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#### 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!

#### 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.

#### The plan’s focus on medicine trades off with a more holistic approach to healthcare – that ensures health inequities while not solving the root of the problem.

Sell and Williams, 20

[Susan K., School of Regulation and Global Governance @ The Australian National University, Political Science @ George Washington University; and Owain D., University of Queensland, Public Health: “Health under capitalism: a global political economy of structural pathogenesis,” Review of International Political Economy, 27:1 (2020), 1-25, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2019.1659842]//AD

Capitalism and private economic activity have produced new health technologies and medicines over time, while at the same time binding these welcome developments in health to supply via the global market. This has skewed the provision of health care toward an increasingly biomedical and reductive model at the expense of more holistic approaches including social determinants of health (Tseris, 2017). Privileged approaches that focus on biomedicine and silver bullets crowd out population-level health policies that address more comprehensive components of health. Governance constructs these outcomes and is co-produced by the interests in regulation and its capture (Glasgow & Schrecker, 2016).

#### The Kritik outweighs the case - Neoliberalism guarantees global inequality and planetary extinction – only a reinvestment in the collective good can solve. Gillespie 17

Gillespie 8/19 – Paul, Dr Paul Gillespie is a former foreign policy editor with The Irish Times. He currently writes a regular column for the newspaper entitled 'World View'. 8/19/17 https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/paul-gillespie-the-west-must-wean-itself-off-unsustainable-growth-1.3190914

On August 2nd the Earth reached its sustainability overshoot date for 2017. This indicator measures how through over-fishing, over-harvesting forests, over-grazing land and mostly by carbon releases we have used more than the planet can renew in a single year. The date was September 17th in 2000. The indicator is produced by the Global Footprint Network which calculates how many planets we would need to sustain the lifestyles of different countries, groups and individuals. This year we would need 1.7 planets and they reckon, on present trends, two would be needed by 2030. If everyone was to live like the average US citizen we would need five planets, like Ireland four, but like Chad, Afghanistan or Cambodia less than one. If all countries were to grow to the point of consuming as much as the wealthiest we would need 3.4 Earths to sustain us. Earth Overshoot Day is calculated by dividing the planet’s biocapacity (the estimated amount of ecological resources Earth is able to generate that year) by humanity’s ecological footprint (humanity’s estimated demand for that year). This ratio is multiplied by 365 to get the date when Earth Overshoot Day is reached. Sustainability they define as the condition in which all human beings can lead fulfilling lives without degrading the planet. Planetary ecology This is a graphic and compelling way to document and publicise the dangerous pressures on planetary ecology arising from present trends. Central to them is the pursuit of endless economic growth and insatiable consumption. There is a contradiction between these imperatives and sustainability since we only have one planet available. How then can the contradiction be resolved? A radical and original approach to these questions is offered by Jason Hickel, an anthropologist at the London School of Economics in his recent book The Divide: A Brief Guide to Global Inequality and its Solutions. He uses the footprint analyses to illustrate not only the urgent need to act but the grossly unequal impact of these trends, their deep historical roots and how they can be effectively tackled. That can only be done if the capitalist economics which makes such growth and consumption an inescapable part of our lives is challenged and superseded. Along the way he notes that in the last century we have lost 50 per cent of the world’s forests, up to 80 per cent of fish stocks and have seen 40 per cent of soil depleted by chemicals and over-cultivation. He challenges United Nations figures and claims rates of wealth rises and reductions of poverty are grossly exaggerated if environmental and social impacts are included in gross domestic product and if real living costs are also factored in. That shows the world is more unequal than normally assumed, a trend reinforced by neoliberal economics from the 1980s. Eight individuals now control more wealth than the poorest half of humanity. Sixty per cent of our species (4.3 billion people) lives on less than five dollars a day, his definition of poverty compared to the UN figures of one quarter that amount yielding an improving one billion people. The historical roots of these inequalities come from the expansion and imperial conquests associated with early European and later American capitalism from the 16th century. That reversed Indian and Chinese domination of world living standards and life expectancy up to the early 1800s. In the last century a skilful management of decolonisation alongside strategic interventions against radical reformist regimes like those in Iran, Ghana, Egypt and Chile from the 1950s to the 1970s ensured continuing Western control of world rules and power. Bracing alternative This is a well-argued and bracing alternative account of world development and sustainability. It adopts Edward Said’s notion of “contrapuntal thinking” to link the metropolitan core to the post-colonial periphery in thinking about power, political priorities and agency. Hickel supports degrowth strategies for the richest societies and shows there are sustainable ways to find wellbeing while abandoning unsustainable growth and consumption imperatives. Shorter working weeks, universal basic incomes, a global minimum wage and Tobin taxes on financial transactions could wean populations off them. This would not be another round of austerity but a step towards a more equal world, capable of overcoming the scarcity assumptions driving current economic orthodoxy and the capitalist power structures and legal dynamics built into them. They threaten to destroy the planet if not challenged and stopped soon.

