**CAP NC**

1. **MARX’S VIEWS ON ETHICS**

**Justice is an abstract idea solely dependent on the mode of production at a given time.**

**Van Wulven 1** Vanwulven, Tyler, "A Marxian Critique of Nonideal Theory." Thesis, Georgia State University, 2018. [https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/philosophy\_theses/229 //](https://scholarworks.gsu.edu/philosophy_theses/229%20//) Needham LF

2.2 Marx on Morality and Justice Marx holds that **not only will** legal and political **institutions reflect** the **material life** of humans, **but so** too **will beliefs** and ideas. **If** the **beliefs** of a given society **reflect** the **mode of production**, the only way **to understand** those ideas will be to **examine them in relation to their** 18 **genesis and development**. Additionally, it follows that if ideas are tied to a given mode of production, **moral ideas** too will **reflect**, in one way or another, a given **mode of production**. Think, for example, of values associated with different epochs. Marx, in a criticism of historians who detach the ruling ideas of an era from their material basis, points out that **ruling ideas change.** Thus **honor and loyalty were** the **values of the aristocracy while freedom and equality are** the **values of bourgeois society**. In later years, Engels declared that “[we] **reject** every attempt to impose on us **any moral dogma** whatsoever **as eternal**, ultimate and forever immutable **ethical law on the pretext that [morality] has** its **permanent principles which stand above history**” (726). He continues **morality has** always been class morality; it has either **justified** the **domination and** the **interests of the ruling class, or,** ever since **the oppressed class** became powerful enough, it has represented its **indignation against** this **domination**. (726) Therefore, for Marx and Engels, just as social relations and social institutions are always in flux, the ideas that arise out of material existence are also in flux. Now, how does this affect justice? The answer is that **justice is affected in** precisely **the same way**; however, the term justice can be understood in both a legal and a moral sense. Given that, for Marx, “every form of production creates its own legal relations, form of government, etc.,” it follows that **justice**, the concept typically **used to describe legal phenomena**, is itself an idea that **arises in, and is conditioned by, the existing mode of production** (Gr; 226). **A** give**n era**, according to Marx’s method, will **contain a** social **totality of needs, productive forces, and** social, economic, and political **relations that determine** the overall form of **social organization**. Part of this overall form is the legal and political apparatus that both grows out of, and helps to develop and fortify, the rules and practices of society. **These developments**, rules, and regulations **determine**, in one sense, **what is just.** Consequently, **justice**, like morality, **can have no transhistorical or** 19 **transsocietal determinate content** — it is determinable at a given moment, but never abstractly determinate. Thus, that it is just to enslave a large number of human beings at one moment and that it is unjust to do so at another lends support to Marx’s view: namely, justice can be determinate and identifiable at any given moment, but it does not retain the same determinacy from era to era, place to place. **Appeals to abstract justice**, then, **are historically-contextualized expressions misrepresented as universal**. Allen Wood (1972) is helpful on this point. On Wood’s reading of Marx, ‘**just’ actions** are those “transactions [that] **fit** the prevailing **mode [of production]**, they **serve a purpose relative to it**” (1972, 256). What is just, then, is a matter of what maintains the existence and reproduction of the social totality as a whole. Again, the legitimacy of Fugitive Slave Act of 1850 expressed the idea that society cannot reproduce itself (in its current form) if slave labor is unenforceable. To adopt **a juridical view**, then, **entails that one takes** these legal and political **determinations as if they do n**o**t presuppose a** given **social totality** composed of interrelated and interworking parts. As Wood explains, such a view “**is** essentially **one-sided**, and **to adopt it as the** fundamental **standpoint from which to judge all social reality is to adopt a distorted conception of that reality**” (1972, 255). Again, the juridical view is a distortion precisely because in taking some particular notion of justice as the primary metric of a given society, one neglects the way in which ideas about justice arise, not to mention the way in which societies function so as to reproduce themselves. The juridical view confuses a context-dependent idea for an abstract one. Furthermore, the juridical view is equally problematic for its neglect of society as a totality that contains needs, production, relations, and ideas which condition and are conditioned 20 by each other. Whatever justice means at a given historical moment must be understood in its broader social and political context. **So long as** identifying **principles of justice is the central concern, developing a** proper **understanding of how** so-called **injustices arise**, for what reasons, in what way, as a result of what needs, production, and relations of power, etc., **will be** secondary and potentially, if not often, **overlooked**. Therefore, **because ‘justice-seeking’** and ‘justice adjudicating’ **ignore** the centrality of civil society and the **interdependency of social phenomena within a** given **mode of production**, we can see how **nonideal theory adopts a flawed view of society**. As Wood explains: Abstracted from a concrete historical context, all formal philosophical principles of justice are empty and useless; when applied to such a context, they are misleading and distorting, since they encourage us to treat the concrete context of an act or institution as accidental, inessential, a mere occasion for the pure rational form to manifest itself. (1972, 257) In other words, to use justice as nonideal theory does — as an abstract, pure, moral, or metaphysical concept — is to misunderstand what justice is. Therefore, the nonideal theorist’s employment of justice, like their ideal theorist counterparts’, is simply confused. Stated differently, abstract justice, from the Marxian understanding of society as a totality of interdependent moments, is a contradiction in terms.

