# NC

## T – No Spec Medicine

#### Interp: The affirmatives must not specific a certain medicine.

#### Violation: They specified “COVID-19 Medicines”

### Standards

#### Textuality

#### Generic resolutions cannot be affirmed by particular instances. Nebel 19:

[Jake Nebel, 8-12-2019, "Genericity on the Standardized Tests Resolution," VBIBriefly, (https://www.vbriefly.com/2019/08/12/genericity-on-the-standardized-tests-resolution/)//BWSLE]

Existential statements say that there exist some things that satisfy a certain property. For example, “Some bees don’t sting” is an existential statement. It is true because there are indeed some bees that don’t sting. Existential statements can be affirmed by pointing to particular examples—e.g., mason bees. Universal statements say that all things satisfy a certain property. For example, “All bees sting” is a universal statement. It is false because, as we just saw, some bees don’t sting—so it’s not the case that all of them do. Universal statements cannot be affirmed by pointing to particular examples, but they can be negated by pointing to particular counterexamples—again, e.g., mason bees. Generic generalizations are neither existential nor universal. Generics are distinct from existential statements because they cannot be affirmed by particular instances. For example, “Birds swim” is a generic. It’s false even though there are some birds that do swim: namely, penguins. You can’t affirm that birds swim by observing that penguins swim .Generics are distinct from universal statements because they can tolerate exceptions. For example, “Birds fly” is a generic. It’s true even though there are some birds that don’t fly: namely, penguins. You can’t negate that birds fly by observing that penguins don’t. Both distinctions are important. Generic resolutions can’t be affirmed by specifying particular instances. But, since generics tolerate exceptions, plan-inclusive counterplans (PICs) do not negate generic resolutions. “Colleges and universities” is a generic bare plural. I don’t think this claim should require any argument, when you think about it, but here are a few reasons. Second, “colleges and universities” fails the upward-entailment test for existential uses of bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Lima beans are on my plate.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some lima beans on my plate. One test of this is that it entails the more general sentence, “Beans are on my plate.” Now consider the sentence, “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” (To isolate “colleges and universities,” I’ve eliminated the other bare plurals in the resolution; it cannot plausibly be generic in the isolated case but existential in the resolution.) This sentence does not entail the more general statement that educational institutions ought not consider the SAT. This shows that “colleges and universities” is generic, because it fails the upward-entailment test for existential bare plurals. Third, “colleges and universities” fails the adverb of quantification test for existential bare plurals. Consider the sentence, “Dogs are barking outside my window.” This sentence expresses an existential statement that is true just in case there are some dogs barking outside my window. One test of this appeals to the drastic change of meaning caused by inserting any adverb of quantification (e.g., always, sometimes, generally, often, seldom, never, ever). You cannot add any such adverb into the sentence without drastically changing its meaning. To apply this test to the resolution, let’s again isolate the bare plural subject: “Colleges and universities ought not consider the SAT.” Adding generally (“Colleges and universities generally ought not consider the SAT”) or ever (“Colleges and universities ought not ever consider the SAT”) result in comparatively minor changes of meaning. (Note that this test doesn’t require there to be no change of meaning and doesn’t have to work for every adverb of quantification.) This strongly suggests what we already know: that “colleges and universities” is generic rather than existential in the resolution. For present purposes, however, these subtle distinctions don’t matter, because the resolution says “ought not.” Why does this matter? Consider again “Unicycles have wheels.” This sentence means, roughly, that each unicycle has at least one wheel (“roughly” because I’m glossing over the distinction between generic and universal for simplicity). By contrast, consider “Unicycles don’t have wheels.” This sentence means, roughly, that each unicycle has no wheels. It’s not just the logical negation of the original proposition, which would be the following: it’s not the case that, for every unicycle, there’s a wheel that it has—i.e., that some unicycle lacks a wheel. This means that, if “standardized tests” is a dependent plural with respect to “colleges and universities,” the resolution means that colleges and universities not consider any standardized tests. Compare: if the resolution were “Unicycles don’t have wheels,” they would have to argue that unicycles don’t have any wheels, not just that there are some wheels unicycles don’t have (e.g., the wheels on my car). This is because the negation of an existential statement (“it’s not the case that some do”) is a universal statement (“all of them don’t”). This is the observation about quantifier scope I made about the Jan–Feb 2019 resolution, and it applies straightforwardly to the standardized tests topic because of the “ought not” wording. So, if “Colleges and universities ought to consider standardized tests” means roughly that colleges and universities ought to consider at least one standardized test, then the sentence “Colleges and universities ought not consider

#### The resolution is the only predictable stasis point for dividing ground—any deviation justifies the aff reinterpreting the resolution at their whim. This decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bound by the resolution, making fairness impossible.

#### Clash – specifying only one state kills clash because the aff can arbitrarily choose any nation, which pushes the neg to t, k, and phil positions because the DA and CP ground changes drastically with each nation. This means we never see topical, substantive clash that is key to real-world education.