#### 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.

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.

## 1NC – Developing Countries PIC

#### We will endorse the entirety of the 1AC - minus their usage of the term ‘developing’ countries, nations or otherwise.

#### Their second advantage literally adresses the “developing world’

#### The term is outdated, unnecessary, and Eurocentric, There is no consistent criteria to determine development, which means the aff has no reason to include it

**Abrahams ‘19**

(Jessica Abrahams, December 05, 2020, Abrahams received her grad degree in journalism from City University London and IR from Institut Barcelona d’Estudis Internacionals. She was a writer, researcher and editor for multiple news sources including Prospect magazine, The Telegraph and Bloomberg News, is now an editor of Devex Pro, “Is it time to retire the term “developing country”?”, [https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/world/is-it-time-to-retire-the-term-developing-country-wto-united-nations-global-inequality //](https://www.prospectmagazine.co.uk/world/is-it-time-to-retire-the-term-developing-country-wto-united-nations-global-inequality%20//) HM)

Is South Korea—[the 12th biggest economy in the world](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/ny.gdp.mktp.cd?most_recent_value_desc=false)—a developing country? It is according to its status at the **W**orld **T**rade **O**rganisation, which entitles the country to certain benefits in trade negotiations. Under pressure from the US, it announced in late October that it will no longer seek to make use of those benefits, though it declined to give up its . Other economic powers that still identify as developing, including China, are so far refusing to budge. It might seem surprising that some of the **richest countries** in the world are still **classified as** developing. But then again, pinning down the details of this nebulous term can be a challenge. Although most intergovernmental organisations use it as an official classification, few define what it means. And without a clear definition, it is arguably a term that has outlived its purpose. It might seem odd that the WTO relies on countries to self-designate. But the UN, which identifies 159 countries as developing, explains that “there is [**no established convention**](https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methods/m49/m49regin.htm#ftnc) **for** [this] **designation**… in the United Nations system.” It is largely based on the regional designations adopted as part of the Millennium Development Goals in 2000, under which North America, Europe, Japan and Australia are considered “developed”—everyone else is developing. With a focus on the economic elements of developments, the International Monetary Fund is the most specific, [taking into account](https://www.imf.org/external/pubs/ft/weo/faq.htm#q4b) a country’s per capita income level, export diversification and degree of integration into the global financial system. But even then, it notes, its classification system “is not based on strict criteria, economic or otherwise” and offers only “a reasonably meaningful method of organising data.” Part of the issue is that most of these classifications were set decades ago, and much about **the world has changed.** If these categorisations were ever fit for purpose, it is not clear that they still are.

#### The global North argues that development leads to increased quality of life to exploit the global South. It ultimately leads to more disparity.

