#### **Capatalism is flawed and anything less than a complete switch in our thinking will be frivilous.**

**Terzakias, E.02** "The global AIDS crisis". Retrieved September 11, 2021, from <https://isreview.org/issues/25/global_aids_crisis/>

**Anything less than giving millions of doses of drugs away for free is an inadequate response** to the problem, but the **pharmaceutical companies are**, according to health economist William McGreevey, “**very unlikely to be persuaded to do so**.”57 **This is not because they can’t afford it**. Pharmaceutical **companies make such enormous profits in** the **developed countries that they do not need to do business in the developing world** to make a return on their research investment. Africa accounts for only 1 percent of all pharmaceutical revenue; **80 percent of revenues and an even higher proportion of profits come from North America, Europe, and Japan**. But cheaper drugs in Africa could undermine prices in the developed world, either through “the re-export of cheaper medicines from poor to rich countries, or from a political backlash if the discounts drew attention to the high profit margins in developed countries.”58 **Discounting drugs to save lives in developing countries is a threat to the profit system**. If cheap, mass-produced drugs are distributed at cost or for free to save AIDS victims, what will come next? Free food for the starving? Free homes for the homeless? Where is the profit in that? **The impact of neoliberalism** **The most commonly used cover for the greed** of the pharmaceutical industry **is “lack of health care infrastructure**.” According to this excuse, pharmaceutical **companies would gladly distribute antiretrovirals at cost if developing countries didn’t lack the infrastructure to administer the drugs.** A little history is helpful in understanding this claim. **The spread of AIDS coincided with and was exacerbated by the adoption of neoliberal policies--also known as Structural Adjustment Programs** (SAPs)--**as the primary way of dealing with developing countries’ problems with debt and poverty**.59

#### **Capitalism causes extinction through war, violence, and environmental decimation**

**Robinson 14** (William I., Prof. of Sociology, Global and International Studies, and Latin American Studies, @ UC-Santa Barbara, “Global Capitalism: Crisis of Humanity and the Specter of 21st Century Fascism” The World Financial Review)

