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#### COVID-19 is a symptom of the disease that is late-stage capitalism— it represents the intrinsic contradictions that have arisen within capitalist economies and the inevitable collapse.

Waitzkin 21 [Howard Waitzkin is at the Department of Sociology and Health Sciences Center, University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, New Mexico, USA, 2021, International Journal of Health Services, DOI: 10.1177/0020731420977711, 8-22-21 amrita]

The official narrative of COVID-19 states that the pandemic has caused the global capitalist economy to collapse, or at least to enter a deep recession and possibly a great depression, but is that correct? **A more accurate interpretation is that the pandemic has triggered a collapse that was going to happen anyway. For many years, the global capitalist economy has been crisis-ridden, unstable**, and “bubbly...subject to blowups.”1 **In August 2019, the interest yield on a 10-year US Treasury bond fell below that of a twoyear bond.** This inversion, indicating a **marked decline in investors’ confidence in long-term earnings, has preceded every recession since the 1950s.** These and other economic trends led the editors of Monthly Review to predict: “**There is now little doubt that the world economy is on the verge of a recession after a long sluggish recovery from the Great Financial Crisis of 2007– 09**.... In this instance, however, there lurks a bigger fear, the possibility of a financial Armageddon on the level of the Great Financial Crisis of 2008—or worse.”2 Conveniently, **the COVID-19 narrative assigns blame for the economic crash to a virus, taking attention away from the structural contradictions and instabilities that would have led to a crash in any case, as predicted for many months before the pandemic began.** The global capitalist **economy has switched to the expansion of finance capital and away from production of useful goods and services.** Financialization now creates “fictitious capital” such as packages of risk, derivatives, and futures. These fictional financial instruments involve gambles on the future valuation of an imaginary reality that does not correspond to any concrete economic good, service, or property. Global markets in financial instruments therefore become a more elite version of gambling that traditionally takes place in poker games, casinos, and racetracks. Creation of fictitious capital and **accumulation of capital through gambling create a vulnerability to burst financial bubbles and crashes like that of 2008.** That particular crash derived from the collapse of collateralized loan obligations: financial instruments that bundled housing loans for investment in global financial markets. **As the COVID-19 pandemic worsened, large investors spurred the rapid decline in prices of stocks and fictional financial instruments, as they rapidly sold off holdings that had become overvalued.** Later, **global stock markets have become more volatile while economic recession has deepened, throwing millions of people into unemployment, housing insecurity, and hunger. Blaming a virus for the crash mystifies the economic contradictions actually responsible for the abrupt end of the latest capitalist bubble**.3

#### The affirmative invests within capitalism in two way. First, is false liberalism. The plan is representative of the idea that capitalism can be saved- eliminating “intellectual property protections” is a scheme that aims to increase market competition for the purpose of profit.

Gilbert 19 [Geoff Gilbert is a Professor of Law in the School of Law and Human Rights Centre at the University of Essex. He was Head of Department between 2000-2003 and 2011-13. In 2012, he was appointed a Professorial Visiting Fellow at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. He was Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Refugee Law from 2002-15 and is co-Editor-in-Chief as of September 2019; he also sits on the Advisory Board., “Free trade” is today’s imperialism by the 1 percent, 1-13-2019,No Publication,https://www.bilaterals.org/?free-trade-is-today-s-imperialism, 8-21-2021 amrita]

As Lawrence Summers, economic adviser to the Clinton and Obama administrations, points out, the GATT/WTO free trade regime has been so successful that today’s free trade agreements aren’t even about the traditional obstacles to free trade, as these obstacles are already effectively eliminated in most countries. **Instead, today’s agreements involve protecting the property rights (especially the intellectual property rights) of multinationals and harmonizing the regulatory regimes across countries with which multinationals must comply. In other words, today’s free trade agreements are about enforcing the unequal economic relationships that global North corporations have continued to enjoy since the times of colonialism. The most egregious example of global North countries using the WTO to codify their colonial unequal economic relationships is the Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPs), an agreement that is part of the WTO. TRIPs extend patent, copyright and trademark protections to all WTO members — effectively the entire world economy.** However, **the global North is a net intellectual property producer and the global South is a net intellectual property consumer. TRIPs’ intellectual property protections extend to goods like pharmaceuticals**, digital technology hardware and software, and most art and media entertainment**. Intellectual property protections allow the global North corporations that own the patents, copyrights and trademarks for these products to maintain monopoly control over them. Global North corporations can charge high prices for pharmaceuticals and digital technology to global South consumers, transferring wealth to global North corporations. Further, intellectual property protections make it impossible for global South corporations to compete with global North corporations to produce these goods, meaning that global North corporations can continue to monopolize the profits**. Since the post-WWII restructuring of the international economy, global South countries have needed to find capital to develop their own industries. **The GATT/WTO free trade framework bars global South countries from creating policies that can help their own industries develop their own surplus capital, as described above, so global South countries have resorted to borrowing money from the financial sector**. The IMF and the World Bank have promoted and subsidized global North banks lending to global South countries, and have only made capital available to global South countries if they accept the conditions of the North’s free trade policies, as well as privatization of any state-owned businesses and deregulation of their economies. **Through the work of GATT/WTO, the IMF and the World Bank, global South governments and corporations have been kept in the unequal economic position developed during colonialism.** As Vijay Prashad explains, US and Western militaries have also helped to expand free trade throughout the world by supporting military dictators and military coups throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America. **This economic and military violence is the visible hand the global North governments and corporations have used to concentrate the world’s wealth**. This visible hand explains how global North, and especially US, corporations continue to own and control a disproportionate amount of the most profitable industries in the global economy.

#### Trips waivers may seem docile but are a *calculated risk* to remedy liberalism’s terminal collapse.

[Patanè, Andrea. COVID-19 Pandemic: Patents and Profits, 15 May 2021, [www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm.]//nagisatm](http://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm.%5d//nagisatm)
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A “calculated risk” Far from an act of ‘international solidarity', [Vaccine Waivers] 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.

#### Second is WTO legitimacy. The plan is a colonialist revision that re-packages the WTO as a legitimate organization that can overcome its insidious past towards a future of equal free trade—that decks class consciousness.

