# Meadows R3 vs Yerba Buena KN

## Case

### Solvency

#### Their plan text doesn’t even solve their own harms- they list their harms here, we read green

Bp-Weeks 20 [​​​​​​​Maurice Bp-Weeks, Maurice is the Co-Executive Director of ACRE. He works with community organizations and labor unions on campaigns to create equitable communities by dismantling systems of wealth extraction that target Black and Brown communities. Maurice has many years of community organizing experience on issues such as housing, revenue and budgets, policing and incarceration, corporate accountability and education justice. He is an alum of the Alliance of Californians for Community Empowerment and the Center for Popular Democracy. Maurice currently serves on the board of Black Organizing for Leadership and Dignity, National Institute for Money in Politics, Investors Advocates for Social Justice, National Black Workers Center, 482 Forward and the Rucks Society, 8-21-2020, "Racial Health Disparities Are Fueled by Big Pharma's Patent Monopolies [Op-Ed]," No Publication, accessed 8-17-2021, https://www.colorlines.com/articles/racial-health-disparities-are-fueled-big-pharmas-patent-monopolies-op-ed] //kn  
Time after time, Black and Brown people pay the price—either with our lives or through pain and suffering—because of systemic racial discrimination and the continued extraction of dollars from us. Nothing illustrates this truth more than COVID-19, which has been killing Black, Latinx and Indigenous people disproportionately because of lack of access to healthcare, safe housing and overrepresentation in what is now recognized as “essential work.” As researchers race to find potential cures for COVID-19, it’s already becoming clear that yet again, only certain people will have access to them. Before it even hits the market, Gilead Science set a heinous price for proposed COVID-19 treatment Remdesivir—over $3,000 per patient. This is just one example of the myriad of life-saving medication which Black and Brown people are denied via pricing. A new report, “[Poi$on](https://acrecampaigns.org/research_post/poison/),” shows that Black folks have twice the rate of hypertension, and twice the mortality rate for diabetes compared to white people. Additionally, Latinx people also have twice the rate of diabetes and are more likely to experience preventable diabetes-related kidney failure and vision loss. On top of this already glaring health disparity, the report finds that Black and Latinx people are more likely to ration medication due to cost, which causes a slew of other issues including heart disease, strokes, and kidney disease. Often, diabetic patients who ration medication have to undergo amputations that are completely preventable with reliable access to affordable medication, leading to what ProPublica has deemed an “[epidemic of amputations](https://features.propublica.org/diabetes-amputations/black-american-amputation-epidemic/)” in Black communities. The high cost of medication is not a coincidence. It’s the result of pharmaceutical companies having total control over their pricing. Of course, in the capitalist hellscape we live in, they always choose to put profits over people without oversight from our government. “Poi$on” also finds that there are some clearly identifiable bad actors here. Eli Lilly hiked the price of its insulin, Humalog, 30 times in just 20 years, including a 585 percent increase between 2001 and 2005. After buying the patent rights to two blood pressure drugs, Nitropress and Isuprel, Valeant Pharmaceutical immediately raised their prices by 212 percent and 525 percent, respectively. A Valeant spokesperson referred to its duty to “maximize the value” for shareholders as justification for this egregious and arbitrary leap in price. If it seems bananas that they’re able to do this, it is. The reason why? These pharmaceutical corporations have the authority to monopolize patents, and then do everything they can to abuse them. With no oversight on drug pricing, greedy pharma executives can gouge prices on a whim, willfully killing countless Black and Brown people in the name of profit. On top of abusing an already corrupt patent system, pharmaceutical companies assemble tangled webs of intellectual property protection that stifle truly innovative medical research, while keeping already hyper-inflated drug prices high. It hasn’t always been this way. Patent monopolies giving pharmaceutical companies control over pricing weren’t introduced until the 1960s, when right-wingers worked to empower corporations and wealthy investors by weakening public-sector regulations and consumer protections. These days, the excuse for the high prices of drugs is attributed to innovation or keeping the market competitive. But **t**he truth is that government-funded research has always been the backbone of medical breakthroughs—pharmaceutical companies profit by buying the patents and monopolizing public knowledge. Luckily, there are some clear solutions. First, and most urgently, our elected officials must ensure medications and vaccines for COVID-19 are offered free of charge. Second, the Department of Health and Human Services must designate systemic racism as a public health emergency, and issue reparations for past harms from the pharmaceutical industry. Third, the federal government must impose compulsory licensing to prevent further abuse of patents by big pharmaceutical companies that lead to monopoly and price gouging. And finally, we must push for measurable steps toward strengthening the public’s ownership of medicine. While everyone deserves access to free, comprehensive healthcare, including medication, the reality is that Black and Latinx communities are being torn apart by the pharmaceutical industry’s insistence on the greedy exploitation of our communities. Congress must step in with bold action plans. Our lives, quite literally, depend on it.

**Manufacturing**

**No solvency and reject "empirical" claims -- vaccines require complex infrastructure to manufacture, not just patents**

**Hotez 5/10** [Peter J. Hotez, Maria Elena Bottazzi, and Prashant Yadav. "Producing a Vaccine Requires More Than a Patent," Foreign Affairs, 5-10-2021, accessed 8-8-2021, https://www.foreignaffairs.com/articles/united-states/2021-05-10/producing-vaccine-requires-more-patent] HWIC

