Journal of the British Islamic Medical Association

Advocacy

Vol 17 - No. 6 | August 2024 | www.jbima.com

ISSN 2634 8071

A Critical Analysis of Philanthrocapitalism

Aalia Qureshi

King's College London

Correspondence: ***k20004215@kcl.ac.uk***

Presented also as a poster at the BIMA National Conference in Warwick University on 31.8.2024

Introduction

Philanthrocapitalism, particularly in the US, will soon dominate the landscape of global health and development, where private actors fund their own initiatives, without enforceable accountability mechanisms, ethical decision-making by qualified experts or transparency in general (Edwards, 2009). Accordingly, research shows that international institutions such as the WHO and World Bank have decreasing say in determining global development goals, arguably due to inadequate financial resources, while private institutions exhibiting white saviour complexes hold increasing political power to exert self-serving influence through manipulation of global institutions (Edwards, 2009). However, there is insufficient research linking philanthrocapitalism to its root causes and posing solutions to its increasingly insidious influence. Thus, this essay seeks to fill that gap by forming a critical analysis of the phenomenon of philanthrocapitalism within the landscape of a neocolonial, capitalist global economy. This essay will first define philanthrocapitalism and present successful examples of philanthropy, before criticising the orientalist narrative through which these schemes are publicly portrayed and the omission of underlying unethical practices. This essays connects philanthrocapitalism to the white saviour industrial complex and highlights the self-perpetuating nature of white saviourism.

Furthermore, this essay explores Marx's theories on the origins on capitalism, criticising unjust knowledge production surrounding the Western colonial narrative and historical disregard of women's roles in social reproduction. This essay then introduces two key players in the philanthrocapitalist industry: the Rockefeller Foundation and its role in manipulating American medical education, research and practice, and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation and its focus on technological solutionism over sustainable social reform, such as genetically modified crops in Africa. Finally, this essay frames philanthrocapitalism as a product of unequal accumulation of wealth, and thus proposes ethical arguments in favour of a redistribution of wealth, through Peter Singer's utilitarian approach, Thomas Pogge's argument regarding negative duty and the Marxist understanding of the "species-being" (Weidel, 2016). This essay also offers a unique Islamic perspective, based on the Islamic values of acting beneficently and promoting social justice through the replacement of an interest-based economy with an equity-based economy, whilst acknowledging the limitations in establishing this over a globally diverse population under no obligation to act Islamically.

Philanthrocapitalism

The term philanthrocapitalism has been defined as "the application of modern business techniques to giving but also the effort by a new generation of entrepreneurial philanthropists and business leaders to drive social and environmental progress" (Bishop, 2013, p. 474). According to SEN (2015), philanthropy depicts a desire to shift the responsibility of global development from public to private institutions, due to states neglecting their population's basic needs (usually due to austerity measures) and the idea that private institutions are better able to meet these needs through philanthropy. Bishop (2013) provides examples of successful philanthropic efforts, like Andrew Carnegie building libraries across the US and other countries, as well as the Gates Foundation funding research to alleviate the burden of diseases in the developing world. However, the paper fails to actually provide evidence on how people benefited from these schemes. The phrase "diseases of the developing world" perpetuates the orientalist view that people in the developing world experience exotic, rare diseases that are different from the West and require

Vol 17 - No. 6 | August 2024 | www.jbima.com
ISSN 2634 8071

Western cures and interventions. Additionally, the narrow focus on diseases like malaria seems shortsighted, when money could be invested into more sustainable interventions such as healthcare system strengthening or non-communicable disease prevention. Overall, Bishop's paper aligns with the stereotypical narrative defining Western philanthropy that focus on the generosity of the wealthy, as opposed to trying to dismantle the power imbalances that cause developing countries to be financially dependent on Western aid and philanthrocapitalism in the first place.

The Lancet (2009) encouraged the Gates Foundation to form a grant award plan that accurately depicts the global burden of disease, so that funds can be allocated accordingly, and to invest in both healthcare system strengthening and research capacity in LMICs. However, these somewhat naïve proposals don't take into account the fundamental nature of philanthrocapitalism: "the super-rich need to stay super-rich in order for their charitable enterprises to functions" and thus pursuing sustainable interventions that decrease a country's future need for ongoing philanthropy would not be in the favour of the Gates Foundation or any similar institution (SEN, 2015, p. 23). Conveniently, the fact that foundations protect large amounts of wealth from taxation is rarely mentioned either.

