# Cap K v. Col

#### Cap is the root of colonialism – best empirical evidence proves it’s a one-way street

Smiley 09

Maurice Smiley 9, "Abstract: Root Cause of Colonialism", December 11, mauricesmiley.blogspot.com/2009/12/there-is-little-doubt-that-colonialism.html

There is little doubt that colonialism has changed the face of the planet and continues to affect postcolonial societies in a number of different ways. Fusing of cultures, religion, economics, and language are but of few of the results of postcolonialism. Some societies have adapted markedly well while others have fallen into abject poverty, civil war, social unrest, and in extreme cases extinction. Regardless of the outcomes, this essay examines the texts we have read throughout the semester in an effort to determine the underlying reason ,or the "why", for colonialism in the first place. The answer is undoubtedly capitalism.¶ In examining colonial Europe, the common thread found in examining the question of why colonialism happened can be seen clearly in Joseph Conrad's "Heart of Darkness", Chinua Achebe's "Things Fall Apart", and V.S. Naipaul's "The Mimic Men". These novels show how the Europeans used various pretexts for rationalizing the colonization of other countries, in order to pave the way for private enterprise to make money.¶ Looking into more recent history, Ha Jin's story, "After Cowboy Chicken Came to Town" shows how America, a postcolonial society itself, uses capitalism as a means of spreading culture and values to other countries. Future evidence of capitalism's role in colonialism can be examined in the Neal Stephenson's "The Diamond Age". In "The Diamond Age", we see a future "globalized" world that is controlled by tribes instead of countries. In examining the relationship between the tribes and globalization, we see evidence that the most successful tribes are really technology corporations who's citizens are members of the corporate culture.¶ Pundits may argue that there were other reasons for colonialism, such as religion, and that capitalism played a secondary role. Jared Diamond's "Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies", Diamond provides evidence through historical facts that the driving force behind colonialism was completely based on capitalism. Further evidence can be found in Juan Gonzalez's "Harvest Empire" where he explores the history behind Spanish colonialism and provides compelling evidence that colonialism is rooted in capitalism.

### L: Focus on Coloniality

#### Focus on coloniality ignores material effects of capital

Lazarus, MA/Prof of English, 11

(Neil, *What postcolonial theory doesn’t say*, Race & Class 53(1))

However, we would be mistaken if we were to infer from all this that there was a congruence to be established between Frank’s ideas and those prevailing in postcolonial studies. For, what Frank goes on to say about postcolonial theory in this paper of 2001 is witheringly dismissive: The re-examination of reality [that I propose] … may [be imagined to] … parallel the denunciation of the received wisdom of both … ‘traditional’ and … dependence as well as world-system theory … by recent post-modernist, post-colonial, and subaltern textual ‘analysis’ as far as the latter go, which is not much. For they offer no examination and much less analysis of any political economic reality and its history. Most importantly they have and offer no global perspective, examination, nor political economic history and analysis of the one world economy and system whose own whole globe encompassing structure and dynamic is so determinant of the possibilities, options and therefore successes and failures of its ever changing geographic, political economic, social and cultural parts.21 Frank scorns the idea of a capitalist world system, but he retains and, indeed, heightens his longstanding commitment to systematicity in sociological analysis. His late work advances the radically continuist argument that while there is indeed a world system, it has been in existence for 5,000 years, not 500. I think Frank is quite wrong about this. His trivialisation of what his one-time intellectual confederate Immanuel Wallerstein has described as the ‘great structural changes’ that have ‘occur[red] in the world in the last several hundred years’, and which, on Wallerstein’s account, ‘make the world of today qualitatively different from the world of yesterday’,22 strikes me as refractory and unconvincing. But we can, at least, easily see the differences between Frank’s standpoint and what Homi K. Bhabha has influentially identified as ‘the postcolonial perspective’, and which, on Bhabha’s own formulation, ‘departs from the traditions of the sociology of underdevelopment or “dependency” theory’, not because the systemic logic underpinning these traditions is insufficiently global or comprehensive in its conception, but because postcolonial theory must ‘resist … the attempt at holistic forms of social explanation’.23 Frank moves towards the specification of a 5,000-year world system; the ‘postcolonial perspective’ abandons system altogether. As Bhabha writes, ‘it forces a recognition of … more complex cultural and political boundaries … ’ than those implicated by any systematic philosophy.24 This comparison tells very severely against postcolonial studies. The problem is that the postcolonialist attention to forms of politics and culture that are supposedly ‘more complex’ than the struggle-based models (now thought to be obsolete) has typically led to a wholesale neglect of the ground beneath their feet. Benita Parry makes just this point in her historical critique of postcolonial studies, writing that: [t]he institutionalization of postcolonial studies took place at a time when the linguistic turn was in the ascendant within philosophy and literary theory, and at the moment when cultural studies was in the process of turning its back on materialist beginnings. The stage was then set for the reign of theoretical tendencies which Edward Said, among others, has deplored for permitting intellectuals ‘an astonishing sense of weightlessness with regard to the gravity of history’. In the realm of postcolonial studies, where premises affording analytical priority to formations of discourse and signifying processes were already to the fore, discussion of the internal structures of texts, enunciations and sign systems became detached from a concurrent examination of social and experiential contexts, situations, and circumstances.25 We need to proceed carefully here, as Parry herself does in her incisive examination of the ‘countercurrents and tensions in Said’s critical practice’.26 For, while Edward Said himself clearly calls for a materialist countermanding of the idealism of mainstream postcolonial studies – with the gravity of history bringing the field’s giddy and unmoored intellectuals back to earth – his is never remotely an historical materialism. My claim in this essay is that postcolonial theory generally has failed to situate colonialism relative to the wider framing history of capitalist development. Even on the best postcolonialist accounts, such as Said’s own in Culture and Imperialism, ‘imperialism’ is typically cast as a political dispensation and referred, in civilisational terms, to ‘the West’ rather than to capitalism. Thus, Said holds ‘imperialism’ to implicate military conquest, alien governance, systematised top-down violence, social asymmetry, cultural and symbolic domination, and Eurocentrism as a set of deeply patterned ‘structures of attitude and reference’. He makes comparatively little of the fact that it centrally involves the imposition of a particular mode or modes of production and specific regimes of accumulation, expropriation and exploitation in the form of the extraction of surplus value, commodification and the generalisation of commodity production, and so on. Parry’s overview of the contradictions deriving from what she calls Said’s ‘deliberated disengagement’ from Marxism in Culture and Imperialism is altogether winning here. I quote from it at length: Said’s was the long view of ‘imperialism’ as ‘the practice, the theory and the attitude of a dominating centre ruling a distant territory,’ and because his interest was in the formation of ideologies underwriting an European hegemony, the study is not concerned with differentiating between mercantile-plantation colonialism, which stimulated the accumulation of capital in Europe, and the subsequent industrial-military interventions of metropolitan nation-states in overseas territories, an era known to historians and political scientists as ‘imperialism’ and austerely described by Rosa Luxemburg as ‘the political expression of the accumulation of capital in its competitive struggle for what remains still open of the non-capitalist environment’. Said wrote with passionate intensity about imperial aggression without referring to the analysis of Lenin or Luxemburg; he distinguished between anticolonial nationalism and liberation movements without alluding to the communist orientation of the latter or the class interests of either; and he placed economic and political machinery and territorial aggrandizement at the center of modern empire without specifying capitalism’s world system. At the same time he cited adherents of the Marxist critique such as Aimé Césaire, Fanon, C.L.R. James, Eqbal Ahmad, Amilcar Cabral, and Walter Rodney with respect, embracing them as comrades in the struggle against colonialism.27 Parry distinguishes pertinently here, in passing, between ‘colonialism’ and ‘imperialism’, and we know that, especially within Marxist theory, there is a very specific deployment that sees ‘imperialism’ as referring narrowly to the process of capitalist accumulation on a world scale in the era of monopoly capitalism. But, as the example represented by Said’s Culture and Imperialism demonstrates, this is not where the blind spot in postcolonial theory is to be located. For our purposes here, in fact, there is no need to cavil at a relaxed usage that would regard the two terms as more or less interchangeable. While this might involve a little imprecision, it would have the advantage of connecting with both mainstream political philosophy and non-specialist convention.28 For the problem is not that postcolonial theory is inclined to conflate the categories of ‘colonialism’ and ‘imperialism’, but that it tends to construe ‘colonialism’ as an exercise solely in political domination, of the global projection of power. It is, therefore, important to insist, in opposition to this emphasis, that whatever else it might have and, indeed, did involve – all the way from the systematic annihilation of whole communities to the cultivation of aesthetic tastes and preferences – colonialism as an historical process involved the forced integration of hitherto uncapitalised societies, or societies in which the capitalist mode of production was not hegemonic, into a capitalist world system. Over the course of a couple of centuries in some territories, mere decades in others, generalised commodity production was imposed: production for exchange rather than use; monetisation; private ownership; the development of specifically capitalist markets (involving ‘free’ wage labour and the buying and selling of labour power) or the appropriation, de- and re-centralising of existing markets and of ancillary systems and institutions designed to enable and facilitate the consolidation, extension and reproduction of capitalist production and capitalist class relations. Along the way, existing social relations and modes of existence were undermined, destroyed, reconfigured; new social relations and modes of existence were brought into being. Existing circuits of production, distributions of power, universes of meaning, were disturbed, appropriated, reoriented. Peasantries were destroyed, along with subsistence, tributary and market economies (some of them vast and elaborate), to be replaced by capitalised agriculture in one location, proletarianisation in another, with waves of migratory labour (more or less regulated, sometimes not at all) in between. Ruling elites were made, unmade and remade, the basis of their power thoroughly transformed.(9-11)

### L: Medical Diplomacy (MUST READ)

#### The plan’s reduction of IP is in line with a broader strategy of vaccine diplomacy – this treats global health as a game of political football to advance imperialist interests in the long-term – only anti-capitalist organizing solves.

