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#### The plan’s reduction of IP is in line with a broader strategy of vaccine diplomacy – this treats global health as a game of political football to advance imperialist interests in the long-term – only anti-capitalist organizing solves.

Patanè, 21

[Andrea, writer for the IMT: “COVID-19 pandemic: patents and profits,” In Defence of Marxism, published 5-15-2021. https://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm]//AD

We are 16 months into a pandemic that according to some reports has claimed 6.9m lives and plunged capitalism into its deepest-ever crisis, and the ruling class is still torn by internecine squabbles over patent waivers, export bans and priority-deals. New rifts have opened up between sections of the bourgeoisie following the recent announcement that US president Joe Biden’s administration now supports “negotiations” on waiving COVID-19 vaccine patents. This is much to the consternation of the Big Pharma parasites, who are pocketing tens of billions of dollars thanks to their exclusive ownership of COVID-19 vaccines and other drugs. Again and again, we find proof that capitalism, a system based on narrow national interests and the pursuit of private profits is utterly unfit for purpose. Indeed, as a recent WHO-led investigation just confirmed, the entire pandemic was preventable. The market and bourgeois politicians brought about this disaster, and are utterly failing to resolve it. IP and Big Pharma profits In October last year, faced with the prospect of global vaccine shortages and the inability of poorer countries to acquire them, India and South Africa presented to the World Trade Organization a request to waive intellectual property rights on all the COVID-19-related drugs and technologies. This would allow the manufacture of cheap, generic versions anywhere in the world. Vaccines and medical technologies fall under the WTO agreements on Trade-Related Intellectual Property Rights, known as TRIPS, which protects the IP of the major pharmaceutical companies. According to one report, a TRIPS waiver could help in vaccinating more than 60 percent of the world population by the end of the year. Everyone on earth could be fully vaccinated by the end of 2022. The pandemic nightmare that billions of people are living through could be over once and for all. Surely then, a TRIPS waiver sounds like a sensible and necessary request? Especially given that the likes of Pfizer, Johnson & Johnson and AstraZeneca have already racked up profits of more than $26bn during the pandemic. What was being demanded was not too radical either: a one time temporary waiver on intellectual property rights related to just one vaccine. Also, the 2001 Doha Declaration on TRIPS and Public Health – agreed by all WTO states – maintains that public health should take precedence over the enforcement of IP rights. Unfortunately, Big Pharma takes a very different view, and isn’t going to let a trivial thing like the Doha Declaration undermine its private claim to COVID-19 vaccines. From their point of view, any concession in this particular case would set a very dangerous precedent. The IP protections afforded to Big Pharma are denying huge swathes of the world population access to vaccines, compounded by the vaccine nationalism of rich countries, which can afford to pay suppliers directly and are gobbling up global supplies. As, Dr. Tedros – the general director of WHO – has warned in the NYT that, following the current trajectory of vaccinations: “[w]e face the very real possibility of affluent countries administering variant-blocking boosters to already vaccinated people when many countries will still be scrounging for enough vaccines to cover their most-at-risk groups”. This is quite an appealing prospect for the Big Pharma bloodsuckers: namely, COVID-19 going endemic, much like a seasonal flu. With new variants breeding out of control in poor countries every year, and seasonal vaccines developed and distributed for those who can pay, billions of dollars would continue to flow in the pockets of these leeches, potentially for the years to come. Moderna CEO Stephane Bancel has already tempted his shareholders with such a “business model” – and is now projecting more than $19.2 billion in sales for this year! However, this bonanza depends on Big Pharma keeping a firm hold on its vaccine IP. Hundreds of thousands of people dying every single year as a result of COVID-19 going endemic is a very minor concern. Unsurprisingly then, Big Pharma has been lobbying governments world over against the TRIPS waiver. Up until now, they have been successful. As of October 2020, the US and EU not only opposed the waiver, but blocked the possibility of any discussion of it from taking place at WTO meetings. Now – after a criminal seven-month period in which hundreds of thousands of people have lost their lives to preventable second and third COVID-19 waves – Biden’s administration has come out in support of entering into negotiations over the TRIPS waiver. Unsurprisingly, Big Pharma reacted to this announcement with dismay. Pfizer CEO Albert Bourla argued that an IP waiver would “disrupt the flow of raw materials” for the vaccine production chain. One suspects he means Big Pharma’s exclusive control over these raw materials will be disrupted. Meanwhile, Johnson & Johnson called the waiver proposal “an unprecedented step that will undermine our global response to the pandemic and compromise safety”, by allowing poor countries to produce vaccines. This is despite the fact that India produces the highest number of vaccines in the world, and was one of the two countries that proposed the waiver in the first place. Big Pharma companies also complained that an IP-waiver would hand the likes of China access to Western-produced mRNA technologies, which aside from vaccine production, could be repurposed for, among other things, cancer research (quelle horreur!). Let us not forget that mRNA technology was developed in publicly-funded university research facilities in the first place, before it was appropriated by private companies. This is simply an argument for the latest developments in medical science being freely available to the entire world, rather than the private property of this or that capitalist regime. A “calculated risk” Far from an act of ‘international solidarity', this latest move from the US government is a calculated political risk, and will be implemented in the interests of US imperialism. A section of the more serious wing of the bourgeoisie understands that a proper economic recovery can happen only if the pandemic is suppressed worldwide. As we have explained elsewhere, wealthy countries risk losing billions of dollars if the pandemic is brought under control only within their own borders, because new variants (like those in India and Brazil) can always mutate elsewhere and reinfect their populations, causing further economic disruption. Therefore, even on a capitalist basis, it is expedient in the long-term for the rich countries to facilitate a global vaccination campaign. Even Pope Francis anointed the demand from his seat in Rome! Biden’s announcement is also an act of vaccine diplomacy. America’s main rivals, China and Russia, have been shoring up their spheres of influence by distributing their Sinopharm and Sputnik V vaccines to poor countries left out by the vaccine nationalism of the US and Europe. Chinese and Russian vaccines have been exported into countries traditionally under western spheres of influence, including Brazil and Hungary. Pushing to waive IP protections on COVID-19 vaccines is therefore partly an effort to push back against the encroachment of rival imperialist powers, which have so far outcompeted Washington in the global vaccination drive. Biden’s announcement is also an attempt to restore the standing and authority of US imperialism on the world stage, which has been bruised by the ‘America First’ vaccine nationalist policy started by Donald Trump, and continued by