Cyclical, Structural, and Systemic Crises ¶ Most commentators on the contemporary crisis refer to the “Great Recession” of 2008 and its aftermath. Yet the causal origins of global crisis are to be found in over-accumulation and also in contradictions of state power, or in what Marxists call the internal contradictions of the capitalist system. Moreover, because the system is now global, crisis in any one place tends to represent crisis for the system as a whole. The system cannot expand because the marginalisation of a significant portion of humanity from direct productive participation, the downward pressure on wages and popular consumption worldwide, and the polarisation of income, has reduced the ability of the world market to absorb world output. At the same time, given the particular configuration of social and class forces and the correlation of these forces worldwide, national states are hard-pressed to regulate transnational circuits of accumulation and offset the explosive contradictions built into the system. ¶ Is this crisis cyclical, structural, or systemic? Cyclical crises are recurrent to capitalism about once every 10 years and involve recessions that act as self-correcting mechanisms without any major restructuring of the system. The recessions of the early 1980s, the early 1990s, and of 2001 were cyclical crises. In contrast, the 2008 crisis signaled the slide into a structural crisis. Structural crises reflect deeper contra- dictions that can only be resolved by a major restructuring of the system. The structural crisis of the 1970s was resolved through capitalist globalisation. Prior to that, the structural crisis of the 1930s was resolved through the creation of a new model of redistributive capitalism, and prior to that the struc- tural crisis of the 1870s resulted in the development of corpo- rate capitalism. A systemic crisis involves the replacement of a system by an entirely new system or by an outright collapse. A structural crisis opens up the possibility for a systemic crisis. But if it actually snowballs into a systemic crisis – in this case, **if it gives way either to capitalism being superseded or to a breakdown of global civilisation – is not predetermined and depends entirely on the response of social and political forces to the crisis and on historical contingencies that are not easy to forecast.** This is an historic moment of extreme uncertainty, in which collective responses from distinct social and class forces to the crisis are in great flux. ¶ Hence my concept of global crisis is broader than financial. There are multiple and mutually constitutive dimensions – economic, social, political, cultural, ideological and ecological, not to mention the existential crisis of our consciousness, values and very being. There is a crisis of social polarisation, that is, of social reproduction. The system cannot meet the needs or assure the survival of millions of people, perhaps a majority of humanity. There are crises of state legitimacy and political authority, or of hegemony and domination. National states face spiraling crises of legitimacy as they fail to meet the social grievances of local working and popular classes experiencing downward mobility, unemployment, heightened insecurity and greater hardships. The legitimacy of the system has increasingly been called into question by millions, perhaps even billions, of people around the world, and is facing expanded counter-hegemonic challenges. Global elites have been unable counter this erosion of the system’s authority in the face of worldwide pressures for a global moral economy. And a canopy that envelops all these dimensions is a crisis of sustainability rooted in an ecological holocaust that has already begun, expressed in climate change and the impending collapse of centralised agricultural systems in several regions of the world, among other indicators. By a crisis of humanity I mean a crisis that is approaching systemic proportions, threatening the ability of billions of people to survive , and raising the specter of a collapse of world civilisation and degeneration into a new “Dark Ages.”2 ¶ This crisis of humanity shares a number of aspects with earlier structural crises but there are also several features unique to the present: ¶ 1. The system is fast reaching the ecological limits of its reproduction. Global capitalism now couples human and natural history in such a way as to threaten to bring about what would be the sixth mass extinction in the known history of life on earth.3 This mass extinction would be caused not by a natural catastrophe such as a meteor impact or by evolutionary changes such as the end of an ice age but by purposive human activity. According to leading environmental scientists there are nine “planetary boundaries” crucial to maintaining an earth system environment in which humans can exist, four of which are experiencing at this time the onset of irreversible environmental degradation and three of which (climate change, the nitrogen cycle, and biodiversity loss) are at “tipping points,” meaning that these processes have already crossed their planetary boundaries. ¶ 2. The magnitude of the means of violence and social control is unprecedented, as is the concentration of the means of global communication and symbolic production and circulation in the hands of a very few powerful groups. Computerised wars, drones, bunker-buster bombs, star wars, and so forth, have changed the face of warfare. Warfare has become normalised and sanitised for those not directly at the receiving end of armed aggression. At the same time we have arrived at the panoptical surveillance society and the age of thought control by those who control global flows of communication, images and symbolic production. The world of Edward Snowden is the world of George Orwell; 1984 has arrived; ¶ 3. Capitalism is reaching apparent limits to its extensive expansion. There are no longer any new territories of significance that can be integrated into world capitalism, de-ruralisation is now well advanced, and the commodification of the countryside and of pre- and non-capitalist spaces has intensified, that is, converted in hot-house fashion into spaces of capital, so that intensive expansion is reaching depths never before seen. Capitalism must continually expand or collapse. How or where will it now expand? ¶ 4. **There is the rise of a vast surplus population inhabiting a “planet of slums,”4 alienated from the productive economy, thrown into the margins, and subject to sophisticated systems of social control and to destruction - to a mortal cycle of dispossession-exploitation-exclusion. This includes prison-industrial and immigrant-detention complexes, omnipresent policing, militarised gentrification,** and so on; ¶ 5. There is a disjuncture between a globalising economy and a nation-state based system of political authority. Transnational state apparatuses are incipient and have not been able to play the role of what social scientists refer to as a “hegemon,” or a leading nation-state that has enough power and authority to organise and stabilise the system. The spread of weapons of mass destruction and the unprecedented militarisation of social life and conflict across the globe makes it hard to imagine that the system can come under any stable political authority that assures its reproduction. ¶ Global Police State ¶ How have social and political forces worldwide responded to crisis? The crisis has resulted in a rapid political polarisation in global society. Both right and left-wing forces are ascendant. Three responses seem to be in dispute. ¶ One is what we could call “reformism from above.” This elite reformism is aimed at stabilising the system, at saving the system from itself and from more radical re- sponses from below. Nonetheless, in the years following the 2008 collapse of the global financial system it seems these reformers are unable (or unwilling) to prevail over the power of transnational financial capital. A second response is popular, grassroots and leftist resistance from below. As social and political conflict escalates around the world there appears to be a mounting global revolt. While such resistance appears insurgent in the wake of 2008 it is spread very unevenly across countries and regions and facing many problems and challenges. ¶ Yet another response is that I term 21st century fascism.5 The ultra-right is an insurgent force in many countries. In broad strokes, this project seeks to fuse reactionary political power with transnational capital and to organise a mass base among historically privileged sectors of the global working class – such as white workers in the North and middle layers in the South – that are now experiencing heightened insecurity and the specter of downward mobility. It involves militarism, extreme masculinisation, homophobia, racism and racist mobilisations, including the search for scapegoats, such as immigrant workers and, in the West, Muslims. Twenty-first century fascism evokes mystifying ideologies, often involving race/culture supremacy and xenophobia, embracing an idealised and mythical past. Neo-fascist culture normalises and glamorises warfare and social violence, indeed, generates a fascination with domination that is portrayed even as heroic.

