## 1.

### T – Hauntology

#### Interpretation and Violation- the aff needs to defend a concrete action that results in their method, they don’t mandate a concrete action but only defends a hauntological investigation of the Hospital System.

#### B. This Procedural is a Voter

#### 1. Aff Conditionality- by not defending concrete action, the aff can clarify or change their method, allowing them to shift at will, which kills clash and cost benefit analysis

#### 2. Predictable Limits- the aff explodes limits by introducing an infinite amount of methods and because there has been no discussion of their method in relation to the topic, kills research skills and education

#### 3. Predictable Ground- the aff’s vague method allows them to spike out of any DA and K links by claiming they are not that method, a concrete action is key, kills clash and competition

#### 4. their method divorces us from Topic Education – nitty gritty debates on details of medicine and health policy informs and educates debaters and enables critical analysis which solves their offense. Form over Content doesn’t take it out since we don’t restrict Form, just the substantive burden of the Aff.

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

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

#### 5. concrete actions are key, methods shouldn’t come first – they are a means to an end. Treating method as an exclusive endpoint legitimizes the very thing they are critiquing

**Fearon and Wendt,** Professor of Poli Sci at Stanford and Professor of IR at Ohio State**,2002**

(James and Alexander, *Handbook of International Relations*, ed. Carlsnaes, p.68)

It should be stressed **that in advocating a pragmatic view** we are not endorsing method**-driven social science.** Too much researchin international relations **chooses problems of things to be explained with a view to whether the analysis will provide support for one or another methodological ‘ism’. But the point of** IR **scholarship shou**l**d be to answer questions** about international politics **that are of great normative concern,** not to validate methods**. Methods are means,** not ends in themselves. As a matter of personal scholarly choice **it may be reasonable to stick with one method and see how far it takes us. But since we do not know how far that is, if the goal of the discipline is insight** into world politics then **it makes** little sense **to rule out one or the** other approach **on a priori grounds. In that case a method indeed becomes a** tacit ontology**, which may lead to** neglect of **whatever** problems **it is poorly suited to address.** Being conscious about those choices is why it is important to distinguish between the ontological, empirical, and pragmatic levels of the rationalist-constructivist debate. We favor the pragmatic approach on heuristic grounds, but we certainly believe a conversation should continue on all three levels.

#### TVA – read a pharma bad aff that reduces IPPs that prop up higher income countries and predatory corporations – pairing their analysis with material solutions solves their impacts but creates a better model of debate.

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

#### Drop the Debater – DTA decks norming and force late breaking 1ar restarts that favor the aff with a 7-6 time skew.

#### **Not specifying the actor and/or method of the aff is a voting issue - decimates core neg ground and nuanced method debates - Cross X is too late for the 1NC strat. At worst let neg choose their actor/method off passing the resolution and stick them with WTO**

## 2.

### CP

#### Counterplan Text – The member nations of the WTO ought to

#### - Critically interrogate the abuse of ghosts in hospitals

#### - Consult the World Health Organization on whether or not to do the Plan.

#### - The World Health Organization ought to publicly declare that their decision on the Plan will represent their future decisions on all intellectual property protections on medicines.

#### - Mandate and Increase analysis of the ethics of hospitals and healthcare

#### The Plan’s unilateral action by the WTO on medical IP undermines WHO legitimacy and silences them into a ghost – forcing a perception of WHO action against Patents is key to re-assert their voice and forefronts analysis of medicine – they say yes.

Rimmer 4, Matthew. "The race to patent the SARS virus: the TRIPS agreement and access to essential medicines." Melbourne Journal of International Law 5.2 (2004): 335-374.

<https://law.unimelb.edu.au/__data/assets/pdf_file/0007/1681117/Rimmer.pdf> (BA (Hons), LLB (Hons) (Australian National University), PhD (New South Wales); Lecturer at ACIPA, the Faculty of Law, The Australian National University)//SidK + Elmer