Gilbert 19 [Geoff Gilbert is a Professor of Law in the School of Law and Human Rights Centre at the University of Essex. He was Head of Department between 2000-2003 and 2011-13. In 2012, he was appointed a Professorial Visiting Fellow at the University of New South Wales in Sydney. He was Editor-in-Chief of the International Journal of Refugee Law from 2002-15 and is co-Editor-in-Chief as of September 2019; he also sits on the Advisory Board., “Free trade” is today’s imperialism by the 1 percent, 1-13-2019,No Publication,https://www.bilaterals.org/?free-trade-is-today-s-imperialism, 8-21-2021 amrita]

Free Trade Imperialism: **Continuing the Unequal Trade of Colonialism With mass global South resistance to colonialism increasing in the early 1900s and intensifying in the aftermath of the world wars, global North corporations and governments no longer needed colonialism.** From their perspective, moving toward the international economic model that would become free trade was much more cost-effective. As the US sociologist Johanna Bockman writes of US government and business elites in the aftermath of the second world war, **“[They] supported neither free trade nor globalization imagined as a level playing field with flows moving evenly around the globe. Instead, they supported the international neocolonial system through the [General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT)], while using the rhetoric of free trade and modernization to support US national interests.”** Roughly 70 years after the global North created the post-second world war international order, global North corporations continue to own and control a disproportionate amount of the most profitable industries in the global economy. Though many US commentators warn of the rise of Brazil, Russia, India and China, US corporations, in 2013, still had leading positions in 18 of the 25 most profitable industries. Moreover**, US corporations are dominant in the most profitable advanced industries, including banking and financial services, aerospace and defense, chemicals, computer hardware and software, insurance, pharmaceuticals, heavy machinery, and oil and gas.** While the US has roughly 5 percent of the world’s population and 25 percent of the global share of gross domestic product, US corporations likely control far more than 25 percent of the profit-producing capital in the world. **These profits are concentrated among the shareholders of multinationals incorporated in the US, which, according to one estimate, are at least 85 percent owned by US citizens. These profits are not being shared with vast majority of people in the world, most of whom do not own any wealth, let alone shares in corporations.** Global North and US multinational dominance of the world economy is not an accident, as global North governments and multinationals have used the international institutions they created following the second world war to continue to dominate the world economy. **These institutions include the United Nations; the GATT, which has since become the World Trade Organization (WTO); the International Monetary Fund (IMF); and the World Bank. The WTO is the main international institution that makes and enforces trade policies. The core GATT/WTO principles are “non-discrimination” and “national treatment.**” Non-discrimination means that countries will not use their trade policies to discriminate between goods that are produced in different foreign countries. National treatment means that countries will not use their trade policies to favor products produced in their own country over products produced in any other country. As described above, global North countries used their trade policies to promote the products of the corporations based in their countries for centuries. **The free trade principles of non-discrimination and national treatment deny the ability of any country to use those same policies today. This allows global North corporations to ensure that global South governments will not create policies that can help their own corporations develop the wealth they need to compete**. **Additionally, since the GATT/WTO free trade framework facilitates continued global North corporate control over advanced industries, global North corporations are far more likely to develop the high-tech industries of the future, as they own the profits from today’s advanced industries which they can invest in research and development.**

#### Capitalism will, without a doubt, cause us to die by climate change

Foster 18 [John Bellamy Foster, John Bellamy Foster is a professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and also editor of Monthly Review. He writes about political economy of capitalism and economic crisis, ecology and ecological crisis, and Marxist theory. “Making War on the Planet.” Monthly Review. September 1, 2018. <https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/> recut 8-22-2021 amrita]

