### WTO link

#### WTO discourse and reducing IP’s for medicines further entrenches the WTO’s Neoliberal agenda. Spills over to other discourse and polices which creates worse from of neoliberalism. That hurts everyone but especially developing countries.

Debra J, 2001 Nov 17"The World Trade Organization's health agenda : Opening up the health services markets may worsen health equity for the poor," PubMed Central (PMC), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/ (LHS IB)

At the World Trade Organization's ministerial conference held last week in Doha, Qatar, world trade leaders from the organisation's 142 member governments focused attention on a critical health issue. Trade ministers debated the flexibility in the organisation's agreement on trade related aspects of intellectual property rights (TRIPS) for countries to protect public health in emergencies. Such clarification is critical for developing countries to improve access and affordability of essential medicines for millions of poor people suffering from HIV/AIDS and other life threatening diseases. But access to essential drugs is not the only health issue affected by global trade rules. Agreements made by the organisation also shape national policies and regulations on issues ranging from food safety and imports of hazardous goods to duties on tobacco.

And there is more to come. The World Trade Organization's negotiations launched in 2000 to further liberalise trade in services under the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) could increase the organisation's influence on financing and delivery of health care. In contrast with other agreements, GATS gives countries considerable flexibility to decide which service sectors to open to foreign competition and to set limits on access to markets. About 60 members of the organisation have already made commitments related to market access in health services. Few of these represent any loosening of existing national policy. But that could change, as the intent of the current GATS negotiations is to “deepen and widen” sectoral commitments.

Some of the proposals under negotiation regarding GATS indicate that developing countries will be asked to open up health service markets to foreign competition. In some cases this could improve the efficiency and quality of health services. But experience in middle income countries indicates that foreign competition in health service markets tends to worsen equity in financing and reduce access to care for the poor. Even when competition between public and private health providers raises quality, it primarily benefits the well off and concentrates on high end care, which has higher profit margins.[1](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B1) In Thailand the entry of foreign owned private health providers has lured physicians away from the public sector, increasing shortages of staff and unequal access to care by different socioeconomic groups.[2](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B2) Multinational firms with contracts to manage public hospitals in Argentina have sought to reduce the proportion of uninsured patients.[3](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B3)

Some argue that such risks to health equity arising from trade liberalisation can be reduced through regulation, and that GATS explicitly recognises the right of the World Trade Organization's members to do so.[4](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B4) But health regulatory systems are weak or non-existent in most developing countries and where they exist, enforcement is limited or ineffective.[5](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B5) GATS negotiators could make regulation in the health sector even more difficult if they restrict the ability of governments to limit foreign entrants or require regulations to not unduly hinder trade. These proposals, currently under discussion in the organisation's GATS council, would apply to all service sectors including health, even if governments did not make commitments to open up health service markets.

Even if members of the organisation choose not to liberalise trade in health services, health care is directly affected by other sectors that are the focus of current negotiations. Financial services, which includes health insurance, is one.[6](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B6) The United States and the European Community have proposed that members of the organisation grant greater market access in financial services, by eliminating or relaxing restrictions on investment by foreign companies—commercial presence, in GATS parlance.[7](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B7) The health implications of such decisions rarely occur to trade negotiators. For example, as part of its negotiations to join the World Trade Organization, China agreed to open up its market to foreign health insurers without assessing the impact on efforts to broaden social health insurance coverage. Private health insurers in Latin America, including those that are foreign invested, compete by selecting the healthiest people and dumping high cost patients on to the public sector.[8](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B8)

The agenda of developing countries for liberalisation of services trade includes proposals to ease the way for temporary employment of professionals from less developed countries in more developed ones.[9](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC1121630/#B9) Developing countries see their skilled labour as a competitive advantage in the global economy and therefore want barriers to such trade reduced. As professionals in all sectors would be covered by such a change, this could, however, increase the medical brain drain and aggravate shortages of health personnel in source countries.