The WHO has been instrumental in coordinating the international network of research on the SARS virus. It has emphasised the need for collaboration between the network participants. The WHO presented the containment of the SARS virus as ‘one of the biggest success stories in public health in recent years’.206 However, it **was less active in the debate over patent law** and public health epidemics. The 56th World Health Assembly considered the relationship between intellectual property, innovation and public health. It stressed that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.207 However, there was much disagreement amongst the member states as to what measures would be appropriate. The WHO has made a number of aspirational statements about patent law and access to essential medicines. Arguably, though, the organisation could be a much more informed and vocal advocate. Initially, the WHO did not view the patent issues related to SARS as being within its field of activities. The agency didnoteven seem aware of the patent proceedings, leaving individual research institutions without guidance. Spokesman Dick Thompson said: ‘What we care about is [that] the international collaboration continues to function. Patents, they don’t really concern us’.208 The director of WHO’s Global Influenza project, Klaus Stöhr, expressed his opinion that the patent filings would not interfere with the international cooperation on the SARS research: ‘I don’t think this will undermine the collaborative spirit of the network of labs’.209 However, he believed that, after the international network of researchers had identified the coronavirus, it was necessary to rely upon companies to commercialise such research. Klaus Stöhr conceded: ‘At a certain point of time you have to give way for competitive pharmaceutical companies’.210 On a policy front, the WHO remained deferential to the WTO over the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines, observing: Owing to the inconclusive nature of the studies conducted to date, and because of the effect that potentially significant price increases could have on access to drugs in poor countries, WHO is currently monitoring and evaluating the effects of TRIPS on the prices of medicines. It is also monitoring the TRIPS impact on other important issues such as transfer of technology, levels of research and development for drugs for neglected diseases, and the evolution of generic drug markets.211 In such a statement, the WHO appears diffident, unwilling to take on more than a spectator role. Such a position is arguably too timid, given the gravity of national emergencies, such as the SARS virus. The organisation could take a much stronger stance on the impact of the **TRIPS** Agreement on public health concerns. The WHO has since enunciated a position statement on the patenting of the SARS virus. A number of high ranking officials from the organisation have commented on the need to ensure that international research into the SARS virus is not impeded by competition over patents. Arguably though, the WHO **should not be limited to a mere spectator role in such policy discussions. It** needstoplay an active advocacy role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. The WHO released a position statement on ‘Patent Applications for the SARS Virus and Genes’ on 29 May 2003.212 The organisation stressed that it had no per se objection to the patenting of the SARS virus: Some people have objected to the SARS patent applications on the ground that the virus and its genes should not be patentable because they are mere discoveries, not inventions. This distinction no longer prevents the granting of patents; the novel claim rests not with the virus itself but with its isolation, and likewise with the identification of the genetic sequence not its mere occurrence. Many patents have been issued on viruses and genetic sequences, though the appropriate policies to follow in such cases — particularly as genomic sequencing becomes more routine and less ‘inventive’ — remain matters of dispute.213 Furthermore, it recognised that public institutions could legitimately use patents as a defensive means to prevent undue commercial exploitation of the research: The “defensive” use of patents can be a legitimate part of researchers’ efforts to make their discoveries (and further discoveries derived therefrom) widely available to other researchers, in the best collaborative traditions of biomedical science.214 The WHO affirmed the need for further cooperation between research organisations in respect of the SARS virus: ‘For continued progress against SARS, it is essential that we nurture the spirit of the unprecedented, global collaboration that rapidly discovered the novel virus and sequenced its genome’.215 The WHO announced its intention to monitor the effects of patents (and patent applications) on the speed with which SARS diagnostic tests, treatments, and vaccines are developed and made available for use, and on the manner in which prices are set for these technologies. It observed: In the longer term, the manner in which SARS patent rights are pursued could have a profound effect on the willingness of researchers and public health officials to collaborate regarding future outbreaks of new infectious diseases. WHO will therefore examine whether the terms of reference for such collaborations need to be modified to ensure that the credit for any intellectual property developed is appropriately attributed, that revenues derived from licensing such property are devoted to suitable uses, and that legitimate rewards for innovative efforts do not impose undue burdens on efforts to make tests, therapies, and preventive measure available to all.216 It maintained that in order to tackle new public health problems with international impact, such as the emergence of severe acute respiratory syndrome (SARS), access to new medicines with potential therapeutic effect, and health innovations and discoveries should be universally available without discrimination.219 The Assembly requested that the Director-General continue to support Member States in the exchange and transfer of technology and research findings, according high priority to access to antiretroviral drugs to combat HIV/AIDS and medicines to control tuberculosis, malaria and other major health problems, in the context of paragraph 7 of the Doha Declaration which promotes and encourages technology transfer.220 The WHO also considered a report on the emergence of the SARS virus and the international response to the infectious disease.221 It was ‘deeply concerned that SARS ... poses a serious threat to global health security, the livelihood of populations, the functioning of health systems, and the stability and growth of economies’.222 The Committee on Infectious Diseases requested that the Director-General ‘mobilize global scientific research to improve understanding of the disease and to develop control tools such as diagnostic tests, drugs and vaccines that are accessible to and affordable by Member States’.223 The Director-General of the WHO, Dr Gro Harlem Brundtland, **told the World Health** Assembly that there was a need to build trust and forge solidarity in the face of public health epidemics: ‘**Ensuring that patent regimes stimulate research and do not hinder international scientific cooperation** is a critical challenge — whether the target is SARS or any other threat to human health’.224 Similarly, Dr Marie-Paule Kieny, Director of the WHO Initiative for Vaccine Research, said: If we are to develop a SARS vaccine more quickly than usual, we have to continue to work together on many fronts at once, on scientific research, intellectual property and patents issues, and accessibility. It is a very complicated process, involving an unprecedented level of international cooperation, which is changing the way we work.225 She emphasised that patents and intellectual property issues and their safeguards can help rather than hinder the rapid development of SARS vaccines and ensure that, once developed, they are available in both industrialised and developing countries.226 C Summary The WHO should play a much more active role in the policy debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. James Love, the director of the Consumer Project on Technology, run by Ralph Nader, is critical of the WHO statement on ‘Intellectual Property Rights, Innovation, and Public Health’.227 He maintains that the Assembly could have addressed ‘practical examples, like SARS’ and cites the report in The Washington Post that notes that a number of commercial companies are investing in SARS research.228 The non-government organisation Médecins Sans Frontières has been critical in the past of the passive role played by the WHO in the debate over access to essential medicines: ‘As the world’s leading health agency, and armed with the clear mandate of recent World Health Assembly resolutions, the WHO can and should **do much more’**.229 The WHO should become a vocal advocate for public health concerns at the WTO and its TRIPS Council — especially in relation to patent law and the SARS virus. It must staunchly defend the rights of member states to incorporate measures in their legislation that protect access to medicines — such as compulsory licensing, parallel imports, and measures to accelerate the introduction of generic pharmaceutical drugs. It needs to develop a clearer vision on global equity pricing for essential medicines. The race to patent the SARS virus seems to be an inefficient means of allocating resources. A number of public research organisations — including the BCCA, the CDC and HKU — were compelled to file patents in respect of the genetic coding of the SARS virus. Such measures were promoted as ‘defensive patenting’ — a means to ensure that public research and communication were not jeopardised by commercial parties seeking exclusive private control. However, there are important drawbacks to such a strategy. The filing of patents by public research organisations may be prohibitively expensive. It will also be difficult to resolve the competing claims between the various parties — especially given that they were involved in an international research network together. Seth Shulman argues that there is a need for international cooperation and communication in dealing with public health emergencies such as the SARS virus: The success of a global research network in identifying the pathogen is an example of the huge payoff that can result when researchers put aside visions of patents and glory for their individual laboratories and let their work behave more like, well, a virus. After all, the hallmark of an opportunistic virus like the one that causes SARS is its ability to spread quickly. Those mounting a response need to disseminate their information and innovation just as rapidly.230 There is a danger that such competition for patent rights may undermine trust and cooperation within the research network. Hopefully, however, such concerns could be resolved through patent pooling or joint ownership of patents. Furthermore, a number of commercial companies have filed patent applications in respect of research and development into the SARS virus. There will be a need for cooperation between the public and private sectors in developing genetic tests, vaccines, and pharmaceutical drugs that deal with the SARS virus. There is also a need to reform the patent system to deal with international collaborative research networks — such as that created to combat the SARS virus. Several proposals have been put forward. There has been a renewed debate over whether patents should be granted in respect of genes and gene sequences. Some commentators have maintained that the SARS virus should fall within the scope of patentable subject matter — to promote research and development in the field. However, a number of critics of genetic technology have argued that the SARS virus should not be patentable because it is a discovery of nature, and a commercialisation of life. There has been a discussion over the lack of harmonisation over the criteria of novelty and inventive step between patent regimes. As Peter Yu comments, ‘[w]hile [the] US system awards patents to those who are the first to invent, the European system awards patents to those who are the first to file an application’.231 There have been calls for the requirement of utility to be raised. There have also been concerns about prior art, secret use and public disclosure. Representative Lamar Smith of Texas has put forward the CREATE Act, which recognises the collaborative nature of research across multiple institutions. Such reforms are intended to ensure that the patent system is better adapted to deal with the global nature of scientific inquiry. The race to patent the SARS virus also raises important questions about international treaties dealing with access to essential medicines. The public health epidemic raises similar issues to other infectious diseases — such as AIDS, malaria, tuberculosis, influenza, and so forth. The WHO made a public statement about its position on the patenting of the SARS virus. It has stated that it will continue to monitor developments in this field. Arguably, there is a need for the WHO to play a larger role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. Not only could it mediate legal disputes over patents in respect of essential medicines, it could be a vocal advocate in policy discussions. The WTO has also played an important role in the debate over patent law and access to essential medicines. A number of public interest measures could be utilised to secure access to patents relating to the SARS virus including compulsory licensing, parallel importation and research exceptions. The appearance of the SARS virus shows that there should be an open-ended interpretation of the scope of diseases covered by the Doha Declaration on the TRIPS Agreement and Public Health. Important lessons should be learned from the emergence of the SARS virus, and the threat posed to global health. As the World Health Report 2003 notes: SARS will not be the last new disease to take advantage of modern global conditions. In the last two decades of the 20th century, new diseases emerged at the rate of one per year, and this trend is certain to continue. Not all of these emerging infections will transmit easily from person to person as does SARS. Some will emerge, cause illness in humans and then disappear, perhaps to recur at some time in the future. Others will emerge, cause human illness and transmit for a few generations, become attenuated, and likewise disappear. And still others will emerge, become endemic, and remain important parts of our human infectious disease ecology.232 Already, in 2004, there have been worries that pharmaceutical drug companies and patent rights are impeding efforts to prevent an outbreak of bird flu — avian influenza.233 There is a need to ensure that the patent system is sufficiently flexible and adaptable to cope with the appearance of new infectious diseases.234

#### 1st and 4th plank solve their offense – forefronts their analysis but ties it to material change.

#### Perm is Severance - Severs Resolved – voter for Fairness and Clash since it arbitrarily shifts the 1AR which makes them a moving target to avoid all Neg Ground.