A short fuse is burning. At the present rate of global emissions, the world is projected to reach the trillionth metric ton of cumulative carbon emissions, breaking the global carbon budget, in less than two decades.[1](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en1) This would usher in a period of dangerous climate change that could well prove irreversible, affecting the climate for centuries if not millennia. Even if the entire world economy were to cease emitting carbon dioxide at the present moment, the extra carbon already accumulated in the atmosphere virtually guarantees that climate change will continue with damaging effects to the human species and life in general. However, reaching the 2°C increase in global average temperature guardrail, associated with a level of carbon concentration in the environment of 450 ppm, would lead to a qualitatively different condition. At that point, climate feedbacks would increasingly come into play threatening to catapult global average temperatures to 3°C or 4°C above preindustrial levels within this century, in the lifetime of many individuals alive today. The situation is only made more serious by the emission of other greenhouse gases, including methane and nitrous oxide. The enormous dangers that rapid climate change present to humanity as a whole, and the inability of the existing capitalist political-economic structure to address them, symbolized by the presence of Donald Trump in the White House, have engendered a desperate search for technofixes in the form of schemes for geoengineering, defined as massive, deliberate human interventions to manipulate the entire climate or the planet as a whole. Not only is geoengineering now being enthusiastically pushed by today’s billionaire class, as represented by figures like Bill Gates and Richard Branson; by environmental organizations such as the Environmental Defense Fund and the Natural Resources Defense Council; by think tanks like the Breakthrough Institute and Climate Code Red; and by fossil-fuel corporations like Exxon Mobil and Shell—it is also being actively pursued by the governments of the United States, the United Kingdom, China, and Russia. The UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has incorporated negative emissions strategies based on geoengineering (in the form of Bio-energy with Carbon Capture and Storage, or BECCS) into nearly all of its climate models. Even some figures on the political left (where “accelerationist” ideas have recently taken hold in some quarters) have grabbed uncritically onto geoengineering as a deus ex machina—a way of defending an ecomodernist economic and technological strategy—as witnessed by a number of contributions to Jacobin magazine’s Summer 2017 Earth, Wind, and Fire issue.[2](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en2) If the Earth System is to avoid 450 ppm of carbon concentration in the atmosphere and is to return to the Holocene average of 350 ppm, some negative emissions by technological means, and hence geoengineering on at least a limited scale, will be required, according to leading climatologist James Hansen.[3](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en3) Hansen’s strategy, however, like most others, remains based on the current system, that is, it excludes the possibility of a full-scale ecological revolution, involving the self-mobilization of the population around production and consumption. What remains certain is that any attempt to implement geoengineering (even in the form of technological schemes for carbon removal) as the dominant strategy for addressing global warming, subordinated to the ends of capital accumulation, would prove fatal to humanity. The costs of such action, the burden it would put on future generations, and the dangers to living species, including our own, are so great that the only rational course is a long ecological revolution aimed at the most rapid possible reduction in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions, coupled with an emphasis on agroecology and restoration of global ecosystems, including forests, to absorb carbon dioxide.[4](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en4) This would need to be accompanied by a far-reaching reconstitution of society at large, aimed at the reinstitution on a higher level of collective and egalitarian practices that were undermined by the rise of capitalism. Geoengineering the Planet Under the Regime of Fossil Capital Geoengineering as an idea dates back to the period of the first discoveries of rapid anthropogenic climate change. Beginning in the early 1960s, the Soviet Union’s (and at that time the world’s) leading climatologist, Mikhail Budyko, was the first to issue a number of warnings on the inevitably of accelerated global climate change in the case of industrial systems based on the burning of fossil fuels.[5](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en5) Although anthropogenic climate change had long been recognized, what was new was the discovery of major climate feedbacks such as the melting of Arctic ice and the disruption of the albedo effect as reflective white ice was replaced with blue seawater, increasing the amount of solar radiation absorbed by the planet and ratcheting up global average temperature. In 1974, Budyko offered, as a possible solution to climate change, the use of high-flying planes to release sulfur particles (forming sulfate aerosols) into the stratosphere. This was meant to mimic the role played by volcanic action in propelling sulfur into the atmosphere, thus creating a partial barrier, limiting incoming solar radiation. **The rationale he offered was that capitalist economies, in particular, would not be able to curtail capital-accumulation-based growth, energy use, and emissions, despite the danger to the climate**.[6](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en6) Consequently, technological alternatives to stabilize the climate would have to be explored. But it was not until 1977 when the Italian physicist Cesare Marchetti proposed a scheme for capturing carbon dioxide emissions from electrical power plants and using pipes to sequester them in the ocean depths that the word “geoengineering” itself was to appear.[7](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en7) Budyko’s pioneering proposal to use sulfur particles to block a part of the sun’s rays, now known as “stratospheric aerosol injection,” and Marchetti’s early notion of capturing and sequestering carbon in the ocean, stand for the two main general approaches to geoengineering—respectively, solar radiation management (SRM) and carbon dioxide removal (CDR). SRM is designed to limit the solar radiation reaching the earth. CDR seeks to capture and remove carbon to decrease the amount entering the atmosphere. Besides stratospheric aerosol injection, first proposed by Budyko, another approach to SRM that has gained influential adherents in recent years is marine cloud brightening. This would involve cooling the earth by modifying low-lying, stratocumulus clouds covering around a third of the ocean, making them more reflective. In the standard scenario, a special fleet of 1,500 unmanned, satellite-controlled ships would roam the ocean spraying submicron drops of seawater in the air, which would evaporate leaving salty residues. These bright salt particles would reflect incoming solar radiation. They would also act as cloud condensation nuclei, increasing the surface area of the clouds, with the result that more solar radiation would be reflected. Both stratospheric aerosol injection and marine cloud brightening are widely criticized as posing enormous hazards on top of climate change itself, while simply addressing the symptoms not the cause of climate change. Stratospheric aerosol injection—to be delivered to the stratosphere by means of hoses, cannons, balloons, or planes—would alter the global hydrological cycle with enormous unpredictable effects, likely leading to massive droughts in major regions of the planet. It is feared that it could shut down the Indian monsoon system disrupting agriculture for as many as 2 billion people.[8](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en8) There are also worries that it might affect photosynthesis and crop production over much of the globe.[9](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en9) The injection of sulfur particles into the atmosphere could contribute to depletion of the ozone layer.