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## 1NC -- K -- Colonial Capitalism

#### Reformism is not emancipatory but instead contributes to the iterative perfection of colonial capitalism –potential of legal change is circumscribed by hegemonic power structures that are embedded in international political systems.

Vanni ’21 -- Dr. Vanni obtained both her PhD and LLM degrees in International Economic Law from the University of Warwick, where her doctoral thesis was awarded the 2018 SIEL–Hart Prize in International Economic Law. She has BA(Hons) in International Relations and Politics from Keele University, where was awarded the Vice-Chancellor Partial Scholarship (2004-2007). Dr. Vanni currently teaches the undergraduate and postgraduate modules in intellectual property law (Amaka Vanni, 3-23-2021, "On Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines and Vaccine Imperialism," TWAILR, <https://twailr.com/on-intellectual-property-rights-access-to-medicines-and-vaccine-imperialism/>, accessed 8-24-2021) //nikki

These events – the corporate capture of the global pharmaceutical IP regime, state complicity and vaccine imperialism – are not new. Recall Article 7 of TRIPS, which states that the objective of the Agreement is the ‘protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights [to] contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology’. In similar vein, Article 66(2) of TRIPS further calls on developed countries to ‘provide incentives to enterprises and institutions within their territories to promote and encourage technology transfer to least-developed country’. While the language of ‘transfer of technology’ might seem beneficial or benign, in actuality it is not. As I discussed in my book, and as Carmen Gonzalez has also shown, when development objectives are incorporated into international legal instruments and institutions, they become embedded in structures that may constrain their transformative potential and reproduce North-South power imbalances. This is because these development objectives are circumscribed by capitalist imperialist structures, adapted to justify colonial practices and mobilized through racial differences. These structures are the essence of international law and its institutions even in the twenty-first century. They continue to animate broader socio-economic engagement with the global economy even in the present as well as in the legal and regulatory codes that support them. Thus, it is not surprising that even in current global health crisis, calls for this same transfer of technology in the form of a TRIPS waiver to scale up global vaccine production is being thwarted by the hegemony of developed states inevitably influenced by their respective pharmaceutical companies. The ‘emancipatory potential’ of TRIPS cannot be achieved if it was not created to be emancipatory in the first place. It also makes obvious the ways international IP law is not only unsuited to promote structural reform to enable the self-sufficiency and self-determination of the countries in the global south, but also produces asymmetries that perpetuate inequalities. Concluding Remarks What this pandemic makes clear is that the development discourse often touted by developed nations to help countries in the Global South ‘catch up’ is empty when the essential medicines needed to stay alive are deliberately denied and weaponised. Like the free-market reforms designed to produce ‘development’, IP deployed to incentivise innovation is yet another tool in the service of private profits. As this pandemic has shown, the reality of contemporary capitalism – including the IP regime that underpins it – is competition among corporate giants driven by profit and not by human need. The needs of the poor weigh much less than the profits of big business and their home states. However, it is not all doom and gloom. Countries such as India, China and Russia have stepped up in the distribution of vaccines or what many call ‘vaccine diplomacy.’ Further, Cuba’s vaccine candidate Soberana 02, which is currently in final clinical trial stages and does not require extra refrigeration, promises to be a suitable option for many countries in the global South with infrastructural and logistical challenges. Importantly, Cuba’s history of medical diplomacy in other global South countries raises hope that the country will be willing to share the know-how with other manufactures in various non-western countries, which could help address artificial supply problems and control over distribution. In sum, this pandemic provides an opportune moment to overhaul this dysfunctional global IP system. We need not wait for the next crisis to learn the lessons from this crisis.

#### WTO is a Trojan Horse for accumulation by dispossession and global imperialism---the regime of credibility surrounding it is ideologically manufactured

Screpanti 14 – Ernesto Screpanti, Professor of Political Economy at the University of Siena, Global Imperialism and the Great Crisis: The Uncertain Future of Capitalism, p. 110-113)

The Role of International Organizations

Of the international economic organizations, those that work most effectively to achieve the expansion of “freedom” are the World Trade Organization, the International Monetary Fund, and the World Bank, the three main political institutions charged with preparing the world for capitalist penetration.

The WTO was founded with the primary aim of favoring the expansion of international trade, and was equipped with effective instruments for disciplining opportunist countries. It fulfills the function of issuing international trade rules and rendering them enforceable better than any national empire has ever managed to do. It achieves this through multilateral agreements carrying binding commitments for signatory states. With the Dispute Settlement Understanding (DSU) these agreements are enforceable. The “judgments” handed down by the WTO’s Dispute Settlement Body (DSB) oblige noncompliant countries to conform to the rules, under the threat of economic sanctions ranging from compensating an injured country for damages to the implementation of retaliatory measures.

The rules, especially those known as “nondiscriminatory clauses,” are supposed to foster the expansion of free trade. In reality, they effectively force member states to accept penetration by multinational corporations. The National Treatment clause, for example, obliges governments to extend the best treatment afforded to national firms, including state-owned companies, to foreign ones. The Market Access clause, in turn, prohibits governments from hindering the entrance of multinational firms.60 Together these rules have contributed to creating a norm that encapsulates the essence of the whole set of regulations, a sort of “most favored firm” clause. If an advantage is granted to a firm, for example, a national company, it must be granted to all firms. This implies, among other things, that once a state-owned company has been privatized there is hardly any going back, even if it results in a market failure.

The TRIPs (Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights) serve to safeguard the ownership of the products of scientific and technological research, trademarks, and the like, and thus to guarantee the profitability of their use. Patents, which are mainly registered in the countries of the imperial Center, cannot be used by developing countries unless they pay the royalties established by the multinational companies to which the patents belong, often even if they apply to vital drugs.61 In the TRIPs, the World Trade Organization clearly reveals its nature as a political organization with the purpose of safeguarding the interests of multinationals. Not by chance, the big corporations played a key role in drawing up the TRIPs agreements.62 While all the other agreements formally have the aim of expanding competition and free trade, the TRIPs agreement takes the form of a protectionist regulation. It explicitly seeks to protect monopoly positions and the monopoly profits provided by scientific and technological research, an activity in which the big multinationals of the North excel.

Even more blatant are the agreements known as TRIMs (Trade- Related Investment Measures). Their content is essentially disciplinary, as they prohibit the adoption of the economic policy instruments63 that the governments of many countries use to protect their economies from certain negative consequences of foreign direct investments. The TRIMs serve to disarm states in their attempts to implement industrial and commercial policies for the benefit of local populations. They mete out discipline in the interests of the multinationals.

But possibly the most brazen of all these agreements is the GATS (General Agreement on Trade in Services), which regulates a highly heterogeneous sector (with 160 sub-sectors) effectively covering the production of all nonmaterial goods, from finance to postal services, from water supply to electricity, from telecommunications to transport, from insurance to banks, from education to health. The sector is so vast that it accounts for two-thirds of global output.

The GATS was expressly proposed, prepared, and armed by certain Anglo-American financial multinational lobbies whose names are well known.64 According to economic science, a large part of the goods covered generate market failures65—because they are produced in conditions of natural monopoly (for example, water supply), because they generate significant externalities (for example, pollution), or because they are commons (for example, woods), public goods (for example, justice), or merit goods (for example, education). This is why their production was traditionally controlled or regulated by the state in the public interest. The GATS instead considers policies that pursue public aims in the production of services as discriminatory. Under the pretense of making markets competitive, it forces signatory states to dismantle public sectors that regulate services and sell off the firms that provide them. In contrast to the other agreements, the GATS is not confined to regulating existing markets but plays a fundamental role as a creator of markets. It seeks to commodify public goods, public utilities, and commons, and to privatize natural monopolies.

Joining the WTO implies acceptance of the rules of national treatment and market access, as well as the principle that public monopolies and public services are unacceptable. Then, when a serious economic crisis arises and leaves a country in need of financial help from the IMF and the WB, the government is forced to sell off state-owned companies and commons to the multinationals.

The WTO has become a partial substitute for gunboats in imperial governance. Through it, the big capital clears and paves the way for expansion and accumulation on a global scale. What is more, it does so with the consent of the exploited countries, which are induced to join the organization to gain access to flows of foreign direct investments from multinationals, assistance from advanced countries, and financial aid from the IMF and WB.

As for the IMF, following the Washington Consensus (of “free market” economics) this pawnbroker for desperate states took on the role of liberator. Previously, based on the Keynesian approach of the Bretton Woods system, the IMF imposed restrictions on the demand side, while granting credit to check the severity of those restrictions as much as possible. With the success of the monetarist ideology of Milton Friedman and the Chicago School in the late 1970s, the “structural” adjustments imposed were expected to affect the supply side, that is, mainly structures of production and ownership, rather than aggregate demand alone. Moreover, a “long-run perspective” was to be preferred, rather than focusing on the “short run.” Thus, from 1979 onward, the IMF began to impose structural reforms with the aim of “relaunching development.” According to neoliberal ideology, such reforms require the deregulation and liberalization of markets. This meant the cutting of tariffs and other forms of protectionism to boost competition, the liberalization of prices to cure inflation, the deregulation of labor markets to foster flexibility and reduce labor costs, the deregulation of financial markets to encourage capital mobility, and the privatization of public utilities to balance national budgets and expand competition. Thus the IMF acts as a bulldozer, preparing the ground for the arrival of multinational capital in desperate states. It does so to make this arrival as profitable as possible: it cuts wages and the cost of raw goods, makes labor flexible, and gets states to sell off public utilities and natural resources at fire-sale prices.

Lastly, the WB plays a more subtle, but no less effective, role in bringing about the expansion of “freedom.” It offers help to developing countries by funding investments in the infrastructure necessary for industrial takeoff, or, in other words, for penetration by multinational capital. Like the IMF, with which it often acts in cooperation, the WB gives nothing for free. In particular, among the conditions for access to its loans, it also demands the demolition of trade barriers, the privatization of services, and the selling off of the commons to private companies.

Could the big multinationals let control over the great international economic organizations slip from their hands? And how could they get those organizations to serve their own interests while maintaining the decision-making autonomy of their managers? A powerful ideological campaign was called for. No sooner said than done. Having unleashed the most imaginative economists and even enlisted the help of the international academic body that decides on the recipients of the Nobel prize for economics, the right doctrines were promptly produced, one more audacious than the other: the right doctrines to replace the dated nineteenth- to twentieth-century free trade theory.66 Then the markets for allegiance, the mass media, the most prestigious U.S. universities, research institutes, and culture academies, sprang into action to defend the new orthodoxy and put the right people in the right places. This is how the great international economic organizations came to be capable of acting autonomously in the interests of multinational capital.