#### Topic Literature – Most literature is about all member nations reducing IP protections, not state-specific scenarios. There is no guarantee that there is quality literature negating every possible affirmative case – leads to shallow, analytical debate and skirts research skills.

#### Limits – Being able to spec a state explodes limits - there 123 options affs that the neg has to prepare for

#### TVA solves - read your aff as an advantage under a whole res aff. We don’t prevent new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. Reject the 1ar’s PICs argument – it leads to absurd conclusions that since the neg could potentially be abusive the aff is justified in flat-out not being T, which leads to infinite abuse in justifying aff abuse.

### Voters:

#### Education – limits on the topic -> deeper educational clash on core aspects of the topic, deep edu is better than shallow edu; edu good – reason for funding, only portable skill from debate

#### Fairness – if aff is not topical, then judge cannot accurately evaluate the round fairly to pick a winner; competitive equity decreases -> ppl leaving the community -> race to the bottom (try to make the most unfair arg to win).

#### Prefer competing interps:

#### Forces clash on T that avoids race to the bottom

#### Avoids judge intervention – no brightline on what is reasonable -> judge can’t effectively evaluate neg arguments

#### Stable advocacy – if no c/I, then it’s never clear what is and is not topical -> race to the bottom of unfair affs

#### Drop the debater - The shell indicts the entire entire advocacy, drop the arg is functionally drop the debater.

#### No RVIs – you don’t win for being topical

## K

#### 1) The current IP system is just a tool of the capitalist structure – the current pandemic provides the moment to overhaul the system, so action must be taken immediately.

**Vanni 21** - Amaka Vanni[Phd(University of Warwick), LLM International Economic Law(University of Warwick), BA International Relations and Politics, Lecturer in Law at the University of Leeds], 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/

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.

#### 2) The idea and history of intellectual property protections is predicated on a capitalist society.

Söderberg 02 - Johan Söderberg[educated at the Falmouth College of Arts in England and holds a degree in Science and Technology Policy from Lund University, Sweden], 3-4-2002, "View of Copyleft vs. Copyright: A Marxist Critique," No Publication,<https://firstmonday.org/article/view/938/860>

Intellectual property rights were invented in the Italian merchant states and accompanied the spread of early capitalism to Netherlands and Britain [8]. Early forms of what has become copyright can be traced further back into history, as is sometimes done by copyright champions. In Talmud tradition, for example, sources of information were thoroughly documented, but for the purpose of ensuring the authenticity of information. Copyright in a non-trivial sense can only be realized within the context of a capitalist society, since its function is meaningless without a developed market economy (Bettig, 1996). For most of human existence oral tradition has dominated. Narratives were in constant flux. Performance was regarded more highly than authorship, which seldom could be credited since most culture was built on religious myths or common folklore, and did not originate from an individual creator. With the emergence of a bourgeoisie consciousness of individuals and property, the spread of market relations, and technological breakthroughs, especially the printing press, the need of copyright was created. Consequently, Great Britain developed the first advanced copyright law. In the sixteenth century religious conflicts spurred the circulation of pamphlets, closely followed by legislation that banned writings of heresy, sedition, and treason. Brendan Scott (2000) argues that this censorship bears the legacy of copyright. For example, the custom of printers and authors to have their name listed with their creations began as a law demanding this practice, not to ensure the originator due credit, but in order for the king to keep track of disobedient writers. In 1556 a royal charter established the Stationers' Company and granted it exclusive control of all printing in the United Kingdom. Limiting the number of publishers was a key strategy in the government's arsenal to regulate writings (Bettig, 1996). The two strategies to consolidate control by eradicating anonymity and restricting the number of sources of reproduction are themes that echo into the present day. The expansion of patents and copyright has grown since. It entered a new stage with the signing of the TRIPs Agreement, a global treaty on intellectual property, in 1994 (May, 2000). The tightening of the intellectual property regime coincides with the increasing exchange value of information and what is held to be the coming of an information age.

#### 3) TRIPS intellectual property protections reinforce a capitalist structure where profits are maintained at the cost of human lives.

**Vanni 21** - Amaka Vanni[Phd(University of Warwick), LLM International Economic Law(University of Warwick), BA International Relations and Politics, Lecturer in Law at the University of Leeds], 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/

