#### The aff’s international approach to the patent system is the essence of the capitalist empire. It seeks to deprive local power while bolstering the influence of the global market over them, securing its position of dominance in the world. Knezevic 07,
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**The corporate-industrialized world nexus project in pushing the global IP agenda with a view to adopt a “common standard”85 or “one size fits all”86 model for patents regardless of the field of technology (in this case medicine) or socio-economic circumstances in question (AIDS epidemic in Africa) is not only hypocritical but dangerous,** and not just to immediate public health concerns. **It constitutes an attempt to sever the juridical notion of patent from its material historical source** – to deprive us of the language to articulate the un-ethics of the situation. **It seeks to monopolize the very language and thought-processes that permit us to ethically and effectively question the ‘rational’ decision-making of world leaders and corporations**. **This is what Hardt and Negri refer to (in a reading of Foucault) as a ‘biopolitics’ of control, which permeates below the level of consciousness to the bios in order to manipulate** 87 [T]he problem of the new juridical apparatus is presented to us in its most immediate figure: a global order, a justice, and a right that are still virtual but nonetheless apply to us...**our internal moral disposition...tends to be determined by the ethical, political, and juridical categories of Empire...The means of the private and individual apprehension of values are dissolved**: with the appearance of Empire, we are confronted no longer with the local 89 This latter tension represents most faithfully the precise tension between the position of developing nations and that of industrialized nations in relation to pharmaceutical patents. **It is the tension between an adaptive conception that is modified as it is historically and socio-economically contextualized or ‘locally mediated’ – and on the other hand a conception that is in juristic terms rigid and by claiming for itself ‘concrete universality’ extinguishes all contextualized conceptions**. This tendency of the very limits of what we are capable of thinking. The sentiment is echoed in the comment cited above by Spiegel regarding the ‘Cuba taboo’ – a conspicuous silence which reflects an “inclination to narrow the boundaries of what are deemed to be possible approaches”88 to public health. Out of this universalized silence, the global order of ‘Empire’ unfolds [my italics]: [T]he problem of the new juridical apparatus is presented to us in its most immediate figure: a global order, a justice, and a right that are still virtual but nonetheless apply to us...our internal moral disposition...tends to be determined by the ethical, political, and juridical categories of Empire...The means of the private and individual apprehension of values are dissolved: with the appearance of Empire, we are confronted no longer with the local mediations of the universal but with a concrete universal itself. Empire to extinguish and erase context and ‘local mediation’ is not directed merely at the Other – **the industrialized world which here is the agent of empire seeks to expunge its own context and history from the record, too, so long as the order that is universalized is the one it dominates at present**. The characteristic of Empire is that it is “formed not on the basis of force but on the basis of the capacity to present force as being in the service of right and peace.”90 **The only truly effective means to resist this process of Empire then is to deny it its ethical foundation by insisting on history**, both that of the developed and developing world, and in particular the complicity of the former in the plight of the latter, for example: Besides introducing new diseases, European colonial incursions created devastating ecological changes in Africa. Mining, plantation agriculture, irrigation schemes, and drainage ditches created good habitats for malaria- bearing mosquitoes. As Africans died from smallpox and famine, cultivated areas returned to bush, promoting the spread of tsetse flies... That, in short, is the sort of thing European ‘transfer of technology’ to Africa achieved in the 19th and early 20th century. Hunter goes on to note some further examples, among them this: it took until the 1960s to rid the Serengeti plain of the rinderpest virus brought there by the British and Italians in the 1880s, by which time most of the native domestic cattle and wild ungulates on which the Masai population depended were dead. From 1880 to 1933 the population of the Belgian Congo declined from around 40 million to 9.25 million. In another French colony it went from 20 million to 2.5 million in the space of 20 years, 1911-1931. On the heels of these ravages, “Western medicine matured at just the right time to be used as a ‘tool of empire’.”92 This configuration, it seems, persists today in what Hardt and Negri call the new ‘imperial paradigm’, which has migrated from “disciplinary society to a society of control.”93 It is the latter that operates at the level of bios, which rather than merely employing physical coercion, attempts to regulate from afar our very thought processes “to narrow the boundaries of what are deemed to be possible approaches.”94 **What is taking place here is the transition to an order wherein the agents of Empire need not instruct colonial subjects what to do or coerce them to it, but are able to ensure that goals are carried out merely by limiting the horizons of thought.