#### Entrepreneurial innovation’ shores up ideological support for neoliberal hegemony---causes securitized militarism and inevitable economic collapse

Ampuja 16 – Marko Ampuja, Lecturer in Media and Communication Studies in the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, “The New Spirit of Capitalism, Innovation Fetishism and New Information and Communication Technologies”, Javnost - The Public Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture, Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 19-20

Introduction

From the viewpoint of critical social theory, one of the most intriguing questions today concerns the legitimacy of neoliberal capitalism since the beginning of the global economic crisis in 2007. Historically, capitalism, whatever its national or regional varieties, has never been stable. It has been characterised by oscillations between periods of economic booms and busts, the latter of which have at times developed into more serious economic and political crises that have threatened the whole capitalist social order. Yet it can be argued that the current crisis is more serious than ever, “spreading more widely and rapidly through an interconnected global economy” (Streeck 2014, 35). This condition has obviously weakened the neoliberal doctrines of self-correcting markets. However, neoliberalism still remains the globally dominant political practice and economic philosophy among elites, seeking justification from increasingly zombie-like ideas that refuse to die even when they have been exposed as fallacies (Quiggin 2010).

Neoliberalism is by no means a coherent system of economic principles. Instead, it is riven with internal contradictions that spring, for example, from its uneasy mixture of free market rhetoric and actual state interventionism, or its simultaneous promotion of individual freedoms and an authoritarian submission to the commands of the market (Harvey 2005, 67–81). In addition, neoliberalism has changed over the decades, each time reconstituting itself in light of different political conditions (Candeias 2013, 10). In the recent conjuncture, its advocates have responded to the global economic crisis by turning towards more authoritarian directions (Bruff 2014), combining economic austerity with coercive policies of war on terror, border control, surveillance and other forms of “security” as responses to growing social discontent.

While neoliberalism keeps reinventing itself, it continues to draw strength from its long-standing ideological assumptions, according to which the market and the private are superior to the state and the public. Consequently, elite opinion and much of the mainstream media in advanced capitalist countries have accepted free capital mobility, privatisation of public enterprises and the removal of welfare benefits as economic policies to which there are no alternatives. Yet the hegemony of neoliberalism is not based on such “tough” economic prescriptions alone. They have been accompanied by positive claims according to which in the past 30 years or so we have moved into a new form of capitalism that signifies fun, creativity and innovation, often associated with new information and communication technologies (ICT) and the information society. These discourses have served as the “happy face” of neoliberal capitalism, offering motivations that have constructed its distinctive moral ethos. This ethos can be defined as “the new spirit of capitalism”, which “justifies people’s commitment to capitalism, and…makes this commitment attractive” (Boltanski and Chiapello 2005; Chiapello and Fairclough 2002, 186) in the neoliberal era.

This spirit has not only motivated corporate leaders, management consultants and politicians; it has been actively communicated to the general public, with the purpose of re-working their everyday understandings. A crucial aspect of this hegemonic work has been an attack against the “nanny state”, which is said to make people passive (Barfuss 2008). This proposition is linked to a general condemnation of the “paternalism” of Keynesian welfare states. By contrast, advocates of the “free market” have offered neoliberal policies as progressive forces, which signal a move from the supposedly rigid and bureaucratic social structures of earlier state-directed capitalism to more open and decentralised market structures. One of the key characters of this new phase of capitalism has been the innovative ICT entrepreneur, many of whom have achieved massive media fame (e.g. the late Steve Jobs). At the same time, new ICT products and innovations (e.g. PCs, mobile phones, smart phones, the Internet and social networking services) have symbolised all that is dynamic in capitalism and assumed to generate beneficial effects across society.

I argue that the mainstream intellectual and media discourses surrounding technological innovations, especially those regarding new ICT and ICT entrepreneurs, have been vital constituents of neoliberal ideology in its different stages. While technological innovations and the impact of new ICT have, of course, been studied much in and across different disciplines, their role in the construction and maintenance of neoliberal hegemony has not received enough attention. The aim of this article is to clarify the importance of mainstream ideas concerning technological innovations and especially new ICT for neoliberal hegemony and to call such mainstream ideas into question.

#### Their fantasies of extinction scenarios infinitely defer a meaningful reckoning with settler colonialism

Dalley, 18—Assistant Professor of English at Daemen College (Hamish, “The deaths of settler colonialism: extinction as a metaphor of decolonization in contemporary settler literature,” Settler Colonial Studies, 8:1, 30-46, dml)

In this way, these settler-colonial narratives of extinction begin as a contemplation of endings and end as a way for settlers to persist. As in the classical solution to the settler-colonial paradox of origins, the native must be invoked and disavowed, and ultimately absorbed into the settler-colonial body as a means of accessing true belonging and the possibility of an authentic future in place. Veracini’s description of the settler-colonial historical imagination thus applies, in modified but no less appropriate form, to visions of futurity haunted by the possibility of death: Settler colonial themes include the perception of an impending catastrophe that prompts permanent displacement, the tension between tradition and adaptation and between sedentarism and nomadism, the transformative permanent shift to a new locale, the prospect of a safe ‘new land’, and the familial reproductive unit that moves as one and finally settles an arcadia that is conveniently empty.67 And yet that parallel means that it is not entirely true to say that settlers cannot contemplate a future without themselves, or that they lack the metaphorical resources to imagine their own demise. It is in fact characteristic of settler consciousness to continually imagine the end. But it does so through a paradox that echoes the ambivalence of Freud’s death drive: it is a fantasy of extinction that tips over into its opposite and becomes a method of symbolic preservation, a technique for delaying the end, for living on in the contemplation of death.68 The settler desire for death conceals that wish – the hope that, between the thought of the end and the act, someone will intervene, something will happen to show that it is not really necessary, that the settlers can stay, that they have value and can go on living. In this way, they make their own redemption, an extinction that is an act of self-preservation, deferring the hard reckoning we know we lack the courage to face, and avoid making the real changes – material, political, constitutional, practical – that might alter our condition of being and set us on the path to a real home in the world. We dream instead of ends, imagining worlds without us, thinking of what it would be like not to be. But at every moment we know that that the dream is nothing but a dream; we know we will awake and still be here, unchanged, unchanging, living on, forever. Thus settlers persist even beyond the moment of extinction they thought they wanted to arrive.

**Vote neg to endorse effective indigenous resistance oriented towards the overthrow of economic globalization and racial neoliberalism.**

Jodi **Melamed**, 20**11** (“Represent and Destroy: Rationalizing Violence in the New Racial Capitalism, <<associate professor of English and Africana Studies @ Marquette University >, P181- p186)//pk