**Websters Revised Dictionary 96** https://www.definitions.net/definition/resolved#:~:text=Webster%20Dictionary,man%20resolved%20to%20be%20rich

RESOLVED MEANS “**HAVING A FIXED PURPOSE**; DETERMINED; RESOLUTE”)

#### “Ought to” proves uncertainty counterplans are competitive. Net benefit – certainty is a da to the aff’s ability to access interrogation because it means we’re not open to ghosts or different spectral interpretations of the past.

Cambridge Dictionary. https://dictionary.cambridge.org/us/dictionary/english/ought-to

used to express something that you expect will happen: He ought to be home by seven o'clock. They ought to have arrived at lunchtime but the flight was delayed. If you show the receipt, there ought not to be any difficulty getting your money back.

#### WHO Cred key to medicine access is critical and Global Right to Health Solves –Nothing in the 1AC specifies why using WTO legitimacy is good.

Bluestone 3, Ken. "Strengthening WHO's position should be a priority for the new Director-General." The Lancet 361.9351 (2003): 2. (Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO))//Elmer

To meet these challenges, WHO must strengthen its resolve to maintain its **independence and lead its member states**, **even at the risk of causing controversy**. A meaningful example is the role that WHO can have in **ensuring access to medicines** for the world’s poorest people. WHO is the only global institution that has the **remit to drive this agenda forward**, yet has failed to do so convincingly. The new Director-General must support and reinvigorate the advocacy efforts of the organisation and provide a proper counterbalance to the interests of the pharmaceutical industry and wealthy member states. As the new Director-General takes office, they will face the dual challenge of **seeing that** the broadest possible public health interpretation of the World Trade Organization’s Doha Agreement on Trade Related Aspects on Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) **is not lost, and** of seizing an opportunity to bring about an international framework for sustainable and predictable tiered pricing of medicines. Without the active intervention of a public health advocate at the level of WHO, there is a risk that both of these initiatives **could founder.** Some people in positions of power still do not have high expectations of WHO or its new Director-General. But for the world’s poorest people, the overwhelming majority of whom live in developing countries, this person’s legacy could literally make the difference between life and death. Ken Bluestone Senior Policy Adviser, Voluntary Service Overseas (VSO)

New leader should re-establish WHO’s credibility The credibility of WHO’s advocacy of the right to health for all has been eroded in recent years. A large reason is WHO’s **failure to challenge the pharmaceutical** industry on access to medicines for people with HIV/AIDS and other diseases. WHO’s collaboration with the industry in the “Accelerated Access” programme on antiretroviral medicines sounds good. In fact, the programme has served as a cover for the organisation’s frequent acceptance of industry arguments for restricting treatment access. To re-establish WHO’s credibility, the new Director-General must lead the organisation to stand consistently with those most deprived of health services. Kenneth Roth, Executive Director, Human Rights Watch.

#### Right to Health solves Nationalist Populism.

Friedman 17 Eric Friedman March 2017 “New WHO Leader Will Need Human Rights to Counter Nationalistic Populism” <https://www.hhrjournal.org/2017/03/new-who-leader-will-need-human-rights-to-counter-populism/> (JD, Project Leader of the Platform for a Framework Convention on Global Health at the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law at the Georgetown University Law Center in Washington, DC)//Elmer

The need for WHO leadership on human rights—and for global leadership on health and human rights beyond WHO—has always been present, yet has become ever more pressing. A reactionary, nationalist populism has been gaining momentum, particularly in the United States and parts of Europe, and some of its most disturbing features, such as xenophobia and disregard for international law and institutions, are surfacing elsewhere. Persisting health challenges—such as immense national and global health inequities, with universal health coverage and the Sustainable Development Goals offering some hope of lessening them—and growing threats such as outbreaks of infectious disease, worsening antimicrobial resistance, and climate change demand the type of leadership that the right to health entails. In this immensely challenging environment, WHO needs to become a 21st century institution that has the gravitas and credibility to carve a path through these obstacles towards global health justice. The next WHO Director-General, to be elected in May, must lead the organization there. The right to health can light the way ahead, with reforms to, and driven by, WHO. These reforms must develop an internal governance that is far more welcoming of civil society, with WHO member states significantly increasing contributions so work on the social determinants of health can expand, and with enhanced transparency and accountability. Furthermore, reforms are needed so that WHO leads on global health equity and human rights, including through national health equity strategies and, above all, the Framework Convention on Global Health (FCGH). The FCGH could help bring the right to health to the next level by capturing core aspects of the right to health, such as: 1) participation and accountability, setting clear standards for people’s participation in health policy-making at all levels, and establishing multi-layered health accountability frameworks with standards to which all nations would be held; 2) equity, including by catalyzing national health equity strategies—which must be developed through broad participation, itself a potentially empowering process—and advancing data disaggregation and more equitable financing; 3) financial resources, with global norms on national and international health financing responsibilities; and 4) respecting and promoting the right to health in all policies, from setting standards on health impact assessments—including participatory processes in developing them, human rights standards, an equity focus, and follow-up processes—to firmly ensuring the primacy of the right to health in other legal regimes that may undermine. From an earlier WHO treaty, the Framework Convention on Tobacco Control, we know the power of international law to significantly advance health, with the transformative power of legally binding global health norms. As a treaty, the FCGH would increase political accountability and accountability through the courts, while helping protect health other treaty-based international regimes, such as trade. It would also be a bold assertion of global solidarity for global justice, as so urgently needed, “demonstrating that the community of nations are indeed stronger together.” One candidate for the WHO Director-General election, David Nabarro, has recognized the value and civil society support that FCGH has already received, and the need to further explore the treaty (mentioned at 1:46:38 mark). A good first step would be establishing a WHO working group on the FCGH, with broad participation, particularly from states, civil society, and representatives of communities most affected by health inequities, along with relevant international agencies. We see signs of resistance of the dangerous nationalist populism, from protests that persist and judicial checks on one of the administration’s vilest acts (an immigration and refugee travel ban, with its effects falling heaviest on Muslims) in the United States to the rejection of the far-right candidate in the elections in the Netherland. Such resistance can prevent some of the worst impacts on the right to health, from discrimination against migrants to cuts to programs vital for health. Meanwhile, let’s construct an edifice for the future of health and human rights, even as we stand against its destruction. WHO, right to health, and FCGH leadership ought to be a core part of that endeavor.