** **It is clear that industrialized countries have taken every opportunity to adapt their patent systems and evolve them according to their immediate socio-economic or public health needs in different epochs**. **Developing countries should be allowed to do the same, especially given the historical complicity of developed countries in their demise and in the retardation of their development**. **The global model imposed by industrialized countries cannot serve the immediate public health needs of the developing world**. In this process and particularly in dealing with existing public health crises such as the AIDS epidemic, Cuba provides the best existing model for developing countries to learn from, given both its success and the country’s socio- economic identity with other developing countries, and there is no reason why this model could not be implemented without replicating its political environment. Over this entire complex, however, looms the hegemonic global order of Empire, with the industrialized world as agent, seeking to universalize its own conception. **In order to resist this universalizing process, developing countries should insist as a matter of right on managing their own public health networks matched by suitable patent regimes crafted to their immediate needs (i.e. compulsory licenses, import of generics) – rather than accepting the universalising imposition in return for ad hoc donations and other aid as a matter of charity or good will**. **Developing nations** should, in other words, **reject ad hoc utilitarian approaches of enforcing patents unconditionally at the service of the industrialized world designed to alleviate their suffering** but never allow them to stand on their own two feet, **leaving them always a step behind and at the mercy of corporate and international donors**. They should continue to assert their moral rights in the face of the global pharmaceutical lobby and insist on their unfettered discretion to determine the existence of health crises on their territories and design patent regimes appropriate to their immediate needs. They should implement “social and organizational priorities” shown to produce results toward the “social production of health” simultaneously investing (socially and financially) in their public health networks and in publicly financed institutions to conduct R&D programs crafted to their concerns, guided by public health needs and motives and not profit possibilities**. The attainment of public health goals is financially well within their reach merely by the implementation of appropriate policies**, as discussed above. This of course raises a number of issues relating to the willingness of African officials and governments to deal with the AIDS crisis in an effective way, and the various cultural and political 96 obstacles to this, however that this only makes the compendium of obstacles to the resolution of the AIDS crisis more complex;97 by removing the global obstacles (stringent pharmaceutical patent protection) and reducing the crisis to the level of national politics, the immediate technical responsibility is placed on the shoulders of leaders who in most cases are in one way or another politically accountable to the very populace afflicted by the epidemic, rather than on the shoulders of corporate executives thousands of miles away who answer primarily to shareholders. Thus if there is unwillingness among African politicians and elites to engage effectively with the epidemic (as some writers suggest), a more systematically ethical and less profit- oriented approach to patent enforcement by industrialized countries would be much more likely to expose this unwillingness and eliminate such politicians. **So long as industrialized countries insist on a ‘common standard’, they will remain the main scapegoat.** If they believe it to be in their interest to produce a greater confluence of norms relating to intellectual property, they should work from the opposite end to where they are now – by investing in the public health networks of developing countries with a view to making them sustainable and self-sufficient both in providing for immediate health needs and conducting R&D in the long term; that is, by working toward a ‘common standard’ in public health rather than in patent protection, for the former would in turn produce greater confluence in patent systems.

