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### Harms

#### [Fernholz] Vaccine nationalism has cast aside global vaccination goals in favor of Eurocentric protectionism

**Fernholz 2021** (Tim Fernholz, “Wealthy countries are choosing pharma profits over global immunity,” March 15, 2021, Quartz, https://qz.com/1983767/the-wto-is-choosing-pharmaceutical-profits-over-global-immunity/) //neth

The wealthiest countries in the world have blocked the latest effort by poor nations to speed access to Covid-19 vaccines and treatments by temporarily lifting World Trade Organization rules protecting intellectual property. Sponsored by South Africa and India and backed by 57 nations, the waiver proposal under discussion since last autumn would have suspended, for the duration of the pandemic, portions of the TRIPS (Trade Related Protections for Intellectual Property Rights) Agreement covering medical necessities. This would allow developing economies to begin manufacturing medical goods without waiting for—or adhering to—licensing agreements with pharmaceutical companies that own the underlying intellectual property for medicines and vaccines. Opposing the proposal last week were the US, the EU, Canada, and UK, whose representatives say they are concerned that freeing intellectual property, even temporarily, could reduce the incentives for corporate research. They also question whether developing nations will be able to begin production soon enough for the waivers to impact the spread of the virus. The debate inside the WTO has put a spotlight on the unequal global access to vaccines that have proven effective in preventing coronavirus infections and death. Vaccine nationalism might be understandable for politicians who must answer to voters’ demands for life-saving interventions. But why does prioritizing corporate profits makes sense when the speedy production of many coronavirus products, from test supplies to novel treatments and especially vaccines, has been driven by unprecedented public funding and global collaboration? International health organizations like Médecins Sans Frontières and Oxfam back the waiver proposal, and compare the coronavirus to other global health crises, like HIV-AIDS or polio, that required setting aside profit motives for the common good. Other paths to vaccine production The intellectual property provisions cover not just the specific formulas for medicines and vaccines, but also the proprietary software and techniques often needed to manufacture them. Critics of the waiver proposal have argued that voluntary licenses offered by the big pharmaceutical companies to local manufacturers can fill the gap. The waiver’s proponents note that these agreements often include restrictions on where the products can be used. In one agreement between South African company Aspen and Johnson & Johnson to manufacture its single-dose vaccine, for example, just 9% of the supply will remain in South Africa. In the US, the Biden administration has declined to respond directly to questions about the waiver proposal, instead emphasizing its efforts to support Covax, a global effort to manufacture vaccines for developing economies. But advocates for those countries say Covax is not enough on its own to defeat the coronavirus. “While ramping up supply is completely essential, it is also wrong to say that IP isn’t the issue,” Yuanqiong Hu, a policy adviser with MSF, said in February. “IP is posing existing and emerging barriers to ensuring access to medicines, vaccines, and other medical tools can be available and accessible in an equitable and universal manner.” The new director of the WTO, the former Nigerian finance minister Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala, whose most recent job was leading Covax, has outlined a “third way” proposal (pdf) seeking a compromise between the rival blocs by speeding up the sharing of information within the existing rules. Some advocates that this is effectively a delaying tactic that benefits rich countries, but other WTO watchers say it could be grounds for a compromise between a totally voluntary response and a complete waiver of IP rules. The path to full immunity So far, about 5% of the world’s population has been vaccinated. Around a third of those vaccinated live in the US. And so while the pace of new infections is falling in the US, it is rising around the world. The problem for public health experts is that even if the virus can be defeated in wealthy nations, its continued persistence in other populations could lead to more dangerous mutations that could set back progress toward immunity or seed new outbreaks. At a time when civil liberties have been sacrificed to public health measures, they say that corporations can contribute their fair share. “We have seen governments locking down and entire economies sequestering people in their homes,” Mustaqeem De Gama, a South African diplomat who is one of the country’s WTO representatives, said in February. “What is the problem with intellectual property rights? Why are intellectual property rights so special, given the fact that a lot of the innovation that we see being used today came from government funding.” In the end, rich nations will sacrifice something one way or the other. Katie Gallogly-Swan, a researcher who works with the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, estimated that the costs of vaccine inequality to the global economy could reach $9 trillion. And we know that the pandemic will not be truly defeated anywhere until it is eradicated everywhere.

#### [Raymond] Capitalism is the root cause of vaccine disparities, both globally and domestically

**Raymond 2021** (Robert R. Raymond, “Capitalism and Racism Are Enemies of an Effective Vaccine Plan,” May 2, 2021, Truthout, <https://truthout.org/articles/capitalism-and-racism-are-enemies-of-an-effective-vaccine-plan/>, \*\*brackets in original text) //neth