#### Populism is an existential threat and the CP solves Authoritarianism

de Waal 16 Alex de Waal 12-5-2016 “Garrison America and the Threat of Global War” <http://bostonreview.net/war-security-politics-global-justice/alex-de-waal-garrison-america-and-threat-global-war> (Executive Director of the World Peace Foundation at the Fletcher School at Tufts University)//Elmer

Polanyi recounts how economic and financial crisis led to global calamity. Something similar could happen today. In fact we are already in a steady unpicking of the liberal peace that glowed at the turn of the millennium. Since approximately 2008, the historic decline in the number and lethality of wars appears to have been reversed. Today’s wars are not like World War I, with formal declarations of war, clear war zones, rules of engagement, and definite endings. But they are wars nonetheless. What does a world in global, generalized war look like? We have an unwinnable “war on terror” that is metastasizing with every escalation, and which has blurred the boundaries between war and everything else. We have deep states—built on a new oligarchy of generals, spies, and private-sector suppliers—that are strangling liberalism. We have emboldened middle powers (such as Saudi Arabia) and revanchist powers (such as Russia) rearming and taking unilateral military action across borders (Ukraine and Syria). We have massive profiteering from conflicts by the arms industry, as well as through the corruption and organized crime that follow in their wake (Afghanistan). We have impoverishment and starvation through economic warfare, the worst case being Yemen. We have “peacekeeping” forces fighting wars (Somalia). We have regional rivals threatening one another, some with nuclear weapons (India and Pakistan) and others with possibilities of acquiring them (Saudi Arabia and Iran). Above all, today’s generalized war is a conflict of destabilization, with big powers intervening in the domestic politics of others, buying influence in their security establishments, bribing their way to big commercial contracts and thereby corroding respect for government, and manipulating public opinion through the media. Washington, D.C., and Moscow each does this in its own way. Put the pieces together and a global political market of rival plutocracies comes into view. Add virulent reactionary populism to the mix and it resembles a war on democracy. What more might we see? Economic liberalism is a creed of optimism and abundance; reactionary protectionism feeds on pessimistic scarcity. If we see punitive trade wars and national leaders taking preemptive action to secure strategic resources within the walls of their garrison states, then old-fashioned territorial disputes along with accelerated state-commercial grabbing of land and minerals are in prospect. We could see mobilization against immigrants and minorities as a way of enflaming and rewarding a constituency that can police borders, enforce the new political rightness, and even become electoral vigilantes. Liberal multilateralism is a system of seeking common wins through peaceful negotiation; case-by-case power dealing is a zero-sum calculus. We may see regional arms races, nuclear proliferation, and opportunistic power coalitions to exploit the weak. In such a global political marketplace, we would see middle-ranking and junior states rewarded for the toughness of their bargaining, and foreign policy and security strategy delegated to the CEOs of oil companies, defense contractors, bankers, and real estate magnates. The United Nations system appeals to leaders to live up to the highest standards. The fact that they so often conceal their transgressions is the tribute that vice pays to virtue. A cabal of plutocratic populists would revel in the opposite: applauding one another’s readiness to tear up cosmopolitan liberalism and pursue a latter-day mercantilist naked self-interest. Garrison America could opportunistically collude with similarly constituted political-military business regimes in Russia, China, Turkey, and elsewhere for a new realpolitik global concert, redolent of the early nineteenth-century era of the Congress of Vienna, bringing a façade of stability for as long as they collude—and war when they fall out. And there is a danger that, in response to a terrorist outrage or an international political crisis, President Trump will do something stupid, just as Europe’s leaders so unthinkingly strolled into World War I. The multilateral security system is in poor health and may not be able to cope. Underpinning this is a simple truth: the plutocratic populist order is a future that does not work. If illustration were needed of the logic of hiding under the blanket rather than facing difficult realities, look no further than Trump’s readiness to deny climate change. We have been here before, more or less, and from history we can gather important lessons about what we must do now. The importance of defending civility with democratic deliberation, respecting human rights and values, and maintaining a commitment to public goods and the global commons—including the future of t he planet—remain evergreen. We need to find our way to a new 1945—and the global political settlement for a tamed and humane capitalism—without having to suffer the catastrophic traumas of trying everything else first.

Preventing death is a prior question to all other ethical theories.

Craig **Paterson** (20**03**, Department of Philosophy, Providence College, Rhode Island. “A Life Not Worth Living?”, Studies in Christian Ethics, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15000090/)

Contrary to those accounts, I would argue that it is death per se that is really the objective evil for us, not because it deprives us of a prospective future of overall good judged better than the alter- native of non-being. It cannot be about harm to a former person who has ceased to exist, for no person actually suffers from the sub-sequent non-participation. Rather, death in itself is an evil to us because it ontologically destroys the current existent subject — it is the ultimate in metaphysical lightening strikes.80 The evil of death is truly an ontological evil borne by the person who already exists, independently of calculations about better or worse possible lives. Such an evil need not be consciously experienced in order to be an evil for the kind of being a human person is. Death is an evil because of the change in kind it brings about, a change that is destructive of the type of entity that we essentially are. Anything, whether caused naturally or caused by human intervention (intentional or unintentional) that drastically interferes in the process of maintaining the person in existence is an objective evil for the person. What is crucially at stake here, and is dialectically supportive of the self-evidency of the basic good of human life, is that death is a radical interference with the current life process of the kind of being that we are. In consequence, death itself can be credibly thought of as a ‘primitive evil’ for all persons, regardless of the extent to which they are currently or prospectively capable of participating in a full array of the goods of life.81 In conclusion, concerning willed human actions, it is justifiable to state that any intentional rejection of human life itself cannot therefore be warranted since it is an expression of an ultimate disvalue for the subject, namely, the destruction of the present person; a radical ontological good that we cannot begin to weigh objectively against the travails of life in a rational manner. To deal with the sources of disvalue (pain, suffering, etc.) we should not seek to irrationally destroy the person, the very source and condition of all human possibility.82

## Case

### ROB – Better Debater

#### Counter-role of the ballot is to vote for the better debater. Anything else is arbitrary, self-serving, and begs the question of the ballot. Our ROB allows for the most clash and subsumes theirs.

## LBL

### method

#### Their advocacy – their street evidence

#### 1] They should defend the material consequences or 1] Presumption – All the Aff does is affirm an already existing movement and an ideological orientation that leads to no material action, 2] Clash – We can’t engage you because you’ll just no link all our Disads, Kritiks, turns etc. by re-interpreting the 1AC since you’re not tied to any one action – destroys ability for activism since activist K v K debates rely on debates over methodologies which the Aff decks

#### 2] There is zero role for the neg – reading the aff or literature outside of round solves the analysis, 1AC has no warrant why debating about it is good.

#### 3] Trauma DA – Spectral analysis sparks traumatic memories and mandates engagement with bad experiences – I have chronic health issues and my worst experiences have been at a hospital – it o/w any intellectual net benefit of the aff since it precludes people from engaging the aff and excludes actual ghosts.

#### On Zemblyas –

#### 1] it freezes action – it says that “the past is incomplete”and shows they continually engage in deconstructing since there are literally infinite different narratives which ignores preventable violence in the squo

#### 2] double-turn – their analysis “cannot be articulated in the languages” which proves that their rhetorical reading in debate does NOTHING since it collapses back into language and makes their impact inevitable.

#### On Auchter –

#### 1] Cooption- these forms of narratives are always coopted by capitalism- proven by movies like the ghosts in Pocahontas and Coco.