Patanè, 21

[Andrea, writer for the IMT: “COVID-19 pandemic: patents and profits,” In Defence of Marxism, published 5-15-2021. https://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm]//AD

We are 16 months into a pandemic that according to some reports has claimed 6.9m lives and plunged capitalism into its deepest-ever crisis, and the ruling class is still torn by internecine squabbles over patent waivers, export bans and priority-deals. New rifts have opened up between sections of the bourgeoisie following the recent announcement that US president Joe Biden’s administration now supports “negotiations” on waiving COVID-19 vaccine patents. This is much to the consternation of the Big Pharma parasites, who are pocketing tens of billions of dollars thanks to their exclusive ownership of COVID-19 vaccines and other drugs. Again and again, we find proof that capitalism, a system based on narrow national interests and the pursuit of private profits is utterly unfit for purpose. Indeed, as a recent WHO-led investigation just confirmed, the entire pandemic was preventable. The market and bourgeois politicians brought about this disaster, and are utterly failing to resolve it. IP and Big Pharma profits In October last year, faced with the prospect of global vaccine shortages and the inability of poorer countries to acquire them, India and South Africa presented to the World Trade Organization a request to waive intellectual property rights on all the COVID-19-related drugs and technologies. This would allow the manufacture of cheap, generic versions anywhere in the world. Vaccines and medical technologies fall under the WTO agreements on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights, known as TRIPS, which protects the IP of the major pharmaceutical companies. According to one report, a TRIPS waiver could help in vaccinating more than 60 percent of the world population by the end of the year. Everyone on earth could be fully vaccinated by the end of 2022. The pandemic nightmare that billions of people are living through could be over once and for all. Surely then, a TRIPS waiver sounds like a sensible and necessary request? Especially given that the likes of Pfizer, Johnson & Johnson and AstraZeneca have already racked up profits of more than $26bn during the pandemic. What was being demanded was not too radical either: a one time temporary waiver on intellectual property rights related to just one vaccine. Also, the 2001 Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health – agreed by all WTO states – maintains that public health should take precedence over the enforcement of IP rights. Unfortunately, Big Pharma takes a very different view, and isn’t going to let a trivial thing like the Doha Declaration undermine its private claim to COVID-19 vaccines. From their point of view, any concession in this particular case would set a very dangerous precedent. The IP protections afforded to Big Pharma are denying huge swathes of the world population access to vaccines, compounded by the vaccine nationalism of rich countries, which can afford to pay suppliers directly and are gobbling up global supplies. As, Dr. Tedros – the general director of WHO – has warned in the NYT that, following the current trajectory of vaccinations: “[w]e face the very real possibility of affluent countries administering variant-blocking boosters to already vaccinated people when many countries will still be scrounging for enough vaccines to cover their most-at-risk groups”. This is quite an appealing prospect for the Big Pharma bloodsuckers: namely, COVID-19 going endemic, much like a seasonal flu. With new variants breeding out of control in poor countries every year, and seasonal vaccines developed and distributed for those who can pay, billions of dollars would continue to flow in the pockets of these leeches, potentially for the years to come. Moderna CEO Stephane Bancel has already tempted his shareholders with such a “business model” – and is now projecting more than $19.2 billion in sales for this year! However, this bonanza depends on Big Pharma keeping a firm hold on its vaccine IP. Hundreds of thousands of people dying every single year as a result of COVID-19 going endemic is a very minor concern. Unsurprisingly then, Big Pharma has been lobbying governments world over against the TRIPS waiver. Up until now, they have been successful. As of October 2020, the US and EU not only opposed the waiver, but blocked the possibility of any discussion of it from taking place at WTO meetings. Now – after a criminal seven-month period in which hundreds of thousands of people have lost their lives to preventable second and third COVID-19 waves – Biden’s administration has come out in support of entering into negotiations over the TRIPS waiver. Unsurprisingly, Big Pharma reacted to this announcement with dismay. Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla argued that an IP waiver would “disrupt the flow of raw materials” for the vaccine production chain. One suspects he means Big Pharma’s exclusive control over these raw materials will be disrupted. Meanwhile, Johnson & Johnson called the waiver proposal “an unprecedented step that will undermine our global response to the pandemic and compromise safety”, by allowing poor countries to produce vaccines. This is despite the fact that India produces the highest number of vaccines in the world, and was one of the two countries that proposed the waiver in the first place. Big Pharma companies also complained that an IP-waiver would hand the likes of China access to Western-produced mRNA technologies, which aside from vaccine production, could be repurposed for, among other things, cancer research (quelle horreur!). Let us not forget that mRNA technology was developed in publicly-funded university research facilities in the first place, before it was appropriated by private companies. This is simply an argument for the latest developments in medical science being freely available to the entire world, rather than the private property of this or that capitalist regime. A “calculated risk” Far from an act of ‘international solidarity', this latest move from the US government is a calculated political risk, and will be implemented in the interests of US imperialism. A section of the more serious wing of the bourgeoisie understands that a proper economic recovery can happen only if the pandemic is suppressed worldwide. As we have explained elsewhere, wealthy countries risk losing billions of dollars if the pandemic is brought under control only within their own borders, because new variants (like those in India and Brazil) can always mutate elsewhere and reinfect their populations, causing further economic disruption. Therefore, even on a capitalist basis, it is expedient in the long-term for the rich countries to facilitate a global vaccination campaign. Even Pope Francis anointed the demand from his seat in Rome! Biden’s announcement is also an act of vaccine diplomacy. America’s main rivals, China and Russia, have been shoring up their spheres of influence by distributing their Sinopharm and Sputnik V vaccines to poor countries left out by the vaccine nationalism of the US and Europe. Chinese and Russian vaccines have been exported into countries traditionally under western spheres of influence, including Brazil and Hungary. Pushing to waive IP protections on COVID-19 vaccines is therefore partly an effort to push back against the encroachment of rival imperialist powers, which have so far outcompeted Washington in the global vaccination drive. Biden’s announcement is also an attempt to restore the standing and authority of US imperialism on the world stage, which has been bruised by the ‘America First’ vaccine nationalist policy started by Donald Trump, and continued by Biden. According to the FT, Katherine Tai (top US trade envoy) and Jake Sullivan (national security adviser) made the case to Biden that pushing for the waiver “was a low-risk way to secure a diplomatic victory”, after coming under fire for not “respond[ing] quickly enough to the unfolding COVID-19 crisis in India”. Here you have it, straight from the horse’s mouth. Under capitalism, vaccines – rather than providing a way out of the pandemic – are tools for ‘low-risk diplomatic victories’. As if this was some sort of football match between world leaders! In short, Biden is stepping in to prioritise the interests of US imperialism as a whole over the immediate interests of the Big Pharma capitalists. But we should say clearly: this cynical attempt to claim the moral high ground came only after the US used its massive economic clout to secure enough vaccines to inoculate its own population several times over. And in fact, the wartime Defense Production Act is still in effect, which forces US manufacturers to fulfil domestic demands for medical equipment before exports are permitted. This de facto export ban has created bottlenecks in the supply chain that have already undermined the WHO-led COVAX programme to vaccinate poor countries. Rest assured, Biden’s policy remains ‘America First’, just by somewhat more calculated means than his predecessor. Protectionist EU Meanwhile, in the Eurozone, where vaccine shortages still abound, EU leaders fired back at Biden that he should lift his export ban and give up some of America’s surplus supply before talking about waiving IP protections. President Emmanuel Macron in France said he favoured waiving vaccine IP in principle, but that this was a lower priority than the US and Britain ending export bans on resources and giving up their spare vaccines. “If we want to work quickly, today there isn’t one factory in the world that can’t produce doses for poor countries because of intellectual property,” Macron said on the weekend. “The priority today is not intellectual property – it’s not true. We would be lying to ourselves. It’s production.” Indeed! And production could be considerably ramped up if Big Pharma companies weren’t content to maintain existing factories at full capacity, rather than creating and repurposing new factories that will stand idle (and unprofitable) when the pandemic ends. It should be noted that no French company has managed to produce a vaccine as yet, meaning IP protection is a lesser concern from the perspective of French capitalism. This is unlike Germany, in which Pfizer’s partner BioNTech is based, and whose Chancellor Angela Merkel argued for preserving IP protections in order to ensure free market “innovation”, stating last Friday: “I believe that we need the creativity and innovative force of companies, and for me, this includes patent protection.” Merkel conveniently forgets that, since the beginning of the pandemic, state intervention has been a far more important influence over vaccine production than the ‘invisible hand’ of the market. The research that led to the COVID-19 technologies vaccines was overwhelmingly paid for out of the public purse. The AstraZeneca vaccine, for instance, was 97 percent publicly funded. Not to mention the billions spent by various states on purchasing doses. This has nothing to do with preserving ‘innovation’, and everything to do with protecting the private interests of German capitalism. Vaccine supremacy Despite misgivings from the likes of Germany, this latest move by the US might force the EU to change its tune. At a European Council summit on the weekend, President Charles Michel said: “[o]n the intellectual property, we don’t think in the short term that it’s the magic bullet but we are ready to engage on this topic as soon as a concrete proposal will be put on the table.” Still, Brussels is embittered at the US for refusing to offer any of its excess supply to help with shortages after the EU bungled its initial vaccine rollout. At the close of the summit, European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen again stated Europe was “open to discussion” on waiting IP, but mostly used the opportunity to strike back at the US: “The European Union is the pharmacy of the world and open to the world. Up to today in the European Union, 400 million doses of vaccines have been produced and 50 percent of them — 200 million doses — have been exported to 90 different countries in the world. So we invite others to do the same [this clearly means the US]. This is the best way right now in the short term to approach the bottlenecks and the lack of vaccines worldwide.” Belgian Prime Minister Alexander De Croo used even-sterner language: “As Europeans, we don’t need to be schooled. The U.S. hasn’t exported a single vaccine in the past six months. Europe is the one that’s been producing for itself and the rest of the world these past six months.” Now the European rollout is a bit more in hand (though still lagging behind the US and Britain, for example), the EU is trying to pursue vaccine diplomacy of its own to compete with China, Russia and the US in the race for vaccine supremacy. At the summit, Leyen announced plans to send more than 600,000 doses to countries in the Western Balkans, with further donations planned for countries in the Eastern Partnership group comprising Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. This notably includes Ukraine, which has already pleaded in vain with Washington for vaccines. While this is all going on, the EU is still waging a war with the British-based AstraZeneca company – taking them to court over delayed deliveries of vaccines. Once again, at a critical juncture in the fight against the pandemic, when global cooperation is most needed, the political leaders of bourgeoisie are embroiled in recriminations and shoring up their narrow national interests. No time for this madness! While the world leaders squabble, the nightmare continues for workers imprisoned by this pandemic. In her official statement to the WTO, Tai said: “negotiations [i.e. for the patent waiving] will take time”. But time is exactly what millions of workers that face the deadly virus today do not have. Because the WTO makes decisions by consensus, with any one of the 164 member states being able to block decisions, the end of November is considered a ‘realistic goal’ for presenting a draft agreement. This is seven months away! While tens of thousands of deaths are being recorded on a daily basis. When deadly new variants are devastating India and Latin America. It took less time to develop the first working vaccine than apparently, it will to agree a patent waiver on that vaccine! This is nothing short of insanity. Furthermore, the US statement to the WTO fell short of making explicit reference to the transferring of vaccine technology and know-how. If the technology underpinning vaccine production is not shared, even with a patent waiver, it will take months before manufacturers will be able to reverse-engineer a generic version, and months further to test it. The Big Pharma fat cats will not share their technology (which was publicly funded in the first place) voluntarily. They are forecasting sales for billions of dollars for 2021 and will do everything they can to push further back the development of generic versions. They can afford to drag things out. For them, time means billions in profits. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown capitalism for what it is. Rather than being a force for progress, private property and the nation state are the main obstacles preventing us from putting an end to the pandemic. Under a democratic, global plan of production we could put the mighty forces of industry and science at the service of society. All the necessary research, technology and expertise could be marshalled to fight this terrible virus. Vaccine production could be stepped up to reach the majority of the world population by the end of the year. It is capitalism alone that prevents this. We must fight the pandemic with class struggle! Expropriate the Big Pharma fat cats!