In view of the risks to health equity and access, the negotiating positions of members on GATS should be informed by evidence about the effects on the health system of liberalisation of services trade and trade policy. Yet there are almost no empirical studies on the impact of reducing trade barriers on health equity, efficiency, access, or quality.

More immediately, health policy makers and practitioners can take advantage of the raised consciousness of trade ministers, following the meeting in Qatar, about the importance of trade policy to health. After trade related aspects of intellectual property rights and access to drugs, the next major health issue on the agenda of the World Trade Organization may well arise in the course of negotiations on trade in services. Health professionals need to work with trade officials to minimise the risks to health equity from liberalisation of services trade, and ensure that any resulting economic gains in health related service sectors generate tangible public health benefits.

#### The WTO is neoliberial

Martin Hart-Landsberg, 4-1-2006, "Monthly Review," Monthly Review, https://monthlyreview.org/2006/04/01/neoliberalism-myths-and-reality/ (LHS IB)

Agreements like the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) and the World Trade Organization (WTO) have enhanced transnational capitalist power and profits at the cost of growing economic instability and deteriorating working and living conditions. Despite this reality, neoliberal claims that liberalization, deregulation, and privatization produce unrivaled benefits have been repeated so often that many working people accept them as unchallengeable truths. Thus, business and political leaders in the United States and other developed capitalist countries routinely defend their efforts to expand the WTO and secure new agreements like the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) as necessary to ensure a brighter future for the world’s people, especially those living in poverty.

For example, Renato Ruggiero, the first Director-General of the WTO, declared that WTO liberalization efforts have “the potential for eradicating global poverty in the early part of the next [twenty-first] century—a utopian notion even a few decades ago, but a real possibility today.”1 Similarly, writing shortly before the December 2005 WTO ministerial meeting in Hong Kong, William Cline, a senior fellow for the Institute for International Economics, claimed that “if all global trade barriers were eliminated, approximately 500 million people could be lifted out of poverty over 15 years….The current Doha Round of multilateral trade negotiations in the World Trade Organization provides the best single chance for the international community to achieve these gains.”2

Therefore, if we are going to mount an effective challenge to the neoliberal globalization project, we must redouble our efforts to win the “battle of ideas.” Winning this battle requires, among other things, demonstrating that neoliberalism functions as an ideological cover for the promotion of capitalist interests, not as a scientific framework for illuminating the economic and social consequences of capitalist dynamics. It also requires showing the processes by which capitalism, as an international system, undermines rather than promotes working class interests in both third world and developed capitalist countries.

The Myth of the Superiority of ‘Free Trade’: Theoretical Arguments

According to supporters of the WTO and agreements such as the FTAA, these institutions/agreements seek to promote free trade in order to enhance efficiency and maximize economic well being. This focus on trade hides what is in fact a much broader political-economic agenda: the expansion and enhancement of corporate profit making opportunities. In the case of the WTO, this agenda has been pursued through a variety of agreements that are explicitly designed to limit or actually block public regulation of economic activity in contexts that have little to do with trade as normally understood.

For example, the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) limits the ability of states to deny patents on certain products (including over living organisms) or control the use of products patented in their respective nations (including the use of compulsory licensing to ensure affordability of critical medicines). It also forces states to accept a significant increase in the length of time during which patents remain in force. The Agreement on Trade Related Investment Measures (TRIMS) restricts the ability of states to put performance requirements on foreign direct investment (FDI), encompassing those that would require the use of local inputs (including labor) or technology transfer. A proposed expansion of the General Agreement on Trade in Services (GATS) would force states to open their national service markets (which include everything from health care and education to public utilities and retail trade) to foreign providers as well as limit public regulation of their activity. Similarly, a proposed Government Procurement Agreement would deny states the ability to use non-economic criteria, such as labor and environmental practices, in awarding contracts.

