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#### Interp: The aff must define which medicines they reduce intellectual property protections for with a delineated text in the 1ac

#### Medicines is a vague and broad term - no normal means. Antonanzas and Postma 16

**Antoñanzas**, F., Terkola, R. **& Postma**, M. The Value of Medicines: A Crucial but Vague Concept. PharmacoEconomics 34, 1227–1239 (**2016**). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40273-016-0434-8> //SR

Key Points for Decision Makers Although the value of healthcare products is commonly understood as a mix of effectiveness, safety and efficiency, there is no clear and shared definition of this abstract and multi-perspective concept, potentially leading to inconsistent decisions across jurisdictions regarding price, reimbursement, and access to those products. Decision makers and health technology assessment bodies should make efforts to explicitly specify the criteria used when appraising health technologies so that their value can be unambiguously conceptualized and measured. Several approaches are used to incorporate the concept of value without explicitly defining it, but adaptations to specific situations (through the weighting of assessment results according to various criteria) are frequently found in real-world practice. Table 2 Cost-effectiveness thresholds in selected European countries Country Affordability threshold (cost/QALY) Austria No [35] France No [23, 35, 43] Germany No [23, 35] Likely to range between €20,000 and €40,000, not formal [43] Hungary Technologies are considered cost effective below the threshold of 2 9 GDP per capita/QALY; technologies are not cost effective above the threshold of 3 9 GDP per capita/QALY [47] Italy No [35] The Netherlands Approximately €20,000, not fixed [47] Absolute maximum of €80,000 for severe diseases; however, orphan medicines have been adopted above this threshold [12] Between €10,000 and €80,000 depending on the burden of disease [37] Spain No [35] Evidence suggests that technologies less than €30,000 are considered efficient and greater than €120,000 as inefficient [51] Sweden Approximately SEK500,000, not fixed [23] €45,000 used as guide, not fixed [35] Approximately €100,000 has been accepted for severe diseases between 2002 and 2007 [12] Likely range is between £25,000 and £40,000, not formal [43] Not explicit, but based on individuals’ willingness to pay [48] UK Yes, approximately £20,000–£30,000 [12, 23, 31, 35] Medicines meeting end-of-life criteria accepted beyond this threshold [12] Evidence suggests between £20,000 and £30,000, not fixed [43, 52]

#### Standards:

#### Strat Skew and Clash - 1ar’s can skirt clash and moot neg ground by no linking medicine specific disads or pics and making the normal means debate late breaking e.g. no vaccine diplomacy since vaccines being medicines is ambiguous or ayurveda pic if you don’t defend the field of medicine.

#### Resolvability - judges can’t know who to vote for if they don’t understand what each side is defending which also denies negs to make rigorous and nuanced strategies. Outweighs - all arguments presume you can resolve them

#### Worst case neg on presumption - policies inevitably fail if policymakers can’t hash out the specifics - our ev empirically proves

#### Cx doesn’t check - a] prep skew - we were forced to prep a 1NC that hedges around the potential of you not speccing and had to prep multiple case negs b] incentivizes infinite abuse and hope you don’t get called out since its no risk if we ask you and you can strategically not meet then get extra time in cx to prep the shell since we asked c] non verifiable since judges don’t flow it d] no brightline to what constitutes a check

## 2

#### We’ll concede the fw.

#### The WTO is globalized neoliberalism – any trade agreement is underwritten by capitalist actors and only serves to legitimize monopoly capitalism and imperialism.