### L: WTO

#### The WTO is inevitably a tool of accumulation for capitalist imperialism – international institutional monopoly capitalism overdetermines the plan’s move to peace – causes war, environmental degradation, and extinction.

Cuong, 18

[Vu Manh, Researcher @ VietEra Foundation: “International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations,” published by Monthly Review on December 19, 2018. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cuong-Vu-10/publication/331162082\_International\_institutional\_monopoly\_capitalism\_and\_its\_manifestations/links/5c6c2588299bf1e3a5b62764/International-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-its-manifestations.pdf]//AD

\*IIMC=International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism

The Evolution of Monopoly Capitalism Monopoly capitalism emerged from “laissez-faire” capitalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as described clearly by V.I. Lenin in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, allowing giant corporations to dominate the accumulation process. Since the late 1970s, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, this system has reached a new level in its development, forging imperial centralism or “International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism” (IIMC), whereby a handful of powerful nation-states explicitly use international organizations to impose their interests and further expand accumulation. Figure 1 presents a brief overview of the conceptualization of capitalism throughout its history, focusing on the development of monopoly capitalism from the 1870s to the present, including both economic and politic facets. It includes IIMC as the newest term in the evolution of monopoly capitalism. (2) (3) (4) (5) As Karl Marx noted, capitalism has an inherent drive toward endless accumulation through the production of “surplus value.” In relation to this defining characteristic of the system, there have been distinct historical configurations of its operation. IIMC represents the highest form of the imperialism stage of capitalism, given the increasingly coordination between the monopoly capital and the state within core nations. As a state-formed monopoly capitalism, IIMC has been forcing most economies to participate in its system, regardless of whether those economies are capitalist or socialist (except North Korea). This is what Nikolai Bukharin pointed to a century ago. According to Samir Amin, in the globalization era, the efficiency of economic management by nation-states has changed. Under IIMC, advanced capitalist states are even stronger, as far as their economic-political reach, and are able to control international institutions and organizations. Within these core nations, the state uses its strength to support the formation of “supercompanies” (the multinational corporations that monopolize one or a number of products/services worldwide), serving the interests of the richest class, while bringing some additional benefits to its broader population. These countries are monopoly nations. Through international institutional settings (e.g., World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization), monopoly capital and monopoly nations extend their influence and power into every corner of the world, even the few remaining socialist strongholds, causing complex conflicts within globalization and regionalization processes. Capital Concentration and the Establishment of Monopoly Nations Capital accumulation and the centralization and concentration of capital led to the formation of monopolies (cartels, syndicates, trusts, consortiums, and conglomerates). This fundamental law of capitalism continues to take effect in the IIMC period, albeit at a very high level. However, the following organic processes contributed to the formation of monopoly nations: 1. The concentration and centralization of capital in super-companies: The increasing strength and expansion of super-companies, especially over the last five decades, have advanced economic internationalization and globalization. Globally, the 500 largest companies generated $31.1 trillion in 2014. They accounted for nearly 40 percent of world income –up 20 percent from less than 20 percent in 1960. Super-companies not only have a monopoly within one country’s borders but also are dominant in other countries worldwide. The overseas assets of the world’s 100 largest non-financial super-companies in 2011 accounted for 63 percent of their total assets, whereas foreign sales reached 65 percent of their total. This is reflected in the intensification of foreign direct investment (FDI); the significant transfer of employment, technology and international financial operations; and the strong rise of financial systems, bank credit, and insurance. Many super-companies with powerful finances (assets, revenues) can far exceed the gross domestic product (GDP) of many economies. For example, Procter & Gamble (ranked 100 in the list of the largest companies), as noted in Table 1,has revenues that are higher than the GDP of Oman,which is the largest economy in a group of 124 smalland medium-sized economies, with $81.8billion in 2014. Supercompanies can dramatically influence small and/or poor countries as they pressure governments to condone environmental degradation, violation of national labor laws, and abuse of labor rights. They can force these governments to tender incentives, which maximize their profits by allowing extremely poor working conditions and low wages. Some super-companies actively destroy local agriculture and kill marine life, which has sparked mass protests. They often hire military personnel to open fire on peaceful protestors and make assassinations. 2. The mass exploitation of workers: The division of labor extends throughout the world. In 2011, the employment of foreign affiliates worldwide reached sixty-nine million jobs, up by 8 percent from 2010. Specifically, the total number of employees of the ten largest companies worldwide in 2014 exceeded 9.8 million, which is more than the population of many independent nations.  This international division of labor is a product of monopoly capitalism, seeking to avoid the “law of declining rate of profit” and striving to increase the rate of profit. John Bellamy Foster and John Smith have clearly presented this trend, using archetypical examples of the labor and production associated with iPhones, T-shirts, and coffee, which involve super-exploitation overseas by super-companies. As a result, over the last three decades, an enormous amount of surplus value has been produced in the periphery, but captured by super-companies within monopoly nations. Through the international division of labor and expansion of branches worldwide, super-companies promote alliances in the form of complex cooperation among themselves and between themselves and small- and medium-sized companies. They adopt a “divide and rule” approach to control labor worldwide. These super-companiestake advantage of the economies of scale to increase their market shares and influence. Once they are in place in peripheral countries, they influence habits and traditional customs. Workers re-align themselves to earn a living wage. 3. The symbiotic growth of monopoly nations and super-companies: Both the state and capital rely on each other to exploit existing internal natural resources (e.g., OECD with its oil); control major production resources throughout the world (e.g., the United States in regard to Iraq’s oil, China influence on its neighbors’ sea routes and exclusive economic zone in the East and South China Seas); and possess key technologies, such as weapons, cell cloning, artificial intelligence robots, patent medicine develop, or media and communication. In other words, monopoly nations are the products of “five monopolies.” Super-companies and monopoly nations exert their technological and economic powers to dominant the world market, leading to both positive and negative impacts. Super-companies like capitalists to have control over mass destructive weapons, in order to defeat competitors and to destroy commoners’ benefits. The first and most outstanding monopoly nation is the United States, which has only two companies that reached a turnover in excess of $5 billion in 1955: General Motors ($9.82 billion) and Exxon Mobil ($5.66 billion). However, by 1990, the number of large companies (over $5 billion of turnover) had reached more than 100. In 2013, the smallest company (Exelon: energy sector) of the 132 largest companies had a turnover of $23.5 billion. On a global scale, the company that has the lowest ranking in the top 500 list of largest companies (ranked by Fortune in 2013) is Ricoh (office-equipment sector), reaching sales of over $23.2 billion. Also included in this list are eighty-nine companies from China, which is a rapid increase, compared to its thirty-four companies in 2008. As of 2015, the Global 500 are represented by 36 countries, but nearly 472 of the Global 500 are from only 16 countries: Canada, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Australia, Brazil, India, and Russia. Of these 16 countries, 13 are the world’s largest economies. Table 2 lists the typical monopoly nations in the world in 2015. The combining of super-companies and states that Lenin analyzed nearly 100 years ago, in which capitalists pivot around political agencies and monopolies, led to the integration of monopoly nations and international institutions/organizations. Thus, under the conditions of IIMC, this integration has crucially influenced the globalization process of the world economy, specifically for the peripheral countries. Although these monopoly nations dominate at different levels and their income is not equivalent, they do not conquer other nations; nonetheless, they help transfer a vast surplus of value from peripheral countries into the core countries. Monopoly Nations Monopolize International Institutions The rise of super-companies has not meant the end of competition, which is globally more intense today than ever before. Simultaneously, monopoly nations do not displace super-companies or prevent their monopolistic power; on the contrary, these states directly and indirectly provide super-companies with advantages and benefits. As Harry Braverman explained, “the state is guarantor of the conditions, the social relations, of capitalism, and the protector of the ever more unequal distribution of property.” The role of the state has changed in monopoly nations: it not only regulates the domestic economy, exploits the state capital, and protects monopolies on the international market, but it also represents and supports the allies of domestic monopolies to affect the activities of international institutions/organizations in its favor and increase its competitiveness. The role of the state and its various imperial alliances with local politicians is facilitated through the discourse of national and international competitiveness. Thus, the rise of monopoly nations has not killed competition in all of its forms. In fact, rivalry is more frequent and fierce between monopoly nations and other economies. The formation of monopoly nations and the emergence of a number of new industrialized countries have caused problems for individual economies to address and settle the issues related to international economic activities. For example, the legal systems and the legal provisions of nations have become a barrier to the circular flow of resources and limited the mobilities of the supercompanies. These can range from the agricultural protection policies that were severely opposed by the Cairns Group at the Uruguay Round in 1986 (the first time developing countries had played an active role) to the restriction regulations in immigration. They are also associated with cultural or political issues such as Internet censorship in China, Euroscepticism trend in European Union and Brexit in the United Kingdom, the opposition of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), and new protectionism in the United States. Meanwhile, the international institutions had just proved their consistency in their role of coordination and international arbitration among new member economies in the beginning phase. Subsequently, the competitiveness among countries has moved to a higher level and continued to increase, which manifested itself in many forms such as disputes of commerce, technology, and finance, etc. The recent disputes include: batteries (solar) between the United States and India; beef among the United States, Indo, and Japan; steel pipes between Japan and China; auto parts between the United States and China; catfish, frozen shrimp, and garments between Viet Nam and the United States; and rare earths among the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China. There is a severe conflict among the United States, the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia on the recent issue of annexing Crimea. Since its establishment, the World Trade Organization has witnessed many disputes over dumping, anti-subsidy, and safeguarded trade among member economies. Most of these arguments are related to monopoly nations. The number of quarrels is growing rapidly: over the last twenty years in particular, the World Trade Organization has had to resolve hundreds of cases. Specifically, the United States is a typical monopoly nation that is associated with the majority of the commercial disputes in the world (344 cases), followed by the European Union (316 cases), Japan (180 cases), and China (155 cases). In the context of the multitude of interlocking and complicated disagreements, the dispute settlement mechanism of World Trade Organization constitutes the basic cornerstone maintaining the multilateral trading order. However, monopoly nations have been controlling this mechanism. If there are disputes among the strongest monopoly nations, this makes them direct competitors (these include the United States, Japan, Western Europe, Russia, and China). Thus, monopoly nations tend to compromise and align with others to monopolize the World Trade Organization. Otherwise, super-companies always plan well to avoid a devalued competition. In the case of Ford, Toyota, and the other leading auto firms, the companies did not try to undersell each other in their prices. Instead, they competed for the low-cost position by making reductions in prime production (labor and raw material) costs that could be implemented in peripheral regions. Monopoly nations monopolize not only the World Trade Organization but also other international institutions/organizations or forums, such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and regional banks. Furthermore, monopoly nations monopolize political forums like G-7, the European Union, and even the most powerful United Nations. Monopoly nations also monopolize most other regional organizations, from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and most recent the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Below is a list of typical international institutions/organizations and mechanisms that the monopoly nations are monopolizing: • United Nations: Founded in 1945, it was monopolized at its founding by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These five members not only have the responsibility to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations but also have the power to veto, thus enabling them to oppose or prevent any proposed resolution of the other members. As a rule, as these five members become stronger, the United Nations is weaker. The weakness of the United Nations is expressed not only in the handling of the South China Sea dispute, but also in events such as Ukraine’s political crisis, the East China Sea quarrels, and its ability to eliminate wars and serious conflicts since the fall of Soviet (31) (32) (33) MR Online | International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations Page 8 of 26 https://mronline.org/2018/12/19/international-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-… 07/01/2019 Union, specifically wars for economic purpose. For instance, the U.S. war machine engaged in Afghanistan (2001-14) and Iraq (2003-11); the Russia annexation of Crimea (2014); and the threat of a Chinese war in the South China Sea. The key motivation of the current aggressive and strongest monopoly nations is to gain control over vital strategic resources. • World Bank: Founded in 1944, an international institution was originally dominated by the United States and the United Kingdom. The domination of monopoly nations is evident in the voting rights of the member economies in the World Bank. Of the members, in 2013 the United States had highest voting rights at 17.69 percent, followed by Japan (6.84 percent), China (4.42 percent), Germany (4.00 percent), the United Kingdom (3.75 percent), and France (3.75 percent). • International Monetary Fund: Established in 1944, the International Monetary Fund’s funding is contributed by the member economies. Since its inception, the United States has always been the largest contributor (17.69 percent) and has been dominant through the majority of the voting rights, followed by other members with large holdings in 2010, such as Japan (6.56 percent), Germany (6.12 percent), the United Kingdom (4.51 percent), France (4.51 percent), and China (4.00 percent). • World Trade Organization: The World Trade Organization was established in 1995 to replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that had been in effect since 1948. Its mission is to eliminate or minimize trade barriers to free trade. The majority of its decisions are based on negotiation and consensus. However, the negotiation process does not always reach consensus among all of its members. This process is often criticized by many developing economies because they are not welcome in the negotiations and because, according to Richard Steinberg, the trade negotiations are actually promoted and end at a negotiating position that provides special benefit for the European Union and the United States. The formation of the regional institutions/organizations, the multilateral economic cooperation forums, and bilateral negotiations are an expression of the ever-increasing conflict between the regionalization and globalization processes. Such examples include the conflicts between the European Union and World Trade Organization on agricultural policy; between North American Free Trade Agreement and World Trade Organization on juridical and political issues; and between Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and World Trade Organization on oil price/supply management. These processes lead to very complicated overlapping and interlocking regional and international organizations because a monopoly nation can be a member of several organizations simultaneously. Thus, these organizations become the direct or indirect means to facilitate the monopoly nations in exploiting other countries. It is inevitable that the activities of powerful international institutions (such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization) have not really brought equal benefits to all. The IIMC built a complex called the “IMNs-United Nation: Specialized Agencies, International Institutions/Organizations, and Region Organizations” (IMNsInIs). This organization is beyond the scope of previous international institutions. In other words, the IIMC is a combination of the power of super-companies, monopoly nations, and the juridical capacity of the international institutions. Under IIMC, capital globalization has not only strengthened the power of monopoly nations but has simultaneously created the dependence of other states/nations on the world market and finance system, which are dominated by monopoly nations. This relationship among states/ nations reflects the development of monopoly nations at the expense of the peripheral regions. In addition, “IMNs-InIs” is different from “transnational capitalism class – transnational state” structure in quality, in which the former has instrumentalized the latter. In IMNs-InIs, the international organizations have progressively been the “instrumental institutions” in the hands of monopoly nations to favor them and hinder other economies. This is typically the case when the United Nations Security Council members impose sanctions against other nations, trumping any efforts that could weaken their veto power. It is true in how monopoly nations dominate the WTO through the Doha Development Agenda to hinder agricultural economies of peripheral countries. It is evident in how the International Monetary Fund serves wealthy countries but increases poverty and environmental degradation in poor countries. The establishment of the Beijing-based Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has raised concerns for both the United States and Japan regarding whether the bank will have high standards of governance and safeguards, which will prevent damage to other creditors. The IIMC is the final stage of “state-formed monopoly capitalism,” the new form of capitalist production that maintains the existence of capitalism and adapts it to new historical conditions.

