## Imperialism k

#### [ROB & Torres] The role of the ballot is to endorse the best anti-racist resistance strategy. This entails rejecting structures of whiteness to endorse better strategies for confronting racism

**Torres 2020** (Christina Torres, July 30 2020, “All Students Need Anti-racism Education,” Teaching Tolerance, <https://www.tolerance.org/magazine/all-students-need-antiracism-education> | Author quals -- Christina Torres is an English teacher at Punahou School in Honolulu, Hawai‘i. A graduate of the University of Southern California and Loyola Marymount University, she previously taught for two years in Los Angeles.) //neth

As more and more teachers, administrators, schools and organizations are questioning their practices and looking at the racist history of their institutions, many are finally asking, “How we can listen to and support Black students, teachers and communities who have been systemically silenced for too long?” This question is essential, and examining anti-Blackness in our practice is something we all must be looking at. Looking at anti-Blackness or inequities brought about by systems rooted in white supremacy and racism is something all students should be doing. While more institutions, including primarily or historically white ones, are committing to this work, white teachers with primarily white students can feel hesitant to discuss these issues since they may not feel it affects them. This idea is a fundamental misunderstanding of what anti-racist work actually is. Anti-racist work means acknowledging that racist beliefs and structures are pervasive in all aspects of our lives—from education to housing to climate change—and then actively doing work to tear down those beliefs and structures. Those beliefs and structures don’t just exist in primarily white/and or privileged institutions—they thrive there. Schools that house mostly students and teachers who have benefited from white privilege can lack the perspective to push back on institutional malpractice or racist mindsets that may be present. In addition, it is difficult to convince those with power and privilege to give those privileges up without clear education and work to understand why doing so is a necessity for true justice in our society. Doing the work in spaces of privilege may look different, but educators cannot pretend that anti-racist work doesn’t exist simply because their student body isn’t directly harmed by racism. There are clear aims that primarily white and otherwise privileged institutions must work toward in the fight against racism. Teachers must re-evaluate their curriculum. When teaching standards and core curricula have been developed for your students, it’s easy to simply follow along. However, it’s important to remember that our education system has been founded on historically racist practices, including silencing those from disenfranchised communities. It’s not just BIPOC who need to see themselves in the literature or history they study. White students need to hear those perspectives as well, just as straight and cisgender students need to read LGBTQ+ stories. This is because students need not just mirrors but also windows into other cultures, as Dr. Rudine Sims Bishop notes in her essay “Mirrors, Windows and Sliding Glass Doors.” Students from communities with white privilege need to hear voices from other perspectives in order to grow their own thinking. Those perspectives need to be diverse and empowering as well—only showing Black suffering or slavery does not begin to break down problematic beliefs about Black people. Instead, students coming from positions of power need to see and understand the power and agency of those who have been historically disenfranchised, particularly since society frequently tells them otherwise. This will allow white students and teachers to have a more accurate and nuanced understanding of our history, while also ensuring they can center BIPOC voices and be allies and accomplices instead of “saviors.” Students need to understand privilege and rethink power. Students from privileged communities can struggle to understand privilege since they may feel that they have had to work hard or struggle at times in their lives. Teachers must help students understand how privilege works at a systemic level that may have given students an edge that, while it may be one they didn’t ask for, is still very real. The work does not stop there, though. It can be easy in teaching privilege to fall into the trap of “white guilt” or “privilege guilt” (or even “survivor guilt” for BIPOC who have moved up socioeconomically and have internalized the belief that their communities were something to be “survived”). While guilt can be an important emotion to notice and process, educators should help students move through it to a place of action. Beyond “feeling bad” about generations of oppression, how can they use this knowledge to advocate for change and begin breaking down their own racist beliefs? How can they also reframe their understandings of privilege so that they stop prioritizing hegemonic ideas of success and worth? Some of that will mean teaching students to analyze and reframe how they see values and stories from other cultures. Most of us were taught to praise white-dominant cultural ideas: financial success, rugged individualism, paternalism. Because of this, cultures with different priorities may not be seen as “successful” or “valuable” in our eyes and in the eyes of our students. We need to teach students with privilege not to be “saviors” for historically disenfranchised communities, but rather to listen to, value and stand in kinship with them so we can work together toward justice. Schools must interrogate their practices and how they gained institutional privilege to begin with. Anti-racist work cannot be done on an individual or classroom level. Administrators, faculty and staff at primarily white or otherwise privileged institutions must question how this has affected their school, students and community. If you don’t have any Black students, why is that? If your school primarily serves folks with high socioeconomic status, what policies and events led to that? Schools need to consider how they can help create more integration in their community by having open and honest discussions with their parents and caregivers about the benefits of diverse schools (including for white students) or questioning policies (such as requirements regarding tardiness and truancy and dress codes) that have made it historically difficult for more diverse populations to join their school community. This also means making students from historically disenfranchised communities feel included when they do attend school. It’s not enough to simply have representation—students must feel that their identities are validated and that their school is a place that accepts them completely. In addition, schools must hold educators and students accountable when they say and do things that make school unsafe for those they claim they want to support. Only when students feel they will be supported by their schools will they be able to fully become a part of that school community. As Dr. Ibram X. Kendi notes in his work How to Be an Antiracist, “There is no neutrality in the racism struggle. ... The claim of ‘not racist’ neutrality is a mask for racism. ... An antiracist is someone who is supporting an antiracist policy by their actions or expressing an antiracist idea.”