Biden. According to the FT, Katherine Tai (top US trade envoy) and Jake Sullivan (national security adviser) made the case to Biden that pushing for the waiver “was a low-risk way to secure a diplomatic victory”, after coming under fire for not “respond[ing] quickly enough to the unfolding COVID-19 crisis in India”. Here you have it, straight from the horse’s mouth. Under capitalism, vaccines – rather than providing a way out of the pandemic – are tools for ‘low-risk diplomatic victories’. As if this was some sort of football match between world leaders! In short, Biden is stepping in to prioritise the interests of US imperialism as a whole over the immediate interests of the Big Pharma capitalists. But we should say clearly: this cynical attempt to claim the moral high ground came only after the US used its massive economic clout to secure enough vaccines to inoculate its own population several times over. And in fact, the wartime Defense Production Act is still in effect, which forces US manufacturers to fulfil domestic demands for medical equipment before exports are permitted. This de facto export ban has created bottlenecks in the supply chain that have already undermined the WHO-led COVAX programme to vaccinate poor countries. Rest assured, Biden’s policy remains ‘America First’, just by somewhat more calculated means than his predecessor. Protectionist EU Meanwhile, in the Eurozone, where vaccine shortages still abound, EU leaders fired back at Biden that he should lift his export ban and give up some of America’s surplus supply before talking about waiving IP protections. President Emmanuel Macron in France said he favoured waiving vaccine IP in principle, but that this was a lower priority than the US and Britain ending export bans on resources and giving up their spare vaccines. “If we want to work quickly, today there isn’t one factory in the world that can’t produce doses for poor countries because of intellectual property,” Macron said on the weekend. “The priority today is not intellectual property – it’s not true. We would be lying to ourselves. It’s production.” Indeed! And production could be considerably ramped up if Big Pharma companies weren’t content to maintain existing factories at full capacity, rather than creating and repurposing new factories that will stand idle (and unprofitable) when the pandemic ends. It should be noted that no French company has managed to produce a vaccine as yet, meaning IP protection is a lesser concern from the perspective of French capitalism. This is unlike Germany, in which Pfizer’s partner BioNTech is based, and whose Chancellor Angela Merkel argued for preserving IP protections in order to ensure free market “innovation”, stating last Friday: “I believe that we need the creativity and innovative force of companies, and for me, this includes patent protection.” Merkel conveniently forgets that, since the beginning of the pandemic, state intervention has been a far more important influence over vaccine production than the ‘invisible hand’ of the market. The research that led to the COVID-19 technologies vaccines was overwhelmingly paid for out of the public purse. The AstraZeneca vaccine, for instance, was 97 percent publicly funded. Not to mention the billions spent by various states on purchasing doses. This has nothing to do with preserving ‘innovation’, and everything to do with protecting the private interests of German capitalism. Vaccine supremacy Despite misgivings from the likes of Germany, this latest move by the US might force the EU to change its tune. At a European Council summit on the weekend, President Charles Michel said: “[o]n the intellectual property, we don’t think in the short term that it’s the magic bullet but we are ready to engage on this topic as soon as a concrete proposal will be put on the table.” Still, Brussels is embittered at the US for refusing to offer any of its excess supply to help with shortages after the EU bungled its initial vaccine rollout. At the close of the summit, European Commission President Ursula von der Leyen again stated Europe was “open to discussion” on waiting IP, but mostly used the opportunity to strike back at the US: “The European Union is the pharmacy of the world and open to the world. Up to today in the European Union, 400 million doses of vaccines have been produced and 50 percent of them — 200 million doses — have been exported to 90 different countries in the world. So we invite others to do the same [this clearly means the US]. This is the best way right now in the short term to approach the bottlenecks and the lack of vaccines worldwide.” Belgian Prime Minister Alexander De Croo used even-sterner language: “As Europeans, we don’t need to be schooled. The U.S. hasn’t exported a single vaccine in the past six months. Europe is the one that’s been producing for itself and the rest of the world these past six months.” Now the European rollout is a bit more in hand (though still lagging behind the US and Britain, for example), the EU is trying to pursue vaccine diplomacy of its own to compete with China, Russia and the US in the race for vaccine supremacy. At the summit, Leyen announced plans to send more than 600,000 doses to countries in the Western Balkans, with further donations planned for countries in the Eastern Partnership group comprising Eastern Europe and the Caucasus. This notably includes Ukraine, which has already pleaded in vain with Washington for vaccines. While this is all going on, the EU is still waging a war with the British-based AstraZeneca company – taking them to court over delayed deliveries of vaccines. Once again, at a critical juncture in the fight against the pandemic, when global cooperation is most needed, the political leaders of bourgeoisie are embroiled in recriminations and shoring up their narrow national interests. No time for this madness! While the world leaders squabble, the nightmare continues for workers imprisoned by this pandemic. In her official statement to the WTO, Tai said: “negotiations [i.e. for the patent waiving] will take time”. But time is exactly what millions of workers that face the deadly virus today do not have. Because the WTO makes decisions by consensus, with any one of the 164 member states being able to block decisions, the end of November is considered a ‘realistic goal’ for presenting a draft agreement. This is seven months away! While tens of thousands of deaths are being recorded on a daily basis. When deadly new variants are devastating India and Latin America. It took less time to develop the first working vaccine than apparently, it will to agree a patent waiver on that vaccine! This is nothing short of insanity. Furthermore, the US statement to the WTO fell short of making explicit reference to the transferring of vaccine technology and know-how. If the technology underpinning vaccine production is not shared, even with a patent waiver, it will take months before manufacturers will be able to reverse-engineer a generic version, and months further to test it. The Big Pharma fat cats will not share their technology (which was publicly funded in the first place) voluntarily. They are forecasting sales for billions of dollars for 2021 and will do everything they can to push further back the development of generic versions. They can afford to drag things out. For them, time means billions in profits. The COVID-19 pandemic has shown capitalism for what it is. Rather than being a force for progress, private property and the nation state are the main obstacles preventing us from putting an end to the pandemic. Under a democratic, global plan of production we could put the mighty forces of industry and science at the service of society. All the necessary research, technology and expertise could be marshalled to fight this terrible virus. Vaccine production could be stepped up to reach the majority of the world population by the end of the year. It is capitalism alone that prevents this. We must fight the pandemic with class struggle! Expropriate the Big Pharma fat cats!