In light of the above, it is clear that philanthrocapitalists are predominantly wealthy white males whose schemes expose their orientalist views. Expanding on this, I argue that the SEN's (2015) use of the phrase "giving back" is ironic since accumulations of wealth held by philanthrocapitalists largely depend on overexploitation of resources and labour from underdeveloped nations, usually in the Global South, and also ongoing local processes that perpetuate racial and social disparities. Furthermore, these schemes often involve unethical practices that are purposefully hidden from the public eye due to biased media output, including environmental pollution through poisonous chemicals and pesticides, forced labour and child labour as well as disgraceful working conditions such as sweatshops (Teubner, 2006). In the next section, I will introduce the concept of white saviourism as a way to frame philanthrocapitalism.

The White Saviour Complex

Finnegan (2022) writes how white saviours tend to be wealthy white people who present themselves and their philanthropy as altruistic. While altruism may be a sincere motivator of philanthropy, performative altruism does not dismantle the existing racial hierarchy or power imbalance, and ultimately functions to reproduce the same methods of production as capitalism. The white saviour industrial complex benefits from racial injustice and structural violence, such as large disparities in earnings, which contribute to the increasing racial income gap – thus the white saviour complex is self-perpetuating and upheld by these injustices (Finnegan, 2022). With disparities in earnings being easier to quantify, this leaves unquantifiable racial injustices obscured in existing research. This includes effects of generational trauma, disparities in the criminal justice system, biased media reporting, unchallenged stereotypes in the public and private sector and a failure to recognise how the white upper-class members still benefit from ongoing neocolonialism (United Nations, 2023). These factors likely contribute to the overall ease with which white upper-class people can accumulate wealth, whilst denying the same opportunities to people of colour. Using an intersectional feminist framework, which analyses how overlapping layers of oppression converge, black people are more likely to suffer from marginalisation, oppression or discrimination on account of wealth, housing, citizenship, skin colour, race, class and ethnicity (Patricia Hill Collins, 2012). Despite intersectionality lacking a defined methodology and focusing almost exclusively on the experiences of black women in the US, it is still useful in understanding how multiple synergistic layers of violence and oppression contribute to socioeconomic disparities and inequality for black people in general (Patricia Hill Collins, 2012) (Nash, 2008) . All in all, the white saviour complex derives itself from the domination and superiority complex of the white race, whilst upholding the stereotype that African people are uncivilised, underdeveloped and in need of saving by Western NGOs. This is without acknowledging the colonial legacy and history of exploitation, genocide and violations of human rights that caused underdeveloped (or overexploited) nations in the first place, since narrative control is a key hallmark of the white savour complex (Manji, 2019). Thus, white saviourism is an accurate method through which to frame philanthrocapitalists.

The Origins of Capitalism

To investigate the origins of philanthrocapitalism, it is necessary to address the origins of capitalism, and how this led to extremely unequal distributions of wealth in today's society. It is predominantly white upper-class males in the West who hold massive accumulations of wealth, and therefore they are more likely to pursue philanthrocapitalist ventures, exhibiting white saviour complexes and manipulating international institutions

through political power. According to Marx's theory on capitalism's origins, primitive accumulation and centralisation of capital were key processes. Primitive accumulation of resources and capital was heavily dependent on "the exchange of unequal values, thus of swindling or usury… and not distinguished… from pillage pure and simple" (Batou, 2015, p. 15). This occurred alongside centralisation of capital, where peripheral areas were drained of resources such as land, fish and tools. These processes often occurred through violence, such as the systemic genocides of non-European populations and deportation of Africans to be used in the slave trade (Batou, 2015). Accumulation by dispossession occurred at the expense of funding social welfare institutions such as education, healthcare and accessible transport (Angelis, 2000). The use of slavery and wage labour exploitation in the peripheries allowed for a major transfer of raw materials to the centres of capital, largely to local upper class members (Moyo and Yeros, 2011). Since these processes continue today under neocolonial projects, this largely sets the stage for today's philanthrocapitalist scene, dominated by the same demographic of wealthy white males exhibiting orientalist views characteristic of the white saviour complex.

One criticism regarding historical literature of capitalism is the lack of explicit and adequate mention of the role women played in social reproduction and unpaid, informal labour. This continues to be an issue in current White Feminist movements, where women are empowered to work and contribute to the economy as equally as men, yet men are rarely counselled to equally share in social reproduction (Forrest, 1998). The deliberate silence regarding women's roles throughout colonial history paves the way for women's unpaid labour in household chores and childcare to continually go unrecognised, which is pivotal to the capitalist modes of production and further disparities in accumulation of wealth (Forrest, 1998).

