# 1AC

### Part 1- I need those drugs

#### Covid slowed down the growth and the revolution is coming now! There can be no abolition of capitalism without internal contradiction, not external shock. Covid has exposed the contradiction to the mass- ensuring the revolution will happen.

M.I. Asma, 20 (M.I. Asma is an anonymous collective of writers, thinkers, and organizers in the imperialist metropoles, writing in order to use the COVID 19 pandemic as an occasion to think capitalism and communist alternatives. “Chapter Thirteen,” *On Necrocapitalism,* <https://necrocapitalism.wordpress.com>)

But we can imagine now, when the riots die down and are literally pacified, that there will be new policies derived from the ideological policing of those opposed to the police––who were policed by these police. In the hope that participating with the deputies of dominant state policy will bring change, the hopeful will become participants with policy––on community police relations initiatives, in a variety of reformist-oriented bodies––and yet, as Moten and Harney remind us, policy has a different understanding of “hope” and “change” (key slogans of the Obama regime, the perfect policy electoral mechanism) where hope for real change is channelled back into the capitalist imaginary. “This is the hope policy rolls like tear gas into the undercommons.” (Ibid., 80) As noted from the outset of this project, capitalism possesses a strong purchase on our imagination; it is difficult to think outside of its boundaries even when we know that what lies within its boundaries is utterly necrotic. Hope for reform rather than hope for the monstrous impossibility of revolution––“monstrous” and “impossible” because these are the terms set by the capitalist imaginary––is indeed a pacifying tear gas. Why not become participants, since being intransigent planners of revolution is to hope for something beyond the limits of this imaginary? As Dionne Brand puts it: This we fear––this we know––that all of our thoughts will be rushed into editorial pages, used up in committee meetings; all the rich imaginings of activists and thinkers who urge us to live otherwise may be disappeared, modified into reform and inclusion, equity, diversity, and palliation. These are policies that will also connect with whatever post-pandemic capitalist reality that awaits us. After all, just as the riots are being treated as an aberration, as a dystopian response to the rationality of liberal capitalism, COVID-19 is classified as a similar aberration. Although the coronavirus revealed capitalism’s inability to deal with crisis––laying bare its rotting foundations while simultaneously exposing how willing the ruling class is to spend more money terrorizing and murdering its most marginalized populations than on Personal Protective Equipment for hospital workers––the capitalist imaginary functions to make us think that the contradiction was merely external. That is, we are meant to believe that there are no meaningful internal contradictions to capitalism itself, and that it is quite capable of establishing a general equilibrium of capitalism and democracy, if only these pesky external forces didn’t show up to ruin everything. According to this perspective, the problem is not capitalism itself but only that capitalism had to deal with an “unprecedented” virus and that any social formation would similarly be affected. The multiple contradictions between the oppressed masses and the state, which should be evident to anyone participating in or observing the rebellions, have been détourned from above by policy-minded liberals who complain about “outside agitators” or “bad protesters” or agents that come from outside of the social contract in order to ruin it for everyone else. As Mao states in On Contradiction, though, the “fundamental cause of the development of a thing is not external but internal; it lies in the contradictoriness within the thing.” (Mao, On Contradiction, 6) This does not mean that there are not external contradictions that are significant (such as the existence of COVID-19 and its pandemic antagonism with capitalist states), only that they are not fundamental in uncovering the identity of an object of thought. As Mao writes a little bit later in the same treatise: “In a suitable temperature an egg changes into a chicken, but no [external] temperature can change a stone into a chicken, because each has a different basis.” (Ibid., 10) Similarly, the exogenous existence of the coronavirus and its affects upon various capitalist states do not explain how these states were equipped to deal with the internal health of their citizens; this external contradiction merely revealed particular aspects of contradictions internal to capitalism. This is evident due to the fact that the nation-states best equipped to deal with the pandemic (though still failing at multiple levels) were ones that had higher levels of social democracy and public infrastructure. A socialist social formation, because its state would concern the protection of citizens rather than the protection of the free market economy, would be even better equipped to deal with a pandemic: with no pressure to “re-open the economy”, with a responsive and needs-based system where housing and food is more important than wage-labour, a pandemic would not rip through its social fabric with the same velocity it has within the capitalist heartlands. When it comes to the rebellion in the US, though, the internal contradictions of racism, of the state’s violence levelled upon the oppressed and exploited, should be even clearer. The external contradiction of the COVID-19 state of emergency was merely the incubation chamber in which these riots, based on an already existing logic, erupted; the supposed external contradictions of “outside agitators”, though, were fabrications. So capitalist policy will rush in to stabilize the internal contradictions by blaming every disruption of social life––as if it was not always already disrupted––on the externality of COVID-19. Recalcitrant populations will be reined in, will be invited into reformist initiatives so as to be transformed into participants, and austerity measures will be unleashed. Capitalism will pacify. What will be the new capitalist policies following the pandemic and when the teargas has cleared? What will we be invited into as participants so as to reopen the economy and paper over the internal contradictions that were briefly laid bare? How will the necrotic aspects of this mode of production once again be pushed under the surface as we are demanded to transform ourselves into proper democratic citizens and thus to discipline our imaginations? Just as it is difficult for those who participate in the capitalist imaginary (either willingly or out of “common sense”) to conceive of a world in which a pandemic will not severely harm and greatly disrupt life, it is even more difficult to conceive of a world in which the police as such cease to exist. The assumption that society will fall apart––that chaos will reign supreme, and that people will fall upon each other as if they have entered the Hobbesian state of nature––demonstrates the strength of this imaginary. The fact that these police rarely solve crimes (unless it’s a bank robbery or the victim is a member of the bourgeoisie), that they have rarely helped victims of violent assault (including the sexual assaults that women routinely face), have escalated situations of violence in every situation in which they are involved, and in fact regularly assault and kill the most marginalized members of society, is dismissed out of hand despite books upon books of empirical data. Instead, the deputies of bourgeois policy cling to the fiction of the necessity of their given state’s repressive apparatus (along with its prisons and other carceral institutions), sometimes going so far as to claim that people making such radical statements are like “flat earthers” despite all of the empirical evidence that demonstrates the police do not “solve crime” but in fact police the parameters of criminalization. These parameters, of course, are determined by the real function of these police: the coercive wing (along with the military, prison guards, etc.) of bourgeois hegemony, the repressive state apparatus that protects the ruling class and its mode of production. But the capitalist imaginary’s strength in this particular situation is that it can still convince people who are horrified by police violence that they are simply watching a spectacle of excess, that the bourgeois repressive apparatus can be reformed and made into a humane creature, because the fantasy alternative of a Hobbesian war of all against all is even worse. “Just look at the looting!” But if we are entirely honest, even the calls to defund and abolish the police can still exist within the capitalist imaginary, just at the farthest edge where they push against the boundaries. Because what would it look like to defund and abolish the police when capitalism is left standing? Calls to replace the police with brigades of social workers seem to forget that the institution of social work has a long history of complicity with state power. Let us not forget, for example, the ways in which social workers and other “non-police” institutions were involved in the 60s Scoop in Canada that relocated Indigenous children with settler families, thus pushing the violent assimilationist logic that defines the particular “race regime”, in Patrick Wolfe’s terminology, to which Indigenous populations are subjected. Such social worker interventions necessitated collaboration with actual police forces, hence creating the kind of “war machine” amalgam (where various policing institutions interlink according to policy) examined by Mbembe. (Mbembe, Necropolitics, 85) Hence, it is not difficult to imagine that social worker institutions, still plugged into state power, will necessitate new forms of policing even if the old police institutions are dead. Shuffling around state institutions, and saying one can replace another because it is more humane, misses the point of why the police exist in the first place. It also fails to recognize that the immanent settler garrison, in settler-capitalist formations, will rush in to replace the official police: racist settlers are armed and prepared to institute settler policy; the official police, in these contexts, was actually generated from an informal state of settler-colonial emergency. The point, here, is that one cannot abolish the repressive state apparatus without first abolishing the state. And even thinking of such an abolition, and what must be constructed following it, leads us to think through other questions beyond the diktat of the capitalist imaginary. Because the violent necrocapitalist imaginary reins us in, demands we think abolition and the world beyond the pandemic according to the capitalist world order; abolitionist demands, delinked from a revolutionary program, can become the new policy. Angela Davis now demands that people vote for Joe Biden––just as she demanded voting for Hilary Clinton and Barack Obama––and people forget that she has been a reformist for a long time, that she emerged as a representative of the Communist Party of the USA and not the Black Panther Party or Black Liberation Army. A policy industry emerges around these kinds of éminence grise; liberal pundits, who ignore everything else such figures have to say, are more than happy to cite their thoughts about electoral policy as part of a general ideological pacification. Lenin’s The State and Revolution is instructive here, and it is worth noting that a number of Leninist radical thinkers contemporary abolitionists celebrate (i.e. George Jackson, Fred Hampton, Assata Shakur, etc.) upheld this text, which argued that following the abolition of the bourgeois state the proletarian state ought to set up its own repressive apparatus for the bourgeoisie. But this much more radical abolitionist language always slips the grasp of policy capture, especially if it leads us to think about what the abolition of capitalism and its bourgeois state will look like. We must imagine new ways of thinking where the structures of dominant power are reversed, where we can conceptualize the defense of socialism that does not allow bourgeois power to reassert itself. Indeed, the most radical articulations of abolitionism identify abolition with communism, as Moten and Harney do in The Undercommons: Not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of any- thing but abolition as the founding of a new society. The object of abolition then would have a resemblance to communism. (HARNEY AND MOTEN, 42)

#### Intellectual property allows capitalism to evolve from material commodity to a higher level of knowledge, signs, and metaphysics that allows capitalism to avoid its destruction. Taking away IPR in medicine allows cap to die from its own contradiction.

Peter Drahos, 4-11-2019, "- A Philosophy of Intellectual Property," No Publication, http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml?referer=&amp;page=9