These agreements are rarely discussed in the mainstream media precisely because they directly raise issues of private versus public power and are not easily defended. This is one of the most important reasons why those who support the capitalist globalization project prefer to describe the institutional arrangements that help underpin it as trade agreements and defend them on the basis of the alleged virtues of free trade. This is a defense that unfortunately and undeservedly holds enormous sway among working people, especially in the developed capitalist countries. And, using it as a theoretical foundation, capitalist globalization advocates find it relatively easy to encourage popular acceptance of the broader proposition that market determined outcomes are superior to socially determined ones in all spheres of activity. Therefore, it is critical that we develop an effective and accessible critique of this myth of the superiority of free trade. In fact, this is an easier task than generally assumed.

### Innovation Link

#### The Neoliberalism approach the aff takes in by restricting IP’s for competition, the invisible hand, and by restricting IP’s is a myth- further entrenches us in neoliberalism and causes meaningless death and drives less innovation and distribution.

Ognian Kassabov, 1-20-2021, "What the vaccine debacle tells us about predatory capitalism," No Publication, https://www.aljazeera.com/opinions/2021/2/21/the-vaccine-debacle-shows-the-predatory-nature-of-capitalism (LHS IB)

Myth one: The private sector is the best innovator

One foundational myth of global capitalism is that private entrepreneurship is the only effective source of innovation and progress. But Big Pharma has long demonstrated this is not necessarily so.

For decades, vaccines have been de-prioritised by the industry as insufficiently profitable. For example, despite the persistence of deadly outbreaks of the Ebola virus in West Africa, there were no serious efforts to develop a vaccine against it until after the epidemic of 2014. And up until the coronavirus pandemic, companies like BionNTech – which partnered with Pfizer to develop a COVID-19 vaccine – were mostly focusing on the application of the mRNA technology in drugs rather than vaccines.

The swift development of COVID-19 vaccines came only in the wake of significant financial support by governments, combined with massive buyout contracts using taxpayers’ money. For instance, US government agencies gave Moderna alone some $2.5bn to help develop the vaccine and buy doses.

That is, the public sector was a key driver of COVID-19 vaccine development and public funds are used to finance the process. In effect, pharmaceutical companies secured a cost-reduced development and risk-free launch of a new product.

The claim that private companies are best at innovation is further eroded by the fact that at least two state-owned companies, Russia’s Gamaleya Institute and China’s Sinopharm, **were successful in developing effective vaccines.**

All of this is not to question the efficacy of available vaccines or the devoted work of the researchers who developed them. Rather, it is to point out the fact that privatising the vaccine development effort not only is too costly and exploitative, but it is also inefficient, as it prevents scientists from collaborating and sharing research to come up with the best possible vaccine.

Myth two: The invisible hand of the market is effective

Another capitalist myth is that competitive markets are the best regulators of supply and demand and the best at achieving the optimal distribution of goods. In early 2020, we witnessed the dark side of this fable, as countries started to outbid each other for vital medical equipment, such as PPE and ventilators.

Demand was high across the board, but supply only went to the wealthy few, at the price of many human lives. This is now happening again, as, amid severe undersupply of vaccines, governments are scrambling to secure enough doses for national use.

Israel has achieved its spectacular vaccination rate by paying higher prices for the vaccines. The US is trying to follow suit. Even within the European Union, where a coordinated response and fair distribution of vaccines in proportion to member states’ populations was negotiated, it emerged that wealthier countries like Germany have managed to secure more vaccines for themselves.

If the present situation continues, where the highest bidders can buy as much as they want, even if it is more than they need, supply will continue to fall short of global demand. The World Health Organization (WHO) has called it “vaccine nationalism”, but what it really is is vaccine capitalism. Countries are rushing to outbid each other on vaccines because there is an inadequate supply, and there is inadequate supply because pharmaceutical companies are allowed not to share their inventions with the world.

As Scottish economist Adam Smith has pointed out, any trade secret is a form of monopoly, and in this sense, pharmaceutical patents enable the supplier to impose a monopoly. Keeping vaccines the exclusive intellectual property of companies renders deployment not only too costly, but also inefficient, as it severely limits production capacities.