Epistemological Injustice in the Production of Knowledge Shaping Narratives on Capitalism and Colonialism

In keeping with the Western narrative of superiority and dominance of the white race, literature downplays the violence and immorality carried out by the West in history. Epistemological injustice refers to making the dominant side's perspective more prominent (i.e. the West) in mainstream knowledge while obscuring and delegitimising knowledge from the opposing side (i.e. previously colonised countries) (Bainton and McDougall, 2021). Feminist theory criticises this by arguing that knowledge production, including whose perspectives are included or erased, reinforces power inequalities and patterns of marginalisation (Townsend and Niraula, 2016). This includes Western historical analyses of colonialism who fail to focus adequately on how exploitative practices affected the lives of people in colonies, contributing to the disregard in Western scholarship for how Western attitudes interact with current world events such as neocolonialism and structural racism. Critical reflexivity, derived from feminist ethics of care, calls on researchers to situate themselves within the sociopolitical context of their research, such that power imbalances, social hierarchies and racism that underpin epistemological injustice can be made evident (Sultana, 2007).

Overall, while academic research focuses on being value-neutral and objective, this overlooks the overarching point that such injustices should objectively not happen again. Slavery, genocide and on-going exploitation of indigenous populations and their resources ought to be called out as unethical and abusive in academic literature. As such, efforts should be made to encourage more inclusive scholarship which equally value different sites of knowledge production. This is however rare to observe in existing literature, as previously alluded to. Therefore, due to a lack of criticism and condemnation of Western exploitative practices in literary culture, people are largely unaware of how systems of inequality and injustice still target people of colour, and remain unaware of how these processes underpin white saviour culture and philanthrocapitalism.

The Role of The Rockefeller Foundation in Racial and Gendered Medical Injustice

In mainstream academia, the role that the Rockefeller Foundation played in the founding of modern medicine and medical education is depicted as remarkable and a sign of extreme generosity. The Rockefeller Foundation is described as representing the "unity of aim and the coordination and material stimulus and support which [were considered] essential to the highest achievement in research" (Markowitz and Rosner, 1973, p. 20). This raises the question – what knowledge did John Rockefeller, the owner of the Standard Oil Company, have that qualified him to centralise and monopolise medical practice, education and research in the US? In reality, the Rockefeller Foundation exerted control over the type of research conducted in other institutes, and

whether the research was published or not depended on the judgement of a jury who represented the Rockefeller Foundation's interests (Markowitz and Rosner, 1973). As such, American medical research was made to exclusively reflect the interests of a small number of powerful men working for the Rockefeller Foundation. This included the trivialisation of natural cures and homeopathy, and a focus into patented drugs largely produced by Big Pharma (Sujatha and Abraham, 2009).

In 1914, $500,000 was donated to Yale University "on the condition that the school procure complete teaching and medical control of the New Haven Hospital [a public hospital]" – as such, the Rockefeller Foundation exerted their manipulative influence over medical practice in the US (Markowitz and Rosner, 1973, p. 22). While resources and funds were channelled into a few elite medical schools and hospitals, medical educational facilities for black people and for women became largely underfunded (Markowitz and Rosner, 1973). This mirrors previous patterns of centralisation and accumulation of capital/ knowledge production by white male social elites. Despite the fact that important medical breakthroughs were enabled through the Rockefeller Foundation, this could in part account for the severe lack of research into women's health and reproductive conditions such as endometriosis and PCOS that continue to affects women's health outcomes, however there is inadequate research to provide concrete evidence for this. This could also explain why black people are underrepresented in research studies despite being disproportionately affected by illnesses, like hypertension and chronic kidney disease (Striving for Diversity in Research Studies, 2021). The Rockefeller Foundation is a prime example of the white saviour complex, as exhibited through their perceived superiority in knowledge and decision making. Moreover, the Foundation shows how philanthrocapitalism serves only to benefit selfish pursuits of the donor and can have devastating and far-reaching implications in increasing racial and gender disparities in health outcomes.

Technological Solutionism: The Case of Genetically-Modified Crops

The Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation is a non-profit private foundation that was formed 24 years ago, with an endowment of just short of $70 million (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, 2022). Substantial financial funds allow the Foundation to exert a disproportionately large influence over the goals of global health, with an overwhelming focus on technological solutionism (Burja, 2022). Technological solutionism refers to the design and production of technology (largely in the West) used to "solve" issues such as malaria or poverty in Africa, without addressing the wider sociopolitical and economic context these issues are situated in and perpetuated by, and without adequate input and informed consent from those on whom the technology is arguably forcibly imposed.

