcing the construction of global value chains in ways that are much less likely to enable or benefit a program of industrial development in countries in the periphery, and also less likely to provide a viable platform for successful economic diversification. The Rise of New Powers It is often argued that the rise of new powers—in particular China, but also India, Brazil, and others—means that notions of imperialism are no longer valid. Yet the imperialist phase of capitalism has been characterized throughout by the emergence of “new kids on the block,” some of which have gone on to become the neighborhood bullies as well. When Lenin wrote his pamphlet, the emergence of the United States as the dominant global power was far from evident. Yet the United States, which seemed at that time to be a minor player among the major European actors, emerged to dominate the world scene for nearly a century. Similarly, the rise of Japan, particularly in the second half of the twentieth century, by no means signified a weakening of imperialist power generally; it merely necessitated a more complicated assessment of such power. At present, the emergence of China is being considered a sign that the global economic landscape is completely transformed. Certainly it is true that the growing weight of China in world trade and investment has had major effects on terms of trade and volumes of exports for many primary producing countries and has brought more countries into manufacturing value chains, even as China has also become the most significant source of manufactured goods imports for most countries. Yet there are dangers of overplaying its current significance. Even now, China accounts for less than 9 percent of global output (measured at constant 2005 prices); its per capita GDP is less than half (around 45 percent) of the global average, and is still many multiples below the average of the so-called “developed” capitalist economies that form part of the imperialist core.3 In relative terms China remains a “poor” country, but it is also true that Chinese capital in various forms is a significant player in the ongoing struggle for control over economic territory occurring across the world. It is worth noting that many of the current hyperbolic mainstream analyses and predictions with respect to China are eerily similar to the descriptions and predictions for Japan in the 1970s, as the emerging giant soon to take over the role of global economic leadership from the United States. A similar point can be made even more forcefully for several of the other nations that were ecstatically described as “emerging markets” that supposedly provided proof that forces of imperialism are no hindrance to the rise of developing countries. Together the BRICS nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa) account for less than 15 percent of world GDP in current price terms, even though their share of global population is just under half. This is still so small as to mean that announcements of these countries as the new imperialist powers may well be very premature, especially when global institutional structures are still very much balanced in favor of the established powers. One reason why the newly emerging economies are often thought to be more significant is because many analyses are not based on nominal exchange rates to compare incomes across different countries, but rather on the Purchasing Power Parity (PPP) exchange rates, which seek to establish the relative purchasing power of each currency in terms of prices of a common basket of commodities. However, the use of PPP exchange rates can be quite dubious, as they are based on prices of supposedly representative baskets of consumption goods in certain countries, which may not be so relevant to consumption elsewhere, especially the poor in much of the developing world. They are unchanging over time across reference periods, even though consumption patterns tend to shift with technological change and evolving preferences. PPP exchange rates are also notoriously imperfect because of the infrequency and unsystematic nature of the price surveys that are used to derive them, which can make them quite dated or even misleading. An even more significant conceptual problem with using PPP estimates is less-widely recognized. In general, countries that have high PPP— that is, where the actual purchasing power of the currency is deemed to be much higher than the nominal value—are typically low-income countries with low average wages. It is precisely because there is a significant section of the workforce that receives very low remuneration, that goods and services are available more cheaply than in countries where the majority of workers receive higher wages. Therefore, using PPP-modified GDP data may miss the point, by seeing as an advantage the very feature that reflects greater poverty of the majority of wage earners in an economy. It would certainly overstate the quantitative significance of such countries in the world economy. All this does not mean that there have been no changes in global economic and political power. It is evident that there have been and will continue to be significant and even transformative changes. However, these changes in the position of countries in the economic and geopolitical ladder do not mean that the basic undercurrent of imperialistic tendencies that drive the global system have disappeared—they may even become more intense as the struggle for economic territory becomes more competitive. Indeed, if the lessons of history are to be recognized, it is likely that the emergence of new powers on the world capitalist stage will generate immense new conflicts—economic, political, and military—as the old imperial powers seek to retain their dominance over the world system. The current trade negotiations reflect Washington’s determination to make an economic pre-emptive attack and lock-in the present power structure based on the U.S.-led triad of the United States/Canada, Western Europe, and Japan. The goal is to create a political-legal superstructure for world trade that will reinforce the advantages of those who currently have the most economic power, including the mega-multinationals centered in the triad. Moreover, it is necessary “to do it today,” as Obama openly declared in May 2015, in a speech at Nike Inc.: “We have to make sure America writes the rules of the global economy, while our economy is in the position of global strength…. Because if we don’t write the rules for trade around the world” there will come a time when “guess what—China will.”4

#### Their reliance on the WTO and its imperialist practices further continues the genocides and upholds the liberal international order. Cross-X checks that they believe that the WTO is necessary, links them to K.