On May 5, President Joe Biden announced that the United States would support an international bid to waive intellectual property rights to vaccines for the duration of the coronavirus pandemic, thereby ostensibly allowing other countries to ramp up production even of the sophisticated technology behind the Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna vaccines against COVID-19. Many in the global health community and developing world welcomed the decision as a victory for greater equity in vaccine distribution, in which middle- and low-income countries are lagging far behind wealthy ones. But the jubilation may be premature. The drive for intellectual property waivers originates in part from the world’s experience fighting the last war, against HIV/AIDS. Patent pools, intellectual property waivers, and other liberalizing mechanisms were urgent in assuring equity of access to lifesaving drugs during that epidemic. But these tools are better suited to medicines and other pharmaceuticals than to vaccines. Producing vaccines—particularly those as technologically complex as the messenger RNA (mRNA) inoculations against COVID-19—requires not only patents but an entire infrastructure that cannot be transferred overnight. The sharing of patents is an important and welcome development for the long term, but it may not even be the most pressing first step. JUST OPEN THE SPIGOT At the turn of the millennium, multinational pharmaceutical companies were charging $10,000 per patient for a daily drug regimen that could keep those infected with HIV/AIDS alive. Those in low- and middle-income countries in Africa and elsewhere could access this cocktail only under limited circumstances. Then, in 2001, the Indian drug manufacturer Cipla Limited began producing versions of a triple antiretroviral drug cocktail for a mere $350. Cipla, in collaboration with Médecins Sans Frontières (Doctors Without Borders), helped usher in a new era of global access to essential medicines—one that justified relaxing or even ignoring international patents and other property rights to produce and distribute an important and lifesaving drug as a generic. Since that time, global health advocacy organizations have found increasingly sophisticated ways to work with multinationals in ensuring access to essential medicines for low- and middle-income countries. In the 2010s, the global health initiative Unitaid helped create a Medicines Patent Pool, in which pharmaceutical companies from all over the world offered antiretroviral drug licenses, thereby creating a path for developing generic versions so long as the patent holders received royalties. The mechanism supplied voluntary licenses to new producers even while protecting the legal rights of the drugs’ original manufacturers. Companies such as Gilead, for example, have supplied voluntary licenses for their antivirals directly to generic manufacturers, allowing for tiered pricing across countries. Barely any COVID-19 vaccines have been administered in the African continent or in low- or middle-income countries in Asia and Latin America. Global health professionals have understandably sought to ascertain whether a similar approach could help make the distribution of COVID-19 vaccines less lopsided. More than one billion vaccine doses have now been administered—but overwhelmingly to people living in just a few countries. More than half have been administered in the United States (250 million) and China (290 million) alone, followed by India (160 million), the United Kingdom (51 million), and Germany (32 million). In contrast, for all practical purposes, barely any COVID-19 vaccines have been [administered](https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2021/world/covid-vaccinations-tracker.html) in the African continent or in low- or middle-income countries in Asia and Latin America. Global health advocates have responded to this inequity by seeking to apply the lessons they learned from antiretroviral drugs and demanding patent pools or other intellectual property waivers for COVID-19 vaccines. In March 2021, Médecins Sans Frontières organized protests at the World Trade Organization (WTO) headquarters in Geneva, unfurling a banner that read, “No COVID Monopolies—Wealthy Countries Stop Blocking TRIPS Waiver,” referring to the organization’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights. The assumption underlying such demands is that intellectual property is a crucial barrier blocking vaccine developers, especially in low- and middle-income countries, from producing COVID-19 vaccines to scale—particularly the high-performing mRNA vaccines that Pfizer-BioNTech and Moderna currently produce. These vaccines elicit more than 90 percent protective immunity against both symptomatic illness and documented infection, including asymptomatic infection, with COVID-19. They are successfully driving the recovery of the United States, Israel, and other nations. But so far, mRNA vaccines are mostly invisible to Africa, Latin America, and low- and middle-income countries in other regions. The hope of those pushing for TRIPS waivers and patent pools is that these will unleash the technology to make the recovery global. IT TAKES A WHOLE ECOSYSTEM Intellectual property sharing may be helpful in the long term. But producing complicated biologics, especially innovative ones such as mRNA or adenovirus-vectored vaccines, is not solely a matter of patent access. Small-molecule antiviral drugs are comparatively straightforward: the multistep chemical processes through which they are synthesized are often fully detailed in published patents or scientific papers. Chemists and formulation experts can often synthesize and scale up production just from knowing the drug structure. But vaccines are different. Producing and manufacturing lipid-encased mRNA molecules, recombinant adenoviruses, or even the proteins or whole inactivated viruses used in older-generation vaccines require a far higher level of sophistication than is needed for producing small-molecule drugs. Moreover, vaccine production must meet stringent requirements for quality control, quality assurance, and regulatory oversight. The **effective transfer of such complex technology requires a receiving ecosystem that can take years, sometimes decades, to build**. Countries seeking to ramp up vaccine production will need to train staff scientists and technicians. They will also need scientific administrators versed not only in basic research and development but also in detailed record keeping, including specific documentation practices such as batch production records. Moreover, they will need strong quality control systems and regulatory guardrails. Building such an infrastructure requires intensive training and often considerable financial investment and risk. It also takes time—by some estimates, vaccine development requires at least 11 years, and even then the probability that such efforts will result in bringing a vaccine to market is less than ten percent. Consider that the COVID-19 vaccines were themselves the outcome of decades of research and development. Few nations are prepared to take such risks. Only a handful of low- or middle-income countries currently have the capacity to produce new vaccines. Only a handful of low- or middle-income countries currently have the capacity to produce new vaccines. The most notable and largest is India, which currently makes the adenovirus-vectored vaccines developed by Janssen and by Oxford and AstraZeneca, as well as an older-technology recombinant protein vaccine and a whole inactivated virus vaccine. Manufacturers in Brazil, Cuba, and some Southeast Asian countries have experience producing childhood vaccines and may be able to develop the capacity to make COVID-19 vaccines as well. Other possibilities may develop elsewhere, including in the Middle East and Africa. But in the near term, such manufacturers will require financing, access to very large amounts of raw materials and supplies (possibly including relaxation of export controls), and some technical expertise in manufacturing and quality control if they are to produce the existing vaccines against COVID-19. Vaccinating India alone will require almost two billion doses, and more than 12 billion doses will be required to vaccinate the world. The emergence of new variants and the need for booster doses may increase demand even further. Whether mRNA vaccine technology can be scaled to produce billions of doses in 2021, or even by early 2022, remains entirely unknown, but the goal is worth pursuing. To this end, some kind of patent relaxation may be necessary, but far from sufficient. Would-be producers will need technical know-how, regulatory controls, and components that are currently in very short supply, such as nucleotides and lipids.