Pandemics don’t spread evenly. The spread depends on environmental conditions such as temperature and airflow, population density and size, and, as it turns out, privilege. Brutal capitalism has driven the disproportionate impact of COVID on marginalized communities, and it is now driving inequities in vaccine distribution. Not surprisingly, the contours of COVID’s impacts have reflected pre-existing societal disparities — which are often shaped along gender, race and class lines. These disparities determine not only how a virus spreads, but also the impacts that the virus has on the individual communities that are exposed. It has been widely reported that Black communities have been impacted disproportionately by COVID, experiencing higher rates of hospitalization, infections and mortality; these trends have continued on into the third wave of COVID, and have inspired hundreds of cities and counties, as well as the Centers for Disease Control, to declare racism to be a public health threat. Black, Indigenous and Latinx communities have less access to health care and testing, access to information, economic stability and work conditions, all of which contributes to the virus’s disparate impact. In addition to race, another significant social determinant of health is class. Essential workers and those who do not have the privilege of working from home are disproportionately impacted by COVID, as they are much more likely to be exposed to the virus. Black workers and most of the low-waged frontline workers have less access to sick leave and are less likely to have health insurance coverage, contributing to the disproportionate impacts of COVID. “People in lower income neighborhoods are more likely to have COVID-19 and are at greater risk of COVID-19 deaths as compared to people in higher income neighborhoods,” Gregorio Millett, former scientist at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and author of the paper “Assessing differential impacts of COVID-19 on black communities,” told Truthout. Lisa Dubay, co-author of the Urban Institute research report titled, “How Risk of Exposure to the Coronavirus at Work Varies by Race and Ethnicity and How to Protect the Health and Well-Being of Workers and Their Families,” noted, “We thought it was really important to look at the intersection of race and exposure, because what we know is that the U.S. has a long history of structural racism and interpersonal racism…. That has resulted in long-standing occupational segregation that privileges whites and people with higher education.” Dubay noted that the lack of sick leave, living wages and health insurance drove COVID’s spread among low-wage workers, disproportionately workers of color. Another population that has been disproportionately impacted by COVID is incarcerated people. According to research reported in the Journal of the American Medical Association, incarcerated people are infected by the coronavirus at a rate more than five times higher than the country’s overall rate. And as of April 16, more than 661,000 incarcerated people and staff have been infected. Amber Casey of the Washington State Department of Public Health told Truthout, “When those folks go back into their communities, which are often heavily policed communities, Black and Brown communities — the same communities that are heavily affected by COVID due to other factors — those communities are more likely to be exposed and it does really keep a reservoir of COVID circulating.” Casey also works closely with folks experiencing homelessness and people who are using drugs — both of which are populations that have been impacted disproportionately by COVID. She points to how a sharp increase in drug overdoses has accompanied the pandemic in these communities. Casey and her department are currently trying to get as many vaccines as possible out to people experiencing homelessness and who are currently using drugs. Indeed, now that the vaccine is quickly rolling out, an opportunity has emerged to remedy the inequities cemented by COVID — but instead, vaccine distribution has proven to be yet another area where disparities are made plain. The Biden administration has been fairly successful at making vaccine shots available — however, when it comes to equitable distribution, it’s a different story. Research has shown that Black and Brown communities in the U.S., for example, are less likely to get access to vaccines for a number of reasons, including internet access for appointments, proximity to vaccine centers or clinics, and informational barriers. As Truthout has covered in depth, similar patterns in vaccine equity also exist on the global scale. According to Krishna Udayakumar, the founding director of the Duke Global Health Innovation Center, just four regions — the U.S., China, India and Europe — account for 70 percent of all vaccinated people in the world. And this is not an issue of supply — it’s actually projected that by this summer, the U.S. will have an enormous oversupply of the vaccine. The issue is equitable distribution. “High-income countries like Australia, Japan, the U.S. and Europe, for example, pre-purchased a lot of the vaccine before it was even manufactured,” Merith Basey of Free the Vaccine told Truthout. “That purchasing power has led to this concept of hoarding, which has left a lot of poorer countries — or even middle-income countries — behind.” Free the Vaccine is a collective of volunteers from 29 countries campaigning for equitable global access to COVID vaccines. Without affordable access for everyone, they believe that the vaccine cannot do its intended job, and that since taxpayers have largely funded the development of these vaccines, they should be available for free to everyone. According to Basey, one of the largest problems is that high-income countries are not sharing the intellectual property around the vaccines. “There’s more than enough to go around. The idea is to have a much more people-centered system rather than a profit-centered system.” “There are [a lot of] countries around the world [that] could manufacture the vaccine locally and work to treat their own populations,” Basey said. “But because of the sort of capitalist frame of the current biomedical R&D system, it means that sharing isn’t happening.” The United States has fully vaccinated roughly 25 percent of its population, but poorer countries like Brazil and Mexico, for example — which have some of the highest rates of COVID cases and deaths, have both vaccinated less than 10 percent of their populations. “The world has a scarcity mindset right now,” Basey said. “But we have the recipe, we just need to share it — there’s more than enough to go around. The idea is to have a much more people-centered system rather than a profit-centered system.” Countries like South Africa and India have led efforts to temporarily suspend patents on COVID vaccines, but these efforts have been blocked by the United States and other wealthy nations at the World Trade Organization. This comes as India is experiencing a massive wave of COVID cases and deaths, recording 315,000 new cases in just a single day, the highest daily toll since the start of the pandemic. As wealthy nations like the United States continue to prioritize shareholder profit over people’s lives, we’re also seeing how global politics and imperialism has penetrated the rollout of COVID vaccines. For example, it has been reported that the pharmaceutical company Pfizer made demands to Latin American countries to put up sovereign assets, such as embassy buildings and military bases, as a guarantee against the cost of future legal cases as part of their COVID-19 vaccine negotiations. Groups like Free the Vaccine are doing important work to ensure global equity and access, but they are up against a corporate, global system that is unwilling and unlikely to make any substantial changes to a profit-focused agenda. As we continue to see the stark disparities in how COVID impacts marginalized communities here in the U.S., as well as inequities in response to COVID globally, it’s become increasingly clear that our current global capitalist economic system is not prepared to deal with major crises adequately. Moments of acute crisis such as this, as devastating as they are, can make space for new conversations and open up opportunities for change. As COVID lays bare the major structural problems in our current social, political and economic systems, we are seeing communities across the country and across the globe rise up to demand substantial reforms, and in many cases, a complete overhaul of entire structures. With the very real possibility of another pandemic on the horizon, it’s important that we fully understand the root causes that drive the inequities in our society so that we can avoid replicating these harmful and deadly patterns in the future.