The argument we have put can be stated in the following propositions. The existence of physical commodities does not depend on law. The existence of abstract objects does. Commerce in physical commodities and abstract objects depends on a scheme of property rights and contract. Marx’s contradiction is that he sees labour as a value-producing commodity and yet does not recognise it as such when it is provided as a service or when it takes the form of an abstract object (in our sense of the term). Now we are in a better position to see how intellectual property accomplishes the task of integrating creative labour into the capitalist mode of production. Marx more clearly than anyone sees that capitalism is a mode of production in which commodities are amassed on a historically unprecedented scale. Capitalism is not, however, the only mode of production which produces commodities. This is true of earlier forms of production. Where capitalism is distinctive is that it is a system in which the labour power of one class has become a circulating commodity available for purchase by another class, the members of both classes being formally free to buy and sell commodities.[61](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-311) It is the condition of being able to readily acquire labour power that gives capitalism its Midas touch in economic production. Our argument has been that capitalism increasingly comes to depend on creative labour. Individual, rational capitalists, subject to competitive pressures, begin to seek out creative labour, for it is creative labour that is the source of much-wanted innovation. We have deliberately steered away from trying to explain this search in terms of the theory of surplus value. Rather our position is this: the search by individual capitalists for creative labour is motivated by the desire for control and ownership of the abstract object so as to gain a competitive edge over a rival. In the next chapter we shall see that the ownership of abstract objects can function to relieve individuals from competitive pressures. This provides another incentive for individual capitalists to chase the ownership of abstract objects. Clearly, if abstract objects exist under conditions of positive inclusive community (that is, they belong to all) the incentives for individual capitalists to pursue them will be considerably reduced. So one task of intellectual property law, from the perspective of the industrialist, is to create conditions of negative community so that the ownership of abstract objects is possible. Intellectual property, in commodifying universal mental constructs, dramatically increases the commodity horizons of capitalism. Intellectual property is perhaps a sign that the commodity nature of capitalism never stops evolving. Marx thought that the commodity of labour power was the form of commodity that was distinctive to capitalism. Our analysis suggests that understanding the productive powers of capitalism does not stop with the commodification of labour power. Through the creation of abstract objects, intellectual property law provides capitalism with another distinctive commodity form and, potentially at least, another means to its further expansion. By creating abstract objects intellectual property brings creative labour directly into the relations of production. Capitalism can continue its historically spectacular commodity production run because through intellectual property law it has re-engineered the possibilities of commodity production. Not only that, creative labour, through the creation of more efficient means of production, actually diminishes the role of physical labour. The aim of the industrialist is no longer to control physical labour through contract and industrial relations law but to control creative labour through intellectual property law. One last remark before we close this section. Intellectual property, we have argued, is fundamental to the task of integrating creative labour and abstract objects into capitalism’s production processes. This argument does not mean that we abandon Marx’s view about the fundamental materiality of production. Much of the literature on post-industrial society or post-capitalist society tends to over-emphasise the role of knowledge in production in order to obtain a convenient and bright dividing line between capitalist and post-capitalist epochs.[62](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-310) Drucker offers a typical characterisation of this: ‘The basic economic resource – “the means of production”, to use the economist’s term – is no longer capital, nor natural resources (the economist’s “land”), nor “labour”. It is and will be knowledge.’[63](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-309) However, our analysis of the role of the abstract object in production, when placed in the context of Marx’s overall theory, suggests that perhaps good old-fashioned industrial capitalism has a way to run before it is given its last rites by scholars. Our reasons for thinking this are these. When he comes to discuss the role of physical forces (the laws of nature) Marx says that these cost the capitalist nothing once they are discovered.[64](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-308) But in order for these laws to enter the productive life of capital they must be consumed productively and that, for Marx, requires that they be mediated by or be embodied in some item of hardware, some industrial article: ‘A water-wheel is necessary to exploit the force of water, and a steam-engine to exploit the elasticity of steam.’[65](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-307) Abstract objects cannot just simply step into production.We now have the makings of a paradox. The greater the role of abstract objects in capitalist production, the greater the production of the hardware of technology there needs to be. Abstract objects propel capitalism into ever-higher levels of industrial production of physical objects. Furthermore it is clear that for Marx each new generation of technologies carries with it greater and greater investment costs. Manual tools are cheap. Machine tools are not – and computer-controlled machine tools, even less so. The rough shape of our paradox is that abstract objects, which once in existence cost nothing or little, when absorbed into capitalist production cost capitalists a great deal in terms of investment. Intangible objects generate ever-higher levels of tangible commodities. It is industrial commodity production that abstract objects help stimulate, with the result that fewer workers are employed in that production directly (because of automation) and more services are required to match the higher levels of production. For the individual capitalist there is no choice about the levels of investment needed to stay in what has become a technological race. Investment is forced upon him by competition.[66](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-306) In language not intended to comfort, Marx says, ‘one capitalist always kills many’.[67](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-305) The upshot of our remarks is this. We must not make intellectual property reveal more than is there. For post-industrial scholars, the intellectual property phenomenon seems to offer support for their pronouncements of radical social transformation. Our position is a more cautious one. Through intellectual property law, capitalism engineers new production possibilities for itself.[68](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-304) Creative labour is brought into the fold of productive labour, but the transformative possibilities of this remain for the time being grounded in a paradigm of commodity accumulation. So-called ‘knowledge societies’ have, through new communications and information technologies, the opportunity to reorganise the work patterns of their individual citizens in ways that liberate those citizens from conditions of alienated labour. But capitalist knowledge societies, if Marx is right about the commodity nature of capitalism, will not take that opportunity. Abstract objects are absorbed into production as part of a cycle of commodity production. Abstract objects are used to continue capitalism’s obsession with, to use modern parlance, the hardware of technology. Inequalities of an apparently new kind (for example, the information-poor versus the information-rich) appear, but in essence they are old forms of inequalities patterned around the ownership of productive forces. ‘Knowledge workers’ end up more like other workers, for like other wage-labourers they come to find themselves in conditions of alienated labour. The impact of intellectual property norms upon the activities of the scientific community provides an example of the way in which the positive expressive activity of scientific research and discovery becomes alienated labour. Natural science becomes part of the natural forces of production because individual capitalists realise they cannot survive without constantly ‘revolutionising the instruments of production’.[69](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-303) Modern industry draws on scientific knowledge to produce a ‘science of technology’.[70](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-302) This science of technology is derived from many earlier separate forms of production such as trade guilds and craft industries. Modern industry takes the knowledge and know-how which has been locked away in these secretive, almost ritualistic enterprises and applies it to improving production. The modern form of the science of technology as we know it seems to be, for Marx, born out of industry.[71](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-301) Once in existence, its utility is apparent to all capitalists who are all constantly seeking to improve their production techniques. Science now finds itself press-ganged into capital’s service. The normative practices of scientists begin to change. Traditionally, scientists organised themselves around the goal of extending knowledge. This goal is served by an ethos of science which consists of four key values: universalism, communism, disinterestedness and organised scepticism.[72](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-300) Intellectual property, we have argued, plays a critical role in integrating creative labour into production. Through this process, intellectual property norms come to change the ethos of science.[73](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-299) (For Marx the change would only be a symptom of deeper causes.) The ethos of science rewards the sharing of information, the public communication of ideas (the incentives being prizes, scientific immortality, recognition and so on). The existence of an intellectual commons is seen to be crucial to successful individual work. This public domain attitude of science begins to change as intellectual property norms come to govern scientific labour. Open communication and the exchange of ideas are no longer so strongly endorsed by scientists because they might, amongst other things, defeat a proprietary claim to the knowledge.[74](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-298) The direction of scientific research becomes increasingly determined by state-based priorities expressed through intellectual property rights. The fact that ideas can in one way or another be owned is itself symbolic of the fact that scientific labour has become alienated labour.

#### Specifically, IPR in medicines such as TRIPS commodifies knowledge and cements legitimacy and survivability of capitalism by using medicines as leverage to control developing states and people

Donald Richards, 2004, Routledge Publication, “Intellectual Property Rights and Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of the TRIPS Agreement”

Given the clear instrumental value of U.S. direct bilateral coercion as well as the U.S. role as hegemonic leader in the Uruguay Round, it is tempting to conclude that the TRIPS agreement is the outcome of the reimposition of U.S. economic control over the international political economic superstructure a la the theory of hegemonic stability. The difficulty with this interpretation is that it presumes that the TRIPS acts in the unified national interest of a single state. This is a false inference on at least two counts. First, contrary to the hegemonic stability thesis, it is no more possible to identify a unified national interest in intellectual property rights in the United States than it is in any other country. A strengthening of global IPRs will impose differential THE POLITICAL ECONOMY OF TRIPS 139 interclass as well intraclass costs and benefits in the United States. The primary beneficiaries of the TRIPS will be those who own and manage the multinational capital responsible for the finance, production, and distribution of knowledge-based commodities around the world. Their benefits will derive from the enhanced monopoly power conferred by stronger patents, copyrights, and trade secrets. It is true that the majority of these owners and managers reside in the center countries of the world capitalist system, including the United States, but it cannot be imagined that they constitute a unified national interest. It is more accurate to describe them as providing leadership to an international historic block. Second, it is more accurate to describe the TRIPS agreement, along with other such additions to the regulatory superstructure of the world capitalist system as the General Agreement on Trade |in Services (GATS) and the agreement on trade-related investment measures (TRIMS), not as responding to the policy dictates of a particular hegemonic state, but rather as responding to an evolving global process of increased movements of financial, production, and commodity capitals. That is to say, it is the internationalization of capital that has provoked the requisite construction of global institutions. The seemingly privileged (hegemonic) position of the United States in this institution building is owing to this country's leadership position as vanguard of the neoliberal orthodoxy. Even in this outwardly nationalistic context, however, the ideological function of neoliberal orthodoxy is to serve a universal rather than a particular (national) interest. While the internationalization of capital displays a universal compulsion to seek higher and higher rates of surplus extraction to feed its own reproduction and expansion, it is apparent that lot all nations enter the process at the same historical moment and on the sane terms. The world capitalist system today continues to display many of the hierarchical characteristics of the earlier, prewar, imperialist era. The post-fordist international division of labor assigns low-level processing and manufacturing activities to those parts of the world (periphery and semiperipheiy) where labor costs are low and can be kept at rates of increase lower than the rates of productivity increase, owing to the weakness of institutions and laws to defend labor rights and interests. Design, marketing, finance, and higher-order technological functions are retained at the center of the system, which continues to be characterized by higher levels of educational attainment, greater resources dedicated to research and development, and a virtual monopoly on the ability to fashion the dominant cultural (including juridical) superstructure within which global production is carried out. The TRIPS agreement is just such an element of this cultural superstructure. By harmonizing and strengthening property rights in knowledge-based products and processes, the agreement lends greater predictability and rationality to the production and circulation systems. Risks and costs are reduced, speeding the circuits of capital. Surplus value is increased due to the greater monopoly (price-setting) power conferred by exclusive ownership. Greater legitimacy is attributed to capitalism overall as the concept of commodification itself gains greater circulation and apparent acceptability. The question of legitimacy, however, is not a closed issue. Counterhegemonic efforts have called into question the provisions of the TRIPS agreement and even the concept of intellectual property rights, especially as they pertain to knowledge-based commodities critical to basic human needs, such as food and medicines. It is natural to ask the question, What are the conditions for successful counterhegemony and the redefinition of property and property rights that advance the interests of the world's marginalized majorities? Do these conditions differ depending on the type of commodities, scientific activities, or production processes at issue? Does global capital have a greater stake in defending certain types of IPRs more than others? These are some of the questions to be pursued in the chapters to follow.

#### TRIPS are used by capitalist hegemons to advance their imperialist goal in the name of development

Sujithxavier, 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/

These events – the corporate capture of the global pharmaceutical IP regime, state complicity and vaccine imperialism – are not new. Recall [Article 7 of TRIPS](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_01_e.htm), 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](https://www.bloomsburyprofessional.com/uk/patent-games-in-the-global-south-9781509927401/), and as [Carmen Gonzalez](https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1631&context=faculty) 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.

#### Dissolving and reducing IPR in medicine is key first step in the counterhegemonic and anti-capitalist act that unites international labor against the ever-ending capitalist regime

Donald Richards, 2004, Routledge Publication, “Intellectual Property Rights and Global Capitalism: The Political Economy of the TRIPS Agreement”

The above discussion of the limited prospects for reform of institutions under global capitalism is not intended to suggest that counterhegemonic challenges are futile. In fact, as stated earlier, I believe that ongoing efforts to influence the form and content of policies of the various international agencies assigned to regulate the global economic system are worthwhile and an essential part of any counterhegemonic program. I also believe that the work of progressive NGOs to provide alternative models and organization is equally essential to any attempt to reshape the knowledge structure that defines our human potential and goals. What I wish to emphasize by way of conclusion to this discussion, however, is the continuing, fundamental importance of progressive, organized, political effort to capture and shape political institutions, including the state, at all levels. Resolution of the problems created by the private appropriation and exploitation of knowledge will not be achieved in piecemeal fashion. It will require, more likely, a broadly coordinated effort involving workers, consumers, environmentalists, intellectuals, and progressive activists of all stripes who face the threat of, and wish to oppose, the new knowledge enclosure as one aspect of the capital-commodity nexus. The internationalization of capital implies the internationalization of the social relations of production. This in turn implies that workers around the world, for example, increasingly face similar challenges in advancing their social, material, and political interests. I do not wish to imply here that the conditions of struggle faced by workers are the same everywhere. Clearly, this is not true. It is increasingly clear, however, that the ability of workers and their organizations to advance their interests in one part of the global capitalist system depends on the strength of workers in other parts of the system. Weakness in labor organizations in one country undermines the strength of similar organizations in other countries. Recognition of this international interdependency has caused labor organizations to increase their efforts to forge closer, collaborative working arrangements with one another. It has also fueled greater coordinated efforts among international labor groups and their allies to press for minimum international labor standards, particularly as they affect occupational health and safety, the right to organize, and the use of child labor. The challenge faced by those seeking progressive change is to broaden and deepen the agenda to include the various social concerns that affect the lives of the marginalized majorities along with those vulnerable to marginalization. In the area of intellectual property, a significant portion of this challenge involves the construction of a counterhegemonic discourse as it applies to the production of knowledge and technology and access to their uses. Workers in the center countries, especially the United States, face rising costs for health care at the same time that public and corporate provisions of such care are in retreat. For many of these people, including a growing cohort of the retired, the necessity of breaking the patent power of the pharmaceutical TNCs is becoming apparent. The rising cost of prescription drugs is a burden that is made worse by the inability of consumers to purchase generic versions of pharmaceuticals. There is a clear commonality of interest, therefore, between users of lifesaving, life-enhancing medicines and producers of these goods in a wider dissemination of the technology for their manufacture. The majority of workers and their families worldwide also have an interest in safe and environmentally responsible methods of producing all manner of output, especially food. Political work at both the domestic and international levels needs to focus on pressuring states to allocate resources in the search for alternatives to the agroindustrial biotechr ology model. There exists plentiful historical evidence that publicly supported and directed research and development efforts have been particularly effective in achieving groundbreaking advances in both these broad areas of technological endeavor. Those who seek progressive change in the way that technology is produced and disseminated cannot cede the ideological ground to those who insist on the centrality of the capital-commodity nexus to technological progress. Any globally organized effort to find alternatives to the transnational capitalist dominated knowledge structure that conditions our understanding of the "lim- its of the possible" as it applies to technology and social justice must contend with the special problem of the United States. By this, I do not refer merely to the fact that the U.S. government is especially aggressive in formulating and executing policies that advance a precapitalist, neoliberal agenda within and without its borders. As noted particularly in Chapter 5, the push to include the TRIPS agreement in the Uruguay Round discussions was given especially strong support by the United States Trade Representative. Neither do I only have in mind the additional fact that U.S.-based transnational corporations are in the forefront of the process of internationalization of capital. Rather, the real challenge to confront for progressive political activists in the United States is the pervasiveness of an ideology grounded in liberal individualism and dedicated to unconstrained consumerism. In other words, nowhere on earth does the force of consensual capitalist hegemony make itself felt more than in the United States of America. As a consequence, proposals that call for either a greater role for public authority or for internationalism are greeted with widespread suspicion and hostility even among large segments of the marginalized and soon to be marginalized. Progressive efforts that focus exclusively, or even primarily, on the moral obligations of average Americans to provide the poor countries with greater access to technology, finance, markets, or aid are not likely to be well received. Neither are moral condemnations of U.S. foreign and economic policies abroad likely to attract favorable attention unless they can also be shown to operate against popular domestic interests. To the contrary, as long as the discourse of "national competitiveness" reigns supreme, American workers will continue to regard their counterparts in both the poor and relatively rich nations as a potential or actual threat to be subdued with ever greater investments in proprietary capital and technology. It is a fact, however, and perhaps an ironic one, that the internationalization of capital is currently undermining the ideological basis for American exceptionalism as it also undermines the ability of U.S. labor organizations to defend workers' material standards of living. The prospects for a new internationalism in which American workers begin to appreciate the common cause they share with workers and other popular (e.g., peasants) classes all over the world cannot be dismissed. Economic and political crises that have greeted the beginning of the twenty-first century have generated a growing sense of skepticism in the United States regarding the neoliberal globalization project as they have elsewhere. Distrust of transnational capital has reached unprecedented levels in the wake of the stock market collapse and the revelations of corporate insider manipulations of equities prices that benefited an elite at the cost of the jobs and pensions of ordinary Americans. In the area of intellectual capital, as noted, American consumers of pharmaceuticals have begun to press for modification of trade rules that currently debar them from access to lower-priced brand-name drugs and generic substitutes. Recently, President Bush felt cpmpelled to support new trade rules that would limit the pharmaceutical industry's ability to keep Canadian generic substitutes for patented drugs out of the U.S. market.2 Some American farmers have recently organized to oppose the biotech revolution that prioritizes the bottom line of transnational agricultural input producers in disregard for their own livelihoods as independent farmers as well as the security of the food supply-3 Political developments such as these provide abundant reminders that the contradictions of capitalist development provide opportunities for counterhegemonic response e jen in those sites where the capitalist fortress seems most impregnable. There can be no presumption, therefore, that we have arrived at any final conclusions to the increasingly important question, Who owns knowledge