[10](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en10) Much of the extra sulfur would end up dropping to the earth, leading to acid rain.[11](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en11) **Most worrisome of all, stratospheric aerosol injection would have to be repeated year after year. At termination the rise in temperature associated with additional carbon buildup would come almost at once with world temperature conceivably rising by 2–3°C in a decade—a phenomenon referred to as the “termination problem.”**[12](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en12) As with stratospheric aerosol injection, **marine cloud brightening would drastically affect the hydrological cycle in unpredictable ways**. For example, it could generate a severe drought in the Amazon, drying up the world’s most vital terrestrial ecosystem with incalculable and catastrophic effects for Earth System stability.[13](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en13) Many of the dangers of cloud brightening are similar to those of stratospheric aerosol depletion. Like other forms of SRM, it would do nothing to stop ocean acidification caused by rising carbon dioxide levels. The first form of CDR to attract significant attention from economic interests and investors was the idea of fertilizing the ocean with iron, thereby boosting the growth of phytoplankton so as to promote greater ocean uptake of carbon. There have been a dozen experiments in this area and the difficulties attending this scheme have proven to be legion. The effects on the ecological cycles of phytoplankton, zooplankton, and a host of other marine species all the way up to whales at the top of the food chain are indeterminate. Although some parts of the ocean would become greener due to the additional iron, other parts would become bluer, more devoid of life, because they would be deprived of the nutrients—nitrate, phosphorus, and silica—needed for growth.[14](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en14) Evidence suggests that the vast portion of the carbon taken in by the ocean would stay on the surface or the intermediate levels of the ocean, with only a tiny part entering the ocean depths, where it would be naturally sequestered.[15](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en15) Among the various CDR schemas, it is BECCS, because of its promise of negative emissions, which today is attracting the most support. This is because it seems to allow nations to overshoot climate targets on the basis that the carbon can be removed from the atmosphere decades later. Although BECCS exists at present largely as an untested computer model, it is now incorporated into almost all climate models utilized by the IPCC.[16](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en16) As modeled, **BECCS would burn cultivated crops in order to generate electricity, with the capture and underground storage of the resulting carbon dioxide. In theory, since plant crops can be seen as carbon neutral—taking carbon dioxide from the atmosphere and then eventually releasing it again—BECCS, by burning biomass and then capturing and sequestering the resulting carbon emissions, would be a means of generating electricity while at the same time resulting in a net reduction of atmospheric carbon. BECCS, however, comes into question the moment one moves from the abstract to the concrete.** The IPCC’s median-level models are projected to remove 630 gigatons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere, around two thirds of the total emitted between the Industrial Revolution and 2011.[17](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en17) This would occur on vast crop plantations to be run by agribusiness. **To remove a trillion tons of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere as envisioned in the more ambitious scenarios would take up a land twice the size of India (or equal to Australia), about half as much land as currently farmed globally, requiring a supply of freshwater equal to current total global agricultural usage.**[18](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en18) The costs of implementing BECCS on the imagined scales have been estimated by climatologist James Hansen—who critically notes that negative emissions have “spread like a cancer” in the IPCC climate models—to be on the order of hundreds of trillions of dollars, with “minimal estimated costs” ranging as high as $570 trillion this century.[19](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en19) The effects of BECCS—used as a primary mechanism and designed to avoid confrontation with the present system of production—would therefore be a massive displacement of small farmers and global food production. Moreover, the notion that the forms of large-scale, commercial agricultural production presumed in BECCS models would be carbon neutral and would thus result in negative emissions with sequestration has been shown to be exaggerated or false when the larger effects on global land use are taken into account. BECCS crop cultivation is expected to take place on vast monoculture plantations, displacing other forms of land use. Yet, biologically diverse ecosystems have substantially higher rates of carbon sequestration in soil and biomass than does monocrop agriculture.[20](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en20) An alternative to BECCS in promoting carbon sequestration would be to promote massive, planetary ecological restoration, including reforestation, together with the promotion of agroecology modeled on traditional forms of agriculture organized around nutrient recycling and improved soil management methods.[21](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en21)This would avoid the metabolic rift associated with agribusiness monocultures, which are less efficient both in terms of food production per hectare and carbon sequestration. Another commonly advocated technofix, carbon capture and sequestration (CCS), is not strictly a form of geoengineering since it is directed at capturing and sequestering carbon emissions of particular electrical plants, such as coal-fired power plants. However, **the promotion of a CCS infrastructure on a planetary scale as a means of addressing climate change—thereby skirting the necessity of an ecological revolution in production and consumption—is best seen as a form of planetary geoengineering due to its immense projected economic and ecological scale**. Although CCS would theoretically allow the burning of fossil fuels from electrical power plants with no carbon emissions into the atmosphere, **the scale and the costs of CCS operations are prohibitive.** As Clive Hamilton writes in Earthmasters: The Dawn of the Age of Climate Engineering, CCS for a single “standard-sized 1,000 megawatt coal-fired plant….would need 30 kilometers of air-sucking machinery and six chemical plants, with a footprint of 6 square kilometers.”[22](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en22) Energy expert Vaclav Smil has calculated that, “in order to sequester just a fifth of current [2010] CO2 emissions we would have to create an entirely new worldwide absorption-gathering-compression-transportation-storage industry whose annual throughput would have to be about 70 percent larger than the annual volume now handled by the global crude oil industry, whose immense infrastructure of wells, pipelines, compressor stations and storage took generations to build.”[23](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en23) **Capturing and sequestering current U.S. carbon dioxide emissions would require 130 billion tons of water per year, equal to about half the annual flow of the Columbia River. This new gigantic infrastructure would be placed on top of the current fossil fuel infrastructure—all in order to allow for the continued burning of fossil fuels**.