Myth three: Capitalist globalisation is fair

The third key myth of late-stage capitalism that is now unravelling portrays globalisation as equally beneficial for all. But a cursory look at the global distribution of vaccines shows that this is far not the case.

As Western countries are able to acquire vaccines, albeit at different pace, many other parts of the world have not even started their vaccination campaigns. Even emerging economies – some of which served as the testing ground for the vaccines – are struggling with limited supply.

As a result of this global inequality in vaccine distribution, we are not only facing what WHO Director General Tedros Ghebreyesus has called a “catastrophic moral failure”, but also an inevitable global economic disaster. Economists are already warning that an uneven global vaccine roll-out would be much costlier for wealthy countries than a coordinated deployment of vaccines.

If the current immunisation inequality persists, the deployment of vaccines in wealthier countries can become close to useless. Even if herd immunity is achieved in some countries, persistent outbreaks in others will continue to disrupt travel and global supply chains. One study suggests that if there is no serious global effort for an equitable vaccination campaign, this could cost developed countries $4.5 trillion.

Immunity cannot function as the privilege of the few. Immunised wealthy countries may try sealing themselves off from the rest, but the sustainability of this global apartheid will be questionable and the human cost – surely appalling.

### Root Cause

#### Neolib is the root cause of Covid and all pandemics- multiple warrants- the aff attempts are just a hopeless attempt and an example of disaster neolib to solve through restricting IP’s- when in reality they can’t since they’re dependent on free markets sacrifices which proliferates the virus

Miloš ŠUmonja, 21- June"Neoliberalism is not dead – On political implications of Covid-19," PubMed Central (PMC), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/ (LHS IB)

The neoliberal pandemic – the causes of crisis

From the viewpoint suggested above, the results of capital’s totalising effort to commodify and eat away its own social and natural preconditions appear as the structural causes of the pandemic, which thus represents a potentially fatal internal crisis of neoliberalism. The crisis is not, as one might conclude from the establishment’s ‘going back to normal’ narrative, an exogenous shock to an otherwise functional system. A Black Swan-type event ([Smith 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr54-0309816820982381)), or a meteorite of history which can only be ascribed to a foreign entity is how capitalism’s ideological defence in the West already projects its own contradictions: to the contingency of nature ([Joye 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr31-0309816820982381)); then to virus-producing China (on 1 February, the German newsmagazine Der Spiegel run a cover page with a headline ‘Coronavirus – Made in China’; Der Spiegel [2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr17-0309816820982381)); to a virus-carrying immigrant; and in a final act of inversion of reality, to the class enemy within (as in the case of Amazon warehouse employee, Chris Smalls, who organised his coworkers to demand safer working conditions amid the pandemic, only to find himself fired because of – breaching of the safety measures; see [Bellafante 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr6-0309816820982381)).

The interventions from the Left highlight at least three constitutive connections between neoliberalism and the pandemic. According to [Rob Wallace (2020a](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr62-0309816820982381), [2020b](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr63-0309816820982381)) evolutionary biologist and phylogeographer, the increased appearance of corona viruses like SARS, MERS or Covid-19 in the human population is a predictable outcome of agroindustry’s devastating impact on natural ecosystems rather than a series of isolated incidents. What is seen is an interplay between industrial production of food and a growing market for exotic wild food. The multinationals’ land-grab and deforestation push the increasing capitalised wildlife deeper into the remaining primary ecosystems. This enables the spillover of previously boxed-in pathogens to human communities that are forced to breach the natural barrier between them while working:

Capital is spearheading land grabs into the last of primary forest and smallholder-held farmland worldwide . . . As industrial production – hog, poultry, and like – expand into primary forest, it places pressure on wild food operators to dredge further into the forest for source populations, **increasing the interface with, and spillover of, new pathogens, including Covid-19.** ([Wallace 2020a](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr62-0309816820982381)).