### AT: Disease

#### Surveillance efforts prevent extinction from future pandemics

Maureen **Miller**, Adjunct Associate Professor of Epidemiology, 8-1-20**21**, "The next pandemic is already happening – targeted disease surveillance can help prevent it," No Publication, https://www.yahoo.com/now/next-pandemic-already-happening-targeted-130202377.html?guccounter=1

As more and more people around the world are getting vaccinated, one can almost hear the collective sigh of relief. But the next pandemic threat is likely already making its way through the population right now. My research as an infectious disease epidemiologist has found that there is a simple strategy to mitigate emerging outbreaks: proactive, real-time surveillance in settings where animal-to-human disease spillover is most likely to occur. In other words, don’t wait for sick people to show up at a hospital. Instead, monitor populations where disease spillover actually happens. The current pandemic prevention strategy Global health professionals have long known that pandemics fueled by [zoonotic disease spillover](https://www.news-medical.net/health/What-is-a-Spillover-Event.aspx), or animal-to-human disease transmission, were a problem. In 1947, the World Health Organization established a global network of hospitals to [detect pandemic threats](https://www.who.int/influenza/gip-anniversary/en/) through a process called [syndromic surveillance](https://www.cdc.gov/nssp/overview.html). The process relies on standardized symptom checklists to look for signals of emerging or reemerging diseases of pandemic potential among patient populations with symptoms that can’t be easily diagnosed. This clinical strategy relies both on infected individuals coming to [sentinel hospitals](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/259884/9789241513623-eng.pdf) and medical authorities who are [influential and persistent](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-china-51364382) enough to raise the alarm. There’s only one hitch: By the time someone sick shows up at a hospital, an outbreak has already occurred. In the case of [SARS-CoV-2, the virus that causes COVID-19](https://www.who.int/emergencies/diseases/novel-coronavirus-2019/technical-guidance/naming-the-coronavirus-disease-(covid-2019)-and-the-virus-that-causes-it), it was likely widespread long before it was detected. This time, the clinical strategy alone failed us. Zoonotic disease spillover is not one and done A more proactive approach is currently gaining prominence in the world of pandemic prevention: viral evolutionary theory. This theory suggests that [animal viruses become dangerous human viruses](https://doi.org/10.3390/v13040637) incrementally over time through frequent zoonotic spillover. It’s not a one-time deal: An “intermediary” animal such as a civet cat, pangolin or pig may be required to mutate the virus so it can make initial jumps to people. But the final host that allows a variant to become fully adapted to humans may be humans themselves. Viral evolutionary theory is playing out in real time with the rapid development of [COVID-19 variants](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/transmission/variant.html). In fact, an international team of scientists have proposed that undetected human-to-human transmission after an animal-to-human jump is the likely [origin of SARS-CoV-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41591-020-0820-9). When novel zoonotic viral disease outbreaks like Ebola first came to the world’s attention in the 1970s, research on the extent of disease transmission relied on [antibody assays](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/testing/serology-overview.html), blood tests to identify people who have already been infected. Antibody surveillance, also called [serosurveys](https://www.cdc.gov/coronavirus/2019-ncov/cases-updates/geographic-seroprevalence-surveys.html), test blood samples from target populations to identify how many people have been infected. Serosurveys help determine whether diseases like Ebola are circulating undetected. Turns out they were: Ebola antibodies were found in more than [5% of people tested in Liberia in 1982](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0769-2617(82)80028-2), decades before the West African epidemic in 2014. These results support viral evolutionary theory: It takes time – sometimes a lot of time – to make an animal virus dangerous and transmissible between humans. What this also means is that scientists have a chance to intervene. Measuring zoonotic disease spillover One way to take advantage of the lead time for animal viruses to fully adapt to humans is long-term, repeated surveillance. Setting up a [pandemic threats warning system](http://dx.doi.org/10.2471/BLT.16.175984) with this strategy in mind could help [detect pre-pandemic viruses](https://doi.org/10.3390/v13040637) before they become harmful to humans. And the best place to start is directly at the source. My team worked with [virologist Shi Zhengli](https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/how-chinas-bat-woman-hunted-down-viruses-from-sars-to-the-new-coronavirus1/) of the Wuhan Institute of Virology to develop a human antibody assay to test for a very distant cousin of SARS-CoV-2 found in bats. We established proof of zoonotic spillover in a small 2015 serosurvey in Yunnan, China: [3% of study participants living near bats](https://doi.org/10.1007/s12250-018-0012-7) carrying this SARS-like coronavirus tested antibody positive. But there was one unexpected result: None of the previously infected study participants reported any harmful health effects. Earlier spillovers of SARS coronaviruses – like the first SARS epidemic in 2003 and Middle Eastern Respiratory Syndrome (MERS) in 2012 – had caused high levels of illness and death. This one did no such thing. Researchers conducted a larger study in Southern China between 2015 and 2017. It’s a region home to bats known to carry SARS-like coronaviruses, including the one that caused the [original 2003 SARS pandemic](https://doi.org/10.1038/nature12711) and the one [most closely related to SARS-CoV-2](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-020-2012-7). Fewer than 1% of participants in this study tested antibody positive, meaning they had been previously infected with the SARS-like coronavirus. Again, none of them reported negative health effects. But syndromic surveillance – the same strategy used by sentinel hospitals – revealed something even more unexpected: An additional [5% of community participants](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.bsheal.2019.10.004) reported symptoms consistent with SARS in the past year. This study did more than just provide the biological evidence needed to establish proof of concept to measure zoonotic spillover. The pandemic threats warning system also picked up a signal for a SARS-like infection that couldn’t yet be detected through blood tests. It may even have detected early variants of SARS-CoV-2. Had surveillance protocols been in place, these results would have triggered a search for community members who may have been part of an undetected outbreak. But without an established plan, the signal was missed. From prediction to surveillance to genetic sequencing The lion’s share of pandemic prevention funding and effort over the past two decades has focused on discovering wildlife pathogens, and predicting pandemics before animal viruses can infect humans. But this approach has not predicted any major zoonotic disease outbreaks – including H1N1 influenza in 2009, MERS in 2012, the West African Ebola epidemic in 2014 or the current COVID-19 pandemic. Predictive modeling has, however, provided robust heat maps of the [global “hot spots”](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-017-00923-8) where zoonotic spillover is most likely to occur. Long-term, regular surveillance at these “hot spots” could detect spillover signals, as well as any changes that occur over time. These could include an uptick in antibody-positive individuals, increased levels of illness and demographic changes among infected people. As with any proactive disease surveillance, if a signal is detected, an outbreak investigation would follow. Pe