Pallavi Arora and Sukanya Thapliyal 19 11-20-2019 TWAILR Digital Colonialism and the World Trade Organization https://twailr.com/digital-colonialism-and-the-world-trade-organization/ Accessed 8-29-2021 CSUF JmB Loyola

Despite its ongoing existential crisis, the World Trade Organization (WTO) continues to be a vital constituent of the imperial global order. It is well on its way to burying the developmental aspirations of Third World states’ aspirations contained in the Doha Development Agenda (DDA) at the urging of more dominant states in the global trading system. ‘New issues’ are being introduced for WTO negotiation, without reaching a conclusion on the contentious ‘traditional issues’ that the DDA sought to address. The most fractious amongst these new issues is the liberalization of electronic commerce (e-commerce). The agenda to liberalize e-commerce has been introduced by digitally advanced states at the behest of Big Tech companies, such as Apple, Amazon, Google, Microsoft, and Facebook. Digitally advanced states seek to maintain their oligopoly over developing country markets by calling for the deregulation of e-commerce, particularly an unrestricted flow of data across borders. Their demand is contested by a group of African states, Least Developed Countries, and India. These countries have a repository of unprocessed data but lack the infrastructure to harness its potential. They are fearful of being reduced to suppliers of data for Big Tech, which would process such data to reap colossal profits. In a sense, their apprehension is reminiscent of India’s famed handloom industry that was decimated when the British Raj exported raw cotton from India to the ‘dark Satanic Mills’ of Victorian England, and then shipped it back in the form of manufactured cloth, generating vast sums of money for the British East India Company. This reflection highlights the lasting entanglement of the WTO with imperialism by examining dialogues around e-commerce liberalization. It reveals the WTO’s corporate heart that pursues the interests of Big Tech while eroding the economic sovereignty of Third World peoples. We start with an overview of the WTO negotiations on e-commerce and the motivations of various member states, followed by an exposition of conflicting viewpoints on neoliberal e-commerce. We argue against liberalization of e-commerce insofar as it forecloses the ability of Third World states to incentivise their domestic e-commerce industry. WTO E-Commerce Negotiations The internet has steadily displaced traditional methods of commerce, becoming a truly global marketplace. Standing on the brink of the Fourth Industrial Revolution, it seems certain that the future belongs to digital technology and innovation. As participants in the digital ecosystem, we all generate vast amounts of data, the lifeblood of the digital economy. Access to data is a prerequisite for e-commerce services, be it digital goods (such as music and software), digital services (such as cloud storage and Big Data analytics), or as a complement to manufacturing and packaging e-commerce deliveries. Thus, while a trite comparison, data is indeed the new oil. Having said that, unprocessed data is of negligible value. It is only after raw data is processed that it becomes essential to the functioning of the digital economy. The differential capacity of states to accumulate and process data leads us to the North-South dimension underlying the digital space. While developing countries are an untapped repository of data, they lack the technical know-how and infrastructure to accumulate and process it. Developed countries, on the other hand, are home to the world’s leading digital firms that are at the forefront of technology and innovation. On the back of an unrestricted supply of data from developing countries, these corporations have achieved enormous profits by processing such data and, thus, capturing developing country markets. It is of utmost importance for developing countries to bridge the digital divide lest they remain subservient to Big Tech corporations of the North. The WTO has been at the centre of negotiations on trade-related aspects of e-commerce since 1998, when its General Council established the Work Programme on Electronic Commerce. Dismayed by the lack of convergence amongst members, the US, EU and Japan (hereafter ‘proponents’) sought to introduce a broader negotiating mandate in 2016. Broadly premised on the Trans-Pacific Partnership Agreement(TPP), their proposals envisage an unregulated internet free for all. They are, inter alia, opposed to any encumbrances upon cross-border data flows, digital custom duties, and forced technology transfers.1 According to these proponents, the