**Adopting a Marxist perspective helps us resist alienation and solve issues of inequalities.**

**Rikowski 1** Rikowski, Ruth. “A Marxist Analysis of the World Trade Organisation’s Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights.” *Policy Futures in Education*, vol. 4, no. 4, Dec. 2006, pp. 396–409, journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.2304/pfie.2006.4.4.396, 10.2304/pfie.2006.4.4.396. Accessed 19 Sept. 2019. // Needham LF

**We need to** try to **grasp** the complexities of the world that we find ourselves in, in **global capitalism** today, **so** that **we can** then try to find a way to **break free** from it all, in order **to create a better, a kinder and a fairer world**. If one took a different position, and argued that global capitalism was a very good system, and that we just need to work through the various issues and dilemmas, one would quickly come up against an insurmountable number of problems (as indeed people do) in regard to issues such as IPRs, moral and humane issues, the public service ethos and the balance in copyright. **A Marxist analysis** is complex, but it **seeks to explain and solve many** of these **real problems** and contradictions, whilst also enabling us to face up to these contradictions. We need a theoretical analysis that helps us to understand and explain the system that we find ourselves in – global capitalism, **with** all its **injustice, inequality, cruelty, suffering and death** – and an Open Marxist theoretical analysis provides us with this, in my view. **Once we have this understanding, we can** then endeavour to **create a** better, kinder and a fairer social, economic and political **system** – one that is **based on human wants and needs** and one that will enable humans to find self- expression and fulfilment, **rather than a system** that is **based on the exploitation, alienation and objectification** of labour, value-creation and the never-ending drive to increase profit margins.

Thus, the role of the judge (ROJ) is resisting alienation since idealizing justice enables us to overlook injustices.

1. **ROLE OF THE BALLOT (ROB):**

It is the role of the ballot to reject capitalism in order to dismantle oppressive ideas. This is especially crucial in healthcare because developing countries and more specifically the less affluent are oppressed by the current healthcare system.

**The exclusion of human rights from the copyrights clause of the TRIPS agreement alienates those in developing countries.**