There are hundreds of examples, from every continent except Antarctica, of indigenous peoples, on the frontlines of globalization’s expansion, who are fighting for the survival of their communities against national governments seeking to ramp up exports, against extractive industries, against pollution and waste industries, against narco-traffickers, against energy and dam projects, against tourism, and against conservation movements that seek to remove indigenous peoples from their lands for so-called wilderness conservation. These include the Yanomami tribe of northern Brazil, who are being forced off their lands by illegal mining; the U’Wa, Nukak, and others in Colombia, who are being killed and driven off lands by governmentsponsored paramilitaries, left-wing guerrillas, and the U.S.-sponsored Plan Colombia, which pays former drug traffickers to seize Indian lands to grow nonnarcotic crops; uncontacted tribes in Peru, who are facing disease and worse with the construction of an oil pipeline through their territories built by the Anglo-French oil giant Perenco; the 200,000 tribal people in the Ethiopia delta region, who are being evicted to build a giant hydroelectric dam financed by the World Bank; the Lahu, Lisu, Meo, and other Hmong highland tribes in Thailand, who are being evicted after the government’s sale of 25,000 kilometers to an international conservation organization; other “conservation refugees,” including the Masai in Kenya and the Bushmen in Botswana; overfishing jeopardizing the survival of Chukchi and Eskimo in Russia; and mining on North American Indian lands, including those of the Cree, Western Shoshone, Mohawk, and Zuni peoples. Hundreds of other examples can be found on the Web sites and in the publications of indigenous organizations and networks, advocates and NGOs, and UN agencies and other multilateral bodies. These include the Indigenous Environmental Network, the White Earth Land Recovery Project, the Tebtebba Foundation, the International Indian Treaty Council, the Asian Indigenous Women’s Network, the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, the Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee, Mines and Communities, the International Forum on Globalization, Amazon Watch, Survival International, Cultural Survival, the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous 182 � Difference as Strategy Issues, and the International Labour Organization’s Department of Indigenous and Tribal Peoples. As indigenous people across the globe over the last forty years have experienced violences generated from the same underlying source, an economic system of accumulation through dispossession, a move to unite opposition has given rise to forceful international indigenous peoples’ movements. One of the central occupations of such movements is illuminating the global resource wars as also paradigm wars, as conflicts at the level of the material politics of knowledge. A materialist understanding of knowledge demonstrates that what counts as legitimate knowledge, emerges from contestatory processes and is not autonomous from but both shapes and is determined by material circumstances and geohistorical conditions. As Chandan Reddy has reflected, “[M]odern western knowledges . . . have been productive of certain expressions of personhood, experience, historical process, materialism, and so forth, while foreclosing other historical, material, and epistemic organizations of subjectivity, historical process, and the so-called natural world.”4 Indigenous peoples’ movements often draw attention to the fact that the material existence of globalization as an economic system relies on the functioning and legitimacy of certain rationalizing modes (e.g., corporate individualism), construals of value (e.g., the sanctity of private property rights), and expressions of personhood (e.g., people as consumers) that many indigenous people do not share. (In this chapter’s opening epigraph, Victoria TauliCorpuz makes this point.) Although most of the knowledge systems of indigenous peoples, communities, and nations have been impacted by the knowledge architecture that supports economic globalization, many yet maintain some epistemic orientations that are defective for, contradict, or offer alternatives to some of its rationalizing modes, values, and notions of personhood—including orientations to collective responsibility—and that can provide the basis for alternative expressions of materialism and economy. Contemporary indigenous cultural activism often goes to work on this epistemic level to mitigate not only the physical violences of the global resource wars but also the violences intrinsic to knowledge systems that restrict what is Difference as Strategy � 183 politically and ethically possible to extractive economies and accumulation by dispossession. Here is what is happening now: As the global resource wars have pushed onto indigenous lands, the knowledge apparatuses sustaining economic globalization have had to bring indigenous peoples into representation in a manner that explains their exploitation as inevitable, natural, or fair. But this state of affairs has also provided an opportunity for indigenous-led cultural activism to insert its own signifying systems into public discourse in order to displace the structures of legitimate knowledge, to contest dominant systems of representation, and to try to open them up to cultural meanings and epistemic orientations originating in indigenous-led interpretative communities. Reductionism and essentialism must be guarded against. The knowledge systems of indigenous peoples differ greatly from one another and are not internally homogenous. They cannot be made completely transparent to culturally nonindigenous peoples, nor can one indigenous episteme be transcoded seamlessly (or even adequately) into another, and recomprehending the world does not change it. Yet encountered on the level of media, transnational movements, and scholarship, the cultural activism of international indigenous peoples’ movements can and does insert into public discourse something like a generalized indigenous inscription of a global world system based on economies of limit and balance, reciprocal relations between people and nature, and the importance of collective rights. Not surprisingly, neoliberal multiculturalism is one of the most useful discourses functioning today to dispossess indigenous peoples of their lands and resources and to make such dispossession appear inevitable, natural, or fair. Neoliberal multiculturalism represents multiculturalism to be the spirit of neoliberalism. It represents the access of producers and investors to diverse markets and the access of consumers to diverse goods to be emblematic of multicultural values and required for global antiracist justice. It justifies the removal of indigenous peoples from their lands by describing the entire world as the rightful potential property of global multicultural citizens. At the same time, it stigmatizes indigenous peoples as monocultural, 184 � Difference as Strategy unrealistic, doomed, chauvinistic, or “tribal,” connoting a negative orientation to an exclusively defined group. If liberal multiculturalism is considered as antecedent to today’s neoliberal multiculturalism, then U.S. multiculturalisms can be seen as having long misrepresented or obscured American Indian sovereignty and land tenure claims. By treating American Indians as ethnic minorities within the framework of cultural pluralism, conventional multicultural discourse has made government-to-government relations between the United States and American Indian nations appear counterintuitive. Today, global multiculturalism can be spoken of as a valorized discourse that circulates throughout transnational political modernity in global media, in international civil society, in international NGOs, in the United Nations, and in other multilateral bodies. It can overlap with neoliberal multiculturalism, but it is not identical to it. Rather, it is a discourse in a global political register that globalizes the template of state multiculturalism (often U.S. multiculturalism) in order to represent an order of multicultural states as an adequate image of a multicultural world. One might think that within this discursive field the relationship between multiculturalism and indigenous rights would remain antagonistic, that the more one argued for indigenous peoples’ rights in the language of global multiculturalism, the more one would strengthen state multiculturalisms—that is, national governments— over and against the rights of indigenous peoples. Yet surprisingly, something new is happening. Indigenous-led cultural activism is successfully using its own version of multiculturalism to make the conceptual bases for new categories of indigenous rights and new strategies for claiming land tenure appear necessary, well founded, and just. An example of such a transcoding is in the chapteropening epigraph by Victoria Tauli-Corpuz, Igorot tribal member, founder of Tebtebba (Indigenous Peoples International Center for Policy Research and Education), and current chairperson of the United Nations Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues. Tauli-Corpuz uses familiar multicultural language that ascribes positive value to difference and antipathy to being homogenized. Yet rather than staying within the field of meanings that multicultural language generally signals, namely Difference as Strategy � 185 that the equal rights of different and diverse peoples must be supported, Tauli-Corpuz uses multicultural reference to assert that a robust right to be different and distinct is the first step in asserting a right for indigenous peoples to opt out of economic globalization and to maintain separate economic systems, in the sense of separate circulations of knowledge, lands, and resources not inscribed within the value forms of capitalist globalization. Of particular interest is indigenous cultural activism that successfully uses its own version of multiculturalism to make the culture/land conceptual bind appear comprehensible, necessary, and well founded. This conceptual bind asserts the inseparability of indigenous peoples from the earth, so that land cannot be thought of apart from its social relations with humans and human existence cannot be thought of apart from its relations to lands, trees, plants, earth formations, waters, and animals. This chapter examines two examples: (1) an activist intervention in the field of law and rights discourse and (2) an activist intervention in the field of literary multiculturalism and how it validates and organizes knowledge about difference and personhood. First examined is how the United Nations Declaration of the Rights of Indigenous People (UNDRIP), which is largely but importantly not completely the product of international indigenous activism, transcodes multiculturalism in order to make possible the first-ever recognition by the United Nations of an indigenous right to self-determination, the firstever recognition of collective rights, a new derivation of rights, and a new right to free, prior, and informed consent. Although the final version of UNDRIP passed by the UN General Assembly was a compromise document and even though many nations recognize UNDRIP only as aspirational or in ways that defang it, should it become effective international customary law, it could provide an important legal tool for indigenous peacemaking in the context of the global resource wars. Second, this chapter offers a reading of Blood Run, a long narrative poem by Allison Hedge Coke, a Huron, Cherokee, and Métis poet and a movement builder within the emergent transnational networks of indigenous peoples’ movements. Blood Run narrativizes the mound city of Blood Run, a major precontact trading settlement that 186 � Difference as Strategy was estimated, around 1650, to have had some ten thousand inhabitants and to have comprised at least six distinct tribes, making it the most populous city in North America at the beginning of European settler colonialism. Blood Run is an epistemically resituating work that transcodes multicultural reference to make it possible for a culturally nonindigenous reader to imagine the viability of an (already existing) indigenous world system, which is to say a world-encompassing circulation of meaning, value, relationality, and matter.

#### The role of debate is to disrupt colonial logics that reproduce epistemic and material violence.

## 1NC -- Case

### 1NC -- Framing

#### Linear Futurism DA – cross apply Dalley - voting for util is a mobilization of settler fantasies because of settlers’ drive to prioritize their own extinction and death as leavel to that of indigenous peoples. They reify a TEMPORAL NARRATIVE that uses doomsday rhetoric to bracket out indigenous people as relics of the past and normalize whiteness as equivalent to humanity —this instills a LINEAR FUTURISM that absolves us of responsibility for settler colonialism

### 1NC -- Turn -- Profit Motive

#### Profit motive breeds superbug.

* Answers “add more capitalism”

Angus, 19 (Ian Angus, is a Canadian ecosocialist activist. " Superbugs in the Anthropocene: A Profit-Driven Plague", Monthly Review, 6-1-2019, https://monthlyreview.org/2019/06/01/superbugs-in-the-anthropocene/, mo)

In 1959, when the biochemical arms race between antibiotics and bacteria was heating up, the noted microbiologist and environmentalist René Dubos warned against a strategy that was entirely dependent on magic bullets.

The belief that disease can be conquered through the use of drugs fails to take into account the difficulties arising from the ecological complexity of human problems. It is an attitude comparable to the naïve cowboy philosophy that permeates the wild West thriller. In the crime-ridden frontier town the hero, singlehanded, blasts out the desperadoes who were running rampant through the settlement. The story ends on a happy note because it appears that peace has been restored. But in reality the death of the villains does not solve the fundamental problem, for the rotten social conditions which had opened the town to the desperadoes will soon allow others to come in, unless something is done to correct the primary source of trouble.88

Sixty years later, Dubos’s warning seems remarkably prescient. The cowboy hero is mortally wounded, the desperadoes are stronger than ever, and the rotten social conditions remain.

Those who hailed the first antibiotics as miracle drugs were not wrong. What those chemicals could have been was a way to work with nature, to use natural processes to overcome diseases that had plagued us for thousands of years. Used with appropriate humility and careful stewardship, in conjunction with a global drive to eradicate the conditions that cause infectious diseases, penicillin and its successors could have been boons to humanity for centuries. But that would have required a radically different economy and society.

Instead, the new drugs were promoted and sold as high-volume commodities whose primary function was to generate fast profits. Pharmaceutical giants and manufacturers, doctors and private hospitals, pharmacies and more—at every stage, the profit-economy has pushed antibiotics for short-term gain, without regard for long-term effects. The expression to kill the goose that lays the golden egg has rarely been more appropriate.

Capitalism always operates in the short term and its defenders always insist that new technology will solve any problems that might arise. For several decades, antibiotics seemed to confirm that superstition—for every drug that stopped working, new ones were discovered. But that did not last. The early discoveries were low-hanging fruit and searching the higher branches has been hard and largely unsuccessful.

Mainstream economists like to claim that the market solves all—if there is a need, customer demand will produce solutions. But today, when bacteria have found ways to resist every available antibiotic, most pharmaceutical companies have abandoned the search for others. Not because new antibiotics would not be profitable, but because they would not be profitable enough. Big Pharma makes double-digit profits from drugs it sells for thousands of dollars a dose to patients who must take them frequently for many years. Antibiotics just do not fit that business model.

And yet, despite Big Pharma’s responsibility for creating the crisis, many mainstream proposals for addressing the AMR crisis involve bribing pharmaceutical makers to get back into the business. With the excuse of correcting a “market failure,” supposed experts urge governments to guarantee still more profits for the companies that have already made billions by hustling antibiotics into oblivion. As Amábile-Cuevas argues, such plans only illustrate the pervasive and destructive impact of free-market theology.

From the clinical side, free-market notions have only allowed antibiotic abuse, especially of broad-spectrum antibiotics that are good for business as they can be used against many diseases; the abandonment of antibiotic R&D, as there are other more profitable avenues for pharmaceutical research; and the immoral notion of the need for “incentives,” including higher prices, to [lure] big-pharma back to the antibiotic business.

From the agricultural arena, which is the main antibiotic abuser, the only reasons for antibiotic usage are of financial nature, most particularly the massive use of antibiotics for “growth promotion.” Agricultural use of antibiotics, of all antibiotics—not only those without direct clinical use, must cease immediately, worldwide. This would prevent the further selection of resistant organisms within food animals, which in turn get into our foodstuff; and the release of antibiotics and resistant organisms in the many forms of waste these activities generate, that end up one way or another in the environment.…

### 1NC -- Defense -- Disease

#### Disease won’t cause extinction

Farquhar 17 – Sebastian Farquhar, Leader of the Global Priorities Project (GPP) at the Centre for Effective Altruism, et al., “Existential Risk: Diplomacy and Governance”, https://www.fhi.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/Existential-Risks-2017-01-23.pdf

1.1.3 Engineered pandemics

For most of human history, natural pandemics have posed the greatest risk of mass global fatalities.37 However, there are some reasons to believe that natural pandemics are very unlikely to cause human extinction. Analysis of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) red list database has shown that of the 833 recorded plant and animal species extinctions known to have occurred since 1500, less than 4% (31 species) were ascribed to infectious disease.38 None of the mammals and amphibians on this list were globally dispersed, and other factors aside from infectious disease also contributed to their extinction. It therefore seems that our own species, which is very numerous, globally dispersed, and capable of a rational response to problems, is very unlikely to be killed off by a natural pandemic. One underlying explanation for this is that highly lethal pathogens can kill their hosts before they have a chance to spread, so there is a selective pressure for pathogens not to be highly lethal. Therefore, pathogens are likely to co-evolve with their hosts rather than kill all possible hosts.39

#### Absolutely no chance of extinction from disease

Adalja 16 [Amesh Adalja, infectious disease physician at the University of Pittsburgh] “Why Hasn't Disease Wiped out the Human Race?” June 17, 2016 (http://www.theatlantic.com/health/archive/2016/06/infectious-diseases-extinction/487514/) - MZhu

But when people ask me if I’m worried about infectious diseases, they’re often not asking about the threat to human lives; they’re asking about the threat to human life. With each outbreak of a headline-grabbing emerging infectious disease comes a fear of extinction itself. The fear envisions a large proportion of humans succumbing to infection, leaving no survivors or so few that the species can’t be sustained.