#### [Boutahar] Removing tools of imperial intervention are key to tearing down structures of compulsory whiteness that are exported by imperial powers -- don’t buy attempts to hide imperialism under the guise of social equality Boutahar 2014 (Youssef Boutahar, “Images of White Womanhood in Contemporary Narratives of Middle Eastern Captivity,” an essay from “Unsettling Whiteness,” edited by Lucy Michael and Samantha Schulz, Inter-Disciplinary Press Oxford, United Kingdom, ISBN: 978-1-84888-282-9 First published in the United Kingdom in eBook format in 2014. First Edition.) //neth

White womanhood has always been regarded as a marker of cultural identity and nation-making projects, justifying the West’s intervention in ‘Third World’ countries in order to lead a civilising mission against the ‘uncivilised.’ White women captives, in particular, have been deployed as patriotic ‘icons’ of war to serve Euro-American policymakers’ imperial schemes. Following the 9/11 attacks, the Bush administration engaged white women culturally and politically in the narrative of justifying the American ‘War on Terror.’ Significantly enough, the abduction stories of Dayna Curry and Heather Mercer, Yvonne Ridley and Jessica Lynch perfectly fit into the U.S. expansionist agenda of democracy and dual liberation; a liberation of ‘vulnerable’ white women from their Arab/Muslim abductors, and ‘subservient’ veiled women from the oppression of their purportedly ‘misogynistic’ cultures. Accordingly, white women hostages’ expectation of a potential sexual assault conforms to a tradition of better-known Barbary captivity accounts which evoke a total denial of humanity to the Muslim captor by stereotyping him as ‘savage’ and sexual ‘brute.’ Such derogatory descriptions, Edward Said notes, allowed Britain to create a ‘settled, clear, and unassailably self-evident’1 rift between the West and the ‘Rest.’ They have been historically used as a convenient rhetoric for empire building. Ironically, the Muslim abductor’s self-restraint, courtesy and generosity in contemporary captivity narratives dislocate the racial stereotype levelled against him, thereby allowing his counter-hegemonic voice to be heard from within the captive-taking culture. Employing postcolonial discourse in analysing white women’s contemporary narratives of Middle Eastern captivity, I shall adopt Homi Bhabha’s theory of ambivalence of colonial discourse and reconsider Edward Said’s binary model of ‘West vs. East.’ I shall also demonstrate the identity crisis white women captives go through once realising that they have been used as a propaganda ‘machine’ to legitimise colonisation in developing countries. 2. Constructing Dayna Curry and Heather Mercer as the White ‘Heroic Victims’ of the Nation The hostage story of Dayna Curry and Heather Mercer created a huge fuss in Western media at a time when Britain and America cooperated to lead a ‘war on terror’ in Afghanistan. Originally published in 2002, Prisoners of Hope: The Story of Our Captivity and Freedom in Afghanistan remains an outstanding captivity narrative of cross-cultural encounter between America and the Middle East. It revolves around the life events of two American missionaries, Curry and Mercer, who decide to embark on a journey to Afghanistan – a country that has been already ravaged by war – in order to alleviate the suffering of poor Afghan women and children while teaching them about the Christian faith. In August 2001, Curry and Mercer were abducted by the ruling Taliban after they had been convicted of showing an Afghan family a film about the life of Jesus. The two American hostages grew afraid at the prospect of being punished with death under the Taliban ‘Islamic’ law for their attempt to evangelise their Afghan friends. While awaiting trial, Curry and Mercer were held in captivity for four months and a half before they were dramatically rescued by the U.S. Special Operation Forces with the co-operation of the Afghan Northern Alliance fighters. Prior to their abduction, Curry and Mercer had been actively involved in humanitarian Christian aid work, helping poor Afghan people, especially women who were living in deplorable conditions. Assuming the position of global feminist ‘saviours,’ Curry and Mercer not only prayed for the most ‘wretched’ and ‘invisible’ creatures on Afghan soil in the name of Christianity, but they also provided them with food and medicine. This scenario of ‘saving’ has already been implemented in the British colonial project which engaged middle class Britis women, as part of the ‘civilising mission,’ to redeem their oppressed ‘sisters’ in colonised countries. Likewise, Afghan burqa-clad women in Prisoners of Hope – a narrative that, one may assume, has been adopted from the bulk of nineteenth-century colonial literature – are similarly projected as ‘vulnerable’ and ‘backward,’ and thus in need of liberation. Describing the plight of Afghan women, Curry produces a racialised knowledge on a misogynistic culture of veiling which reduces women to ‘blue ghosts.’ In so doing, Curry denies the humanity of Afghan women, denigrates the ‘backwardness’ of their Islamic society, and therefore sets the tone for the Bush administration’s neo-imperialist agenda. Yet, if the major goal of Western feminism is to reinforce the fight for women’s rights and unshackle the chains of their political and religious oppression, this goal is undermined by the hegemonic position such Western feminists assume in their support for the lead up to the ‘war on terror’ in Afghanistan. The purported war of liberation, as reported by Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch and RAWA(the Revolutionary Association of the Women of Afghanistan), has in many levels worsened the situation. Afghan conservatives, in particular, have vehemently rejected a war being led in the name of women’s rights since it was perceived as a threat to Afghan women’s culture and religion. In fact, the abduction story of Curry and Mercer in Afghanistan received a huge Western media attention at a time of political and cultural conflict between the U.S. and the Middle East. Having been represented as ‘icons’ of western freedom and emancipation, Curry and Mercer were, nevertheless, portrayed as vulnerable and helpless once they fell into the hands of their abductors; their cultural encounter with the Taliban made them reveal their imperialist anxieties and fear of Muslim sexual predation. By sensationalising their plight in captivity, U.S./Western media managed to construct a lurid narrative of victimised white femininity in need of liberation from ‘barbaric’ Muslim masculinity. Indeed, their dramatic ‘rescue’ by U.S. Special Forces has been pivotal in the process of producing Curry and Mercer as white ‘heroic’ ‘victims’ of the empire. White femininity in Prisoners of Hope remains undoubtedly crucial to the construction of Curry and Mercer as vulnerable to the trope of interracial rape and central to their representation as American heroines. Their heroism was essentially articulated in terms of resistance to the ‘infidel’ Other, preferring martyrdom for attempting to proselytise Afghan people than renouncing their Christian faith. After they had been intercepted by the Vice and Virtue Taliban police, Curry and Mercer became paranoid as they feared being physically abused by their captors. Just as with her predecessors, Elizabeth Marsh and Maria Martin, Curry exhibits a strong tendency towards preserving her white Christian identity even at the expense of being exposed to physical torture. The white female body, in this respect, discursively constitutes a site through which the whole nation or community is represented. So any attempt of violence against the white woman captive may be understood as a violation of the nation itself which has to maintain its immunity from the ‘brutishness’ of the racialized ‘other’ by means of a holy ‘War on Terror.’ Nonetheless, the Taliban never perpetrated any violence against them. Instead, they treated them with generosity and respect. In this sense, the frailty of the white woman captive turns out to be an illusion created by Western media and the U.S. government whenever there is a need to justify America’s military intervention. Accordingly, the myth of the ‘black’ rapist, which is deeply inculcated in white women captives’ imaginary, is inevitably evoked in Curry and Mercy’s captivity experience. Given the cultural separation of men and women in both public and private spheres, the presence of two female hostages among their male abductors engenders a sense of discomfort and fear of sexual molestation on the part of Curry and Mercer. In fact, Curry admits that she ‘felt less vulnerable with Heather... and thought it less likely the Taliban would commit rape or any other horrible act against us now that we were together.’3 Resisting separation from each other, therefore, seems the only means to protect their vulnerable white femininity from sexual molestation and hence save the honour of their nation.