As for the speed at which the virus has spread, the unprecedented physical connectivity in the word of global supply chains and low-cost flying was not the only contributing social factor. It should not be forgotten that the initial reaction from most governments to the outbreak was an exercise in ‘epidemiological neoliberalism’ ([Frey 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr20-0309816820982381)). This policy bluntly exposed the politics of the whole project: pretend to do nothing while making sure that the ‘natural laws’ of markets keep functioning, even if it means allowing people to get sick and die from ‘just another flu’. Encapsulated in social-Darwinian ‘survival of the fittest’ notion of ‘herd immunity’, this solution in practice consisted of voluntary behavioural guidelines – business as usual, just wash your hands and keep your distance. This, in effect, turned a social problem into an individual matter, thus shaking off any responsibility the authorities had for the public health crisis.

However, with the numbers of infected inevitably rising in consequence, the genocidal charade backfired, not just because the public lost faith in neoliberal crisis management but also because the markets lost confidence in it. In the United States, for example, President Donald Trump changed his approach only during the March stock crash. Then, in the wake of what was becoming the greatest pandemic since the Spanish Flu, the disastrous effects of 40 years of neoliberal privatisation of public health institutions were revealed. That is, the lack of staff and material capacities in underfunded state hospitals, and the complete inability of the private for-profit health industry to provide even the most basic medical equipment and treatment in the time of social need. To illustrate the point: in Italy, one of the countries hardest hit by the pandemic, austerity cuts in the national health system resulted in an extraordinary 50% reduction in hospital beds between 1997 and 2015, and 46,000 less hospital employees from 2009 to 2017 ([Autore & Corizzo 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr3-0309816820982381)). Add the outsourcing of medical production in search for cheap labour and that health companies have no commercial interest in preparing for or preventing emergency situations – in keeping hospital beds empty and magazines stocked with face masks and gloves, or investing in vaccine development – and you get a centennial public health crisis.

In response to the crisis, the resources of national states have been mobilised in full force, mandatory lockdowns imposed, and branches of industry told what to produce. However, with the majority of workers not working, global supply chains broke, demand collapsed, production fell, company revenues sharply dropped and stock markets plunged. The IMF projects global growth to fall to -3%, a downgrade of over 6 percentage points from January 2020, which makes the ongoing capitalist crisis ‘the worst economic downturn since the Great Depression’ ([Gopinath 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr24-0309816820982381)). Indications of what awaits the working classes are clear: in the United States, the world epicentre of both neoliberalism and the pandemic, unemployment rose to 14.7% in April, again the worst rate since the Great Depression ([BBC 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr5-0309816820982381)). Moreover, in August, the real unemployment rate, which includes underemployed and marginally attached to the labour market, reached 16.8% ([Hindery 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr28-0309816820982381)), with a significant number of disproportionately women and minority workers facing permanent job loss ([Data Speaks 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr14-0309816820982381)).

A number of authors on the Left, who have warned of this crisis even before Covid-19 detonated it, argued that the pandemic has brought to light the underlying weaknesses of the neoliberal capital accumulation model in terms of investment, productivity and growth. These had all been left unresolved in the aftermath of the 2008 Recession ([Harvey 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr26-0309816820982381); [Lapavitsas 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr32-0309816820982381); [Roberts 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr45-0309816820982381)). While delivering harsh austerity to people across the globe, the last decade has seen the transformation of failed ‘privatised Keynesianism’ policy regime ([Crouch 2009](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr13-0309816820982381)), reliant on private debt, to a policy of a ‘quantitative easing ad infinitum’. Simply put, central banks provided cheap money to commercial banks for loans to big corporations, which used them, not to create jobs, but to buy back their own stock and so enrich their shareholders. The gravity of an increasingly exhausted real economy was bound to kick in. The gap between promised value of financial capital gains and the insufficient production of surplus value has become unsustainable even in the eyes of the investor class ([Toussaint 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr61-0309816820982381)). In fact, during the last quarter of 2019, the US Federal Reserve had to calm the financial markets with massive injections of liquidity. German industrial production fell to its lowest levels since 2008, as did China’s economic growth.