#### [Vanni] This isn’t unique to COVID – TRIPS has always precluded LMIC access to medications – HIV/AIDS proves that racialized capitalism is real

**Vanni 2021** (Amaka Vanni, March 23, 2021, “On Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines and Vaccine Imperialism,” Third World Approaches to International Law Review, <https://twailr.com/on-intellectual-property-rights-access-to-medicines-and-vaccine-imperialism/>) //neth

Intellectual property rights (IPRs) are time-limited legal rights granted to inventors and creators. IPRs include copyrights, trademarks, patents, trade secrets, and geographical indications, while protected subject-matters include, but are not limited to, brands, inventions, designs, and biological materials. Importantly, IPRs overlap as a product may be covered by a series of rights. For example, a pharmaceutical medicine, defined by Britannica as a ‘substance used in the diagnosis, treatment, or prevention of disease’, is protected by patents, trademarks, and trade secrets. Patents are the most common form of IPR used for the protection of innovation in pharmaceuticals. Patents grant inventors limited market exclusivity for their inventions, and, in exchange, the inventor must disclose sufficient information such that competitors will be able to step into the market. This disclosure allows a competitor to make preparation to enter the market at the end of the monopoly period. Due to this legally-mandated exclusivity, patent owners – usually multinational corporations – have the right to prevent others from making, using, or selling a patented invention. The TRIPS Agreement, concluded as part of the Uruguay Round of multilateral trade negotiation and in force since 1995, provides a minimum of 20 years patent protection. The belief is that the duration allows corporations to recoup the expenses of developing, testing and upscaling an innovative pharmaceutical product. From the onset, the TRIPS IP regime created imbalance between innovation, market monopoly, and medicines access, because it failed to take into consideration the health burden, development needs and local conditions of the various countries that make up the WTO. This has led to several issues. First, the market monopoly of IP rights, which allows the corporation to set the market for drugs, has created a privileged societal class with access to lifesaving medication distinguishing them from those excluded from access to available medications. This phenomenon is vividly illustrated in the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1990s and early 2000s. While HIV/AIDS patients in developed countries were able to afford antiretroviral (ARVs) treatments, which had been developed, approved and patented as early as 1987, many patients in Africa and other parts of the developing world could not afford the approximately USD 12,000 per annum treatment at that time. By 2001, approximately 2.4 million people in the region had died of AIDS. The South African government intervened to reduce the cost of ARVs by amending its domestic patent laws to allow the authorization of parallel imports of patented pharmaceuticals and to encourage the use of generic drugs, but it was sued by the US industry group Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA). Though the lawsuit was eventually dropped, it highlights the measures pharmaceutical corporations, backed by some national governments, are willing to take to protect their profits at the cost of human lives. Significantly, we see how law (or the threat of legal action) is used not only to protect and expand the profitability of a certain kind of property but, as Anjali Vats and Deidré Keller have taught us, also reveals IP law’s racial investments in whiteness and its continuing implications for racial (in)equality, particularly in the way it informs systems of ownership, circulation, and distribution of knowledge. Similarly, Natsu Saito takes up the analysis of IP, race and capitalism by theorizing some of the ways in which ‘value’ in IP law concentrated in the hands of large corporations is calculated in terms of its profitability rather than what it contributes to the well-being of society. However, the proverbial chickens have come home to roost as even rich countries are beginning to feel the bite of the dysfunctional IP system. The issue of excessive pricing for medicines is a growing problem in developed countries as well and has now become the single biggest category of healthcare spending in these states, particularly the US. An empirical report by I-MAK reveals how excessive pharmaceutical patenting is extending monopolies and driving up drug prices. The report, for example, notes that over half of the top twelve drugs in the US have more than 100 attempted patents per drug. Specifically, the report revealed that Humira® by AbbVie (used in the treatment of Crohn’s disease and the US’s highest grossing drug) has been issued 130 patents. The drug costs USD 44,000 annually and generated more than USD 19.2 billion for the company in 2019 alone. The Report also notes that the first patent filed for Herceptin® – used in the treatment for certain breast and stomach cancers – was in 1985 but currently has pending patent applications that could extend its market monopoly for 48 more years. Meanwhile, Celgene has over 105 patents for its oral cancer drug Revlimid® (used in the treatment of multiple myeloma) extending its monopoly until the end of 2036 – a patent lifespan of 40 years. In addition to excessive patenting and pricing, we have also come to understand the power of data in this context.