neo-liberal vision holds the promise of a strong digital economy. Similar provisions on e-commerce are found in other bilateral and regional trade agreements including the US-Korea Free Trade Agreement (2012), Mexico-Panama Free Trade Agreement (2015), and ongoing negotiations in the Trade in Services Agreement (TISA), among others. After the US withdrawal from TPP in January 2017, the same text forms part of the Comprehensive and Progressive Agreement for Trans-Pacific Partnership (2018) (CPTPP). Although the TPP has disintegrated, it still forms the basis for negotiations at various bilateral and multilateral forums, hence for the purposes of this Reflection we refer to TPP rules. Seventeen developing and two developed countries, identifying themselves as ‘Friends of E-Commerce for Development’, joined the chorus as they also see merit in liberal e-commerce as their ticket to digital growth. These include Argentina, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Mexico, Moldova, Montenegro, Nigeria, Pakistan, Sri Lanka and Uruguay, and the MIKTA (Mexico, Indonesia, South Korea, Turkey and Australia) group. Notably, China’s reasons for advocating the liberalization of digital trade are quite distinct from the proponents. While principally in favour of liberal e-commerce, China is against an unrestricted flow of cross-border data and limitations on data-localization, citing reasons of national security. This is in line with China’s aspirations to grow in digital trade, while also securing the Chinese government’s heavy regulation of the internet.2 On the other end of the spectrum are the African Group, Least Developed Countries, and India (hereafter ‘opponents’), who oppose a TPP-style framework on e-commerce for its complete lack of developmental flexibilities. These opponents contend that their large quantity of user data must be considered a valuable resource in the digital economy. Instead, a TPP-style agreement on e-commerce assigns no economic value to unprocessed data and calls for its unimpeded flow across borders. Agreeing to such a framework ˗ opponents contend ˗ would make their markets a goldmine for Big Tech, which would consolidate their market share and obliterate domestic e-commerce platforms. The problem is exacerbated by lack of infrastructure and technology in developing countries to support domestic e-commerce initiatives. Opponents seek to realize the economic value of their data as a means to closing the digital divide. More importantly, they envisage a greater role for the state in regulation of its laggard e-commerce sector to bring it up to speed with digitally advanced states. Opponents successfully lodged their opposition at the Buenos Aires Ministerial Conference in 2017. But proponents have nonetheless commenced exploratory work with support from the WTO Secretariat and endorsement by the World Economic Forum. Given these developments, it is a tall order ahead for developing countries, some of which have already bought into the ‘grand myth’ of development through e-commerce liberalization. From a TWAIL perspective, the WTO negotiations on digital trade, among other things, occasion a reflection on what it means to ‘do TWAIL’ at a time when historical alliances amongst countries of the South have either disintegrated or are in jeopardy. To Regulate or not to Regulate The debate over e-commerce repeats two longstanding competing visions of global political economy: an open Internet ostensibly free from governmental control as opposed to government regulation over e-commerce. The centre-piece of the opponents’ argument is that the neoliberal vision of free e-commerce subverts the role of the state in the digital economy and thereby undermines the domestic e-commerce industry of Third World states. To substantiate this claim, we revisit Chimni’s prescient piece, ‘International Institutions Today: An Imperial Global State in the Making’ that traces the synergies between international institutions, corporate actors, and dominant states in shaping the imperial global order.Chimni argues the WTO is working in the interests of an emerging transnational capitalist class and powerful states to the disadvantage of the Third World. With the purported objective of regulatory harmonization, the WTO prescribes uniform global standards that remove impediments to capital accumulation at the global level. It is through this process that economic sovereignty of Third World states has been ceded to the WTO in crucial areas such as agriculture, intellectual property, and services. Orford also identifies how this ‘pose[s] an illegitimate constraint on the political choices open to peoples and governments’, undermining substantive democracy in the Third World.