#### **The alternative is to affirm the model of the Communist Party – only the Party can provide effective accountability mechanisms to correct violent tendencies, educate and mobilize marginalized communities, and connect local struggles to a movement for international liberation.**

**Escalante 18** (Alyson Escalante is a Marxist-Leninist, Materialist Feminist and Anti-Imperialist activist. “PARTY ORGANIZING IN THE 21ST CENTURY” September 21st, 2018 <https://theforgenews.org/2018/09/21/party-organizing-in-the-21st-century/>)

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.

**Patents are a tool of racial capitalism that have historically been used by the global north to maintain systems of economic colonialism by denying countries access to life-saving medicine.**

**Keeyaa, C. (2019,** January 1). Pirates and property: The moralities of branded and generic medicines. Retrieved September 11, 2021, from <http://eprints.lse.ac.uk/102949/>

**The moral fear around ‘wasting’ material resources if land does not become private property,** as theorised by Locke, has been replaced in the debate of branded versus generic medicine with the metaphor of ‘piracy’. For Big Pharma, intellectual property protects them as ‘inventors’ and their narrative of the history of IP is something like a fairy tale: “The patent was a contract between the state and the inventor in which the inventor disclosed their invention to the world in return for a limited period of monopoly. Once the knowledge was made public, everybody could make the invention to which the knowledge related. In this way the story has a happy ending. The inventor benefited and so did society.” (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 42). Of course, **what the historical record actually shows about patents is 28 that it has always been accompanied by “a ruthless trade morality”** (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 35), **or a logic of accumulation**. In February of 1998, represented by the South African Pharmaceutical Manufacturer’s Association (PMA**), thirty-nine Big Pharma companies sued the South African government in the High Court of Pretoria. This came a year after the** introduction of the Medicines and Related Substances Control Amendment Act (**Medicines Act): an Act that had provisions for the import of generic HIV/AIDS medicines to treat an increasingly devastating HIV/AIDS epidemic in South Africa.** For Big Pharma**, this provision was a blatant violation of the World Trade Organisation’s (WTO) patent protections.** Backed by the U.S. government**, South Africa was threatened with trade sanctions and the removal of aid if they did not revoke the Act’s generics provisions** (Owen 2013, 262). For the country only just emerging from the apartheid era**, the Medicines Act was important to the reworking of a deeply unequal and racially segregated public health system.** The **import of generics would help achieve lower drug costs and greater access to essential medicines.** This trial became the global symbol for defence of “the public health exception”. The exception allowed for specific procedures in the international legislation that governed intellectual property in the instance of a “national emergency or other circumstances of extreme urgency,” including a “public health crisis” (Fassin 2007, 67). For Big Pharma, the provision for importing generics was nothing short of theft or ‘piracy’. Indeed, since the 1980s, the discursive construction of generics producers as ‘pirates’ and ‘thieves’ (Owen 2013; Drahos and Braithwaite 2002) was an important aspect of their lobbying for the globalisation of the intellectual property rights framework through the 29 medium of TRIPS. I**ntellectual property rights**, argue Drahos and Braithwaite (2002) **have been used as tools of censorship and monopoly from the very beginning.** **Copyright first appears in 1557 in England** as a kind of printing privilege granted by Queen Mary to the Stationers, a craft guild. Over time, the **Stationers became an extension of the state, with the powers of search and seizure. The Stationers spend a lot of time destroying printing presses and jailing those whose printers are not part of their guild**, as well as **fighting a perceived ‘piracy’ that they have created themselves through a brutal monopoly** (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 29-30). Drahos and Braithwaite (2002) connect the metaphor of piracy used by Big Pharma to the real acts of piracy that helped Queen Elizabeth I’s England to flourish and the North American colonies to grow. Famous pirates made their name during this time such as Captain John Avery and William Kidd, part of which meant the slaughter of those on the coasts of the Red Sea, Persian Gulf, or the Coast of Malabar. Indeed, it was “**universal pirate opinion that it was no sin for Christians to rob heathens**” (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). Later, the rhetoric of piracy was used throughout British colonial rule in diverse ways: from using the so-called ‘piracy’ of Malays and others in Southeast Asia as ground for military interference, to a drawn out and brutal offensive against Anglo-American pirates who threatened the shipping lanes necessary to Britain’s hegemony. “Corpses dangled in chains in British ports around the world ‘as a Spectacle for the Warning of others’” (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 24) and indeed the practice of ‘as a S**pectacle for the Warning of others’ has continued in much more abstract ways, such as trade sanctions, warning lists, and political bullying.