### L: Impact

#### Capitalism is inherently unsustainable and will inevitably collapse, it’s only a question if we choose to keep it afloat. The contradictions of global neoliberalism will push humanity to total extinction.

Foster 19

(Professor Foster received his PhD from York University. 2-1-2019, " Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?," Monthly Review, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, JKS)

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history, accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and what at this point can only be called a planetary ecological “death spiral.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into new means of surveillance, control, and displacement of the working population. The institutions of liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism, the rear guard of the capitalist system, is again on the march, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3 Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 Soaring inequality in income and wealth has its counterpart in the declining material circumstances of a majority of the population. Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7 The capture of the surplus value produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13 Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15 In the United States and other high-income countries, life expectancy is in decline, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18 At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21 More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.23 The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27 War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29 Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30 More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35 The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction, to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38 If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40 Nevertheless, major energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity. Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42 We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the externalities of this irrational system, such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43 Some would argue that China stands as an exception to much of the above, characterized as it is by a seemingly unstoppable rate of economic advance (though carrying with it deep social and ecological contradictions). Yet Chinese development has its roots in the 1949 Chinese Revolution, carried out by the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Zedong, whereby it liberated itself from the imperialist system. This allowed it to develop for decades under a planned economy largely free of constraints from outside forces, establishing a strong agricultural and industrial economic base. This was followed by a shift in the post-Maoist reform period to a hybrid system of more limited state planning along with a much greater reliance on market relations (and a vast expansion of debt and speculation) under conditions—the globalization of the world market—that were particularly fortuitous to its “catching up.” Through trade wars and other pressures aimed at destabilizing China’s position in the world market, the United States is already seeking to challenge the bases of China’s growth in world trade. China, therefore, stands not so much for the successes of late capitalism but rather for its inherent limitations. The current Chinese model, moreover, carries within it many of the destructive tendencies of the system of capital accumulation. Ultimately, China’s future too depends on a return to the process of revolutionary transition, spurred by its own population.44 How did these disastrous conditions characterizing capitalism worldwide develop? An understanding of the failure of capitalism, beginning in the twentieth century, requires a historical examination of the rise of neoliberalism, and how this has only served to increase the destructiveness of the system. Only then can we address the future of humanity in the twenty-first century.

## ALTS

### Communist Horizon

#### The alternative is to orient political and social struggle toward the communist horizon – this redirection is crucial to redefine the political futures psychoanalytically imagineable– anything less is mere apologism for continued leftist failure

**Dean 12** [Jodi, Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, *The Communist Horizon*, Verso: Brooklyn, NY, 2012, p. 1-12]