#### Slight adjustments to the current IP system inevitably fail while allowing global regimes to expand their power. The aff specifically kills the opportunity to critique the current system allowed for by the pandemic. Krikorian and Torreele 6-23,

Krikorian, Gaëlle, and Els Torreele. "We Cannot Win the Access to Medicines Struggle Using the Same Thinking That Causes the Chronic Access Crisis." *Health and Human Rights* 23.1 (2021): 119.

**Supply gaps and market failures are also increasing for health products considered not profitable enough to continue production. The availability of medicines and diagnostics required in small volumes is being increasingly threatened, as is the case for many neglected diseases such as tuberculosis, sleeping sickness, leishmaniasis, and diphtheria**. We are also seeing shortages of old and inexpensive yet essential medicines, such as penicillin and cotrimoxazole.[23](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r23) **In the context of the COVID-19 pandemic, we have witnessed global shortages of key antibiotics** (such as amoxicillin and doxycycline), **morphine, and basic reagents for diagnostics**.[24](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r24) At various points since the start of the pandemic, even if one wanted to buy these, they are simply not available or have already been sold to the highest bidder. **This has led to calls for considering essential medicines strategic products that every country or region should be self-sufficient in and for creating nonprofit- and government-controlled production to ensure this**.[25](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r25) These **emerging tensions are questioning the efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and fairness of the dominant system**. Another extraordinary example of unjustified control by pharmaceutical companies that affects patients worldwide is the rising prices of previously cheap—yet lifesaving—medicines, such as insulin, where a few corporations control the market for their mutual benefit and are able to increase prices year after year to the detriment of many people with diabetes who can no longer afford the treatment.[26](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r26) Seeking to challenge this status quo, **a group of scientists is exploring small-scale community-based open source production of insulin**.[27](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r27) In a similar move to increase access to overly expensive medicines and circumvent monopolies, doctors and pharmacists are looking into bedside magistral production as a way to provide personalized medicine.[28](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r28) **The COVID-19 crisis has added to the growing understanding that the scarcity of many essential medicines, vaccines, and raw materials is not inevitable but rather the consequence of policies** and decisions from the industry and governments. On the one hand, pharmaceutical companies have wielded unrivaled power to determine the scope and direction of medical innovation and to decide who gets access and under which conditions. On the other hand, **states, relinquishing their power to exert their health sovereignty, agree to rely on the private sector for the provision of these essential health tools**. **They thus became dependent on a handful of producers and a globalized supply that cannot fulfill all existing needs**, chose to adopt economic and industrial policies that **prioritized business interests over the needs of their populations and health systems**.[29](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r29) Business-as-usual is not an option; we must break the deadlock Wishing to replicate past successes, **health advocates have pushed for broadening the scope of existing solutions** to encompass additional diseases and health technologies and to expand the set of “eligible” countries for the exceptions created in earlier years. **This has been welcomed by some of the organizations embodying those solutions, as they see it as an opportunity to expand their mandate and scope of activities across disease areas or to new territories and be able to tap into additional funding sources for sustainability**. This applies for instance to Gavi, the Coalition for Epidemic Preparedness Innovations, the Global Fund, the Foundation for Innovative Diagnostics, and Unitaid, which positioned themselves as key players in the design, setup, and functioning of ACT-A together with the Gates Foundation and Wellcome. The same players are now advocating for ACT-A’s evolution into a permanent epidemic response infrastructure.[30](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r30) **But the replication and routinization of ad hoc and donor-driven solutions, bringing more and more public health areas under the control of self-declared global health institutions that focus on narrowly defined biomedical solutions, does not necessarily suit all current and future health challenges or take into account existing shortfalls or pitfalls of these mechanisms**. **It also does not address the governance gaps that exist in many international organizations that function more like untransparent public-private partnerships than institutions whose policies are dictated by public interest**. **Because countries’ ability to set priorities and develop an integrated health policy are often hampered and skewed by donor subsidies and their priorities, there are growing voices from “beneficiary” countries calling for increased agency and participation, if not leadership and autonomy, in designing the solutions they deem most fit to promote the health and well-being of their populations**—a movement that also includes #DecolonizeGlobalHealth.[31](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r31) **For the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, it is clear that the established global health architecture is unable—and ill suited—to work out relevant and equitable solutions for the developing world,** as exemplified by ACT-A and its well-intended but so far ineffective COVAX facility, held hostage to supply restrictions by companies and the vaccine nationalism from those who created it in the first place.[32](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r32) **Voluntary proposals that keep developing nations captive to the willingness of corporations and wealthy countries to access lifesaving public health tools are being increasingly criticized**.[**33**](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r33) **The political tensions on an IP waiver on COVID-19-related technologies at the World Trade Organization are reopening an old battle that raged during the HIV epidemic 20 years ago between developing countries challenging monopolies on medical technologies and the wealthy countries defending the pharmaceutical corporations** located in their countries.[34](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r34) However, the COVID-19 vaccine scarcity affects people everywhere, rendering the flaws of the monopoly-based yet highly subsidized pharmaceutical economy visible to more people, and making it obvious that **limited exceptions to the IP regimes** (for a few patents, for one virus, for a few months, and so forth) **will not fix the problems.** The COVID-19 crisis illustrates the critical role of public contributions in the research, development, production, and deployment of medical innovations for global public health.[35](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8233016/#r35) The inequities in vaccine access that we are seeing due to the fact that control over such innovations was left in the hands of a few private companies highlights the colossal unbalance that exists between the public health interest and private profits. They illustrate how public resources are used without adequate checks and balances to ensure public value, and fail to prevent growing inequalities in access, even in the wealthiest countries. **Tinkering in the margins of the status quo is unlikely to be successful**. The market-based health, pharmaceutical, and medical innovation policies that our governments designed are unable to generate the relevant health technologies and make them available—at an affordable price—to all who need them. Therefore, **we need transparent R&D and access policies and governance that are no longer captive to the current, Western-driven global health order**. The design of needs-driven research and production of pharmaceuticals could be organized to deliver health commons, not market commodities, making the best of public capacities and setting up transparent and fair collaboration with the private sector for the public interest.