#### The plan strips the reformist content of the topic from the revolutionary form of the demand in a dialectical ambivalence towards debate’s prevailing bourgeois institutionalism. Thus, the ROB is to contest capitalism. CX checks any questions about ROB. The plan is an insurgent break from the capitalist imaginary where demands are linked to a revolutionary internationalist program capable of resisting the capitalism. We will pay no head to the lies of the oppressor nor platform fascism’s processes. No violence but revolutionary violence; no war but the people’s war!

Dean and Heron, 20 (Jodi, communist party organizer and Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, NY; Kai Heron editor at ROAR Magazine and a casualized academic with research interests in political theory, ecology, psychoanalysis, and political economy. “Revolution or Ruin,” *E-Flux*, Journal #110 - June 2020, <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/110/335242/revolution-or-ruin/>) \*emphasis original accessed:2021/1/3

For Riofrancos, a politics of pure negation is unhelpful because it mistakes the GND for a “prepackaged solution” to the climate crisis that one either accepts or rejects wholesale. She proposes that the plan is better thought of as an ever-changing “terrain of struggle” with “the potential to unleash desires and transform identities” and reasons that if the final shape of the GND is still to be decided, then to reject it is to cede important territory to fossil capital. As an alternative, she suggests that we “take our cue from social movements that adopt a stance of critical support, embracing the political opening afforded by the Green New Deal while at the same time contesting some of its specific elements, thus pushing up against and expanding the horizon of possibility.” “Critical support” for the GND is as unsatisfactory as a politics of “pure negation.” Like all democratic socialist strategy, it subordinates working class struggle to the task of electing progressive candidates. It gives up on the left’s revolutionary tradition to focus instead on the more “realistic” task of agitating for gradual leftward shifts in the Overton window. As with all political strategies, the efficacy of democratic socialism rests on the achievability of its aims. While Jeremy Corbyn’s election as Labour’s leader in 2015 and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s success in 2018 gave democratic socialism a boost, the Democratic National Committee’s opposition to Bernie Sanders and the 2019 UK election have shown the limits of mainstream parties’ tolerance for socialism. To think it possible to implement a progressive GND with the DNC that we have, the Supreme Court that we have, the House of Lords that we have, or the patterns of property and land ownership that we have—that is to say, with the capitalist state that we have—is to assume that the institutions of ruling class power can be used for mass benefit without removing the ruling class. Riofrancos proposes that “extra-parliamentary, disruptive action from below” should be combined with “creative experimentation with institutions and policies,” but surely by now—in the midst of compounding crises—we should be beyond experimenting with bourgeois institutions on bourgeois terms. Riofrancos’s “critical support” excludes the option of building towards revolution. As her argument unfolds, it moves from defending the GND as an important site of struggle to arguing that it is the site of struggle. To question the GND’s electoralism is to make a choice for “resignation cloaked in realism,” to acquiesce to an endless “waiting for [the] ever-deferred moment of rupture.” The obvious but unspoken third option here, though, is to build toward the moment of “rupture,” or more concretely the seizure of power, outside of the Democratic or Labour Parties. No doubt this option remains unspoken because it is too “unrealistic,” too undemocratic, and too “authoritarian” for democratic socialists to countenance. Let’s look at this third option more closely. To build towards an eco-communist revolution, we need to avoid both a politics of pure negation and a politics of “critical affirmation.” As Marx argued, revolutions need dialectics. They need us to find what Fredric Jameson calls the “dialectical ambivalence” in capitalism. This means training ourselves to locate aspects of the present that point beyond themselves and towards the communist horizon. Lenin did precisely this after the outbreak of the First World War. Rather than joining with the majority of the socialist parties of the Second International in capitulating to imperialist war, and rather than wallowing in melancholia following the betrayal of so many of his German comrades as they voted for war credits, Lenin saw in the war an opportunity for revolutionary advance. Those interested in the emancipation of the working class needed to fight not for peace but for the dialectical conversion of nationalist war to civil war. The war, and the collapse of the Second International, was the opportunity for something new. What would it mean to think dialectically about the GND? We think it would mean stripping the policy’s reformist *content* away from its revolutionary *form*. For decades environmental movements in the capitalist core have busied themselves fighting for local solutions to global problems: cooperatives, local currencies, urban agriculture, and ethical consumerism. As these experiments blossomed, the climate crisis continued unabated. More pipelines were built, more indigenous land was stolen, more fires raged, and more species flickered out of existence. In their form the GND and GIR put localism aside. Both recognize that the climate crisis demands a state-led, centrally planned, and global response. They take for granted that we need a state to intervene on behalf of nature and workers against capital. The fact that the GND and GIR promise to do this is what makes capitalists fear them. Those who are excited about the promise of the GND—such as Riofrancos—have similarly turned towards the state as a terrain of struggle and a locus of power. Consciously or not, these movements have learned from the failures of Climate Camp, Occupy, and the Movement of Squares. It is not enough to suspend the normal running of things. Taking responsibility means taking power and organizing society in what Marx called the interests of “freely associated workers,” or more controversially, the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” The struggles to implement the GND and GIR tell us that environmentalists are increasingly aware of the need to seize the state—and the need to develop a fighting organization with the capacity to do so.

#### Extinction

Marques; 2020

* Famine
* Climate change
* Deforestation
* Overfishing
* Biodiversity loss/species extinction
* Ocean acidification/ eutrophication
* Pollution
* War/nuke
* Facism
* Pandemic- covid

(Luiz; Ambiente & Sociedade; Vol. 23; “Pandemics, existential and non-existential risks to humanity”; https://www.scielo.br/pdf/asoc/v23/1809-4422-asoc-23-e0126.pdf)

These crises demand undelayable, globally orchestrated political reactions of our societies that are, at the same time, being divided into two evermore hardened and incommunicative groups. On one hand, the state-corporative establishment, determined to maintain the machinery of business as usual at all costs, is advancing its pawns on the international chessboard to guarantee that nothing changes in post-pandemic energy and food systems. On the other, the perception of scientists and growing sectors of society that we have reached a limit beyond which we can no longer advance, given that the harmful effects of globalized capitalism increasingly supersede their benefits. Observation of the concurrence of combined regressions in human security contribute to that perception: (1) after decades of progress in the struggle against food insecurity, the number of people battling acute hunger and suffering from malnutrition has been on the rise over the last four years (FAO, 2019, p. 6). According to the fourth annual Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC, 2020), around 183 million people in 47 countries were classified as being in Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2) conditions, at risk of slipping into Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) if confronted by an additional shock or stressor. The current pandemic is precisely this additional shock; (2) the six most recent years (2014-2019) and the current one have been the hottest of the last twelve millennia; (3) the globalized food system drove the loss of 3.61 million km2 of tree cover between 2001 and 2018, according to Global Forest Watch; (4) the heavily subsidized industrial fishing system is now sacrificing the oceans’ future (PAULY, 2019); (5) the catastrophic decline in biodiversity is annihilating vertebrate populations (Living PIanet Index, 2018) and may lead to the extinction of one million species over the next few decades (IPBES, 2019); (6) acidification and eutrophication of the oceans and of various bodies of fresh water is creating marine dead zones and threatening ruptures of trophic chains in the aquatic environment; (7) industrial pollution poisons, sickens, and kills tens of millions of people worldwide each year (WHO Report on Cancer, 2020, for instance); (8) growing geopolitical tensions are seen, with the intensification of endemic conflicts focused on water and energy resources and the anguishing resumption of the nuclear arms race. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) estimates that the nine nuclear armed countries spent US$ 72.9 billion (US$ 35.4 billion was spent by the U.S. alone) on their 13,000+ nuclear weapons in 2019, an increase of US$ 7.1 billion compared to 2018 (ICAN, 2019); (9) democracy and tolerance are increasingly threatened by waves of more or less orchestrated fake and hate news, by flareups of fascism, irrationality, and physical and psychic violence.

3. Existential and non-existential risks These crises are interlinked and act in synergy, that is, they reciprocally strengthen one another. And precisely because they are interdependent and reciprocally strengthening each other, it is senseless to deal with them separately. It makes no sense, for example, to understand the current pandemic as simply a health emergency, isolated from other ongoing crises. Most of all, we should not classify these crises in an hierarchical order according to the greater or lesser risk they represent for humanity, as proposed by the University of Cambridge’s Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, or by Toby Ord, from the University of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, in his recent book, The Precipice. Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity (2020).

The considerations proposed by these centers and researchers are very momentous. But they start from the false premise of dividing the risks to which humanity and other species are increasingly exposed into existential and non-existential ones. That dividing line does not exist. An existential risk is, frequently, made from a conjunction of crises that, separately, do not existentially threaten humanity but that, together, have the potential to do so. Will Steffen and colleagues (2018), for example, explored the possibility that “a 2°C warming could activate important tipping elements, raising the temperature further to activate other tipping elements in a domino-like cascade that could take the Earth System to even higher temperatures”. That domino effect can lead us to what the authors called a Hothouse Earth, that is, a largely uninhabitable planet. And, once again, there is no clear dividing line between a planet that is largely uninhabitable and one that is completely uninhabitable for humans and innumerous other species. A chapter written for the English edition of my book, Capitalism and Environmental Collapse (2020), titled “Climate Feedbacks and Tipping Points”, shows how devoid of meaning we find the question, frequently debated in the scientific community and taken up again by Toby Ord, of the probabilities of a warming capable of generating what is called runaway climate change. Let us remember what is truly at stake here for the destiny of humanity. The runaway global warming conjecture, feared by a growing number of scientists (but still rejected by the IPCC3 ), would be able to lead the Earth toward conditions that prevail today on Venus. This conjecture may be interesting from a strictly scientific point of view, but it is totally useless from the point of view of the fate of animals and forests, because both would cease to exist under conditions that are much less extreme. Yangyang Xu and Veerabhadran Ramanathan (2017) have thus categorized the risks implicated at three levels of global warming: “>1.5°C as dangerous; >3°C as catastrophic; and >5°C as unknown, implying beyond catastrophic, including existential threats”. As established by a host of the next-generation climate models, a global warming of 5°C or even more above the pre-industrial period can be reached by 2100, because “even if coal use doesn’t rise in a catastrophic way, 5°C of warming could occur by other means, including thawing permafrost” (TOLLEFSON, 2020, p. 446).

Understanding this, one can ask if the current pandemic represents an existential or a non-existential risk for humanity. Having now, through the month of June, infected more than eight x million people and reaped more than 450 thousand officially confirmed fatalities (according to preliminary estimates, the real numbers are much higher), the current pandemic has not yet shown signs of cooling off. Nothing lets us state that the worst is over. In fact, it continues accelerating in the southern hemisphere, and can still affect a quarter billion people in Africa alone, according to a recent model (McVEIGH, 2020). Beyond this, new waves of contagion are taking place in the north where it had begun to weaken, and new outbreaks can continue occurring in 2021. That said, as bad as it may be, we know that, in and of itself, Covid-19 obviously does not represent an existential threat for humanity. But if the pandemic can turn society’s attention away from what is in play, society will be paralyzed to the point of keeping it from reacting to the above-mentioned socioenvironmental crises. Most importantly, if the post-pandemic economy gives way to even more desperate and destructive attempts at economic recovery, it may become a decisive link in the chain of factors that are already leading us to cross tipping points conducive to a world largely or completely uninhabitable by humans and numerous other species.