From the onset, the TRIPS IP regime created imbalance between innovation, market monopoly, and medicines access, because it failed to take into consideration the health burden, development needs and local conditions of the various countries that make up the WTO. This has led to several issues. First, the market monopoly of IP rights, which allows the corporation to set the market for drugs, has created a privileged societal class with access to lifesaving medication distinguishing them from those excluded from access to available medications. This phenomenon is vividly illustrated in the HIV/AIDS crisis of the 1990s and early 2000s. While HIV/AIDS patients in developed countries were able to afford antiretroviral (ARVs) treatments, which had been developed, approved and patented as early as 1987, many patients in Africa and other parts of the developing world could not afford the approximately USD 12,000 per annum treatment at that time. By 2001, approximately 2.4 million people in the region had died of AIDS. The South African government intervened to reduce the cost of ARVs by amending its domestic patent laws to allow the authorization of parallel imports of patented pharmaceuticals and to encourage the use of generic drugs, but it was sued by the US industry group Pharmaceutical Research and Manufacturers of America (PhRMA). Though the lawsuit was eventually dropped, it highlights the measures pharmaceutical corporations, backed by some national governments, are willing to take to protect their profits at the cost of human lives. Significantly, we see how law (or the threat of legal action) is used not only to protect and expand the profitability of a certain kind of property but, as Anjali Vats and Deidré Keller have taught us, also reveals IP law’s racial investments in whiteness and its continuing implications for racial (in)equality, particularly in the way it informs systems of ownership, circulation, and distribution of knowledge. Similarly, Natsu Saito takes up the analysis of IP, race and capitalism by theorizing some of the ways in which ‘value’ in IP law concentrated in the hands of large corporations is calculated in terms of its profitability rather than what it contributes to the well-being of society. However, the proverbial chickens have come home to roost as even rich countries are beginning to feel the bite of the dysfunctional IP system.

#### Capitalism causes every impact—poverty, inequality, democratic decline, disease, climate change, women and worker exploitation, and nuclear war

**Foster 19** (John, PhD from York University, Professor at the University of Oregon Department of Sociology, “Capitalism Has Failed—What Next?,” Monthly Review, 2/1/19, <https://monthlyreview.org/2019/02/01/capitalism-has-failed-what-next/>, JLin)