#### Global capitalism and industrialization cause climate change and extinction. McDuff 19,

McDuff, Phil. "Ending climate change requires the end of capitalism. Have we got the stomach for it." *The Guardian* 18 (2019).

Climate change activism is increasingly the domain of the young, such as 16-year-old Greta Thunberg, the unlikely face of the school strike for climate movement, which has seen many thousands of children walk out of school to demand that their parents’ generation takes responsibility for leaving them a planet to live on. In comparison, the existing political establishment looks more and more like an impediment to change. **The consequences of global warming have moved from the merely theoretical and predicted to observable reality over the past few years, but this has not been matched by an uptick in urgency. The need to keep the wheels of capitalism well-oiled takes precedence even against a backdrop of fires, floods and hurricanes**. Today’s children, as they become more politically aware, will be much more radical than their parents, simply because there will be no other choice for them. This emergent radicalism is already taking people by surprise. **The Green New Deal (GND**), a term presently most associated with 29-year-old US representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, **has provoked a wildly** **unhinged backlash from the “pro free market” wing**, who argue that it’s a Trojan horse, nothing more than an attempt to piggyback Marxism onto the back of climate legislation. Think we should be at school? Today’s climate strike is the biggest lesson of all Greta Thunberg, Anna Taylor and others Greta Thunberg Read more **The criticism feels ridiculous. Partly because the GND is far from truly radical** and already represents a compromise solution**, but mainly because** the radical economics isn’t a hidden clause, but a headline feature. **Climate change is the result of our current economic and industrial system.** GND-style proposals marry sweeping environmental policy changes with broader socialist reforms because the level of disruption required to keep us at a temperature anywhere below “absolutely catastrophic” is fundamentally, on a deep structural level, incompatible with the status quo. **Right now we can, with a massive investment of effort by 2030, just about keep the warming level below 1.5C. This is “bad, but manageable” territory. Failing to put that effort in sees the world crossing more severe temperature barriers that would lead to outcomes like ecosystem collapse, ocean acidification, mass desertification, and coastal cities being flooded into inhabitability. We will simply have to throw the kitchen sink at this. Policy tweaks such as a carbon tax won’t do it. We need to fundamentally re-evaluate our relationship to ownership, work and capital. The impact of a dramatic reconfiguration of the industrial economy require similarly large changes to the welfare state. Basic incomes, large-scale public works programmes, everything has to be on the table to ensure that the oncoming system shocks do not leave vast swathes of the global population starving and destitute. Perhaps even more fundamentally, we cannot continue to treat the welfare system as a tool for disciplining the supposedly idle underclasses. Our system must be reformed with a more humane view of worklessness, poverty and migration than we have now.** Unfortunately for our children, the people they have to convince of all this are the people who have done very well out of this system, and are powerfully incentivised to deny that it is all that bad. Already, Joke Schauvliege, a Belgian environment minister, has been forced to resign after falsely claiming that she had been told by Belgian state security services that “ghosts” behind the scenes were behind demonstrations in Belgium. This conspiracism of the elite, these claims that genuine mass movement can’t possibly really exist and must be in some way being guided by agents provocateurs, is just one of the ways in which those currently running things have resorted to a kind of political gaslighting in an attempt to maintain their grip on power. 3:18 Dianne Feinstein rebuffs young climate activists' calls for Green New Deal – video **Gaslighting is a term I don’t use lightly, because it describes a genuine form of emotional abuse, where an abuser will deny reality in an attempt to get their victim to literally doubt their own sanity, and this should not be diluted by overuse. Yet I struggle to think of another word that adequately sums up the way in which “sensible” adults are doubling down on their tactic of manufacturing a political reality which bears no relationship to the world we see around us. It’s the Marxism of Groucho rather than Karl: “Who are you going to believe? The serious political professionals or your own lying eyes?”** US Senator Dianne Feinstein’s meeting with schoolchildren petitioning her to take action over the issue went viral because of the way she condescended to them for, basically, asking her to leave them a planet behind to live on. “I’ve been doing this for 30 years,” she said, “I know what I’m doing.” The obvious response is, of course, that messing something up for 30 years is quite long enough, thanks. Long tenure without results is not the same thing as expertise. This is a tough and bitter pill to swallow for the political professionals whose feet are firmly under the table. It is increasingly obvious that all their tactics have done almost nothing except run down the clock, but still they insist that it’s the young who just don’t get it and that things aren’t that simple. They’re the living embodiment of the famous New Yorker cartoon, with a suited man sat in a post-apocalyptic landscape telling his young audience “Yes, the planet got destroyed. But for a beautiful moment in time we created a lot of value for shareholders.” Capitalism can crack climate change. But only if it takes risks Larry Elliott Larry Elliott Read more **This is reality v the vested interests of the powerful. Any meaningful policy has to upset the established power base and the political donor class. Any policy that doesn’t upset these people will be useless. To pretend that we can compromise our way through this while we wait for a magical, technological bullet that will keep temperatures down without costing us anything is beyond wilful ignorance now. It is a question of basic morality.** Many of today’s climate strikers won’t even be 30 by the time the 1.5C deadline comes around in 2030. They are asking us to consider a simple question: is their future worth more than preserving our reputations? What will our response to them be?