4. Overcoming the vicious cycle that imprisons globalized capitalism Even though at this moment it is the most apparent aspect, the pandemic is, in short, only one facet of the great existential threat represented by globalized capitalism. The mother of all threats is the vicious cycle of destructive intensification that imprisons globalized capitalism: the more that system struggles to reverse the decline in rates of growth, the more environmentally destructive it becomes, and the more destructive it becomes, the more the impacts of that destruction will impede its growth. Covid-19 is, in large part, one of the results of that trap, since global warming, deforestation, the destruction of wildlife habitats, the domestication and raising of poultry and mammals on an industrial scale destroy the evolutionary balance among species, facilitating the conditions for numerous viruses to jump from one species to another, including our own. The current pandemic offers the chance for a civilizational turn, probably the last chance before environmental imbalances spin beyond societies’ control. The project of globalized capitalism, the only possible one for it, is to continue advancing blindly in its logic of destruction. Pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are already nearly within normal ranges in China again and James Temple (2020, p. 56) analyzed how: the threat of rapidly accelerating climate change will remain. And we’ll be living in a much poorer world, with fewer job opportunities, less money to invest in cleaner systems, and deeper fears about our health, our financial futures, and other lurking dangers. These are ripe conditions to further inflame nationalist instincts, making our global challenges even harder to solve.

### Part 2- Expect the unexpected

#### Advocacy- resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.

#### Consequentialism is repugnant:

#### [A] it justifies atrocities since it justifies allowing us to harm some for the benefit of others – even if they spew some pain quantifiability argument that doesn’t solve since there are still instances some get great benefit from others harm.

#### [B] it can’t justify intrinsic wrongness – We can’t know whether our action was good until we’ve evaluated the states of affairs they’ve produced since it’s based on the outcome of the action, i.e., if asked the question “is genocide okay?” a utilitarian would not be able to say yes because there are situations in which it would be morally obligatory to do so if it maximized pleasure. Probability doesn’t solve because that just allows for moral error and freezes action while attempting to calculate the perfect decision.

#### Academic spaces like debate have been recalibrated as spaces for the creation of human capital

Hall 19

(Richard Hall is Professor of Education and Technology at De Montfort University, and a National Teaching Fellow. He is a Director of Leicester Vaughan College, a trustee of the Open Library of Humanities, and a co-operator at the Social Science Centre in Lincoln, UK. “On authoritarian neoliberalism and poetic epistemology”) 2021/1/5

Both the process of reproducing higher education (HE) and the meaning of academic institutions in the global North is framed by the secular crisis of capitalism (Hall 2015). Across a global terrain, the failure to reinstate stable forms of accumulation and to counteract the tendency of the rate of profit to fall has catalysed educational policy focused upon discourses of entrepreneurship, employability, excellence, and impact. Education has been recalibrated as a site for the extraction of rents, the generation of surpluses, and the creation of new human capital, grounded in a desire for productivity (McGettigan 2015). One result has been that academic practices, such as public engagement and the production of scholarship, have been tied to the imposition of value-for-money (Newfield 2016), behind which hides the labour theory of value. This tends to reduce both academic autonomy and knowledge production to their exchange-value as representative of their social utility. One critical terrain for analysing this reduction is through the policy- and practice-based framings of authoritarian neoliberalism, as a mode of control. Authoritarian neoliberalism emerges from forms of governance that normalise hegemonic modes of behaviour and discourses, by disciplining non-co-operative individuals and groups (Johnson 2018). Such forms of non-co-operation include: first, dissent and opposition to the commodification of social goods like welfare, healthcare and education; and second, the failure to generate new forms of human capital or to maintain well-being in the face of precarious employment or performance management. Such symptoms are a function of an individual’s failure to manage their own risk in relation to the market and the value of their own labour in the reproduction of existing social norms. This tends to increase the marginalisation of specific individuals and groups, based upon their relationship to dominant, authoritative positions rooted in the intersection of whiteness, heterosexuality, maleness and ableism(Steinþórsdóttir at al. 2017). The technocratic practices, policies and ideas that are associated with authoritarian neoliberalism as a mode of disciplinary governance enable an analysis of knowledge production at the level of society (Bruff 2014; Bruff and Tansel 2018; Tansel et al. 2017). Knowledge production is recalibrated by audit technologies that correct performance through corporate governance, national and international league tables, excellence frameworks, competition for student numbers and fees, and tenure arrangements. This is not a smooth or uncontested terrain, but it places the academic in sharp, disciplinary relief to her own labour process, knowledge production, academic communities and her sense of Self (Hall 2018). Here, there is a powerful relationship between audit technologies and commodification processes, which both proletarianise academic labour by instantiating a precarious, gig economy, and also connect knowledge production and dissemination to techniques that enable learning analytics about those activities to be captured in near real-time. This allows institutions and corporations to finesse educational performance, through performative, audit cultures (Pasquale 2018). However, there are counter-narratives of ways in which knowledge production might be reimagined, and through which that knowledge might be reproduced as a movement of becoming across a social terrain (Braidotti 2017; Motta 2018). The potential for new forms of humanism related to the functions of intellectual knowledge at the level of society critique the imposition of a prosaic, epistemic starting point for life. Instead, they imagine life reflected and refracted by a poetry of illumination, or a quality of light that enables us to see how understanding is born of a collective, visceral, emotional, cognitive and philosophical experience (Lorde 2013). Here, engagement with indigenous and decolonising studies in education enable us to turn these processes that erupt in the global North back upon themselves, by holding a mirror up to commodification and objectification, and instead revealing the power of stories and narratives that de-centre the world as it is projected hegemonically (Bhambra et al. 2018; Tuhiwai Smith et al. 2018).

### Part 3-Don’t resist

#### 1. The aff ROB before T and theory

#### [a] Jurisdiction- the ROB speaks specifically to this round and how the ballot should be signed, while theory is about norm-setting which is out of the judge’s scope because that is out of round

#### [b] Offense- the ROB constrains what is and isn’t offensive so theory must be contextualized to the framing or else it’s not offensive so you can’t vote on it

#### [c] Theory speaks to a fair and educational space but my ROB evidence says that those spaces can’t exist prior to the aff because they’re grounded in ableism

#### [d] Side Constraint- the kritik sets out a problem in debate and the ROB attempts to resolve it otherwise that bias can never be solved and influences theory meaning it’s a side constraint on effective theory

**[e] we can weigh the case – I’m not leveraging my advocacy which is what T is criticizing but only a warrant – they need to prove that the warrants are unfair – the only reason you couldn’t engage was because the aff was not presented traditionally**

### UV

#### Interpretation: At all TOC bid distributing tournaments, debaters must disclose all previously read positions with highlighting on the 2021-2022 NDCA LD wiki for every round they have debated this season 30 mins before the round.

#### Violation – check below

#### 1. Debate resource inequities—you’ll say people will steal cards, but that’s good—it’s the only way to truly level the playing field for students such as novices in under-privileged programs.

#### 2. Evidence ethics – open source is the only way to verify before round that cards aren’t miscut – full text doesn’t solve since you could have highlighted unethically.  That’s a voter – maintaining ethical ev practices is key to being good academics and we should be able to verify you didn’t cheat

#### 3. Supercharge- you basically only have cap disclosed and even failed to give out round reports or dislosing what you read on r3 in UK. Means I have no clue what kind of debater or what you have read before.

#### 4. Bad practice- all of your docs are unhighlighted which forces debaters to guess what your warrant is going to be. 30 minutes is not going to be enough to check all of the cards

#### Fairness is a voter because debate is a competitive activity with a winner and a loser – Force them to answer as to why it’s a competition. Education is a voter because schools, educational institutions, pay for it.

#### No RVIs because its illogical – you wouldn’t win chess for playing properly – Prefer logic for it’s a litmus test for other arguments

#### Prefer competing interps because a) reasonability is a race to the bottom pushing the limits on how much abuse is justifiable b) reasonability is subjective and invites judge intervention

#### Drop the debater to deter future abuse

Graphical user interface, application

Description automatically generated

# 1NC

## 1

#### [Malott 18] Capitalism is a bundle of contradictions strapped together by brutal expansion and violence – internal contradictions of labor and capital fuels the expansion and exploitation but simultaneously creates the tools of its own destruction

Malott 18[ (Curry Malott is an Associate Professor in the department of Educational Foundations and Policy Studies at West Chester University of Pennsylvania, US. His teaching and research focus on Marxist educational theory and the history of education.) “What Is Dialectical Materialism? An Introduction.” Liberation School, 4 Apr. 2018, liberationschool.org/what-is-dialectical-materialism-an-introduction/?fbclid=IwAR2ZhW5ws9\_sfJOSFxuy5YD7kUMY7PQKjWY0JUnTONE4mbIM\_0-rzuJJfPk. Accessed 9 July 2021.] Comrade PW
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What is Marx’s method? In developing his method, Marx challenged what he considered to be vulgar materialism for its tendency to ignore the totality and the relationship between consciousness and material reality. A philosophical term, the “totality” refers to the total of existence in any given moment. At the same time, Marx rejected pure idealism for substituting material reality with the idea of reality (i.e. with abstract thought). Idealism therefore leads to the false assumption that alienation or estrangement can be overcome in the realm of thought alone, as if we could change our material reality by changing our ideas and beliefs. Rather, Marx’s dialectical method is based on “the unifying truth of both” (1844/1988, 154). What this means is that “it is not enough that thought should seek to realize itself; reality must also strive toward thought.” In other words, Marx’s method entails the examination of the relationship between ideas and material reality, specifically as it pertains to class struggle and the emancipation of the proletariat. Marx’s dialectics are called “dialectical materialism” in contrast with Hegel’s dialectics. Marx wrote that he “discover[ed] the rational kernel within the mystical shell” (1867/1967, 29) of Hegel’s dialectics. To realize this revolution the working-class must not only understand the interaction of forces behind the development of society, but it must understand itself as one of those forces. The dialectic is a powerful weapon because it breaks through the capitalist illusion of individualism and atomism and disrupts the idea that isolated facts speak for themselves. Only by situating facts or ideas in the historical totality of society do they begin to make real sense. To comprehend this revolutionary movement we must conceive the interaction of forces as much more than the interaction of static and independent entities. When the parts of the totality change, their relationship to the totality changes, and they themselves change. Dialectics presents reality as an ongoing social process; nothing is ever static or fixed. Dialectics is both a method–or a way of investigating and understanding phenomena–and a fact of existence. For Engels, what is most central to dialectics is the tendency toward perpetual “motion and development” (1894/1987, 131). What follows is a summary of the dialectical theory of movement and change. The concept around which the dialectical understanding of development revolves is the negation of the negation, which will be taken up first, before turning to the concept of sublation. The unity of opposites or the interpenetration of opposites, a central driving force of the dialectic is then explored. Finally, we look at the tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality, which in turn allows us to understand the negation of the negation more deeply. The negation of the negation The tendency toward the negation of the negation is arguably at the heart of dialectical development. Engels, for example, notes that the negation of the negation is “extremely general—and for this reason extremely far-reaching and important” (1894/1987, 131). The negation of the negation refers specifically to the way that phenomena and structures produce their opposites. For example, in the first volume of Capital, Marx (1867/1967) writes that capitalist private property is the negation of individual private property, or property held by the proprietor or individual laborer. Peasant proprietors, as small-scale industrial producers, tended to own private property and produced their own means of subsistence. This small-scale, scattered, petty industry of the peasants was limited in terms of its ability to foster economic growth. The advent of the capitalist era included the expropriation of the peasants from their means of production. The logic of the feudal system and exchange created the agencies of its own annihilation. While feudalism was overcome in capitalism, aspects of it were preserved but reconfigured in a way to facilitate economic growth. For example, the private property of peasants was abolished, but private property itself was not. Capitalism concentrates and centralizes property, tending towards monopoly. Bigger capitalists buy out or otherwise out maneuver smaller capitalists. At the same time, capitalism creates its antagonist: the working class. As capital grows so too does the working class. These contradictions provide the basis for the second negation: the expropriation of the expropriators, or the transformation of capitalism into socialism. Under socialism the means of production that existed under capitalism are preserved. Instead of being held in private they are held in common. In place of exploitation the means of production are put in the service of meeting the many needs of the producers. This process is called sublation. When something is sublated it is both overcome yet preserved. We can also see sublation at work in Marx’s theory of monopoly. Monopolies create the material basis for socialism as they aggregate and concentrate productive forces. Socialist revolution expropriates these from the capitalists, but instead of breaking them up into smaller enterprises, the working class takes control of them as they are. If this is still a bit confusing at this point, it should be clearer after we go through the other components of dialectics. Of course, capitalism is not going to automatically transform into socialism, even though its own internal logic orients its development in that general direction. Capitalist crises and contradictions are necessary for socialist revolutions but they are not sufficient. If they were sufficient, then we would already be living under socialism! The interpenetration of opposites What compels entities to be in a constant state of motion are their internal contradictions, or the forces generated by the unity of opposites. The most central or essential contradiction within capitalism is between labor and capital. Labor and capital are opposites because they have contradictory drives. For example, historically, labor has spontaneously sought to decrease the rate of exploitation by collectively bargaining for higher wages, better conditions, benefits, and so on. When successful, these decrease profit margins. Capital, on the other hand, seeks to always increase the rate of exploitation. Labor and capital are therefore compelled by opposite and antagonistic drives. This antagonism can be managed and mediated by unions and state regulation, but it can only be overcome through the negation of the negation. Labor and capital, as such, do not have an independent existence apart from each other. To be a worker is by definition to be exploited by capital, and to be a capitalist is by definition to exploit workers. The relationship between labor and capital is therefore internal and constitutes the totality. As a relation of exploitation, capital is a unity of contradictions. The dialectical development of this relationship over time is the movement of the balances of forces within capitalism. A common mistake is to conceptualize the movement generated from antagonistically-related social classes as the interaction of separate forces external to each other. This leads to the false belief that the role of the working-class revolution today is to destroy capitalism and replace it with socialism. Socialism can only be created out of what already exists. Marx and Engels believed that socialism would first emerge out of the most developed capitalist countries. This did not turn out to be true, as socialism emerged first in Russia, an underdeveloped, predominantly feudal-based country. Socialism, nevertheless, was ushered in by the producers and created out of an old society, not separate from it. Quantity into quality The tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality offers deeper insight into the negation of the negation. So far, we have seen how the essential contradiction within capitalism is the labor/capital relationship, which is an example of the unity of opposites. We also saw the sublation of private property from one negated mode of production to the next. Investigating the interrelationship of these two issues will provide the basis for our example of the transformation of quantity into quality. The inherently unequal relationship between labor and capital was established, in part, through the violence of expropriating peasants from their means of production. Without direct access to the means of production, former peasants were forced to sell their ability to work for a wage, thereby becoming part of the working class. Although beyond the scope of this short introduction, it’s crucial to note that the violence of slavery, colonialism, and settler colonialism were equally important in establishing capitalism. The competition between capitalists drives technological development. Because the price of any given commodity tends to center around the average amount of time its production requires, devising new technologies that can reduce the number of labor hours it takes to produce whatever commodity is a tendency internal to capitalism. In the short term this gives the capitalist at the technological forefront a competitive advantage because they can sell the commodity below its social value. But as soon as the new technology gets integrated into the entire branch or branches of industry, the average amount of time that it takes to produce whatever commodity lowers, and the competition begins anew. While new labor-saving technologies can be super profitable for individual capitalists in the short term, in the long term it reduces the number of labor hours simultaneously set into motion. It also means that more capital is invested into machinery rather than workers. And since workers produce value and machines do not, this contributes to the tendency of the falling rate of profit. When the amount of labor hours it takes to transform a given quantity of raw materials into whatever commodity is reduced, the composition of capital shifts quantitatively, by degree. Historically, individual capitalists have countered the falling rate of their profit margins in many ways such as devising schemes to reduce the price they pay for labor even while its value remains the same thereby pushing the laborer into depravity and impoverishment. The capitalist, driven to counter the falling rate of profit by extracting more and more value from the laborer, thereby deepens capital’s crisis. The internal drive of capital to forever expand the accumulation of surplus value brings the unity of opposites, labor and capital, into growing conflict with each other. This movement is the developmental process at the heart of the dialectics of capitalism. While the capitalist has an interest in maintaining the contradiction and creating the illusion of capital’s permanence, the objective interest of labor is to resolve the contradiction, thereby changing the quality of production relations. This is quantity into quality and the center of struggle between labor and capital. The quantitative changes provide the basis or possibility of qualitative change. Conclusion One of the reasons why dialectical materialism is so important is because it embodies a deep revolutionary optimism. Drawing attention to the fact that the future already exists as an unrealized potential within the present demystifies the seeming permanence of capitalism. In other words, it reveals the defeat of imperialism as a real potential and not a fantasy. For example, it is a fact that the most advanced means of production, labor saving technologies, as they currently exist, are able to meet the basic needs of every person in the world. In this way, the future liberation of humanity from exploitation and material oppression already exists. The practicality of the aforementioned optimism resides in the fact that Marx’s method correctly locates the agent of revolutionary transformation within the working class, the many.