[24](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en24) A Planetary Precautionary Principle for the Anthropocene If today’s planetary ecological emergency is a product of centuries of war on the planet as a mechanism of capital accumulation, fossil-capital generated geoengineering schemes can be seen as gargantuan projects for keeping the system going by carrying this war to its ultimate level. Geoengineering under the present regime of accumulation has the sole objective of keeping the status quo intact—neither disturbing the dominant relations of capitalist production nor even seeking so much as to overturn the fossil-fuel industry with which capital is deeply intertwined. Profits, production, and overcoming energy poverty in the poorer parts of the world thus become justifications for keeping the present fossil-capital system going, maintaining at all cost the existing capitalist environmental regime. The Promethean mentality behind this is well captured by a question that Rex Tillerson then CEO of Exxon Mobil Corporation asked—without a trace of irony—at an annual shareholders meeting in 2013: “What good is it to save the planet if humanity suffers?”[25](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en25) The whole history of ecological crisis leading up the present planetary emergency, punctuated by numerous disasters—from the near total destruction of the ozone layer, to nutrient loading and the spread of dead zones in the ocean, to climate change itself—serves to highlight the march of folly associated with any attempt to engineer the entire planet. The complexity of the Earth System guarantees that enormous unforeseen consequences would emerge. As Frederick Engels warned in the nineteenth century, “Let us not…flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first.”[26](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en26) In the face of uncertainty, coupled with an extremely high likelihood of inflicting incalculable harm on the Earth System, it is essential to invoke what is known as the Precautionary Principle whenever the question of planetary geoengineering is raised. As ecological economist Paul Burkett has explained, the strong version of the Precautionary Principle, necessarily encompasses the following: (1) The Precautionary Principle Proper, which says that if an action may cause serious harm, there is a case for counteracting measures to ensure that the action does not take place. (2) The Principle of Reverse Onus, under which it is the responsibility of those supporting an action to show that it is not seriously harmful, thereby shifting the burden of proof off those potentially harmed by the action (e.g. the general population and other species occupying the environment). In short, it is safety, rather than potential harm, that needs to be demonstrated. (3) The Principle of Alternative Assessment, stipulating that no potentially harmful action will be undertaken if there are alternative actions available that safely achieve the same goals as the action proposed. (4) All societal deliberations bearing on the application of features 1 through 3 must be open, informed, and democratic, and must include all affected parties.[27](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en27) It is clear that geoengineering promoted in a context of a capitalist regime of maximum accumulation would be ruled out completely by a strong Precautionary Principle based on each of the criteria listed above. There is a near certainty of extreme damage to the human species as a whole arising from all of the major geoengineering proposals. If the onus were placed on status quo proponents of capitalist geoengineering to demonstrate that great harm to the planet as a place of human habitation would not be inflicted, such proposals would fail the test. Since the alternative of not burning fossil fuels and promoting alternative forms of energy is entirely feasible, while planetary geoengineering carries with it immense added dangers for the Earth System as a whole, such a technofix as a primary means of checking global warming would be excluded by that criterion, too. Finally, geoengineering under the present economic and social system invariably involves some entity from the power structure—a single multi-billionaire, a corporation, a government, or an international organization—implementing such action ostensibly on behalf of humanity as a whole, while leaving most affected parties worldwide out of the decision-making process, with hundreds of millions, perhaps billions, of people paying the environmental costs, often with their lives. In short, geoengineering, particularly if subordinated to the capital accumulation process, violates the most sacred version of the Precautionary Principle, dating back to antiquity: First Do No Harm. Eco-Revolution as the Only Alternative As an extension of the current war on the planet, a regime of climate geoengineering designed to keep the present mode of production going is sharply opposed to the view enunciated by Barry Commoner in 1992 in Making Peace with the Planet, where he wrote: “If the environment is polluted and the economy is sick, the virus that causes both will be found in the system of production.”[28](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en28) There can be no doubt today that it is the present mode of production, particularly the system of fossil capital, that needs to change on a global scale. In order to stop climate change, the world economy must quickly shift to zero net carbon dioxide emissions. This is well within reach with a concerted effort by human society as a whole utilizing already existing sustainable technological means—particularly when coupled with necessary changes in social organization to reduce the colossal waste of resources and lives that is built into the current alienated system of production. Such changes could not simply be implemented from the top by elites, but rather would require the self-mobilization of the population, inspired by the revolutionary actions of youth aimed at egalitarian, ecological, collective, and socialized solutions—recognizing that it is the world that they will inherit that is most at stake. Today’s necessary ecological revolution would include for starters: (1) an emergency moratorium on economic growth in the rich countries coupled with downward redistribution of income and wealth; (2) radical reductions in greenhouse gas emissions; (3) rapid phase-out of the entire fossil fuel energy structure; (4) substitution of an alternative energy infrastructure based on sustainable alternatives such as solar and wind power and rooted in local control; (5) massive cuts in military spending with the freed-up economic surplus to be used for ecological conversion; (6) promotion of circular economies and zero-waste systems to decrease the throughput of energy and resources; (7) building effective public transportation, together with measures to decrease dependence on the private automobile; (8) restoration of global ecosystems in line with local, including indigenous, communities; (9) transformation of destructive, energy-and chemical-intensive agribusiness-monocultural production into agroecology, based on sustainable small farms and peasant cultivation with their greater productivity of food per acre; (10) institution of strong controls on the emission of toxic chemicals; (11) prohibition of the privatization of freshwater resources; (12) imposition of strong, human-community-based management of the ocean commons geared to sustainability; (13) institution of dramatic new measures to protect endangered species; (14) strict limits imposed on excessive and destructive consumer marketing by corporations; (15) reorganization of production to break down current commodity chains geared to rapacious accumulation and the philosophy of après moi le déluge; and (16) the development of more rational, equitable, less wasteful, and more collective forms of production.[29](https://monthlyreview.org/2018/09/01/making-war-on-the-planet/#en29) Priority in such an eco-revolution would need to be given to the fastest imaginable elimination of fossil fuel emissions, but this would in turn require fundamental changes in the human relationship to the earth and in the relationship of human beings to each other. A new emphasis would have to be placed on sustainable human development and the creation of an organic system of social metabolic reproduction. Centuries of exploitation and expropriation, including divisions on the basis of class, gender, race, and ethnicity, would have to be transcended. The historical logic posed by current conditions thus points to the necessity of a long ecological revolution, putting into place a new system of sustainable human development aimed at addressing the totality of needs of human beings as both natural and social beings: what is now called ecosocialism.