The term "horizon" marks a division. Understood spatially, the horizon is the line dividing the visible, separating earth from sky. Understood temporally, the horizon converges with loss in a metaphor for privation and depletion. The "lost horizon" suggests abandoned projects, prior hopes that have now passed away. Astrophysics offers a thrilling, even uncanny, horizon: the "event horizon" surrounding a black hole. The event horizon is the boundary beyond which events cannot escape. Although "event horizon" denotes the curvature in space/time effected by a singularity, it's not much different from the spatial horizon. Both evoke a fundamental division that we experience as impossible to reach, and that we can neither escape nor cross. I use "horizon" not to recall a forgotten future but to designate a dimension of experience that we can never lose, even if, lost in a fog or focused on our feet, we fail to see it. The horizon is Real in the sense of impossible-we can never reach it-and in the sense of actual (Jacques Lacan's notion of the Real includes both these senses). The horizon shapes our setting. We can lose our bearings, but the horizon is a necessary dimension of our actuality. Whether the effect of a singularity or the meeting of earth and sky, the horizon is the fundamental division establishing where we are. With respect to politics, the horizon that conditions our expe1ience is communism. I get the term "communist horizon" from Bruno Bosteels. In The Actuality of Communism, Bosteels engages with the work of Alvaro Garcia Linera. Garcia Linera ran as Evo Morales's vice presidential ru1ming mate in the Bolivian Movement for Socialism-Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the Peoples (MAS-IPSP). He is the author of multiple pieces on Marxism, politics, and sociology, at least one of which was written while he served time in prison for promoting an armed uprising (before becoming vice president of Bolivia, he fought in the Tupac Kataii Guerrilla Army). Bosteels quotes Garcia Linera's response to an interviewer's questions about his party's plans following their electoral victim)': "The general horizon of the era is communist."1 Garcia Linera doesn't explain the term. Rather, as Bosteels points out, Garcia Linera invokes the communist horizon "as if it were the most natural thing in the world," as if it were so obvious as to need neither explanation nor justification. He assumes the communist horizon as an ineducible feature of the political setting: "We enter the movement with our expecting and desiring eyes set upon the communist horizon." For Garcia Linera, communism conditions the actuality of politics. Some on the Left dismiss the communist horizon as a lost horizon. For example, in a postmodern pluralist approach that appeals to many on the Left, the economists writing as J. K . Gibson-Graham reject communism, offering "post-capitalism" in its stead. They argue that descriptions of capitalism as a global system miss the rich diversity of practices, relations, and desires constituting yet exceeding the economy and so advocate "reading the economy for difference rather than dominance" (as if dominance neither presupposes nor relies on difference).2 In their view, reading for difference opens up new possibilities for politics as it reveals previously unacknowledged loci of creative action within everyday economic activities. Gibson-Graham do not present Marxism as a failed ideology or communism as the fossilized remainder of an historical expe1iment gone horribly wrong. On the contrary, they draw inspiration from Marx’s appreciation of the social character of labor. They engage Jean-Luc Nancy's emphasis on communism as an idea that is the "index of a task of thought still and increasingly open." They embrace the reclamation of the commons. And they are concerned with neoliberalism's naturalization of the economy as a force exceeding the capacity of people to steer or transform it. Yet at the same time, Gibson-Graham push away from communism to launch their vision of postcapitalism. Communism is that against which they construct their alterative conception of the economy. It's a constitutive force, present as a shaping of the view they advocate. Even as Nancy's evocation of communism serves as a horizon for their thinking, they explicitly jettison the term "communism," which they position as the object of "widespread aversion" and which they associate with the "dangers of posing a positivity, a nonnative representation." Rejecting the positive notion of "communism," they opt for a te1m that suggests an empty relationally to the capitalist system they ostensibly deny, "post-capitalism." For Gibson-Graham, the term "capitalist" is not a term of critique or opprobrium; it's not part of a manifesto. The term is a cause of the political problems facing the contemporary Left. They argue that the discursive dominance of capitalism embeds the Left in paranoia, melancholia, and moralism. Gibson-Graham's view is a specific instance of a general assumption shared by leftists who embrace a generic post-capitalism but eschew a more militant anticapitalism. Instead of actively opposing capitalism, this tendency redirects anticapitalist energies into efforts to open up discussions and find ethical spaces for decision-and this in a world where one bond trader can bring down a bank in a matter of minutes. I take the opposite position. The dominance of capitalism, the capitalist system, is material. Rather than entrapping us in paranoid fantasy, an analysis that treats capitalism as a global system of appropriation, exploitation, and circulation that enriches the few as it dispossesses the many and that has to expend an enormous amount of energy in doing so can anger, incite, and galvanize. Historically, in theory and in practice, critical analysis of capitalist exploitation has been a powerful weapon in collective struggle. It persists as such today, in global acknowledgment of the excesses of neoliberal capitalism. As recently became clear in worldwide rioting, protest, and revolution, linking multiple sites of exploitation to narrow channels of privilege can replace melancholic fatalism with new assertions of will, desire, and collective strength. The problem of the Left hasn't been our adherence to a Marxist critique of capitalism. It's that we have lost sight of the communist horizon, a glimpse of which new political movements are starting to reveal. Sometimes capitalists, conservatives, and liberal democrats use a rhetoric that treats communism as a lost horizon. But usually they keep communism firmly within their sight. They see communism as a threat, twenty years after its ostensible demise. To them, communism is so threatening that they premise political discussion on the repression of the communist alternative. In response to left critiques of democracy for its failure to protect the interests of poor and workingclass people, conservatives and liberals alike scold that "everybody knows" and "history shows" that communism doesn't work. Communism might be a nice ideal, they concede, but it always leads to violent, authoritarian excesses of power. They shift the discussion to communism, trying to establish the limits of reasonable debate. Their critique of communism establishes the political space and condition of democracy. Before the conversation even gets going, liberals, democrats, capitalists, and conservatives unite to block communism from consideration. It's off the table. Those who suspect that the inclusion of liberals and democrats in a set with capitalists and conservatives is illegitimate are probably democrats themselves. To determine whether they belong in the set of those who fear communism, they should consider whether they think any evocation of communism should come with qualifications, apologies, and condemnations of past excesses. If the answer is "yes," then we have a clear indication that liberal democrats, and probably radical democrats as well, still consider communism a threat that must be suppressed-and so they belong in a set with capitalists and conservatives. All are anxious about the forces that communist desire risks unleashing. There are good reasons for liberals, democrats, capitalists, and conservatives to be anxious. Over the last decade a return to communism has re-energized the Left. Communism is again becoming a discourse and vocabulary for the expression of universal, egalitarian, and revolutionary ideals. In March 2009, the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities hosted a conference entitled "On the Idea of Communism." Initially planned for about 200 people, the conference ultimately attracted over 1 ,200, requiring a spillover room to accommodate those who couldn't fit in the primary auditorium. Since then, multiple conferences-in Paris, Berlin, and New York-and publications have followed, with contributions from such leading scholars as Alain Badiou, Etienne Balibar, Bruno Bosteels, Susan Buck-Morss, Costas Douzinas, Peter Hallward, Michael Hardt, Antonio Neg1i, Jacques Ranciere, Alberto Toscano, and Slavoj Zizek. The conferences and publications consolidate discussions that have been going on for decades. For over thirty years, Antonio Negri has sought to build a new approach to communism out of a Marxism reworked via Spinoza and the Italian political experiments of the 1970s. The Empire trilogy that Negri coauthored with Michael Hardt offers an affirmative, non-dialectical reconceptualization of labor, power, and the State, a new theory of communism from below. Alain Badiou has been occupied with communism for over forty years, from his philosophical and political engagement with Maoism, to his emphasis on the "communist invariants"-egalitarian justice, disciplinary tenor, political volunteerism, and trust in the people-to his recent appeal to the communist Idea. Communism is not a new interest for Slavoj Zizek either. In early 2001 he put together a conference and subsequent volume rethinking Lenin. Where Negri and Badiou reject the Party and the State, Zizek retains a certain fidelity to Lenin. "The key 'Leninist' lesson today," he writes, is that "politics without the organizational form of the Party is politics without politics."4 In short, a vital area of radical philosophy considers communism a contemporary name for emancipation)', egalitarian politics and form part of the communist legacy. These ongoing theoretical discussions overlap with the changing political sequences marked by 1968 and 1989. They also overlap with the spread of neoliberal capitalist domination, a domination accompanied by extremes in economic inequality, ethnic hatred, and police violence, as well as by widespread militancy, insurgency, occupation, and revolution. The current emphasis on communism thus exceeds the coincidence of academic conferences calling specifically for communism's return with the new millennium's debt crises, austerity measures, increased unemployment, and overall sacrifice of the achievements of the modern welfare state to the private interests of financial institutions deemed too big to fail. Already in an interview in 2002, p1ior to his election to the Bolivian presidency, Evo Morales had announced that "the neoliberal system was a failure, and now it's the poor people's turn."·' Communism is reemerging as a magnet of political energy because it is and has been the alterative to capitalism. The communist horizon is not lost. It is Real. In this book, I explore some of the ways the communist horizon manifests itself to us today. As Bosteels argues, to invoke the communist horizon is to produce "a complete shift in perspective or a radical ideological turnabout, as a result of which capitalism no longer appears as the only game in town and we no longer have to be ashamed to set our expecting and desiring eyes here and now on a different organization of social relationships."6 With communism as our horizon, the field of possibilities for revolutionary theory and practice starts to change shape. Barriers to action fall away. New potentials and challenges come to the fore. Anything is possible. Instead of a politics thought primarily in terms of resistance, playful and momentary aesthetic disruptions, the immediate specificity of local projects, and struggles for hegemony within a capitalist parliamentary setting, the communist horizon impresses upon us the necessity to abolish capitalism and to create global practices and institutions of egalitarian cooperation. The shift in perspective the communist horizon produces turns us away from the democratic milieu that has been the form of the loss of communism as a name for left aspiration and toward the reconfiguration of the components of political struggle-in other words, away from general inclusion, momentary calls for broad awareness, and lifestyle changes, and toward militant opposition, tight organizational forms (party, council, working group, cell), and the sovereignty of the people over the economy through which we produce and reproduce ourselves.

#### Counter ROB: Tell tabroom who won. It should be about impact framing and weighing (which we will do) but there’s not a “role of the ballot.” When we see our results on tabroom, it just says if we won or lost.

# CP – Abolish WTO

## CX

How does the aff use the WTO to ensure enforcement?

How does the aff ensure cooperation between WTO member states over the plan?

## CP

### 1NC Text

#### Text:

#### 1. The World Trade Organization ought to be abolished.

#### 2. The following 164 countries listed in the speech doc ought to independently and without influence from international government [opponent’s plan]

Afghanistan

Albania

Angola

Antigua and Barbuda

Argentina

Armenia

Australia

Austria

Bahrain, Kingdom of

Bangladesh

Barbados

Belgium

Belize

Benin

Bolivia, Plurinational State of

Botswana

Brazil

Brunei Darussalam

Bulgaria

Burkina Faso

Burundi

Cabo Verde

Cambodia

Cameroon

Canada

Central African Republic

Chad

Chile

China

Colombia

Congo

Costa Rica

Côte d’Ivoire

Croatia

Cuba

Cyprus

Czech Republic

Democratic Republic of the Congo

Denmark

Djibouti

Dominica

Dominican Republic

Ecuador

Egypt

El Salvador

Estonia

Eswatini

European Union (formerly EC)

Fiji

Finland

France

Gabon

Gambia

Georgia

Germany

Ghana

Greece

Grenada

Guatemala

Guinea

Guinea-Bissau

Guyana

Haiti

Honduras

Hong Kong, China

Hungary

Iceland

India

Indonesia

Ireland

Israel

Italy

Jamaica

Japan

Jordan

Kazakhstan

Kenya

Korea, Republic of

Kuwait, the State of

Kyrgyz Republic

Lao People’s Democratic Republic

Latvia

Lesotho

Liberia

Liechtenstein

Lithuania

Luxembourg

Macao, China

Madagascar

Malawi

Malaysia

Maldives

Mali

Malta

Mauritania

Mauritius

Mexico

Moldova, Republic of

Mongolia

Montenegro

Morocco

Mozambique

Myanmar

Namibia

Nepal

Netherlands

New Zealand

Nicaragua

Niger

Nigeria

North Macedonia

Norway

Oman

Pakistan

Panama

Papua New Guinea

Paraguay

Peru

Philippines

Poland

Portugal

Qatar

Romania

Russian Federation

Rwanda

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Saint Lucia

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Samoa

Saudi Arabia, Kingdom of

Senegal

Seychelles

Sierra Leone

Singapore

Slovak Republic

Slovenia

Solomon Islands

South Africa

Spain

Sri Lanka

Suriname

Sweden

Switzerland

Chinese Taipei

Tajikistan

Tanzania

Thailand

Togo

Tonga

Trinidad and Tobago

Tunisia

Turkey

Uganda

Ukraine

United Arab Emirates

United Kingdom

United States

Uruguay

Vanuatu

Venezuela, Bolivarian Republic of

Viet Nam

Yemen

Zambia

Zimbabwe

Hawley, senator, JD Yale, 20

(Josh, 5-5, https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/05/opinion/hawley-abolish-wto-china.html)

The coronavirus emergency is not only a public health crisis. With [30 million Americans unemployed](https://www.cnbc.com/2020/04/30/us-weekly-jobless-claims.html), it is also an economic crisis. And it has exposed a hard truth about the modern global economy: it weakens American workers and has empowered China’s rise. That must change. The global economic system as we know it is a relic; it requires reform, top to bottom. We should begin with one of its leading institutions, the World Trade Organization. We should abolish it.