ople identified with [symptoms that can’t be easily diagnosed](https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-018-05373-w) can then be screened using genetic sequencing to characterize and identify new viruses. This is exactly what Greg Gray and his team from Duke University did in their search for [undiscovered coronaviruses](https://doi.org/10.1093/cid/ciaa347) in rural Sarawak, Malaysia, a known “hot spot” for zoonotic spillover. Eight of 301 specimens collected from pneumonia patients hospitalized in 2017-2018 were found to have a canine coronavirus never before seen in humans. Complete viral genome sequencing not only suggested that it had recently jumped from an animal host – it also harbored the same mutation that made both SARS and SARS-CoV-2 so deadly. [[The Conversation’s most important coronavirus headlines, weekly in a science newsletter](https://theconversation.com/us/newsletters/science-editors-picks-71/?utm_source=Yahoo&utm_medium=inline-link&utm_campaign=newsletter-text&utm_content=science-corona-important)] Let’s not miss the next pandemic warning signal The good news is that surveillance infrastructure in global “hot spots” already exists. The [Connecting Organisations for Regional Disease Surveillance](https://www.cordsnetwork.org/) program links six regional disease surveillance networks in 28 countries. They pioneered “participant surveillance,” partnering with communities at high risk for both initial zoonotic spillover and the gravest health outcomes to contribute to prevention efforts. For example, Cambodia, a country at risk of pandemic avian influenza spillover, established a free national hotline for community members to report animal illnesses directly to the Ministry of Health in real time. Boots-on-the-ground approaches like these are key to a timely and coordinated public health response to stop outbreaks before they become pandemics. It is easy to miss warning signals when global and local priorities are tentative. The same mistake need not happen again.

## 1NC

### 1

#### Text: The member nations of the World Trade Organization should delay patent enforcement with the exception of Black-owned patents.

#### It competes- it’s a PIC, duh. Don’t let them squirrel. If they had exceptions, they’d obviously be specified somewhere in the aff.

#### The patent system was designed to exclude Black inventors

Johnson 19

(Shontavia Jackson Johnson serves as associate vice president for academic partnerships and innovation at Clemson University. She has also founded the Johnson International Group, a consulting firm specializing in law, pop culture, and innovation, 2019, The Colorblind Patent System and Black Inventors, American Bar Association, <https://www.americanbar.org/groups/intellectual_property_law/publications/landslide/2018-19/march-april/colorblind-patent-system-black-inventors/>, JKS)

From inception, our patent system recognized that American progress needs inventors and that inventors should own the fruits of their intellectual labor for some period of time when certain requirements are met. On paper, these constitutional ideals have always applied equally to the demographic tapestry of American inventors. The original law did not explicitly exclude certain races of inventors from participation in the patent system, unlike some of the other laws that existed at that time. There were, however, practical legal barriers that excluded the earliest black inventors in the United States from obtaining patents. The patent system simply was not available at that time to enslaved people—they were not considered American citizens, and the rights and provisions of the Constitution did not extend to them.5 In addition, states enacted laws that prevented enslaved people from owning any kind of property, presumably including patents. For black inventors who were either born free or otherwise acquired their freedom, there were also legal barriers. After 1793, the Patent Act “included a ‘Patent Oath,’ which eventually required patent applicants to swear to be the ‘original’ inventor of the claimed invention and to their country of citizenship.”7 The U.S. Supreme Court’s 1857 Dred Scott opinion held that black Americans could not be citizens of the United States.8 Arguably, free blacks were precluded from patenting their inventions after Dred Scott because they did not have a country of citizenship and presumably could not swear to the Patent Oath.9 Even after the Dred Scott opinion was superseded by the Thirteenth and Fourteenth Amendments after the Civil War, “the economic and educational conditions that many free blacks faced . . . simply were not conducive to pursuing whatever incentives and opportunities U.S. patent law provided.”10 There was and continues to be a consistently wide gap between the colorblind American patent system and certain groups of inventors, especially black inventors.

#### Patents are key to supporting revolutionary Black inventors and reducing the racial gap in patentees.

Johnson 19

(Shontavia Jackson Johnson serves as associate vice president for academic partnerships and innovation at Clemson University. She has also founded the Johnson International Group, a consulting firm specializing in law, pop culture, and innovation, 2019, The Colorblind Patent System and Black Inventors, American Bar Association, <https://www.americanbar.org/groups/intellectual_property_law/publications/landslide/2018-19/march-april/colorblind-patent-system-black-inventors/>, JKS)