#### [Fukuda] The WTO upholds four of the five pillars of capitalist imperialism

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

Studies on imperialism can be traced back to J. A. Hobson (1902) and R. Hilferding (1909). Based on their works, Lenin (1917) characterized imperialism as a regime of governance by monopoly capital, concluding that imperialism is a decaying stage of capitalism. Lenin outlined [by] five pillars by which to define imperialism. The first is monopoly capital gaining control of the major industries of a country. The growth of monopoly capital is a consequence of market concentration caused by competition among firms. Once market concentration reaches a certain point, it becomes possible for a small number of winners to form collusions, such as cartels, which transform the nature of the economy, leading to the dominance of monopoly capital. The second pillar is the formation of business relationships between industrial and financial monopoly capital. Monopoly capital also forms cozy relationships with government through the financing of political campaigns and through revolving doors. In short, monopoly capital wields governing power over national economies through market concentration, collusions among large firms, and direct political influence. The third pillar is foreign investment. Drawing on its political influence, monopoly capital effects the transfer of wealth from workers, farmers, small to medium-sized businesses, and the self-employed to monopoly capital. The resulting distortion of income distribution causes disproportionate growth among industries—especially between manufacturing and farming—and suppresses consumption. This leads to over-accumulation, which forces monopoly capital to export merchandise and invest abroad. The fourth pillar is global divisions among monopoly capital through cartels. These divisions occur in the same way as those which take place at the national level; competition among large firms, and the market concentration which follows, leads to the formation of global cartel agreements. The fifth pillar is colonization of less-developed countries by the Great Powers, operating at the behest of monopoly capital. Such colonization is an outcome of global competition among opposing elements of monopoly capital. Monopoly capital takes advantage of colonization to monopolize control of natural resources and export markets, and as a means to protect capital invested in less-developed countries against appropriation. Figure 1 shows how the five pillars are related. The figure starts with monopoly capital as governing powers, from which follows a causal relationship down to the last outcome, competition for colonization. In other words, colonization is the final outcome of the governing power of monopoly capital. This is why Lenin considered monopoly capital to be the key to imperialism.1 monopoly capital as governing power ↓ distorted income distribution and unbalanced growth ↓ accumulation of redundant capital ↓ merchandise export and foreign investments ↓ global competition and global collusion ↓ struggles for colonization Figure 1 Lenin’s “Imperialism” Looking at contemporary capitalism from the viewpoint of Lenin’s “Imperialism,” it is clear that four of the five pillars (excepting the fifth) are still applicable to capitalism under the WTO regime. First, a small number of multinational corporations typically control more than half the market-share of major industries. For example, in the commercial seed market, the world’s top three corporations (Monsanto, DuPont, and Syngenta of Switzerland) control almost half of the world market. Cargill, along with its top four competitors, handle 85 percent of world grain trade. In the pharmaceutical industry, the top ten corporations hold a combined 54.8 percent share of the world market (ETC Group 2008). In banking, the world’s top 45 banks account for nearly 40 percent of the gross tier 1 capital of the top 1,000, and about 45 percent of the total assets (The Banker, June 24, 2009). It hardly needs saying that these companies enhance their power considerably through close relationships with governments, and through political contributions, lobbying, revolving doors, and the like.

#### [Fukuda] Financial monopoly capital exports imperialism

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

Second, industrial and financial monopoly capital establish political action groups