#### [Badiou 08]“The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways. The point, however, is to change it” – truth is the process from theory to practice, pure theorization divorced of practice and rebellions leads to useless accumulation of ideas and idealist absurdities. Thus, the role of the ballot is to vote for the best method to rebel against the reactionary bourgeoise

Badiou 08 [(Alain Badiou, a professor emeritus of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Supérieure, Paris, works with Organisation Politique, a postparty organization.)“The Maoism of Alain Badiou.” The Marxist-Leninist, The Marxist-Leninist, 24 Mar. 2008, marxistleninist.wordpress.com/2008/03/23/the-maoism-of-alain-badiou/. Accessed 4 Sept. 2021.] Comrade PW

A. Practice, Theory, Knowledge We are already handed something essential here: every Marxist statement is—in a single, dividing movement—observation and directive. As a concentrate of real practice, it equals its movement in order to return to it. Since all that is draws its being only from its becoming, equally, theory as knowledge of what is has being only by moving toward that of which it is the theory. Every knowledge is orientation, every description is prescription. The sentence, “it is right to rebel against the reactionaries,” bears witness to this more than any other. In it we find expressed the fact that Marxism, prior to being the full-fledged science of social formation, is the distillate of what rebellion demands: that one consider it right, that reason be rendered to it. Marxism is both a taking sides and the systematization of a partisan experience. The existence of a science of social formations bears no interest for the masses unless it reflects and concentrates their real revolutionary movement. Marxism must be conceived as the accumulated wisdom of popular revolutions, the reason they engender, the fixation and detailing of their target. Mao Zedong’s sentence clearly situates rebellion as the originary place of correct ideas, and reactionaries as those whose destruction is legitimated by theory. Mao’s sentence situates Marxist truth within the unity of theory and practice. Marxist truth is that from which rebellion draws its rightness, its reason, to demolish the enemy. It repudiates any equality in the face of truth. In a single movement, which is knowledge in its specific division into description and directive, it judges, pronounces the sentence, and immerses itself in its execution. Rebels possess knowledge, according to their aforementioned essential movement, their power and their duty: to annihilate the reactionaries. Marx’s Capital does not say anything different: the proletarians are right to violently overthrow the capitalists. Marxist truth is not a conciliatory truth. It is, in and of itself, dictatorship and, if need be, terror. Mao Zedong’s sentence reminds us that, for a Marxist, the link from theory to practice (from reason to rebellion) is an internal condition of theory itself, because truth is a real process, it is rebellion against the reactionaries. There is hardly a truer and more profound statement in Hegel than the following: “The absolute Idea has turned out to be the identity of the theoretical Idea and the practical Idea. Each of these by itself is still one-sided” (Hegel, [Science of Logic](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/hegel/works/hl/hlconten.htm)). For Hegel, absolute truth is the contradictory unity of theory and practice. It is the uninterrupted and divided process of being and the act. Lenin salutes this enthusiastically: “The unity of the theoretical idea (of knowledge) and of practice—this NB—and this unity precisely in the theory of knowledge, for the resulting sum is the “absolute idea” (Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm)). Let us read this sentence very carefully, since, remarkably, it divides the word “knowledge” into two. That is a crucial point, on which we shall often return: knowledge, as theory, is (dialectically) opposed to practice. Theory and practice form a unity, that is to say, for the dialectic, a unity of opposites. But this knowledge (theory/)practice contradiction is in turn the very object of the theory of knowledge. In other words, the inner nature of the process of knowledge is constituted by the theory/practice contradiction. Or again, practice, which as such is dialectically opposed to knowledge (to theory), is nevertheless an integral part of knowledge qua process. In all Marxist texts we encounter this scission, this double occurrence of the word “knowledge,” designating either theory in its dialectical correlation to practice or the overall process of this dialectic, that is, the contradictory movement of these two terms, theory and practice. Consider Mao, [“Where Do Correct Ideas Come From?”](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-9/mswv9_01.htm): “Often, correct knowledge can be arrived at only after many repetitions of the process . . . leading from practice to knowledge and then back to practice. Such is the Marxist theory of knowledge, the dialectical materialist theory of knowledge” (Mao Zedong, Five Philosophical Essays). The movement of knowledge is the practice-knowledge-practice trajectory. Here “knowledge” designates one of the terms in the process but equally the process taken as a whole, a process that in turn includes two occurrences of practice, initial and final. To stabilize our vocabulary,2 and remain within the tradition, we will call “theory” the term in the theory/practice contradiction whose overall movement will be the process of “knowledge.” We will say: Knowledge is the dialectical process practice/theory. On this basis we may expose the reactionary illusion entertained by those who imagine they can circumvent the strategic thesis of the primacy of practice. It is clear that whoever is not within the real revolutionary movement, whoever is not practically internal to the rebellion against the reactionaries, knows nothing, even if he theorizes. Mao Zedong did indeed affirm that in the theory/practice contradiction—that is, in a phase of the real process—theory could temporarily play the main role: “The creation and advocacy of revolutionary theory plays the principal and decisive role in those times of which Lenin said, ‘Without revolutionary theory there can be no revolutionary movement'” (Mao, [On Contradiction](http://www.marxists.org/reference/archive/mao/selected-works/volume-1/mswv1_17.htm)). Does this mean that, at that moment, theory amounts to an intrinsic revolutionary possibility, that pure “Marxist theoreticians” can and must emerge? Absolutely not. It means that, in the theory/practice contradiction that constitutes the process of knowledge, theory is the principal aspect of the contradiction; that the systematization of practical revolutionary experiences is what allows one to advance; that it is useless to continue quantitatively to accumulate these experiences, to repeat them, because what is on the agenda is the qualitative leap, the rational synthesis immediately followed by its application, that is, its verification. But without these experiences, without organized practice (because organization alone allows the centralization of experiences), there is no systematization, no knowledge at all. Without a generalized application there is no testing ground, no verification, no truth. In that case “theory” can only give birth to idealist absurdities. We thus come back to our starting point: practice is internal to the rational movement of truth. In its opposition to theory, it is part of knowledge. It is this intuition that accounts for Lenin’s enthusiastic reception of the Hegelian conception of the absolute Idea, to the point that he makes Marx into the mere continuation of Hegel. (“Marx, consequently, clearly sides with Hegel in introducing the criterion of practice into the theory of knowledge,” Lenin, [Philosophical Notebooks](http://www.marxists.org/archive/lenin/works/cw/volume38.htm).) Mao Zedong’s sentence lends its precision to Lenin’s enthusiasm. It is the general historical content of Hegel’s dialectical statement. It is not just any practice that internally anchors theory, it is the rebellion against the reactionaries. Theory, in turn, does not externally legislate on practice, on rebellion: it incorporates itself in the rebellion by the mediating release of its reason. In this sense, it is true that the sentence says it all, an all that summarizes Marxism’s class position, its concrete revolutionary significance. An all outside which stands anyone who tries to consider Marxism not from the standpoint of rebellion but from that of the break; not from the standpoint of history but from that of the system; not from the standpoint of the primacy of practice but from that of the primacy of theory; not as the concentrated form of the wisdom of the working people but as its a priori condition.

#### [Bachand 20] Attempting to resolve the inherent contradictions within capitalism through international organizations in order to “fix” the crisis exasperate the continuation of capitalist contradictions. The affirmative acts as a regulatory measure to ensure the regime of accumulation is constantly stabilized

Bachand 20 Rémi Bachand, What’s Behind the WTO Crisis? A Marxist Analysis, European Journal of International Law, Volume 31, Issue 3, August 2020, Pages 857–882, Remi Bachand Bookmark Professor in the Law department at Universite du Quebec a Montreal <https://doi.org/10.1093/ejil/chaa054> //avery