Fukuda 10 [Fukuda, Yasuo. "WTO regime as a new stage of imperialism: Decaying capitalism and its alternative." World Review of Political Economy 1.3 (2010): 485. //MSJ SB]

The objectives of the World Trade Organization (WTO) regime are to liberalize trade in goods and services and force developing countries to introduce neo-liberal policies. The purpose is to advance deregulation, privatization, and free trade. T. Friedman (2006) characterized globalization after 2000 as the world becoming flat, whereby every company, organization, or individual can gain entry into a global marketplace, and where all people are free to start businesses which may benefit from a worldwide commercial network. However, this is just one side of globalization under the WTO regime. Multinational corporations as monopoly capital reap most of the benefits of the “flat” world economy. WTO Agreements have ushered in a new era of corporate globalization. The aim of this article is to show that corporate globalization represents a new stage of imperialism, whereby monopoly capital not only controls the world market, but writes the market rules as well. This new form of imperialism is nothing less than a decaying stage of capitalism in which, quite apart from people being guaranteed the chance to lead happy and stable lives, the very potential for doing so is undermined and destroyed. Finally, principles of localization are presented as an alternative to corporate globalization.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. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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

* You can’t solve problems with the same actor who causes the problems
* Uniquely bad: now monopoly capitalism has the ability to DESIGN THE MARKET RULES THEY PLAY BY so it’s literally impossible for small power players to ever win
  + The authorities are corrupt
* Last line of the card: WTO and neolib are inseparable so any agreement they make must be capitalist because it’s made by global corporate superpowers
* You can’t pass a law unless you have a cozy relationship w US government, to do that you have to be capitalist

#### Capitalism’s successes necessitate human extinction and destroy the value to life – it’s try or die for alternative organizing

Duzgun 20 [Eren Duzgun (teaches Historical Sociology and International Relations at Leiden University, Netherlands), 4-5-2020, "Capitalism, Coronavirus and the Road to Extinction," Socialist Project, https://socialistproject.ca/2020/04/capitalism-coronavirus-and-road-to-extinction/]