#### The alternative is earth democracy. It prioritizes local values and production over globalization, dismantling global capitalist power while maintaining the ability to produce at large scales and ensure wellbeing of citizens, but it is incompatible with the aff’s view on global trade and the WTO. Fukuda 10,

Fukuda, Yasuo. "WTO regime as a new stage of imperialism: Decaying capitalism and its alternative." *World Review of Political Economy* 1.3 (2010): 485.

There is considerable ongoing debate between “globaphobes” and “globaphiles.” **The decaying nature of modern capitalism shows that free trade is not a panacea for citizen welfare**. The task of this section is not however to recount the arguments between globaphobes and globaphiles. Rather, **the aim is to outline an alternative system**. **The matter at hand is how to restore viability, independence, and sustainability to local communities**. But before arguing how this may be achieved, it is worthwhile to clarify the social conditions necessary for realizing such an outcome. **V. Shiva (2005: Ch. 2) advocates “earth democracy” as an alternative to corporate globalization**. **Earth democracy is composed of four basic principles of sustainable society**. **The first is “ecological sustainability.”** That is, **the recognition that all species have intrinsic worth and that their life-cycles are interdependent of one another.** **The second is “community control of the commons.”** **Resources vital to sustenance, including public services and infrastructure, should not be privately owned; public resources must remain in the commons**. The **third is “security of livelihoods.”** That is, the idea that **all people have the right to basic needs, such as food, water, housing, and jobs**. **The fourth is “local sovereignty,” which amounts to community self-governance in regards to local economic affairs.** **Localization of the economy does not mean a closed economy; rather, it is the idea that local production should have priority over trade**. These four principles are necessary conditions for sound and sustainable community life. The second principle, community control of the commons, and the fourth, local sovereignty, are necessary conditions for the third, security of livelihoods. The first principle, ecological sustainability, guarantees preservation of the environment, thereby protecting sustainability of livelihoods as well. **These principles are not just the necessary conditions for sustainable society (Cavanach and Mander 2004), they are also the policy guidelines for realizing it** (Korten 2001). **It is a requirement of earth democracy that corporate globalization be dismantled**. This is because **corporate globalization denies all of the principles of earth democracy**. Therefore, the **power structure of corporate globalization must be broken up**. **First, the Anti-Trust Act must be reformed so that governments can mitigate the power of large firms in the global marketplace**. Large companies that have no technical reason for maintaining such large organizations should be broken up into more governable segments. **Second, market rules such as WTO agreements, should be rewritten**. **Introduced in the name of deregulation and trade liberalization, the aim of these rules has been nothing other than to allow large companies to use monopolistic power to control the global marketplace**. **Local governments must take back the right to formulate policy on matters affecting their own communities, reclaiming the policy space which has been hijacked by the WTO, the IMF, and the World Bank**. **Third, the ability of corporate power to design market systems must be checked**. The political power of big business is principally based on cozy relationships with government. Therefore, **political contributions from corporations must be prohibited**, **lobbying tied to political money should not be allowed**, **and revolving doors between big business and government must be closed** (Marx et al. 2007). Finally, **corporations should be deprived of the entitlement to express their political opinions through media, think tanks, etc**. Simultaneous to the dismantling of the excesses of corporate power, **it is also necessary that communities regain their independence on matters of economic policy**. The arguments presented below are intended to itemize the policy tasks needed for the rebuilding of community-based society. The **first task is to strengthen the foundations of the local economy**. Here, **the policy matter is how to secure productive investment in local communities**. **Local governments need to protect and support their home firms by adopting policies such as local contents regulations, and reinvestment rules in regards to profits gained locally.** The **second task is to support and nurture local businesses, such as small to medium-sized firms, the self-employed, family farming, and so forth**, as these represent core elements of the local economy. The **priority of industrial policies must be to shift power from big business to these local actors**. The objective of such a policy shift should be to strengthen reproductive circulation within the local economy. Local actors are interdependent on one another through the internal circulations which occur at the local level. Therefore, **the strengthening of local actors leads to the independence of the local economy**. But this policy does not amount to locally closed economies (autarky). To the contrary, **it is essential that local industries establish linkages with external markets to ensure viability of the local economy**. **What is important here is for local actors to take the initiative in establishing these linkages**. Therefore, large firms need to be regulated so as to prevent them from damaging the interests of local economic actors. **Large companies should be made to support local actors rather than inhibit them**. The **third task is for local communities to regain control of the commons.** The commons, including **natural resources** (water, soil, seeds, gene information), **public services and utilities** (municipal water supplies, electric power sources, educational services, medical care), **are indispensable to peoples’ lives**. **It is thus a prerequisite to the establishment of economic independence that local communities retain their policy space on issues which concern the commons**. Even in cases of private ownership, **local communities should have the final say with respect to governance of the commons**. In addition, it should be strongly encouraged for citizens to develop a stake in the local economy through, for example, promotion of the co-ownership of cooperatives and the establishment of municipal holding companies. Localization is a way for people to realize democracy on a higher level. Upon this new dimension of democracy, local citizens can make strides toward more healthy and sustainable lives.