### 1NC Colonialism

#### The WTO as an institution is unethical and perpetuates colonialism

Godrej 20

(Dinyar, Co-editor @ New Internationalist, 4-20, https://newint.org/features/2020/02/10/brief-history-impoverishment)

For countries that were undergoing economic ravishment by structural adjustment, the 1990s brought new torments in the form of the World Trade Organization (WTO), a club dominated by rich nations. In the name of creating a ‘level playing field’, the WTO required poorer countries to sign up to an all-or-nothing, binding set of rules, which removed protections for domestic industries and allowed foreign capital unhindered access. This was strongly prejudicial to the interests of local industries, which were not in a position to withstand foreign competition. Influence within the WTO is weighted by the size of a nation’s economy – thus even if all poorer nations joined forces to demand policy changes they would still not have a chance against wealthy nations. This trade injustice has drawn widespread protests and pressure for the WTO to reform. Meanwhile, wealthy nations are increasingly going down the route of bilateral Free Trade Agreements (FTAs). Usually negotiated in secret, the interests of their corporations are paramount in FTAs and include the ability to sue states for eye-watering sums (should they, for example, want to terminate a contract or nationalize an industry) with no provision for states to do the same. Such instruments are working to create a utopia for transnational corporations, creating a business-friendly climate, which translates as the demolition of labour protection, tax cuts for the wealthiest and a supine regulatory environment. Tax havens operated by the richest countries are home to huge sums of illicit wealth draining out of some of the poorest. Today, due to how the global economy has been engineered, for every dollar of aid sent to poorer countries, they lose 10 times as much in outflows – and that’s before one counts their losses through unfair trade rules and underpaid labour. Foreign investors take nearly $500 billion a year in profits from the Global South, and trade-power imbalances cost poorer nations $700 billion a year in lost export revenue. 7 CONCENTRATION In the 21st century wealth increasingly flows through corporate hands towards a small super-elite. In a trend that began in the 1990s, the lion’s share of equity value is being realized through squeezing workers: the classification ‘working poor’ so familiar in the Global South is now increasingly also being used in the wealthy North, where neoliberal capitalism is leading inevitably to wage erosion and work precarity, coupled with the withdrawal of state support. Inequality is rising dramatically. In 2018 the richest 26 people owned wealth equivalent to the poorest half of the world’s population. And their wealth was increasing at the rate of $2.5 billion a day. Meanwhile 3.4 billion people – nearly half the world – were living on less than $5.50 a day.

### 1NC Heg Bad

#### Eliminating the WTO ends U.S. global hegemony, as the US tries to control the rest of the world

Bello, PhD, 2000

(Walden, Sociology @ Stanford, https://users.ox.ac.uk/~magd1352/ecologist/Should%20WTO%20be%20abolished.pdf)

The idea that the world needs the World Trade Organisation (WTO) is one of the biggest lies of our time. The WTO came about, in 1995, mainly because it was in the interest of the US and its corporations. The European Union, Japan and especially the developing countries were mostly ambivalent about the idea; it was the US which drove it on. Why? Because though the US, back in 1948, blocked the formation of an International Trade Organisation (ITO), believing that, at that time, the interests of its corporations would not be served by such a global body, it had changed its mind by the 1990s. Now it wanted an international trade body. Why? Because its global economic dominance was threatened. The flexible GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade) system, which preceded the WTO, had allowed the emergence of Europe and East Asia as competing industrial centres that threatened US dominance even in many high-tech industries. Under GATT’s system of global agricultural trade, Europe had emerged as a formidable agricultural power even as Third World governments concerned with preserving their agriculture and rural societies limited the penetration of their markets by US agricultural products. In other words, before the WTO, global trade was growing by leaps and bounds, but countries were using trade policy to industrialise and adapt to the growth of trade so that their economies would be enhanced by global trade and not be marginalised by it. That was a problem, from the US point of view. And that was why the US needed the WTO. The essence of the WTO is seen in three of its central agreements: the Agreement on Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), the Agreement on Agriculture (AOA), and the Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMs). The purpose of TRIPs is not to promote free trade but to enhance monopoly power. One cannot quarrel with the fact that innovators should have preferential access to the benefits that flow from their innovation for a period of time. TRIPs, however, goes beyond this to institutionalise a monopoly for high-tech corporate innovators, most of them from the North. Among other things, TRIPs provides a generalised minimum patent protection of 20 years; institutes draconian border regulations against products judged to be violating intellectual property rights; and – contrary to the judicial principle of presuming innocence until proven guilty – places the burden of proof on the presumed violator of process patents. What TRIPs does is reinforce the monopolistic or oligopolistic position of US high tech firms such as Microsoft and Intel. It makes industrialisation by imitation or industrialisation via loose conditions of technology transfer – a strategy employed by the US, Germany, Japan, and South Korea during the early phases of their industrialisation – all but impossible. It enables the technological leader, in this case the US, to greatly influence the pace of technological and industrial development in the rest of the world.

#### Primacy causes endless war, terror, authoritarianism, prolif, and Russia-China aggression.

Ashford, PhD, 19

(Emma, PoliSci@UVA, Fellow@CATO, Power and Pragmatism: Reforming American Foreign Policy for the 21st Century, in New Voices in Grand Strategy, 4, CNAS)

Humility is a virtue. Yet in the last quarter century, American policymakers have been far more likely to embrace the notion of America as the “indispensable nation,” responsible for protecting allies, promoting democracy and human rights, tamping down conflicts, and generally managing global affairs. Compare this ideal to the U.S. track record – endless Middle Eastern wars, the rise of ISIS, global democratic backsliding, a revanchist Russia, resurgent China, and a world reeling from the election of President Donald Trump – and this label seems instead the height of hubris. Many of the failures of U.S. foreign policy speak for themselves. As the daily drumbeat of bad news attests, interventions in Iraq and Libya were not victories for human rights or democracy, but rather massively destabilizing for the Middle East as a whole. Afghanistan – despite initial military successes – has become a quagmire, highlighting the futility of nation- building. Other failures of America’s grand strategy are less visible, but no less damaging. NATO expansion into Eastern Europe helped to reignite hostility between Russia and the West. Worse, it has diluted the alliance’s defensive capacity and its democratic character. And even as the war on terror fades from public view, it remains as open-ended as ever: Today, the United States is at war in seven countries and engaged in “combating terrorism’ in more than 80.1 To put it bluntly: America’s strategy since the end of the Cold War – whether it is called primacy or liberal internationalism – may not be a total failure, but it has not been successful either. Many have tried to place blame for these poor outcomes.2 But recrimination is less important than understanding why America’s strategy has failed so badly and avoiding these mistakes in future. Much of the explanation is the natural outcome of changing constraints. Iraq and Libya should not be viewed as regrettable anomalies, but rather the logical outcome of unipolarity and America’s liberal internationalist inclination to solve every global problem. It’s also a reliance on flawed assumptions – that what is good for America is always good for the world, for example. Support for dangerous sovereignty-undermining norms adds to the problem; just look at the Responsibility to Protect (R2P), which has proved not to protect populations or stabilize fragile states, but to provoke chaos, encourage nuclear proliferation, and undermine the international institutions. Perhaps, if nothing else had changed, a form of watered-down liberal internationalism that foreswore interventionism and drew back from the war on terror might have been possible.3 But international politics are undergoing a period of profound transformation, from unipolarity to regional or even global multipolarity. Primacy – and the consistent drumbeat of calls in Washington to do more, always and everywhere – is neither sustainable nor prudent. Nor can we fall back on warmed-over Cold War–era strategies better suited to an era of bipolar superpower competition.

# \*\*WTO21- Safety DA\*\*

## \*\*1NC\*\*

#### Covid-19 vaccines are safe and effective right now.

Moline ‘21

(Heidi L. Moline, MD; Michael Whitaker, MPH; Li Deng, PhD; Julia C. Rhodes, PhD; Jennifer Milucky, MSPH; Huong Pham, MPH; Kadam Patel, MPH; Onika Anglin, MPH; Arthur Reingold, MD Shua J. Chai, MD; Nisha B. Alden, MPH; Breanna Kawasaki, “Effectiveness of COVID-19 Vaccines in Preventing Hospitalization Among Adults Aged ≥65 Years” <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/volumes/70/wr/mm7032e3.htm> , August 13)