**Rikowski 2**

**TRIPS and Large Corporations** The **power of large corporations and rich countries** in the developed world **and the lack of democracy at the WTO are** illustrated **clear**ly **through TRIPS**. The **developed countries typically benefit at the expense of** the **developing countries.** The Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA), is probably the world’s most powerful industrial lobby and in many ways it shapes the **TRIPS** agenda. As Watkins says: Dictated by the US pharmaceutical industry, and driven through by threats of US trade sanctions, the agreement **was opposed by virtually every developing country in the Uruguay Round**. (Watkins, 2003, p. 32) Furthermore, ‘**TRIPS** enshrines the US patent law in the multilateral trade system’ (Watkins, 2003, p. 32). It **forces developing countries to adopt** the **standards of the rich countries** in the west. **Over 90% of patents** for new technologies **are held by corporations in rich countries**. **There are two rights in copyright – moral and economic rights**. Ideally, both of these should be included in all copyright legislation, agreements, directives and conventions, although in reality **moral rights are often excluded**. This, I would argue, is because of the **drive embedded within capitalism** itself, where **entrepreneurial drives** and trade are bound **to take precedence over** moral and **humane considerations.** Moral rights have been excluded from the copyright section of TRIPS. Most of the Berne Convention is included in TRIPS apart from moral rights. **The WTO says** that: **Members do not have** rights or **obligations under** the **TRIPS** Agreement **in respect of** the rights conferred under Article 6 bis of that Convention, i.e. **the moral rights** (the right to claim authorship and to object to any derogatory action in relation to a work, which would be prejudicial to the author’s honour of reputation), or of the rights derived therefrom. (WTO, und.a, p. 4) Thus, a very important part **of the Berne Convention** that was established over 100 years ago has been excluded from the TRIPS Agreement. Even where moral rights are included in copyright legislation, it can sometimes be difficult to enforce, there are often waiver facilities, and it can be difficult for creators to obtain their appropriate moral rights. But if it is not there at all, then creators really are at a serious disadvantage. Instead, the emphasis in TRIPS is on economic rights and trade. *TRIPS and Traditional Knowledge* TRIPS does not refer to traditional knowledge (TK) directly, but clearly TRIPS is likely to impact on TK. Drahos & Braithwaite refer to patent law and TRIPS, saying that: Patent law ... has become one of the main mechanisms by which public knowledge assets have been privatized. TRIPS itself is an outcome of this process of privatization of the intellectual commons. (Drahos & Braithwaite, 2002, p. 150) They draw attention to the fact that the ‘intellectual commons’, which includes TK, is being patented and privatised, and then traded through TRIPS. It should be noted that most people and organisations, such as NGOs that look at, and are concerned about, patents in TRIPS, examine areas other than information, education and libraries. They focus, in particular, on areas such as drugs, genes and the patenting of life-forms. Thus, I am exploring a very new, undeveloped area here. Given that TRIPS is about transforming IPRs into international tradable commodities, TK for the benefit of the local, indigenous population is under threat. *TK and IPR Issues in the Developing World* TK cannot be encapsulated in copyright, which would provide copyright protection, unless it is in a tangible form. This means that local indigenous communities in the developing world are very vulnerable and can be exploited. Many have been gathering their knowledge for hundreds of years. However, most of these people would not have the skills and capabilities to be able to write down what they know, and to transform it into a tangible form. This makes it easy for large companies to come along and appropriate this knowledge, patent it, turn it into an IPR and make money out of it, without giving due recompense to the indigenous population. As Utkarsh (2003, p. 190) says, with globalisation: ‘**knowledge** and other public goods are rapidly **being appropriated, transformed