So, states intervened and started acting as buyer, employer and creditor of last resort. No neoliberal taboo was left unbroken: from a 1,200 dollars per person government giveaway in the United States; nationalisation of payrolls across the Europe; different credit guarantee schemes suspension of mortgage payments and additional funding (48.5 billion pounds) for the NHS, public services and charities in the United Kingdom; expanded childcare benefits for low-income parents and basic income support for the self-employed in Germany; tax and utility bill holidays, and nationalisations of ailing companies in France ([International Monetary Fund [IMF] 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr29-0309816820982381)); to government takeovers of Alitalia airline in Italy ([Roberts & Leali 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr46-0309816820982381)) and hospitals in Ireland ([TheJournal.ie 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr60-0309816820982381)). In a passage summing up ‘the return of the state’ interpretation of these developments, one author writes:

The age of neoliberalism, in terms of the primacy of market interests over all other social interests, is coming to an end . . . After four decades of neoliberal scepticism about the state, a long-forgotten fact is coming to the light: that nation states still have enormous creative power, if only they are willing to use it. ([Saxer 2020](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr52-0309816820982381))

### Stolen

#### The aff’s positioning of competition as intrinsic good acts to maintain the stability of capital accumulation.

* AT: Capitalism is when monopoly

Christophers 16 [Brett Christophers, Professor in the Department of Social and Economic Geography at Uppsala University, “The Great Leveler: Capitalism and Competition in the Court of Law,” 2016, Harvard University Press, pp. 8-15, EA]

The aforementioned argument that capitalism has historically migrated from a state of competitiveness to a state of monopoly or oligopoly is deficient in four primary respects, both empirical and conceptual in nature.

First, there is something deeply misleading about the either/or nature of this historical narrative. One of the most important—although rarely acknowledged—of Marx’s insights was that capitalism always, everywhere, requires both. It needs competition, assuredly, not least to drive technological innovation and the reinvestment of profits, and thus growth. But it also needs monopoly—not merely to enhance visibility within and control over otherwise potentially chaotic business environments, but also to underwrite capitalist, market-based trade per se. Not for nothing does David Harvey argue, after Marx, that the “monopoly power of private property” is “both the beginning point and the end point of all capitalist activity.”20 For the legal institution of private property does confer monopoly: the exclusive power to dispose of said property as the owner alone sees fit.

Capital’s seemingly paradoxical need for both competition and monopoly is explored in Chapter 1, which extracts from Marx a conceptualization of capitalism that critically informs the remainder of the book: that of capitalism always, necessarily, teetering on a knife edge, balanced precariously between the contradictory forces of competition and monopoly, and perennially in danger of lapsing too far to one side or the other. “The problem,” Harvey shrewdly observes, “is to keep economic relations competitive enough while sustaining the individual and class monopoly privileges of private property that are the foundation of capitalism as a political-economic system.”21

And it is here that our economic laws crucially enter the picture. In metaphorical terms, the law acts as a powerful leveler: a pincer of sorts on the critical, combustible nexus of monopoly and competition, applicable from one side of the knife edge, the other, or both. Antitrust (competition) law, meaningfully enforced, serves to constrain monopoly power where it coheres too readily, thus boosting competition; IP law acts from the other side, allowing a degree of monopoly power where none “naturally” coheres, and limiting competition in the process. This conceptualization of economic law is sketched out in Chapter 3. Together, such laws help to ensure that over the long term, market-based capitalism is not too competitive (driving down prices and profits) but, in Harvey’s terms, remains competitive enough (avoiding stagnation and rent-seeking). In the process, the laws in question historically have contributed substantially to keeping capitalist accumulation regimes broadly in balance.