as a means to advance common political goals. The negotiation of the General

Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) represents a typical example of this sort of collusion between major companies of both the industrial and financial spheres. Third, no monopoly capital can survive without strategic foreign investment, including direct as well as portfolio investment. For instance, automobile companies will not survive without gaining access to Chinese and Indian markets. Fourth, in the course of intense competition over dominant market shares, large multinational corporations often collude to form price cartels (Connor 2001; Levenstein and Suslow 2001). The cartel-based character of monopoly capital culminated during GATT Uruguay Round negotiations, as large businesses cooperated to set market-rules specifically tailored to their own ends. There is no colonization occurring under the WTO regime. Modern capitalism lacks the fifth pillar of early 20th century imperialism. However, this does not mean that modern capitalism is without imperialism. Monopoly capital has gained new methods of obtaining the governing power over developing countries in place of colonization. First, major multinational corporations subcontract to firms in developing countries, thereby assimilating these firms into global business networks. For example, big food retailers such as Wal-Mart and Tesco have established global supply chain management networks which subcontract to farmers in developing countries, thereby bringing these farmers under centralized managerial control (South Centre and Traidcraft 2008). Here, prices fetched at farm gates are determined by monopolists at the top of the supply chain. Second, monopoly capital now dictates the rules of trade by directly involving itself in the crafting of trade policy. Big business coalitions took part in drafting the WTO Agreements. In the case of GATS, multinational corporations, including Citigroup, J. P. Morgan Chase, and Barclays Bank, drafted the proposal under the authorization of US and EU governments, and then used lobbying to push the agreement through at the time of negotiations (Balanyá et al. 2003). In the case of the negotiations for the agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS), it was the US Intellectual Property Committee (USIPC), a US business group, which wrote the initial draft, at the request of the US Trade Representative (Weissman 1996). Those party to the USIPC include Monsanto, Pfizer, DuPont, and IBM. Market and trade rules amount to a form of infrastructure vis-à-vis the markets. The body which decides the rules of trade has a considerable advantage over other stakeholders. Under the current setting, it is large multinationals, especially the agents of US monopoly capital, which control the rules of trade, specifically through cozy relationships with the US government. Therefore, it is the governance of trade rules which most distinguishes modern capitalism from the imperialist systems of the early 20th century. The IMF and the World Bank are monopoly capital’s third source of governing power over developing countries. The IMF and the World Bank are under the control of the G7 (the US, Japan, Germany, France, the UK, Canada, and Italy), which hold nearly 42 percent of the votes in these two organizations. Within the G7 itself, only the US (specifically the US Treasury Department) has the power of veto. Furthermore, US and EU companies routinely establish relationships with the IMF and the World Bank directly. Stanley Fisher, former deputy managing director of the IMF, became vice-chairman of Citibank shortly after finishing his IMF tenure. James Wolfensohn, a former World Bank president, came from a senior executive role at Salomon Brothers and, following his stint at the World Bank, returned to Wall Street as chairman of the International Advisory Board of Citigroup. In 1995, while president of the World Bank, Wolfensohn started a Staff Exchange Program in order to facilitate employee sharing between multinational corporations and the Bank (Cray 2006). It was against this backdrop that the IMF and World Bank, through loan conditionality, forced developing countries to adopt open door policies, resulting in a flood of imports from the developed world (Marsden 2003; Weissman 2000; Weisbrot et al. 2009). Thus, the WTO regime is nothing short of a regime of imperialism, whereby monopoly capital exercises governing power over both national markets and the world economy. Whereas the first four of the five pillars by which Lenin defined imperialism still apply under the WTO regime, in place of the fifth (colonization), monopoly capital has gained new tools of dominance, most specifically the ability to design market rules. In losing the policy space to protect and develop local firms, developing countries are obliged to become incorporated into a global network managed by monopoly capital. In this way, income is steadily transferred from the lower rungs of the global economy to monopoly capital at the top. In short, the WTO regime constitutes a new stage of imperialism, in which monopoly capital holds hegemony over market rules in place of colonization.

#### [Fukuda] The WTO’s brand of capitalist imperialism is creating a rich vs poor divide

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

The WTO regime was devised under the initiatives of monopoly capital as a means

to promote corporate globalization. The next task is to explore what corporate

globalization has brought to society. The true nature of corporate globalization is