and marketed by commercial concerns, without any benefit** being shared **with the original producers’**. Western law also often treats TK as part of the public domain, and thus freely available to everyone. This is another problem. This is partly because of the culture embedded within the indigenous community itself, with its emphasis on sharing and the community spirit. Many people in the developing world see TK as being part of Nature itself, and there are also religious connotations. Thus, many would be against any notion of people owning, or seeming to own, any of this knowledge, or turning it into any form of IPR. Meanwhile, Aguilar argues that patents and other IPRs are not really suitable for protecting TK for both practical and cultural reasons. Instead, there is a need to look for viable alternatives, otherwise those in the indigenous communities will become the ‘victims of knowledge piracy’ (Aguilar, 2003, p. 181). He argues that a *sui generis* system tied to the framework that is provided by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and in Article 27.3(b) of TRIPS is urgently needed. *TRIPS and the Developing World* What are the implications of TRIPS for the developing world in general? Many NGOs argue that **TRIPS is** largely **disadvantageous for the developing world.** This is for a number of reasons. Firstly, the **strong IPRs systems** and practices that are being established **in WTO** member countries through TRIPS will **give monopoly rights to** many **private**ly-run **research organisations and** to various **powerful private corporations**. Secondly, **TRIPS** makes it **mandat**ory for WTO member countries **to patent some** categories of **life forms** and other living processes. This has raised various ethical, religious and environmental questions. The third reason is the concern that TRIPS favours large private companies and modern technology, and the fourth is the misappropriation of much TK and the lack of concern about the rights of local communities, indigenous populations and farmers, and the important role that they have played in developing this TK. *Patents and TRIPS in the Developing World* The TRIPS patent system was established in the joint statement presented to the GATT Secretariat, in June 1988 by the Intellectual Property Committee (IPC) of the USA and industry associations of Japan and Europe. The IPC is a coalition of 13 major US corporations which aims to ensure that TRIPS works to its advantage. The members of IPC include corporations like Hewlett Packard, General Motors, IBM, Rockwell and Warner. Patents laws have existed in various developing countries for over 100 years. Embedded in these patent laws was some desire to help the indigenous populations. But this is now threatened by TRIPS because of the lack of a democratic process. Shiva (2001), for example, refers to various patent systems that have evolved through multinational corporations and have been pushed by governments in the developed world through TRIPS, and how this can damage the democratic process of nation states. Fundamentally, it will be impossible to implement TRIPS in a way that will significantly benefit the developing world, because of the inherent inequalities and contradictions that are built into the very fabric of global capitalism itself. Furthermore, the drives of capital are infinite; it will never be satisfied. So, there will never come a point where it will be decided that the inequalities need to be lessened in any fundamental way. Instead, **TRIPS**, as a tool which aids the furtherance of global capitalism**, is likely to increase** the **inequalities**. Furthermore, inequalities **and poverty will only** ever **be lessened** (and largely on a temporary basis) **when pressure is placed on** those in **positions of power**. In regard to TRIPS this rests on putting pressure on the WTO through organisations such as the Third World Network and various NGOs in order to soften some of the most worrying of the implications of TRIPS for the poor and those in the developing world. However, capitalism is a battlefield upon which various compromises are and can only ever be made, but it can never ultimately be for the benefit of the labourer and the poor. To change the situation on a permanent basis, we need to terminate capitalism and replace it with socialism and eventually with communism in my opinion.