#### The WTO is inevitably a tool of accumulation for capitalist imperialism – international institutional monopoly capitalism overdetermines the plan’s move to peace – causes war, environmental degradation, and extinction.

Cuong, 18

[Vu Manh, Researcher @ VietEra Foundation: “International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations,” published by Monthly Review on December 19, 2018. https://www.researchgate.net/profile/Cuong-Vu-10/publication/331162082\_International\_institutional\_monopoly\_capitalism\_and\_its\_manifestations/links/5c6c2588299bf1e3a5b62764/International-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-its-manifestations.pdf]//AD

\*IIMC=International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism

The Evolution of Monopoly Capitalism Monopoly capitalism emerged from “laissez-faire” capitalism in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as described clearly by V.I. Lenin in Imperialism, the Highest Stage of Capitalism, allowing giant corporations to dominate the accumulation process. Since the late 1970s, especially since the collapse of the Soviet Union, this system has reached a new level in its development, forging imperial centralism or “International Institutional Monopoly Capitalism” (IIMC), whereby a handful of powerful nation-states explicitly use international organizations to impose their interests and further expand accumulation. Figure 1 presents a brief overview of the conceptualization of capitalism throughout its history, focusing on the development of monopoly capitalism from the 1870s to the present, including both economic and politic facets. It includes IIMC as the newest term in the evolution of monopoly capitalism. (2) (3) (4) (5) As Karl Marx noted, capitalism has an inherent drive toward endless accumulation through the production of “surplus value.” In relation to this defining characteristic of the system, there have been distinct historical configurations of its operation. IIMC represents the highest form of the imperialism stage of capitalism, given the increasingly coordination between the monopoly capital and the state within core nations. As a state-formed monopoly capitalism, IIMC has been forcing most economies to participate in its system, regardless of whether those economies are capitalist or socialist (except North Korea). This is what Nikolai Bukharin pointed to a century ago. According to Samir Amin, in the globalization era, the efficiency of economic management by nation-states has changed. Under IIMC, advanced capitalist states are even stronger, as far as their economic-political reach, and are able to control international institutions and organizations. Within these core nations, the state uses its strength to support the formation of “supercompanies” (the multinational corporations that monopolize one or a number of products/services worldwide), serving the interests of the richest class, while bringing some additional benefits to its broader population. These countries are monopoly nations. Through international institutional settings (e.g., World Bank, International Monetary Fund, World Trade Organization), monopoly capital and monopoly nations extend their influence and power into every corner of the world, even the few remaining socialist strongholds, causing complex conflicts within globalization and regionalization processes. Capital Concentration and the Establishment of Monopoly Nations Capital accumulation and the centralization and concentration of capital led to the formation of monopolies (cartels, syndicates, trusts, consortiums, and conglomerates). This fundamental law of capitalism continues to take effect in the IIMC period, albeit at a very high level. However, the following organic processes contributed to the formation of monopoly nations: 1. The concentration and centralization of capital in super-companies: The increasing strength and expansion of super-companies, especially over the last five decades, have advanced economic internationalization and globalization. Globally, the 500 largest companies generated $31.1 trillion in 2014. They accounted for nearly 40 percent of world income –up 20 percent from less than 20 percent in 1960. Super-companies not only have a monopoly within one country’s borders but also are dominant in other countries worldwide. The overseas assets of the world’s 100 largest non-financial super-companies in 2011 accounted for 63 percent of their total assets, whereas foreign sales reached 65 percent of their total. This is reflected in the intensification of foreign direct investment (FDI); the significant transfer of employment, technology and international financial operations; and the strong rise of financial systems, bank credit, and insurance. Many super-companies with powerful finances (assets, revenues) can far exceed the gross domestic product (GDP) of many economies. For example, Procter & Gamble (ranked 100 in the list of the largest companies), as noted in Table 1,has revenues that are higher than the GDP of Oman,which is the largest economy in a group of 124 smalland medium-sized economies, with $81.8billion in 2014. Supercompanies can dramatically influence small and/or poor countries as they pressure governments to condone environmental degradation, violation of national labor laws, and abuse of labor rights. They can force these governments to tender incentives, which maximize their profits by allowing extremely poor working conditions and low wages. Some super-companies actively destroy local agriculture and kill marine life, which has sparked mass protests. They often hire military personnel to open fire on peaceful protestors and make assassinations. 2. The mass exploitation of workers: The division of labor extends throughout the world. In 2011, the employment of foreign affiliates worldwide reached sixty-nine million jobs, up by 8 percent from 2010. Specifically, the total number of employees of the ten largest companies worldwide in 2014 exceeded 9.8 million, which is more than the population of many independent nations.  This international division of labor is a product of monopoly capitalism, seeking to avoid the “law of declining rate of profit” and striving to increase the rate of profit. John Bellamy Foster and John Smith have clearly presented this trend, using archetypical examples of the labor and production associated with iPhones, T-shirts, and coffee, which involve super-exploitation overseas by super-companies. As a result, over the last three decades, an enormous amount of surplus value has been produced in the periphery, but captured by super-companies within monopoly nations. Through the international division of labor and expansion of branches worldwide, super-companies promote alliances in the form of complex cooperation among themselves and between themselves and small- and medium-sized companies. They adopt a “divide and rule” approach to control labor worldwide. These super-companiestake advantage of the economies of scale to increase their market shares and influence. Once they are in place in peripheral countries, they influence habits and traditional customs. Workers re-align themselves to earn a living wage. 3. The symbiotic growth of monopoly nations and super-companies: Both the state and capital rely on each other to exploit existing internal natural resources (e.g., OECD with its oil); control major production resources throughout the world (e.g., the United States in regard to Iraq’s oil, China influence on its neighbors’ sea routes and exclusive economic zone in the East and South China Seas); and possess key technologies, such as weapons, cell cloning, artificial intelligence robots, patent medicine develop, or media and communication. In other words, monopoly nations are the products of “five monopolies.” Super-companies and monopoly nations exert their technological and economic powers to dominant the world market, leading to both positive and negative impacts. Super-companies like capitalists to have control over mass destructive weapons, in order to defeat competitors and to destroy commoners’ benefits. The first and most outstanding monopoly nation is the United States, which has only two companies that reached a turnover in excess of $5 billion in 1955: General Motors ($9.82 billion) and Exxon Mobil ($5.66 billion). However, by 1990, the number of large companies (over $5 billion of turnover) had reached more than 100. In 2013, the smallest company (Exelon: energy sector) of the 132 largest companies had a turnover of $23.5 billion. On a global scale, the company that has the lowest ranking in the top 500 list of largest companies (ranked by Fortune in 2013) is Ricoh (office-equipment sector), reaching sales of over $23.2 billion. Also included in this list are eighty-nine companies from China, which is a rapid increase, compared to its thirty-four companies in 2008. As of 2015, the Global 500 are represented by 36 countries, but nearly 472 of the Global 500 are from only 16 countries: Canada, the United States, France, Germany, Italy, the Netherlands, Switzerland, the United Kingdom, China, Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Australia, Brazil, India, and Russia. Of these 16 countries, 13 are the world’s largest economies. Table 2 lists the typical monopoly nations in the world in 2015. The combining of super-companies and states that Lenin analyzed nearly 100 years ago, in which capitalists pivot around political agencies and monopolies, led to the integration of monopoly nations and international institutions/organizations. Thus, under the conditions of IIMC, this integration has crucially influenced the globalization process of the world economy, specifically for the peripheral countries. Although these monopoly nations dominate at different levels and their income is not equivalent, they do not conquer other nations; nonetheless, they help transfer a vast surplus of value from peripheral countries into the core countries. Monopoly Nations Monopolize International Institutions The rise of super-companies has not meant the end of competition, which is globally more intense today than ever before. Simultaneously, monopoly nations do not displace super-companies or prevent their monopolistic power; on the contrary, these states directly and indirectly provide super-companies with advantages and benefits. As Harry Braverman explained, “the state is guarantor of the conditions, the social relations, of capitalism, and the protector of the ever more unequal distribution of property.” The role of the state has changed in monopoly nations: it not only regulates the domestic economy, exploits the state capital, and protects monopolies on the international