Modern black inventors are also at the forefront of cutting-edge technology that improves both the public and private sectors. In the private sector, Marian Rogers Croak currently holds more than 135 patents primarily related to voice-over Internet protocol (VoIP) technology, which paved the way for VoIP systems like Skype and Google Hangouts.63 Croak spent more than 30 years at AT&T, where she managed 2,000+ engineers and led AT&T to replace wired communications with Internet protocol.64 She currently serves as a vice president of engineering at Google, where she is responsible for Google’s global expansion of Internet access in emerging markets and elsewhere.65 Another such inventor is Janet Emerson Bashen, the founder and current CEO of Bashen Corporation, who became the first black woman to obtain an American software patent in 2006. Early in her career, Bashen worked in the insurance industry and noticed that the industry needed private, third parties to investigate Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) claims. She founded a company to meet this need and then coinvented a way to securely store information about EEO investigations.67 Bashen went on to develop new software that facilitates EEO complaints and other Title VII adherence. In the public sector, there are esteemed inventors such as Dr. Robert G. Bryant of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA). Bryant has served as an inventor or coinventor on dozens of issued patents related to polymers and advanced composites during his career at NASA.69 His work is highly regarded in the industry, having received numerous accolades over the years, including R&D 100 awards in 1994 and 1996 and the NASA Government Invention of the Year Award in 2006.These black American inventors illustrate the range of benefits associated with encouraging innovation and access to the American patent system. Those who can participate in it not only receive the personal right to exclude others from making, using, offering for sale, or selling their invention, but they also receive a gateway to revolutionizing our country with their innovations. Unfortunately, the reality remains that black patentees are woefully underrepresented in America. Recent studies show wide disparities between the number of U.S. patents issued to inventors of color and the total number of patents issued.71 This is particularly true for black and Hispanic inventors. There is no reliable data on the actual number and proportion of black American patentees because the United States Patent and Trademark Office (USPTO) does not currently collect demographic data about patentees.72 However, tangential and anecdotal research suggests that the rates are very low.73 For example, one 2010 study found that from 1970 to 2006, black American inventors received six patents per million people, compared to 235 patents per million for all U.S. inventors.74 Another 2016 study found that black Americans “apply for patents at nearly half the rate of whites.”75 A 2016 Information Technology & Innovation Foundation report, The Demographics of Innovation in the United States, found even more grim results.76 The report surveyed “innovators,” defined as people who have won national awards for their inventions; people who have filed for international, triadic patents77 for their innovative ideas in three technology areas (information technology, life sciences, and materials sciences); and people who have filed triadic patents for large advanced-technology companies. This report identified only 0.3 percent of black American respondents as “innovators.”

#### The aff’s race-neutral approach to patents devastates momentum for Black-owned businesses. Black women patentees are necessary to solve gender and racial pay gaps in the industry.

Black Business 20

(11-3-2020, "Black Female CEO Launches CBD Beverage Brand With Unique Patent to Combat Mother's Cancer Treatments," Black Business.com, <https://www.blackbusiness.com/2020/11/ja-nice-johnson-black-female-ceo-launches-axis-cbd-beverage-brand-patent.html>, JKS)

Ja-nice Johnson, Founder and CEO of Axis™ Hemp in A Cap, has launched the now leading CBD Beverage brand nationwide. The innovative patent stemmed from necessity as the CEO was in search of various CBD treatments to administer to her mother battling Stage 4 Cancer. After tedious efforts of mixing products to aid to her mother’s treatments, Ja-nice then acquired the license to the unique Vessl™ technology to incorporate into beverages and is now leading the market with her innovation. Vessl™, the company that provides its unique patent, recently announced their partnership with GRAMMY® Award-winning singer, songwriter, Miguel who also serves as a Corporate Ambassador and Advisor for the brand. The patented bottle closure provides instant and pressurized mixing of the beverage with alkaline water immediately prior to use. With this technology, the premium quality 6oz Hemp beverage holds and protects 25mg of hemp extract and flavor to provide the best all-natural ready-to-drink Hemp cocktail. No sugars, no calories, packed with electrolytes, B & C Vitamins, and Zinc to rehydrate and boost your immune system. Axis™ has now developed a product line of four (4) Hemp infused beverages: Triple Berry Daiquiri, Strawberry Daiquiri, Lemon Drop Daiquiri, and Mighty Mango Daiquiri. Supporting medical studies continue to show the numerous benefits of CBD (a cannabinoid) alleviating neuropathic pain, inflammation, anxiety, and more. Furthermore, athletes have taken to the CBD wave utilizing it post-workout to alleviate sore muscles. No matter your preference of use, Johnson wants consumers to know, “Every sip is a tribute to those surviving, fighting, or anyone loss to this illness." A company committed to diversity with a model of inclusion, Axis is minority-owned and operated in addition to being LGBTQ+ inclusive. Recent studies have shown that Black women-owned businesses represented the highest rate of growth of any group over the last five years. Deemed “necessity entrepreneurs” because, due to higher unemployment rates and vast gender and racial pay gaps, women of color start businesses out of both the need to survive and innovation. Axis™ has been diligent in becoming a leading company, working to create and ease the burden for those battling cancer, post-workout recovery, and a health enthusiast that understands the health benefits of CBD use. With that, Johnson is a reminder that Black female entrepreneurs are truly changing the game.

#### Only 4% of cannabis businesses are Black-owned. The PIC is key to ensure they aren’t left behind. This \*fits their framework of minimizing oppression\*

Vilnits 21

(Liza, PRWeb, 9-4-2021, "TrueStopper, Austin’s First Female, Black-Owned Cannabis Business, Launches Line of Holistic Health & Chronic Pain CBD Solutions," <https://www.prweb.com/releases/truestopper_austins_first_female_black_owned_cannabis_business_launches_line_of_holistic_health_chronic_pain_cbd_solutions/prweb17945152.htm>, JKS)