expressed in its outcomes. Lenin characterized imperialism as a decaying stage of capitalism, owing to its unproductive character, which he described as rentier capitalism. The aim of this section is to show that corporate globalization too is nothing more than a decaying stage of capitalism. Over the past three decades, multinational corporations have drastically increased their shares of foreign investment and have greatly expanded their activities in the global marketplace. UNCTAD publishes the Trans-Nationality Index (TNI), which is a composite of three ratios: (foreign assets)/(total assets), (foreign sales)/(total sales), and (foreign employment)/(total employment). The TNI for the world’s top 100 companies increased from 47.0 percent in 1993 to 55.8 percent in 2003, an increase of 8.8 percent (UNCTAD 2007). The top 200 companies increased their share of total assets by 655.9 percent between 1983 and 2002, while the world GDP increased by just 179.5 percent over the same period (Anderson et al. 2005). This gap between the growth rates of corporate assets and GDP shows a considerable income shift from wages to profits. This rise in profits against wages has advanced considerably in the course of globalization (Ellwood 2001). Turning to the issue of standards of living in local communities, here the bleak side of corporate globalization is on full display. Corporate globalization has created a divided society, distinguished by rising levels of poverty among those at the lower end of the economic spectrum. In the US, which is the most unequal society among the OECD, the Gini coefficient (which measures household income inequality) has risen almost constantly since the late 1960s. Presently, the top 20 percent of US households possess 47.3 percent of total household income (2007) and 84.7 percent of net assets (2004) (Wolff 2001; Mishel et al. 2008/2009). This level of inequality is the result of considerable income gaps between capital and labor; management and the rank-and-file; standard and non-standard forms of employment; and large companies and subcontractors. It is the activities of monopoly capital which have caused the widening of these gaps. Moreover, multinational corporations have developed so-called downsizing policies, replacing standard employees with their non-standard counterparts. Such downsizing has drastically changed the make-up of society. These changes have transformed what was once basically a cooperative society into one which is markedly divided. Furthermore, this policy of downsizing is itself the result of corporate globalization in two key ways. One is a shift in the power balance toward multinational corporations; the other is the intensification of global competition among multinationals. Large multinational firms benefit from a wide range of selection-capacity in deciding where to locate facilities, including the ability to outsource production abroad. On the other hand, it is very difficult for workers to cross national borders in search of better employment opportunities; workers must seek jobs within their respective region. This difference in the flexibility of capital against labor gives capital the upper hand in regards to negotiated labor contracts. Deregulation of labor markets further advantages management over labor. Therefore, neo-liberal policies in the labor market affect the power balance between management and labor in just the same way as a collapse of trade unions. For just the same logic as in the labor market, the power balance has undergone a steady shift toward monopoly capital and away from small to medium-sized firms. Corporate globalization has also widened the per capita income gap between the north and the south, exacerbating the south’s poverty. While the number of people living on less than $1.25 per day decreased between 1981 and 2005, the number of people living on less than $2 per day rose considerably over the same period. After the collapse of the housing bubble in 2008, around 1 billion people now face chronic hunger and starvation. Poverty in developing countries often has a historical context, such as estate ownership or civil war. Still, neo-liberal policies have made it much more difficult for developing countries to address issues of poverty within their borders (Oxfam 2002; UNCTAD 2004: 189).

#### [Fukuda] Attempts to call for “economic advancement” of LMICs are attempts to control and subordinate POC

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

The IMF and the World Bank have occupied a central role in bringing developing

countries into the fold of corporate globalization. Since the 1980s, under the IMF’s Structural Adjustment Program (SAP), more than 100 developing countries have been forced to adopt “open door” policies with respect to investment and trade (Chossudovsky 1997, 1998). Once the door has been pried open, large multinational firms—for instance, the major players of agribusiness and infra-business—are quick to extend their reach into the newly available markets. As a result, considerable damage results to the people of developing countries through, for example, loss of traditional industries like family farming and the privatization of hitherto public resources such as community water supplies. After the 1997 East Asian financial crisis, the IMF met with severe criticism for imposing neo-liberal based readjustment regimes on the afflicted countries. Nevertheless, the IMF has continued to adhere to a neo-liberal approach with respect to the global recession which is currently underway following the collapse of the housing bubble in 2008 (Weisbrot et al. 2009). The IMF’s Structural Adjustment Program was formulated as global rules by WTO agreements. Thus, neo-liberalism has become the predominant feature with respect to international rules on trade. Liberalization of trade policy amounts to nothing but the loss on the part of national governments of the policy space to govern. Developing countries need flexible tariff systems, quantitative import controls, and capital controls to protect their local industries. They also need policies such as local content controls and export subsidies to foster new economic development. WTO agreements prohibit or strictly limit the use of these industrial policies, in spite of the fact that these very same policies were employed to great effect by developed countries during their earlier stages of development. Deprived of this policy space, developing countries are easily brought under the governance of monopoly capital. Following the collapse of the Bretton Woods system, global capitalism underwent a variety of considerable changes, leading to the intensification of a casino-like character on the part of the financial sector, accompanied by increasing levels of instability with respect to peoples’ lives. This transformation of the structure of capitalism proceeded in parallel with the financialization of the economy, the phenomenon whereby trends in financial markets have come to lead the non-financial sectors. In the US, the ratio of financial assets to GDP rose from 4.2 in the 1970s, to 6.0 in 1980s, and to 10.0 by 2007. The share of financial-sector profits, including insurance and real property, exceeded the profits of all non-financial sectors in the US in the late 1990s.