Irfan and Lamichhane 20

M.I Mohamed Irfan and Pukar Lamichhane; Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic Language South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Central Department of Public Administration Tribhuwan University Nepal and World Health Organization Project Manager; “Understanding Development: Changing Concept and Impact on Developing Countries”; Kalam International Research Journal, Faculty of Arts and Culture at South Eastern University of Sri Lanka; April 13, 2020; <http://ir.lib.seu.ac.lk/bitstream/handle/123456789/5650/12.%20K2020%20-%2013(4)%20(114-128).pdf?sequence=1>; EMJ

Development is a multi-dimensional process involving reorganization and reorientation of entire economic as well as social system. So, development is not purely an economic phenomenon rather it is a process of improving the quality of all human lives. The dimension of development is very much diversified which includes economic, social, political, legal & institutional structures, technology in various forms, the environment, religion, the arts, and culture. There are mainly three distinct conceptualizations of development: Development as a long term process of structural societal transformation; Development as short-to-medium term outcomes and desirable targets; and Development as a dominant discourse of western modernity. There is no doubt that development itself is a western centric concept. The discourse of development made it possible for the European powers to continue the colonial domination by using the language of development. In colonial period, power was centralized and had their own agenda in social, economic and political matter and forms of capitalism were introduced and development were mainly concentrated in urban centers. Efforts at industrialization were uneven and sporadic. Natural resources were unilaterally exploited by artificially created controlled mechanism. Later on, in post-World War II period many countries freed from colonial rule. The goal of development was to raise income and give poor nations access to basic necessities. Institutional apparatus was established (e.g. World Bank, IMF) in order to channel material aid and the ideology associated with development to these countries. This ideology repeats the basic 'truth' of Enlightenment that progress is the achievement of characteristic features of the already rich societies in the West. Consequently, in the post-colonial era these institutional apparatus became the centers of power-knowledge production and also the source of channeling them to the societies outside the West. The activities of these international financial are blamed to have been mechanized to work as per the policy of limited developed countries and scholar such as Joseph Stiglitz potray severely criticizes these organizations. Various development theories were proposed by the western thinkers in post war period such as Modernization Theory, Dependency Theory, Statism, etc. Modernization Theory was argued for creating certain injustices (for developing countries) by market economies. Dependency theory argued that the first world guides third-world development through aid, investment. However, it was criticized for draining the colonies of their sources that could have been used for investment, and had killed off local capitalism through competition. That means, by siphoning surplus away from the third world, the first world had enriched itself and by keeping the third world underdeveloped the first world ensured a ready market for their finished goods and a cheap supply of raw materials for their factories. The conclusion drawn from dependency theory was that Third world countries had to sever their ties to the world economy and become more self-sufficient with autonomous national development strategies. Thus, the faith in the state as the motor for development came in light. Some argue that globalization is a western concept that has lead to the development of the economy but at the same time there is counter argument that it has lead to enhance the gap between poor and rich, means increasing disparity. There is harsh criticism that globalization has been galvanized by developed countries (North) in their own favor and has used by them as a weapon for expanding their imperialism and neo-colonialism to the developing countries (South). The concept of development has changed drastically with the change in time. At present world, development is not limited to the sphere of economic prosperity. It demands the greater dimension of social inclusion, equality, ecological conservation, human rights and sustainability. Developing countries need to stand rigidly in formation of their own indigenous policies. These countries need to be careful enough to commercialize their agriculture even through continuous government subsidy, develop rural infrastructure and build Industrial backbone and adopting globalization principles in selective manner. The most essential step for them is the real transformation of regionalism in practice. These countries can only improve their bargaining capability by standing together emphasizing on regional trade and development.

#### Development discourse forced by the West imposes ecocentrism, leading to over-exploitation of resources.

Irfan and Lamichhane 20

M.I Mohamed Irfan and Pukar Lamichhane; Faculty of Islamic Studies and Arabic Language South Eastern University of Sri Lanka, Central Department of Public Administration Tribhuwan University Nepal and World Health Organization Project Manager; “Understanding Development: Changing Concept and Impact on Developing Countries”; Kalam International Research Journal, Faculty of Arts and Culture at South Eastern University of Sri Lanka; April 13, 2020; <http://ir.lib.seu.ac.lk/bitstream/handle/123456789/5650/12.%20K2020%20-%2013(4)%20(114-128).pdf?sequence=1>; EMJ