#### The alternative is a global revolution against the violence of the US led LIO – movements in that status quo are working and subverting the US and their imperialism exerted through multilateral institutions – even if those movements fail the orientation of those movements is what is necessary because the only way out of US neoimperalism is to continue to fight – the Vietcong forces are proof that movements can stand up to US imperialism

**Sirohi & Bhupatiraju** 20**21 (R. A., S. “Reassessing the Pink Tide. doi:10.1007/978-981-15-8674-3) ajoseph**

For the left to accept such a possibility however would be to miss the polarizing effects of capitalism on a global scale; it would be to ignore the reality of the vast transfers of surpluses from the South to the North that sustain the system. Moreover, to accept such an understanding would also put the left in direct confrontation with its mass base-the poorest sections of society who bear the brunt of imperialism. This is precisely why a generation of anti-imperialist thinkers argued that the way out of underdevelopment and poverty that the peripheries were stuck in, was *to break away from global trading and financial networks* and not in the hope that imperialism could be made benevolent. Their preferred strategy was for 12Here Harvey seems to be differentiating between “accumulation by dispossession” on the one hand and “primitive accumulation” on the other. By doing so, even as he takes to task those versions of Marxism that relegate the violence of dispossession to the margins of capitalism and even as he asserts the continued relevance of such forms of accumulation, his reading nonetheless remains stuck in a stadial conceptualization of capitalism. 4 REARMING THE LEFT 179 peripheral regions to regain hold of the nation state and use the national sovereignty thus obtained to push against the boundaries of imperialism. Thus while radical critics of capitalism are correct in suggesting that only an “inner” transformation of our societies can provide lasting answers to the problems that we face today, for the Global South this process must begin first and foremost through an “outer” transformation of its external links. What is more is that this assertion of sovereignty does not necessarily have to come at the cost of socialist internationalism and indeed historically, the most vociferous demands for political and economic independence have gone hand in hand with heroic acts of internationalism. In a speech delivered in 1965, Che Guevara emphasized this relation as follows: “To raise the living standards of the underdeveloped nations, therefore, we must fight against imperialism. And *each time a country is torn away from the imperialist tree, it is not only a partial battle won against the main enemy but it also contributes to the real weakening of that enemy*, and is one more step toward the final victory. There are no borders in this struggle to the death. We cannot be indifferent to what happens anywhere in the world, because a victory by any country over imperialism is our victory, just as any country’s defeat is a defeat for all of us. The practice of proletarian internationalism is not only a duty for the peoples struggling for a better future, it is also an inescapable necessity” (Guevara 1965). These words remain as true today. Countries like Brazil and India which have diversified industrial bases and major agricultural capabilities can afford to think of an ambitious project of delinking, but such a strategy is likely to be much harder for smaller economies without some sort of international or at least regional level cooperation. Moreover, countries of the Global South that seek to radically challenge capitalism in this way are bound to face the wrath of capital in imperial centres through sanctions, military interventions and so on, and thus the success of delinking in any one country no doubt can benefit from cooperation and support of workers and peasants across the world. Left forces in the North have a particularly important role to play in this regard and in some senses the new contours of the global world economy make such solidarity more possible than ever before. Because although imperialism today continues to rely on extracting super profits from the peripheries, this renewed cycle of imperialism today has gone hand in hand with an erosion of the welfare state in the North and an intense commodification of labour in these parts of the world, all of which have served to weaken the “internal alliances” between capital and labour; Alliances, one 180 R. A. SIROHI AND S. BHUPATIRAJU might add, that Samir Amin at one point saw as constituting a crucial feature of autonomous capitalist development in centres of world capitalism. Conditions such as these can serve to sharpen class conflict and raise working-class consciousness to an entirely new levels in the North, thus providing fertile soil for genuine socialist internationalism. Beyond Developmentalism If the left in the Global South is to emphasize delinking, then such a strategy directly brings home the question of state power to the centre of discussion. It was Lenin’s major contribution to show how important it was for the left not to be satisfied merely by taking state power. In order for socialist movement to move forward and not get trapped within the boundaries of capitalism, *the state would have to be “smashed”.* And yet the very concept of “smashing” has been very fuzzy. Smashing the state did not for once imply a rejection of economic planning for instance. It was not some nihilistic strategy aimed at the destruction of all things that the state had its hands in. It did not for example mean that there was no room for provision of public services like health and education within socialist society.13 It however did mean destruction of the army, prisons and all those arms of the state that were bulwarks of status quo. It also implied a level of decentralization that the capitalist state could never dream of accommodating. Thus what Marxists implied when they sought the smashing of the state was the destruction of the alienating form that the state took; an institution that people create but one that nonetheless comes to dominate them as if it were an external force.