#### 2] materialism DA – their focus on solely narratives prevents any material or exportable activity and priorities armchair abstraction which doesn’t solve violence

### Underview

#### On Heron – materiality first

#### 1] Distancing DA – analyzing the consequences of material actions trains debaters to take responsibility for what we perpetuate via the government instead of distancing ourselves from the state which results in apathy and turns their model

#### 2] backlash DA – conservatives are cracking down on critical literature which is a solvency deficit on the advocacy since they cant make a difference and turns the aff since they are targeted for their movement

#### 3] epistemology is bad – trains debaters to analyze minutia which trades off with external analysis. Only our model allows a large scope of clash while remaining nuanced enough to include questions of scholarship.

#### **On Santos –**

#### 1] This card isn’t about UTIL is about the west’s colonialism

#### 2] Death and genocide are still bad which is what their impacts rely on.

#### Sin flows neg –

#### Ontology based policy-making is explicitly what we advocate for

### Hauntology Bad

#### Haunting metaphors reassert colonial power – forces assimilation and glosses over the material existence of those affected

Cameron, 08 (Emilie, Department of Geography at Queen’s University, “Indigenous spectrality and the politics of postcolonial ghost stories,” Cultural Geographies, July 11, 2008, <http://cgj.sagepub.com/content/15/3/383>, AW)

The very slipperiness and indeterminacy of haunting makes it amenable to a great variety of invocations and seems to capture something of the unfinished, contested nature of colonial and postcolonial geographies, but in this essay I ask what risks are involved in deploying a ‘spectrogeographical’ lens in studies of the colonial and postcolonial, and particularly in figuring Indigenous bodies, voices, and histories in ghostly terms. If, as Haraway notes, we inevitably read the world through tropes, we can still choose ‘less-deadly version[s] for moral discourse’,11 and at a time when spectral metaphors are proliferating, it seems crucial to interrogate the ‘deadliness’ of this particular line of thought. I would like to make a contribution along these lines by drawing attention to the longer history of haunting tropes in Canada and their re-emergence in the past decade or so in, among other places, a wilderness park in southwestern British Columbia. My intent is to draw points of connection between past and present hauntologies and interrogate the positionality of those who figure Indigenous peoples in ghostly terms. I will argue that allegorical representations of Indigenous peoples as ghosts haunting the Canadian state reinscribe colonial relations even as they are characterized as ‘post’ colonial expressions of recognition and redress, raising questions about the politics of postcolonial ghost stories. In a recent review of the proliferation of haunting metaphors in Canadian cultural production, Goldman and Saul cite Canadian settler-author Catherine Parr Traill’s declaration that ‘ghosts or spirits… appear totally banished from Canada. This is too matter-of-fact a country for such supernaturals to visit’.12 Traill made this claim in 1833, but it was echoed by poet and critic Earle Birney in 1947 when he stated that ‘it’s only by our lack of ghosts we’re haunted’.13 Birney was referring to certain Canadians’ preoccupation with their apparent ‘lack’ of history in comparison to their American neighbours, a matter of particular nationalist concern that has defined Canadian cultural production for decades. Such claims to ‘ghostlessness’, however, are more the exception than the rule. Northey14 argues that, in fact, ghosts have been at the center of nation-building projects in Canada for a long while, beginning in the nineteenth century. In particular, and of relevance to this essay, Bentley15 argues that ghosts have been instrumental figures in efforts to connect Aboriginality with settler history, creating an aesthetic link between the ‘Indian past’ and the settler present. The Aboriginal ghost has been used to evoke a generalized sense of history in the Canadian landscape, but always with a sense of linearity and succession. It is assumed that Aboriginal ghosts are all that remains of the ‘disappearing Indian’, and that settler-Canadians have inherited this rich land from those who have now ‘passed’. The ‘spectral native’ was a particularly common figure among the Confederation poets, a group of writers working at the turn of the twentieth century who aimed to cultivate a uniquely Canadian literary voice and articulate the grounds for a budding Canadian nationalism.16 One of their more celebrated members, Duncan Campbell Scott, also spent his career in the federal Department of Indian Affairs, holding the post of Deputy Superintendent from 1923–1932, the era during which some of the most restrictive and assimilative policies relating to Aboriginal peoples were crafted and implemented. While traveling into Northern Ontario to arrange for the surrender of Cree and Ojibway lands in 1905, Scott wrote a poem entitled ‘Indian Place Names’ that begins: The race has waned and left but tales of ghosts, That hover in the world like fading smoke About the lodges: gone are the dusty folk That once were cunning with the thong and snare And mighty with the paddle and the bow; They lured the silver salmon from his lair, They drove the buffalo in trampling hosts, And gambled in the teepees until dawn. But now their vaunted prowess is all gone, Gone like a moose-track in April snow. But all the land is murmurous with the call Of their wild names that haunt the lovely glens Where lonely water falls, or where the street Sounds all day with the tramp of myriad feet.17 Scott wrote a number of mournful Indian poems like this one, lamenting the loss of the very cultures he was instrumental in attacking. Although critics like Stan Dragland18 have argued that Scott’s poetry gave expression to his inner torment over the assimilation of Indigenous peoples into Canadian society, Groening19 insists that Scott’s poems supported and articulated his assimilationist agenda. Ghostly, fading Indians, regrettable or not, were an essential component of Scott’s vision as Deputy Superintendent of Indian Affairs. Scott was unequivocal that Indians should ‘progress into civilization and finally disappear as a separate and distinct people, not by race extinction but by gradual assimilation with their fellow citizens’, 20 and the motif of fading, spectral Indians in Scott’s poetry worked to naturalize the policies he enacted as Deputy Superintendent. The portrayal of Indigenous peoples as fading ghosts extended far beyond Scott’s poetry, but the political implications of Scott’s use of this trope are particularly stark given the context within which ‘Indian Place Names’ was written. Scott was engaged in negotiations with real, live ‘Indians’ when he wrote this poem, and it is this mismatch between the poem’s aestheticized ‘ghosting’ of Indigenous peoples and their embodied, material existence around the treaty table that is of note. This mismatch becomes all the more resonant from a contemporary vantage point: the Cree and Ojibway clearly did not ‘wane’, after all. They were real then and they are real today, in spite of Scott’s efforts, both poetic and bureaucratic.

### Doesn’t Solve – Utopian

#### Academy DA – their analysis is utopian and fails, they distract from real pragmatism and keep us in the status quo

Rorty 96 [Richard, 1996, Professor at Virginia, “Deconstruction and Pragmatism” //recut Majeed & Jacobs]