### Solvency

#### [WTO] Thus, we affirm that the WTO ought to waive the TRIPS agreement in accordance with the waiver submitted by India and South Africa

**WTO 2021** (Council for Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights , WAIVER FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE TRIPS AGREEMENT FOR THE PREVENTION, CONTAINMENT AND TREATMENT OF COVID-19, May 25 2021, <https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669R1.pdf&Open=True>) //neth

Decides as follows: 1. The obligations of Members to implement or apply Sections 1, 4, 5 and 7 of Part II of the TRIPS Agreement or to enforce these Sections under Part III of the TRIPS Agreement, shall be waived in relation to health products and technologies including diagnostics, therapeutics, vaccines, medical devices, personal protective equipment, their materials or components, and their methods and means of manufacture for the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19. 2. This waiver shall be in force for at least 3 years from the date of this decision. The General Council shall, thereafter, review the existence of the exceptional circumstances justifying the waiver, and if such circumstances cease to exist, the General Council shall determine the date of termination of the waiver. 3. The waiver in paragraph 1 shall not apply to the protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms (Sound Recordings) and Broadcasting Organizations under Article 14 of the TRIPS Agreement. 4. This decision is without prejudice to the right of least developed country Members under paragraph 1 of Article 66 of the TRIPS Agreement. 5. This waiver shall be reviewed by the General Council not later than one year after it is granted, and thereafter annually until the waiver terminates, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 4 of Article IX of the WTO Agreement. 6. Members shall not challenge any measures taken in conformity with the provision of the waivers contained in this Decision under subparagraphs 1(b) and 1(c) of Article XXIII of GATT 1994, or through the WTO's Dispute Settlement Mechanism.

#### [Baker] Info sharing is popular among LMICs, is precedented, and will set a norm

**Baker 2020** (Brook Baker, “South Africa and India’s Proposal to Waive Recognition and Enforcement of Intellectual Property Rights for COVID-19 Medical Technologies Deserves Universal Support, But Countries Also Have to Take Domestic Measures,” October 10, 2020, HealthGap, <https://healthgap.org/south-africa-and-indias-proposal-to-waive-recognition-and-enforcement-of-intellectual-property-rights-for-covid-19-medical-technologies-deserves-universal-support-but-countries-also-have-to/>) //neth

On October 2, India and South Africa petitioned the World Trade Organization (WTO) to allow all WTO members to bypass granting or enforcement of patents, trade secrets, industrial designs, and copyrights on COVID-19-related drugs, vaccines, diagnostics and other medical technologies for the duration of the pandemic. The proposed “Waiver From Certain Provisions Of The TRIPS Agreement For The Prevention, Containment And Treatment Of COVID-19” should be promptly and emphatically supported by governments, international institutions, global health initiatives, and all of civil society—from health workers, to academics, and access-to-medicines activists. We should expect vociferous opposition from the biopharmaceutical industrial and its supporters from wealthy country governments who have been claiming (confusingly and inconsistently) that IP is essential to innovation and that IP is not a barrier to the pandemic response. But the world desperately needs freedom to expand production of COVID-19 health products, secure lower prices, and speed their equitable distribution to all corners of the globe. Article IX 3 and 4 of the Marrakesh Agreement establishing the WTO clearly states that WTO Member States have the right to establish a waiver from the recognition or enforcement of intellectual property rights under the WTO Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS Agreement) in exceptional circumstances like those presented by the COVID-19 pandemic. The conditions on the waiver and its time duration will need to be finalized, but there is no doubt that South Africa and India have presented well-grounded justifications for the proposed waiver. The TRIPS Council meets October 15-16 and could approve the waiver and forward it for decision to the Ministerial Conference in June 2021. Given the urgent nature of the proposal, the waiver proposal should be forwarded to the WTO General Council even before then for an earlier decision. There is ample precedent—multiple previous intellectual property waivers have been granted by the WTO, including a waiver on the enforcement of Article 31(f) of the TRIPS Agreement and waivers of certain obligations under Article 70(8) and (9). Although the preference at the WTO is to reach consensus, countries can force a vote and a three-fourths majority will pass the waiver. The most compelling justification of the waiver is that intellectual property rights do in fact present significant barriers to the scale-up and diffusion of manufacturing capacity to produce sufficient quantities of vaccines, medicines, diagnostic tests, personal protective equipment, and other medical technologies needed to diagnose, prevent, treat, and cure COVID-19. Unfortunately, efforts to secure voluntary cooperation have thus far been unsuccessful. Although Costa Rica and 40 other countries Convinced The World Health Organization To Establish The COVID-19 Technology Access Pool, which would accept voluntary transfer of exclusive patents, data, and information rights and thereafter license those rights to qualified producers, no biopharmaceutical company has offered such rights over the past four months. The restrictive, flawed voluntary licenses negotiated by Gilead for remdesivir, and by Oxford and AstraZeneca on their candidate vaccine are shrouded in secrecy and exclude sales in many countries. The world needs this waiver: because IPR barriers are real; because voluntary measures are insufficient; and because vaccine, therapeutic, and diagnostic nationalism is leaving medical cupboards bare in the Global South. The world also needs the waiver for symbolic reasons – too many countries have bought the message that the TRIPS Agreement stands in the way of prioritizing public health and that they are powerless. But the waiver proposal is a mighty tool that they can use immediately to free themselves from the shackles of IP and market fundamentalism that is leaving so many so far behind. Passing the waiver will send a powerful message to industry that it should begin to share its technology voluntarily or it will be forced to do so involuntarily.