American writer Evgeny Morozov writes that "solutionism presumes rather than investigates the problems it is trying to solve, reaching for the answer before the questions have been fully asked" and reduces our ability to be morally and ethically reflexive, since technology is framed as the ultimate solution as opposed to one tool in the arsenal that should be continually revised and improved upon (Morozov, 2013, p. 6). As evidenced further ahead, there in fact appears to be absolutely no consideration of ethics or morality in the Foundation's schemes, in which charity and profit appear to be one and the same thing, as is characteristic of philanthrocapitalism. The Foundation are the second largest donors of WHO (after the US), yet these donations are largely ear-marked to finance malaria, tuberculosis and HIV/AIDS eradication research (Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation, n.d.). As such, these funds ae given to pharmaceutical companies such as Merck, GSK, Novartis and Bayer HealthCare, many of whose positions are occupied by Foundation staff members (Martens and Seitz, 2015). Put simply, much of the funds allegedly dedicated for philanthropic purposes, end up back in the hands of the Foundation as opposed to helping those in need.

The Foundation has dedicated over $170 million towards research into genetic modification, as a technique to allegedly improve outcomes for African farmers and attempt to "empower millions of people to lift themselves out of poverty" (Rock et al., 2023, p. 1-2). This language implies that African people are responsible for their own poverty, without addressing social or environmental factors such as inadequate pay, climate change or lack of access to basic infrastructure such as water and healthcare. Crops can be genetically modified such that they produce greater quantities of yield with qualities like disease, drought and insect resistance or nutritional enhancement (Rock et al., 2023). However, these projects often operate with top-down governance to prioritise the donor's interests, with little input from African farmers or scientists (Rock et al., 2023). Furthermore, with technology production largely concentrated in the West, patents over genetic modification and gene editing are predominantly held by

Western institutions, which restricts access to African scientists. This is in spite of research evidence being largely drawn from the African continent, mirroring colonialist patterns of extracting resources and labour from Global South in order to benefit the Global North (Rakotonarivo and Andriamihaja, 2023). Research showed that genetically modified crops were 5 to 10 times more expensive than the original crops (Fischer, 2021). The detrimental effects on the livelihoods of those selling non-modified crops were not studied, while wider environmental concerns regarding impacts on ecosystems and agroecology were largely ignored (Deutsche Welle, 2022). The ethical and health implications of GM crops that are a staple part of a massive population's diet are rarely mentioned either – this prompts the question: who actually benefits from GM crops? Forcing African farmers and African markets to increase sales of GM patented seeds as opposed to traditional resources thus appears to be yet another neocolonial, white saviour complex-exhibiting project seeking to increase Africa's dependence on Western technology, primarily benefiting Western pharmaceutical and research institutions. The Gate's Foundation clearly exhibits paternalistic, culturally superior attitudes in their approaches to philanthropy, while failing to empower the people they allegedly aim to help.

Ethical Arguments in Favour of Acting to End Poverty

Philanthrocapitalist organisations, as evidenced above, often act unethically, manipulating international institutions like the WHO for self-serving interests. This undermines global efforts to reduce poverty and increase global health. One theory on reducing the growing influence of philanthrocapitalism is to work towards a redistribution of wealth. Here I will summarise an ethical argument in favour of supporting this theory. Drawing from Peter Singer's (1972) utilitarianist approach, the average person in the West, relative to the average person in poverty, has such an excess in wealth that a relatively small donation would massively help an individual person in poverty – as such, the average person has a moral duty to donate to worthy causes. However, considering that the wealthiest 1% of the global population hold 45% of total wealth, the potential impact that their wealth can make on global poverty makes it arguable that the responsibility lies almost entirely in their hands and not the remaining 99% of the population (Buchholz, 2022).

Philosopher Thomas Pogge (2005) argues that we have a negative duty to stop (or at least decrease) our contributions to global economic institutions or companies which perpetuate global disparities through neocolonial expansion, operating monopolies or unethical, exploitative practices, otherwise we are morally complicit in their crimes. In cases where such information is obscured, I would add that we have a moral duty to enquire about the ethics of the companies with which we engage. Furthermore, according to Weidel (2016), capitalist societies forces us to embrace the unnatural ideology of "the rugged individual", which indoctrinates people to accept that they are independent, self-reliant beings and as such, their dignity is attached to these values. Interacting with people in poverty (increasingly common with social media) disgusts "the rugged individual" as they are perceived to have no dignity, and therefore we choose not to help (Weidel, 2016). Marx argues that this goes against our shared human essence (our "species-being"), which is fundamentally in connection with others through empathy, dependency and need (Petrovic, 1963). Although Weidel (2016) refers solely to direct interaction with a person in poverty, I would extend this logic to engaging with unethical institutions too. Therefore, to help people in poverty whether directly or indirectly, as opposed to turning a blind eye, is to embrace our fundamental human nature and reject ideologies imposed collectively on society through capitalism.

Since a significant majority of the global population follow an organised religion, and moral values in religious societies are heavily derived from religious scripture, religious arguments in approaches to economics and wealth are equally important to discuss. Here I will discuss the Islamic view on wealth and the Islamic Economic System.