** The rhetoric of piracy in the intellectual property rights regime that surrounds **biomedicine and technology has a popular association with a history of savagery, desperation, and illegality,** 30 and a lesser known association with the weaponised metaphors of economic and political gain. Or in other words, expansion and accumulation. It is fascinating to see the reuse of metaphors from the time of primitive accumulation (the seventeenth century) in the time of accumulation of dispossession. As ‘**piracy’ lends Big Pharma a powerful metaphor of good** (Big Pharma) **versus evil** (generics producers) (Owen 2013; Drahos and Braithwaite 2002), an acute sense of morality begins to take shape. One of my informants (Informant A) works as a campaigner against the patent laws choking people’s access to medicine in South Africa. **They** told me, I **don’t think that people are actually aware of the greed that pharmaceuticals have.** I think it also goes back to the political understanding of everything that’s at play. I think that generally there isn’t actually awareness of how they’re playing the system and how they’re actually using the system to sort of, to **make more profit, to really put people’s lives on the line**. I think we just look at them as these inventors and yes, they do great work by inventing, like, all these drugs, all this life-saving medicine and stuff, but I also think they wield their power, obviously their financial power that they can actually contribute to and influence key decisions in government…it’s not in the public eye, you know, that there is medicine that can actually save you, to save you from dying but some **pharmaceutical decides that they won’t make it available in some specific country and then you can’t access it.** People think, “Oh well, there’s no cure, there’s nothing that can actually save me.” 31 They conceptualise Big Pharma as tricksters, saying “Pharmaceuticals still get new tricks to trick the system”. In general, when a pharmaceutical corporation develops a medicine, it places patents not just on the medicine itself but on every compound in the medicine, the dosage methods, the processes of producing it. Some **information is also held back and protected under trade-secret law.** Brand name identity is thus preserved under trade mark law and the written information surrounding the compound is protected by copyright, ensuring that this wall of intellectual property lasts longer than the length of any single patent (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 6). **Manipulation of this system happens constantly to ensure generics producers are excluded from the market.** Informant A tells me about a tactic that is used by Big Pharma to keep generics out of market for as long as possible called ‘Evergreening’: “where pharmaceutical companies will develop a drug that would be given a twenty-year patent and in that process, maybe fifteen years down the line of the patent, t**hey’ll tweak, or rather just change a small molecule within the drug, or package it in a different way and they will apply for another patent to extend their monopoly for another plus years.”**. The ‘piracy’ of generics medicines producers could arguably then be of any compound, process, or dosage method of any medicine, rendering Big Pharma as the ultimate monopoly over medicines (Boldrin and Levine 2008). By framing generics as ‘pirates’ and their own ever-expansion as ‘protection from theft’, Big Pharma presents its use of the intellectual property rights system as morally necessary. Behaviours of Accumulation and Extraction Primitive accumulation’s seizing of land for property has become more abstract during accumulation as dispossession. Here, the accumulation of intellectual property is simply one 32 aspect of a larger project of neoliberalisation. In this section I will outline the behaviours of accumulation and expansion that are evident in the globalisation of the intellectual property regime. I have already argued that these behaviours are self-justified as working against ‘piracy’. The rhetoric of ‘piracy’ makes expansion a moral imperative and the processes of making this imperative come to life connect back to racial capitalism. This will be explored in the following section. TRIPS as an agreement is about more than patents: it sets minimum standards in copyright, trade marks, geographical indications, industrial designs, and lay-out designs of integrated circuits. It was the first stage in ensuring that the morality of expansion reproduces globally as the intellectual property standards in TRIPS obligate all members of the WTO (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 10). For Big Pharma, TRIPS will ensure the enclosure of biotechnology through patents and trade secret law. It also functions