Clinical trials of COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized for emergency use in the United States (Pfizer-BioNTech, Moderna, and Janssen [Johnson & Johnson]) indicate that these vaccines have high efficacy against symptomatic disease, including moderate to severe illness (1–3). In addition to clinical trials, real-world assessments of COVID-19 vaccine effectiveness are critical in guiding vaccine policy and building vaccine confidence, particularly among populations at higher risk for more severe illness from COVID-19, including older adults. To determine the real-world effectiveness of the three currently authorized COVID-19 vaccines among persons aged ≥65 years during February 1–April 30, 2021, data on 7,280 patients from the COVID-19–Associated Hospitalization Surveillance Network (COVID-NET) were analyzed with vaccination coverage data from state immunization information systems (IISs) for the COVID-NET catchment area (approximately 4.8 million persons). Among adults aged 65–74 years, effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalization was 96% (95% confidence interval [CI] = 94%–98%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 95%–98%) for Moderna, and 84% (95% CI = 64%–93%) for Janssen vaccine products. Effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalization among adults aged ≥75 years was 91% (95% CI = 87%–94%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 93%–98%) for Moderna, and 85% (95% CI = 72%–92%) for Janssen vaccine products. COVID-19 vaccines currently authorized in the United States are highly effective in preventing COVID-19–associated hospitalizations in older adults. In light of real-world data demonstrating high effectiveness of COVID-19 vaccines among older adults, efforts to increase vaccination coverage in this age group are critical to reducing the risk for COVID-19–related hospitalization. COVID-NET includes data on laboratory-confirmed COVID-19–associated hospitalizations in 99 U.S. counties in 14 states, representing approximately 10% of the U.S. population.† COVID-NET cases were hospitalizations that occurred in residents of a designated COVID-NET catchment area who were admitted within 14 days of a positive SARS-CoV-2 test result. COVID-NET program personnel collected information on COVID-19 vaccination status (vaccine product received, number of doses, and administration dates) from state IISs for all sampled COVID-NET cases.§ Some sites expanded collection of information on vaccination status to all reported COVID-NET cases, not only sampled cases, which were included for analysis if all cases in a single month had vaccination status available. Data from 13 sites were included for analysis; one site (Iowa) does not have access to the state IIS and cannot collect vaccination data.¶ Population-level vaccination coverage was determined using deidentified person-level COVID-19 vaccination data reported to CDC by jurisdictions, pharmacies, and federal entities through the IISs,\*\* Vaccine Administration Management System,†† or direct data submission.§§ The study was restricted to adults aged ≥65 years and included the period February 1–April 30, 2021. The Janssen vaccine was authorized for use during the study period beginning March 15, 2021.¶¶ Patients were classified as 1) unvaccinated (no IIS record of vaccination), 2) partially vaccinated (1 dose of Moderna or Pfizer-BioNTech received ≥14 days before hospitalization or 2 doses, with the second dose received <14 days before hospitalization), or 3) fully vaccinated (receipt of both doses of Moderna or Pfizer-BioNTech with second dose received ≥14 days before hospitalization or receipt of a single dose of Janssen ≥14 days before hospitalization). Patients with only 1 dose of any COVID-19 vaccine received <14 days before hospitalization were excluded. Daily county-level coverage data for adults aged 65–74 and ≥75 years in the COVID-NET catchment area were estimated using population denominators from the U.S. Census Bureau; vaccination status was classified as described for hospitalized cases.\*\*\* For vaccine records missing county of residence, county of vaccine administration was used. To estimate vaccine effectiveness and corresponding 95% CIs, methods were adapted based on previously published literature (4). Poisson regression was used to compare case counts by vaccination status (outcome) and the proportion of the population vaccinated and unvaccinated (offset).††† Data were stratified by age group because of the potential for confounding by age, and adjusted for COVID-NET site, time (number of weeks since the start of the study period as a categorical covariate), and monthly site-specific sampling frequency.§§§ Vaccine effectiveness was calculated as one minus the exponent of the estimated coefficient of the exposure (vaccination status) variable. For estimating effectiveness of full vaccination, partially vaccinated persons were excluded; for estimating effectiveness of partial vaccination, fully vaccinated persons were excluded. Vaccine product–specific estimates excluded persons who had received other COVID-19 vaccines. To account for the interval between infection and hospitalization, sensitivity analyses were conducted using a reference date 1 week and 2 weeks before admission, rather than admission date, for classification of vaccination status for cases (i.e., adding 7 and 14 days, respectively between last vaccine dose and hospital admission date); the same adjustment was included for population vaccination coverage. Statistical analyses were conducted using SAS software (version 9.4; SAS Institute). This activity was reviewed by CDC and was conducted consistent with applicable federal law and CDC policy.¶¶¶ During February 1–April 30, 2021, among 7,280 eligible COVID-NET patients, 5,451 (75%) were unvaccinated, 867 (12%) were partially vaccinated, and 394 (5%) were fully vaccinated; 568 (8%) who received a single vaccine dose <14 days before hospitalization were excluded from the analysis (Table). Vaccination coverage in the population increased rapidly during this period among persons aged ≥65 years and varied by age and vaccine product (Figure 1). Among adults aged ≥65 years in the COVID-NET catchment area, full vaccination coverage from any of the three authorized vaccines ranged from 0.7% on February 1, 2021, to 72% on April 30, 2021. Effectiveness of full vaccination in preventing hospitalization among adults aged 65–74 years was estimated at 96% (95% CI = 94%–98%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 95%–98%) for Moderna, and 84% (95% CI = 64%–93%) for Janssen vaccine products. Among adults aged ≥75 years, effectiveness of full vaccination was 91% (95% CI = 87%–94%) for Pfizer-BioNTech, 96% (95% CI = 93%–98%) for Moderna, and 85% (95% CI = 72%–92%) for Janssen vaccine products (Figure 2). Effectiveness of partial vaccination among adults aged 65–74 years was 84% (95% CI = 76%–89%) for Pfizer-BioNTech and 91% (95% CI = 87%–93%) for Moderna vaccine products. Among those aged ≥75 years, effectiveness of partial vaccination was 66% (95% CI = 48%–77%) for Pfizer-BioNTech and 82% (95% CI = 76%–86%) for Moderna vaccine products. Sensitivity analyses accounting for interval between infection and hospitalization did not yield notably different vaccine effectiveness estimates, with point estimates varying by <1% for Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccine models. Point estimates for Janssen COVID-19 vaccine models varied by <10%, with few cases eligible for inclusion and wide CIs.

#### But, waiving patent rights does not guarantee vaccine safety

Smith Spark ‘21

(Laura,- Former Senior Broadcast Journalist for the BBC, and Newsweek editor of CNN,,“Right Countries Urged to Share Vaccine Knowledge as WTO Debates Waving Patents” <https://www.cnn.com/2021/05/05/world/covid-19-vaccine-patents-wto-intl/index.html>, May 05)

If the proposed waiver were to be approved, then **technological know-how** must be transferred to new production sites as well as the intellectual property rights, Rockwell said. Countries must also ensure that they have a strict but transparent regulatory infrastructure in place, he added. The proposed waiver has previously been obstructed by a ["small number" of wealthier nations](https://www.msf.org/countries-obstructing-covid-19-patent-waiver-must-allow-negotiations), according to Doctors Without Borders. When it was blocked at the WTO in March, aid organization [Oxfam](https://reliefweb.int/report/world/oxfam-response-wto-trips-waiver-covid-19-vaccines-being-blocked-again-rich-countries) slammed the decision as a "massive missed opportunity" to speed up worldwide vaccine production, and accused rich countries of "siding with a handful of pharmaceutical corporations in protecting their monopolies against the needs of the majority of developing countries who are struggling to administer a single dose."**Gross Failure of Leadership** Rights group Amnesty International and the People's Vaccine Alliance urged G7 leaders Wednesday to listen to their people and ensure vaccine knowledge is shared. "G7 governments have clear human rights obligations to put the lives of millions of people across the world ahead of the interests of the pharmaceutical companies that they have funded," said Steve Cockburn, head of economic and social justice at Amnesty International, [in a news release](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/05/an-average-of-7-in-10-across-g7-countries-think-their-governments-should-force-big-pharma-to-share-vaccine-know-how/). "It would be a gross failure of leadership to continue blocking the sharing of life-saving technologies, and would only serve to prolong the immense pain and suffering caused by this pandemic." Wednesday's WTO meeting comes a day after the chief of Pfizer said the company was expecting approximately $26 billion in revenue from its Covid-19 vaccine in 2021.More than 300 public health experts [signed a letter](https://www.publichealth.columbia.edu/sites/default/files/trips_sign_on_letter_4-30-21.pdf) Friday arguing that the United States should join an effort to force vaccine makers to waive intellectual property rights to coronavirus vaccines and treatments so more countries can start making them. The group, led by Columbia University professors Terry McGovern and Chelsea Clinton, said the so-called TRIPS waiver would allow local manufacture of vaccines, treatments and diagnostics. "Allowing countries to manufacture locally will speed access to vaccines and treatment, prevent unnecessary deaths, and facilitate a stronger, faster economic recovery," they wrote. "Until vaccines, testing, and treatments are accessible to everyone everywhere we risk recurring new variants, drug resistance, and greater loss of life and suffering at home and globally." That appeal came a fortnight after more than 170 former world leaders and Nobel laureates, including former UK Prime Minister Gordon Brown, former President of Liberia Ellen Johnson Sirleaf and former French President François Hollande sent an [open letter to the White House](https://peoplesvaccinealliance.medium.com/open-letter-former-heads-of-state-and-nobel-laureates-call-on-president-biden-to-waive-e0589edd5704) urging President Joe Biden to support the temporary waiver on IP rights for Covid-19 vaccines at the WTO. **Legal Battles** But even as public pressure grows, some experts argue that handing over the IP rights for Covid-19 vaccines won't necessarily mean that more can be rapidly produced worldwide at large scale. US infectious diseases chief Anthony Fauci [told the UK's Financial Times](https://www.ft.com/content/2f41b122-5738-4707-a822-0d79276710c5) on Monday that he was not convinced that forcing companies to share their intellectual property was the most effective approach, warning that legal battles could slow the process."Going back and forth, consuming time and lawyers in a legal argument about waivers -- that is not the endgame. People are dying around the world and we have to get vaccines into their arms in the fastest and most efficient way possible," he said. Thomas Bollyky, director of the Global Health Program at the Council on Foreign Relations, told CNN on Friday that what's really needed to scale up global manufacturing of vaccines is technology transfer. "It's not just a matter of intellectual property. It's also the **transfer of know-how,**" he said. "I **don't think there's clear evidence** that a waiver of an intellectual property is going to be the best way for that technology transfer to occur."Waiving patents will not work in the same way for vaccines as it has for drugs, Bollyky said. For HIV drugs, for example, manufacturers were more or less able to reverse engineer them without much help from the original developer. It's **very different for vaccines**, where it's really a **biological process** as much as a product. It's hard to scale up manufacturing in this process for the original company, let alone another manufacturer trying to figure this out without assistance," he said. "**It requires a lot of knowledge that's not part of the IP."** The deal between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India is a successful example of such technology transfer, Bollyky said, where the licensing of IP happened voluntarily. "The question is what can we do to facilitate more deals like the one between AstraZeneca and the Serum Institute of India to have this transfer," he said.

#### The plan leads to uncontrolled use of patented technologies, which turns vaccine access, and causes dangerous health consequences.

Crosby and Diamond ‘21

(Daniel Crosby JD@Washington University of Law, Evan Diamond JD@Harvard Law School M.S. Biochemistry@UPenn, Isabel Fernandez de la Cuesta JD@Complutense University Madrid, Jamieson Greer JD@University of Virginia Law School, Jeffery Telep JD@University of Florida, Brian White JD@University of Virginia, “Group of Nearly 60 WTO Members Seek Unprecedented Waiver from WTO Intellectual Property Protection for Covid-related Medical Projects” <https://www.jdsupra.com/legalnews/group-of-nearly-60-wto-members-seek-2523821/>, March 05)

Waiver risks uncontrolled use of patented technologies, without improving vaccine access.Pharmaceutical companies can provide, and have provided, licenses to distribute or scale-up production of COVID-19 vaccines and therapies at reduced cost. Such license agreements allow for expanded access in low- and middle-income countries, while also setting reasonable parameters so that patents and other IP rights are used to address the specific medical needs of the COVID-19 pandemic at hand, and not for other purposes. License agreements also allow for orderly technology transfer, including of unpatented “trade secret” information and other critical “know-how,” that may be essential to efficiently producing and scaling-up safe and effective versions of technologically complex vaccines and biologic drug products. Under the present TRIPS waiver proposal, however, member countries could try to exploit an extraordinarily broad scope of IP and copy patented technologies so long as they are “in relation to prevention, containment or treatment of COVID-19.” For example, under an expansive reading of the proposed waiver language, a member country could try to produce patented pharmaceutical compounds that have other indicated uses predating COVID-19, if such compounds had later been studied or experimentally used for potential symptomatic relief or antiviral activity in COVID-19 patients. The same risks may be faced by manufacturers of patented materials or devices that have multiple uses predating COVID-19, but also may be used as “personal protective equipment” or components thereof, or in other measures arguably relating to COVID-19 “prevention” or “containment.”At the same time, it is unclear how the proposed TRIPS waiver could provide the technology transfer and know-how critical for making the complex molecules and formulations constituting the various COVID-19 vaccines. Vaccine manufacture undertaken by an unauthorized party without the proper processes and controls could result in a different product that is potentially ineffective or results in unwanted health consequences. And even if an unauthorized manufacturer could overcome those substantial hurdles to reverse-engineer and scale up a safe and effective vaccine copy, it would likely take substantial time and a series of failures to do so. Notably, several of the original COVID-19 vaccine developers have recently faced low product yield and other manufacturing challenges during pre-commercial scale-up efforts and the initial months of commercial production.