I’m not afraid of this apocalyptic scenario, but I do understand the impulse. Worry about the end is a quintessentially human trait. Thankfully, so is our resilience.

For most of mankind’s history, infectious diseases were the existential threat to humanity—and for good reason. They were quite successful at killing people: The 6th century’s Plague of Justinian knocked out an estimated 17 percent of the world’s population; the 14th century Black Death decimated a third of Europe; the 1918 influenza pandemic killed 5 percent of the world; malaria is estimated to have killed half of all humans who have ever lived.

Any yet, of course, humanity continued to flourish. Our species’ recent explosion in lifespan is almost exclusively the result of the control of infectious diseases through sanitation, vaccination, and antimicrobial therapies. Only in the modern era, in which many infectious diseases have been tamed in the industrial world, do people have the luxury of death from cancer, heart disease, or stroke in the 8th decade of life. Childhoods are free from watching siblings and friends die from outbreaks of typhoid, scarlet fever, smallpox, measles, and the like.

So what would it take for a disease to wipe out humanity now?

In Michael Crichton’s The Andromeda Strain, the canonical book in the disease-outbreak genre, an alien microbe threatens the human race with extinction, and humanity’s best minds are marshaled to combat the enemy organism. Fortunately, outside of fiction, there’s no reason to expect alien pathogens to wage war on the human race any time soon, and my analysis suggests that any real-life domestic microbe reaching an extinction level of threat probably is just as unlikely.

Any apocalyptic pathogen would need to possess a very special combination of two attributes. First, it would have to be so unfamiliar that no existing therapy or vaccine could be applied to it. Second, it would need to have a high and surreptitious transmissibility before symptoms occur. The first is essential because any microbe from a known class of pathogens would, by definition, have family members that could serve as models for containment and countermeasures. The second would allow the hypothetical disease to spread without being detected by even the most astute clinicians.

The three infectious diseases most likely to be considered extinction-level threats in the world today—influenza, HIV, and Ebola—don’t meet these two requirements. Influenza, for instance, despite its well-established ability to kill on a large scale, its contagiousness, and its unrivaled ability to shift and drift away from our vaccines, is still what I would call a “known unknown.” While there are many mysteries about how new flu strains emerge, from at least the time of Hippocrates, humans have been attuned to its risk. And in the modern era, a full-fledged industry of influenza preparedness exists, with effective vaccine strategies and antiviral therapies.

HIV, which has killed 39 million people over several decades, is similarly limited due to several factors. Most importantly, HIV’s dependency on blood and body fluid for transmission (similar to Ebola) requires intimate human-to-human contact, which limits contagion. Highly potent antiviral therapy allows most people to live normally with the disease, and a substantial group of the population has genetic mutations that render them impervious to infection in the first place. Lastly, simple prevention strategies such as needle exchange for injection drug users and barrier contraceptives—when available—can curtail transmission risk.

Ebola, for many of the same reasons as HIV as well as several others, also falls short of the mark. This is especially due to the fact that it spreads almost exclusively through people with easily recognizable symptoms, plus the taming of its once unfathomable 90 percent mortality rate by simple supportive care.

Beyond those three, every other known disease falls short of what seems required to wipe out humans—which is, of course, why we’re still here. And it’s not that diseases are ineffective. On the contrary, diseases’ failure to knock us out is a testament to just how resilient humans are. Part of our evolutionary heritage is our immune system, one of the most complex on the planet, even without the benefit of vaccines or the helping hand of antimicrobial drugs. This system, when viewed at a species level, can adapt to almost any enemy imaginable. Coupled to genetic variations amongst humans—which open up the possibility for a range of advantages, from imperviousness to infection to a tendency for mild symptoms—this adaptability ensures that almost any infectious disease onslaught will leave a large proportion of the population alive to rebuild, in contrast to the fictional Hollywood versions.

While the immune system’s role can never be understated, an even more powerful protector is the faculty of consciousness. Humans are not the most prolific, quickly evolving, or strongest organisms on the planet, but as Aristotle identified, humans are the rational animals—and it is this fundamental distinguishing characteristic that allows humans to form abstractions, think in principles, and plan long-range. These capacities, in turn, allow humans to modify, alter, and improve themselves and their environments. Consciousness equips us, at an individual and a species level, to make nature safe for the species through such technological marvels as antibiotics, antivirals, vaccines, and sanitation. When humans began to focus their minds on the problems posed by infectious disease, human life ceased being nasty, brutish, and short. In many ways, human consciousness became infectious diseases’ worthiest adversary.

### 1NC -- Disease Representations Bad

#### Securitizing disease is a means of threat projection on the Global South that causes the imposition of violent management mechanisms---it also turns the case by pushing responses away from civil society, causing the state to hoard treatment, and overfocusing on specific threats at the expense of general health

Balzacq 16 – Thierry Balzacq, Professor of Political Science and International Relations at Namur University, The Institute for Strategic Research, Sarah Léonard University of Dundee, and Jan Ruzicka, Aberystwyth University, “‘Securitization’ Revisited: Theory and Cases”, International Relations, Vol. 30(4), p. 512-513

Global health

Health issues have also received growing attention, notably as a result of the dramatic increase in the volume and density of global forms of mobility, which have affected global pandemics.142 Scholars have mainly focused on the normative and methodological dimensions of the securitization of health issues. The normative question has taken the following form: should health problems be securitized? The methodology-related enquiries have questioned what accounts for the success of securitizing moves concerning health issues. The answers provided to these questions have also had broader implications for securitization theory.

Elbe highlights, for instance, the normative dilemma inherent to the securitization of HIV/AIDS.143 On the one hand, securitization has the benefits of raising awareness, which enables a wider recognition of the deleterious effects of the issue and a more resolute commitment of resources in order to curb the pandemic. On the other hand, securitization also carries costs. One is that the securitization of HIV/AIDS could lead to a massive state involvement obscuring the role of other actors. For example, responses to the disease could be ‘pushed away from civil society toward military and intelligence organizations with the power to override the civil liberties of persons with HIV/AIDS’.144 Another negative feature of the securitization of HIV/AIDS is the activation of a ‘threat-defence logic’. Particularly in developing countries, armed forces would receive high priority for medical treatment. It can therefore be concluded that securitizing an issue should not be the a priori preferred option. Thus, one of the strengths of securitization theory is that it highlights the ‘normative choices that are always involved in framing issues as security issues and [… warns] of potential dangers inherent in doing so’.145

In addition, Youde argues that the disadvantages of securitizing health issues, in general, and the avian flu, in particular, ‘strongly outweigh the positives’.146 He builds his argument upon detailed empirical analysis of official statements and identifies three main costs of the securitization of avian flu. First, the securitization of avian flu can mobilize inappropriate responses, as it leads to health issues being addressed with traditional security means, such as armed forces. Second, securitization can prompt governments to devote a disproportionate amount of resources to counter a specific threat at the expense of tackling other issues.147 An extreme focus on a single disease can actually render a state particularly vulnerable to other threats, as its bureaucratic structures and human and financial assets all become focused on an ‘absolute priority’. Third, Youde argues that the securitization of avian flu has worsened the gap between Western states and the rest of the world. By often blaming the South for spreading the disease, Western states have imposed their anxieties, perception of the problem and specific management mechanisms upon the Third World.

#### Disease threats create dread risk, a permanent culture of anxiety that transforms all of life into management of insecurity---this turns the case, collapsing effective solutions to illness by promoting dramatically unequal prioritization of response and short term technological solutions that paper over the underlying causes of disease

McInnes 17 – Colin McInnes, UNESCO Professor of HIV/AIDS, Education and Health Security in Africa at Aberystwyth University, and Anne Roemer-Mahler, Lecturer in International Relations and a Fellow at the Centre for Global Health Policy at the University of Sussex, “From Security to Risk: Reframing Global Health Threats”, International Affairs, Volume 93, Issue 6, November, https://academic.oup.com/ia/article/93/6/1313/4568585?rss=1

Framing (and) risk

We take a different approach, arguing that global health requires a broader understanding of the process and consequences of risk assessment. To this end, we apply insights from two sets of ideas located in social constructivism: framing, and the risk society. Framing is understood as the presentation of an issue in such a way as to tie it into a broader set of ideas about the world, and through this to gain influence and policy purchase. Gitlin, for example, defines frames as ‘persistent patterns of cognition, interpretation and presentation, of selection, emphasis and exclusion, by which symbol-handlers routinely organise discourse’.24 They may be deployed and promoted by a range of stakeholders (including transnational advocacy groups, international organizations and epistemic communities) and used by them as a tool of persuasion to generate or legitimize specific pathways of response. They may be deployed to call attention to an issue, to influence other actors' perceptions of their own interests, or to convince them of the legitimacy/appropriateness of the advocate's preferred policy response. When used successfully in this way, the chosen frames ‘resonate with public understandings, and are adopted as new ways of talking about and understanding issues’, and actors will be likely to modify their behaviour accordingly.25

We use frames to examine two specific examples of how the concept of risk is used in global health. The first discusses how framing in terms of ‘global health risks’ has opened up a new discourse, distinct from that of ‘global health security’. We argue that this initially appears to be a depoliticizing move, creating an aura of scientific neutrality and inclusiveness and a moral imperative to act which make the ‘global health risk’ frame less politically charged and divisive than the ‘global health security’ frame. Yet we maintain that the ‘global health risk’ frame is nevertheless intrinsically political in that it reflects the unequal abilities of actors to define what global health risks are, and therefore to shape the policy responses promoted through this frame, and raises the question of whose health/freedom from risk matters most. Second, we move the discussion of risk on to suggest that there is no single, agreed global health risk frame, but rather that different actors frame risks from health issues differently, leading to competing understandings of the nature of the problem and the means of resolution. Unlike the first example, here ‘risk’ appears as one of a variety of terms, used sometimes interchangeably, to suggest societal vulnerability—the sense of being ‘at risk’. Specifically, we examine how three of the key organizations involved in the global response to the west African Ebola outbreak—the WHO, Médecins Sans Frontières (MSF) and the UN Security Council—framed the problem in different ways, promoting different pathways of response based upon their own interests and values rather than on a ‘scientific’ understanding of risk.