This flurry of deconstructive activity seems to me to have added little to our understanding of literature and to have done little for leftist politics. On the contrary, by diverting attention from real politics, it has helped create a self-satisfied and insular academic left which—like the left of the 1960s—prides itself on not being co-opted by the system and thereby renders itself less able to improve the system. Irving Howe’s much-quoted jibe—‘These people don’t want to take over the government; they just want to take over the English Department’— seems to me to remain an important criticism of this academic left. I see no real connection between what Derrida is up to and the activity which is called ‘deconstruction’, and I wish that the latter word had never taken hold as a description of Derrida’s work. I have never found, or been able to invent, a satisfactory definition of that word. I often use it as shorthand for ‘the sort of thing Derrida does’, but I do so faute de mieux, and with a self-exculpatory shrug. In an article called ‘Deconstruction’ (published in volume 8 of The Cambridge History of Literary Criticism), I claim that there are deep differences between Derrida’s own motives and interests and those of Paul de Man, the founder of the school of literary criticism which was briefly (before the advent of ‘cultural studies’) dominant in the US. I argue that the de Manian way of reading texts—as testifying to ‘the presence of a nothingness’—is very different from Derrida’s approach to texts. So much for the opposed misreadings of Derrida which I mentioned at the outset. I turn now to the relation of the sort of thing that Derrida does to pragmatism. Pragmatism starts out from Darwinian naturalism—from a picture of human beings as chance products of evolution. This starting-point leads pragmatists to be as suspicious of the great binary oppositions of Western metaphysics as are Heidegger and Derrida. Darwinians share Nietzschean suspicions of Platonic other-worldliness, and the Nietzschean conviction that distinctions like mind-vs.-body and objective-vs.-subjective need to be reformulated in order to cleanse them of Platonic presuppositions and give them a firmly naturalistic sense. Naturalists, like Derrideans, have no use for what Derrida calls ‘a full presence which is beyond play’, and they distrust, as much as he does, the various God-surrogates which have been proposed for the role of such a full presence. Both kinds of philosophers see everything as constituted by its relations to other things, and as having no intrinsic, ineluctable nature. What it is depends on what it is being related to (or, if you like, what it differs from). When it comes to language, pragmatists see the later Wittgenstein, Quine and Davidson as having got rid of the dualistic, Fregean ways of thinking which dominated the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus and early analytic philosophy. They read Derrida on language as making pretty much the same criticisms of the Cartesian/Lockean/Husserlian view of ‘language as the expression of thought’ which Wittgenstein made in his Philosophical Investigations. They read both Derrida and Wittgenstein not as having discovered the essential nature of language, or of anything else, but simply as having helped get rid of a misleading, and useless, picture—the one which Quine called the myth of the museum: the image of there being an object, the meaning, and next to it its label, the word. What pragmatists find most foreign in Derrida is his suspicion of empiricism, and naturalism—his assumption that these are forms of metaphysics, rather than replacements for metaphysics. To put it another way: they cannot understand why Derrida wants to sound transcendental, why he persists in taking the project of finding conditions of possibility seriously. So when pragmatists are told by ‘deconstructionists’ that Derrida has ‘demonstrated’ that Y, the condition of the possibility of X, is also the condition of the impossibility of X, they feel that this is an unnecessarily high-faluting way of putting a point which could be put a lot more simply: viz., that you cannot use the word ‘A’ without being able to use the word ‘B’, and vice versa, even though nothing can be both an A and an B. In my own writing about Derrida I have urged that we see him as sharing Dewey’s utopian hopes, but not treat his work as contributing, in any clear or direct way, to the realization of those hopes. I divide philosophers, rather crudely, into those (like Mill, Dewey and Rawls) whose work fulfils primarily public purposes, and those whose work fulfils primarily private purposes. I think of the Nietzsche-HeideggerDerrida assault on metaphysics as producing private satisfactions to people who are deeply involved with philosophy (and therefore, necessarily, with metaphysics) but not as politically consequential, except in a very indirect and long-term way. So I think of Derrida as at his best in works like the ‘Envois’ section of La Carte postale—works in which his private relationships to his two grandfathers, Freud and Heidegger, are clearest.

#### The aff reinstates authoritarianism which magnifies their impacts

Carman and Carl 6-15 Ezequiel Carman and Joseph Carl 6-15-2021 "A U.S. vaccine diplomacy strategy for Latin America and the Caribbean" <https://theglobalamericans.org/2021/06/a-u-s-vaccine-diplomacy-strategy-for-latin-america-and-the-caribbean/> (Ezequiel Carman is an Argentine lawyer and global health and trade policy consultant. Previously, he served as a legal advisor to the Ministry of Justice of Buenos Aires, an assistant professor of international public law at the Universidad Católica Argentina, and a research assistant at the O’Neill Institute for National and Global Health Law. Joseph Carl is a graduate of Liberty University, where he studied international relations and strategic international studies. He has worked for the U.S. Department of State and the Heritage Foundation.)//Elmer