TrueStopper, a holistic health company that leverages professionally-formulated and regenerative hemp-based products, has announced an expanded product line to support the evolving chronic pain and health needs of patients, consumers, and providers. As Austin’s first female, black-owned Cannabis business, founder and CEO Dr. Kirsten Shepard (DC, LMT) is advocating for more opportunities for women and BIPOC founders as well as more transparency in the CBD market. “TrueStopper is one of only 4 percent of Cannabis businesses that is African American-owned. A green wave is on the horizon, but it’s time to change the narrative so that women and BIPOC founders aren’t left behind,” said Dr. K. “And while the CBD industry is experiencing exponential growth right now, it’s not without its challenges. In addition to diversity gains, we must be advocating for more clear regulations to ensure the opaque CBD market is not tarnished by vendors who overlook high quality and purity as a product standard.” Penn Medicine recently found that nearly 70 percent of Cannabidiol extracts sold online are mislabeled. Offering products that are professionally-formulated and triple-tested by ISO-certified labs, all TrueStopper offerings have a verified certificate of analysis, are non-toxic, and contain 0-0.3 percent THC. In addition to the previously available salves, roll-ons, and hemp extracts (that range from 300-2,400 mg), TrueStopper now offers face, hair, and body oils, pain patches, CBN and CBG tinctures, bath bombs, calming and focus tablets, gummies, and dog chews. The company also has an international patent pending for a maximum strength formulation and will soon launch a line of CBD-infused cookies made in partnership with Austin-based GoodenSweet. TrueStopper’s products have primarily been used by seniors and veterans to alleviate chronic neck, back, joint, muscle, and nerve pain, as well as athletes who are focusing on injury prevention and recovery.

### 2

#### 1. 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!

#### 2. 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.

#### 3. Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause goes unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

Global capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations. We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction in the planetary history with 150 to 200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 Capitalism has also led to explosive social inequalities. The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12 The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature, a finite category. Secondly, capitalism treats human labor as a cost. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system -- and act accordingly. The critical task ahead is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path. Given the system's DNA, such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that without democratic control of wealth and social governance of the means of production, we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return**.**

#### 4. The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only party organizing can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct chauvinist tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for global liberation.

Elyson 18

Escalante, Philosophy @ UOregon, 18

[Alyson, M.A., is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>] rVs

I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

**5. The role of the ballot is to resist neoliberal ideology – filter negative arguments through an epistemological dismantling of neoliberalism.**

HAY & ROSAMUND, PhDs, 2002 (Colin and Ben, Journal of European Public Policy Volume 9, Issue 2, 2002 p. 3-5)

The implicit supposition which seems to underlie much of the sceptical or second-wave literature seeking to expose the ‘myth’ or ‘delusion’ of globalisation, is that a rigorous empirical exercise in demystification will be sufficient to reverse the tide of ill-informed public policy made in the name of globalisation. Sadly, this has not proved to be the case. For **however convinced we might be by the empirical armoury mustered against the hyperglobalisation thesis** by the sceptics, their **rigorous empiricism leads them to fail adequately to consider the way in which globalisation comes to inform public policy-making.** **It is here,** we suggest, that **the discourse of globalisation** — and the discursive construction of the imperatives it is seen to conjure along with attendant fatalism about the possibilities for meaningful political agency — **must enter the analysis**. For, as the most cursory reflection on the issue of structure and agency reveals, **it is the ideas actors hold about the context in which they find themselves** rather than the context itself **which informs the way in which they behave** (Hay 1999a, forthcoming a). **This is no less true of policy makers and governments**. **Whether** the **globalisation** thesis **is ‘true’** or not **may matter far less than whether it is deemed to be true** (or, quite possibly, just useful) **by those employing it**. Consequently, **if the aim** of the sceptics **is to discredit the political appeal to dubious economic imperatives associated with globalisation**, then they might **we**ll **benefit from asking** themselves **why and under what conditions** politicians and **public officials invoke** external **economic constraints** in the first place. It is to this task that we direct our attentions in this paper. Yet at the outset a certain word of caution is perhaps required. For, even if we accept the potential causal role that ideas about globalisation might play in the structuration of political and economic outcomes, we may be in danger of narrowing the discursive field of our attentions at the outset. The ideas policy makers use to legitimate and/or to rationalise their behaviour should not simply be seen as more or less accurate reflections of the context they perceive (based on more or less complete information). Nor should discourses be understood as necessarily and exclusively ‘strategic’ (i.e. as relating to situations in which an actor’s employment of a discourse correlates directly to particular material interests). **Discourse matters** in at least two respects. **The way** in which **actors behave is not merely a reflection** of the degree of accuracy and completeness **of the information they possess**; **it is also** a reflection of **their normative orientation** towards their environment and potential future scenarios. Thus the constraints and/or opportunities which globalisation is held to imply might be understood (or misunderstood) in very similar ways in different (national) contexts. Yet such understanding are likely to provoke divergent responses from political actors with different normative orientations and diverse institutional contexts. Put simply, **though actors may share a** common **understanding of** the process of **globalisation, they may respond** very **differently to its** perceived **challenges and threats** **depending on whether one regards the future it promises in a positive or negative light** – witness the still ongoing debate within the governing SPD in Germany between supporters of Schröder and Lafontaine (see Lafontaine 1998; Lafontaine and Müller 1998; Schröder 1998; and for a commentary Jeffery and Handl 1999), or that in France between Bourdieu, Forrester and anti-globalisation groups like ATTAC on the one hand and social liberals within the Parti Socialiste on the other (see Bourdieu 1998; Boudieu and Wacquant 1999; Forrester 1999; and for a commentary Bouvet and Michel 1999; Meunier 2000). Within the European Commission, there is evidence to suggest that common understandings of globalisation can be quite consistent with distinct conceptions of the capacity to exercise meaningful agency as actors take up quite different ‘subject positions’ in relation to globalisation (Rosamond, 1999; 2000b). **It is important**, then, at the outset **that we consider the potential causal role of ideas about globalisation in the structuration of political and economic outcomes**.3 Our central argument is, we think, likely to prove controversial. It is simply stated, though its implications are more complex. Essentially, we suggest, **policy makers acting on the basis of assumptions consistent with the hyperglobalisation thesis may well serve**, in so doing, **to bring about outcomes consistent with that thesis, irrespective of its veracity and,** indeed, irrespective of its perceived veracity**.** This provocative suggestion with, if warranted, important implications, clearly requires some justification (see also Hay 1999b; Rosamond 1999, 2000b, 2000c). **Globalisation has become** a key referent of contemporary political discourse and, increasingly, **a lens through which policy-makers view the context in which they find themselves.** **If** we can assume that political actors have no more privileged vantage point from which to understand their environment than anyone else and — as most commentators would surely concede — that **one of the principal discourses through which that environment now comes to be understood is that of globalisation, then the content of such ideas is likely to affect significantly political dynamics.**