Our understanding of risk is informed by the ‘risk society’ approach, which originated in the work of sociologists Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens.26 In particular, we take four key insights from this approach. The first is that risk does not exist independently of observation but is socially constructed. As Durodie explains, risk is a ‘socially mediated cultural product … that we come to view something as being a particularly pertinent risk, and how we respond to it, is socially mediated’.27 This is a fundamental departure from ‘scientific’ calculations of risk, which assume that a risk exists whether we identify it or not, and remains unaffected by the manner in which we perceive it.

The second is that the contemporary understanding of risk is not probabilistic but possibilistic, leading to what Furedi terms a precautionary culture: ‘Precautionary culture encourages society to approach human experience as a potential risk to our safety. Consequently every conceivable experience has been transformed into a risk to be managed.’28 Risks are no longer simply a product of what people decide to do, or not to do, but are also the product of factors beyond their control. As Furedi suggests: ‘Vulnerable people cannot manage the uncertainties facing them … To be at risk is no longer about what you do—it is about who you are.’29

This leads directly to a third key insight: the heightened sense of uncertainty and vulnerability which accompanies what Beck termed ‘reflexive modernity’.30 We see vulnerability as an enduring condition of contemporary culture, and hazards as increasingly dangerous because of the uncertainty surrounding them.31 Both Beck and Giddens reverse Enlightenment arguments that increased knowledge leads to progress, arguing that this knowledge has created new hazards that we do not possess the ability to understand and manage.32 Moreover, as Freedman argues, it is this sense of vulnerability, not the threat itself, that drives responses, both individual and collective.33 However, not all risks elicit the same degree of fear;34 and here the concept of ‘dread risk’ is useful to us. Understandings of dread risk vary—for Slovic and Weber, for example, it refers to a combination of lack of control and extreme potential, whereas Gizerenger uses it to refer to low-probability, high-consequence events.35 For us, it opens up the possibility of diseases that induce fear that is unrelated to the likelihood of infection or death. This fear may be prompted by the symptoms involved, the lack of a vaccine or cure, or the stigma associated with the disease. Ebola accordingly represented a ‘dread risk’ because, although the chances of infection outside west Africa were vanishingly low, the lack of an effective vaccine or cure, coupled with the gruesome symptoms, created the unprecedented levels of ‘fear and terror’ which Margaret Chan identified, as noted above.

Fourth and finally, we take from Beck and Giddens the idea of a precautionary culture, of ‘being at risk’, and of the heightened sense of vulnerability that leads us to conflate ‘threat’ and ‘risk’. This is prompted in part by an empirical observation that the two terms are sometimes used synonymously; but also in part by the reflection, arising from the arguments above, that there is no functional difference between being ‘under threat’ and ‘at risk’. Both are disruptive challenges to everyday life,36 and both are reflections of the uncertainties and vulnerabilities of reflexive modernity. In so arguing we are also influenced by Giddens's distinction between risk and danger or hazard. For Giddens, danger or hazard exists independent of observation, whereas risk is socially constructed through societies' concern for the future. Implicitly, the specific use of the term ‘risk’ is not required; rather, what is significant is the use of terms, whatever they may be, that reflect concern for future events.37

Global health risks: unpredictable, unavoidable and potentially catastrophic

In this section of the article we discuss the way in which health problems, especially outbreaks of infectious disease and pandemics, have increasingly been explicitly framed as ‘global risks’. We show how the ‘global health risk’ frame initially appears particularly suitable to promote global collective action, because it combines an aura of scientific neutrality with a moral call to action. This makes it appear less politically charged and divisive than the ‘global health security’ frame.38 ‘Risk’ has, of course, a long history of use not only in medicine and public health, but in modern science more generally. Its most important use is to calculate the statistical likelihood (or probability) of an event happening. For instance, in medical and public health discourses, terms such as ‘risk factor’ and ‘mortality risk’ are commonly used to indicate the likelihood of individuals acquiring and dying from a disease. While this use of ‘risk’ as a technical term for the calculation of probabilities remains predominant among health experts, something different appears to be happening in the policy discourse on global health: here, the term ‘risk’ is used to refer to events that are considered incalculable. Portraying a health issue as a ‘global risk’ in this fashion is not a statistical exercise; rather, it constructs the issue as a policy problem in a particular manner and promotes a particular set of policy responses.

Over the past decade, we have seen the emergence of a discourse that portrays certain global health issues, notably infectious disease pandemics and AMR, as global health risks. This discourse is manifest in a range of policy documents and reports and, indeed, the names of institutions that have recently been created. The Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future (emphasis added) starts from the premise that ‘infectious diseases remain one of the biggest risks facing humankind’.39 The World Bank's World Development Report 2014 states that pandemics are one of the key risks facing the world today,40 and the World Economic Forum's Global Risks Report 2016 discusses pandemics as one of the global risks ‘in focus’.41 ‘Risk’ is used here to refer to events that are considered difficult or even impossible to calculate. For instance, the Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future states: ‘Although there are enormous uncertainties in modelling the risks and potential impact of infectious disease crises, the case is compelling no matter how it is calculated.’42 Bill Gates, co-chair of the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, which is one of the key players in global health, argues that ‘even though we can't compute the odds for threats like bioterrorism or a pandemic, it's important to have the right people worrying about them and taking steps to minimize their likelihood and potential impact’.43 By highlighting the difficulty, or even impossibility, of calculating the likelihood of an event occurring, the technical meaning of the term ‘risk’ as statistical likelihood is turned on its head.44

The use of the term ‘risk’ to refer to events that are considered incalculable and unpredictable is not confined to the field of global health; indeed, a ‘risk discourse’ has emerged in a wide range of global debates. The World Economic Forum's 2016 Global Risks Report, for example, identifies a ‘landscape’ populated by multiple, diverse risks.45 Over a decade earlier, the OECD identified ‘emerging systemic risks’ posed by natural disasters, industrial accidents, infectious diseases, terrorism and lack of food safety;46 the World Bank's World Development Report 2014 (itself entitled Risk and opportunity) discusses risk management as a powerful tool for development;47 and in 2015, the UN General Assembly endorsed the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction, which embodies a shift in terminology from disaster management to disaster risk management, and also includes a strong focus on health.48

The perception that the world faces a number of risks with potentially disastrous consequences has also been the focus of scholarly debates, driven most prominently by the works of Ulrich Beck and Anthony Giddens.49 These authors are concerned with new forms of risk that modern societies face, notably those created by industrialization and the rise of technologies. Beck distinguishes between risks that societies and governments have found ways to cope with, such as accidents in factories or traffic, and those large-scale problems that call into question the capacity of modern societies to deal with them. Both Beck and Giddens highlight the impact of globalization on the quality of these risks, which have potentially enormous repercussions not only because they are large scale, but also because they are inherently global.

Globalization plays a key role in the ‘global health risk’ framing: not only in the accelerated mobility which makes it easier for pathogens to spread widely and rapidly, but in the interconnectedness of critical systems for economics, finance, communication, trade and travel.50 In this interconnected world, the potentially catastrophic impact of pandemics on critical systems is likely to have global repercussions. Moreover, the global and catastrophic impact appears unavoidable: new pathogens with pandemic potential emerge all the time through natural evolution, and their transmission is facilitated through global systems of travel and trade, which cannot be disrupted, because they are of vital importance for the functioning of modern society.51 Hence it is the combination of natural evolution and a social order based on global infrastructures that makes infectious disease outbreaks appear potentially catastrophic, yet unpredictable and unavoidable.

The perception of infectious disease outbreaks as global risks therefore feeds into a general sense of vulnerability to disaster in modern societies. This sense of social vulnerability is linked mainly to the potential impact of an event, rather than its likelihood, reflecting the shift from a probabilistic to a possibilistic view of risk.52 As the report of the Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future comments: ‘There are very few threats that can compare with infectious diseases in terms of their potential to result in catastrophic loss of life.’53 Similarly, Bill Gates declared that ‘bioterrorism and pandemics are the only threats I can foresee that could kill over a billion people’.54 It is also worth noting that while the World Economic Forum's Global Risks Reports have ranked pandemics among the top five global risks in terms of impact, they have not made it into the top five in terms of likelihood.55

Responding to global health risks through better preparedness

If this is the perception of the problem, what does an appropriate response look like? Interesting insights into this question come from Andrew Lakoff's and Stephen Collier's work on the emergence of a new set of organizations and strategies in US security policy for the protection of transport and energy infrastructures and economic and financial systems.56 The US government perceives the threat to these ‘vital systems’ as emanating from events such as terrorist attacks, pandemics and natural disasters. Because these events are deemed unavoidable, conventional security policies that focus on prevention are seen as inadequate. The US government has therefore adopted a strategy focused on mitigating the impact of such events by becoming more prepared for their occurrence. Hence, preparedness emerges as the key rationale for how to respond to the incalculable risk of unavoidable and potentially disastrous events. The basis for acting on risks framed as unpredictable, yet unavoidable and potentially catastrophic, is not to calculate what is more or less likely to happen, but to be prepared for whatever happens.57

This language and rationality of preparedness are evident beyond the United States in the international debate on global risks, including global health risks. For instance, the Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future states: ‘The global community spends relatively little to protect populations from the risks of pandemics. Compared with other high-profile threats to human and economic security—such as war, terrorism, nuclear disasters and financial crises—we are underinvested and underprepared.’58 The Global Health Security Agenda, a US-led international initiative of more than 50 countries, argues in a recent report that ‘the enormous costs of pandemics can be averted with strategic investment in capacity building and preparedness’.59 The background paper on pandemics for the World Bank's World Development Report 2014 states: ‘Active promotion of whole-of-society resilience and pandemic preparedness can benefit countries by reducing not only pandemic impact, but also the costs of other disasters and major crises.’60 The language of preparedness has also featured in the names of newly created institutions, such as the Coalition on Epidemic Preparedness Innovations (CEPI), established in the aftermath of the Ebola outbreak, the WHO's 2011 Pandemic Influenza Preparedness Framework and the European Commission's 2013 Global Research Collaboration for Infectious Disease Preparedness (GloPID-R).61 In an article in The Lancet, the founders of CEPI underscored the rationale behind the preparedness response: ‘Although no-one knows what the next outbreak will be we must develop the required arsenal now.’62