#### The role of the ballot is to vote for the debater that best contests capitalist values. These values are necessary to the global capitalist system but are still contestable by the multitude. Capitalism employs extreme violence to maintain their values corrupting social understandings of it but continued minoritarian resistance of the multitude is key. Southall 10,

Southall, Nicholas. "A multitude of possibilities: the strategic vision of Antonio Negri and Michael Hardt." (2010).

Hardt and Negri‘s (2004:13) explanation of war as a mechanism of containment, where ―**war has become a regime of biopower and a permanent social relation**‖ is challenged by Alex Callinicos (2004: 11) who argues that this is only a trend because ―at least in the 160 advanced capitalist societies, what binds people to the existing order is still much more the ideology of liberal democracy, the benefits that are still to be had through the welfare state, and the material and spiritual comforts offered by consumerism‖. But for Hardt and Negri **there is no tendency towards mediation between the proletariat and capital**. **The now expanded proletariat**, rather than consenting, **is continuously antagonistic, its constituent power countered by repression, terror and global war**. **There is no subordination without coercion as coercion pervades the whole of Empire.** Yet in spite of some of what Hardt and Negri say, this is not a recent development, or evidence of real subsumption, for capital is always founded on violence. ―**The ultimate disciplinary instrument of the world market is, as it has always been, force**. **War is always critical to capitalist control, as a means for extending its circuits over new domains, dividing opposition, and destroying any threat to the operation of the market**‖ (Dyer-Witheford: 1999: 140). In the twentieth century, at least 110 million and possibly 200 million people, most of whom were civilians, died in armed conflicts (Renner: 1999). Yet these are not all the victims of the **constant global class war which causes continual destruction, death and social misery through the organised violence of capital** and its state forms. Vinay Lal (2002: 9, 49) highlights the ―true ‗unknown soldier‘ of the twentieth century‖ as the victim of development. **The violence of the past one hundred years was not confined to warfare, genocide, political insurrection** or other conventional categories, since **development has often been an act of violence involving the killing of millions of people**. Similarly for Linebaugh (2003: 445), **the workplace must be seen as ‗producing death‘ and the ―punishment of capital must include not only the mutilations, homicides, injuries, stress of the office, mine, and mill, it must also include the migrations, the uprootings, the forced confinements**, the slavery of the sex industries that have become planetary phenomena‖. The Midnight Notes Collective (2002) counts as **casualties of war the people who suffer from ill-health and death due to cuts to public health, medical care and occupational and environmental safety because of rising war budgets.** They further highlight how **the violence of continued mass starvation and price rises that put basic requirements beyond the means of many, ―are the denouement of a long war on the 161 people of the planet to eliminate the most elementary right: the right to eat to live**‖ (Federici: 2000; Caffentzis: 2008). **Although the violence of capitalist development is uneven in intensity and scope, it is a continuous, constant presence**. **The victims of the class war are a**n **example and warning to those who resist, refuse and rebel, demonstrating the outcome of capital‘s strategy of decomposition and intensifying global competition rather than cooperation**. Today, capitalism‘s permanent crisis causes an intensification of the daily, global class war. Hardt and Negri recognise that the **class war serves capital and that the ending of class war is a strategic imperative of the proletariat**. The class war is not a war the multitude requires or desires; it is