#### [Dutta] Don’t give credence to calls to preserve IPP – they’re perpetuated by wealthy nations furthering the rich vs poor divide

**Dutta 2020** (Prabhash K. Dutta, “India’s TRIPS waiver proposal at WTO: It’s rich vs poor over Covid-19 vaccine,” December 10, 2020, India Today, <https://www.indiatoday.in/news-analysis/story/india-trips-waiver-proposal-wto-covid-19-vaccine-1748319-2020-12-10>) //neth

Covid-19 pandemic has exposed many global faultlines. The lack of mutual trust and coordination among the countries resulted in a novel coronavirus outbreak in China’s Wuhan becoming a pandemic within a couple of months. Scientific research began at a frantic pace to find a cure of Covid-19 and prevention from the coronavirus infection. Now is the time when vaccines are ready for use, and drug candidates have emerged as potential treatment of Covid-19. But there is another competition going on among the countries. Who has the right to access Covid-19 vaccine and drugs? The rich countries are where most researches are happening. These researches require a lot of money. Hence, they are now supporting the right to protect their intellectual property -- vaccines and drugs. This is where a meeting of the World Trade Organisation (WTO) scheduled for Thursday becomes crucial. Drugs and vaccines are trading commodities and hence they come under the WTO regime. The WTO’s TRIPS (Trade Related Intellectual Property Rights) council has to take a decision on a proposal put forth by India and South Africa in October this year. India and South Africa have proposed for temporary waiver of global intellectual property obligations for a stronger and coordinated fight against the Covid-19 pandemic. Most developing countries are in support of the proposal but rich and developed countries, such as the European Union nations, the US and Canada oppose it. India and South Africa have argued that waiver is necessary as several developing and poor countries were not in a position to utilise the TRIPS flexibilities for importing and exporting pharmaceuticals. TRIPS flexibilities warrant compulsory licensing mechanism in countries for using generic versions of patented medicines. India and South Africa submitted their proposal to the TRIPS Council on October 2. It calls for removing barriers for accessing affordable medical products, including vaccines and medicines for prevention, containment and treatment of Covid-19. South Africa is the current chair of the TRIPS council but it is facing strong opposition from the rich countries in getting the waiver proposal accepted. At an informal meeting of the TRIPS council in November, the US, the EU, Japan, Canada and Switzerland opposed the waiver proposal saying it would undermine the efforts put together by these countries so far to collaborate the fight the pandemic. In simpler words, they pressed for prioritisation of intellectual property rights of the vaccine-developing pharmaceutical companies over threat to human lives in poor countries. This has led to a state where vaccine nationalism has taken precedence over the need for a united front against Covid-19. Vaccine nationalism is a danger that may hamper the fight against Covid-19 pandemic. Even UN Secretary-General Antonio Guterres has warned against vaccine nationalism, which, he said, is moving “at full speed”. Guterres on Wednesday said the vaccine nationalism may leave poor people around the globe watching preparations for inoculations against the coronavirus in some rich nations and wondering if and when they will be vaccinated.

### Framing/method

#### [Trott] Educational spaces reinforce the dichotomy between the ruling class and the working class – our aff is an instance of injecting anti-capitalist pedagogy into debate

**Trott 2017** (Jeremy Trott, August 7 2017, “Capitalism and education,” The Socialist, <https://thesocialist.org.au/capitalism-and-education/>) //neth

More subtly, the education system teaches children not to think in a critical way. History lessons brush over events that might make young minds question the status quo, such as the genocide of Aboriginal people during colonisation. Propaganda is hammered in through rituals like singing the national anthem at school assembly, or in the United States, the Pledge of Allegiance. The second task of education under capitalism is to cultivate a new generation of ruling class managers and controllers of the working population. Wealthy private and exclusive select-entry schools train students from a young age to think of themselves as leaders, deserving of success and better than everyone else. These people are nurtured to study subjects like law and business. Many of them go on to be bosses, judges and reliable politicians who feel the system worked for them. Thirdly, employers require a labour force with the skills necessary to do the work that creates their profits. This is the main role played by vocational courses, which are increasingly run on a for-profit basis. There is also a need for researchers and scientists who can find profitable outlets to invest in, like new technology, and advancements that can help capitalists cut across their competitors by reducing costs.