**Covid-19, by contrast, has begun its journey and taken its biggest toll thus far in the most advanced and affluent parts of the world**. This is to say, the contagion is no longer limited to the persistently undernourished, underdeveloped, and war-torn parts of the world; its impact is no longer restricted to a distant wet market or a third world country alone. **Instead, it has emerged and expanded in the very heart of the capitalist world order at a time when capitalism has not only been already firmly established across the globe but has been testing the eco-biological limits of the entire planet. Should things remain the same, Covid-19 and its future cousins are likely to claim the lives of not just ‘some’ people as they did in the past, but of humanity as a whole. In this sense, perhaps for the first time in modern history, the biological blitzkrieg activated by the coronavirus has thrown into sharp relief the immediately existential and undeniably global contradictions and consequences generated by capitalism.** Contradictions on a Global Scale Critical biologists and epidemiologists have put the blame on industrial agriculture as the root cause of the emergence of new pathogens since the 1990s. [According to Rob Wallace](https://climateandcapitalism.com/2020/03/11/capitalist-agriculture-and-covid-19-a-deadly-combination/), giant agribusiness and resource extraction firms have now reached the last virgin forests and smallholder-held farmlands in the world, subordinating them to the logic of capitalist markets. **The loss of the ecological diversity and complexity of these huge tracts of land has increasingly forced wild food operators to hunt in previously untouched parts of the jungle, which, in turn, has increased “the interaction with, and spillover of, previously boxed-in pathogens, including Covid-19.”** Likewise, global warming has forced or allowed pathogens to escape their natural habitat. As a result, new viruses against which we have no immunity “are being sprung free, threatening the whole world.” In short, [as John Vidal writes](https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2020/mar/18/tip-of-the-iceberg-is-our-destruction-of-nature-responsible-for-covid-19-aoe), “we disrupt ecosystems, and we shake viruses loose from their natural hosts. When that happens, they need a new host. Often, we are it.” **That some agribusiness firms have been blatantly risking lives for profit would not come as a surprise to the critical reader**. Even [Bill Gates has been sounding the alarm](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=6Af6b_wyiwI) about the potentially deadly consequences of irresponsible business practices and new viruses. **Yet, what tends to remain underemphasized in these debates is that the blame belongs neither solely to ‘greedy’ firms that have driven viruses out of their natural habitat, nor to ‘short-sighted’ politicians who have not invested enough in vaccine technology or national health systems. Instead, the problem is rooted in the very structure and rationality of the system as a whole. That is, we may go extinct as a result of the ‘successes’ of the very system ‘we’ created in the first place, i.e., capitalism. How did we end up losing control of an ‘economic’ system of our own making?** This is indeed an anomaly in human history. The conception of the ‘economy’ as an autonomous sphere dictating its own rules over society did not exist in non-capitalist societies. As the economic anthropologist [Karl Polanyi](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Polanyi#Works) put it, “neither under tribal, nor feudal, nor mercantile conditions was there… a separate economic system in society.” The economy either “remained nameless” or had “no obvious meaning,” for the economic process and prices were instituted through non-market means, such as kinship, marriage, age-groups, status, political patronage, etc. Even “where markets were most highly developed, as under the mercantile system,” the economic system, as a rule, “[was absorbed in the social system](https://books.google.ca/books?id=SgHuxQEACAAJ)” and showed “no tendency to expand at the expense of the rest.” In this sense, the market with a distinctive logic, autonomy, and dynamic of its own was completely unknown to our ancestors, and indeed, the emergence of the idea of ‘self-regulating’ markets represented a complete reversal of the way in which past economies functioned. **In order for ‘self-regulating’ markets to ‘self-regulate’, a variety of political and institutional arrangements had to be initiated to progressively eliminate the non-market survival strategies that humans previously relied upon.** Most notably, the age-old communal systems of social and moral regulation needed to be eradicated, a process that systematically subordinated the ‘natural and human substance of society’, i.e., land and labour, to market relations for the first time in history. Rise of Capitalism **At the heart of the rise of capitalism, therefore, rested a ‘political’, legal, and violent process that led to the historically unprecedented characterization of land and labour as commodities. Without commodifying land and labour, i.e., without treating the planet’s living substance as commodities, it would have been impossible to view the ‘economy’ as an institutionally and motivationally self-regulating sphere of life, an almost robotic creature functioning at the expense of human lives and livelihoods. Capitalism presupposed from the very beginning a radical transformation in the human use of nature as well as in the provision of life’s essential requirements. In this sense, the danger of global extinction which we have been going through is not a temporary hiccup in an otherwise smoothly operating capitalist ecosystem but has always been a possibility built into the very structure of market society.