#### Endorse a dictatorship of the proletariat. Global capitalism’s inequities can only be fully purged once its intrinsic contradictions expose themselves and allow for the collapse of the bourgeoisie state. A dictatorship is required to solidify our transition to communism and is why you should reject any perm that attempts to preserve the state apparatus.

Revolution 73 Proletarian Dictatorship Vs. Bourgeois “Democracy”; Encyclopedia of Anti-Revisionism On-Line; Revolution; May 1973; Edited by Paul Saba; <https://www.marxists.org/history/erol/ncm-1/pd-v-bd.htm>; CE

This situation can only be reversed by socialist revolution to overthrow capitalist rule. The first task of this revolution is to smash the power of the bourgeois state through the armed might of the workers and their allies. The bourgeoisie and its armed forces are disarmed. The political structure and the courts and bureaucracies of the bourgeois state–and all its rules and regulations aimed at enslaving the people–are abolished. Once in power the working class moves to socialize the ownership of the means of production-making them the common property of society–to resolve the basic contradiction of capitalism, to break down the obstacles capitalism puts in the way of progress, and makes possible the rapid development of society. Socialism is a higher form of society than capitalism, and is bound to replace it all over the world, just as capitalism replaced the feudal system of landlords and serfs. In the process of socialist revolution the working class and its allies builds up their own state machine, the dictatorship of the proletariat. Workers are armed and organized into people’s militias and armed forces. The capitalists and their enforcers are punished for their crimes against the people. This dictatorship imposed by the working class on the former exploiters and over new capitalist elements who arise under socialism is absolutely necessary in order to crush their resistance and prevent them from wrecking socialism and restoring their rule. Although this country’s capitalists like to point to the Soviet Union today and say, “This is what communism means,” the dictatorship of the proletariat is not what exists in the Soviet Union today. The working class was once in power in the Soviet Union and was building a powerful socialist society which was the bright hope of workers around the world. But the capitalist class was able to stage a comeback, when a new bourgeoisie seized power in the mid-’50s and turned the Soviet Union back from a socialist country to a capitalist country. Today the Soviet Union, as well as Cuba and most Eastern European countries under its thumb, are examples of bourgeois dictatorships. They disguise themselves as socialist countries where the working class rules, but in reality a new capitalist class rules and enforces its strict dictatorship over the working class. The dramatic events in China since the death of Mao Tsetung and the arrest of those most closely associated with him are signs of the fact that a new bourgeoisie has seized the reins in China and is attempting to steer this country, too, down the capitalist road. The dictatorship of the proletariat is qualitatively different from the bourgeois state that exists in the U.S. and the Soviet Union and other capitalist countries. Its purpose is not to enforce exploitation and the rule of a tiny minority. The proletarian state for the first time in history means the rule of the majority, the working class, allied with all of the oppressed. At the same time that there is a dictatorship over the former capitalist exploiters there is the unparalleled extension of real democracy for those oppressed by capitalism–the working people. The proletarian state is a million times more democratic than even the most democratic capitalist state. No longer do a handful of parasites run society for their own private profit and the working class sets out to transform all of society. To accomplish this the government is set up and run by workers, and the press, television stations, schools, etc., which the capitalists use to mold public opinion and shore up their rule, are stripped from them and become the common property of the working class and the masses of people. Since the working class and the socialist society built under its leadership represent the interests of the great majority of society, the workers openly proclaim their rule and openly dictate to their former exploiters and tormentors. The rule of the working class cannot be exercised by deceiving the masses of people, but only by their active involvement in every part of the political life of society and raising their political consciousness. But socialism is not a Utopia. It replaces capitalism, but cannot do away in one stroke with the inequalities, the old selfish ideas and the remnants of capitalism. Socialism itself is only the lower stage and transition to a still higher form of society, communism, where there will no longer be any classes, and, therefore, there will no longer be any need for the dictatorship of the proletariat. During this entire transition period, the working class must maintain and strengthen its rule over the former exploiters and the new bourgeois elements that arise under socialism, prevent them from subverting the new society and restoring the old, and overcome the remaining influences of their dog-eat-dog, “look out for number one” philosophy. When everyone in society can share equally in mental and manual work, in producing goods and services and managing the affairs of society; when the outlook of the working class, putting the common good above narrow, individual interests, has become “second nature” to members of society; when goods and services can be produced so abundantly that money is no longer needed to exchange them and they can be distributed to people solely according to their needs; then society will have reached the stage of communism. Classes will have been completely eliminated, and the state as such will be replaced by the common administration of society by all its members. As this happens, throughout the world, mankind will have scaled a great mountain and will look out on a whole new horizon. The experience of the socialist countries, the Soviet Union under the leadership of Lenin and Stalin and the People’s Republic of China during the lifetime of Mao Tsetung, has shown that the working class can overthrow the exploiters and run society in the interests of the masses of people. The fact that the rule of the working class was overthrown in the Soviet Union and now temporarily in China also shows how stubborn the class struggle is under socialism and the need for the proletarian dictatorship to be maintained. Communism will show that the people can do away completely and forever with the institutions and influences of capitalism and all other forms of class society. Karl Marx, founder of communist philosophy and of the revolutionary workers movement, wrote, “The existence of classes is only bound up with particular phases in the development of production . . . the class struggle necessarily leads to the dictatorship of the proletariat. . . [and] this dictatorship itself only constitutes the transition to the abolition of classes and to a classless society. ”

#### We allow for innovation but better—our Marxist dictatorship still provides the incentive for innovating without the profit and productivity based mindset that pushes us to overconsumption and death.

Nieto 20 [Nieto, Maxi & Mateo Tomé, Juan. Maxi Nieto is a doctoral candidate at Universidad Miguel Hernández de Elche. Juan Mateo Tome is a professor at Complutense University of Madrid (2020). Dynamic Efficiency in a Planned Economy: Innovation and Entrepreneurship Without Markets. Science & Society. 84. 42-66. 10.1521/siso.2020.84.1.42. 8-28-2021 amrita]

4. Innovation and Entrepreneurship in a Planned Economy 4.1. Innovation and social property. **Innovation occurs as a result of a long and complex accumulation process of knowledge and creativity, where very rarely is a single individual solely responsible. This is an essentially social process in which a plurality of actors and institutions contribute in very different spheres and circumstances.** The Austrian School presents an idealized image of innovation in capitalist economies, attributing it exclusively to the figure of the enterprising entrepreneur — whether in a disruptive sense (Schumpeter), or in a strictly coordinating sense (Kirzner). In fact, the entrepreneurial function develops within specific institutional frameworks and organized structures, both at the micro and macro levels. In this sense, **a socialist economy has significant advantages for developing technological and business innovation, as opposed to a capitalist economy: i) socialism allows for greater and more efficient allocation of resources to R&D&I activities, thanks to centralized control of the surplus and the absence of sumptuous consumption and a rentier population; ii) there are no obstacles (property rights) to the free dissemination of new products and techniques; iii) the equal distribution of resources (which guarantees that no basic needs go unmet) allows for discovery and fuller development of talent, which likewise occurs when work is undertaken through tasks that are more balanced for the majority and less routine; iv) in allocating investment, more information is available and the criteria are more varied than mere expectation of profit; v) social ownership is more inclusive and participatory than capitalist enterprise in terms of generating and mobilizing knowledge (tacit or not) and encouraging innovation; vi) socialism does not impose short-term innovation cycles looking to generate products that can be commercialized in, say, four to six months, as is typical in capitalist economies.** Under these favorable general conditions, the development of innovation in a socialist economy would unfold in three fundamental areas: G4774.indd 59 11/26/2019 10:34:47 AM 60 SCIENCE & SOCIETY i) **Strategic planning: this traces the main lines of scientific, technological, and innovation research**. Here would enter programs for the development of new technologies and infrastructures, as well as visionary projects that explore eventualities and future scenarios. This sort of research is carried out in universities, scientific academies, technological institutes, and other specialized centers in coordination with the business world. The process would consist in testing different alternative productive projects or techniques in order to verify results, in connection with the companies and sectors being served. ii) **Companies: research, design, and innovation departments**. iii) **Business entrepreneurship: individuals and teams put forward proposals in hopes of securing financing.** For any of these three areas, material incentives would exist that reward the degree to which the freely programmed objectives are achieved, in addition to purely social or moral incentives such as social recognition or professional and personal fulfilment. In the next section, we focus on how socialist entrepreneurship — something that the Austrian School considers impossible — would ostensibly work.

#### The aff must defend their epistemic orientation and not just the causal consequences of the plan:

#### Interrogation DA: A dissection of the aff at the level of scholarship is crucial to ensure that capitalist and reactionary logics are not being reproduced in the debate space.

#### Movement DA: Anti-capitalist discussion is crucial to un-indoctrinate people from the hold of capitol. Movement building starts inside the classroom.