The rationality of preparedness is manifest not only in the language used around global health risks, but also in the instruments and tools of policy responses. Key to this are surveillance systems designed to pick up signs of an outbreak early and monitor the spread of diseases. Thus, in the last two decades, many states (especially OECD countries) have strengthened their infectious disease surveillance systems.63 In particular, revisions to the International Health Regulations (IHR) in 2005 expanded systematic surveillance at the global level. WHO member states are now required to implement early-warning systems and establish laboratories that can detect potential threats and report outbreaks to the WHO.64 Many global health initiatives working within the global health risks framework emphasize the importance of the IHR in strengthening pandemic preparedness.65 A second set of governance mechanisms to strengthen preparedness is the development and stockpiling of drugs and vaccines. To that end, the WHO has developed a pharmaceutical ‘R&D preparedness’ strategy, the R&D Blueprint.66 Starting from the premise that ‘infectious disease epidemics pose a clear and ongoing risk to global health, security and economic prospects’,67 the Blueprint is aimed at accelerating the development of drugs and vaccines to prevent and treat infectious diseases with pandemic potential by agreeing on priority pathogens, identifying financing mechanisms, and providing coordination and technical guidance. CEPI, an alliance of governments, pharmaceutical companies, philanthropic organizations and academics, was set up to ‘pursue a proactive (“just-in-case”) and accelerated (“just-in-time”)’ strategy to develop vaccines against infectious diseases with pandemic potential.68 Meanwhile national governments, especially in Europe and North America, have created stockpiles of medicines and vaccines for potential infectious disease pandemics,69 while the EU has agreed on a joint-purchasing approach for medicines and vaccines required for such events.70

Finally, the rationality of preparedness as a response to global health risks is manifest in the development of procedures, legislation and financing mechanisms that can be activated in an emergency. Procedures have been created to facilitate the accelerated development and use of relevant drugs and vaccines. As the World Economic Forum's Global Risks Report 2016 argues: ‘Preparedness and response measures range from the behavioural … to the need to invest in diagnostic, drug and vaccine R&D and in its enabling environment, especially advancing a regulatory framework.’71 At the national level, legislation is most advanced in the United States, notably with the creation of the Animal Efficacy Rule and the Emergency Use Authorization (EUA). The Animal Efficacy Rule responds to the problem posed by the fact that many of the diseases that are considered health security threats occur rarely if at all in nature. Drugs and vaccines against such threats can often not be approved on the basis of human clinical trials, because disease outbreaks may be too short or involve too few people for large-scale clinical testing to be organized, while deliberately exposing humans to pathogens merely for the purpose of pharmaceutical development is considered unethical.72 Under the Animal Efficacy Rule, the US Food and Drug Administration can approve pharmaceuticals on the basis of efficacy studies conducted with animal models, rather than on human clinical trials. The safety of any product developed by this route, however, does have to be demonstrated in human studies. Similarly, the EUA, established as part of the Project Bioshield Act (2004) and the Pandemic and All-Hazards Preparedness Reauthorization Act (2013),73 can provide authorization for the use of pharmaceuticals and medical devices that have not yet been fully tested for safety and efficacy. Although there is no equivalent to the animal rule in other countries or at the international level, some countries and international organizations have nevertheless prepared emergency use authorization procedures as part of pandemic preparedness strategies. For instance, the European Medicines Agency has initiated procedures for accelerating the availability of vaccines during an influenza pandemic, including a ‘mock-up procedure’ whereby a vaccine can be authorized on the basis of the virus strain that might cause a pandemic, before the pandemic has actually occurred; and during the 2014 west African Ebola outbreak, WHO created emergency use assessment and listing (EUAL) procedures to evaluate the performance, quality and safety of pharmaceutical technologies prior to their formal licensing as a means to accelerate their use during an emergency. The EUALs have been used for the assessment of Ebola diagnostics and the first Ebola vaccine. In addition, financing facilities have been created to strengthen global pandemic preparedness. In 2015, WHO member states set up a Contingency Fund for Emergencies to fund initial response activities, and a year later the World Bank launched the Pandemic Emergency Financing Facility to ‘create the first-ever insurance market for pandemic risk’.74

Global health risks: a moral imperative for global action?

The framing of pandemics as a global risk shapes both the perception of the problem, as unpredictable yet unavoidable and potentially catastrophic, and the path of the policy response, namely towards strengthening pandemic preparedness. Moreover, this framing sets a tone that is particularly suitable for global collective action and global governance. A key insight from sociological theories of risk is that modern societies not only create new risks (by creating new technologies), but also want to control them. As Giddens writes: ‘Risk is the mobilizing dynamic of a society bent on change, that wants to determine its own future rather than leaving it to religion, tradition, or the vagaries of nature.’75 Niklas Luhmann finds that there is a common perception that ‘the future depends on decisions made in the present’.76 From this perspective, the future risk of disasters depends on decisions that someone has made—or not made. If this is the case, ‘one can demand that such dangers be obviated’.77 Hence, with the perception that risks depend, at least partly, on human decisions comes the expectation that decisions be made that minimize future risks. Inherent in the modern perception of risk, therefore, is a call to action in response to unplanned processes.

How, then, is this call to action to be reconciled with a portrayal of risks as unpredictable? If we perceive risks as unpredictable, we cannot use the rational calculation of relative likelihood as the basis of decision-making on which risks to prioritize. So how do we decide where to allocate finite resources? In the public and political debate on global health risks, the key rationale for decision-making and action is the potentially disastrous impact of a pandemic.78 The Commission on a Global Health Risk Framework for the Future suggests that an annual commitment of US$4.5 billion could significantly strengthen global pandemic preparedness. It then goes on to ask: ‘How does $4.5 billion per year stack up against the potential risks? The 1918 influenza pandemic killed approximately 50 million people … and arguably as high as 100 million in 1918–1920.’ It goes on to suggest that ‘during the 21st century global pandemics could cost in excess of $6 trillion’.79 CEPI, with its mission to develop vaccines against future pandemics, argues that ‘infectious disease epidemics … match wars and natural disasters in their capacity to endanger lives, disrupt societies and damage economies … Many of the epidemic diseases that we know pose the greatest threat to society could be prevented with vaccines. But very few vaccines against these threats have been developed to create proven medical products.’80 And the Global Health Security Agenda points out: ‘Experts estimated that the 2003 SARS outbreak cost the global economy between $30 billion and $40 billion in just 6 months. The next severe influenza pandemic, for example, could cost the world economy up to $6 trillion. The enormous costs of pandemics can be averted with strategic investment in capacity building and preparedness.’81

By emphasizing the potentially catastrophic impact of global health risks, this framing makes it difficult to oppose measures that could help mitigate or prepare for the catastrophe.82 Faced with potentially enormous losses, not only in human lives but also in economic terms, it is difficult to argue that resources should be spent elsewhere. The sense of fear and urgency created by this framing lifts the issue beyond the level of conflicting interests, moving it outside the realm of politics. Furthermore, the potential for political argument is defused by language that underscores the global nature of the impact, referring to millions of lives lost globally, damages to the global gross domestic product (GDP), and the rapidity with which ‘an airborne influenza virus could spread’, reaching ‘all major global capitals within 60 days’.83 This inclusive character of the risk frame is particularly important in the global political arena, where the range of interests and perspectives on health issues is wide, where cooperation is voluntary and where persuasion can be a powerful tool to promote cooperation.84

The global health risk frame appears particularly suitable for the promotion of global collective action and global governance in that it combines a moral imperative to act with a tone of neutrality and inclusiveness. Yet the global health risk frame is not neutral; it is highly political, in that it privileges some interests over others. For instance, the framing of specific health issues, notably pandemics, as global health risks does more to promote the interests of the United States and other high-income countries in establishing global systems of epidemic intelligence and medical countermeasure development than it does to promote the health interests of many people in poor countries.85 The most likely and most disastrous health threats that people in low-income countries face on an everyday basis are not pandemics, but infectious diseases without pandemic potential and non-communicable diseases.86 This is not to say that people in low-income countries might not potentially benefit from better global disease surveillance and the availability of medicines and vaccines to contain outbreaks with pandemic potential: an earlier response to the Ebola outbreak in west Africa in 2014, and the availability of medicines or vaccines, might have saved thousands of lives in the region. Yet millions of people die every year from health issues that are not defined as global risks and that are unlikely to be addressed by preparedness policies.87 The global health risk frame reflects the ability of certain actors to define what global risks are and to shape the allocation of global health governance resources. Obscuring the political dimension of the global health risk framework behind a tone of neutrality, urgency and inclusiveness may, at first glance, appear advisable to facilitate collective action. Yet, we suggest, it may also undermine the legitimacy and thereby the effectiveness of global health governance in the long run: for effective and legitimate global health governance requires that national and local interests feel represented in global decision-making. Depoliticizing global health governance, however, limits the scope for contestation, negotiation and compromise between different interests by erecting a screen of scientific neutrality.

Competing risks in global health crises

The global health risk frame, then, while it initially seems more attractive than the security frame because of its apparent neutrality and moral imperative, in effect risks obscuring the political aspect of how decisions over priorities are made. We also detect another way in which the risk frame is not an objective, technical exercise but a site where different interests and values can be expressed, and therefore where politics and potential contestation come into play. To do this, we shift the focus in this section of the article to discuss how global health has been framed in terms of different types of risk, especially in the context of crises.88 Whereas the previous section noted the use of ‘risk’ as a discursive move, here we consider its use synonymously with other terms such as ‘threat’ or ‘danger’ to indicate societal vulnerability. Thus in this discourse the term ‘risk’ may either be used explicitly or implied.89

The section builds on the work done on framing in agenda-setting, specifically in studies that use framing to explain why some global health issues achieve greater prominence than others.90 These studies point out that levels of mortality and morbidity do not always offer a satisfactory explanation for which health issues appear on international agendas. The appearance of the Zika virus in South America in 2015–16, for example, received widespread attention and was declared a Public Health Emergency of International Concern (PHEIC) by the WHO—only the fourth health emergency to reach this highest level of alert—despite no one having died from the disease. These studies suggest that what matters is rather how health issues are presented, or ‘framed’, to resonate with powerful actors' interests.91 In the literature on global health, framing has therefore been used principally to explore how advocates persuade powerful actors to take positions and use their influence on a particular health issue (agenda-setting).92 But framing may also be used to legitimize the actions of these powerful actors. The World Bank, for example, plays a major role in health policy because it can frame health as an issue for developing economies. Frames in global health are therefore used by advocates and actors alike both to persuade and to legitimate actions. Using this insight, we suggest that a health issue can be successfully constructed as a risk by framing it as a risk to something or to someone. Risks are framed to resonate with the interests of particular communities who possess power, in an attempt to generate or legitimize action. Building on our previous work,93 we suggest that four frames relating to risk can be identified in global health.

The biomedical frame is perhaps the most straightforward and longstanding, and is used to suggest that an issue is a risk to human health. In its narrowest sense, it focuses on the risk to the functioning of the human body from exposure to pathogens and toxins, but may also be scaled up to consider the risk to the physical and mental health of communities. Thus a highly pathogenic zoonotic virus such as H5N1 (avian influenza) has been successfully framed as a biomedical risk because of its high mortality rate (currently in excess of 50 per cent of humans infected by poultry), but also because of the potential of a pandemic if the virus mutates to allow human-to-human transmission.