** On the one hand, by treating land and labour as commodities, by subjecting people’s utilization of land and enjoyment of life to their ability to continuously increase market competitiveness and productivity, capitalism has enabled massive technological advancements in all spheres of life. This, in turn, has generated, above all, an unprecedented potential to feed, clothe, and accommodate an ever-increasing world population. **On the other hand, however,** [**as Ellen Wood argues**](https://monthlyreview.org/1998/07/01/the-agrarian-origins-of-capitalism/)**, by subordinating all other considerations to the imperatives of market competition, capitalism has also created poverty, homelessness, environmental destruction and pandemics**. Billions of people who could be fed and housed are subjected to immense doses of insecurity, living their lives under the constant threat of joblessness, homelessness, loss of status and starvation. **In a similar fashion, the environment that could be protected is systematically destroyed for profit, and killer viruses that could be contained are unleashed.** Undoubtedly, Covid-19 has become the archetypal example that lays bare “the destructive impulses of a system in which the very fundamentals of existence are subjected to the requirements of profit.” **Can the ‘positive’ and ‘negative’ outcomes of capitalism be somewhat reconciled? Indeed, for a brief period in the Global North, it seemed they could be**. During the so-called [Golden Age of Capitalism](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-golden-age-of-capitalism-9780198287414) (1945-70), massive productivity increases (alongside working-class struggles) allowed for steady increases in wages, job security, expansion of welfare state, improvements in the living conditions of the majority of the labouring masses as well as the expansion of civil and political liberties. **Yet, this brief period of generalized prosperity and stability also facilitated the incorporation of the western working classes into the dominant capitalist ideology, causing them to turn a blind eye to the economically destabilizing, environmentally destructive, and socially degrading impact of global capitalism in the Global South.** The main ‘problem’ with the Global South has been, by and large, a question of ‘timing’. **Once capitalism was established and consolidated in the Global North, it has not only led to the birth of new and more effective forms of imperialist control and neocolonial expansion but has also irrevocably undermined the potentially positive outcomes of capitalist development elsewhere.** For example, the [MIT political economist Alice Amsden](https://global.oup.com/academic/product/the-rise-of-the-rest-9780195170597), a large chunk of whose work in the 1970s and 1980s sought to explain the success of the ‘Asian Tigers’, more recently concluded that the massive technological and infrastructural gap between the North and the South has literally made impossible capitalist ‘development’ of any sort in the vast majority of southern economies since the 1990s. The economic situation in the Global North has gotten progressively worse too. Under the conditions of increased global economic competition wages have been stagnating or declining since the 1970s, while decades of fiscal austerity wiping out most of the economic and social gains of the earlier period. The new reality of high unemployment, stagnant wages, long work hours and precarious jobs has been masked for a while by a debt-driven growth, the unsustainability of which has been bitterly testified by millions of people since the 2008 financial crisis. All in all, market imperatives have been regulating social reproduction almost worldwide for a long time but with no prospect of capitalist ‘development’ for an overwhelming majority of the world’s population in the South and the North alike. **Furthermore, the ecologically disastrous and socially inhumane consequences of capitalism have long outweighed the prospects of material gain in the Global South.** In this respect, what is being painfully realized in the current conjuncture is that the North is no longer able to externalize the worst consequences of such an unsustainable mode of life. The North isn’t and won’t be spared the existential threats posed by global capitalism. **The implication is that any meaningful attempt at solving the present, and future crises needs to take the bull by the horn**. There is literally no choice to be made between ‘capitalism’ and ‘capitalism with a human face’. **As long as the underlying dynamics of our lives remain the same, as long as we keep treating nature and human beings as commodities, no** [**cosmetic surgery**](https://foreignpolicy.com/2018/09/12/why-growth-cant-be-green/) **will do. To the contrary, historical experience suggests that such minimal interventions will sooner or later backfire, re-legitimizing capitalism pure and simple. The only way to ‘re-embed’ our economies and save our lives from ecological collapse is by intervening in the very heart of the beast: land and human beings need to be taken out of the market. The beast is not tameable; it needs to be**[**killed**](https://monthlyreview.org/product/what_every_environmentalist_needs_to_know_about_capitalism/)**.**