Less than two decades into the twenty-first century, it is evident that capitalism has failed as a social system. The world is mired in **economic stagnation, financialization, and the most extreme inequality in human history,** accompanied by mass unemployment and underemployment, precariousness, **poverty, hunger, wasted output and lives, and** what at this point can only be called a planetary **ecological “death spiral**.”1 The digital revolution, the greatest technological advance of our time, has rapidly mutated from a promise of free communication and liberated production into **new means of surveillance, control, and displacement** of the working population. The institutions of **liberal democracy are at the point of collapse, while fascism**, the rear guard of the capitalist system, **is again on the march**, along with patriarchy, racism, imperialism, and war. To say that capitalism is a failed system is not, of course, to suggest that its breakdown and disintegration is imminent.2 It does, however, mean that it has passed from being a historically necessary and creative system at its inception to being a historically unnecessary and destructive one in the present century. Today, more than ever, the world is faced with the epochal choice between “the revolutionary reconstitution of society at large and the common ruin of the contending classes.”3 Indications of this failure of capitalism are everywhere. Stagnation of investment punctuated by bubbles of financial expansion, which then inevitably burst, now characterizes the so-called free market.4 **Soaring inequality** in income and wealth has its counterpart in the **declining material circumstances of a majority of the population.** Real wages for most workers in the United States have barely budged in forty years despite steadily rising productivity.5 Work intensity has increased, while work and safety protections on the job have been systematically jettisoned. Unemployment data has become more and more meaningless due to a new institutionalized underemployment in the form of contract labor in the gig economy.6 Unions have been reduced to mere shadows of their former glory as **capitalism has asserted totalitarian control over workplaces**. With the demise of Soviet-type societies, social democracy in Europe has perished in the new atmosphere of “liberated capitalism.”7 The capture of the surplus value **produced by overexploited populations in the poorest regions** of the world, via the global labor arbitrage instituted by multinational corporations, is leading to an unprecedented amassing of financial wealth at the center of the world economy and relative poverty in the periphery.8 Around $21 trillion of offshore funds are currently lodged in tax havens on islands mostly in the Caribbean, constituting “the fortified refuge of Big Finance.”9 Technologically driven monopolies resulting from the global-communications revolution, together with the rise to dominance of Wall Street-based financial capital geared to speculative asset creation, have further contributed to the riches of today’s “1 percent.” Forty-two billionaires now enjoy as much wealth as half the world’s population, while the three richest men in the United States—Jeff Bezos, Bill Gates, and Warren Buffett—have more wealth than half the U.S. population.10 **In every region of the world, inequality has increased sharply in recent decades**.11 The gap in per capita income and wealth between the richest and poorest nations, which has been the dominant trend for centuries, is rapidly widening once again.12 More than 60 percent of the world’s employed population, some two billion people, now work in the impoverished informal sector, forming a massive global proletariat. The global reserve army of labor is some 70 percent larger than the active labor army of formally employed workers.13 Adequate health care, housing, education, and clean water and air are increasingly out of reach for large sections of the population, even in wealthy countries in North America and Europe, while transportation is becoming more difficult in the United States and many other countries due to irrationally high levels of dependency on the automobile and disinvestment in public transportation. Urban structures are more and more characterized by gentrification and segregation, with cities becoming the playthings of the well-to-do while marginalized populations are shunted aside. About half a million people, most of them children, are homeless on any given night in the United States.14 New York City is experiencing a major rat infestation, attributed to warming temperatures, mirroring trends around the world.15 In the United States and other high-income countries, **life expectancy is in decline**, with a remarkable resurgence of Victorian illnesses related to poverty and exploitation. In Britain, gout, scarlet fever, whooping cough, and even scurvy are now resurgent, along with tuberculosis. With inadequate enforcement of work health and safety regulations, black lung disease has returned with a vengeance in U.S. coal country.16 **Overuse of antibiotics, particularly by capitalist agribusiness, is leading to an antibiotic-resistance crisis, with the dangerous growth of superbugs** generating increasing numbers of deaths, which by mid–century could surpass annual cancer deaths, prompting the World Health Organization to declare a “global health emergency.”17 These dire conditions, arising from the workings of the system, are consistent with what Frederick Engels, in the Condition of the Working Class in England, called “social murder.”18 At the instigation of giant corporations, philanthrocapitalist foundations, and neoliberal governments, public education has been restructured around corporate-designed testing based on the implementation of robotic common-core standards. This is generating massive databases on the student population, much of which are now being surreptitiously marketed and sold.19 The corporatization and privatization of education is feeding the progressive subordination of children’s needs to the cash nexus of the commodity market. We are thus seeing a dramatic return of Thomas Gradgrind’s and Mr. M’Choakumchild’s crass utilitarian philosophy dramatized in Charles Dickens’s Hard Times: “Facts are alone wanted in life” and “You are never to fancy.”20 Having been reduced to intellectual dungeons, many of the poorest, most racially segregated schools in the United States are mere pipelines for prisons or the military.21 More than two million people in the United States are behind bars, a higher rate of incarceration than any other country in the world, constituting a new Jim Crow. The total population in prison is nearly equal to the number of people in Houston, Texas, the fourth largest U.S. city. African Americans and Latinos make up 56 percent of those incarcerated, while constituting only about 32 percent of the U.S. population. Nearly 50 percent of American adults, and a much higher percentage among African Americans and Native Americans, have an immediate family member who has spent or is currently spending time behind bars. Both black men and Native American men in the United States are nearly three times, Hispanic men nearly two times, more likely to die of police shootings than white men.22 Racial divides are now widening across the entire planet. **Violence against women and the expropriation of their unpaid labor**, as well as the higher level of exploitation of their paid labor, are integral to the way in which power is organized in capitalist society—and how it seeks to divide rather than unify the population. More than a third of women worldwide have experienced physical/sexual violence. Women’s bodies, in particular, are **objectified, reified, and commodified as part of the normal workings of monopoly-capitalist marketing.