market, but it also represents and supports the allies of domestic monopolies to affect the activities of international institutions/organizations in its favor and increase its competitiveness. The role of the state and its various imperial alliances with local politicians is facilitated through the discourse of national and international competitiveness. Thus, the rise of monopoly nations has not killed competition in all of its forms. In fact, rivalry is more frequent and fierce between monopoly nations and other economies. The formation of monopoly nations and the emergence of a number of new industrialized countries have caused problems for individual economies to address and settle the issues related to international economic activities. For example, the legal systems and the legal provisions of nations have become a barrier to the circular flow of resources and limited the mobilities of the supercompanies. These can range from the agricultural protection policies that were severely opposed by the Cairns Group at the Uruguay Round in 1986 (the first time developing countries had played an active role) to the restriction regulations in immigration. They are also associated with cultural or political issues such as Internet censorship in China, Euroscepticism trend in European Union and Brexit in the United Kingdom, the opposition of the Trans-Pacific Partnership (TPP), and new protectionism in the United States. Meanwhile, the international institutions had just proved their consistency in their role of coordination and international arbitration among new member economies in the beginning phase. Subsequently, the competitiveness among countries has moved to a higher level and continued to increase, which manifested itself in many forms such as disputes of commerce, technology, and finance, etc. The recent disputes include: batteries (solar) between the United States and India; beef among the United States, Indo, and Japan; steel pipes between Japan and China; auto parts between the United States and China; catfish, frozen shrimp, and garments between Viet Nam and the United States; and rare earths among the United States, the European Union, Japan, and China. There is a severe conflict among the United States, the European Union, Ukraine, and Russia on the recent issue of annexing Crimea. Since its establishment, the World Trade Organization has witnessed many disputes over dumping, anti-subsidy, and safeguarded trade among member economies. Most of these arguments are related to monopoly nations. The number of quarrels is growing rapidly: over the last twenty years in particular, the World Trade Organization has had to resolve hundreds of cases. Specifically, the United States is a typical monopoly nation that is associated with the majority of the commercial disputes in the world (344 cases), followed by the European Union (316 cases), Japan (180 cases), and China (155 cases). In the context of the multitude of interlocking and complicated disagreements, the dispute settlement mechanism of World Trade Organization constitutes the basic cornerstone maintaining the multilateral trading order. However, monopoly nations have been controlling this mechanism. If there are disputes among the strongest monopoly nations, this makes them direct competitors (these include the United States, Japan, Western Europe, Russia, and China). Thus, monopoly nations tend to compromise and align with others to monopolize the World Trade Organization. Otherwise, super-companies always plan well to avoid a devalued competition. In the case of Ford, Toyota, and the other leading auto firms, the companies did not try to undersell each other in their prices. Instead, they competed for the low-cost position by making reductions in prime production (labor and raw material) costs that could be implemented in peripheral regions. Monopoly nations monopolize not only the World Trade Organization but also other international institutions/organizations or forums, such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and regional banks. Furthermore, monopoly nations monopolize political forums like G-7, the European Union, and even the most powerful United Nations. Monopoly nations also monopolize most other regional organizations, from Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation to the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and most recent the Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank. Below is a list of typical international institutions/organizations and mechanisms that the monopoly nations are monopolizing: • United Nations: Founded in 1945, it was monopolized at its founding by the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. These five members not only have the responsibility to maintain international peace and security in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations but also have the power to veto, thus enabling them to oppose or prevent any proposed resolution of the other members. As a rule, as these five members become stronger, the United Nations is weaker. The weakness of the United Nations is expressed not only in the handling of the South China Sea dispute, but also in events such as Ukraine’s political crisis, the East China Sea quarrels, and its ability to eliminate wars and serious conflicts since the fall of Soviet (31) (32) (33) MR Online | International institutional monopoly capitalism and its manifestations Page 8 of 26 https://mronline.org/2018/12/19/international-institutional-monopoly-capitalism-and-… 07/01/2019 Union, specifically wars for economic purpose. For instance, the U.S. war machine engaged in Afghanistan (2001-14) and Iraq (2003-11); the Russia annexation of Crimea (2014); and the threat of a Chinese war in the South China Sea. The key motivation of the current aggressive and strongest monopoly nations is to gain control over vital strategic resources. • World Bank: Founded in 1944, an international institution was originally dominated by the United States and the United Kingdom. The domination of monopoly nations is evident in the voting rights of the member economies in the World Bank. Of the members, in 2013 the United States had highest voting rights at 17.69 percent, followed by Japan (6.84 percent), China (4.42 percent), Germany (4.00 percent), the United Kingdom (3.75 percent), and France (3.75 percent). • International Monetary Fund: Established in 1944, the International Monetary Fund’s funding is contributed by the member economies. Since its inception, the United States has always been the largest contributor (17.69 percent) and has been dominant through the majority of the voting rights, followed by other members with large holdings in 2010, such as Japan (6.56 percent), Germany (6.12 percent), the United Kingdom (4.51 percent), France (4.51 percent), and China (4.00 percent). • World Trade Organization: The World Trade Organization was established in 1995 to replace the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade that had been in effect since 1948. Its mission is to eliminate or minimize trade barriers to free trade. The majority of its decisions are based on negotiation and consensus. However, the negotiation process does not always reach consensus among all of its members. This process is often criticized by many developing economies because they are not welcome in the negotiations and because, according to Richard Steinberg, the trade negotiations are actually promoted and end at a negotiating position that provides special benefit for the European Union and the United States. The formation of the regional institutions/organizations, the multilateral economic cooperation forums, and bilateral negotiations are an expression of the ever-increasing conflict between the regionalization and globalization processes. Such examples include the conflicts between the European Union and World Trade Organization on agricultural policy; between North American Free Trade Agreement and World Trade Organization on juridical and political issues; and between Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries and World Trade Organization on oil price/supply management. These processes lead to very complicated overlapping and interlocking regional and international organizations because a monopoly nation can be a member of several organizations simultaneously. Thus, these organizations become the direct or indirect means to facilitate the monopoly nations in exploiting other countries. It is inevitable that the activities of powerful international institutions (such as the World Bank, International Monetary Fund, and World Trade Organization) have not really brought equal benefits to all. The IIMC built a complex called the “IMNs-United Nation: Specialized Agencies, International Institutions/Organizations, and Region Organizations” (IMNsInIs). This organization is beyond the scope of previous international institutions. In other words, the IIMC is a combination of the power of super-companies, monopoly nations, and the juridical capacity of the international institutions. Under IIMC, capital globalization has not only strengthened the power of monopoly nations but has simultaneously created the dependence of other states/nations on the world market and finance system, which are dominated by monopoly nations. This relationship among states/ nations reflects the development of monopoly nations at the expense of the peripheral regions. In addition, “IMNs-InIs” is different from “transnational capitalism class – transnational state” structure in quality, in which the former has instrumentalized the latter. In IMNs-InIs, the international organizations have progressively been the “instrumental institutions” in the hands of monopoly nations to favor them and hinder other economies. This is typically the case when the United Nations Security Council members impose sanctions against other nations, trumping any efforts that could weaken their veto power. It is true in how monopoly nations dominate the WTO through the Doha Development Agenda to hinder agricultural economies of peripheral countries. It is evident in how the International Monetary Fund serves wealthy countries but increases poverty and environmental degradation in poor countries. The establishment of the Beijing-based Asian Infrastructure Investment Bank has raised concerns for both the United States and Japan regarding whether the bank will have high standards of governance and safeguards, which will prevent damage to other creditors. The IIMC is the final stage of “state-formed monopoly capitalism,” the new form of capitalist production that maintains the existence of capitalism and adapts it to new historical conditions.