**The alternative is the communist hypothesis! Thought experiments like the alt allow us to hollow out capitalist spaces and destroy faith in the system. Herod 4**

Herod 04 – James Herod author of several books on capitalism and social activist since 1968 Getting Free 2004 http://site.www.umb.edu/faculty/salzman\_g/Strate/GetFre/06.htm

It is time to try to describe, at first abstractly and later concretely, **a strategy for destroying capitalism**. This strategy, at its most basic**, calls for pulling time, energy, and resources out of capitalist civilization and putting them into building a new civilization**. The image then is **one of emptying out capitalist structures, hollowing them out, by draining wealth, power, and meaning out of them until there is nothing left but shells**. This is definitely **an aggressive strategy.** It **requires great militancy, and constitutes an attack on the existing order.** **The strategy clearly recognizes that capitalism is the enemy and must be destroyed,** but it is **not a frontal attack aimed at overthrowing the system, but an inside attack aimed at gutting it**, while simultaneously replacing it with something better, something we want. Thus **capitalist structures** (corporations, governments, banks, schools, etc.) **are not seized so much as simply abandoned. Capitalist relations are not fought so much as they are simply rejected**. We **stop participating in activities that support** (finance, condone) **the capitalist world and start participating in activities that build a new world while simultaneously undermining the old. We create a new pattern of social relations alongside capitalist relations and then we continually build and strengthen our new pattern while doing every thing we can to weaken capitalist relations.** In this way **our new democratic, non-hierarchical, non-commodified relations can eventually overwhelm the capitalist** relations **and force them out of existence**. This is how it has to be done. **This is a plausible, realistic strategy**. **To think that we could create a whole new world of decent social arrangements overnight**, in the midst of a crisis, during a so-called revolution, or during the collapse of capitalism**, is foolhardy**. **Our new social world must grow within the old, and in opposition to it, until it is strong enough to dismantle and abolish capitalist relations**. Such a **revolution will never happen automatically,** blindly, determinably, because of the inexorable, materialist laws of history. **It will happen, and only happen, because we want it to, and because we know what we’re doing and know how we want to live, and know what obstacles have to be overcome before we can live that way, and know how to distinguish between our social patterns and theirs.** But we must not think that the capitalist world can simply be ignored, in a live and let live attitude, while we try to build new lives elsewhere. (There is no elsewhere.) There is at least one thing, wage-slavery, that we can’t imply stop participating in (but even here there are ways we can chip away at it). **Capitalism must be explicitly refused and replaced by something else. This constitutes War, but it is not a war in the traditional sense of armies and tanks, but a war fought on a daily basis, on the level of everyday life**, by millions of people. **It is a war nevertheless because the accumulators of capital will use coercion, brutality, and murder, as they have always done in the past, to try to block any rejection of the system. They have always had to force compliance; they will not hesitate to continue doing so.** Nevertheless, **there are** many **concrete ways that** individuals, groups, and neighborhoods can **gut capitalism**, which I will enumerate shortly. We must always **keep in mind how we became slaves; then we can see more clearly how we can cease being slaves**. We were forced into wage-slavery because the ruling class slowly, systematically, and brutally destroyed our ability to live autonomously. **By driving us off the land, changing the property laws, destroying community rights, destroying our tools, imposing taxes, destroying our local markets**, and so forth, we were **forced onto the labor market in order to survive**, our only remaining option being to sell, for a wage, our ability to work. It’s quite clear then how **we can overthrow slavery. We must reverse this process. We must begin to reacquire the ability to live without working for a wage or buying the products made by wage-slaves** (that is, we must get free from the labor market and the way of living based on it), **and embed ourselves instead in cooperative labor** and cooperatively produced goods. Another clarification is needed. **This strategy does not call for reforming capitalism, for changing capitalism into something else. It calls for replacing capitalism, totally**, with a new civilization. This is an important distinction, because **capitalism has proved impervious to reforms, as a system**. We can sometimes in some places win certain concessions from it (usually only temporary ones) and win some (usually short-lived) improvements in our lives as its victims, but **we cannot reform it piecemeal, as a system**. Thus **our strategy of gutting and eventually destroying capitalism requires at a minimum a totalizing image, an awareness that we are attacking an entire way of life and replacing it with another, and not merely reforming one way of life into something else.** Many people may not be accustomed to thinking about entire systems and social orders, but everyone knows what a lifestyle is, or a way of life, and that is the way we should approach it. The thing is this: **in order for capitalism to be destroyed** millions and millions of **people must be dissatisfied with their way of life. They must want something else and see certain existing things as obstacles to getting what they want**. It is not useful to think of this as a new ideology. It is not merely a belief-system that is needed, like a religion, or like Marxism, or Anarchism. Rather **it is a new prevailing vision, a dominant desire**, an overriding need. **What must exist is a pressing desire to live a certain way**, and not to live another way. If this pressing desire were a desire to live free, to be autonomous, to live in democratically controlled communities, to participate in the self-regulating activities of a mature people, then capitalism could be destroyed. **Otherwise we are doomed to perpetual slavery and possibly even to extinction.** The content of this vision is actually not new at all, but quite old. **The long term goa**l of communists, anarchists, and socialists **has always been to restore community**. Even the great peasant revolts of early capitalism sought to get free from external authorities and restore autonomy to villages. Marx defined communism once as a free association of producers, and at another time as a situation in which the **free development of each is a condition for the free development of all**. Anarchists have always called for worker and peasant self-managed cooperatives. **The long term goals have always been clear**: to abolish wage-slavery, **to eradicate a social order organized solely around the accumulation of capital for its own sake, and to establish in its place a society of free people who democratically and cooperatively self-determine the shape of their social world**.