I negate the resolution, Resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines

1. **LINK:** The Aff reduces IPR which only solves one symptom of the root cause of capitalism perpetuated by the WTO.

**The WTO sustains capitalism through TRIPS which catalyzes the commodification of knowledge.**

**Rikowski 3**

TRIPS = Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights Agreement from WTO

In my book, *Globalisation, Information and Libraries* (Rikowski, 2005), I place TRIPS within an Open Marxist theoretical perspective. In essence, my argument is that **IPRs, through TRIPS, are** being **transformed into international tradable commodities**. **Value** that is created **from labour** (and particularly from intellectual labour in this regard) becomes **embedded in the commodity**. Furthermore, **value can only ever be created from labour**. These **commodities are** then **sold** in the marketplace **and profits are made** and this **ensures the continued success of global capitalism, whilst labour is exploited, alienated and objectified.** Following on from Marx, we need to begin our analysis of capitalism with the commodity. The logic of capitalism is **the commodification of all** that **surrounds us**. Now, we are seeing this process starting to take effect **in areas** that were unheard of before – this includes schools, universities and libraries. These are areas that **were previously thought to be** something **beyond commercialisation** and trading. But **through the WTO** we are now witnessing a dramatic change. The logic of this at a future date will be that the public will probably have to pay for services, the same way that they pay for other goods in shops, and services provided by other private companies, such as a taxi service. So, the aim in **TRIPS** is to **transform** knowledge, information and **ideas into IPRs** that can then be **traded in the market**place. Fundamentally, the **TRIPS** assists with the process of **commodify**ing **more** and more **areas of social life**. But what *exactly* is this value, which becomes embedded in the commodity? I consider this in depth in my dissertation on value creation through knowledge (Rikowski, 2003a), and also provide an overview of it in *Globalisation, Information and Libraries* (Rikowski, 2005), and further explore it in the forthcoming book that I am editing, *Knowledge Management: social, cultural and theoretical perspectives* (Rikowski, 2007). Capitalism goes through different stages, such as the Agricultural Revolution and the Industrial Revolution, and now **we are** moving **in**to **the knowledge revolution** (see Rikowski, 2000a, b, 2003b). Throughout all these periods, capitalism is sustained by value, and this value can only ever be created by labour. As Marx said: ‘human labour creates value, but is not itself value. It becomes value only in its congealed state, **when** embodied in the form of some object’ (1867, p. 57). In the Industrial Revolution, value was largely extracted from manual labour, but in the knowledge revolution **value is** being **increasingly extracted from intellectual labour. TRIPS assists with this** extraction of value, **and with** the **embedding** of **it in** the **commodity**…*Implications of the WTO in General for Educators and Information Professionals* In regard to the WTO in general**, large corporations and rich countries wield** a very **considerable amount of power and influence at the WTO**. The United Kingdom House of Lords Select Committee on Economic Affairs in its report on *Globalisation*, spoke about the influence that rich countries wield at the WTO, saying: We recognise that member countries of the WTO vary in size and economic power. They vary, therefore, in their capacity to influence decisions in the WTO and, more fundamentally, to maintain a presence at the WTO. It would be naive to believe that an organisation like the WTO would not be dominated by a small number of rich countries. (House of Lords, 2002, p. 10) There are many implications here for educators and information professionals**. If more knowledge** and information **is encapsulated in IPRs** that are **owned by large corporations in rich countries**, for example, whether this be in the developed world or in the developing world, then **it is less likely that this information will be made freely available**. Instead, IPRs will be traded, as in the spirit of TRIPS. A further concern is the fact that **many important decisions** as a result of these different agreements will **reside within the WTO** itself**, rather than within individual nation states.** This involves the eroding of power of nation states. Thus, it is likely that more IPR legislation in WTO member states will have to fall in line with TRIPS and that the **power** and influence **of educators**, information professionals and librarians **over IPR legislation** and directives is likely to **be even more minimal.** Thus, in essence **global capitalism** is being **perpetuated** and furthered **through the WTO**. This is because **trade agreements** that are being **developed at the WTO**, such as the GATS and TRIPS, are helping to **ensure** that more and **more areas of social life are** being **commodified**. Capitalism is sustained by value, and not by any set of moral principles, and this includes any possible moral issues in regard to intellectual property rights.