#### The plan’s focus on medicine trades off with a more holistic approach to healthcare – that ensures health inequities while not solving the root of the problem.

Sell and Williams, 20

[Susan K., School of Regulation and Global Governance @ The Australian National University, Political Science @ George Washington University; and Owain D., University of Queensland, Public Health: “Health under capitalism: a global political economy of structural pathogenesis,” Review of International Political Economy, 27:1 (2020), 1-25, DOI: 10.1080/09692290.2019.1659842]//AD

Capitalism and private economic activity have produced new health technologies and medicines over time, while at the same time binding these welcome developments in health to supply via the global market. This has skewed the provision of health care toward an increasingly biomedical and reductive model at the expense of more holistic approaches including social determinants of health (Tseris, 2017). Privileged approaches that focus on biomedicine and silver bullets crowd out population-level health policies that address more comprehensive components of health. Governance constructs these outcomes and is co-produced by the interests in regulation and its capture (Glasgow & Schrecker, 2016).

#### Capitalism causes conflict due to constant demand for resources

McDonald 02 [(Patrick J., Doctor of Philosophy), “The Invisible Hand of Peace: Capitalism, the War Machine, and Liberal International Relations Theory] IC

While classical liberals generally hold that capitalism increases prosperity and expands individual liberty, Marxist scholarship takes a much more negative view of its consequences, particularly with respect to the outbreak of war in the international system. Instead of empowering the pacific elements of society, notably a business class, to restrain the state from pursuing an aggressive foreign policy, Marxist-Leninism locates the origins of war in this capitalist sector. As the capitalist system reproduces itself, greater portions of national wealth concentrate in the hands of a few leading holders of capital. This dominant domestic coalition then translates control over the forces of production into political influence and encourages policies of protectionism and expansionism, by military force if necessary, to acquire new sources of raw materials and cheap labor. More generally called imperialism, such policies culminate in war between those states with the most developed economies—the great powers.5 The classical writers on imperialism, including Luxemburg, Hilferding, Bukharin, and Lenin built on Marx’s concentration on capitalist development within economies to examine how these pressures led to the global integration of economies outside of Western Europe.6 Most of these arguments began from the same dynamic, namely the exploitation of labor by the holders of capital, to explain this expansion. Arguing that wages are set by the costs of subsistence and not labor’s productivity, the owners of capital are able to generate a surplus from this divergence. A contradiction then emerges in such a system. By paying labor subsistence wages, the owners of capital constrain labor’s ability to consume all the goods produced in an economy. Marked by periods of crisis due to underconsumption and limited investment, these pressures translate into a search for foreign outlets for both investment and unsold goods. Many of these Marxist arguments, and those of a liberal, Hobson,7 traced the sources of underconsumption to a series of financial changes across European economies in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Hilferding (1981) noted that as most firms shifted from being owned by single individuals or families to multiple shareholders, the rise of joint stock companies allowed the wealthiest owners of capital to expand their control over smaller investors. Even though the largest capitalists no longer owned all of the capital in a firm, their majority control granted them authority over production decisions. As their ability to control large portions of financial capital increased, they were able to exert greater influence over industrial capital as well. At the center of all these developments, the largest banks actively encouraged the consolidation of industry as a way of minimizing lending risks. While competitive capitalism was marked by a separation between industrial and financial capital, the fusion of these two interests defined monopoly capitalism. Moreover, this centralization tended to feed on itself. Competitive industries were forced to consolidate as a defensive tactic to offset rising costs due to the consolidation in the rest of the domestic economy. The financial sector thus sat at the apex of a domestic economic structure that allowed them to control investment and productive decisions over consolidated industries. This power then translated into political influence and support for a more aggressive foreign policy. To offset declining interest rates due to a surplus of savings and underconsumption in the home economy, the financial sector sought outlets for their excess capital, many times calling on the military power of the state to protect these investments abroad. Because the supply of foreign outlets was finite, the need for military intervention increased as the competition among great powers to divide up the world intensified. Lenin, for example, argued that this competition among the leading capitalist states to secure colonial outlets caused World War I. Moreover, the financial class also encouraged other policies, such as protection, that also intensified conflict among states. While bolstering consolidation by preventing foreign competition in the domestic economy, protection also generated pressures to expand the size of the domestic market through expansion if necessary. While these writers generally agreed that the trend toward consolidation and monopolization within domestic economies would produce international conflict, they disagreed over its inevitability and thus of the direct links between capitalism and war. Instead of ultimately ending in expansion, Hobson argued that state intervention to redistribute income could enhance the purchasing power of labor and reduce the need to seek foreign outlets for the problems of underconsumption. Kautsky (1970) argued that imperialism was not the necessary result of capitalist development but a deliberate policy choice. As the costs of subjugating colonial territories and arms races with other great powers increased, he argued that it would promote opposing domestic interests that could foster a compromise among the leading industrial powers. In this stage of ultraimperialism, capitalists would collude to divide up the rest of the world. Lenin (1993) instead saw this consolidation and drive to seek out new markets as the inevitable product of capitalist development. These dynamics would ultimately end in war that would wipe the slate clean for a socialist revolution.

#### The alternative is to orient political and social struggle toward the communist horizon – this redirection is crucial to redefine the political futures psychoanalytically imagineable– anything less is mere apologism for continued leftist failure

**Dean 12** [Jodi, Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges, *The Communist Horizon*, Verso: Brooklyn, NY, 2012, p. 1-12]