as an important vehicle for accumulation by dispossession through the forcing open of world markets, exactly like India: a country labelled as a notorious ‘pirate’ for making generics a fundamental part of their national pharmaceutical industry. Indeed, as a combination of a market-opener and a globalisation of the morality of accumulation, TRIPS can be seen as a cog in the engine wheels of “the motor of accumulation” (Harvey 2003, 182). TRIPS has been effective since 1995 and was negotiated during the Uruguay Round of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT). Those missing from the important negotiation meetings and tables are easily identifiable: African, Asian, South American countries were repeatedly denied entry into spheres in which they might have the power to object and derail TRIPS. Alongside this came a system of coercion and blindsiding in which 33 Third World countries were threatened through trade sanctions, and were also unprepared for the level of capital that had been sunk into intellectual property lawyers and infrastructure. India was the last stand against TRIPS. When finally having to sign during the Final Act of Marrakesh in April 1994, a number of Indian parliamentarians and members of the judiciary delivered rousing speeches about the recolonisation of India (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 146). However, the Indian pharmaceutical industry, along with every other member of the WTO was now forced to play by intellectual property rules set in Washington and New York (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). In the aptly named TRIPS Was Never Enough, Sell says, “Despite the fact that a TRIPS advocate triumphantly exclaimed, “we got 95% of what we wanted,” that 5% has always mattered, and 95% was never enough. While many countries believed that they were negotiating a ceiling on intellectual property rules, they quickly discovered they actually had negotiated only a floor.” (Sell 2011, 448). After TRIPS came TRIPS-plus, U.S.-plus, and ACTA-plus, making TRIPS look like a walk in the park in comparison to the stringency that these initiatives have brought (Sell 2011, 448). TRIPS-plus in particular targets the import of generic medicines and the logics of expansion and accumulation present themselves again. A crucial aspect of primitive accumulation, accumulation by dispossession, and racial capitalism is extraction. Within the context of pharmaceutical intellectual property practice and TRIPS, three important kinds of extraction take place: the forcing open of markets through the obligation of building intellectual property infrastructure (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002); the theft from the collective knowledge of indigenous peoples (Olufunmilayo 2006; Drahos and Braithwaite 2002); and the outsourcing of clinical trials to 34 the Third World while producing drugs for a Western market (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002; Fassin 2007; Lurie and Wolfe 1997; Angell 1997). Minds and Bodies for Extraction In the world of intellectual property, those who hold the webs of patents, patent lawyers, and the capital to keep it all spinning, are lords of the knowledge economy and thus, knowledge exporters. Those who are knowledge poor, like South Africa and other Third World countries, are also knowledge importers (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). TRIPS ensures that not only will knowledge **poor countries have to standardise themselves to Western intellectual property rights, but they will have to pay dearly for the privilege**. The message of the discourse around piracy has been that governments of other countries are stealing from the minds of U.S. inventors by not following patent protection. This narrative is connected with larger processes of the world order. In the 1950s, pharmaceutical corporations, particularly Pfizer International, made sweeping overseas sales figures. Due to recently independent postcolonial nations trying to rebuild themselves politically and economically, national pharmaceutical industries were nascent or non-existent. Drugs had to be imported and Pfizer profited. Countries like India and China were at first long-term prospects of profit. As their national pharmaceutical industries grew, they quickly became dangers to an established global system of branded medicine, one rooted in colonialism and imperialism (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002). The avid extension and proliferation of the intellectual property regime, particularly in regards to pharmaceuticals, can thus be seen as a legal disciplinary mechanism for those countries daring to circumvent Big Pharma. By pouring resources into an infrastructure to support intellectual property rights, (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002) **lower 35 income countries (primarily post-colonies) are being pulled away from investing in basic human rights needs, such as access to medicines.