#### [ROB & Barnum & Illara] The role of the ballot is to endorse the debater who best performatively promotes anticapitalist praxis – this is uniquely key in educational spaces like debate. To clarify, this means that we learn about praxis through our in-round speech acts, thus making us better advocates in the real world.

**Barnum and Illara 2016** (Anthony Barnum and Jason Illara, February 2016, “Teaching Issues of Inequality Through a Critical Pedagogy of Place,” Journal of Sustainability Education, <http://www.susted.com/wordpress/content/teaching-issues-of-inequality-through-a-critical-pedagogy-of-place_2016_03/>) //neth

Sustainability, engagement, place-based and experiential learning are buzz-words in public discourse from classrooms to community organizations, but what do these words mean and how do we as educators create meaningful learning experiences where learners, whether traditional students or community members, can learn and practice the sociological imagination? This paper provides an example of how educators from academia and the larger community of which they are a part can build partnerships where both students and community members can benefit as they work to build a future where social responsibility becomes practice and not just theory. Today, both students and faculty engage in discourse and the study of ideas of sustainability in relation to society and the environment. However, it is less common for these same ideas of sustainability to apply to critiques and analyses of a larger sustainable culture. In terms of thinking about sustainability, students and faculty must push themselves to also consider aspects of social, political, and economic sustainability. How to conceptualize these ideas, and what they might and could mean especially in terms of addressing issues of inequality provides many areas for new research and theorizing. This is the logical next step in addressing sustainability and several environmental sociologists suggest that environmental issues cannot be dealt with until inequality is addressed (see Barbosa 2015). This paper challenges educators to consider how teaching issues of social, political, and economic inequality can be addressed in the classroom and how students can participate in the work of a sustainable community by becoming “student-teachers” (Freire 1989). A course on Inequalities in the U.S. at a small liberal arts college has been redesigned to incorporate ideas and concepts related to social, political, and economic sustainability. The purpose was for students to address and understand inequalities within the context of the U.S. at both the macro and the micro level in terms of how inequality can be seen and understood as a social issue that should be examined at multiple levels. By partnering with The Cumberland County Historical Society, course objectives and assignments have been rethought so that students can come to understand inequalities as they exist in the shared social environments around them through local spaces, not just in the abstract macro spaces that they are used to considering in the academic classroom. Through place-based and experiential learning activities, students are able to come to a better understanding of the study of inequalities both theoretically and as applied to specific local, state, regional, and national contexts. Issues related to the effects of the system of stratification based on race, class, gender, sexuality, etc. within the U.S. need to be rethought in how they must be addressed in holistic and sustainable ways to achieve real and lasting solutions through social change. By addressing the teaching of inequalities in this way service-learning, experiential, and place-based learning opportunities have been incorporated where students can spend time at local community organizations and use both qualitative and quantitative methods and reasoning. The objective is to enable students to see inequality within local, regional, and national contexts and to link these experiences to global forces. At the same time students need to learn to see the social worlds that we inhabit and for them to become active participants in the local community where they become teachers on issues of inequality. One of the main pedagogical goals was to take this course and to teach it with an integrated service-learning component, which would allow students to examine areas of American society related to inequalities of race, class, and gender. Experiential based learning was incorporated through service learning projects where students would be required to spend time at a local community organization. This was done as a means to use C. Wright Mills’ “sociological imagination” (2013) whereby students could link personal troubles to larger social issues, enabling them to see inequality within local, regional, national, and global contexts, and encourage them to make connections to the larger social worlds that they inhabit. The project stretches the traditional study of inequality to make use of place-based learning and to facilitate the identification of various forms of inequality in the social world around us by providing a framework through which students are able to exit the campus bubble and to meaningfully engage in the local community. The study of inequality often examines the distribution of power and resources within a society but often fails to put a personal face to these issues, which are often treated at the macro level through examining the distribution of power and resources. The goal of this project was to rethink the course Inequalities in the U.S so that it challenges students to not only think about inequality abstractly and theoretically, but concretely and experientially. This should both enable and empower students to think about inequality not only at the national and regional levels but also at the state and local community levels. This course redesign advances learning because it directs students to examine how inequality is an unsustainable social practice and how a more sustainable society might be better designed to ameliorate issues of inequality. By participating in service-learning projects students are able to connect the problems and solutions to inequality from the classroom to the actual lived experience of individuals and communities. A key component of this redesign is an attempt to get students to engage in ideas outside of the classroom and to get their hands dirty through taking ideas and concepts related to inequality and to apply them through research and service learning. This project, it is hoped, will contribute to the relationship building between ‘town and gown’ so that both the communities of a small liberal arts college, a local historical society, and the surrounding municipality will be able to see themselves not as separate, but as parts of the same community. A large part of this project is for students to not only learn about inequality through the local community as a living laboratory, but also flip their roles as students and become what Freire refers to as “student-teachers” (1989). Thus they will not only learn, but in turn teach what they learn to both each other and the larger community. One of the key ways of dealing with sustainability and with issues of inequality is first and foremost educating publics about issues as a means to instigate social change. Learning for the sake of learning is good, but learning for the sake of praxis lends itself to more active and engaged learning and social action. When learning can be applied and shared, it amplifies itself and moves beyond an individual act and becomes an act of community building. Learning of this type is necessarily situated within a particular place and at a particular time with particular actors. In order to implement a pedagogy of place specific social change towards sustainability, this paper now turns to a discussion of Freirian pedagogy, which lends itself to praxis as a form of social change through consciousness building or awakening.