a product of the capitalist system. The multitude‘s class war is simultaneously a war against class and a war against war. The questions of how to fight a ‗war against war‘ and how to end class are at the centre of Hardt and Negri‘s strategic vision for peace as an alternative to class war. As Massimo De Angelis (2007: 42) explains, the problem for alternatives to capital is how conflict can become ―a force for the social constitution of value practices that are autonomous and independent from those of capital‖ (emphasis in original). Discussing class conflict around capitalist labour and value, De Angelis (2005) and David Graeber (2005) point out that **the politics of alternatives to capitalist society lie not in the struggle to appropriate value but in the struggle to establish what value is**. ―Similarly, the ultimate freedom is not the freedom to create or accumulate value, but the freedom to decide (collectively or individually) what it is that makes life worth living‖ (Graeber: 2005: 58). Various types of value are produced, realised, defended or challenged in ―intense social struggle‖ over ―the ability to define what‘s important in life‖ (Graeber: 2005:15). For De Angelis (2005: 70) ―commodity values are about processes of class struggle‖ but if we understand value in general as the importance people give to their action and understand the norms and standards through which people judge this ‗importance‘ as emerging from a continuous interacting process of social 162 constitution, then in conditions in which this process takes the capitalist form Negri‘s claim (that value is beyond measure) simply does not make sense (De Angelis: 2005: 70) But, as De Angelis (2005) himself points out, value cannot be understood ‗in general‘. **The multitude creates a variety of proletarian use values and capitalist norms and standards depend on social controls, which are continually contested**. For Hardt and Negri **the capitalist form is intertwined with the communist form, with class struggle over value occurring throughout society**. Because of the growing antagonism of the communist form within Empire, they argue that **capitalist value is imposed by violence to deal with capitalist crisis**. Harry Cleaver (1979: 83) explains that capitalist crisis appears ―because **capitalist production is not concerned with production as such but with social control through the imposition of work through the commodity-form and thus the realisation of value**‖. For Cleaver (2005: 127) the problem with Hardt and Negri‘s view of value ―is that it separates the concepts of labour as producer of wealth and labour as means of domination, associating only the former with value‖. Cleaver argues that Marx‘s concept of value . . . has always designated primarily the role of labour as undifferentiated capitalist command rather than its production of wealth. Indeed the very distinction between use value and value is that between wealth understood as that which labour produces of use to the working class and that which labour produces of use to capital, i.e. command. **Class relations are relations of struggle not of domination and command**; this is why the contemporary crisis of capitalist value is not a crisis of value in general, but a crisis of value as command and domination. **Economic and political relations are relations of force between capital and labour and capital‘s ability to impose its value is the power to maintain its system**. However, **while capital attempts to repress communist use values, it is also forced to try to assimilate them, because of the unbreakable power of the multitude. But the power of the multitude is not containable and no amount of violence can completely secure capitalist value.**

# On case

#### The affirmative can’t solve the root cause of the problems developing nations face – WTO News Briefing 20

WTO News Briefing; ; 10‐16‐2020; ”Members discuss intellectual property response to the COVID‐19 pandemic”; https://www.wto.org/english/news\_e/news20\_e/trip\_20 oct20\_e.htm, World Trade Organization News, accessed 7‐21‐2021; JPark