## Case

### Util

#### Util enables sacrificial genocide and excuses capitalist violence

Santos 3 2003, Boaventura de Souza Santos is a Professor of Sociology at the University of Coimbra, “Collective Suicide?”, Bad Subjects, Issue # 63 , http://www.ces.fe.uc.pt/opiniao/bss/072en.php

According to Franz Hinkelammert, the West has repeatedly been under the illusion that it should try to save humanity by destroying part of it. This is a salvific and sacrificial destruction, committed in the name of the need to radically materialize all the possibilities opened up by a given social and political reality over which it is supposed to have total power. This is how it was in colonialism, with the genocide of indigenous peoples, and the African slaves. This is how it was in the period of imperialist struggles, which caused millions of deaths in two world wars and many other colonial wars. This is how it was in Stalinism, with the Gulag and in Nazism, with the holocaust. And now today, this is how it is in neoliberalism, with the collective sacrifice of the periphery and even the semiperiphery of the world system. With the war against Iraq, it is fitting to ask whether what is in progress is a new genocidal and sacrificial illusion, and what its scope might be. It is above all appropriate to ask if the new illusion will not herald the radicalization and the ultimate perversion of the western illusion: destroying all of humanity in the illusion of saving it. Sacrificial genocide arises from a totalitarian illusion that is manifested in the belief that there are no alternatives to the present-day reality and that the problems and difficulties confronting it arise from failing to take its logic of development to its ultimate consequences. If there is unemployment, hunger and death in the Third World, this is not the result of market failures; instead, it is the outcome of the market laws not having been fully applied. If there is terrorism, this is not due to the violence of the conditions that generate it; it is due, rather, to the fact that total violence has not been employed to physically eradicate all terrorists and potential terrorists. This political logic is based on the supposition of total power and knowledge , and on the radical rejection of alternatives; it is ultra-conservative in that it aims to infinitely reproduce the status quo. Inherent to it is the notion of the end of history. During the last hundred years, the West has experienced three versions of this logic, and, therefore, seen three versions of the end of history: Stalinism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the plan; Nazism, with its logic of racial superiority; and neoliberalism, with its logic of insuperable efficiency of the market. The first two periods involved the destruction of democracy. The last one trivializes democracy, disarming it in the face of social actors sufficiently powerful to be able to privatize the State and international institutions in their favour. I have described this situation as a combination of political democracy and social fascism. One current manifestation of this combination resides in the fact that intensely strong public opinion, worldwide, against the war is found to be incapable of halting the war machine set in motion by supposedly democratic rulers. At all these moments, a death drive, a catastrophic heroism, predominates, the idea of a looming collective suicide, only preventable by the massive destruction of the other. Paradoxically, the broader the definition of the other and the efficacy of its destruction, the more likely collective suicide becomes. In its sacrificial genocide version, neoliberalism is a mixture of market radicalization, neoconservatism and Christian fundamentalism. Its death drive takes a number of forms, from the idea of "discardable populations", referring to citizens of the Third World not capable of being exploited as workers and consumers, to the concept of "collateral damage" , to refer to the deaths, as a result of war, of thousands of innocent civilians. The last, catastrophic heroism, is quite clear on two facts: according to reliable calculations by the Non-Governmental Organization MEDACT, in London, between 48 and 260 thousand civilians will die during the war and in the three months after (this is without there being civil war or a nuclear attack); the war will cost 100 billion dollars, enough to pay the health costs of the world's poorest countries for four years. Is it possible to fight this death drive? We must bear in mind that, historically, sacrificial destruction has always been linked to the economic pillage of natural resources and the labor force, to the imperial design of radically changing the terms of economic, social, political and cultural exchanges in the face of falling efficiency rates postulated by the maximalist logic of the totalitarian illusion in operation. It is as though hegemonic powers, both when they are on the rise and when they are in decline, repeatedly go through times of primitive accumulation, legitimizing the most shameful violence in the name of futures where, by definition, there is no room for what must be destroyed. In today's version, the period of primitive accumulation consists of combining neoliberal economic globalization with the globalization of war. The machine of democracy and liberty turns into a machine of horror and destruction.