Drawing on Italian activist and intellectual Antonio Gramsci, the neo-Gramscian school of IR strives to explain the development and reproduction of a social order. Specifically, it focuses on the reason for which social classes that are disadvantaged and exploited by a social order nevertheless adhere to it without attempting to reverse it. Gramsci qualifies this situation by using the concept of ‘hegemony’ which designates, among other things, the capacity of a dominant group to convince, using ideological procedures, other groups that a social order is good for them even if this is not objectively the case. Transposing this analysis at the global level, Robert Cox explains that hegemony: … means dominance of a particular kind where the dominant state creates an order based ideologically on a broad measure of consent, functioning according to general principles that in fact ensure the continuing supremacy of the leading state or states and leading classes but at the same time offer some measure or prospect of satisfaction to the less powerful.43 Criticizing the focus put by mainstream approaches in IR, Cox claims that hegemony is not essentially the supremacy of the leading state(s), but of the dominant classes of these state(s).44 Moreover, coming from the Marxist’s tradition and emphasizing the economic aspect of any social organization, he argues that hegemony ‘is an order within a world economy with a dominant mode of production which penetrates into all countries and links into other subordinate modes of production’.45 In other words, hegemony is the capacity of the dominant classes of the dominant state(s) to expand, reproduce and legitimize the mode of production that is favourable to their interests. Cox sees an important relation between international organizations (and institutions) and hegemony. In his mind: International institutions and rules are generally initiated by the state which established the hegemony. At the very least they must have that state’s support. The dominant state takes care to secure the acquiescence of other states according to a hierarchy of powers within the inter-state structure of hegemony.46 More precisely, they have many roles in the reproduction of hegemony: (1) [T]hey embody the rules which facilitate the expansion of hegemonic world orders; (2) they are themselves the product of the hegemonic order; (3) they ideologically legitimate the norms of the world order; (4) they co-opt the elites from peripheral countries and (5) they absorb counter-hegemonic ideas.47 Stephen Gill, Cox’s colleague at York University, adds an interesting dimension to these roles. With the concept of ‘new constitutionalism’ that is supported by international organizations, he refers to … political and legal reforms to redefine the political via a series of precommitment mechanisms. These include constitutions, laws, property rights and various institutional arrangements, designed to have quasi-permanent status. A central objective of new constitutionalism is to prevent future governments from undoing commitments to a disciplinary neoliberal pattern of accumulation.48 The important aspect underlined by Gill is the capacity of international organizations to exclude from the political discussion, from what is commonly sensed as ‘possible’, some aspects that are incompatible with the social order promoted by the dominant groups and social classes. Globally, the neo-Gramscian contribution is useful to emphasize the link between an international organization and a specific social order based on the reproduction of dominant social classes’ interests. Hence, an international organization (it is at least true for the most important of them) cannot be understood if not situated inside the political and economic order to which it belongs. It is also presumably the case that when this order is not functioning well any longer, the international organization will also enter into crisis, or be radically transformed. B Théorie de la régulation and Social Structure of Accumulation Theory The second step relates to a ‘mode of regulation’ that supports and legitimizes the regime of accumulation. It is constituted by ‘institutional forms’ whose functions are notably to ‘reproduce the fundamental social relations of the mode of production’ and to ‘pilot’ the reproduction of the regime of accumulation.53 To explain their argument, the SSAT claim that capitalism is ‘an inherently conflictual system’ but that its contradictions can be attenuated through the construction of sets of institutions that mitigate and channel class conflict and stabilize capitalists’ long-run expectations. Institutions in this sense are conceived of broadly and can be economic, political, ideological, or cultural in character. […] [These institutions] are mutually compatible and generally supportive of each other as well as supportive of the accumulation process.54 Joining this assessment to our earlier analysis of the neo-Gramscians, we may now deduce that hegemony does not simply represent the expansion of a ‘mode of production’ (as Cox claims) but of the ‘regime of accumulation’ that is adopted by the dominant classes of the dominant state(s) because it is felt that it is the best one to defend their interests. In fact, international organizations on which Cox and Gill focus may be interpreted as being part of what the école de la régulation calls the ‘mode of regulation’. Their function becomes clearer with the input of the SSAT and the école de la régulation: to ensure the efficiency, the legitimacy and the permanency of the regime of accumulation. C The Importance of the Rate of Profit and the Counteracting Factors to Its Fall Our last theoretical influence comes directly from Marx, who explained that the inevitable change in the organic composition of capital (that is the relation between constant capital55 and variable capital56) implies a tendency of the rate of profit to fall,57 a phenomenon that Marx strongly associates with overproduction and over accumulation of capital.58 For Marx, this fall is only a long-term tendency because of the existence of some counteracting factors that can be put in play to countervail the fall of profit. Marx enumerates six of these counteracting factors: the intensification of labour exploitation, the reduction of wages, the cheapening of the price of elements of constant capital, the relative surplus population, foreign trade (to which we can associate foreign investment) and the increase in share capital (that will here be associated to financialization59).60 The theoretical explanation for the law of the tendential fall in the rate of profit is controversial, even though some authors continue to defend it and use it in a somewhat convincing way.61 Now, even without defending Marx’s theoretical explanation, many Marxist-oriented authors put the evolution of the rate of profit (and generally its fall) at the core of their work.62 For us, the usefulness of this type of analysis is that evolution of the rate of profit is obviously an essential part of capitalism, whose single aim is to ensure capital accumulation. Geographer David Harvey’s New Imperialism offers a particularly important contribution for any international lawyer wishing to understand the link between capitalism and international law. In this book (as well as elsewhere), Harvey develops a theory of ‘capital fix’. As he explains: The central point of this argument concerned a chronic tendency within capitalism, theoretically derived out a reformulation of Marx’s theory of the tendency for the rate of profit to fall, to produce crises of overaccumulation. Such crises are typically registered as surpluses of capital (in commodity, money, or productive capacity forms) and surpluses of labour side by side, without there apparently being any means to bring them together profitably to accomplish socially useful tasks. […] Since it is the lack of profitable opportunities that lies at the hearth of the difficulty, the key economic (as opposed to social and political) problem lies with capital. If devaluation is to be avoided, then profitable ways must be found to absorb the capital surpluses.63 Capital has to find solutions to face this fall of opportunities and the fall of the rate of profit. Harvey introduces the double meaning of the concept of ‘fix’: A certain portion of the total capital is literally fixed in and on the land in some physical form for a relative long period of time (depending on its economic and physical lifetime). […] The spatio-temporal ‘fix’, on the other hand, is a metaphor for a particular kind of solution to capitalist crises through temporal deferral and geographical expansion. […] The production of space, the organization of wholly new territorial divisions of labour, the opening up of new and cheaper resources complexes, of new regions as dynamic spaces of capital accumulation, and the penetration of pre-existing social formation by capitalist social relations and institutional arrangements (such as rules of contract and private property arrangements) provide important ways to absorb capital and labour surpluses.64 Hence, with the theory of ‘capital fix’, Harvey develops Marx’s own concept of ‘counteracting factors’ (a concept we will continue to use in the following pages), underlying the necessity for capital to find strategies to face its inherent contradictions. The importance of this theoretical finding is that many counteracting factors can be put at work with the help of international law and international organizations. Put together, the ideas of this section lead us to propose the following conclusion. Capitalism is wrought with strong and inherent contradictions that have the long-term tendency to bring down the rate of profit. Even if the theorization proposed by Marx of this fall has not been explicitly accepted by all, several authors have factually shown its existence and its implications. The sustainability of the rate of profit is an important, if not the main aspect of a regime of accumulation,65 and when a fall occurs, the regime of accumulation must react. In such a situation, the function of a mode of regulation (to use the concept of the école de la régulation) is actually to find ways to operationalize enough counteracting factors to re-establish a satisfying rate of profit, at least for leading state(s)’ dominant classes. Finally, if we follow the neo-Gramscian argument and admit that the purpose of international organizations is to promote the well-functioning of a regime of accumulation (and consequently the sustainability of the rate of profit), we can conclude that an international organization’s (and especially one with economic functions like the WTO) existence is linked with its capacity to put the counteracting factors at work to ensure that the dominant classes of the leading state(s) can rake satisfying profit. Consequently, if it is not able to achieve this goal, one can predict that, one day or another, its very existence will be challenged.

#### [Vanni 21] Reformism not only fails but also perpetuate global inequality – the aff is a weaponization of medicines that increases Global South dependency in service of the corporate giants

Vanni 21[(Dr. Vanni obtained both her PhD and LLM degrees in International Economic Law from the University of Warwick, She has BA(Hons) in International Relations Her main area of research is international economic law, with a focus on intellectual property law, international trade law, global economic governance, law and development.  )“On Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines and Vaccine Imperialism.” TWAILR, 23 Mar. 2021, twailr.com/on-intellectual-property-rights-access-to-medicines-and-vaccine-imperialism/. Accessed 6 Sept. 2021.] PW

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.

#### [Escalante 18] The alt is to embrace the dual power strategy through party organizing – builds popular support by serving the people, offers accountability measures, and unified in the long-term goal of creating a better society to replace capitalism

[Escalante 18 (Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist.)theforgenews. “Party Organizing in the 21st Century.” The Forge News, The Forge News, 21 Sept. 2018, theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/. Accessed 15 Aug. 2021.] Comrade PW

Chauvinism = aggressive/exaggerated patriotism

The Need For A Party: I would argue that within the base building movement, there is a move towards party organizing, but this trend has not always been explicitly theorized or forwarded within the movement. My goal in this essay is to argue that base building and dual power strategy can be best forwarded through party organizing, and that party organizing can allow this emerging movement to solidify into a powerful revolutionary socialist tendency in the United States. One of the crucial insights of the base building movement is that the current state of the left in the United States is one in which revolution is not currently possible. There exists very little popular support for socialist politics. A century of anticommunist propaganda has been extremely effective in convincing even the most oppressed and marginalized that communism has nothing to offer them. The base building emphasis on dual power responds directly to this insight. By building institutions which can meet people’s needs, we are able to concretely demonstrate that communists can offer the oppressed relief from the horrific conditions of capitalism. Base building strategy recognizes that actually doing the work to serve the people does infinitely more to create a socialist base of popular support than electing democratic socialist candidates or holding endless political education classes can ever hope to do. Dual power is about proving that we have something to offer the oppressed. The question, of course, remains: once we have built a base of popular support, what do we do next? If it turns out that establishing socialist institutions to meet people’s needs does in fact create sympathy towards the cause of communism, how can we mobilize that base? Put simply: in order to mobilize the base which base builders hope to create, we need to have already done the work of building a communist party. It is not enough to simply meet peoples needs. Rather, we must build the institutions of dual power in the name of communism. We must refuse covert front organizing and instead have a public face as a communist party. When we build tenants unions, serve the people programs, and other dual power projects, we must make it clear that we are organizing as communists, unified around a party, and are not content simply with establishing endless dual power organizations. We must be clear that our strategy is revolutionary and in order to make this clear we must adopt party organizing. By “party organizing” I mean an organizational strategy which adopts the party model. Such organizing focuses on building a party whose membership is formally unified around a party line determined by democratic centralist decision making. The party model creates internal methods for holding party members accountable, unifying party member action around democratically determined goals, and for educating party members in communist theory and praxis. A communist organization utilizing the party model works to build dual power institutions while simultaneously educating the communities they hope to serve. Organizations which adopt the party model focus on propagandizing around the need for revolutionary socialism. They function as the forefront of political organizing, empowering local communities to theorize their liberation through communist theory while organizing communities to literally fight for their liberation. A party is not simply a group of individuals doing work together, but is a formal organization unified in its fight against capitalism. Party organizing has much to offer the base building movement. By working in a unified party, base builders can ensure that local struggles are tied to and informed by a unified national and international strategy. While the most horrific manifestations of capitalism take on particular and unique form at the local level, we need to remember that our struggle is against a material base which functions not only at the national but at the international level. The formal structures provided by a democratic centralist party model allow individual locals to have a voice in open debate, but also allow for a unified strategy to emerge from democratic consensus. Furthermore, party organizing allows for local organizations and individual organizers to be held accountable for their actions. It allows criticism to function not as one independent group criticizing another independent group, but rather as comrades with a formal organizational unity working together to sharpen each others strategies and to help correct chauvinist ideas and actions. In the context of the socialist movement within the United States, such accountability is crucial. As a movement which operates within a settler colonial society, imperialist and colonial ideal frequently infect leftist organizing. Creating formal unity and party procedure for dealing with and correcting these ideas allows us to address these consistent problems within American socialist organizing. Having a formal party which unifies the various dual power projects being undertaken at the local level also allows for base builders to not simply meet peoples needs, but to pull them into the membership of the party as organizers themselves. The party model creates a means for sustained growth to occur by unifying organizers in a manner that allows for skills, strategies, and ideas to be shared with newer organizers. It also allows community members who have been served by dual power projects to take an active role in organizing by becoming party members and participating in the continued growth of base building strategy. It ensures that there are formal processes for educating communities in communist theory and praxis, and also enables them to act and organize in accordance with their own local conditions. We also must recognize that the current state of the base building movement precludes the possibility of such a national unified party in the present moment. Since base building strategy is being undertaken in a number of already established organizations, it is not likely that base builders would abandon these organizations in favor of founding a unified party. Additionally, it would not be strategic to immediately undertake such complete unification because it would mean abandoning the organizational contexts in which concrete gains are already being made and in which growth is currently occurring. What is important for base builders to focus on in the current moment is building dual power on a local level alongside building a national movement. This means aspiring towards the possibility of a unified party, while pursuing continued local growth. The movement within the Marxist Center network towards some form of unification is positive step in the right direction. The independent party emphasis within the Refoundation caucus should also be recognized as a positive approach. It is important for base builders to continue to explore the possibility of unification, and to maintain unification through a party model as a long term goal. In the meantime, individual base building organizations ought to adopt party models for their local organizing. Local organizations ought to be building dual power alongside recruitment into their organizations, education of community members in communist theory and praxis, and the establishment of armed and militant party cadres capable of defending dual power institutions from state terror. Dual power institutions must be unified openly and transparently around these organizations in order for them to operate as more than “red charities.” Serving the people means meeting their material needs while also educating and propagandizing. It means radicalizing, recruiting, and organizing. The party model remains the most useful method for achieving these ends. The use of the party model by local organizations allows base builders to gain popular support, and most importantly, to mobilize their base of popular support towards revolutionary ends, not simply towards the construction of a parallel economy which exists as an end in and of itself. It is my hope that we will see future unification of the various local base building organizations into a national party, but in the meantime we must push for party organizing at the local level. If local organizations adopt party organizing, it ought to become clear that a unified national party will have to be the long term goal of the base building movement. Many of the already existing organizations within the base building movement already operate according to these principles. I do not mean to suggest otherwise. Rather, my hope is to suggest that we ought to be explicit about the need for party organizing and emphasize the relationship between dual power and the party model. Doing so will make it clear that the base building movement is not pursuing a cooperative economy alongside capitalism, but is pursuing a revolutionary socialist strategy capable of fighting capitalism. The long term details of base building and dual power organizing will arise organically in response to the conditions the movement finds itself operating within. I hope that I have put forward a useful contribution to the discussion about base building organizing, and have demonstrated the need for party organizing in order to ensure that the base building tendency maintains a revolutionary orientation. The finer details of revolutionary strategy will be worked out over time and are not a good subject for public discussion. I strongly believe party organizing offers the best path for ensuring that such strategy will succeed. My goal here is not to dictate the only possible path forward but to open a conversation about how the base building movement will organize as it transitions from a loose network of individual organizations into a unified socialist tendency. These discussions and debates will be crucial to ensuring that this rapidly growing movement can succeed.