### 3

**1. Pharma profits are up from COVID vaccines, patent waivers threaten this**

**Buchholz 5-17-21**

(Katharina, https://www.statista.com/chart/24829/net-income-profit-pharma-companies/)

The profitability of coronavirus vaccines has been in the spotlight since U.S. President Joe Biden come out in support of temporarily lifting vaccine patents to make the production of the life-saving inoculations more financially feasible for poorer countries. EU leaders meanwhile remain divided over such a move. Company financial reports show that COVID-19 vaccine makers and developers like Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer, Moderna, AstraZeneca and BioNTech have seen their profits increase since the vaccine rollout, at times majorly. In early May, stocks of several companies that benefit from COVID-19 vaccine sales **took a nosedive on the news of Biden’s reversal**. Moderna stocks, for example, were still down more than 6 percent at close on May 5, the day of the announcement. Stocks recovered somewhat as German chancellor Angela Merkel came out against patent waivers the following day. While fluctuations in the stock market price have hurt drug makers in the **short term**, patent waivers would diminish the bottom line of companies involved with the development and production of COVID-19 **vaccines in the long term**. Pharma giants like Johnson & Johnson and Pfizer bring in billions of dollars of income every quarter from diverse sources, so the COVID bump was smaller for them. In the case of Pfizer, which has been a bigger producer than J&J, the year-over-year profit increase was a handsome 44 percent, however. For smaller AstraZeneca, the COVID year meant that its profits doubled. In the case of Moderna, the past year has turned a Q1 loss into a profit. The case is similar for German company BioNTech, which collaborated with Pfizer on its COVID vaccine. While Q1 2021 brought in a profit of $1.1 billion, the company ran a deficit since its founding in 2008 up until Q4 2020, when it posted a profit for the first time. The $446 million earned stood in contrast to losses of almost $428 million accrued in the first nine months of the year.

**2. Strong IP protection spurs innovation by encouraging risk-taking and incentivizing knowledge sharing -- prefer statistical analysis of multiple studies**

**Ezell and Cory 19** [Stephen Ezell, vice president & global innovation policy @ ITIF, BS Georgetown School of Foreign Service. Nigel Cory, associate director covering trade policy @ ITIF, MA public policy @ Georgetown. "The Way Forward for Intellectual Property Internationally," Information Technology & Innovation Foundation, 4-25-2019, accessed 8-25-2021, https://itif.org/publications/2019/04/25/way-forward-intellectual-property-internationally] HWIC

IPRs Strengthen Innovation

Intellectual property rights power innovation. For instance, analyzing the level of intellectual property protections (via the World Economic Forum’s Global Competitiveness reports) and creative outputs (via the Global Innovation Index) shows that counties with stronger IP protection have more creative outputs (in terms of intangible assets and creative goods and services in a nation’s media, printing and publishing, and entertainment industries, including online), even at varying levels of development.46

IPR reforms also introduce strong incentives for domestic innovation. Sherwood, using case studies from 18 developing countries, concluded that poor provision of intellectual property rights deters local innovation and risk-taking.47 In contrast, IPR reform has been associated with increased innovative activity, as measured by domestic patent filings, albeit with some variation across countries and sectors.48 For example, Ryan, in a study of biomedical innovations and patent reform in Brazil, found that patents provided incentives for innovation investments and facilitated the functioning of technology markets.49 Park and Lippoldt also observed that the provision of adequate protection for IPRs can help to stimulate local innovation, in some cases building on the transfer of technologies that provide inputs and spillovers.50 In other words, local innovators are introduced to technologies first through the technology transfer that takes place in an environment wherein protection of IPRs is assured; then, they may build on those ideas to create an evolved product or develop alternate approaches (i.e., to innovate). Related research finds that trade in technology—through channels including imports, foreign direct investment, and technology licensing—improves the quality of developing-country innovation by increasing the pool of ideas and efficiency of innovation by encouraging the division of innovative labor and specialization.51 However, Maskus notes that without protection from potential abuse of their newly developed technologies, foreign enterprises may be less willing to reveal technical information associated with their innovations.52 The protection of patents and trade secrets provides necessary legal assurances for firms wishing to reveal proprietary characteristics of technologies to subsidiaries and licensees via contracts.

Counties with stronger IP protection have more creative outputs (in terms of intangible assets and creative goods and services in a nation’s media, printing and publishing, and entertainment industries, including online), even at varying levels of development.

The relationship between IPR rights and innovation can also be seen in studies of how the introduction of stronger IPR laws, with regard to patents, copyrights, and trademarks, affect R&D activity in an economy. Studies by Varsakelis and by Kanwar and Evenson found that R&D to GDP ratios are positively related to the strength of patent rights, and are conditional on other factors.53 Cavazos Cepeda et al. found a positive influence of IPRs on the level of R&D in an economy, with each 1 percent increase in the level of protection of IPRs in an economy (as measured by improvements to a country’s score in the Patent Rights Index) equating to, on average, a 0.7 percent increase in the domestic level of R&D.54 Likewise, a 1 percent increase in copyright protection was associated with a 3.3 percent increase in domestic R&D. Similarly, when trademark protection increased by 1 percent, there was an associated R&D increase of 1.4 percent. As the authors concluded, “Increases in the protection of the IPRs carried economic benefits in the form of higher inflows of FDI, and increases in the levels of both domestically conducted R&D and service imports as measured by licensing fees.”55 As Jackson summarized, regarding the relationship between IPR reform and both innovation and R&D, and FDI, “In addition to spurring domestic innovation, strong intellectual property rights can increase incentives for foreign direct investment which in turn also leads to economic growth.”56