## Case

#### No Solvency – reducing IP doesn’t solve for distribution or manufacturing.

**Moore 5/4** [Anne Moore, 5-4-2021, "COVID vaccines: why waiving patents won't fix global shortage – scientist explains," Conversation, <https://theconversation.com/covid-vaccines-why-waiving-patents-wont-fix-global-shortage-scientist-explains-158643>] //DD PT

COVID-19 vaccines are key to ending the pandemic. From a humanitarian, moral and pragmatic perspective, the countries must unite to ensure fair and rapid access to these vaccines, worldwide. As [political](https://www.who.int/news-room/commentaries/detail/a-global-pandemic-requires-a-world-effort-to-end-it-none-of-us-will-be-safe-until-everyone-is-safe) and [health](https://www.gavi.org/vaccineswork/why-no-one-safe-until-everyone-safe-during-pandemic) leaders have stressed: [no one is safe until we are all safe](https://www.theguardian.com/world/2021/jan/31/jeremy-farrar-until-we-are-all-safe-no-one-is-safe-covid-is-a-global-problem). But satisfying this need is complicated. Before the pandemic, the global demand for all vaccines was around [5.5 billion doses](https://www.who.int/immunization/programmes_systems/procurement/mi4a/platform/module2/2020_Global_Vaccine_Market_Report.pdf?ua=1) a year. We now need at least three times this for COVID-19 alone, with continued high-scale production likely to be needed in subsequent years. Such a fast increase in vaccine production is unprecedented and expected obstacles need to be addressed. One particular idea gaining traction is that vaccine production is being limited by patents and other intellectual property (IP) rights – legal mechanisms that allow organisations to stop others (for a limited period) from making, using or selling their inventions without their permission – and that these should be waived. This, however, should not be a major priority. Not the main barrier South Africa and India have [petitioned](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669.pdf&Open=True) the World Trade Organization (WTO) to waive certain IP protections, for a limited time, that relate to products for preventing, containing or treating COVID-19. This would allow countries to produce COVID-related products, such as vaccines, for themselves, [without fear](https://theconversation.com/intellectual-property-and-covid-19-medicines-why-a-wto-waiver-may-not-be-enough-155920) of being punished for infringing the IP rights of the companies that developed them. Various NGOs, former heads of state and Nobel laureates have [declared their support](https://peoplesvaccinealliance.medium.com/open-letter-former-heads-of-state-and-nobel-laureates-call-on-president-biden-to-waive-e0589edd5704). It’s [claimed](https://www.unaids.org/en/resources/presscentre/featurestories/2021/april/20210414_letter-waive-intellectual-property-rules-COVID-vaccines) that waiving IP agreements “would expand global manufacturing capacity”, allowing production to ramp up “unhindered by industry monopolies that are driving the dire supply shortages blocking vaccine access”. The WTO petition [references](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-03-20/world-war-ii-style-production-may-%20carry-legal-risks-for-patriots) [suggestions](https://eu.courier-journal.com/story/news/2020/04/03/beshear-calls-3-m-%20release-patent-n-95-respirator-amid-pandemic/5112729002/) that IP rights have limited the availability of personal protective equipment and the production of ventilators during the pandemic. However, little (if any) evidence has been presented that suggests IP protection is blocking COVID-19 vaccine manufacture. Rather, technical and logistic issues are the biggest barriers currently standing in the way of increasing vaccine production and deployment. To boost vaccine availability right now, it would be better to address these. One obstacle to increasing production is the [supply of raw materials](https://www.businesstoday.in/current/economy-politics/not-just-serum-shortage-of-vaccine-raw-material-troubling-global-vaccine-makers/story/433506.html) needed to make and deploy these vaccines. The almost instantaneous tripling of demand for specialised materials is placing [huge pressure](https://www.cidrap.umn.edu/news-perspective/2021/03/officials-explore-covid-vaccine-supply-gaps-boosting-production) on many pharmaceutical and medical supply chains. This needs to be fixed, not just to help with the production of [authorised COVID-19 vaccines](https://theconversation.com/the-world-is-hungry-for-mrna-covid-vaccines-like-pfizers-but-were-short-of-vital-components-159143), but also to ensure we don’t delay testing and approving vaccines still in development. Second, transferring the manufacturing process from one facility to another always takes significant resources, as staff at the new site need to be trained in every aspect of production and quality assurance. On top of this, skills are also required in the clinical, legal, commercial and regulatory aspects. Expanding production capacity is thus not instantaneous, and certainly wouldn’t immediately happen just because IP protection has been waived. Nevertheless, this technology transfer continues, with several COVID-19 vaccine manufacturers transferring their technology, under licence, to sub-contractors. An example is the licensing of the AstraZeneca vaccine to the [Serum Institute of India](https://www.theguardian.com/global-development/2021/feb/14/we-took-a-huge-risk-the-indian-firm-making-more-covid-jabs-than-anyone). To get manufacturing going, the institute dedicated 1,000 staff to the project. This raises a further point, which is that for technology transfer to work, countries must have specialised facilities and a skilled workforce capable of making vaccines. They also need robust regulatory authorities to audit and approve the safety of what’s produced. Advocating for current and long-term commitments to increasing these skills around the world could be a more successful way of increasing the number of countries manufacturing vaccines in the long term, compared to waiving IP rights. Indeed, past efforts to increase worldwide manufacturing capacity and access for other medicines, [such as those for drug-resistant tuberculosis](https://www.google.com/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=&ved=2ahUKEwiFw4T616PwAhWVQhUIHYVND4kQFjACegQIBBAD&url=https%3A%2F%2Feuropa.eu%2Fcapacity4dev%2Ffile%2F22470%2Fdownload%3Ftoken%3DOGn_hfs3&usg=AOvVaw2PxlEmDbZbxQiiBvWsj7pj), have taken this sort of broader approach and not focused solely on IP. Likewise, if we are serious about improving access to COVID-19 vaccines, other issues need to be addressed. Pricing, as well as allocation and deployment mechanisms, such as Covax, [must be optimised](https://www.thelancet.com/journals/lancet/article/PIIS0140-6736(21)00306-8/fulltext) to allow equitable vaccine deployment. IP remains useful Love it or loathe it, IP also plays a central role in getting vaccines developed. Given the emergency we’re in, companies that are normally competitors are [working together to produce vaccines](https://www.biopharmadive.com/news/novartis-pfizer-biontech-cororonavirus-vaccine-supply-deal/594215/). Here, IP can facilitate cooperation; it’s clear which organisation owns what technology, meaning companies don’t have to worry about their ideas being taken when collaborating. Plus, for academics who aim to translate their research into having real-world impact, there are few options other than to license their innovations to commercial entities who have the expertise and resources to bring the research into clinical use. The COVID-19 vaccine partnership between the University of Oxford and AstraZeneca is a successful example of this inter-dependency. Such transactional agreements (and so developing health innovations from academic research) rely on IP and being able to give commercial partners exclusive access to knowledge. Enacting an IP waiver risks bringing levels of uncertainty across the vaccine field because, without the exclusive rights to a product, it’s less clear if developing it will lead to a return on investment. This may put companies off working on vaccines. The vaccine space has only recently grown from being a very narrow field, comprising just a few companies at the [start of the century](https://www.healthaffairs.org/doi/pdf/10.1377/hlthaff.24.3.622), so the threat of losing developers is real. We need to have as many competitors in the field as possible to sustain diverse academic-commercial partnerships. This diversity has already helped create a range of COVID-19 vaccines. Current IP regulations are not perfect, and this IP waiver discussion rightly forces an examination of current systems. However, waiving IP is unlikely to be a short-term solution to rapid vaccine manufacture and deployment and could lead to long-term obstacles for vaccine development.