#### [Robinson 18] mode of production determines the social relations – the capitalistic mode is an inherently unsustainable and expansionary one – causes extinction via overaccumulation, environmental degradation, and mass social crisis

Robinson 18 [William I, professor of sociology, global studies and Latin American studies at the University of California at Santa Barbara. 2018. “Accumulation Crisis and Global Police State.”<http://revolutionary-socialism.com/en/accumulation-crisis-and-global-police-state/>] JCH-PF, recut by PW

Each major episode of crisis in the world capitalist system has presented the potential for systemic change. Each has involved the breakdown of state legitimacy, escalating class and social struggles, and military conflicts, leading to a restructuring of the system, including new institutional arrangements, class relations, and accumulation activities that eventually result in a restabilization of the system and renewed capitalist expansion. The current crisis shares aspects of earlier system-wide structural crises, such as of the 1880s, the 1930s or the 1970s. But there are six interrelated dimensions to the current crisis that I believe sets it apart from these earlier ones and suggests that a simple restructuring of the system will not lead to its restabilization – that is, our very survival now requires a revolution against global capitalism (Robinson, 2014). These six dimensions, in broad strokes, present a “big picture” context in which a global police state is emerging. First, the system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. We have already passed tipping points in climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and diversity loss. For the first time ever, human conduct is intersecting with and fundamentally altering the earth system in such a way that threatens to bring about a sixth mass extinction (see, e.g., Foster et al., 2011; Moore, 2015). These ecological dimensions of global crisis have been brought to the forefront of the global agenda by the worldwide environmental justice movement. Communities around the world have come under escalating repression as they face off against transnational corporate plunder of their environment. While capitalism cannot be held solely responsible for the ecological crisis, it is difficult to imagine that the environmental catastrophe can be resolved within the capitalist system given capital’s implacable impulse to accumulate and its accelerated commodification of nature. Second, the level of global social polarization and inequality is unprecedented. The richest one percent of humanity in 2016 controlled over half of the world’s wealth and 20 percent controlled 95 percent of that wealth, while the remaining 80 percent had to make do with just five percent (Oxfam, 2017). These escalating inequalities fuel capitalism’s chronic problem of overaccumulation: the TCC cannot find productive outlets to unload the enormous amounts of surplus it has accumulated, leading to chronic stagnation in the world economy (see next section). Such extreme levels of social polarization present a challenge of social control to dominant groups. As Trumpism in the United States as well as the rise of far-right and neo-fascist movements in Europe so well illustrate, cooptation also involves the manipulation of fear and insecurity among the downwardly mobile so that social anxiety is channeled towards scapegoated communities. This psychosocial mechanism of displacing mass anxieties is not new, but it appears to be increasing around the world in the face of the structural destabilization of capitalist globalization. Extreme inequality requires extreme violence and repression that lend themselves to projects of 21st century fascism. Third, the sheer magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as well as the magnitude and concentrated control over the means of global communication and the production and circulation of symbols, images, and knowledge. Computerized wars, drone warfare, robot soldiers, bunker-buster bombs, a new generation of nuclear weapons, satellite surveillance, cyberwar, spatial control technology, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare, and more generally, of systems of social control and repression. We have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society, a point brought home by Edward Snowden’s revelations in 2013, and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication and symbolic production. If global capitalist crisis leads to a new world war the destruction would simply be unprecedented. Fourth, we are reaching limits to the extensive expansion of capitalism, in the sense that there are no longer any new territories of significance to integrate into world capitalism and new spaces to commodify are drying up. The capitalist system is by its nature expansionary. In each earlier structural crisis, the system went through a new round of extensive expansion – from waves of colonial conquest in earlier centuries, to the integration in the late 20th and early 21st centuries of the former socialist countries, China, India and other areas that had been marginally outside the system. There are no longer any new territories to integrate into world capitalism. At the same time, the privatization of education, health, utilities, basic services, and public lands is turning those spaces in global society that were outside of capital’s control into “spaces of capital,” so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. What is there left to commodify? Where can the system now expand? New spaces have to be violently cracked open and the peoples in these spaces must be repressed by the global police state. Fifth, there is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums” (Davis, 2007) pushed out of the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction, into a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. Crises provide capital with the opportunity to accelerate the process of forcing greater productivity out of fewer workers. The processes by which surplus labor is generated have accelerated under globalization. Spatial reorganization has helped transnational capital to break the territorial-bound power of organized labor and impose new capital–labor relations based on fragmentation, flexibilization, and the cheapening of labor. These developments, combined with a massive new round of primitive accumulation and displacement of hundreds of millions, have given rise to a new global army of superfluous labor that goes well beyond the traditional reserve army of labor that Marx discussed. Global capitalism has no direct use for surplus humanity. But indirectly, it holds wages down everywhere and makes new systems of 21st century slavery possible. Dominant groups face the challenge of how to contain both the real and potential rebellion of surplus humanity. In addition, surplus humanity cannot consume and so as their ranks expand the problem of overaccumulation becomes exacerbated. Sixth, there is an acute political contradiction in global capitalism: economic globalization takes places within a nation-state system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to substitute for a leading nation-state with enough power and authority to organize and stabilize the system, much less to impose regulations on transnational capital. In the age of capitalist globalization governments must attract to the national territory transnational corporate investment, which requires providing capital with all the incentives associated with neoliberalism – downward pressure on wages, deregulation, austerity, and so on – that aggravate inequality, impoverishment, and insecurity for working classes. Nation-states face a contradiction between the need to promote transnational capital accumulation in their territories and their need to achieve political legitimacy. As a result, states around the world have been experiencing spiraling crises of legitimacy. This situation generates bewildering and seemingly contradictory politics and also helps explain the resurgence of far-right and neo-fascist forces that espouse rhetoric of nationalism and protectionism even as they promote neo-liberalism.
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#### No solvency – they’re still capitalist

Baker 20 [Dean Baker “News for Bill Gates: Capitalism Is Still Capitalism without Patent Monopolies - Center for Economic and Policy Research.” Center for Economic and Policy Research, 23 Nov. 2020, cepr.net/news-for-bill-gates-capitalism-is-still-capitalism-without-patent-monopolies/. Accessed 18 Sept. 2021.] Comrade PW

Like Donald Trump, Bill Gates apparently has a hard time understanding some things. The NYT had a major [article](https://www.nytimes.com/2020/11/23/world/bill-gates-vaccine-coronavirus.html?action=click&module=Top%20Stories&pgtype=Homepage) on Gate’s role in developing vaccines against the coronavirus. At one point, the piece notes critics of Gates, who complain about how he has promoted patent monopoly financing of the development of vaccines and drugs, which allow these items to sell at prices that can be many thousand percent above the free market price. The piece then presents Gates’ rejoinder: “This capitalism thing — there actually are some domains that actually works in, …. North Korea doesn’t have that many vaccines, as far as we can tell.” Gates apparently is not aware that the U.S. government paid for Moderna’s research and testing costs for its vaccines. While it also granted Moderna a patent monopoly on the vaccine (we can never give drug companies too much money) it is apparently possible to pay for research up front, and the patent monopolies are not necessary. This would allow for vaccines and drugs to be sold as cheap generics from the day they are approved by the FDA. It would also take away the incentive for drug companies to lie about the safety and effectiveness of their drugs, as they did in pushing opioids in the 1990s and 00s. This would still very much be a capitalist system. The companies doing research would be making profits, just as military contractors like Lockheed make profits. They just would not be doing it through government-granted patent monopolies. It is perhaps understandable that someone who became one of the world’s richest people as a result of these monopolies (actually most copyright monopolies), may not want to envision a capitalism that uses more efficient incentive mechanisms, the rest of us should be able to think more clearly about such issues.

### Link – IP reform

#### [Frase 13] IP reformism is just another neoliberal fantasy – reduction in protection actually leads to increased gender violence

Frase 13 [(Peter Frase is an editor at Jacobin magazine, a Ph.D. candidate in sociology at the CUNY Graduate Center, and has written for In These Times and Al Jazeera. He lives in New York City.) “Property and Theft.” Jacobinmag.com, 2013, jacobinmag.com/2013/09/property-and-theft. Accessed 5 Aug. 2021.] PW

We have here something a bit like the old “reform or revolution” dichotomy, which arrays the advocates of smashing the existing system against the timid meliorism of those who only want to make it more humane. But the contrast fails here just as it did in the larger drama of twentieth-century socialism, where revolution and reform both ultimately led back to capitalist restoration and neoliberal retrenchment. We need another path — one that recognizes the necessity of reformist struggles within capitalist institutions, while still attempting to move toward a break with the system and the creation of a fundamentally new kind of economy and society. André Gorz called this the “non-reformist reform”: a project of “reforms which advance toward a radical transformation of society” by making a “modification of the relations of power” which could “serve to weaken capitalism and to shake its joints.” What would constitute a non-reformist reform of intellectual property? The revolutionary overthrow of all intellectual property, even if it were possible, leaves unanswered the question of how to ensure that those who create knowledge and culture are provided for, and how to control the exploitation of the cultural commons by digital capitalists. The anarchist championing of online piracy only allows for some resistance around the edges, without posing a fundamental challenge to the system. And yet the idea of reforming IP into something better and more egalitarian, something that truly rewards all who participate in the work of creation, seems like another iteration of the naïve dream of a just and democratic capitalism. Anne Elizabeth Moore and Sean Andrews approach this bundle of contradictions in different ways. For Moore, the central point is that IP is now and has always been gendered, and therefore any path toward its transformation and abolition must explicitly work toward addressing inequities that are embedded in our notions of culture, even if that sometimes means more IP rather than less. “An across-the-board loosening of IP protection,” she fears, would “lead to the increased piracy of those cultural productions already less protected, worsening the economic gender gap.” The task is to “correct for generations of cultural misogyny,” which entails fundamentally rethinking what counts as IP, beyond an isolated male inventor in his study, the image of whom forms the explicit or implicit basis of much of our current regime. Insofar as the socialist perspective is taken to be hostile to the existence of intellectual property and private property more generally, Moore’s argument might be taken as a challenge to it. But this is to confuse a socialist approach with a libertarian one. The libertarian absolutist case against IP is consistent with the movement’s anti-statist trappings, and depends on the inference that because intellectual property is a debased, false form of property, it therefore does not fall within the purview of the state’s property-defending mission. A socialist, however, can recognize that law and the state are contested terrain, and that replacing the regime of capitalist private property requires erecting, at least in the interim, an alternative form of socialized property, in order to defend the commons against the persistent efforts of the capitalist class to enclose and appropriate it. The struggle over traditional physical property provides many examples of this. Land trusts that are available to the public are an alternative to private ownership. Worker coooperatives and B Corporations, which are dedicated to a social purpose rather than only maximizing profit, are being pursued as alternatives to the traditional corporate form. This is an appealing model for a potentially non-capitalist approach to the cultural commons that isn’t simply hostile to the legal system, but attempts to use it as a mechanism for contesting the narrow capitalist definition of property. But as we attempt to forge new property forms, new contradictions and unintended consequences will arise. In embracing a superficially appealing new licensing model, we could end up accidentally imprisoning ourselves in something just as bad as or worse than what we have now. Take, for example, a project that Andrews mentions, the Creative Commons license. This is, as he notes, a legal property form just as much as traditional copyright. However, where copyright gives an owner the right to keep knowledge closed, Creative Commons is designed to facilitate creators who want to ensure their creations remain open, while at the same time making sure that they receive credit for them. One of the more common versions is the CC BY license, which allows unlimited distribution and repurposing as long as the original creator receives credit in any new version or copy. Another, CC BY-SA, adds the provision that those who redistribute or remix something must “license their new creations under the identical terms,” a provision with the potential to virally spread Creative Commons protection to other non-covered work. Going further in a superficially anti-capitalist direction, CC BY-NC-SA also prohibits commercial use, while CC BY-NC-ND also prohibits the creation of modified and derivative works. These licenses might seem like a promising ways to protect the rights of creators and keep work out of the hands of corporate content monopolists. But they also pose contradictions and compromises for those who would like the commons to be as open and accessible as possible, but who recognize that a short-run strategy of total IP rejectionism is susceptible to exploitation by capitalist interests. Creative Commons demonstrates this, as does the simpler GNU Public License (GPL) for software.