The term "horizon" marks a division. Understood spatially, the horizon is the line dividing the visible, separating earth from sky. Understood temporally, the horizon converges with loss in a metaphor for privation and depletion. The "lost horizon" suggests abandoned projects, prior hopes that have now passed away. Astrophysics offers a thrilling, even uncanny, horizon: the "event horizon" surrounding a black hole. The event horizon is the boundary beyond which events cannot escape. Although "event horizon" denotes the curvature in space/time effected by a singularity, it's not much different from the spatial horizon. Both evoke a fundamental division that we experience as impossible to reach, and that we can neither escape nor cross. I use "horizon" not to recall a forgotten future but to designate a dimension of experience that we can never lose, even if, lost in a fog or focused on our feet, we fail to see it. The horizon is Real in the sense of impossible-we can never reach it-and in the sense of actual (Jacques Lacan's notion of the Real includes both these senses). The horizon shapes our setting. We can lose our bearings, but the horizon is a necessary dimension of our actuality. Whether the effect of a singularity or the meeting of earth and sky, the horizon is the fundamental division establishing where we are. With respect to politics, the horizon that conditions our expe1ience is communism. I get the term "communist horizon" from Bruno Bosteels. In The Actuality of Communism, Bosteels engages with the work of Alvaro Garcia Linera. Garcia Linera ran as Evo Morales's vice presidential ru1ming mate in the Bolivian Movement for Socialism-Political Instrument for the Sovereignty of the Peoples (MAS-IPSP). He is the author of multiple pieces on Marxism, politics, and sociology, at least one of which was written while he served time in prison for promoting an armed uprising (before becoming vice president of Bolivia, he fought in the Tupac Kataii Guerrilla Army). Bosteels quotes Garcia Linera's response to an interviewer's questions about his party's plans following their electoral victim)': "The general horizon of the era is communist."1 Garcia Linera doesn't explain the term. Rather, as Bosteels points out, Garcia Linera invokes the communist horizon "as if it were the most natural thing in the world," as if it were so obvious as to need neither explanation nor justification. He assumes the communist horizon as an ineducible feature of the political setting: "We enter the movement with our expecting and desiring eyes set upon the communist horizon." For Garcia Linera, communism conditions the actuality of politics. Some on the Left dismiss the communist horizon as a lost horizon. For example, in a postmodern pluralist approach that appeals to many on the Left, the economists writing as J. K . Gibson-Graham reject communism, offering "post-capitalism" in its stead. They argue that descriptions of capitalism as a global system miss the rich diversity of practices, relations, and desires constituting yet exceeding the economy and so advocate "reading the economy for difference rather than dominance" (as if dominance neither presupposes nor relies on difference).2 In their view, reading for difference opens up new possibilities for politics as it reveals previously unacknowledged loci of creative action within everyday economic activities. Gibson-Graham do not present Marxism as a failed ideology or communism as the fossilized remainder of an historical expe1iment gone horribly wrong. On the contrary, they draw inspiration from Marx’s appreciation of the social character of labor. They engage Jean-Luc Nancy's emphasis on communism as an idea that is the "index of a task of thought still and increasingly open." They embrace the reclamation of the commons. And they are concerned with neoliberalism's naturalization of the economy as a force exceeding the capacity of people to steer or transform it. Yet at the same time, Gibson-Graham push away from communism to launch their vision of postcapitalism. Communism is that against which they construct their alterative conception of the economy. It's a constitutive force, present as a shaping of the view they advocate. Even as Nancy's evocation of communism serves as a horizon for their thinking, they explicitly jettison the term "communism," which they position as the object of "widespread aversion" and which they associate with the "dangers of posing a positivity, a nonnative representation." Rejecting the positive notion of "communism," they opt for a te1m that suggests an empty relationally to the capitalist system they ostensibly deny, "post-capitalism." For Gibson-Graham, the term "capitalist" is not a term of critique or opprobrium; it's not part of a manifesto. The term is a cause of the political problems facing the contemporary Left. They argue that the discursive dominance of capitalism embeds the Left in paranoia, melancholia, and moralism. Gibson-Graham's view is a specific instance of a general assumption shared by leftists who embrace a generic post-capitalism but eschew a more militant anticapitalism. Instead of actively opposing capitalism, this tendency redirects anticapitalist energies into efforts to open up discussions and find ethical spaces for decision-and this in a world where one bond trader can bring down a bank in a matter of minutes. I take the opposite position. The dominance of capitalism, the capitalist system, is material. Rather than entrapping us in paranoid fantasy, an analysis that treats capitalism as a global system of appropriation, exploitation, and circulation that enriches the few as it dispossesses the many and that has to expend an enormous amount of energy in doing so can anger, incite, and galvanize. Historically, in theory and in practice, critical analysis of capitalist exploitation has been a powerful weapon in collective struggle. It persists as such today, in global acknowledgment of the excesses of neoliberal capitalism. As recently became clear in worldwide rioting, protest, and revolution, linking multiple sites of exploitation to narrow channels of privilege can replace melancholic fatalism with new assertions of will, desire, and collective strength. The problem of the Left hasn't been our adherence to a Marxist critique of capitalism. It's that we have lost sight of the communist horizon, a glimpse of which new political movements are starting to reveal. Sometimes capitalists, conservatives, and liberal democrats use a rhetoric