**3. Biopharmaceutical innovation is key to prevent future pandemics and bioterror**

**Marjanovic and Feijao 20** [Sonja Marjanovic Ph.D., Judge Business School, University of Cambridge. Carolina Feijao, Ph.D. in biochemistry, University of Cambridge; M.Sc. in quantitative biology, Imperial College London; B.Sc. in biology, University of Lisbon. "How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis," RAND Corporation, 05-2020, accessed 8-8-2021, https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html] HWIC

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

**4. That causes extinction, which outweighs.**

**Millett & Snyder-Beattie ‘17**. Millett, Ph.D., Senior Research Fellow, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford; and Snyder-Beattie, M.S., Director of Research, Future of Humanity Institute, University of Oxford. 08-01-2017. “Existential Risk and Cost-Effective Biosecurity,” Health Security, 15(4), PubMed

In the decades to come, advanced bioweapons could **threaten human existence**. Although the **probability** of human extinction from bioweapons **may** be low, the **expected value** of **reducing** the risk could **still** be **large**, since such risks jeopardize the existence of **all future generations**. We provide an overview of biotechnological extinction risk, make some rough initial estimates for how severe the risks might be, and compare the cost-effectiveness of reducing these extinction-level risks with existing biosecurity work. We find that reducing human extinction risk can be more cost-effective than reducing smaller-scale risks, even when using conservative estimates. This suggests that the risks are not low enough to ignore and that more ought to be done to prevent the worst-case scenarios. How worthwhile is it spending resources to study and mitigate the chance of human extinction from biological risks? The risks of such a catastrophe are presumably low, so a skeptic might argue that addressing such risks would be a waste of scarce resources. In this article, we investigate this position using a cost-effectiveness approach and ultimately conclude that the expected value of reducing these risks is large, especially since such risks jeopardize the existence of all future human lives. **Historically, disease events have been responsible for the greatest death tolls** on humanity. The 1918 flu was responsible for more than 50 million deaths,1 while smallpox killed perhaps 10 times that many in the 20th century alone.2 The Black Death was responsible for killing over 25% of the European population,3 while other pandemics, such as the plague of Justinian, are thought to have killed 25 million in the 6th century—constituting over 10% of the world's population at the time.4 It is an open question whether a future pandemic could result in outright human extinction or the irreversible collapse of civilization. A skeptic would have many good reasons to think that existential risk from disease is unlikely. Such a disease would need to spread worldwide to **remote populations**, overcome **rare genetic resistances**, and **evade detection**, cures, and **countermeasures**. Even evolution itself may work in humanity's favor: **Virulence and transmission is often a trade-off**, and so **evolutionary pressures** could push against maximally lethal wild-type pathogens.5,6 While these arguments point to a very small risk of human extinction, they **do not rule** the possibility **out** entirely. Although rare, there are recorded instances of **species going extinct due to disease**—primarily in amphibians, but also in 1 mammalian species of rat on Christmas Island.7,8 **There are** also **historical examples of large human populations being almost entirely wiped out** by disease, especially when multiple diseases were simultaneously introduced into a population without immunity. The most striking examples of total population collapse include **native American tribes** exposed to European diseases, such as the Massachusett (86% loss of population), Quiripi-Unquachog (95% loss of population), and the Western Abenaki (which suffered a staggering 98% loss of population).9 In the modern context, no single disease currently exists that combines the worst-case levels of transmissibility, lethality, resistance to countermeasures, and global reach. But **many diseases are proof** of principle that **each worst-case attribute can be realized independently**. For example, some diseases exhibit nearly a 100% case fatality ratio in the absence of treatment, such as rabies or septicemic plague. Other diseases have a track record of spreading to virtually every human community worldwide, such as the 1918 flu,10 and seroprevalence studies indicate that other pathogens, such as chickenpox and HSV-1, can successfully reach over 95% of a population.11,12 Under optimal virulence theory, **natural evolution** would be an **unlikely** source for pathogens with the **highest possible levels of transmissibility, virulence, and global reach**. But **advances in biotech**nology might allow the creation of diseases that **combine such traits**. Recent controversy has **already emerged** over a number of **scientific experiments** that resulted in viruses with enhanced **transmissibility**, **lethality**, and/or the ability to overcome **therapeutics**.13-17 Other experiments demonstrated that mousepox could be modified to have a 100% case fatality rate and render a vaccine ineffective.18 In addition to transmissibility and lethality, studies have shown that other disease traits, such as incubation time, environmental survival, and available vectors, could be modified as well.19-21 Although these experiments had scientific merit and were not conducted with malicious intent, their implications are still worrying. This is especially true given that there is also a **long historical track record** of**state-run bioweapon research** applying cutting-edge science and technology to design agents not previously seen in nature. The Soviet bioweapons program developed agents with traits such as enhanced virulence, resistance to therapies, greater environmental resilience, increased difficulty to diagnose or treat, and which caused unexpected disease presentations and outcomes.22 Delivery capabilities have also been subject to the cutting edge of technical development, with Canadian, US, and UK bioweapon efforts playing a critical role in developing the discipline of aerobiology.23,24 While there is no evidence of state-run bioweapons programs directly attempting to develop or deploy bioweapons that would pose an existential risk, the logic of deterrence and **m**utually **a**ssured **d**estruction could create such incentives in more unstable political environments or following a breakdown of the Biological Weapons Convention.25 The **possibility of a war** between great powers could also increase the pressure to use such weapons—during the World Wars, bioweapons were used across multiple continents, with Germany targeting animals in WWI,26 and Japan using plague to cause an epidemic in China during WWII.27