#### [Khasru 20] If Aff really cared about the Global South they would have negated – COVID-19 provides the perfect opportunity for developing countries to end their dependence on Western assistance, but the aff kills it by increasing their dependency on vaccine technology and allows for the continuation of the debt economy – developing economies want autonomy, not prolonged assistance

Khasru 20[Syed Munir Khasru. “The Global South’s Pandemic Path to Self-Reliance | by Syed Munir Khasru - Project Syndicate.” Project Syndicate, 17 Nov. 2020, [www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/will-covid19-reduce-global-south-aid-dependency-by-syed-munir-khasru-2020-11. Accessed 10 Sept. 2021](http://www.project-syndicate.org/commentary/will-covid19-reduce-global-south-aid-dependency-by-syed-munir-khasru-2020-11.%20Accessed%2010%20Sept.%202021).] PW

MELBOURNE – COVID-19 continues to have a devastating impact on public health and to rattle the global economy with structural shocks. The pandemic has now killed [more than one million](https://coronavirus.jhu.edu/map.html) people, while the International Monetary Fund estimates that global GDP will [shrink by 4.4%](https://blogs.imf.org/2020/10/13/a-long-uneven-and-uncertain-ascent/) in 2020. But, strange as it may seem, the current crisis could offer developing countries a path toward greater economic self-reliance. This is partly because developed countries have in general borne the brunt of the pandemic’s health effects so far. Many advanced Western economies have experienced [more COVID-19 cases and deaths](https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/?utm_campaign=homeAdUOA?Si%23countries) relative to their populations than have developing countries of the Global South, despite their superior health-care systems and stronger social safety nets. For example, India’s health system ranks [112th globally](https://www.who.int/healthinfo/paper30.pdf), while that of the United States ranks 37th. But whereas India has so far reported about [6,400 COVID-19 cases per million population](https://www.worldometers.info/coronavirus/?utm_campaign=homeAdUOA?Si%23countries), America’s tally is more than four times higher. Some developing countries like Vietnam [combated the coronavirus effectively](https://www.bbc.com/news/world-asia-52628283) by introducing strict testing, tracing, and quarantine measures at a very early stage – something most developed countries failed to do. Even after allowing for possible underreporting and data inaccuracies in poorer countries, the relative performance of developed economies remains a paradox. Moreover, development financing has already started to plummet as richer countries focus on engineering domestic post-pandemic recoveries. The OECD [estimates](http://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/the-impact-of-the-coronavirus-covid-19-crisis-on-development-finance-9de00b3b/) that external private finance inflows to developing economies could decrease by $700 billion year on year in 2020, exceeding the impact of the 2008 global financial crisis by 60%. Non-resident portfolio outflows from emerging markets totaled [$83.3 billion](https://www.iif.com/Portals/0/Files/content/1_IIF_Capital%20Flows%20Tracker_April.pdf) in March 2020 alone, according to the Institute of International Finance. And the OECD thinks global foreign direct investment (FDI) will drop by [at least 30%](https://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/foreign-direct-investment-flows-in-the-time-of-covid-19-a2fa20c4/) this year, with flows to developing economies likely to fall even more. Such trends imply a grim outlook for Global South countries that historically have largely relied on development aid from the Global North. But studies have shown that development aid and humanitarian assistance do not necessarily foster economic empowerment. A recent [OECD survey](https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/sites/3a2e52d2-en/index.html?itemId=/content/component/3a2e52d2-en) found that between 48% and 94% of respondents in developing countries do not believe that humanitarian assistance helps them to become economically self-reliant. People want financial autonomy, not prolonged assistance. The debate over the effectiveness of development aid is an old one, with critics claiming that rich countries use aid as a tool to exploit developing economies’ resources, and often [attach conditions](https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/sep/02/as-a-system-foreign-aid-is-a-fraud-and-does-nothing-for-inequality) to ensure that donors reap the bulk of the export receipts. But many developed countries have lost much of their soft power because of their shambolic pandemic responses. Even before COVID-19 struck, many developing economies had been looking for ways to make a sustainable shift from aid dependency to self-reliance. In 2018, Rwanda banned second-hand clothes imports with the aim of encouraging its domestic textile industry to produce higher value-added garments; the US responded by ending the country’s duty-free export privileges. And last year, the United Kingdom’s government [allocated](https://www.bbc.com/news/business-49068882) part of its £14 billion ($18.5 billion) aid budget to capacity-building projects intended to help developing countries increase their international trade and attract FDI. Today, developing countries have more opportunities to become self-reliant. For starters, trade in developing East Asia has declined less sharply than in the West during the pandemic, [according](https://www.wto.org/english/news_e/pres20_e/pr862_e.htm) to the World Trade Organization. A key reason for this is that industries producing high value-added goods usually [suffer more during downturns](https://www.bain.com/about/media-center/press-releases/2020/spring-luxury-report/). Developing countries’ greater resilience, stemming from their reliance on low value-added manufacturing, is evident in Vietnam’s [textile and garments sector](https://ph.trends365.net/article/5f50323ede5aad0a81add8fa), which has remained operational throughout the pandemic and is expected to have a swifter recovery in 2021 compared to their regional competitors. Second, digitization will play a crucial role in the post-pandemic recovery by significantly boosting e-commerce, which implies a fairer competitive playing field for producers around the world. Bangladesh’s e-commerce sector [grew by 26%](https://thefinancialexpress.com.bd/economy/bangladesh/covid-cranks-up-bangladesh-e-commerce-1602474106) year on year by August, and other South Asian countries show a similar trend. Third, the health-care and pharmaceuticals sectors are expected to thrive in the post-pandemic economy as people become more aware of the importance of health and fitness. Least developed countries can take advantage of World Trade Organization provisions by producing more generic drugs, which face no patent-related obstacles. Top of Form Bottom of Form Finally, governments in the Global South can mobilize domestic resources to offset the decline in external development finance – in particular by transforming their tax policies to generate revenue from fast-growing digital economic activities. Currently, developing countries’ low levels of tax revenue as a share of GDP – typically [between 10-20%](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268884638_Why_Do_Developing_Countries_Tax_So_Little), compared to 40% in high-income countries – hinder development by constraining governments’ ability to invest in public goods like health, infrastructure, and education. Developing countries face several hurdles on the path to self-reliance, not least poor governance, unfavorable business climates, and civil conflicts. But they also must break with the post-1945 paradigm of external development finance, which has been primarily driven by the Global North and shaped by its geopolitical agenda. For far too long, developing countries have had to listen to lectures from those who think they know better. Today, developing-country governments must chart a development agenda that is free from donor conditionality. Every crisis contains great opportunities, and the COVID-19 pandemic is no different. It offers developing countries nothing less than the chance to reinvent and reboot their economies – and to shake off the disabling legacy of external aid dependency.

#### [Murshed 11] Prevents diversification of resources that increases risk of conflict

Murshed 11 [(Syed Mansoob Murshed Professor of Economics of Sustainable Development at the International Institute of Social Studies (ISS), Erasmus University, Rotterdam Netherlands, and Coventry University, UK (Corresponding author: murshed@iss.nl).)| New directions in conflict research from an economics perspective|<https://core.ac.uk/download/43315678.pdf>] PW

3.2.4 Prosperity and violence More generally, historical accounts suggest that violence and increasing prosperity initially go hand in hand in the early stages of development, but decline thereafter (Bates 2001). Traditional societies may have rules and norms that manage violent behaviour, even making peaceful dispute settlement self-enforcing. An increase in prosperity may 42 Conflicts over natural resources in the global south – Conceptual approaches encourage predatory behaviour in the form of private violence by the less fortunate, or group violence if the collective action problem is resolved. Once growth progresses further, violence must decline to sustain the security of investment, and the state has to perform regulatory and security provisioning functions. Increasing violence may be symptomatic of the return of privatised social violence, precipitated by frustration spawned by greater awareness in the midst of the lack of commensurate individual (rather than national) progress. Gurr’s (1970) notion of relative deprivation argues that when people perceive that they have less than their just deserts, they will revolt. This is more likely to occur when the general or average level of prosperity is increasing, but some groups are left behind, as is often the case following globalisation led growth. Another issue that may produce violence in developing countries, but has received scant attention, is the growing inequality between the richer and poorer nations of the world. Milanovic (2011) demonstrates that the growth effort required for poor countries to catch up, including that for fast growing emerging economies like India, is much greater than expected. Secondly, individual positions in a global income distribution are much more determined by domicile (the country where you work) rather than socioeconomic class or occupation. For example, the income inequality between two similarly qualified doctors working in Britain and Zimbabwe may be greater than the measured inequalities that exist within a single nation state. In an era of widespread informational dissemination about more affluent life styles, disparities between nations may encourage people disaffected by this global inequality of opportunity to revolt against their government’s failure to deliver a higher and fairer standard of living. The draconian restrictions on international migration do not help to resolve these tensions. 3.3 NATURAL RESOURCE ENDOWMENTS AND CIVIL WAR The scarcity of resources such as land or water for agriculture or pastoralism may produce conflict. During the last decade, however, the fact that economic dependence on primary goods exports enhances conflict risk became an oft-cited finding in the rational choice literature in conflict studies. Collier and Hoeffler (2004) thus argue that the abundance of natural resource rents is said to lead to the greed motivation for conflict, the idea being that it is easier to purloin profits or rents associated with the production of natural resource based commodities. This result has been subjected to a great deal of scrutiny, and as a consequence has not emerged unscathed. The fact that this simple assertion, based on a non-robust statistical association, needs to be nuanced is now widely accepted; see Murshed, 2010, chapter 3 for a detailed review. A major concern with the Collier and Hoeffler (2004) econometric work was that it conflated all primary goods exports (the independent variable was primary goods exports as a share of national income) with key lootable or obstructable resources, and excluded illegal substances. To be a source of conflict a natural resource based product needs to be contestable (Ross 2003); prime examples of these are oil, gas, alluvial diamonds and narcotics bases (coca and poppy). Furthermore, there is a measurement issue: do we take into account the total stock of resources in our measurement of conflict risk rather than flows (indicated by production or exports). Additionally, when we differentiate between on-shore and off-shore oil, alluvial and deep mine diamonds, the conflict risks are greater with both on-shore oil and alluvial diamonds (both are New directions in conflict research from an economics perspective 43 more obstructable or lootable). Finally, there are issues with sample size and averaging, rendering the econometric findings of Collier and Hoeffler non-robust to variations in coverage. The availability of lootable and obstructable resource rents may be a better explanation for the longer duration of civil war rather than its actual onset. Natural resource rents can, in and of themselves, also become a source of grievance leading to war and insurgency if local populations feel that they are not getting their fair share of the proceeds of resource rents. Such is the case in the Niger Delta region of Nigeria. It can also cause secessionist tendencies among relatively rich regions that no longer want to share their wealth with their fellow countrymen, as in the case of Aceh in Indonesia. The greed motivation for conflict discussed thus far is by no means the only explanation. Aptly titled, the resource curse provides another explanation for conflict. The resource curse argues that the presence of substantial natural resource rents retards development through political economy channels. This has a bearing on resource rents as a potential driver of civil war, as civil war is one (violent) form of competition over the right to control resource rents. In a nutshell, the negative effects of resource rents from a political economy perspective arise when it leads to rent seeking and corruption, both of which have a destructive effect on normal productive investment and hence growth. The key mechanism in the middle which transforms resource wealth and rents to a problematic political economy is institutional quality. Kleptocratic motivations may also lead to the deliberate undermining of the institutions that sustain the social contract mentioned above. The important point is that institutional quality is partially historically determined, but they are equally determined by (or endogenous to) natural resource abundance or dependence..

#### Waivers don’t solve without increasing manufacturing. The aff only helps companies make a quick buck

Mercurio 21
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Second, the proposed waiver will do nothing to address the problem of lack of capacity or the transfer of technology and goodwill. Pharmaceutical companies have not applied for patents in the majority of developing countries – in such countries, any manufacturer is free to produce and market the vaccine inside the territory of that country or to export the vaccine to other countries where patents have not been filed.33 Patents cannot be the problem in the countries where no patent applications have been filed, but the lack of production in such countries points to the real problem – these countries lack manufacturing capacity and capability. While advanced pharmaceutical companies will have the technology, know‐how and readiness to manufacture, store and transport complex vaccine formulations, such factories and logistics exist in only a handful of countries.34 Regardless of whether an IP waiver is granted, the remaining countries will be left without enhanced vaccine access and still reliant on imported supplies. With prices for the vaccine already very low, it is doubtful that generic suppliers will be able to provide the vaccine at significantly lower prices. Under such a scenario, the benefit of the waiver would go not to the countries in need but to the generic supplier who would not need to pay the licence fee or royalty to the innovator. Thus, the waiver would simply serve to benefit advanced generic manufacturers, most of which are located in a handful of countries, including China and Brazil as well as (unsurprisingly) India and South Africa. Countries would perhaps be better off obtaining the vaccine from suppliers that have negotiated a voluntary licence from the patent holder, as such licences include provisions for the transfer of technology, know‐how and ongoing quality assurance support.