#### [Kirker] Discourse matters – especially in educational spaces

**Kirker 2017** (Jessica Kirker, “Professional Friction: Racialized Discourse and the Practice of Teaching Art,” Copyright 2017 by The Journal of Social Theory in Art Education / Volume 37, <https://scholarscompass.vcu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1502&context=jstae>) //neth

Language is crucial in situating our selves and others. Discursive patterns create alliances or factions, establish hierarchies, and subjugate individuals or groups. In this autoethnographic study, I consider how I, as a White woman teaching art, participate in, maneuver, and manipulate spoken and unspoken racialized discourses within the context of a high school with a diverse population of students. Through the data collection process of journaling over one school year, I recorded reflections on conversations, speeches, and written communication with, between, and regarding teachers, students, parents, and school administrators. I employed discourse analysis on these texts and draw upon Critical Race Theory and Whiteness Studies to examine the discourses that govern the school and inform its social conventions as manifested in my professional identity as it intersects with various collegial spaces. I also show the value in performing an autoethnography as a way to evolve as a social justice educator and scholar as well as a means to give voice to teachers’ stories so that we can render visible the way radicalized discourses and discords they create can shape the daily practice of teaching art. Discussions of racial discrimination often only exist as history lessons, but the lessons taught throughout U.S. schools about racial identity are deeply embedded within the daily practices of all members of a school community. Racial identities are established on a daily basis through (seemingly) casual interactions and microagressions between teachers, students, parents, and administrators. The discourses that position and subjugate individuals can be as simple as an informal email or a casual hallway conversation to more public approaches like disciplinary hearings or faculty meetings. These messages establish relationships of sameness or difference, power or subordination, and allegiance or contention. Beyond the interactions of daily personal relationships, there are normalizing school practices; ways of doing things, guiding principles, and procedures, that define and shape parties in relationship to each other as well as ascertaining a dominant value system over the school context. Rules as well as social norms are communicated through highly visible social etiquette conventions as well as formalized policies and legislation (Hodge & Kress, 1988). The discourses that define these rules are often structured to ensure dominant parties remain unchallenged (Hodge & Kress, 1988). In the context of U.S. schools, censorship of speech or imagery, management tactics, and disciplinary policies are often designed to fit the interests and desires of dominant White educational leaders.

#### [Wright] Anticapitalism isn’t about the past impacts of cap – it’s about whether capitalism can continue to be beneficial in the future

**Wright 2015** (Erik Olin Wright, December 5 2015, “How to Be an Anticapitalist Today,” Jacobin, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/12/erik-olin-wright-real-utopias-anticapitalism-democracy/ | Author quals -- Erik Olin Wright is a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin – Madison and the author of many books. His latest is Alternatives to Capitalism: Proposals for a Democratic Economy.) //neth

Both of these accounts are anchored in the realities of capitalism. It is not an illusion that capitalism has transformed the material conditions of life in the world and enormously increased human productivity; many people have benefited from this. But equally, it is not an illusion that capitalism generates great harms and perpetuates unnecessary forms of human suffering. The pivotal issue is not whether material conditions on average have improved in the long run within capitalist economies, but rather whether, looking forward from this point in history, things would be better for most people in an alternative kind of economy. It is true that the centralized, authoritarian, state-run economies of twentieth-century Russia and China were in many ways economic failures, but these are not the only possibilities. Where the real disagreement lies — a disagreement that is fundamental — is over whether it is possible to have the productivity, innovation, and dynamism that we see in capitalism without the harms. Margaret Thatcher famously announced in the early 1980s, “There is No Alternative,” but two decades later the World Social Forum declared “Another World is Possible.” I argue that another world — one that would improve the conditions for human flourishing for most people — is indeed possible. In fact, elements of this new world are already being created today, and concrete ways to move from here to there exist. Anticapitalism is possible, not simply as a moral stance toward the harms and injustices of global capitalism, but as a practical stance towards building an alternative for greater human flourishing.

#### [Wright] The aff isn’t a question of destroying capitalism, it’s a method of treating the harmful symptoms. This means we don’t have to win that we end capitalism right now, just that we mitigate harms.