While a number of developing and least developed country members welcomed the proposal as a contribution to the discussion, many were still studying it in their capitals and asked for clarification on certain points, particularly regarding its practical imple‐ mentation and the possible economic and legal impact of the waiver at national level. **A number of developing and developed country members opposed the waiver proposal, noting that there is no indication that intellectual property rights (IPRs) have been a gen‐ uine barrier to accessing COVID‐19 related medicines and technologies. While acknowl‐ edging that the sustained and continued supply of such medicines and technologies is a difficult task, they observed that non‐efficient and underfunded health care and pro‐ curement systems, spiking demand and lack of manufacturing capacity are much more likely to impede access to these material**s. In the view of these members, solutions can be legitimately sought within the existing IP system as the TRIPS Agreement provides enough tools and sufficient policy space for members to take measures to protect public health. **The suspension of IPRs, even for a limited period of time, was not only unnec‐ essary but it would also undermine the collaborative efforts to fight the pandemic that are already under way.**

#### Waiving patents can’t resolve drug access issues but instead create a more dangerous scenario for developing countries – Garde 21

Damian Garde (national biotech reporter for STAT), Helen Branswell (senior writer at STAT covering infectious diseases and global health; former CDC Knight Fellow and Nieman Global Health Fellow at Harvard; recipient of the 2020 George Polk Award for coverage of the Covid pandemic), and Matthew Herper (senior writer at STAT covering medicine). “Waiver of patent rights on Covid‐19 vaccines, in near term, may be more symbolic than substantive.” Stat News. 6 May 2021. JDN. https://www.statnews.com/2021/05/06/waiver‐of‐patent‐rights‐on‐covid‐19‐vaccines‐ in‐near‐term‐may‐be‐more‐symbolic‐than‐substantive/

In October, **Moderna vowed not to enforce its Covid‐19‐related patents for the duration of the pandemic, opening the door for manufacturers that might want to copy its vaccine. But to date, it’s unclear whether anyone has, despite the vaccine’s demonstrated efficacy and the worldwide demand for doses. That underscores the drug industry’s case that patents are just one facet of the complex process of producing vaccines**. “There are currently no generic vaccines primarily because there are hundreds of pro‐ cess steps involved in the manufacturing of vaccines, and thousands of check points for testing to assure the quality and consistency of manufacturing. One may transfer the IP, **but the transfer of skills is not that simple,” said Norman Baylor,** who formerly **headed the F**ood and **D**rug **A**dministration**’s Office of Vaccines Research and Review**, and who is now president of Biologics Consulting. While there are factories around the world that can reliably produce generic Lipitor, vaccines like the ones from Pfizer and Moderna — **using messenger RNA technology** — require skilled expertise that even existing manufacturers are having trouble sourcing. “In such a setting, imagining that someone will have staff who can create a new site or refurbish or reconfigure an existing site to make mRNA [vaccine] is highly, highly unlikely,” Yadav said. **There are already huge constraints on some of the raw materials and equipment used to make vaccines. Pfizer, for instanc**e, had to appeal to the Biden administration to use the Defense Production Act to help it cut the line for in‐demand materials necessary for manufacturing. Rajeev Venkayya, head of Takeda Vaccines — which is not producing its own Covid vaccine but is helping to make vaccine for Novavax — said supply shortages are impacting not just Covid vaccine production but the manufacture of other vaccines and biological products as well. “This is an industry‐wide ... looming crisis that will not at all be solved by more tech transfers,” Venkayya said. He suggested many of the people advocating for this move are viewing the issue through the prism of drug development, where lifting intellectual property restrictions can lead to an influx of successful generic manufacturing. “I think in this area there is an unrecognized gap in understanding of the complexities of vaccine manufacturing by many of the ‘experts’ that are discussing it,” said Venkayya, who stressed that while he believes they have good intentions, “nearly **all of the peo‐ ple who are providing views on the value of removing patent protections have zero experience in vaccine development and manufacturing**.”  As Michelle McMurry‐Heath, CEO of the trade group BIO, put it in a statement, “**hand‐ ing needy countries a recipe book without the ingredients, safeguards, and sizable work‐ force needed will not help people waiting for the vaccine.”**