that treats communism as a lost horizon. But usually they keep communism firmly within their sight. They see communism as a threat, twenty years after its ostensible demise. To them, communism is so threatening that they premise political discussion on the repression of the communist alternative. In response to left critiques of democracy for its failure to protect the interests of poor and workingclass people, conservatives and liberals alike scold that "everybody knows" and "history shows" that communism doesn't work. Communism might be a nice ideal, they concede, but it always leads to violent, authoritarian excesses of power. They shift the discussion to communism, trying to establish the limits of reasonable debate. Their critique of communism establishes the political space and condition of democracy. Before the conversation even gets going, liberals, democrats, capitalists, and conservatives unite to block communism from consideration. It's off the table. Those who suspect that the inclusion of liberals and democrats in a set with capitalists and conservatives is illegitimate are probably democrats themselves. To determine whether they belong in the set of those who fear communism, they should consider whether they think any evocation of communism should come with qualifications, apologies, and condemnations of past excesses. If the answer is "yes," then we have a clear indication that liberal democrats, and probably radical democrats as well, still consider communism a threat that must be suppressed-and so they belong in a set with capitalists and conservatives. All are anxious about the forces that communist desire risks unleashing. There are good reasons for liberals, democrats, capitalists, and conservatives to be anxious. Over the last decade a return to communism has re-energized the Left. Communism is again becoming a discourse and vocabulary for the expression of universal, egalitarian, and revolutionary ideals. In March 2009, the Birkbeck Institute for the Humanities hosted a conference entitled "On the Idea of Communism." Initially planned for about 200 people, the conference ultimately attracted over 1 ,200, requiring a spillover room to accommodate those who couldn't fit in the primary auditorium. Since then, multiple conferences-in Paris, Berlin, and New York-and publications have followed, with contributions from such leading scholars as Alain Badiou, Etienne Balibar, Bruno Bosteels, Susan Buck-Morss, Costas Douzinas, Peter Hallward, Michael Hardt, Antonio Neg1i, Jacques Ranciere, Alberto Toscano, and Slavoj Zizek. The conferences and publications consolidate discussions that have been going on for decades. For over thirty years, Antonio Negri has sought to build a new approach to communism out of a Marxism reworked via Spinoza and the Italian political experiments of the 1970s. The Empire trilogy that Negri coauthored with Michael Hardt offers an affirmative, non-dialectical reconceptualization of labor, power, and the State, a new theory of communism from below. Alain Badiou has been occupied with communism for over forty years, from his philosophical and political engagement with Maoism, to his emphasis on the "communist invariants"-egalitarian justice, disciplinary tenor, political volunteerism, and trust in the people-to his recent appeal to the communist Idea. Communism is not a new interest for Slavoj Zizek either. In early 2001 he put together a conference and subsequent volume rethinking Lenin. Where Negri and Badiou reject the Party and the State, Zizek retains a certain fidelity to Lenin. "The key 'Leninist' lesson today," he writes, is that "politics without the organizational form of the Party is politics without politics."4 In short, a vital area of radical philosophy considers communism a contemporary name for emancipation)', egalitarian politics and form part of the communist legacy. These ongoing theoretical discussions overlap with the changing political sequences marked by 1968 and 1989. They also overlap with the spread of neoliberal capitalist domination, a domination accompanied by extremes in economic inequality, ethnic hatred, and police violence, as well as by widespread militancy, insurgency, occupation, and revolution. The current emphasis on communism thus exceeds the coincidence of academic conferences calling specifically for communism's return with the new millennium's debt crises, austerity measures, increased unemployment, and overall sacrifice of the achievements of the modern welfare state to the private interests of financial institutions deemed too big to fail. Already in an interview in 2002, p1ior to his election to the Bolivian presidency, Evo Morales had announced that "the neoliberal system was a failure, and now it's the poor people's turn."·' Communism is reemerging as a magnet of political energy because it is and has been the alterative to capitalism. The communist horizon is not lost. It is Real. In this book, I explore some of the ways the communist horizon manifests itself to us today. As Bosteels argues, to invoke the communist horizon is to produce "a complete shift in perspective or a radical ideological turnabout, as a result of which capitalism no longer appears as the only game in town and we no longer have to be ashamed to set our expecting and desiring eyes here and now on a different organization of social relationships."6 With communism as our horizon, the field of possibilities for revolutionary theory and practice starts to change shape. Barriers to action fall away. New potentials and challenges come to the fore. Anything is possible. Instead of a politics thought primarily in terms of resistance, playful and momentary aesthetic disruptions, the immediate specificity of local projects, and struggles for hegemony within a capitalist parliamentary setting, the communist horizon impresses upon us the necessity to abolish capitalism and to create global practices and institutions of egalitarian cooperation. The shift in perspective the communist horizon produces turns us away from the democratic milieu that has been the form of the loss of communism as a name for left aspiration and toward the reconfiguration of the components of political struggle-in other words, away from general inclusion, momentary calls for broad awareness, and lifestyle changes, and toward militant opposition, tight organizational forms (party, council, working group, cell), and the sovereignty of the people over the economy through which we produce and reproduce ourselves.