**Since patents generally exclude women in the first place, the aff won’t change anything because women are left out of the entire sphere of medical research.**

**Reardon 20** Reardon, Sara. “Gender Gap in US Patents Leads to Few Inventions That Help Women.” *Nature*, vol. 597, no. 7874, 20 Aug. 2021, pp. 139–140, www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02298-9, 10.1038/d41586-021-02298-9. Accessed 16 Sept. 2021. // Needham LF

When **Rembrand Koning**’s wife was giving birth to their first child in 2017, the couple was dismayed by **the lack of technology for new mothers** who were recovering from pregnancy complications. Baby scales were hard to use one-handed, breast pumps were frustrating, and there were few resources to help Koning’s wife with the post-partum pre-eclampsia that she experienced. It seemed, Koning says now, as **if designers of health-care tech**nologies **had little first-hand knowledge of childbirth** and the **difficulties** that could arise. Perhaps, reasoned Koning, an economist at Harvard University in Cambridge, Massachusetts, the relative **scarcity of women’s health products on the market** was **due to a scarcity of women inventing** them. A study[1](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02298-9#ref-CR1) that he published in June confirms this theory: **few biotechnology patents are owned by women**, and **female inventors are** significantly **more likely** than are male ones **to patent health products for women**. **Patenting** inventions has long been **a mainly male endeavour**: a 2016 report[2](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02298-9#ref-CR2) by the Institute for Women’s Policy Research, a US non-profit organization that aims to improve the lives of women by shaping public policy, found that **a woman was cited as the lead inventor on just 7.7% of all patents filed between 1977 and 2010 in the United States**. Those female-owned patents **tended to involve products such as jewellery and clothing.** Koning theorizes that **those who have** the opportunity **to invent** anything **have** a **strong influence on what** actually **gets invented. When inventors are diverse**, he adds, “those people may **see problems that men may have dismissed or overlooked”.** To find out whether this trend extends to the health field, Koning and his colleagues looked at more than 400,000 biomedical patents filed between 1976 and 2010 with the US National Bureau of Economic Research, a non-profit organization that collates all data from the US Patent and Trademark Office. In **2010**, they found that **only 16.2% of patents** were **generated by** research **teams consisting mostly of women — up from 6.3% in 1976.**Next, using a machine-learning algorithm, the researchers scoured the patents for terms that indicate whether the invention related to women’s or men’s health, then determined the gender make-up of the patent-holders for each. **Teams made up of all women**, they found, **were 35% more likely** than all-male teams **to invent technologies relating to women’s health.** But teams made up of all women or all men were equally likely to patent technologies for men’s health. **If women and men** had **produced an equal number of patents since 1976**, the researchers estimated, **there would be 6,500 more female-focused inventions today.**Koning says that there are probably multiple reasons for these disparities. **The unequal numbers** of patents produced by men and women **suggests that fewer women have the chance to invent**. That’s not surprising, he says, given the **barriers** that **women face** advancing **in science** and engineering **fields**. Still, the **discrepancy is** particularly **striking** considering that [**half of life-science PhDs in the United States are held by women**](https://www.ncses.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19304/digest/field-of-degree-women)**.** Elina Berglund, a particle physicist and entrepreneur in New York City, is also not surprised by the findings. “It makes sense to me that one is more likely to spend time innovating or solving a problem that they have either experienced or are close to,” she says. After failing to find an effective non-hormone-based, non-invasive form of contraception, Berglund co-developed an app that used an algorithm to track fertility cycles. In 2018, Natural Cycles became the first direct-to-consumer contraceptive app to be approved by the US Food and Drug Administration. “I realized the unmet need for this option for contraception by experiencing it myself,” says Berglund, who is now chief executive of Natural Cycles. “I believe that the gender gap is indeed why women’s health has been an under-served and under-researched area for so long.” Mathias Nielsen, a sociologist at the University of Copenhagen who researches social stratification in science, says that Koning’s study represents the first time that anyone has quantified an issue that he says researchers have long suspected: **less attention is given to** innovation in **women’s health because the mostly male entrepreneurial field researches it less**. “It’s a very interesting and important contribution to the discussion of how diversity links to innovation,” he says. Sociologist Laurel Smith-Doerr, who studies gender diversity in science, is not surprised by the gender gap in patenting, but says that the link between women’s patents and women’s health is an important advance. She thinks that further research is needed to examine how gender and ethnicity collectively influence invention trends. The same work needs to be repeated with nationality, she argues, and also with regards to whether the inventor is the first in their family to attend university. Smith-Doerr, who is at the University of Massachusetts Amherst, adds that inventors are often drawn to work on problems that affect their own daily lives. That could partly explain why diseases that disproportionately affect those from minority ethnic groups or people who live in developing countries tend to receive less research funding and interest than do diseases that affect financially privileged white people. If research teams were more racially diverse, the focus of their interest might change, she says. “**We’d be better off with inventions** that represent **all of the knowledge and** all the human **capacity we have**,” she says. Diversity, she adds, is also important for ensuring that medical devices and technologies that target all genders benefit all of them equally. “Historically, **the male body has been** taken as **the baseline**,” Nielsen says; **certain tech**nologies **and practices** such as personal protective equipment and drug-dosing regimens **don’t** necessarily **work well for women**. Koning expects that the male-heavy invention trend is also visible in the concepts that make it to the marketplace. **Venture capitalists are** much **less likely to fund women’s inventions**: start-up companies led by women in the United States received [only 2.3% of total venture-capital funding in 2020](https://hbr.org/2021/02/women-led-startups-received-just-2-3-of-vc-funding-in-2020), and **women represent just 12% of venture-capital decision-makers**. Koning thinks that this trend might extend to inventions that most benefit women. He cites stories about venture capitalists shying away from touching a breast pump, for instance, thinking it was “gross”. Men are also more likely to be on the scientific advisory boards of companies and start-up businesses[3](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-021-02298-9#ref-CR3). Koning says that his team is now looking into digital health products and apps, and whether they benefit certain communities or genders more than others. The team also plans to look at whether the gender imbalance in entrepreneurship affects the products that are brought to market. “Our hope is that in 20 years, some of this stuff starts disappearing,” he says.