** Here we see Harvey’s accumulation by dispossession clearly. Though Harvey is less particular about the racial aspect of the extraction, Alexander, Legassick and Hemson, Tutu, and even Mbeki make very clear that there is a power imbalance between extractors and those extracted from. Drahos and Braithwaite (2002) point to the ways in which racist narratives of the ‘East’ were mobilised for the movement of the U.S. government to put in place sanctions against Asian countries who did not yet follow patent protection laws in the 1980s and 1990s, forcing them to behave. Indeed, this example of a racial and imperial attitude seems to form a stubborn undercurrent not just through TRIPS but through Big Pharma’s more specific practices in the Third World. For example, Western intellectual property rights did not recognise the rights of indigenous peoples. By the time evidence proved individual pharmaceutical corporations were stealing indigenous peoples’ collective knowledge, TRIPS had been set into stone (Drahos and Braithwaite 2002, 71). **Unethical clinical trials are another striking example. Lurie and Wolfe (1997) describe the deaths of hundreds of infants in the Third World who were needlessly unethically infected in trials of interventions to reduce perinatal transmission of HIV. Even trials that are ‘ethical’, however, are often conducted within vulnerable populations in Third World countries, creating a cheap clinical trial pool for pharmaceutical corporations to test drugs** on (Fassin 2007; Lurie and Wolfe 1997; Angell 1997). Informant C, a doctor, tells me they feel that there have been so many conspiracy theories about the HIV/AIDS crisis in South Africa that they feel almost reluctant saying what they think out loud. Yet when I ask about their opinion of Big Pharma’s role in Africa, they tell me with a sigh: 36 South Africa and Africa is like, what’s the word? a testing ground. I hate saying that but I sometimes do feel. I hate saying that because it’s putting the conspiracy theories, the cynicism into something. I guess, that it’s my feeling: it’s subjective rather than objective. When I say conspiracy theory, I mean it’s something that you don’t want to believe is happening but you know that there is probably truth in it. Their hesitation comes with high stakes: the only reason their partner is able to get treatment for skin cancer is due to access to a clinical trial. Otherwise, the treatment costs R95, 000 every three weeks for two years. “They are doing some good work out there,” they tell me. Big Pharma’s moral location in South Africa is nebulous and uneven, as is the ‘**global apartheid’ of neoliberalism. Indeed, their practices follow the same logic of racial capitalism: the bodies of colonial subjects that propped up the Empire have become the bodies of postcolonial subjects who prop up a much more diffuse, abstract corporate Empire. T**he lines between conspiracy and controversy are just as thin across the world as they are in South Africa. When it came to HIV/AIDS, then, is it any wonder that Mbeki’s AIDS denialism was so ardent? In the story of HIV/AIDS in South Africa, and its larger history of medicine, the lines between controversy, conspiracy, and colonialism are incredibly thin. After the end of apartheid, reports detailed a litany of health violations by the apartheid government. Beginning with the systematic underfunding of health care in bantustans, the list of crimes described is deplorable: the avoidance of punishment for doctors who covered up torture; 37 refusing emergency medical care to doctors, or breaking patient confidentiality to report to the security forces; non-consensually injecting women with controversial contraceptive Depo-Provera; and the actions of Dr. Wouter Basson or “Dr. Death”. Basson was a key member of the chemical and biological warfare program of the apartheid government, and though never convicted, he was accused of poisoning anti-apartheid activists, producing cholera and anthrax, and injecting salmonella and botulism into chocolates (Decoteau 2013, 88-9). Some claimed that Mbeki had said that the CIA were behind the spread of HIV/AIDS, since it served the pharmaceutical companies. Journalists ridiculed Mbeki but it was later revealed that there was a very real link between the CIA and the South African military intelligence under apartheid and during the international embargo (Fassin 2007, 295). **A doctor (Informant B) who worked through the height of the HIV/AIDS crisis told me in reference to HIV/AIDS medicine, “As long as Big Pharma is making money off HIV/AIDS, there’s no reason to find a cure.” Describing the helplessness of watching people die every day due to no treatment, they tell me that they are glad there are generic ARVs available and that the government has made HIV/AIDS treatment so accessible.** However, they remain unconvinced about the efficacy of some generics, feeling that branded ARVs are proven to work. In fact, they are suspicious of the corporatisation of generic medicines within the health insurance system of MedicalAid in South Africa. Deals have been struck between MedicalAid and generics companies so only particular generic ARVs can be given to patients. Yet Big Pharma also produces generics, and the doctor tells me of their wariness of ‘stockouts’: when generic ARVs run out in clinics and doctors are forced to prescribe branded ARVs. “It’s very convenient,” they say to me.