The rights frame is based not simply on the idea of a risk to ‘the enjoyment of the highest attainable standard of health’, as articulated in the constitution of the WHO (1946) and subsequently developed in international law (including the Universal Declaration on Human Rights in 1948), but also on how ill-health may lead to discrimination. This has been particularly prominent in campaigns concerning HIV/AIDS and tobacco control. From the 1980s on, AIDS activists have fought against discriminatory practices affecting both individual people living with HIV and AIDS, and communities which are perceived as being at high risk from HIV infection (notably the gay community, but also immigrants from countries with a high incidence of the disease). In contrast, while ‘big tobacco’ has argued that restrictions on tobacco use infringe an individual's freedom to choose to smoke, advocates of tobacco control counter that smoking (including passive smoking) affects the right to health enshrined in the WHO constitution.

The economics frame suggests that a health issue may be a risk to global economic growth or to development in low-income countries. Factors such as lost productivity owing to worker absenteeism, reduced investment in areas affected by a disease outbreak, formal travel restrictions or a general unwillingness to travel (affecting both business people and tourists) and a lack of workforce mobility have all been deployed to suggest how economies may be affected by health issues and especially communicable diseases. During the first decade of the twenty-first century, for example, fears were commonly expressed that HIV represented an economic risk to fragile African states, potentially threatening their viability; and early assessments of the SARS outbreak in 2002–2003 identified the economic costs in terms of tens of billions of dollars, feeding into ideas that newly emerging communicable diseases threatened global economic growth and were a risk not only to low-income countries but to high-income states as well.

Finally, there is the security frame. Health may be framed as a security risk, not least because of its effects on state stability. HIV, for example, has been presented as a risk to ‘the glue that holds societies together’ because of its effects on professional classes such as teachers, civil servants and the police; viruses such as smallpox have been identified as potential weapons for use by terrorists; epidemics threaten the social contract, when governments are unable to provide protection for their citizens; and new diseases, or diseases new to a region, may provoke widespread fear in society (as briefly occurred in 2014, when Thomas Edward Duncan was diagnosed with Ebola in the United States).

This list is not intended to be exhaustive, but rather to indicate how global health may be framed as a risk in different ways. Framing provides an analytical tool to highlight the fact that health is a political space: framings are driven at least partly by strategic interests and compete for resources over how to respond and whose interests to privilege over others. This use of framing is explored in the next section.

Framing Ebola as a global risk

As an example of how these different frames are used, we explore three organizations central to the outbreak of Ebola in west Africa in 2014–15: the WHO; the international humanitarian NGO MSF; and the UN Security Council. Each of these organizations presented the risk from the outbreak in different ways, allowing them to construct different pathways for response.

Predictably, the WHO framed the outbreak in biomedical terms. In her report to the special session of the executive board on Ebola in January 2015, for example, Director-General Margaret Chan spoke of the outbreak in almost exclusively health terms. She emphasized its size and complexity compared to previous outbreaks, the weakness of the public health infrastructure which allowed it to develop, the establishment of new laboratories to provide diagnoses, and the skill and bravery of health personnel in treating those infected. The risk was to the lives and well-being of individuals in west Africa.94 This framing established a pathway for response based on established public health and biomedical methodologies of surveillance, prevention of infection, controlling the spread of the disease and treatment of those affected. The WHO emphasized its role in assisting nearby states to prevent the spread of the disease; the need for improved health-system functions to prevent new outbreaks of Ebola from developing into crises; and its role in fast-tracking the development of improved diagnostics and vaccines.95 It was also sceptical about the introduction of travel restrictions, not because of the potential economic impact (a common concern), but because of its potential to limit the number of aid workers being sent to west Africa.

Nevertheless, the WHO did also deploy additional frames. In the opening paragraph of its report to the January 2015 special session of the executive board on Ebola, the WHO secretariat wrote that the outbreak ‘represents a threat to global health security’,96 while for the same meeting Margaret Chan wrote that ‘what began as a health crisis quickly escalated into a humanitarian, social, economic and security crisis’.97 The use of additional framings was also evident in Chan's September 2014 briefing to the UN Security Council. In this she not only deployed the security frame, talking of the risk of state failure, but also used the economic frame, reiterating the World Bank's warning of a ‘potentially catastrophic blow’ to economies in an already weak region.98 The economic framing is also seen in other WHO documents, which note that Ebola ‘devastated the health systems and economies’ of countries affected in west Africa,99 and that health emergencies such as the Ebola outbreak ‘can have long-term consequences that undermine decades of social development’.100

In widening the framing of the Ebola outbreak beyond the biomedical, the WHO was legitimizing the involvement of other actors rather than resisting it. Whether this was a conscious strategy to gain wider support and assistance, or a reflection of the manner in which the crisis had evolved beyond the WHO's control, is unclear. But it does stand in stark contrast to the framing presented by MSF, the other high-profile health actor involved. MSF consistently presented the Ebola crisis in biomedical terms, focusing on the nature and spread of the disease and on the suffering of patients. Although the organization's use of the biomedical frame is hardly surprising, the heavy—almost total—focus on this frame is perhaps more so, given the potential utility of the rights and economic (especially economic development) frames in promoting improved health provision. Given MSF's historic wariness about working with military forces, however, its avoidance of the security frame is perhaps more predictable.

A typical example of MSF's biomedical framing is the short, high-profile article posted on its website in June 2014, in which it made a plea for additional resources. Dr Bart Janssens, MSF's head of operations, is prominently quoted, stating: ‘The epidemic is out of control … there is a real risk of it spreading to other areas.’ The focus is on the spread of the disease, the high numbers of cases, the strain on MSF (‘[we have]reached our limits’), and the need for additional medical and public health resources to bring it under control.101 Two months later, in response to the WHO's declaration of the outbreak as a PHEIC, Janssens commented:

For weeks, MSF has been repeating that a massive medical, epidemiological and public health response is desperately needed to saves lives and reverse the course of the epidemic. Lives are being lost because the response is too slow … all of the following need to be radically scaled up: medical care, training of health staff, infection control, contact tracing, epidemiological surveillance, alert and referral systems, community mobilisation and education.102

MSF's consistent use of a biomedical framing led to a clear pathway of response: ‘a massive deployment of medical and disaster relief specialists from states’.103 When MSF's international president, Dr Joanne Liu, provided a special briefing for the UN, she too used the biomedical frame:

Six months into the worst Ebola epidemic in history, the world is losing the battle to contain it … In West Africa, cases and deaths continue to surge. Riots are breaking out. Isolation centers are overwhelmed. Health workers on the front lines are becoming infected and are dying in shocking numbers. Others have fled in fear, leaving people without care for even the most common illnesses. Entire health systems have crumbled. Ebola treatment centers are reduced to places where people go to die alone, where little more than palliative care is offered. It is impossible to keep up with the sheer number of infected people pouring into facilities. In Sierra Leone, infectious bodies are rotting in the streets. Rather than building new Ebola care centers in Liberia, we are forced to build crematoria.104

This led to her identifying and discussing a particular pathway of response based on prevention, containment and treatment. Most notably, she departed from MSF's traditional aversion to working with military forces to ask for military aid. However, this was within the biomedical frame and its identified pathway of response, rather than an attempt to securitize the outbreak:

Many of the Member states represented here today have invested heavily in biological threat response. You have a political and humanitarian responsibility to immediately utilize these capabilities in Ebola-affected countries. To curb the epidemic, it is imperative that States immediately deploy civilian and military assets with expertise in biohazard containment. I call upon you to dispatch your disaster response teams, backed by the full weight of your logistical capabilities.105

Unlike the WHO and MSF, whose organizational focus was on health, the UN Security Council had only occasionally intervened on health issues. Its most notable health interventions prior to the Ebola outbreak focused on HIV/AIDS, including Resolution 1308 (which concerned the impact of HIV on peacekeeping).106 In September 2014, however, it passed two Resolutions in a single week concerning the Ebola outbreak, both following discussions in the Council. The first, Resolution 2176 of 15 September, expressed the Council's ‘grave concern’ over the outbreak and extended the UN peacekeeping mission in Liberia (UNMIL) until 31 December 2014. Significantly, the Council determined ‘that the situation in Liberia continues to constitute a threat to international peace and stability in the region’.107 The second and longer resolution followed an extended (but consensual) discussion in the Council on 18 September. This discussion included briefings from, among others, Margaret Chan, David Nabarro (Senior UN System Coordinator for Ebola) and Jackson K. P. Niamah from MSF. Council members and the subsequent Resolution 2177 consistently framed the risk in terms of security. In particular, the risk of state failure was alluded to when several Council members noted the fragile and vulnerable condition of affected countries, a point reiterated in Resolution 2177.108

Although the security framing dominated both the discussion in the Council and its two resolutions, legitimizing the deployment of military forces to assist in the region, other framings were also used. These additional framings allowed the Council to develop a pathway of response which emphasized collaboration not only among elements of the UN system, but also among those states able to provide aid. Resolution 2177, for example, ‘stress[ed] the need for coordinated efforts of all relevant United Nations System entities to address the Ebola outbreak’,109 while Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon's opening comments in the Council debate drew on multiple frames to portray the outbreak as a ‘complex emergency’ requiring a coordinated response.110 The economic frame was used by a number of those participating in the debate,111 with Resolution 2177 noting the risk to economies, including the risk posed by travel restrictions;112 the rights frame was deployed, with the Council noting in particular the impact on women and the humanitarian dimensions of the outbreak;113 and multiple contributions (including those from all representatives of the five permanent members) referred to the outbreak as a health crisis (though often as ‘more than’ a health crisis).114 Interestingly, Resolution 2177 linked both health and security by referring to the Global Health Security Agenda, allowing it to include public health measures in its pathway of response.115 Thus we see, in these framings by three organizations key to the Ebola response, a deployment of frames based on organizational logics and interests; the use of additional frames to generate wider support; and the potential for contestation.

Conclusion

The rise of health issues on international agendas led to the framing of threats to health as security issues. This created an uneasy relationship between politics and health by moving national interests into an area traditionally dominated by scientific rationality and a predisposition towards cosmopolitan norms. Framing global health issues as risks appears to be less politically charged and divisive than the security frame, because it combines an aura of scientific objectivity with a moral call to action over the potentially catastrophic impact of infectious diseases. In this article we have maintained that, despite its technical use in public health, in the policy discourse on global health the risk frame is not immune to values and interests but is, on the contrary, inherently political. We have demonstrated this by highlighting how the risk frame privileges a specific approach to global health policy, namely one characterized by a possibilistic and ‘preparedness’ rationale. This approach focuses on potential future catastrophes rather than presently existing health problems, and emphasizes technological solutions rather than addressing the socio-economic determinants of health. Furthermore, we have examined how the framing of the 2014–15 west African Ebola outbreak in terms of risk revealed the presence of not one but multiple different risk framings existing simultaneously.