The Prohibition of Usury in Islam

Since religion relies on an absolute divine accountability and judgement mechanism, this is reflected in the behavioural assumptions built into the Islamic Economic System. In Islam, the absolute ownership of all things on Earth belongs solely to God, which God has subjected to mankind's service on Earth, for which mankind will be called to account. This is a motivation for acting ethically (Ayyaz, 2010). The Quran states that: "In their wealth they acknowledge the right of those who asked and of those who could not" (Chapter 51: Verse 20) – this reflects the right of an Islamic society, including skilled/ unskilled workmen, the supplier of capital and the community as a whole, to shares in the wealth of

those who own it (Ayyaz, 2010). Overall, Islamic normative rules combine ethical responsibility with legal responsibilities as derived from the Quran, such as the prohibition of usury or interest (Qasaymeh, 2011). This prohibition is made on the basis of usury conflicting with the Islamic Principle of Distributive Equity and leading to unjust accumulations of wealth: "Interest in any amount acts in transferring wealth from the assetless section of the population" (Visser and McIntosh, 1998) (Choudhury and Malik, 1992, p. 51).

Prohibiting usury is not an exclusively Islamic perspective – the Lutheran Council of 1515 interpreted usury to be "when gain is sought to be acquired from the use of a thing, not in itself fruitful (such as a flock or a field) without labour, expense or risk on the part of the lender," and therefore usury is unearned income, while Birnie (1952) reinforced the view that life without labour is unnatural (Visser and McIntosh, 1998). Combining this with Marx's view that acting against our human-nature is a sign of being a slave to capitalism (or being afflicted with the unnatural ideology of "the rugged individual"), this leads to the conclusion that usury is unnatural and therefore immoral, both from a religious and a secular perspective (Petrovic, 1963).

Implementing a Global Islamic Economic System

Following on from this, a global implementation of interest-free Islamic Banking systems could provide the mechanism for an equitable redistribution of wealth. The systems are focused around two financially equitable approaches: "*mudarabah* – a joint venture between the bank and a 'partner' with both contributing to the capital of the project and sharing the profit or loss, and *musharakah* – in which all the capital for an investment is provided by the bank in return for a predetermined share of the profit or loss of the business undertaking" (Hanif Basit et al., 2004, p. 37) (Kahn & Mirakhor, 1986). At first glance, it appears to be a disadvantage that money-lending institutions can gain or lose capital depending on the success of the project, especially in a globalised economy where loans are often in the millions, yet macroeconomic models based on Islamic Economics predict that the rate of return of capital based on *Mudarabah* investments is as equally viable in the long term as rates of returns in credit-based economies (Zangeneh, 1995).

Alongside this, there is increased motivation for lenders (whether this is the World Bank, or a national bank) to be informed about schemes and provide expert guidance, support and resources throughout the process, which would increase the chances of success overall (Zangeneh, 1995). Other important principles of Islamic Economic Systems is that decision-making must not be on an individual basis, but must reflect the opinions of board-members and shareholders and be made with the overall benefit of society in mind (Wilson, 2015). Islamic economist Syed Naqvi focuses on the micro-economic level, arguing that while Muslims have free will (*ikhtiyar*) to execute business decisions as they wish, it is their moral duty (*fardh*) to serve society in order to become closer to God, an ultimate goal in Islam (Wilson, 2015). In the absence of any realistic accountability mechanisms or adequate global governance in the current economy, the Islamic view of divine accountability and judgement motivating morality and accountability seems as viable a solution as any.

However as there are limited case-studies to draw on, there may be difficulties in applying the Islamic system to real-life ethical dilemmas such as prioritising different social issues over others. This is especially complicated considering the vast difference of opinions that already exists amongst Islamic scholars. Another criticism of the Islamic Economic System is its assumption that citizens will act ethically in line with Islamic principles, however this assumption does not apply to non-Muslims, and as such has limited applicability when applying this system to a global economy. However, given that Islam is the fastest growing religion in the world and set to surpass Christianity by the end of the century, its potential applicability is worth reconsidering in the future (Lipka and Hackett, 2017). Overall, this system decreases the risk of domination of philanthrocapitalism for three main reasons: it leads towards a fairer distribution of wealth where unfair accumulations do not exist; people are more inclined to act morally and work towards social justice due to the promise of absolute accountability for all individual deeds, and where racial hierarchies do not exist since all human life is valued equally in Islam.