**23 The mass media-propaganda system, part of the larger corporate matrix, is now merging into a social media-based propaganda system that is more porous and seemingly anarchic, but more universal and more than ever favoring money and power. Utilizing modern marketing and surveillance techniques, which now dominate all digital interactions, vested interests are able to tailor their messages, largely unchecked, to individuals and their social networks, creating concerns about “fake news” on all sides.24 Numerous business entities promising technological manipulation of voters in countries across the world have now surfaced, auctioning off their services to the highest bidders.25 The elimination of net neutrality in the United States means further concentration, centralization, and control over the entire Internet by monopolistic service providers. **Elections are increasingly prey to unregulated “dark money” emanating from the coffers of corporations and the billionaire class**. Although presenting itself as the world’s leading democracy, the United States, as Paul Baran and Paul Sweezy stated in Monopoly Capital in 1966, “is democratic in form and plutocratic in content.”26 In the Trump administration, following a long-established tradition, 72 percent of those appointed to the cabinet have come from the higher corporate echelons, while others have been drawn from the military.27 War, engineered by the United States and other major powers at the apex of the system, has become perpetual in strategic oil regions such as the Middle East, **and threatens to escalate into a global thermonuclear exchange**. During the Obama administration, the United States was engaged in wars/bombings in seven different countries—Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Libya, Yemen, Somalia, and Pakistan.28 Torture and assassinations have been reinstituted by Washington as acceptable instruments of war against those now innumerable individuals, group networks, and whole societies that are branded as terrorist. A new Cold War and nuclear arms race is in the making between the United States and Russia, while Washington is seeking to place road blocks to the continued rise of China. The Trump administration has created a new space force as a separate branch of the military in an attempt to ensure U.S. dominance in the militarization of space. Sounding the alarm on the increasing dangers of a nuclear war and of climate destabilization, the distinguished Bulletin of Atomic Scientists moved its doomsday clock in 2018 to two minutes to midnight, the closest since 1953, when it marked the advent of thermonuclear weapons.29 Increasingly severe economic sanctions are being imposed by the United States on countries like Venezuela and Nicaragua, despite their democratic elections—or because of them. Trade and currency wars are being actively promoted by core states, while racist barriers against immigration continue to be erected in Europe and the United States as some 60 million refugees and internally displaced peoples flee devastated environments. Migrant populations worldwide have risen to 250 million, with those residing in high-income countries constituting more than 14 percent of the populations of those countries, up from less than 10 percent in 2000. Meanwhile, ruling circles and wealthy countries seek to wall off islands of power and privilege from the mass of humanity, who are to be left to their fate.30 More than three-quarters of a billion people, over 10 percent of the world population, are chronically malnourished.31 Food stress in the United States keeps climbing, leading to the rapid growth of cheap dollar stores selling poor quality and toxic food. Around forty million Americans, representing one out of eight households, including nearly thirteen million children, are food insecure.32 Subsistence farmers are being pushed off their lands by agribusiness, private capital, and sovereign wealth funds in a global depeasantization process that constitutes the greatest movement of people in history.33 Urban overcrowding and poverty across much of the globe is so severe that one can now reasonably refer to a “planet of slums.”34 Meanwhile, the world housing market is estimated to be worth up to $163 trillion (as compared to the value of gold mined over all recorded history, estimated at $7.5 trillion).35 The Anthropocene epoch, first ushered in by the Great Acceleration of the world economy immediately after the Second World War, has generated enormous rifts in planetary boundaries, **extending from climate change to ocean acidification, to the sixth extinction,** to disruption of the global nitrogen and phosphorus cycles, to the loss of freshwater, to the disappearance of forests, to **widespread toxic-chemical and radioactive pollution**.36 It is now estimated that 60 percent of the world’s wildlife vertebrate population (including mammals, reptiles, amphibians, birds, and fish) have been wiped out since 1970, while the worldwide abundance of invertebrates has declined by 45 percent in recent decades.37 What climatologist James Hansen calls the “species exterminations” resulting from accelerating climate change and rapidly shifting climate zones are only compounding this general process of biodiversity loss. Biologists expect that half of all species will be facing extinction by the end of the century.38 If present climate-change trends continue, the “global carbon budget” associated with a 2°C increase in average global temperature will be broken in sixteen years (while a 1.5°C increase in global average temperature—staying beneath which is the key to long-term stabilization of the climate—will be reached in a decade). Earth System scientists warn that the world is now perilously close to a Hothouse Earth, in which catastrophic climate change will be locked in and irreversible.39 The ecological, social, and economic costs to humanity of continuing to increase carbon emissions by 2.0 percent a year as in recent decades (rising in 2018 by 2.7 percent—3.4 percent in the United States), and failing to meet the minimal 3.0 percent annual reductions in emissions currently needed to avoid a catastrophic destabilization of the earth’s energy balance, are simply incalculable.40 Nevertheless, major **energy corporations continue to lie about climate change, promoting and bankrolling climate denialism**—while admitting the truth in their internal documents. These corporations are working to accelerate the extraction and production of fossil fuels, including the dirtiest, most greenhouse gas-generating varieties, reaping enormous profits in the process. The melting of the Arctic ice from global warming is seen by capital as a new El Dorado, opening up massive additional oil and gas reserves to be exploited without regard to the consequences for the earth’s climate. In response to scientific reports on climate change, Exxon Mobil declared that it intends to extract and sell all of the fossil-fuel reserves at its disposal.41 Energy corporations continue to intervene in climate negotiations to ensure that any agreements to limit carbon emissions are defanged. Capitalist countries across the board are putting the accumulation of wealth for a few above combatting climate destabilization, threatening the very future of humanity. Capitalism is best understood as a competitive class-based mode of production and exchange geared to the accumulation of capital through the exploitation of workers’ labor power and the private appropriation of surplus value (value generated beyond the costs of the workers’ own reproduction). The mode of economic accounting intrinsic to capitalism designates as a value-generating good or service anything that passes through the market and therefore produces income. It follows that the greater part of the social and environmental costs of production outside the market are excluded in this form of valuation and are treated as mere negative “externalities,” unrelated to the capitalist economy itself—whether in terms of the shortening and degradation of human life or the destruction of the natural environment. As environmental economist K. William Kapp stated, “capitalism must be regarded as an economy of unpaid costs.”42 We have now reached a point in the twenty-first century in which the **externalities** of this irrational system, **such as the costs of war, the depletion of natural resources, the waste of human lives, and the disruption of the planetary environment, now far exceed any future economic benefits that capitalism offers to society** as a whole. The accumulation of capital and the amassing of wealth are increasingly occurring at the expense of an irrevocable rift in the social and environmental conditions governing human life on earth.43 Some would argue that China stands as an exception to much of the above, characterized as it is by a seemingly unstoppable rate of economic advance (though carrying with it deep social and ecological contradictions). Yet Chinese development has its roots in the 1949 Chinese Revolution, carried out by the Chinese Communist Party headed by Mao Zedong, whereby it liberated itself from the imperialist system. This allowed it to develop for decades under a planned economy largely free of constraints from outside forces, establishing a strong agricultural and industrial economic base. This was followed by a shift in the post-Maoist reform period to a hybrid system of more limited state planning along with a much greater reliance on market relations (and a vast expansion of debt and speculation) under conditions—the globalization of the world market—that were particularly fortuitous to its “catching up.” Through trade wars and other pressures aimed at destabilizing China’s position in the world market, the United States is already seeking to challenge the bases of China’s growth in world trade. China, therefore, stands not so much for the successes of late capitalism but rather for its inherent limitations. The current Chinese model, moreover, carries within it many of the destructive tendencies of the system of capital accumulation. Ultimately, China’s future too depends on a return to the process of revolutionary transition, spurred by its own population.44 How did these disastrous conditions characterizing capitalism worldwide develop? An understanding of the failure of capitalism, beginning in the twentieth century, requires a historical examination of the rise of neoliberalism, and how this has only served to increase the destructiveness of the system. Only then can we address the future of humanity in the twenty-first century.