#### Our interpretation is that educational spaces should be about political orientations. Any other knowledge is depoliticizing and precludes revolution. We must teach the students to overcome bourgeois consciousness—Divorce learning from its applicability into economic productivity and criticize the aff’s starting point.

Starr 79 (John Bryan, John Bryan Starr has written extensively on China, including Ideology and Culture and Continuing the Revolution. He has taught at the Universities of Yale, California and Dartmouth and was president of both the Yale China Association and the China Institute. | Continuing the Revolution: The Political Thought of Mao, Published 1979.)//tbrooks //LK [RCT 12/17/19]

Mao's first recorded thoughts on the reform of the Chinese education system are found in an article written in 1917 on the subject of physical education. There he saw three aspects to the process of education: the moral, the intellectual, and the physical. He berated the existing school system particularly for its failure to attend to the third of these aspects, arguing that China needed a strong population to salvage itself from its weak position in the world, and that, as they were then constituted, the schools not only failed to contribute to the physical well-being of their students, but they actually undermined that well-being by the demands they placed on the students in their academic work.49 In setting up a university in Yan'an for workers and peasants who had joined the Red Army, Mao enunciated anew his principles of the purpose of an education system: it must instill a correct political orientation, give the students the experience of hard work, and insure their integration with the masses of workers and peasants.50 He elaborated on these principles two decades later in setting forth a series of "principles of educating youth": 1. Teach them to grasp Marxism-Leninism and to overcome petty-bourgeois consciousness. 2. Teach them to have discipline and organization and to oppose anarchism and libertarianism in organization. 3. Teach them to penetrate resolutely into the lower levels of practical work and to oppose looking down on practical experience. 4. Teach them to become close to the workers and peasants, to serve them resolutely, and to oppose the consciousness of looking down on workers and peasants.51 The revolution that sought to break down the existing, institutionalized education system and to reestablish these pedagogical principles touched upon every aspect of the education system: curriculum, faculty, students, and the management of the schools.52 The impulse toward deinstitutionalization was especially clear in Mao's proposals for reform of the curriculum. Courses, he argued, should be made relevant to the practical tasks facing the society as a whole. To insure this relevance, work and study should be combined either by relocating the school in a factory or other workplace, or by constructing productive workshops as adjuncts to the schools.53 Once students have completed their schooling, they should be encouraged, through a regular system of downward transfer (xiaxiang) to apply their newly acquired skills where they are most needed.54 Instructors should themselves take part in practical work at the basic level,55 and should be assisted in the classroom by teams of workers, peasants, and soldiers in order to insure that their instruction remains relevant and politically correct.56 Students are to be recruited from among workers and peasants with practical experience, to avoid the development and perpetuation within the education system of a protoclass consisting of the children of the well-educated and well-placed.57 Finally, pursuant to the principle of self-reliance and in furtherance of the goal of deinstitutionalization, schools should be locally, rather than centrally, managed wherever possible.58 The institutionalization of education—its exclusive relegation to the classroom and its control by professional educators and administrators—was thus opposed by Mao on three analytically distinguishable but related grounds. First, he believed that the institutionalization of education depoliticizes the learning process, whereas he saw the linking of the inculcation of information and skills to the conveying of political principles, techniques, and values as being the only means of resolving the contradiction between red and expert in the political system. Second, the confinement of education to the classroom results, he argued, in a kind of learning that is irremediably divorced from its practical applicability—an outcome that not only causes an estrangement of the education system from the process of economic development, but, more fundamentally, conveys to the student a mistaken sense of the relationship between theory and practice. Finally, the institutionalization of education places, for instructional purposes, the least corrupted members of the society in the hands of the most easily corruptible, hardly a situation designed to solve the problem of embourgeoisement in a socialist society.