In a retrospective look at the construction of Third World, it is explicit to understand how the language of Development has been used by the West for legitimizing its interventions over the Third World. Further these countries have been referred to in a variety of forms. Before they gained independence, they were called Backward countries and upon the gaining of independence, they became Emergent or New States. Afterwards they became Developing Countries in order to fit into the Western notion of universal development or alternatively as Underdeveloped countries in the terminology of dependency critiques. Accordingly, the concepts Third Word and Development are inventions of the economically rich nations of the West and thus, Escobar (1995) argued development has become a discourse; a particular mode of thinking and a source of practice designed to instill in underdeveloped countries the desire to strive towards industrial and economic growth. Even though the broad meaning of development is the promotion of the creativity of humans, economic growth is the primary criterion by which development is determined. That is why economics has become the master discipline of theory-building and policy formulation. In his retrospective look at development anthropology at the World Bank, Michael Cernea referred to the econocentric and technocentric conceptual biases of development strategies as profoundly damaging. These paradigmatic biases largely neglect history of civilization and the associated values. The latter were the essential elements of social harmony and the balance between man and nature. Econocentrism does not tolerate the equivalence of nature with man. Therefore, it attempts to surrender nature by means of destruction and over-exploitation. Material accumulation has been the primary goal of the econocentric and techno centric development approaches.

#### Multispecies exploitation heightens extinction pathways and rushes the inevitable extinction timer.

Thurner et. al 8-15-21

Stephanie D. Thurnera, Sarah J. Converseb, and Trevor A. Brancha; a School of Aquatic Fishery Sciences at University of Washington, bU.S. Geological Survey, Washington Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, School of Environmental and Forest Sciences & School of Aquatic and Fishery Sciences; “Modeling opportunistic exploitation: increased extinction risk when targeting more than one species”; *Ecological Modelling* Vol. 454; August 15, 2020; <http://ir.lib.seu.ac.lk/bitstream/handle/123456789/5650/12.%20K2020%20-%2013(4)%20(114-128).pdf?sequence=1>; EMJ