#### There are too many logistical issues with the waiver – the plan doesn’t work

**Mercurio 21**[Simon F.S. Li Professor of Law, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, Hong Kong, PMC, “The IP Waiver for COVID-19: Bad Policy, Bad Precedent” June 21, 2021, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/>] DD MN

On 5 May 2021, the US reversed its position and announced that it would support a waiver for COVID-19 vaccines.[6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn6) To be clear, this does not mean that the US supported the waiver as proposed by India and South Africa. Instead, the US has simply agreed to negotiate the perimeters of a waiver. Others, including the **European Union (EU), Canada, Australia, Norway, Switzerland, the United Kingdom (UK) and even leading developing countries such as Brazil, Chile and Mexico remain opposed or lukewarm on the waiver**.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn7) The US dropping opposition does not mean the concerns of other Members will simply disappear – one would hope that these nations opposed the waiver for valid reasons and did not simply blindly follow the US. Indeed, **many** of the above-listed **Members** **remain unconvinced that** even such a draconian step as **a waiver of IPRs would accomplish** the goal of **increased vaccine production**.[8](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn8) For its part, the EU continues to favour an approach which makes better use of existing flexibilities available in the TRIPS Agreement.[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn9)

Thus, those expecting quick agreement on the waiver will be disappointed. **Negotiations at** **the WTO are always difficult and lengthy**, and US Trade Representative Katherine Tai acknowledged that the “negotiations will take time given the consensus-based nature of the institution and the complexity of the issues involved”.[10](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn10) **Issues of negotiation will include the scope of the waiver.** Whereas the original proposal and its amended form extend the waiver beyond patents and vaccines to include nearly all forms of IP (i.e. copyright,[11](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn11) industrial designs and trade secrets) as well as to all “health products and technologies including diagnostics, therapeutics, vaccines, medical devices, personal protective equipment, their materials or components, and their methods and means of manufacture for the prevention, treatment or containment of COVID-19”[12](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn12) (with no requirement on how or the extent to which they are related to or useful in combatting COVID-19), the US and others seem to support a waiver limited to patents and vaccines.[13](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn13) **The length of the waiver will also be a contentious negotiating issue**, with proponents seeking a virtual indefinite waiver lasting until the Membership agrees by consensus that it is no longer required – meaning even a single Member’s objection to ending the waiver would mean the waiver continues to remain in force[14](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn14) – as will the request that any action claimed to be taken under the waiver is outside the scope of the WTO’s dispute settlement mechanism.[15](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn15) These provisions will almost certainly be opposed by other Members, who would perhaps agree to a time-limited waiver which could be extended rather than an unchallengeable indefinite waiver which will be difficult to reverse. **The proposal** also **fails to mention** anything in relation to **transparency and notification requirements and lacks safeguards against abuse or diversion. These points will likely also prove contentious in the negotiations.**

**With so many initial divergences and as yet undiscussed issues, the negotiations at best could be completed by the time of the next WTO Ministerial Conference, scheduled to begin on 20 November 2021.** There is precedent in this regard, as previous TRIPS negotiations involving IP and pharmaceuticals were not fully resolved until the days before the Ministerial Conferences (in 2003 and 2005).[16](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC8223179/#Fn16) There is also a chance that the **negotiations will continue past the calendar year 2021.**

#### The plan can’t solve manufacturing expertise and reduces international distribution.

**Pooley 21** [James Pooley, 5-25-2021, "The Big Secret Behind the Proposed TRIPS Waiver," IPWatchdog, <https://www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/25/big-secret-behind-proposed-trips-waiver/id=133905/>] //DD PT

So, this is why a temporary waiver of TRIPS—which would suspend national obligations to enforce IP rights—can’t possibly help countries like India get more vaccines to its citizens. The know-how required to manufacture at scale is owned by the companies like Pfizer and Moderna that are producing doses in record volumes. To effect the demanded “technology transfer,” governments would have to secure the agreement of those companies not just to hand over their entire “cookbook” but also to send qualified scientists and technicians to spend time at the foreign facilities, basically consulting on how to implement the secret processes to produce a safe vaccine. And even if that transfer happened tomorrow, getting to the point of actually manufacturing in volume would take more than a year. Not only would the TRIPS waiver not produce the results the proponents want, it would likely reduce the current level of international distribution of vaccines, by interfering with access to the limited supplies of required ingredients. In fact, this supply chain disruption was recently cited by none other than the government of India in pushing back against popular demands for a compulsory license on Gilead’s Remdesivir and other COVID-19 treatments, noting that the “main constraint” was not intellectual property rights but preventing competition for scarce “raw materials and other essential inputs.”