The framing of health in terms of risk instead of security is useful in understanding how health issues both reflect and contribute to the wider Zeitgeist of societal vulnerability. The idea that dangers exist that are uncontrollable and are the product of technical progress (in this context, improved trade and transport links which act as a vector for the spread of communicable disease) is not unique to health but is rather part of a much wider trope. The perception of vulnerability is both a defining feature of modern society and the driver for individual and collective action. It is related not necessarily to the likelihood of an event occurring but rather to the consequences of it. The risk frame allows us to place health issues in this wider context, where disease is just one of a number of concurrent dangers rather than a separately identifiable hazard.

We have illustrated the uneasy relationship between global health and politics by viewing it through the lens of framing analysis. We have shown how the framing of infectious disease pandemics as a global risk creates a certain perception of the policy problem at hand: how to respond to a future event that is potentially catastrophic, yet unpredictable and unavoidable? Furthermore, we have shown how this framing establishes a particular pathway of response based on policies of preparedness. The frame initially appears conducive to the avoidance of political conflict—both because of its neutral, almost scientific tone, and because it combines a sense of urgency with the suggestion that measures can be taken to mitigate disaster, which are difficult to oppose without seeming negligent. It also promotes a sense of inclusiveness by articulating the potentially catastrophic impact of pandemics in cosmopolitan terms—as global loss of lives and damage to the global economy. In other words, by creating a moral imperative to act and a sense of inclusiveness, the global risk frame can help to defuse political argument about where the benefits and costs of preparedness policies lie. However we also argue that, at the same time, the global health risk frame is inherently political. In particular, the material consequences of its adoption are likely to benefit populations in high-income countries more than those in low-income countries, and therefore privilege the interests of the former over those of the latter. At the same time, it ‘depoliticizes’ global health governance by constructing a superordinate threat and by limiting the scope for legitimate contestation based on different interests and values.

### 1NC -- Innovation Bad

#### Even if they do result in innovation, benefits will be unequally distributed, preventing access and resulting in massive social instability---voting Neg prioritizes organic activities shut out by neolib that are most likely to avoid their impact

Ampuja 16 – Marko Ampuja, Lecturer in Media and Communication Studies in the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, “The New Spirit of Capitalism, Innovation Fetishism and New Information and Communication Technologies”, Javnost - The Public Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture, Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 30-31

From a neo-Marxist viewpoint, the compulsions of capital accumulation, tied to the compulsions of seeking technological advantages over competitors, form the underlying dynamic of innovation rather than the cultural heroism of entrepreneurs. In one variant of this argument, offered by Mandel (1975, 192), the pressures to innovate are based on “a constant hunt for ‘technological rents’” that provide the source of surplus profits. These arise out of the monopolies over technological discoveries and improvements that are guarded by patents. In another variant, the emphasis is on the argument that the development of superior technologies allows temporary “extra” profits. These profits, however, are not based on those technologies themselves or the ingenuity of innovators. Rather, they ultimately arise out of the social relations between capital and labour and the work of all those who toil to produce “innovations” (Harvey 2003, 7). This is combined with the fact that the introduction of new production methods is motivated by increases in labour productivity. Since social power in capitalism is based on inequalities between classes, innovation, too, is tied to these inequalities. Decision-making power over what kind of technological innovations will be produced are very unevenly distributed, as are the social consequences of their production, such as in the case of how high-risk financial innovations contributed to the global economic crisis that has caused massive social polarisations and instability.

By downplaying these structural features that are specific to the capitalist mode of production, the current liberal discourses of innovation turn into specific ideological forms of neoliberal capitalism. Neo-Schumpeterian commentators (such as Castells), who emphasise the importance of liberal-capitalist cultural values and a heroic entrepreneurial spirit, ignore the material dynamics that drive technological innovation and ICT infrastructures forward. Castells argues that in “the new economy”, productivity growth is derived from the application of knowledge and innovation, which constitutes “the actual source of wealth” (2004, 151). Such remarks show that he tends to ignore the role of labour power and its subjection to the demands of capital accumulation in his analyses, “preferring to focus instead on labour as just one factor of production among others” and treating knowledge in similar terms “as a factor of production rather than as a contested social relation” (Jessop 2003, 45–46).

It is important to avoid fetishising commercial technological innovations and explaining their creation with one-sided pro-market theories. According to these, innovation must by necessity be guided by the market and flourishes in the conditions of neoliberal capitalism, which provide a more dynamic environment for innovation than the Keynesian welfare state. However, these perspectives avoid the discussion of how the subordination of education, information and knowledge to the needs of capital “increasingly and frontally clash with the needs of free creative activity” (Mandel 1975, 273). In other words, they undermine all those innovative activities and forms of collective knowledge generation that do not directly support capital accumulation. This is a seriously truncated idea of innovation.

#### It causes financialization that triggers economic meltdown

Ampuja 16 – Marko Ampuja, Lecturer in Media and Communication Studies in the Department of Social Research, University of Helsinki, “The New Spirit of Capitalism, Innovation Fetishism and New Information and Communication Technologies”, Javnost - The Public Journal of the European Institute for Communication and Culture, Vol. 23, No. 1, p. 29-30

Other destructive innovations glossed over in the pro-innovation literature can be found in financial markets. Henwood (1998, 49) points out that “money capital longs for exotic forms”, especially new financial instruments that usually promise the highest profits. While the history of financial instruments is a long one, the decades following the deregulation of financial markets in the 1980s have witnessed a huge acceleration of financial innovations assisted by new ICT and statistical software (Sveiby 2012, 130–136). Many of these innovations involve high risks with negative economic and social implications. Innovations in the financial practices of securitisation, such as collateralised debt obligations (CDOs), exemplify such implications. During the lead up to the financial crisis that hit in 2007–2008, many leading Wall Street investment banks found the opportunity to make huge profits by pooling together subprime mortgages into CDOs that proved to be highly attractive to investors who bought them in large quantities in the early 2000s. The CDOs were inherently risky since they were bundled together from mortgages issued to less creditworthy homeowners. Yet this very feature made the CDOs highly profitable, at the same time as rating agencies gave them AAA ratings, which made it possible for all kinds of institutional investors to buy these high-return products (Blackburn 2008; Quiggin 2010, 62–64). In the end, such financial gimmickry merely hid the true “toxicity” of the CDOs, which became evident when the debt-based housing bubble burst and the value of CDOs quickly collapsed, triggering the meltdown of banks in the United States and elsewhere in the world that had invested in mortgage-backed securities. Such financial innovations, although not of course the sole reason behind the global financial crisis, testify to the enormous complexity and high risks related to financialisation and securitisation. They are also a reminder of the false belief in the capacity of markets to self-correct and of the perils of the deregulation of financial markets. Instead of expressing the supposedly benevolent nature of the “capitalist spirit” that nurtures the innovation of new financial instruments, the huge risks involved in them actually testify to the need to keep such a profit-seeking spirit at bay; through state regulation, for example (see Quiggin 2010, 21).

The risky innovations in financial markets are examples of a broader variety of “dysfunctional innovations”, which sustain economic and social inequality instead of stimulating sustainable economic development (Senker and Cudworth 2012). The lack of attention to harmful innovations “allows the concept to retain its positive buzz among policy makers” (Sveiby, Gripenberg, and Segercrantz 2012, 80). The relatively unchecked optimism of mainstream innovation discourses needs to be confronted with alternative, critical perspectives that focus on the specifically capitalist dynamics which underpin commercialised technological innovation.

### 1NC -- Defense -- Food Wars

#### No food insecurity – trends, international responses, and no escalation.

Pinker 18—Johnstone Family Professor in the Department of Psychology at Harvard University [Steven, February 2018, *Enlightment Now: The Case for Reason, Science, Humanism, and Progress*, Chapter 7: Sustenance, Viking, Accessed through the Wake Forest Library] AMarb

Not only has chronic undernourishment been in decline, but so have catastrophic famines—the crises that kill people in large numbers and cause widespread wasting (the condition of being two standard deviations below one’s expected weight) and kwashiorkor (the protein deficiency which causes the swollen bellies of the children in photographs that have become icons of famine).8 Figure 7-4 shows the number of deaths in major famines in each decade for the past 150 years, scaled by world population at the time. Writing in 2000, the economist Stephen Devereux summarized the world’s progress in the 20th century: Vulnerability to famine appears to have been virtually eradicated from all regions outside Africa. . . . Famine as an endemic problem in Asia and Europe seems to have been consigned to history. The grim label “land of famine” has left China, Russia, India and Bangladesh, and since the 1970s has resided only in Ethiopia and Sudan. [In addition,] the link from crop failure to famine has been broken. Most recent drought- or flood-triggered food crises have been adequately met by a combination of local and international humanitarian response. . . . If this trend continues, the 20th century should go down as the last during which tens of millions of people died for lack of access to food.9
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So far, the trend has continued. There is still hunger (including among the poor in developed countries), and there were famines in East Africa in 2011, the Sahel in 2012, and South Sudan in 2016, together with near-famines in Somalia, Nigeria, and Yemen. But they did not kill on the scale of the catastrophes that were regular occurrences in earlier centuries.

#### No resource wars---stats, reserves, and economics

Easterbrook 18—Author of eleven books, he has been a staff writer, national correspondent or contributing editor of The Atlantic for nearly 40 years, was a fellow in economics, then in government studies, at the Brookings Institution, and a fellow in international affairs at the Fulbright Foundation [Gregg, February 2018, *It's Better Than It Looks: Reasons for Optimism in an Age of Fear*, Chapter 6: Why is Violence in Decline?, pgs 142-3, Google Play] AMarb

Since the middle of the twentieth century, the Green Revolution has decoupled crop production from acreage, followed by the intellectual property revolution decoupling wealth from the riches of nature, and war has declined. Today Germany's population is 20 percent larger than during the Nazi era, and no German worries about where the next meal will come from or eyes the territory of neighboring nations. In recent generations it has become cheaper to buy than to conquer. Holding land is today just one of many paths to wealth—a longer, winding path compared to investing in start-ups—and while lush topsoil always will be in demand, the politics of scarcity do not apply to food supply, and may never again. Nations that eye each other warily can compete economically to their hearts' content, compiling reserve accounts to purchase equity or real estate in a world where goods move without restraint on the waters and capital can, in most cases, cross borders to a fare-thee-well. Exactly why the United States invaded Iraq in 2003 has never been clear: we can only be sure this was not a war of conquest, as it would have cost noticeably less to purchase all the oil in Iraq than to seize by force that godforsaken country. Broadly across the globe, buying is now cheaper—as well as a lot more practical—than attacking. And war has declined.