Although extinction itself may ultimately be inevitable, the rate at which it is occurring has been exacerbated by human activity (Bascompte, 2003). Compelling evidence shows that Earth's biota is amid its sixth mass extinction, and recent extinction rates are both unparalleled in human history and highly unusual in Earth's history (Baillie et al., 2004; Ceballos et al., 2015). Many major processes driving an increase in extinction rates are anthropogenic, including direct human exploitation, habitat loss, climate change, and introduced species (Diamond et al., 1989; Ichii et al., 2019; Keith et al., 2008; Purvis et al., 2000; Thomas et al., 2004). The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services identifies direct exploitation as the second most important driver of change in the global state of nature (Ichii et al., 2019), and biological resource use is listed as a threat for all 189 species listed as “extinct” or “extinct in the wild” on the IUCN Red List (IUCN, 2020). When exploitation is directly targeted on a single species, extinction is expected to be relatively uncommon (e.g. Grafton et al., 2007). This is because as population size decreases, search costs nearly always begin to outweigh revenue, except in obvious cases where species are extraordinarily valuable or can be easily exploited (e.g., dodos). Nevertheless, extinction and serious depletion have been reported for many exploited species, resulting in a variety of hypotheses that provide explanations for high extinction risks under single-species exploitation, including tragedy of the commons (Feeny et al., 1990, 1996; Hardin, 1968; Ostrom, 1999; Ostrom et al., 1999), economics of overexploitation (Clark, 1973; Grafton et al., 2007), the Allee effect (Allee, 1931; Stephens et al., 1999), and the anthropogenic Allee effect (Courchamp et al., 2006). Intrinsic biological factors that decrease mean individual fitness at low population sizes can also increase extinction risk, collectively termed the Allee effect (Allee, 1931; Stephens et al., 1999). Reproduction and survival can be diminished in small populations through numerous mechanisms, which include mate shortage, lack of cooperation, and genetic Allee effects such as inbreeding depression. In such cases, species can suffer reproductive failure at low densities, resulting in rapid extinction once the population falls below a minimum population size. This phenomenon has been blamed for the demise of passenger pigeons (e.g., Stephens and Sutherland, 1999). An allied hypothesis is the anthropogenic Allee effect, where instead of lower survival at low numbers, income from exploitation increases markedly at low numbers (Courchamp et al., 2006). The classic case is when rare products such as beluga sturgeon caviar become disproportionately valuable because of their rarity, allowing for profitable overexploitation. Examples of species experiencing anthropogenic Allee effects include spectacular butterflies sought by collectors, goat-antelopes (family Caprinae) sought by trophy hunters, geckos (Goniurosaurus luii) captured to be exotic pets, large game birds (Tetrao urogallus) impacted by ecotourism, and the Chinese bahaba exploited for its perceived medicinal value (Courchamp et al., 2006; Holden and McDonald-Madden, 2017). In short, sometimes people are prepared to pay exorbitant prices to hunt, collect, or own specimens of the rarest species. All preceding explanations assume single-species exploitation, but when exploitation directly targets more than one species, the number of extinction pathways expands. For example, when many species are exploited together (e.g., through fisheries trawling gear), attempting to maximize overall revenue causes some species to decline to low levels (e.g., Hilborn et al., 2012; Ricker, 1958). Three modes of exploitation can be distinguished depending on the relative value of the various species: accidental exploitation, where there is accidental by-catch while targeting a species with economic value (Hall et al., 2000; Rasmussen et al., 2011); incidental exploitation, in which a less-desirable species with lower economic value is exploited while pursuing a higher-value target species (Megalofonou, 2005); and opportunistic exploitation, where a rare species with high monetary value is stumbled upon during targeted exploitation of a more abundant, less valuable target species (Branch et al., 2013). Opportunistic exploitation allows for valuable, yet scarce, species (hereafter, rare species) to be exploited while profitably targeting another more common species, because there are reduced (or zero) search costs associated with exploitation of the rare species. Thus, in multispecies exploitation scenarios there is a continuum of extinction pathways from accidental exploitation to incidental exploitation to opportunistic exploitation as value of the vulnerable species increases relative to other targeted species. Of these three pathways, opportunistic exploitation is most problematic since this mode involves the greatest economic incentive to continue exploitation of the species most at risk (Branch et al., 2013). Consider the case where black rhinoceroses (Diceros bicornis) were hunted to extinction in the Luangwa Valley, Zambia, even though illegally poaching rhino alone was not profitable due to their rarity (Milner-Gulland and Leader-Williams, 1992). Hypotheses assuming only single-species systems cannot fully explain this extinction event. In this case, illegal poaching was profitable when elephants and rhinos were hunted together, and as rhinos became rare, elephants became the main target (Milner-Gulland and Leader-Williams, 1992). Thus, opportunistic exploitation contributed to the extinction of black rhinoceros in Zambia in the 1990s (Chomba and Matandiko, 2011).

## Trademark/Counterfeits DA

#### Counterfeit medicines related to insulin are prevalent in the squo and disproportionately affect oppressed peoples

Cheng BA LLB 09

May M. Cheng (BA LLB), Nov 2009, "Is the Drugstore Safe? Counterfeit Diabetes Products on the Shelves," PubMed Central (PMC), <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b12> // AW