#### [Alt & Fukuda] The alternative is earth democracy – a shift away from capitalist globalization and a focus on sovereignty

**Fukuda 2010** (Yasuo Fukuda, January 2010, “WTO REGIME AS A NEW STAGE OF IMPERIALISM: DECAYING CAPITALISM AND ITS ALTERNATIVE,” World Review of Political Economy, <https://hermes-ir.lib.hit-u.ac.jp/hermes/ir/re/22161/0101106701.pdf>) //neth

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.

**Case**
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#### **Reducing IP protections chills future investment – even the perception of wavering commitment scares off companies.**

Grabowski et al. ’15 (Harry; Professor Emeritus of Economics at Duke, and a specialist in the intersection of the pharmaceutical industry and government regulation of business; February 2015; “The Roles Of Patents And Research And Development Incentives In Biopharmaceutical Innovation”; Health Affairs; <https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/10.1377/hlthaff.2014.1047>; Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

Patents and other forms of **intellectual property** **protection** play **essential roles** in encouraging innovation in biopharmaceuticals. As part of the “21st Century Cures” initiative, Congress is reviewing the policy mechanisms designed to accelerate the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments. Debate continues about how best to balance patent and intellectual property incentives to encourage innovation, on the one hand, and generic utilization and price competition, on the other hand. We review the current framework for accomplishing these dual objectives and the important role of patents and regulatory exclusivity (together, the patent-based system), given the lengthy, costly, and risky biopharmaceutical research and development process. We summarize existing targeted incentives, such as for orphan drugs and neglected diseases, and we consider the pros and cons of proposed voluntary or mandatory alternatives to the patent-based system, such as prizes and government research and development contracting. We conclude that patents and regulatory exclusivity provisions are likely to remain the core approach to providing incentives for biopharmaceutical research and development. However, prizes and other voluntary supplements could play a useful role in addressing unmet needs and gaps in specific circumstances. Technological innovation is widely recognized as a key determinant of economic and public health progress. 1,2 Patents and other forms of intellectual property protection are generally thought to play essential roles in encouraging innovation in biopharmaceuticals. This is because the process of developing a new drug and bringing it to market is **long, costly, and risky**, and the costs of imitation are low. After a new drug has been approved and is being marketed, its **patents protect it** from competition from chemically identical entrants (or entrants infringing on other patents) for a period of time. **For firms** to have an **incentive** to **continue to invest** in innovative development efforts, they must have an **expectation** that they can **charge enough** during this period to **recoup** costs and make a profit. After a drug’s patent or patents expire, **generic rivals** can enter the market at **greatly reduced development cost** and prices, providing added consumer benefit but **eroding** the **innovator drug** company’s revenues. The Drug Price Competition and Patent Term Restoration Act of 1984 (commonly known as the Hatch-Waxman Act) was designed to balance innovation incentives and generic price competition for new drugs (generally small-molecule chemical drugs, with some large-molecule biologic exceptions) by extending the period of a drug’s marketing exclusivity while providing a regulatory framework for generic drug approval. This framework was later changed to encompass so-called biosimilars for large-molecule (biologic) drugs through the separate Biologics Price Competition and Innovation Act of 2009. Other measures have been enacted to provide research and development (R&D) incentives for antibiotics and drugs to treat orphan diseases and neglected tropical diseases. Discussion continues about whether current innovation incentives are optimal or even adequate, given evolving public health needs and scientific knowledge. For instance, the House Energy and Commerce Committee recently embarked on the “21st Century Cures” initiative, 3 following earlier recommendations by the President’s Council of Advisors on Science and Technology on responding to challenges in “propelling innovation in drug discovery, development, and evaluation.” 4 In this context, we discuss the importance of patents and other forms of intellectual property protection to biopharmaceutical innovation, given the unique economic characteristics of drug research and development. We also review the R&D incentives that complement patents in certain circumstances. Finally, we consider the pros and cons of selected voluntary (“opt-in”) or mandatory alternatives to the current patent- and regulatory exclusivity–based system (such as prizes or government-contracted drug development) and whether they could better achieve the dual goals of innovation incentives and price competition. The essential rationale for patent protection for biopharmaceuticals is that long-term benefits in the form of continued future innovation by pioneer or brand-name drug manufacturers outweigh the relatively short-term restrictions on imitative cost competition associated with market exclusivity. Regardless, the entry of other branded agents remains an important source of therapeutic competition during the patent term. Several economic characteristics make patents and intellectual property protection **particularly important** to **innovation incentives** for the biopharmaceutical industry. 5 The R&D process often takes more than a decade to complete, and according to a recent analysis by Joseph DiMasi and colleagues, per new drug approval (including failed attempts), it involves more than a **billion** dollars in out-of-pocket costs. 6 Only approximately one in eight drug candidates survive clinical testing. 6 As a result of the high risks of failure and the high costs, research and development must be funded by the **few successful, on-market products** (the top quintile of marketed products provide the dominant share of R&D returns). 7,8 Once a new drug’s patent term and any regulatory exclusivity provisions have expired, competing manufacturers are allowed to sell generic equivalents that require the investment of only several million dollars and that have a high likelihood of commercial success. **Absent intellectual property protections** that allow marketing exclusivity, innovative firms would be **unlikely** to make the costly and risky investments needed to bring a new drug to market. Patents confer the right to exclude competitors for a limited time within a given scope, as defined by patent claims. However, **they do not guarantee demand**, nor do they prevent competition from nonidentical drugs that treat the same diseases and fall outside the protection of the patents. New products may enter the same therapeutic class with common mechanisms of action but different molecular structures (for example, different statins) or with differing mechanisms of action (such as calcium channel blockers and angiotensin receptor blockers). 9 Joseph DiMasi and Laura Faden have found that the time between a first-in-class new drug and subsequent new drugs in the same therapeutic class has been dramatically reduced, from a median of 10.2 years in the 1970s to 2.5 years in the early 2000s. 10 Drugs in the same class compete through quality and price for preferred placement on drug formularies and physicians’ choices for patient treatment. Patents play an **essential role** in the economic “ecosystem” of **discovery and investment** that has developed since the 1980s. Hundreds of start-up firms, often backed by venture capital, have been launched, and a robust innovation market has emerged. 11 The value of these development-stage firms is largely determined by their proprietary technologies and the candidate drugs they have in development. As a result, the **strength of intellectual property protection** plays a **key role** in funding and partnership opportunities for such firms. Universities also play a key role in the R&D ecosystem because they conduct basic biomedical research supported by sponsored research grants from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and the National Science Foundation (NSF). The Patent and Trademark Law Amendments Act of 1980 (commonly known as the Bayh-Dole Act) gave universities the right to retain title to patents and discoveries made through federally funded research. This change was designed to encourage technology transfer through industry licensing and the creation of start-up companies. Universities received only 390 patents for their discoveries in 1980, 12 compared to 4,296 in 2011, with biotechnology and pharmaceuticals being the top two technology areas (accounting for 36 percent of all university patent awards in 2012). 13