However, unlike the unipolarity that characterized the 1990s and early 2000s, the U.S. is no longer the only global superpower, and the **humanitarian decisions it makes now**—during a new global health crisis—have the potential to be **hugely consequential** for the country’s **influence** and image. Similar to its trajectory at the height of the AIDS crisis, Washington only recently voiced its desire to back the WTO patent waiver proposal, having come under tremendous international pressure. Granted, the U.S. backed a patent waiver for COVID-19 vaccines much faster than it did for ARVs in the 1980s. However, having been presented with a rare opportunity to make amends for past moral missteps—by **eliminating vaccine IP protections** to ensure that affordable, generic versions of COVID-19 vaccines could be manufactured en masse around the world—the U.S. once again **hesitated**, limiting opportunities for developing nations to recover from the pandemic and again **amplifying criticisms of the United States**. Backed by over 100 developing countries, India and South Africa are once again leading the current fight to eliminate IP protections. India and South Africa filed a waiver with the WTO requesting a temporary suspension of patent obligations under TRIPS (Sections 1, 4, 5, and 7 of Part II) so that developing countries can access vaccines in a timely manner. The intent of this effort is to boost domestic manufacturing capacity by facilitating the widespread production of generic versions of COVID-19 vaccines, evening the odds with respect to global vaccine procurement and accessibility. The waiver would also allow developing countries to procure vaccines more expeditiously, either by producing them themselves or by streamlining the cumbersome institutional and legal requirements of importing pharmaceutical products from other countries that possess the necessary manufacturing capacity. After months of pushback from activists and political leaders, the U.S. finally expressed its support for patent waivers, with several key Western powers (notably France and the European Union (EU)) following suit. However, Germany—a major political player in the patent waiver debate due to its powerful pharmaceutical sector—continues to oppose the move. Other European countries remain similarly split on the patent waiver proposal, reflecting the fact that any patent waiver proposal will still requires extensive negotiation (in order for it to be accepted, there must be unanimous consent among WTO members). Political leaders and activists continue to call on the West to support the **waiving of IP protections**, noting that current projections anticipate that wealthy countries will be able to immunize their entire populations by the end of 2021, while developing countries will only see the same results in the next three to four years. Unlike the AIDS pandemic, COVID-19 has generated not only massive medical concerns, but also a global economic crisis: vaccination campaigns in richer countries have already allowed them to begin to rebuild their economies, while mass unemployment and lockdowns continue to strangle the economies of many developing nations. Increasing the supply and accessibility of vaccines in the developing world will undoubtedly facilitate a faster, and more equal, economic recovery. Continuing to allow the virus to spread unencumbered throughout the Global South, however, will only increase the likelihood of further viral mutations, possibly jeopardizing the efficacy of existing vaccines and further perpetuating already grave economic and medical concerns. Washington’s initial unwillingness to cross the pharmaceutical industry has undeniably damaged the moral standing of the United States. Moreover, this decision also created a humanitarian void eagerly **filled by Beijing and Moscow**, as they actively seek to position themselves as the benefactors of the most COVID-19-stricken region of the world: Latin America and the Caribbean. To date, Russian and Chinese vaccine diplomacy have already led to **economic, diplomatic, and political losses** being felt by Washington; this trend, if allowed to continue, will only further limit U.S. regional influence with its neighbors to the south. A lack of strategy and political will In the absence of an effective vaccine diplomacy strategy from Washington, and with the perpetuation of its current nationalistic vaccine policy, some of the pharmaceutical companies that the U.S. so readily protects have pushed countries throughout Latin America and the Caribbean into the waiting arms of Beijing and Moscow. While some Latin American countries have received a few vaccines from Western companies, most nations in the region continue to struggle to obtain doses. Pfizer, a U.S. pharmaceutical company, was accused of bullying Latin American countries during vaccine procurement negotiations, using its own leverage to attempt to force desperate nations to offer sovereign assets—such as their embassies—as collateral. Pfizer’s efforts resulted in a lost deal with Argentina, which has continued to grow increasingly closer to China. While the U.S. possesses a surplus of COVID-19 vaccines, it has failed to develop an effective, far-reaching donation strategy. Only recently did the Biden administration announce its plans to ship 80 million vaccines—a small portion of its surplus supply—abroad. Of the initial 25 million doses destined to be distributed internationally, 19 million will be donated to the largely mismanaged UN-backed COVAX program, with only six million of these COVAX doses designated for Latin America and the Caribbean. In comparison, China alone has donated or sold over 165 million vaccines to Latin America, with countries like Chile and Uruguay having vaccinated 80 and 63 percent of their populations, respectively, with Chinese vaccines. The administration of U.S. President Joe Biden previously donated a total of 4.2 million AstraZeneca vaccines to Canada and Mexico, the first vaccines that the U.S. had sent abroad. Still, this relatively modest donation was preceded by repeated calls from prominent Latin American leaders for President Biden to donate vaccines to U.S. allies in Latin America. Mexican President Andrés Manuel López Obrador (AMLO) was notably rebuffed in his request for shipments of U.S. vaccines, being told by the Biden administration that it was prioritizing the vaccination of the American public (despite the fact that Washington had already bought enough vaccines to inoculate the entire U.S. population several times over). Colombia President Iván Duque of Colombia, a country that is a key regional ally, has also called for the Biden administration to aid countries in the Western Hemisphere that are struggling to procure vaccines. By contrast, some Latin American officials have described easier negotiations, cheaper prices, and overall better terms in their successful agreements with Russia and China. Last year, for example, Beijing offered a USD $1 billion loan to Latin American nations to help finance their purchasing of Chinese-made vaccines—an offer that was well-received by recipient countries. Due to a lack of vaccine support and assurance from Washington, countries are growing closer to Beijing and Moscow, succumbing to rival geopolitical powers that do not align with the diplomatic and economic interests of the United States. Brazil remains one of the countries hardest hit by the COVID-19 pandemic. Despite President Jair Bolsanaro’s anti-science tendencies and hawkish stance towards Beijing, however, his government has still proven susceptible to the influence of China. Earlier this year, a New York Times report brought attention to the Bolsonaro government’s arrangement to allow Huawei, the Chinese telecommunications giant, to participate in upcoming biddings for contracts to construct Brazil’s 5G network. (Under the Trump Administration, Brazil had been one of the 50 countries to agree to the Clean Network Initiative—an agreement that committed signatories to forbidding Huawei from being involved in their 5G networks, due to national security concerns.) The announcement came after Brazil’s telecommunications minister, Fábio Faria, traveled to Beijing to meet with Huawei executives. Recounting his trip, Faria was quoted as saying that he had taken “advantage of the trip to ask for vaccines.” This development aligns with recent warnings from the U.S. Southern Command Chief Admiral Craig Faller, who claimed, during a U.S. Senate Armed Services Committee hearing, that China was using its vaccine leverage to push for Huawei’s integration into Latin America’s 5G networks. In the absence of Washington, several countries have increased their engagement with China and Russia (or have at least been pressured to). Paraguay and Guyana, for instance, have been pushed by China to switch their official diplomatic recognition from Taiwan (Republic of China, or ROC) to China (People’s Republic of China, or PRC) and to increase bilateral trade relations. Colombia, historically one of Washington’s closest allies in Latin America, uncharacteristically applauded Beijing’s efforts to promote human rights at the United Nations Human Rights Council, only one week after it received half a million doses of a Chinese-made vaccine. In Mexico, Beijing and Moscow also scored points; after securing a second shipment of Chinese vaccines, Mexico announced it would expand its “strategic partnership” with China. With respect to Russia, when (AMLO) tested positive for COVID-19 in January, he received a call from Russian President Vladimir Putin, wishing his Mexican counterpart a quick recovery. Shortly thereafter, AMLO announced that Mexico would receive a shipment of 24 million Russian vaccines and that he had invited Putin to visit Mexico, which would mark the Russian leader’s first visit to the country in nearly a decade. These developments are especially relevant when considering the fact that, before President Biden announced the sharing of the U.S. supply of AstraZeneca vaccines with Mexico, he had initially rejected AMLO’s call for assistance. In Bolivia, Putin has curried favor with President Luis Arce. President Arce’s political leanings are reminiscent of those of his predecessor, Evo Morales, who had an especially close relationship with Moscow; it would be reasonable to expect, therefore, that Arce may be similarly keen to deepen Moscow’s relationship with La Paz. After donating a large supply of vaccines to Bolivia, Putin sought out Arce to discuss the possible revival of several key Russian projects in the country: among them, the reactivation of a suspended nuclear power plant project, Russian development of Bolivia’s natural gas reserves, and investments in the country’s extensive lithium deposits (lithium being a mineral key to the global transition to clean energy, as it is a vital component in the production of high capacity batteries in both civilian and military hardware). In 2019, Russian businesses were beaten by other firms in the rush to invest in Bolivia’s nascent lithium industry; however, Arce has recently announced plans for new lithium projects that have received interest from both Russian and American companies. Throughout Latin America and the Caribbean, Russia has continued to sign vaccine deals in an effort to increase its influence. Russia’s vaccine diplomacy has primarily been a soft power push, unlike China’s more brazen “wolf warrior” diplomacy. Nevertheless, it represents a re-establishment of a foothold in the region that Russia (and its predecessor, the USSR) has not boasted since the Cold War. While some countries, like Mexico and Bolivia, appear genuinely interested in deepening their ties with U.S. geopolitical rivals, it is widely recognized that most other nations of Latin America and the Caribbean are being **squeezed politically by vaccines**. If Latin America is not **offered a practical alternative**, it will likely continue to conduct business with Moscow and Beijing, thus incurring more debts of gratitude to global powerhouses eager to **expand their economic and political influence through vaccine diplomacy**. A forward-thinking strategy To this point, the U.S. has been significantly outpaced by China and Russia when it comes to building and strengthening relations with its Latin American and Caribbean neighbors. The dynamic surrounding COVID-19 vaccine distribution is evocative of another era of recent history when the U.S. abandoned the suffering of the developing world for the sake of profit-maximizing pharmaceutical companies. With Latin America and the Caribbean being the region hardest hit in the world by the COVID-19 pandemic—much as Africa was at the height of the AIDS pandemic—the U.S. is only undermining its moral standing and regional influence by failing to more readily extend a helping hand. As the war against COVID-19 reaches a détente in the U.S., the Biden administration should make this issue a top priority. First, the U.S. needs to aggressively push its Western partners to back the IP patent waiver at the WTO in order to push forward a patent proposal that will help **increase vaccine production capacity** worldwide. Doing so will demonstrate **to the world** that Washington has the political will to defy the wishes of the powerful pharmaceutical industry and and re-establish its **leadership role** among the Western powers.