1. **IMPACTS:**

Subpoint A) WTO-enabled monopolies on developing nations

**Disparity in Covid-19 Vaccine distribution protocols have created a vaccine apartheid wherein poor nations are left to die because of lack of access**

**Lennard 21**Natasha Lennard, educator of Critical Journalism at the New School for Social Research and Contributing Writer for the Intercept, 6-11-2021, "The G7 Upheld Vaccine Apartheid. Officials From the “Global South” Are Pushing Back.," Intercept, <https://theintercept.com/2021/06/17/vaccine-g7-covid-internationalism-summit/>]

IF **THE GROUP of Seven summit** in the United Kingdom last week made anything clear, it is that those **powers** [**cannot**](https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/g7-summit-climate-aid-vaccines-b1865119.html) **be trusted to end** the urgent **crises** facing life **on Earth** — for humans and nonhumans alike. When it comes to the Covid-19 pandemic, the **G7** nation-**states reaffirmed their commitment to global vaccine apartheid** through neoliberal governance, only slightly obscured under a guise of **charitable offerings.** The concessions **are insufficient at best**. Amnesty International [condemned](https://www.amnesty.org/en/latest/news/2021/06/g7-pledge-to-share-one-billion-vaccine-doses-with-poorer-countries-is-a-drop-in-the-ocean/) the G7’s pledge to provide 1 billion doses to middle- and low-income countries as a “drop in the ocean.” G7 leaders failed to agree to waive vaccine [intellectual property](https://theintercept.com/2021/04/15/covid-vaccine-patent-ip-poll/) rules and commit to knowledge and technology sharing. **Under the current medicine monopoly regime, it is** [**projected**](https://www.oxfam.org/en/press-releases/more-million-covid-deaths-4-months-g7-leaders-failed-break-vaccine-monopolies) **to take until 2078 for the world’s poorest countries to vaccinate their populations**. **G7 countries are expected to vaccinate** their populations **by January 2022** “We do not have a system that protects against unequal access. Later this week, government ministers from many of the countries that will suffer most — and have already suffered — from this abhorrent vaccine inequality are convening online alongside scientists and global health advocates to forge a different path out of the pandemic. The [summit](https://act.progressive.international/vaccine-internationalism/), hosted by Progressive International, recognizes vaccine internationalism as the necessary order of the day. Politicians from states including Cuba, Venezuela, Vietnam, Kenya, Kerala — which is in India — and Argentina will attend, alongside Western parliamentarian progressive allies like the U.K.’s Jeremy Corbyn and Greece’s Yanis Varoufakis. The question is whether a solidarity-based bloc can be established with sufficient power and cooperation to undo vaccine apartheid. The stakes could not be higher**. Covid-19 is** all but **assured to shift from a pandemic into an endemic disease, with the victims** of historic and ongoing colonialism **left to die by the millions.** [I’m i](https://theintercept.com/newsletter/?source=Article-In&referrer_post_id=360405)n “We do not have a system that protects against unequal access,” Varsha Gandikota-Nellutla, an India-based coordinator with Progressive International, told me by email. She pointed to the disparities between the European Union and countries in Africa. “Consider this: the EU has already made a deal with BioNTech/Pfizer for 1.8 billion booster shots even as **the entire continent of Africa has vaccinated less than 2 percent of its population** with the first and second doses.” Gandikota-Nellutla noted that at current rates**, it will take nearly six decades for the world to be vaccinated** — a statistic echoed by the People’s Vaccine Alliance, a coalition of organizations including Amnesty International, Health Justice Initiative, Oxfam, Stop AIDS Campaign, and UNAIDS. She said, “We’re witnessing the ills of nationalism, imperialism, and racial capitalism all play out in the most grotesque of ways in the vaccine race.” **WE KNOW WHAT vaccine nationalism looks like: Powerful countries, aided by World Trade Organization** regulations, **make deals with leviathan pharmaceutical companies** to buy up **and hoard vaccines**. **Poorer** **countries are** **forced into positions of dependence** on insufficient charity; **Big Pharma gets bigger.** Meanwhile, intellectual property [fetishist](https://www.wired.com/story/opinion-the-world-loses-under-bill-gates-vaccine-colonialism/) Bill Gates asserts, despite evidence from international scientists to the contrary, that poorer nations are per se incapable of developing, regulating, and distributing vaccines safely and efficiently. A system of health care scarcity is developed by design, with results no less than genocidal. The basic means of surviving a pandemic are held as a political cudgel by the richest countries over the poorest. At present, for example, Venezuela has been shut out of receiving any of the half a billion Pfizer vaccine doses President Joe Biden pledged to donate to COVAX, short for COVID-19 Vaccines Global Access, the initiative purportedly committed to equitable international vaccine distribution. Despite Biden stating that vaccine donations “don’t include pressure for favors or potential concessions,” Venezuela has been shut out of COVAX access due to ongoing, brutal U.S. sanctions against the country. “No country has the right to obstruct the access to health of any other,” Venezuelan Foreign Minister Jorge Arreaza, who will be attending the Summit for Vaccine Internationalism, said in a statement. “**Obstructing** **a people’s access to vaccines during the pandemic is a crime against humanity** and the free peoples of the world must unite and design mechanisms to avoid this medical apartheid, where a few have access to vaccines and others are excluded.” ANY SORT OF robust vaccine internationalism — in which collective potentials for vaccine production and distribution are truly unlocked — has so far been off the table. Yet we have seen a number of recent examples of production and sharing outside the top-down control of powers like the U.S. and the EU.