#### We have reached a tipping point – neoliberalism is no longer able to control its spiral into disaster.  Massive structural violence and extinction are inevitable without a fundamental rethinking of the current system.

**Farbod ‘15**  [Faramarz Farbod  (PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College), Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)] [LADI](http://www.theladi.org/evidence) recut SF

Global **capitalism is the 800-pound gorilla. The twin ecological and economic crises, militarism, the rise of the surveillance state, and a dysfunctional political system can all be traced to its normal operations.** We need a transformative politics from below that can challenge the fundamentals of capitalism instead of today's politics that is content to treat its symptoms. The problems we face are linked to each other and to the way a capitalist society operates. We must make an effort to understand its real character. The fundamental question of our time is whether we can go beyond a system that is ravaging the Earth and secure a future with dignity for life and respect for the planet. What has capitalism done to us lately? **The best science tells us that this is a do-or-die moment. We are now in the midst of the 6th mass extinction** in the planetary history with 150 to **200 species going extinct every day, a pace 1,000 times greater than the 'natural' extinction rate.1 The Earth has been warming rapidly** since the 1970s with the 10 warmest years on record all occurring since 1998.2 The planet has already warmed by 0.85 degree Celsius since the industrial revolution 150 years ago. An increase of 2° Celsius is the limit of what the planet can take before major catastrophic consequences. Limiting global warming to 2°C requires reducing global emissions by 6% per year. However, global carbon emissions from fossil fuels increased by about 1.5 times between 1990 and 2008.3 **Capitalism has** also **led to explosive social inequalities.** The global economic landscape is littered with rising concentration of wealth, debt, distress, and immiseration caused by the austerity-pushing elites. Take the US. The richest 20 persons have as much wealth as the bottom 150 million.4 Since 1973, the hourly wages of workers have lagged behind worker productivity rates by more than 800%.5 It now takes the average family 47 years to make what a hedge fund manager makes in one hour.6 Just about a quarter of children under the age of 5 live in poverty.7 A majority of public school students are low-income.8 85% of workers feel stress on the job.9 Soon the only thing left of the American Dream will be a culture of hustling to survive. Take the global society. The world's billionaires control $7 trillion, a sum 77 times the debt owed by Greece to the European banks.10 The richest 80 possess more than the combined wealth of the bottom 50% of the global population (3.5 billion people).11 **By 2016 the richest 1% will own a greater share of the global wealth than the rest of us combined.12** The top 200 global corporations wield twice the economic power of the bottom 80% of the global population.13 Instead of a global society capitalism is creating a global apartheid. What's the nature of the beast? Firstly, the "egotistical calculation" of commerce wins the day every time. Capital seeks maximum profitability as a matter of first priority. Evermore "accumulation of capital" is the system's bill of health; it is slowdowns or reversals that usher in crises and set off panic. **Cancer-like hunger for endless growth is in the system's DNA and is what has set it on a tragic collision course with Nature**, a finite category. Secondly, **capitalism treats human labor as a cost**. It therefore opposes labor capturing a fair share of the total economic value that it creates. **Since labor stands for the majority and capital for a tiny minority, it follows that classism and class warfare are built into its DNA, which explains why the "middle class" is shrinking and its gains are never secure**. Thirdly, private interests determine massive investments and make key decisions at the point of production guided by maximization of profits. That's why in the US the truck freight replaced the railroad freight, chemicals were used extensively in agriculture, public transport was gutted in favor of private cars, and big cars replaced small ones. What should political action aim for today? The political class has no good ideas about how to address the crises. One may even wonder whether it has a serious understanding of the system, or at least of ways to ameliorate its consequences. The range of solutions offered tends to be of a technical, legislative, or regulatory nature, promising at best temporary management of the deepening crises. The trajectory of the system, at any rate, precludes a return to its post-WWII regulatory phase. **It's left to us as a society to think about what the real character of the system is, where we are going, and how we are going to deal with the trajectory of the system** -- and act accordingly. **The critical task** ahead **is to build a transformative politics capable of steering the system away from its destructive path**. Given the system's DNA, **such a politics from below must include efforts to challenge the system's fundamentals, namely, its private mode of decision-making** about investments and about what and how to produce. Furthermore, it behooves us to heed the late environmentalist Barry Commoner's insistence on the efficacy of a strategy of prevention over a failed one of control or capture of pollutants. At a lecture in 1991, Commoner remarked: "Environmental pollution is an incurable disease; it can only be prevented"; and he proceeded to refer to "a law," namely: "if you don't put a pollutant in the environment it won't be there." What is nearly certain now is that **without democratic control of wealth and social governance** of the means of production, **we will all be condemned to the labor of Sisyphus. Only we won't have to suffer for all eternity, as the degradation of life-enhancing natural and social systems will soon reach a point of no return.**