#### No cancer is not and cannot be contagious doesn’t spill to extinction – get trolled

Fayed 20 [Lisa Fayed](https://www.verywellhealth.com/lisa-fayed-581904) Lisa Fayed is a freelance medical writer, cancer educator and patient advocate. Updated on January 27, 2020https://www.verywellhealth.com/is-cancer-contagious-514238 meza

Cancer is not contagious in the conventional sense and is not considered an infectious or communicable disease. Cancer itself cannot be transmitted from one person to another (unlike some animals**)** by breathing the same air, sharing a toothbrush, touching, kissing, or having sex. With a few rare exceptions (organ transplant recipients, mother to fetal transmission, and a few rare events), the immune system will recognize any foreign cells (including cancer cells from another person) and destroy them. **Some infections that can be transmitted (including some sexually transmitted diseases), however, may increase the risk of developing cancer**. **In addition,** cancer may run in families, but instead of being transmitted, this risk is related to genetic traits (a genetic predisposition) or common exposures that increase risk**.**1 Mature ethnic woman with cancer wearing headwrap on couch FatCamera / Getty Images Contagiousness and Cancer **Since cancer can be contagious in some species, wondering why it is not in humans is a good question that can be looked at in a few different ways.** The first way to look at this is by visualizing what happens if a cancer cell from another person were to enter our body (it would have to be directly transmitted since cancer cells can't live outside the body). This is what former Venezuelan president Hugo Chavez claimed when he stated that his enemies gave him cancer.2 **In an unethical experiment conducted in the 1950s and 1960s, two New York researchers actually did some experiments in which they injected cancer cells into healthy prisoners and cancer patients (the recipients were not informed of this experiment) to see if he could "cause" cancer**. With only one exception**,** the recipient's immune system fought off the cancer cells before they passed beyond the nodule stage.3 **Our immune cells see cancer cells from another person as they would see disease-causing viruses or bacteria.** (In the study, the experiment was justified by the researchers who hoped to discover ways to build an immunity to cancer, and was funded by the American Cancer Society and the U.S. Public Health Service).3 In one other human experiment, melanoma cells were transferred from a person to his mother to try to induce immunity to cancer, and the mother died from melanoma.4 There are a few other very rare exceptions, for example, a 2015 report in The New England Journal of Medicine describes how cancer cells from a tapeworm invaded a man's body spreading to several lymph nodes and his lungs. While ordinarily, the immune system would not allow this, the man was severely immunosuppressed due to HIV/AIDS. There have also been rare cases in which cancer has been transmitted (via a needle poke or a cut on the hand) to a lab worker and a surgeon (sarcoma). In these cases, however, while the cancer cells grew locally where they entered the body, but they did not progress beyond the site of entry.5 The lack of contagiousness of cancer is also better understood when looking at how cancer develops. Cancer cells arise after a series of mutations (in genes that control the growth of the cell) lead to uncontrolled growth of the cell. Even when genetic damage occurs, the human body has genes (such as tumor suppressor genes) that code for proteins designed to either repair damaged DNA or eliminate damaged cells. Further support for the lack of contagiousness is the lack of epidemics. In addition, oncologists and other health professionals who are exposed to large numbers of people with cancer are not any more likely to develop the disease. Further support for the lack of contagiousness is the lack of epidemics. In addition, oncologists and other health professionals who are exposed to large numbers of people with cancer are not any more likely to develop the disease.

### Impact – No Superbugs

#### ABR induced Pandemic will only spur small death-tolls – most are too healthy to catch it

Tyson 12 {Greg, syndicated science columnist, PhD student in microbiology (Northwestern), “Tipping Point: The Threat of Antibiotic Resistance,” Helix, 8/17, <http://helix.northwestern.edu/article/tipping-point-threat-antibiotic-resistance>}

What happens if we stand pat? **We won’t return to the Middle Ages**, where plague wiped out one third of Europe’s population. The truth is that many of the most dangerous and widespread bacterial pathogens that truly deserve the moniker “superbug” **have been tamed**, especially in the United States. This is because for the healthy person, pathogens like MRSA are **not an immediate threat**. But people hospitalized and already sick with other conditions are in danger of contracting bacterial infections we are sometimes powerless to treat. It truly is a shame that we are constantly making medical advances in other fields, but have taken a step back in this area. Some potential solutions include treating infections with multiple antibiotics and offering greater incentives for the pharmaceutical industry to produce these products. Also, more specific therapies directed at toxins the bacteria produce could be used in conjunction with antibiotics to more effectively control infections. Stories about MRSA as a “superbug” **are often overblown, causing unnecessary panic among people unlikely to get sick.** Nevertheless, it rightfully draws attention to a public health problem that requires new solutions. The appropriate response is concern and action. But if we continue to ignore the problem, it can only get worse.