1. **ALTERNATIVE:** Abolish the WTO

#### The affirmative is only attacking the symptom of capital dispossession. We must refuse the call for easy reform and dedicate ourselves to the real task of anti-capitalist movement building.

Patrick **Reinsborough 2003** (has been involved in campaigns for peace, the environment, and social justice for over twenty years. He co-founded the smartMeme strategy & training project in 2002 and with his colleague has trained over 3,000 organizers and partnered with over 100 high impact organizations to frame issues, strengthen alliances and win critical campaigns.  Patrick was previously the Organizing Director of the Rainforest Action Network where he mobilized thousands of people to confront corporations who destroy the environment and violate human rights. Patrick's work has incorporated a range of creative tactics including brand busting, cross-cultural alliance building, markets campaigning and nonviolent direct action.  DE-COLONIZING THE REVOLUTIONARY IMAGINATION Journal of aesthetics and politics August 2003 volume 1, issue 2 <http://www.joaap.org/1/de_colonizing/index.html>)

**Our planet is heading into an unprecedented global crisis.** The blatancy of the corporate power grab and the accelerating ecological meltdown is evidence that **we do not live in an era where we can afford the luxury of fighting the symptoms**. As is often noted, crisis provides both danger and opportunity. The extent that these two opposing qualities define our era will be largely based on the appeal and breadth of the social movements which arise to address the crisis. This essay is part of my own struggle to explore a politics that is commensurate with the scale of the global crisis. In part it was inspired by a profound strategy insight I received while watching a circling bird of prey. The raptor seemed to spend hours calmly drifting on the breezes, waiting and watching, then suddenly made a lightning quick dive to seize its prey. Had I only witnessed the raptor’s final plunge, I might not have realizing that it took hours of patient surveillance for the raptor to be in the right place to make a seemingly effortless kill. I was struck by what a clear metaphor the raptor’s circling time is for what our movements need to do in order to be successful. Social change is not just the bird of prey’s sudden plunge—the flurry of direct confrontation - but rather the whole process of circling, watching, and preparing. **Analysis is the most import tool in the social change toolbox. It is this process of analysis— the work to find the points of intervention and leverage in the system we are working to transform— that suggests why, where and how to use the other tools.** **Many of us are impatient in our desire for change and particularly, those of us from privileged backgrounds, are often times unschooled in the realities of long-term struggle.** I often recall the Buddhist saying “The task before us is very urgent so we must slow down.” This essay is my effort as an organizer who has been deeply involved in a number of recent global justice mass actions, to “slow down” a bit and explore some new analytical tools. My hope is that this essay will incite deeper conversations about strategies for building movements with the inclusiveness, creativity and depth of vision necessary to move towards a more just and sane world. To do so, let’s begin by asking why aren’t more global north movements coming forward with systemic critiques? Why despite the increasingly obvious nature of the crisis, isn’t there more visible resistance to the corporate take over of the global political system, economy and culture? The answer to this question lies in our exploration of how pathological values have shaped not only the global system but also our ability to imagine true change. **The system we are fighting is not merely structural it’s also inside us, through the internalization of oppressive cultural norms which define our worldview. Our minds have been colonized to normalize deeply pathological assumptions**. Thus often times our own sense of self-defeatism becomes complicit with the anesthetic qualities of a cynical mass media to make fundamental social change unimaginable. As a consequence **activists frequently ghettoize themselves by self-identifying through protest and failing to conceive of themselves as building movements that can actually change power relations.** **All too often we project our own sense of powerlessness by mistaking militancy for radicalism and mobilization for movement building. It seems highly unlikely to me that capitalism will be smashed one widow at a time.** Likewise getting tens of thousands of people to take joint action is not an end in itself, rather only the first step in catalyzing deeper shifts in Western culture. Our revolution(s) will really start rolling when the logic of our actions and the appeal of our disobedience is so clear that it can easily replicate and spread far beyond the limiting definition of “protester” or “activist”. To do so, our movements for justice, ecology and democracy must deepen their message by more effectively articulating the values crisis underlying the corporate system. We must lay claim to life-affirming, common sense values and expose one of the most blatant revolutionary truths of the modern era: the corporate rule system rooted in sacrificing human dignity and planetary health for elite profit is out of alignment with an increasing number of people’s basic values. **This is the domain of post-issue activism— the recognition that the roots of the emerging crisis lie in the fundamental flaws of the modern order and that our movements for change need to talk about re-designing the whole global system— now. Post-issue activism is a dramatic divergence from the slow progression of single-issue politics, narrow constituencies and band-aid solutions**. Traditional single-issue politics, despite noble and pragmatic goals, is not just a strategic and gradualist path to the same goal of global transformation. Rather **the framework of issue-based struggle needs to affirm the existing system in order to win concessions and thus inhibits the evolution of more systemic movements. Too often we spend our time campaigning against the smoke rather than clearly alerting people to the fact that their house is on fire. Post-issue activism is the struggle to address the holistic nature of the crisis and it demands new frameworks, new alliances and new strategies**. We must find ways to articulate the connections between all the “issues” by revealing the pathological nature of the corporate take over. To do so we must rise to the challenge of going beyond (rather than abandoning) single-issue politics. We have to learn to talk about values, deepen our analysis without sacrificing accessibility and direct more social change resources into creating political space for a truly transformative arena of social change. To explore de-colonizing the revolutionary imagination, we must reference the history of colonization. The word colonialism comes from “colonia” a Latin word for rural farmstead. When the armies of the Roman empire conquered the peoples of Europe they seized the land and created colonias to control the territory. A thousand years later Europe came to be controlled by leaders who went on to mimic this cruelty, and force Western civilization ("a disease historically spread by sharp swords"1 ) upon the rest of the world. Colonialism is not just a process of establishing physical control over territory, it is the process of establishing the ideologies and the identities - colonies in the mind - that perpetuate control. Central to this process has been the manufacture of attitudes of racism, nationalism, patriarchal manhood, and the division of society into economic classes. If we are to take seriously de-colonizing the revolutionary imagination then we must examine how these attitudes, shape the way we conceive of social change. Likewise we must remember that analysis is shaped by experience and that those who suffer directly as targets of these manufactured attitudes of oppression often live the experiences which create clear analysis. Effective revolutions listen. In facing the global crisis, the most powerful weapon that we have is our imaginations. But first **we must liberate ourselves from the conceptual limitations we place on social change. As we expand the realm of the possible we shape the direction of the probable. This means directly confronting the myths and assumptions that make a better world seem unattainable.** To that end this essay endeavors to explore some tools to help us unshackle our imaginations and deepen the momentum of the global justice movements into a political space to fundamentally re-design the global system.

So the aff is in a double bind: they still have harms from cap bc they keep the wto in power, but they take out financial incentive for producing drugs.