#### **R&D’s key to innovation – otherwise, future pandemics.**

Marjanovic et al. ’20 (Sonja; Ph.D. at the University of Cambridge; May 2020; “How to Best Enable Pharma Innovation Beyond the COVID-19 Crisis”; RAND; <https://www.rand.org/pubs/perspectives/PEA407-1.html>; Accessed: 8-31-2021; AU)

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

**[Bapanapalli] Forced charity hurts society & violates the right to pursue one’s own ends**

**Bapanapalli 2020** (Why Forced ‘Charity’ Is Bad Economics, May 13 2020, Satish Bapanapalli, Foundation for Economic Education, <https://fee.org/articles/why-forced-charity-is-bad-economics/>) //neth

Fulfillment from Charity I couldn’t agree more. Just like freedom is a fundamental desire of every human being, so is the desire to help fellow humans. Individuals express charity in many other forms such as support towards animal welfare, nature conservancy, promotion of arts, incentivizing fundamental research, and environmental causes. Not to be a cynic, but the fulfillment that charity brings to people is just like any other service. We pay a price to watch a movie or have a great time at an amusement park like Universal Studios. In return, we get the satisfaction of great memories. In the case of charity, the price we pay brings us fulfillment. So, why is it important to view fulfillment derived from charity just like any other commodity? Because then economists can apply their theories and have fun! (\*huge economist grin\*) Let’s consider two thought experiments. First, how would you feel if your desire is to buy a Lexus sedan with your money, but you are forced to buy a Hyundai sedan instead for the same price, even though the Hyundai sedan is priced much lower in the market? Second, let’s say you get great satisfaction by donating your money to the Wounded Warrior Project. However, you are instead forced to donate that money to help with protection of Indian Rhinoceros’ habitat. How does that make you feel? Both thought experiments are similar. Buying a Lexus sedan and donating to Wounded Warrior Project are your personal choices. That is why charity is personal! If you are instead coerced to donate to charities that you do not relate to, then you do not derive equivalent fulfilment out of that donation.