Deaths caused by counterfeit medication often do not make the news in developing countries due to how commonplace such occurrences have become. Back in 1988, Dr. Dora Nkem Akunyili, a distinguished professor of pharmacology in Nigeria, witnessed the death of her 21-year-old sister due to hyperglycemia. However, it was not diabetes that killed her; it was the fake insulin supplied to her for treatment.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b11) A survey published in 2001 by the Nigerian Institute of Pharmaceutical Research indicated that some 80% of the drugs distributed in major pharmacies in Lagos, Nigeria, were counterfeit. Upon her appointment as head of the Nigerian National Agency for Food and Drug Administration and Control (NAFDAC) that same year, Dr. Akunyili became a crusader against counterfeit medicines, getting the police to raid premises, publicly burning mountains of fake drugs and putting suppliers behind bars. Her actions drew the wrath of the fake drug barons who firebombed NAFDAC's offices, and in a December 2003 ambush, six gunmen opened fire on her car. Undeterred, she has continued with a strong grassroots campaign that starts with educating consumers and involving all stakeholders, yielding impressive results. In 2006, the NAFDAC published a new survey showing a 90% decrease in the incidence of counterfeit drugs in circulation and a take of $100 million in counterfeit drugs seized and destroyed over a 5-year period.[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b11) In February of 2009, it was reported that police in China had arrested four suspects on charges of selling fake diabetes drugs that killed two patients in the remote Northwest region of Xinjiang. The fatal drugs were falsely labeled with a known local brand name and contained illegal quantities of the chemical ingredient glibenclamide, which, while used in the treatment of diabetes, in excessive quantities can cause serious low blood glucose and consequent brain damage.[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b12) Examples from developing countries are too numerous to recount. However, increasingly, the sale of counterfeit medical products in pharmacies is no longer isolated to developing countries. In recent years, there have been a number of incidents involving counterfeit blood glucose test strips for use with glucose meters being sold in licensed pharmacies in the United States. There are over 10 million Americans who measure blood glucose, many of whom rely on at-home diabetes tests to take sensitive measurements of blood sugar levels to monitor insulin requirements. OneTouch® Test Strips, manufactured by LifeScan, a Johnson & Johnson company, the world's largest consumer-health products maker, were the most successful of these products in the United States. In 2006, about one million phony OneTouch test strips turned up in at least 35 states and in a number of countries in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. These counterfeit test strip kits, manufactured in China, were found to give incorrect readings, with the potential to cause patients to inject dangerous levels of insulin.[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b13) The counterfeiters had accurately copied many elements of the test strip packaging, with the important exception of the lot number on the carton, which was incorrect, enabling the company to identify the fakes and issue public warnings.[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b13) The Chinese businessman responsible for their distribution was apprehended and convicted in a Shanghai court in August 2007 and sentenced to 3.5 years in prison, among other penalties.[14](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b14),[15](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b15) Also in 2006, Johnson & Johnson and Lifescan successfully brought civil actions in a number of countries arising from these events [for example, Johnson & Johnson et al. v. Butt et al. (2007) 162 A.C.W.S. (3d) 232 (Ont. S.C.) and Johnson & Johnson et al. v. Alexander Vega et al. (2006) QCCS 5883 (Que. S.C.)]. The counterfeit test strips were sold via two Canadian companies to a number of U.S. distributors, which in turn ended up in over 700 U.S. pharmacies.[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b16) The case underscores the burgeoning number of fake medical products entering the North American market and the danger of their infiltrating the legitimate supply chain through “gray market” channels that may act as a cover for dealing in illicit counterfeits.[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b16) In another case involving defective blood glucose test strips in the United States, criminal charges led to a guilty plea in January 2009 by the president of a recycling company in Knox, Indiana.[17](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b17) Bayer had discovered that Nor AmPlastics Recycling Inc. fraudulently sold previously recalled test strips on eBay for $3700 in profits, while Bayer was paying $8000 to recycle the diabetic glucose strips that were recalled by Bayer.[17](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b17) Officials confirmed that over 100 people had purchased the bogus strips, but there were no reports of injuries.[17](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2787054/#b17)

#### Counterfeits for hormones like insulin have the wrong amount of API – literally killing patients who think they are being treated

Williams PharmD and MSPH 14

Lakeisha Williams, Pharmd, Msph Drug Information Specialist Xavier University Of Louisiana College Of Pharmacy New Orleans, Louisiana Ellen Mcknight Pharmd Candidate, 2017 Xavier University Of Louisiana College Of Pharmacy New Orleans, Louisiana, 6-19-2014, "The Real Impact of Counterfeit Medications," No Publication, <https://www.uspharmacist.com/article/counterfeit-meds%20/> // AW