**Wright 2015** (Erik Olin Wright, December 5 2015, “How to Be an Anticapitalist Today,” Jacobin, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2015/12/erik-olin-wright-real-utopias-anticapitalism-democracy/ | Author quals -- Erik Olin Wright is a professor of sociology at the University of Wisconsin – Madison and the author of many books. His latest is Alternatives to Capitalism: Proposals for a Democratic Economy.) //neth

The major alternative to the idea of smashing capitalism in the twentieth century was taming capitalism. This is the central idea behind the anticapitalist currents within the left of social-democratic parties. Here is the basic argument. Capitalism, when left to its own devices, creates great harms. It generates levels of inequality that are destructive to social cohesion; it destroys traditional jobs and leaves people to fend for themselves; it creates uncertainty and risk for individuals and whole communities; it harms the environment. These are all consequences of the inherent dynamics of a capitalist economy. Nevertheless, it is possible to build counteracting institutions capable of significantly neutralizing these harms. Capitalism does not need to be left to its own devices; it can be tamed by well-crafted state policies. To be sure, this may involve sharp struggles since it involves reducing the autonomy and power of the capitalist class, and there are no guarantees of success in such struggles. The capitalist class and its political allies will claim that the regulations and redistribution designed to neutralize these alleged harms of capitalism will destroy its dynamism, cripple competitiveness, and undermine incentives. Such arguments, however, are simply self-serving rationalizations for privilege and power. Capitalism can be subjected to significant regulation and redistribution to counteract its harms and still provide adequate profits for it to function. To accomplish this requires popular mobilization and political will; one can never rely on the enlightened benevolence of elites. But in the right circumstances, it is possible to win these battles and impose the constraints needed for a more benign form of capitalism. The idea of taming capitalism does not eliminate the underlying tendency for capitalism to generate harms; it simply counteracts their effects. This is like a medicine which effectively deals with symptoms rather than with the underlying causes of a health problem. Sometimes that is good enough. Parents of newborn babies are often sleep-deprived and prone to headaches. One solution is to take an aspirin and cope; another is to get rid of the baby. Sometimes neutralizing the symptom is better than trying to get rid of the underlying cause. In what is sometimes called the “Golden Age of Capitalism” — roughly the three decades following World War II — social-democratic policies, especially in those places where they were most thoroughly implemented, did a fairly good job at moving in the direction of a more humane economic system. Three clusters of state policies in particular significantly counteracted the harms of capitalism: serious risks — especially around health, employment, and income — were reduced through a fairly comprehensive system of publicly mandated and funded social insurance. The state provided an expansive set of public goods (funded by a robust tax system) that included basic and higher education, vocational skill formation, public transportation, cultural activities, recreational facilities, research and development, and macro-economic stability. And finally, the state created a regulatory regime to curb the most serious negative externalities of the behavior of investors and firms in capitalist markets — pollution, product and workplace hazards, predatory market behavior, and so on. These policies did not mean that the economy ceased to be capitalist: capitalists were still basically left free to allocate capital on the basis of profit-making opportunities in the market, and aside from taxes, they appropriated the profits generated by those investments to use as they wished. What had changed was that the state took responsibility for correcting the three principle failures of capitalist markets: individual vulnerability to risks, under-provision of public goods, and negative externalities of private profit–maximizing economic activity. The result was a reasonably well-functioning form of capitalism with muted inequalities and muted conflicts. Capitalists may not have preferred this, but it worked well enough. Capitalism had, at least partially, been tamed. That was the Golden Age — a faint memory in the harsh first decades of the twenty-first century. Everywhere today, even in the strongholds of Northern European social democracy, there have been calls to roll back the “entitlements” connected to social insurance, reduce taxes and public goods, deregulate capitalist production and markets, and privatize state services. Taken as a whole, these transformations go under the name of “neoliberalism.” A variety of forces have contributed to the diminished willingness and apparent capacity of the state to neutralize the harms of capitalism. Globalization has made it much easier for capitalist firms to move investments to places in the world with less regulation and cheaper labor, while the threat of capital flight, along with a variety of technological changes, has fragmented and weakened the labor movement, making it less capable of resistance and political mobilization. Combined with globalization, the increasing financialization of capital has led to massive increases in wealth and income inequality, which in turn has increased the political leverage of opponents of the social-democratic state. Instead of being tamed, capitalism has been unleashed. Perhaps the three decades or so of the Golden Age were just an historical anomaly, a brief period in which favorable structural conditions and robust popular power opened up the possibility for the relatively egalitarian model. Before that time capitalism was a rapacious system, and under neoliberalism it has become rapacious once again, returning to the normal state of affairs for capitalist systems. Perhaps in the long run capitalism is not tamable. Defenders of the idea of revolutionary ruptures with capitalism have always claimed that taming capitalism was an illusion, a diversion from the task of building a political movement to overthrow capitalism. But perhaps things are not so dire. The claim that globalization imposes powerful constraints on the capacity of states to raise taxes, regulate capitalism, and redistribute income is a politically effective claim because people believe it, not because the constraints are actually that narrow. In politics, the limits of possibility are always in part created by beliefs in the limits of possibility. Neoliberalism is an ideology, backed by powerful political forces, rather than a scientifically accurate account of the actual limits we face in making the world a better place. While it may be the case that the specific policies that constituted the menu of social democracy in the Golden Age have become less effective and need rethinking, taming capitalism remains a viable expression of anticapitalism.