Although Islamic literature focuses mainly on applying these systems within individual sovereign states, I argue that in line with the shift towards a globalised economy, these principles should be also applied globally to institutions such as the World Bank. After the financial crisis of the 1980s, the World Bank provided long-term loans along with economy and policy reform advice to LMICS, forcing these states into crippling debt (Bretton Woods Project, 2020). Pope John Paul II (1987) stated the following regarding the debt crisis: 'Capital needed by the debtor nations to improve their standard of living now has to be used for interest payments on their debts'.

ISSN 2634 8071

Needless to say, this situation could've been avoided if equity-based financing options with reform recommendations based on establishing social justice and equitable redistributions of wealth had been used, as opposed to interest-based finance.

Conclusion

To conclude, philanthropic organisations positively serves society in material ways, such as through Gates' malaria eradication campaigns, easing significant financial burden from the government in funding global development goals. However, the same demographic of wealthy white males from the US dominates the philanthrocapitalist scene (despite an marked increase in international philanthropic actors) who exhibit the same orientalist views in their philanthropic visions. Furthermore, the public narrative surrounding philanthrocapitalists often hides unethical and illegal practices such as top-down governance approaches that prioritise Western interests and downplay the needs of local scientists and researchers. This is characteristic of the white saviour complex, where wealthy white individuals are performatively altruistic and present themselves as wanting to "give back" to primarily black people and people of colour, without acknowledging the underlying power imbalances and social hierarchies that perpetuate racial inequalities in the first place.

The origins of these processes stem from the origins of capitalism, according to Marx, namely accumulation of capital by dispossession and centralisation of capital. These exploitative processes progressively drained the peripheries, or the Global South, of their resources. As a result, social welfare structures such as education and healthcare were left largely underfunded. Literature focusing on colonialism, unless written from a feminist framework, largely fails to take into account women's social reproduction and household labour, which is likely intentional considering how much capitalist economies benefit from unpaid labour. Furthermore, due to a vast gap in the application of ethics within research, and an emphasis on research being value-neutral, there is a failure to acknowledge and condemn the depths of trauma caused by the West's exploitative practices through capitalism and colonisation. Critical reflexivity, rooted in a feminist ethics of care framework, addresses this by encouraging researchers to situate themselves within the sociopolitical context they are studying.

Turning to current-day effects of capitalism such as unequal accumulations of wealth, this has the undue consequence of extremely wealthy individuals gaining political power and manipulating public institutions for self-interests. The Rockefeller Foundation, held in high prestige in mainstream media, manipulated and controlled the medical industry in the US, changing medical curriculums to favour patented drugs owned by Big Pharma over natural remedies, and reducing opportunities within the medical field for black people and women, demographics that remain underrepresented in medical research to this day. Alongside this, the Gates Foundation favour technological solutionism such as GM crops over sustainable social and healthcare reform, benefiting their own Foundation Trust members who hold positions within pharmaceutical companies.

In order to work towards a redistribution of wealth and alleviation of global poverty, Singer argues that we all have a moral responsibility to donate small portions of our wealth given the amount of difference it makes on an individual level while Pogge argues that we have a duty not to financially contribute to companies engaging in unethical, exploitative practices. In order to counter the capitalism-imposed ideology of "the rugged individual", Marx argues that helping to alleviate poverty (directly or indirectly) connects us to our "species-being" and is thus the morally correct position. Islamic theology presents the most viable method for establishing a redistribution of wealth by arguing that in the Islamic Economic System, equity-based finance should replace usury/interest-based finance, with the underlying assumption that citizens will act ethically. To supplement this article, further research could be taken into successful attempts to redistribute wealth locally, and how these could be applied to the global economy.

Reference:

1. Finnegan AC. Growing Up White Saviors. Journal of Applied Social Science. 2022 Mar 25;16(3):193672442210820.

2. Teubner G. The Anonymous Matrix: Human Rights Violations by "Private" Transnational Actors. The Modern Law Review [Internet]. 2006 [cited 2022 Apr 6];69(3):327–46. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/3699030

3. Ahmad K. The challenge of Global Capitalism: An Islamic perspective. Policy Perspectives [Internet]. 2004 [cited 2023 May 14];1(1):1–29. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/42909126

4. Qasaymeh K. Islamic banking in South Africa: between the accumulation of wealth and the promotion of

ISSN 2634 8071

social prosperity. The Comparative and International Law Journal of Southern Africa [Internet]. 2011 [cited 2023 Jun 21];44(2):275–92. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/23253100

5. SEN J. Commodification of "Giving Back" in a Neo-liberal World. Economic and Political Weekly [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2021 Feb 23];50(42):22–5. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44004065

6. Bishop M. Philanthrocapitalism: Solving Public Problems through Private Means. Social Research [Internet]. 2013;80(2):473–90. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24385612

7. The Lancet. What Has the Gates Foundation Done for Global health? The Lancet. 2009 May;373(9675):1577.

8. United Nations. UK: Discrimination against People of African Descent Is structural, Institutional and systemic, Say UN Experts [Internet]. OHCHR. 2023. Available from: https://www.ohchr.org/en/press-releases/2023/01/uk-discrimination-against-people-african-descent-structural-institutional

9. Manji F. EMANCIPATION, FREEDOM OR TAXONOMY? Racism After Apartheid. Wits University Press; 2019.

10. Patricia Hill Collins. Social Inequality, Power, and Politics: The Journal of Speculative Philosophy. 2012;26(2):442.