#### No “super virus” - Strong diseases that kill to effectively the host will mutate to become more mild

Green, writer for world building, July 1 2015 "Is non-manmade pandemic a realistic threat to modern first world?" worldbuilding.stackexchange.com/questions/19945/is-non-manmade-pandemic-a-realistic-threat-to-modern-first-world

The problem with short gestation period diseases is if you, as the disease, kill your host too quickly then you don't get a chance to spread yourself around as much. Diseases that kill quickly typically turn into diseases that don't kill too quickly because a fast-killer doesn't "survive" long in the population while tamer mutations have more time to expose other hosts. A virus will change over time in relation to the selection pressure of a host's immune system (herd immunity may play a factor too). The longer a virus survives and the more hosts it infects, the greater the chance for mutation.¶ There's this article from 1999 that talks about mutation rates in RNA viruses. (I'm sure there are newer, better articles to be had.) The mutation rates are stupid high on the order of around 75% per genome per replication. The mutation rate is much lower for DNA-based microbes (including both viral and cellular organisms) at .34%. The authors of the paper state that these numbers are hard to gauge because the mediocre quality of the data. If that's just one nucleotide involved in the mutation, at trillions or quadrillions of replications across many different hosts, there will be mutation.

### CC Inevitable – Alt Causes

#### 1. Acidification.

CBD, 10 (Center for Biological Diversity, Targeted News Service, “Legal Settlement Will Require EPA to Evaluate How to Regulate Ocean Acidification Under Clean Water Act”, 2010, L/N)

Ocean acidification, the "other carbon dioxide problem," results from the ocean's absorption of CO2 from the atmosphere, which increases the acidity of the ocean and changes the chemistry of seawater. The primary known consequence of ocean acidification is that it impairs the ability of marine animals to build and maintain the protective shells and skeletons they need to survive. Nearly every marine animal studied to date has experienced adverse effects due to acidification. "Ocean acidification is global warming's evil twin, and **CO2 pollution is one of the biggest threats to our marine environment**," said Sakashita. "We need prompt action to curb CO2 emissions to avoid the worst consequences of acidification."

#### 2. Overfishing.

NEWS Press ‘9(“End of the line at famed film festival”, 1-19, L/N)

Audiences at the famous Sundance film festival are being treated to the world premiere of a new movie highlighting the parlous state of the world's oceans. The End of the Line, a feature length documentary made with the support of WWF, has its first showing in the World Cinema Documentary competition today (Monday 19th Jan). The film - based on the book of the same name by UK environment journalist Charles Clover - calls for networks of marine protected areas, well-managed fishing and sustainable seafood as key solutions to restoring our oceans' health and bounty. Along with several other NGOs, WWF contributed to the film both financially and with expert advice. The End of the Line points the finger at over-fishing as one of the main reasons behind the current state of our marine environment. WWF International's Director of Marine Programme, Miguel Jorge, agrees. "**Overfishing is the single biggest immediate threat to our oceans**, and the film highlights some of the most conspicuous examples of excessive exploitation of marine resources, such as the decimation of bluefin tuna stocks in the Mediterranean." "It is important to note that there are many within the fishing and seafood sectors working hard to fish responsibly and supply consumers with healthy seafood that is good for the oceans and WWF is committed to working openly with these proactive, progressive players."

#### 3. Plastic pollution.

NYT, 8(Donovan Hohn, Contributing Ed. – Harpers, “Sea of Trash”, 6-22, L/N)

We still have limited tax dollars to spend and scarier nightmares to fear. No one -- not Pallister, not Moore -- will tell you that **plastic pollution is the greatest man-made threat our oceans face**. Depending whom you ask, that honor goes to global warming, agricultural runoff or overfishing. But unlike many pollutants, plastic has no natural source and therefore there is no doubt that we are to blame. Because we can see it, plastic is a powerful bellwether of our impact upon the earth. Where plastics travel, invisible pollutants -- pesticides and fertilizers from lawns and farms, petrochemicals from roads, sewage tainted with pharmaceuticals -- often follow. Last June, shortly before my voyage in the Opus began, Sylvia Earle, formerly N.O.A.A.'s chief scientist, delivered an impassioned speech on marine debris at the World Bank in Washington. ''Trash is clogging the arteries of the planet,'' Earle said. ''We're beginning to wake up to the fact that the planet is not infinitely resilient.'' For ages humanity saw in the ocean a sublime grandeur suggestive of eternity. No longer. Surveying the debris on remote beaches like Gore Point, we see that the ocean is more finite than we'd thought. Now it is the sublime grandeur of our civilization but also of our waste that inspires awe.