Counterfeit drugs have been defined as products deliberately and fraudulently produced and/or mislabeled with respect to identity and/or source to make it appear to be a genuine product.1-4 Counterfeit medications include drugs that contain no active pharmaceutical ingredient (API), an incorrect amount of API, an inferior-quality API, a wrong API, contaminants, or repackaged expired products.1,5 Some counterfeit medications may even be incorrectly formulated and produced in substandard conditions.5 Counterfeiting can apply to both branded pharmaceuticals and their less expensive generic counterparts.6 In fact, generic drugs are sometimes confused with counterfeit medications, which may pose an obstacle to the widespread use and acceptance of generic medications. This may create a particular challenge for pharmaceutical industries in places such as India, Europe, and Japan—countries in which generic drugs are manufactured. Moreover, any impact on generic-drug use is potentially far-reaching. It is estimated that half of all prescriptions in the United States, for example, are now filled with approved generic drugs, with expenditures estimated in the billions.6 Counterfeit Drugs: A Global Problem For years, the number of counterfeit medications that have made their way into trusted pharmacies and subsequently to patients’ medicine cabinets has been on the rise. Imagine the scenario in which a patient takes a medication for a life-threatening illness, only to become aware later that the doses contained no APIs. It is estimated that this misfortune has occurred with thousands of people worldwide and continues to happen. The growing issue of counterfeit medications is a concern not only for the patient, but also for pharmacists and pharmaceutical companies. Wertheimer et al state that the magnitude of the drug-counterfeiting problem is difficult to gauge.7 Since the crimes of producing and selling counterfeit drugs generally become known only when the perpetrators are caught, any accurate determination of prevalence is difficult.7 The World Health Organization (WHO) has estimated that 10% of global pharmaceutical commerce, or $21 billion worth, involves counterfeit drugs.7,12 Drug counterfeiting, although not a new phenomenon, has provoked greater concern because it has become so widespread in recent years.8,9 A WHO study revealed that nearly one-half (48.7%) of the documented cases of drug counterfeiting were reported in developing countries of the Western Pacific (China, the Philippines, and Vietnam), followed by developing countries grouped within WHO’s Regional Office for Africa, with 18.7%. The industrialized areas of WHO’s Regional Office for Europe came in third, with 13.6% of reported cases.10,11 It is estimated that approximately 1% of counterfeit medications are sold in the U.S, but the numbers are increasing annually.1 Most U.S. counterfeit medications are purchased online; however, others have infiltrated legitimate supply chains. Drugs Most Often Counterfeited High-demand, expensive medications such as various chemotherapeutic drugs, antibiotics, vaccines, erectile dysfunction drugs, weight loss aids, hormones, analgesics, steroids, antihistamines, antivirals, and antianxiety drugs are common counterfeiting targets.1,3,4 Among those deceived into buying counterfeit drugs are consumers who use medicines inappropriately or who seek to purchase medications at discounted prices. In addition to being very cheap to make, counterfeit medicines often closely resemble actual medications, with nearly identical labels and tablets, thus duping unsuspecting pharmacists and patients. It has been reported that oftentimes drug counterfeiters use cheap and sometimes harmful materials such as brick dust, sheetrock, and flour to create their bogus tablets.13 Pfizer reported discovering 14 of its counterfeited pharmaceutical products in at least 36 countries, including the U.S., in the first 9 months of 2009 and reportedly seized more than 11 million counterfeit tablets, capsules, and vials that year.1,14,15 Also in 2009, a U.S. government crackdown uncovered some 800 packages of counterfeit medications, including Viagra (sildenafil citrate), Vicodin (hydrocodone bitartrate and acetaminophen), and Claritin (loratadine).16 Mui and Ylan state that some of the drugs had as much as three times the amount of API than is typically prescribed, while others contained no API at all or harmful substances.16 Internet Sites the Largest Suppliers Increasing access to the Internet coupled with new methods of manufacturing and distributing illegal pharmaceuticals have created new challenges to safeguarding the legitimate pharmaceutical supply chain.2 Thousands of websites openly sell unapproved and/or counterfeit drugs, as well as prescription drugs without requiring a valid prescription, all in violation of federal and state laws. Many of these sites are hosted by U.S. registrars, accept payment by U.S. payment processors, and ship their products via U.S.