11. Nash JC. Re-thinking Intersectionality. Feminist Review [Internet]. 2008;89:1–15. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40663957

12 Batou J. Accumulation by Dispossession and Anti-Capitalist Struggles: a Long Historical Perspective. Science & Society [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2024 Jan 2];79(1):11–37. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/24583625

13. Angelis MD. Marx's Theory of Primitive accumulation: a Suggested Reinterpretation. wwwacademiaedu [Internet]. 2000 Jan 1 [cited 2024 Jan 2]; Available from: https://www.academia.edu/3132423/Marxs_theory_of_primitive_accumulation_A_suggested_reinterpretation

14. Moyo S, Yeros P. Rethinking the Theory of Primitive Accumulation: Imperialism and the New Scramble for Land and Natural Resources By Sam Moyo and Paris Yeros. wwwsemanticscholarorg [Internet]. 2011; Available from: https://www.semanticscholar.org/paper/Rethinking-the-Theory-of-Primitive-Accumulation%3A-By/a60e230882d4a4dd9589900607b1c34bf15386f3

15. Forrest A. The Industrial Relations Significance of Unpaid Work. Labour / Le Travail [Internet]. 1998;42:199–225. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/25148886

16. Townsend D, Niraula K. Documentary Filmmakers: Bridging Practice and Scholarship in Peacebuilding. International Journal of Conflict Engagement and Resolution [Internet]. 2016;4(1):28–40. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/26928582

17. Sultana F. Reflexivity, Positionality and Participatory ethics: Negotiating Fieldwork Dilemmas in International Research [Internet]. ResearchGate. 2007. Available from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228497658_Reflexivity_positionality_and_participatory_ethics_Negotiating_fieldwork_dilemmas_in_international_research

18. Bainton N, McDougall D. Unequal Lives in the Western Pacific [Internet]. 1st ed. Bainton N, Mcdougall D, Alexeyeff K, Cox J, editors. JSTOR. ANU Press; 2021 [cited 2024 Jan 2]. p. 1–46. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv1h45mj4.5

19. Striving for Diversity in Research Studies. New England Journal of Medicine. 2021 Oct 7;385(15):1429–30.

20. O'Connor TP. John D. Rockefeller. The Journal of Education [Internet]. 1902;56(8 (1392)):139–9. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/44063478

21. Markowitz GE, Rosner DK. Doctors in Crisis: A Study of the Use of Medical Education Reform to Establish Modern Professional Elitism in Medicine. American Quarterly. 1973 Mar;25(1):83.

22. Sujatha V, Abraham L. Medicine, State and Society. Economic and Political Weekly [Internet]. 2009;44(16):35–43. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/40279154

23. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. Foundation Fact Sheet [Internet]. www.gatesfoundation.org. 2022. Available from: https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/foundation-fact-sheet

ISSN 2634 8071

24. Burja S. The Gates Foundation's Blind Spot [Internet]. brief.bismarckanalysis.com. 2022 [cited 2024 Jan 3]. Available from: https://brief.bismarckanalysis.com/p/the-gates-foundations-blind-spot

25. Morozov E. To save everything, Click Here : the Folly of Technological Solutionism. New York: PublicAffairs; 2013.

26. Deutsche Welle. Africa, GMOs and Western Interests – DW – 11/30/2022 [Internet]. dw.com. 2022 [cited 2024 Jan 3]. Available from: https://www.dw.com/en/africa-gmos-and-western-interests/a-62825327

27. Rock JS, Schnurr MA, Kingiri A, Glover D, Stone GD, Ely A, et al. Beyond the Genome: Genetically Modified Crops in Africa and the Implications for Genome Editing. Development and Change. 2023 Jan;54(1):117–42.

28. Fischer K. Why Africa's New Green Revolution Is Failing – Maize as a Commodity and anti-commodity in South Africa. Geoforum. 2021 Aug;130.