#### The alt is socializing pharma by replacing patent monopolies with public funding – deconstructs capitalism and solves the affirmative by making medicine accessible globally

Baker, Dean, “Replace Patent Monopolies with Direct Public Funding For Drug Research”, Truthout, Center For Economic And Policy Research, July 1 2019

It is impressive to see many of the leading Democratic candidates put forward bold progressive proposals. Unfortunately, in the case of prescription drugs, their imagination has been notably weak. While there have been proposals for lowering drug prices, none of them have been willing to attack the fundamental problem: government makes prices high by granting patent monopolies.This is a simple but incredibly important point that is often lost in the debate. We frequently hear comments about how progressives want the government to intervene in the free market to bring drug prices down through various mechanisms. That story turns logic on its head. In almost all cases, drugs are cheap to manufacture. It is government-granted patent monopolies or some other form of exclusivity that makes drugs expensive. In a truly free market, drugs are cheap. The restrictions on prices being proposed are simply efforts to limit the extent to which drug companies can exploit the monopolies the government has given them. That should lead to the next question: Why give drug companies monopolies in the first place? The obvious reason under the current system is that it is expensive to develop new drugs. This requires initial preclinical research and then an extended period of clinical testing to establish their safety and effectiveness, and ultimately bring them through the Food and Drug Administration’s (FDA) approval process. Most leads for new drugs end up going nowhere, which means that the drug company has spent a great deal of money for no return. No pharmaceutical company would undertake major expenditures for developing new drugs if they would have to compete with generics, which are every bit as good, from the day they were approved by the FDA. The declared intent of government patent monopolies is to give companies an incentive to develop new drugs.There is nothing natural about this mechanism for financing research, and even now, the government does not rely exclusively on patent monopolies for financing research. It **s**pends nearly [$40 billion a year](https://www.nih.gov/about-nih/what-we-do/budget) on research through the National Institutes of Health (NIH) and other agencies. While most of this funding goes to more basic research, many important drugs have been developed with government funding. In addition, the NIH has supported thousands of clinical trials. In principle, there is no reason that Congress could not double or triple the amount of funding for medical research and replace the [$70 billion](https://truthout.org/articles/sanders-khanna-bill-would-stop-propping-up-drug-prices/) that is now supported by patent monopolies. The NIH, or a new agency, could parcel out this money through long-term contracts to private companies. The condition of getting the funding is that all research findings would be posted on the web as soon as practical so that other researchers could benefit from it. The other major condition of the funding is that **[**and] all patents are placed in the public domain, so newly developed drugs could be sold immediately as generics**.** The savings to consumers from going this route would be enormous. Cutting-edge drugs that sell for tens or even hundreds of thousands of dollars would instead sell for a [few hundred dollars](https://www.thebodypro.com/article/1000-fold-mark-up-for-drug-prices-in-high-income-c). People would no longer have to struggle with insurers or use GoFundMe pages to pay for necessary medications. The savings to the economy would also be huge. We will spend roughly $460 billion this year on drugs that would likely sell for less than $80 billion in a true free market. The difference of $380 billion a year is more than twice the size of the Trump tax cut and five times the size of the food stamp (SNAP) budget. The benefits go beyond just the savings. Patent monopolies give drug companies an enormous incentive to push their drugs as widely as possible, even when they may not be the most effective drug or have harmful side effects. Purdue Pharma would not have been pushing OxyContin so vigorously if it were selling at generic prices. While the opioid crisis is an extreme case, drug companies exaggerate the benefits of their drugs and conceal negative side effects [all the time](https://www.cepr.net/patent-monopolies-and-the-costs-of-mismarketing-drugs/). If we went the route of direct public funding, the savings would go beyond prescription drugs. Medical equipment and tests are also made expensive because of government-granted patent monopolies. NPR recently did a [piece](https://www.npr.org/sections/health-shots/2019/06/17/732497053/a-year-after-spinal-surgery-a-94-000-bill-feels-like-a-backbreaker) about a woman who had a surprise bill of $94,000 for neuromonitoring services during a surgery on her spine. The reason this process could be billed for $94,000, as opposed to perhaps 1/20th of this amount, is that the process is patented. If the neuromonitoring system had been developed with public funds, there would be no huge bill with which to surprise patients. Given the many bold progressive proposals that Senators Elizabeth Warren, Bernie Sanders and some of the other candidates have put forward, it is surprising that they have not proposed to reform the financing of drug and other medical research. This failure is especially peculiar, since both Sanders and Warren (along with Senators Cory Booker, Kirsten Gillibrand and Amy Klobuchar) were sponsors of a [bill](https://www.brown.senate.gov/newsroom/press/release/brown-introduces-prop) that would provide some public funding for research that would lead to new drugs being introduced as generics.The patent monopoly system of financing the development of new drugs and medical equipment is a disaster in just about every way. Many of the leading Democratic contenders know how to do better, they need to add this to their agenda.