# Case

#### The underpinnings of “settler” colonialism theory are rooted in reconciliation and implies that the nation-state is no longer colonial. We should hold onto other framings like imperialism to understand violence against indigenous peoples.

Barker 11

(Joanna Barker, , California-born Lenape (citizen of the Delaware Tribe of Indians). Professor of American Indian Studies at San Francisco State University, 2-13-11, Why “Settler Colonialism” Isn’t Exactly Right, https://tequilasovereign.com/2011/02/28/why-settler-colonialism-isnt-exactly-right/, JKS)

In numerous books and articles published in between these definitions (1999 and 2010), authors have sought to flush out the specific historical conditions of when, how, and why settlers have claimed sovereignty and territorial rights over indigenous peoples. These conditions have been located within settler programs of genocide (Patrick Wolfe’s 2006 essay “Settler Colonialism and the Elimination of the Native”), settler segregationist land rights laws (Sherene H. Razack’s 2002 edition, Race, Space, and the Law: Unsettling a White Settler Society), settler theft of indigenous children (Margaret D. Jacobs’ 2009 book White Mother to a Dark Race: Settler Colonialism, Maternalism, and the Removal of Indigenous Children in the American West and Australia, 1880-1940), and settler assertions of jurisdiction over indigenous lands and crimes (Lisa Ford’s 2010 book Settler Sovereignty: Jurisdiction and Indigenous People in America and Australia, 1788-1836). I have not been entirely convinced by the arguments about “settler colonialism” in these works, and have been thinking much about why that is so. I have learned a lot about the important historical differences between what is described as “imperial,” “colonial,” “settler,” and “nation-state” understandings and claims of their own sovereignties and territorial rights against those of indigenous peoples. I have also had lots of unease with the claim that something new or unique has happened within “settler colonialism” from the empire/imperialism of the nation-state. So I begin with the etymology of “settler” as a thing or person that settles within the etymology of “settle” as a thing or person that “comes to rest,” that establishes a “permanent residence.” Fair enough. That would seem to be in line with the important efforts of scholars like Wolfe, Cavanagh, Veracini, Razack, Jacobs, Ford, and so many others to figure out the kind of “colonial” structure and social formation that has been historically articulated through the ascension of the Nation-State and its usurpation of indigenous sovereignty and territorial rights through criminal jurisdiction and violent programs of genocide and child theft. But “settle” also belongs etymologically to “reconcile” or “reconciliation,” which means to “bring together” (again), to “make friendly,” and to “make consistent.” And here is where I have troubles with “settler colonialism.” Because it suggests not merely an important set of contingencies within the historical genocide and dispossession of indigenous peoples, but because it anticipates a reconciling of those histories within the current structure and social formation of the nation-state. A nation-state that is, albeit colonial, but by implication no longer imperialist or colonialist proper. The nation-state is treated within “settler colonialism” as having moved beyond its own tragically imperial and colonial history to be something else, still albeit colonial, but not quite entirely colonial because it is “reconciled” and “consistent.” I guess I am wanting to hold onto harsher terms like “imperialism” and “colonialism” proper to describe the current relationship of the United States to American Indians, Alaskan Natives, Native Hawaiians, and the indigenous peoples of its occupied territories in the Pacific and the Caribbean. I think it is important and necessary to secure indigenous self-determination and decolonization to hold onto the “empire” in our understanding, describing, and strategizing ways of empowerment and revolution. Of course, the U.S. as an empire has gone through many transformations since the 1770s. Of course it is important to understand those transformations in all of their historical contingencies and cultural specificities. But I do not think “settler colonialism” helps us understand the current structure or social formation of the U.S. as a global force or in relation to indigenous peoples within its various kinds of borders.

#### Framing colonialism without the baggage of “settler” solves the aff

Barker 11

(Joanne Barker, California-born Lenape (citizen of the Delaware Tribe of Indians). Professor of American Indian Studies at San Francisco State University.3-15-11, More Musings on Why “Settler Colonialism” Doesn’t Work (For Me), https://tequilasovereign.com/2011/03/16/more-musings-on-why-settler-colonialism-doesnt-work-for-me/, JKS)

The point in the United States, as an imperial power, is that the rhetoric of state apologies has allowed the U.S. to coopt the issues to its ends. So that, whether you read the apologies as articulated through dominant religious dogma about “forgiveness” or a more secular humanist claim to the “public good,” what the apologies work to “restore” is not healing and empowerment of the abused and the oppressed. What they work to “restore” is the formation of the very same interpersonal and social structures that uphold the nation-state’s power (like certain kinds of families and certain kinds of communities) and in which violence against women, children, and racialized groups is made possible (rationalizing and warranting ever-expanding forms of state control). So that, while indigenous peoples have welcomed (for the most part) the apologies as an acknowledgement of the severe historical wrongs and grossly unlawful actions of their states in regards to their self-determination and territorial rights, the apologies have completely cut off the possibility for any restitution or reparation of indigenous governance and territories in the context of those wrongs and actions. In effect, then, the apologies have been about recusal and amnesty for the imperial state, providing for the operationalization of state power to disclaim and be recused from any legal obligation or responsibility to redress their historical wrongs and illegal actions in court. It is as if powerful imperial states like the U.S., Australia, and Canada are saying, “sorry,” but ultimately I/we have no legal responsibility or culpability in the historical wrongs and illegal actions committed against you as individuals or as sovereign nations. I/we apologize and might be willing/able to pay you off, but any other real restitution is simply not going to happen. So get over it. It happened in the past, anyways. As I wrote previously, “settler” belongs etymologically to “reconcile.” Imperial Privilege I think a great part of the disclaimers at the heart of nation-state apologies to indigenous peoples is inseparable from the historical and ongoing efforts of nation-state governments to protect their legal and economic entitlements to indigenous governments, lands, and bodies. The nation-state has, after all, been able to establish and maintain its privileges and access to indigenous peoples’ governments, lands and bodies without any real fear of international accountability or legal consequence. So, while costly and difficult, it would seem that indigenous peoples should simply stop asking the nation-state for apologies and demand a full court legal redress. For unless or until the state is genuinely prepared to make legal reparations, apologies are disingenuous at best and insulting at worst. There can be no “restoration” or “reconciliation” without responsibility and reparation. And that difference is the difference between “settler colonialism” and the imperial state. It is the different between understanding a nation-state as a polity that has transformed itself from a colonial, imperial historical past into a liberal humanist democracy. Albeit still colonial, but ultimately reconciled within itself to its ideals.

#### This isn’t a dirty word PIC that tries to skate aff discussion but about our conceptual frame of the structure of the imperial state and which lens you should endorse – all of their aff framing proves our analytics lenses are important

#### The plan gets circumvented through prioritization of bilateral trade agreements with those who respect the spirit of intellectual property.

Durand and Milberg, 18

[Cédric, Associate Prof. Political Economy @ U-Geneva, member @ Paris Nord Economics Center; and William, Dean @ The New School for Social Research: “Intellectual Monopoly in Global Value Chains,” published in 2018, https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-01850438]//AD

The contention over IPRs exemplified by the dispute between the US and China, reflects the heightened sensitivity of the US and other high-income economies to IPRs in an era where their governments and businesses consider innovation as their main competitive advantage. The US today is the leader of the movement toward stricter international IP norms, in contrast to its position in earlier periods (Peng, Ahlstrom, Carraher, & Shi, 2017). It is the most active complainant at the WTO under the TRIPS agreement but, as illustrated by the recent actions of the Trump administration, TRIPS is not enough (Sell, 2010). The US seeks other ways to extend internationally the standard of IP protection found in U.S. law and in particular to apply existing IP protection to digital media (Akhtar & Ferguson, 2011, p. 25). In order to circumvent the flexibility in the WTO TRIPS Agreement, and the reluctance of developing countries at the WTO to raise WTO standards of IP protection (Helfer, 2004), developed economies have relied increasingly on bilateral and regional preferential trade agreements (PTAs) to accomplish the objective of securing intellectual property related economic advantages (Abbott, 2006; Shadlen, 2008). The international intellectual property policymaking arena has grown ever more complex with overlapping transnational norms. For example, the 33 pages of the chapter dedicated to IPRs in the US-CAFTA agreement details the treaties and conventions that the parties shall ratify, which defines precisely and extensively the scope of IPRs concerned (copyrights, performance, patents, communication, trademarks, plants, microorganisms, industrial design, geographical indication, name domains…). Additionally, it describes enforcement mechanisms to be implemented in national legislation and considers supplementary protection of intellectual property under the investment chapter (CAFTA, 2004). IP provisions included in Japanese and EU international trade agreements are more general but they also provide supplementary coverage and additional obligations (Liberti, 2010). Moreover, investment treaties and chapters dedicated to investment protection in trade agreements open additional routes for IP protection, which can exercise a powerful chilling effect on government actions via the exposure to the risk of costly investor-state arbitration disputes (Ho, 2015, 2016; Kasolowsky & Leikin, 2017). The DESTA database (Dür et al., 2014) allows us to track this qualitative evolution in bilateral and regional trade agreements. IP provisions of trade agreements were nonexistent before the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed in 1992. They became a standard feature of trade agreements in the 2000s. Figure 6 shows the number of PTAs signed each year and of those, the ones which included IPRs. It also shows the percentage of PTAs with an IP provision. By 2016, every PTA signed included an IP provision.

#### TRIPS enhances human rights

Samir Raheem Alsoodani 15, “"The WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) may offered an access to essential pharmaceutical drugs for developing countries,” Journal Of the College of law /Al-Nahrain University 2015, Volume 17, Issue 2, Pages 393-410, <https://www.iasj.net/iasj/article/109180>

In contrast, Anderson and Wager (2006) believe that the TRIPS Agreement provisions enhanced human rights principles, because of the many features throughout the TRIPS Agreement, such as the emphasis on the need for a balance between the advantages, the commitments, and the rights for both the users and the producers of the invention. Other examples include nondiscrimination treatment, and the stipulation that all disputes must be settled under the WTO system, which secures the rule of law governing international trade. The TRIPS Agreement has favoured the least developed countries with distinctive and more lenient treatment, as these countries have until 2016 to enforce protection of patent rights with regards to undisclosed data relating to pharmaceutical products.

**Red nation is a group of indigenous people in favor of marxism, card is old and outdated compareredf to how indigenous people have gotten involved in indigenous movements**