#### Governance is inevitable and turns case

Renaux 19 [Valarie, 5/29/19, Philosophy. Writing on Marxism, eliminativism in philosophy of mind and metaethics, suffering(-focused ethics), and philosophical pessimism, “Marxism and the State”, <https://medium.com/@valarierenaux/marxism-and-the-state-eeb6ceca4515> //GBS Majeed & Jacobs]

Here, perhaps, is a manifestation of one of the foundational flaws in anarchist theory: its veneration of human nature (as it understands it, at least). Bakunin claims that “human nature” makes corruption and counterrevolutionary, anti-proletarian actions inevitable once a section of the working class seizes power. Why does he say this? What proof does he have? In a word, none. ‘Human nature’ as it is predominantly understood is nothing more than our proclivity towards certain actions within specific material contexts, which are subject to change — and thus so are the proclivities. Even if it could be established that capitalist society generates some kind of fundamental proclivity among the working class and even humanity as a whole to act out of greed, selfishness and short-termism (which is practically speaking impossible to prove anyway), it does not follow that this is inherent and unavoidable in the human animal itself as some kind of abstract template for our actions. By elevating the human creature itself to the level of pseudoreligious ideology, anarchism practises exactly the same form of ideologising that the bourgeoisie and the feudal and even patrician classes before them have long done. Marxism rightfully does not concern itself with such sophistry, with such meaningless protestations against placing power in the hands of the working class and its party. “During its lifetime the working class state will continually evolve up to the point that it finally withers away: the nature of social organisation, of human association, will radically change according to the development of technology and the forces of production, and man’s nature will be equally subject to deep alterations always moving away more and more from the beast of burden and slave which he was.”²⁴ This links closely with the final problem with Bakunin and the anarchists’ position on the state that we shall address here. Bakunin describes his fictitious once-proletarians as “look[ing] down” on the workers from the “governing heights of the State.” What does this mean? It means, in one clear sense, that Bakunin sees the state as something distinct from society, something separate from and alien to it, something parasitical and detached from the productive elements of society. But never has or will the state be something “imposed on society from without,”²⁵ something that stands above class distinctions, or gendered divisions in labour, or religious and secular ideology alike, or indeed anything else. The state is not separate from society; it is society, it is the inevitable and necessary product of a society as it exists at certain stages of historical-economic development, and without it, the society would be reduced to utter barbarism, open, ubiquitous kinetic violence, a marked decline in living standards for all, both relative and actual, a severe degradation in the quality of goods, and so on. In a word, you would have social and even civilisational collapse. This is because ‘society’ is not one harmonious thing; rather, it is the aggregate of all human social and economic relations, and these humans and their socioeconomic situations are anything but uniform. Without the state, with its monopoly on violence and its often dominant role in the cultural narrative, these contradictions — irreconcilable contradictions — would be acted out through direct, physical struggle. There are but two outcomes to such a thing: either a state will be formed a new, but only after an extended period of acute crisis dealing devastating damage to all, and so the destruction of the state (and more precisely the failure to build a new state to replace it) was not only pointless but entirely undesirable to the society, or, worse still, the construction of a new state, for whatever reason, fails, and the population collapses into a regressed state of primitive-communism. History would have been reset. There does not exist some dichotomy of society and state, only the existence of a society with a state, and if a society has a state, it needs a state, and simply seeking its destruction is entirely misguided and naïve, springing from a fundamental misconstruing of what the state is, what society is, and what one’s own material interests are. In a word, it is idealism — it is utopianism. It should be evident from the rest of this essay that the state is not something that can be simply dismantled and destroyed by force and violence; it can only “wither away” when the material conditions are right. To attempt to act outside of history as anarchism does is dangerous to all, never mind arrogant and individualist. It is a position in absolute opposition to the interests of the workers. General remarks on the nature of class dictatorship Mao Zedong famously taught that “[p]olitical power grows out of the barrel of a gun.”²⁶ Truly there is no more succinct and accurate description of politics — which is, at its core, the systematised control and regulation of violence — than this. Anything that suggests otherwise is an obfuscation; such obfuscations serve an agenda, and all but always one of the ruling class. The class destined to vanquish class society itself has no need of the propaganda and sophistry of traditional class rule; we can, and should, state in no uncertain terms that the only rational expression of our political interests is a class dictatorship won and maintained by force of arms for the exclusive benefit of our economic class at the expense of all others. The proletarian state represents, for the first time in history, the material and thus socio-political interests of the vast majority of the people. From this simple fact an equally simple conclusion can be drawn: namely, that both when the working class is barred from power and when it holds it, it is only benefited by a frank and open understanding of the thoroughly class- and violence-based nature of state power. In the former situation, the proletarian is aware that society is organised upon his exploitation and that he has no material interest whatsoever in the preservation of the status quo, while in the latter, he sees that he should not be afraid of ‘tyranny,’ that the bourgeoisie are justly and necessarily without power and rights, and that should they be granted them, they will use them to undermine and overthrow the régime and institute terror of a previously unprecedented scale and harshness. In short, the stripping away of the pretensions and illusions of the state represent, and reinforce, heightened class consciousness. In terms of our interests, power is best manifested naked, and as proletarians, we have, unequivocally, a side on which to fall in the class struggle. As such, our political goals must include as a matter of necessity the seizure of state power. The lessons of the Paris Commune and of all revolutionary ventures throughout history is that the revolution that does not seize state power is thwarted. Never, in all human history, has this truth been countered. What’s more, the nature of the dictatorship of the proletariat is that it is exactly that: a dictatorship. All true communists know this to be so, and do not fear, but relish the opportunities that lie in controlling the state. The state is a tool — a weapon, and no weapon has morals in and of itself. Only when the sword is taken up and brandished in anger does it become an instrument of war and not simply a sliver of metal. The state is much the same. The anarchic view of the state is one of an enemy of ‘the people,’ one that is inherently undesirable and wretched, whoever straddles it. Marxism is not so naïve, not so utopian: the state serves her masters, and serves them well; when the working class reigns, the state delivers its Terror upon the counterrevolution and with it the socialist society can progress, in time, to a communist one. Without it, the working class movement is simply destroyed the instance the bourgeois reaction can organise itself anew. Marxism is scientific socialism; it is not utopianism. It would be false and misleading to claim that Marxism has ends; rather, it merely has analyses and observations. In their scientific study of the march of history and the intricacies of the capitalistic mode of production, the Marxists have discovered and laid out the series of progressions and laws that, hopefully, this essay has allowed the reader to understand, if only in brief: that “the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggle,”²⁷ that the working class must smash the existing bourgeois state, that the working class must create its own state to serve its own needs, and that this state must inevitably be the last stage of the state in all history. Marxism does not talk of that which is impossible; only that which is possible. The triumphs of the working class movement during the twentieth century prove this to be so, but much that was won has since been lost. As the Great Acceleration of the Anthropocene deepens, the need to place power in the hands of the workers intensifies with every passing week towards a singularly apocalyptic zenith. In the past, Marxists have rightly given the slogan socialism or barbarism?, but today, that is no longer sufficient: today, it it must be socialism or extinction? In matters of war and revolution, liberalism’s façades are quick to fall from the eyes of the class conscious worker. The premier and central issue of working class politics must be the conquest of state power. Only then can we change the world.