29. Rakotonarivo OS, Andriamihaja OR. Global North–Global South Research Partnerships Are Still Inequitable. Nature Human Behaviour [Internet]. 2023 Dec 1 [cited 2024 Jan 3];7(12):2042–3. Available from: https://www.nature.com/articles/s41562-023-01728-0

30. Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation. How We Work | Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation [Internet]. www.gatesfoundation.org. Available from: https://www.gatesfoundation.org/about/how-we-work

31. Martens J, Seitz K. Philanthropic Power and Development Who Shapes the agenda? [Internet]. 2015 Nov. Available from: https://archive.globalpolicy.org/images/pdfs/GPFEurope/Philanthropic_Power_online.pdf

32. Singer P. Famine, Affluence, and Morality. Philosophy & Public Affairs [Internet]. 1972;1(3):229–43. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/2265052

33. Buchholz K. Infographic: Where the 1 Percent Dominate Wealth Creation [Internet]. Statista Infographics. 2022. Available from: https://www.statista.com/chart/28788/share-of-wealth-held-by-the-wealthiest-1-percent-of-the-population-by-country/

34. Pogge T. Severe Poverty as a Violation of Negative Duties. Ethics & International Affairs. 2005 Mar;19(1):55–83.

35. Weidel T. Ideology and the Harms of Self-Deception: Why We Should Act to End Poverty. Ethical Theory and Moral Practice [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2024 Jan 4];19(4):945–60. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/24762667.pdf?refreqid=fastly-default%3A8e4a84b99257451cd63d48590442cf13&ab_segments=0%2Fbasic_search_gsv2%2Fcontrol&origin=&initiator=&acceptTC=1

36. Petrovic G. Marx's Theory of Alienation. Philosophy and Phenomenological Research [Internet]. 1963 Mar;23(3):419–26. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/2105083.pdf

37. Ayyaz DrIA. Islam's Response to the Global Economic Crisis [Internet]. Al Islam. 2010 [cited 2024 Jan 4]. Available from: https://www.alislam.org/articles/islams-response-to-the-global-economic-crisis/

38. Hanif Basit M, Bockarie A, Kallon T, Fareed A, Fazal A, Fauzia B, et al. The Review of Religions [Internet]. 2004 Jul [cited 2024 Jan 4]. Available from: https://www.reviewofreligions.org/wp-content/uploads/pdf/RR200407.pdf#page=21

39. Choudhury MA, Malik UA. The Foundations of Islamic Political Economy. Choice Reviews Online. 1992 Nov 1;30(03):30–160530–1605.

40. Visser WAM, McIntosh A. History of Usury Prohibition [Internet]. www.alastairmcintosh.com. Accounting, Business & Financial History; 1998. Available from: https://www.alastairmcintosh.com/articles/1998_usury.htm

41. Birnie A. A. Birnie, the History and Ethics of Interest. Glasgow, Edinburgh, London, W. Hodge & Co. Ltd., 1952, 40 p., 3/6. Recherches Économiques de Louvain/ Louvain Economic Review [Internet]. 1952 Aug 1 [cited 2024 Jan 4];18(5):538–8. Available from: https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/recherches-economiques-de-louvain-louvain-economic-review/article/abs/a-birnie-the-history-and-ethics-of-interest-glasgow-edinburgh-london-w-hodge-co-ltd-1952-40-p-36/6D9381F3F0D667B458EE2B63521E7DDC

ISSN 2634 8071

42. Zangeneh H. A Macroeconomic Model of an Interest-free System. The Pakistan Development Review [Internet]. 1995 [cited 2024 Jan 4];34(1):55–68. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/pdf/41259844.pdf?refreqid=fastly-default%3A323200c5339dad01a47276e084a47c55&ab_segments=&origin=&initiator=&acceptTC=1

43. Bretton Woods Project. The World Bank: What it is and how it operates [Internet]. Bretton Woods Project. 2020. Available from: https://www.brettonwoodsproject.org/2020/07/the-world-bank-what-is-it-and-how-it-works/

44. John Paul II. Sollicitudo Rei Socialis (30 December 1987) | John Paul II [Internet]. www.vatican.va. 1987. Available from: https://www.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_30121987_sollicitudo-rei-socialis.html

45. Lipka M, Hackett C. Why Muslims Are the world's fastest-growing Religious Group [Internet]. Pew Research Center. 2017. Available from: https://www.pewresearch.org/short-reads/2017/04/06/why-muslims-are-the-worlds-fastest-growing-religious-group/

46. Wilson R. Micro-economic morality: a Theory of the Firm Enlightened by Islamic Values. In: Islam and Economic Policy: An Introduction. Edinburgh University Press; 2015. p. 19–34.

47. Edwards M. Why "Philanthrocapitalism" Is Not The Answer: Private Initiatives and International Development. In: Doing Good or Doing Better: Development Policies in a Globalising World [Internet]. Amsterdam University Press; 2009. p. 237–54. Available from: https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctt46n0g6.14.