#### The ROB is the resist capitalism. Everything we know has been shaped by capitalist imagination which leads to the cooption of education and therefore it is the judge’s highest obligation. Giroux 15

Giroux, Henry A., and Henry A Giroux. “Henry A. Giroux: Higher Education and the Promise of Insurgent Public Memory.” Truthout, Truthout, 3 Mar. 2015, truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/.

These throwaway academics are the new invisible poor fighting for better wages, job security, benefits and full-time positions. The status and exploitation of the labor of part-time workers is shameful and is indicative of the degree to which neoliberalism’s culture of cruelty, brutality and iniquitous power now shapes higher education. And while there are a number of serious movements among adjuncts and others to fight against this new form of exploited labor, it is fair to say that such resistance will face an uphill battle. The corporatized university will not only fight such efforts in the courts with their bands of lawyers and anti-union thugs; they will also use, as we have seen recently on a number of campuses, the police and other state repressive apparatuses to impose their will on dissenting students and faculty. But if this growing group of what Kate Jenkins calls the “hyper-educated poor” [(18)](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/#a18) joins with other social movements fighting against militarization, and the war on public goods, public servants and workers, there is a chance for the emergence of a new political formation that may succeed in turning the momentum around in this ongoing battle over academic labor and the fate of higher education in the future. Memory is no longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. While the post-9/11 attacks have taken an even more dangerous turn, higher education is still a site of intense struggle, but it is fair to say the right wing is winning. The success of the financial elite in waging this war can be measured not only by the rise in the stranglehold of neoliberal policies over higher education, the increasing corporatization of the university, the evisceration of full-time, tenured jobs for faculty, the dumbing down of the curriculum, the view of students as customers, and the growing influence of the military-industrial-academic complex in the service of the financial elite, but also in the erasing of public memory. Memory is no longer insurgent; that is, it has been erased as a critical educational and political optic for moral witnessing, testimony and civic courage. On the contrary, it is either being cleansed or erased by the new apologists for the status quo who urge people to love the United States, which means giving up any sense of counter memory, interrogation of dominant narratives or retrieval of lost histories of struggle. The current call to cleanse history in the name of a false patriotism that celebrates a new illiteracy as a way of loving the United States is a discourse of anti-memory, a willful attempt at forgetting the past in the manufactured fog of historical amnesia. This is particularly true when it comes to erasing the work of a number of critical intellectuals who have written about higher education as the practice of freedom, including John Dewey, George S. Counts, W.E.B. Du Bois, the Social Reconstructionists, and others, all of whom viewed higher education as integral to the development of both engaged critical citizens and the university as a democratic public sphere. [(19)](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/#a19) Under the reign of neoliberalism, with few exceptions, higher education appears to be increasingly decoupling itself from its historical legacy as a crucial public sphere, responsible for both educating students for the workplace and providing them with the modes of critical discourse, interpretation, judgment, imagination, and experiences that deepen and expand democracy. As universities adopt the ideology of the transnational corporation and become subordinated to the needs of capital, the war industries and the Pentagon, they are less concerned about how they might educate students about the ideology and civic practices of democratic governance and the necessity of using knowledge to address the challenges of public life. [(20)](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/#a20) Instead, as part of the post-9/11 military-industrial-academic complex, higher education increasingly conjoins military interests and market values, identities and social relations while the role of the university as a public good, a site of critical dialogue and a place that calls students to think, question, learn how to take risks, and act with compassion and conviction is dismissed as impractical or subversive. [(21)](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/#a21) The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States. The corporatization, militarization and dumbing down of rigorous scholarship, and the devaluing of the critical capacities of young people mark a sharp break from a once influential educational tradition in the United States, extending from Thomas Jefferson to John Dewey to Maxine Greene, who held that freedom flourishes in the worldly space of the public realm only through the work of educated, critical citizens. Within this democratic tradition, education was not confused with training; instead, its critical function was propelled by the need to provide students with the knowledge and skills that enable a “politically interested and mobilized citizenry, one that has certain solidarities, is capable of acting on its own behalf, and anticipates a future of ever greater social equality across lines of race, gender, and class.” [(22)](https://truthout.org/articles/higher-education-and-the-promise-of-insurgent-public-memory/#a22) Other prominent educators and theorists such as Hannah Arendt, James B. Conant and Cornelius Castoriadis have long believed and rightly argued that we should not allow education to be modeled after the business world. Dewey, in particular, warned about the growing influence of the “corporate mentality” and the threat that the business model posed to public spaces, higher education and democracy.

### Underview

#### The alt is not a rejection of the state, thus I do not cede the political and can engage in state action.

#### Don’t let the aff make a perm, each of the links acts as an independent DA to the aff that turns the case. That means that the perm will never solve those disadvantages, but the alt alone will. Any inclusion of the aff fails.

#### Weigh the K above the case—capitalism controls the root cause of all of their impacts. If we don’t analyze capitalism, we allow it to run rampant and continue on its unsustainable path towards extinction.