-based express courier companies or the U.S. Postal Service (USPS).2 Counterfeit Drugs: A Public Health Concern Counterfeiting drugs is not only illegal, but it is also a major public health concern. Counterfeit drugs often contain the correct ingredients in incorrect quantities; however, they may also contain either a wrong API—which may even be toxic—or no active substance at all.15 Treatment with ineffective counterfeit drugs such as antibiotics can lead to the emergence of resistant organisms and may have a deleterious effect on a wide section of the population. In extreme cases, counterfeit drugs may even cause death.3 For example, it has been estimated that between 60,000 and 80,000 children in Niger with fatal falciparum malaria were treated with a counterfeit vaccine containing only chloramphenicol, an antibiotic that is generally combined with another medication, which may have resulted in more than 100 fatal infections.17, 18 As a consequence of such damaging effects, counterfeit drugs may erode public confidence in healthcare systems, healthcare professionals, the suppliers and sellers of genuine drugs, the pharmaceutical industry, and national drug regulatory authorities.4 Taking Legal Action To disrupt and dismantle illicit networks trading these harmful counterfeit drugs in the U.S. and countries such as Africa and Asia, the White House’s Counterfeit Inter-Agency Working Group has collaborated with the FDA; the Departments of Justice, State, and Commerce; and the Agency for International Development as well as both foreign and domestic law enforcement partners such as U.S. Customs and Border Protection and U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement. In order to eliminate the distribution of counterfeit drugs, the combined efforts of these agencies have implemented strategies that include partnerships with the private sector to secure supply chains and share intelligence; identify, seize, forfeit, and destroy products that infringe trademarks and copyrights; and levy monetary penalties and enforce laws at the U.S. border.2 The FDA is working with law enforcement agencies and USPS inspectors to secure the global drug-supply chain by identifying drugs that are most likely to be counterfeited, contaminated, or adulterated and targeting shipments of these drugs for additional inspection.1 In addition, anticounterfeiting initiatives in other countries have been launched, including the Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement—an initiative between the European Union, Japan, the U.S., and Switzerland. Other efforts to thwart counterfeiting include the World Customs Organization’s Provisional Standards Employed by Customs for Uniform Rights Enforcement, G-8 Countries’ Initiatives on Counterfeits, World Intellectual Property Organization’s Advisory Committee on Enforcement, and Security and Prosperity Partnership, an initiative between Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.6 Anticounterfeiting Technologies Many anticounterfeiting technologies are being utilized by pharmaceutical companies to ensure distribution of the authentic product from the manufacturing site to the pharmacy.1 Among these technologies used by pharmaceutical manufacturers are holograms, color-shifting inks, and embedded codes, images, and dyes.1 These anticounterfeiting features allow pharmacists to identify suspicious medications as possible counterfeits. Protecting Consumers According to the Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America, consumers who purchase medications online should avoid the following: sites that are located outside of the U.S. that do not indicate any physical address; sites that do not have a license by the relevant State Boards of Pharmacy; sites without a licensed pharmacist to answer questions; and websites that do not require a prescription.8,10 Consumers who wish to purchase drugs over the Internet should look for websites that have the Verified Internet Pharmacy Practice Sites seal. These sites, which are created by the National Association of Boards of Pharmacy, are licensed pharmacies selling FDA-approved medications to discourage the sale of counterfeit drugs from illegitimate online sources.5 Role of the Pharmacist Pharmacists are vital in ensuring the safety of medications used by patients. Furthermore, they are responsible for the integrity of the supply chain, ranging from manufacturer to distributor and, ultimately, to the patient. Specifics on how pharmacists, pharmacy students, and technicians can combat counterfeit medications are shown in TABLE 1.1,11 Conclusion Counterfeit medications may be detrimental to a patient’s health status. The use of substandard drugs may result in adverse side effects, treatment failure, resistance, toxicity, and even death. It is important that pharmaceutical companies, healthcare professionals, pharmacists, and patients be educated about counterfeit medications and the laws being enforced to prevent this crime. With increased awareness and the promotion of global health, the growing threat of counterfeit medications may begin to decline.