At the pivot of this overall mechanism sits the phenomenon of profit. Following the lead of scholars such as Robert Brenner, this book places front and center the relationship between profitability and the interrelated dynamics of competition and monopoly.22 As, indeed, did the classicals: Profit rates were, as Chapter 1 will show, fundamental to their theorization of competition. But it is vital to recognize, as writers such as Keith Cowling have done, that this relationship does not assume a simplistic less-competition-means-more-profit form, isolated as it were from other contributory factors.23 Indeed, the book shows that excesses neither of competitive intensity nor of monopoly power support long-term stability of profit-making and accumulation.

Instead, it leans more toward the type of argument proffered by Gérard Duménil and Dominique Lévy, which is that the dynamics of profitability strongly influence the state’s attempts to regularize regimes of accumulation, and that stabilizing capitalism is thus in no small part a question, ultimately, of stabilizing profitability.24 Or, as David Gordon and coauthors have written, the reproduction of capitalism is “fundamentally conditioned by the level and stability of capitalist profitability. As profits go, in short, so goes the economy.”25 The book’s particular slant on such conceptions is to consider corporate profits more in relative than absolute terms—and relative to, especially, labor and wages. While a comparable focus has recently been adopted by Thomas Piketty in his much discussed Capital in the Twenty-First Century, the inspiration underlying the approach taken here lies much further back in time, in the work in particular of Michal Kalecki.26 For as Kalecki showed both historically and conceptually, the relation of capital with labor, and profit with wages, is centrally implicated in the monopoly-competition relation and the balance that capitalism requires of it. Kalecki, it is fair to say, would have had some very interesting things to say about the Apple wage-suppression antitrust lawsuit.

A second and related problem with the linear historical narrative of from-competition-to-monopoly is its positing of monopoly and competition not only as mutually exclusive alternatives, but as separable ones. Once more, we can turn to Marx for an effective disabusal of this figuring. Monopoly and competition, he argued, are much more closely related, and much more closely connected, than is typically recognized. “Monopoly produces competition, competition produces monopoly,” he maintained, somewhat aphoristically, in a letter he wrote to Pavel Annenkov in 1846.27 Capital not only requires both but is in fact the expression, inter alia, of their synthesis—a synthesis that Marx, in trademark dialectical fashion, described not as a “formula” but as a “movement,” specifically “the movement whereby a true balance is maintained between competition and monopoly.”28 Such movement comprises opposing but connected economic dynamics of centralization and decentralization. When one or the other dynamic becomes disproportionately powerful, Marx argues, the “counteracting tendency” kicks in to return capital to a balanced configuration of monopoly and competition.

This balanced organization of productive forces—always inherently unstable and always prone to knife-edge slippages—is very close to what Edward Chamberlin would later call “monopolistic competition.”29 Such monopolistic competition internalizes monopoly and competition in dialectical relation with one another and is the capitalist norm—and always has been. “The notion of a bygone ‘competitive’ stage of capitalism where firms were price-takers is,” as Duménil and Lévy insist, “a fiction derived from the neoclassical analytical apparatus.”30 Equally fictional, albeit a fiction usually emanating from a very different analytical source, is the notion of a contemporary “monopoly” stage of capitalism absent meaningful competition.31

The historical, U.S.- and U.K.-based narrative related in this book therefore turns on precisely this dialectical, restless synthesis of monopoly and competition, and its ever-evolving, historically and geographically specific forms. In recent years, it is Harvey who has provided the most provocative reading of this dialectic and of its centrality to capitalism. It is, Harvey argues, one of numerous “moving” contradictions that plague the capital form, and with which capital constantly wrestles as it enters into and out of crisis.32 Harvey repeats Marx’s observation that capital requires a balance of competitive and monopolistic forces. He then derives from this postulate the propositions that crisis occurs when such forces become imbalanced—although this is not the only cause of crisis—and that such crisis can only be “fixed” once balance is restored. The result is that capital historically “oscillates” between relative excesses of monopoly and competition, always finding balance hard to achieve, let alone sustain.33 Understanding capital and its historical development in this particular regard, Harvey insists, requires us to recognize “how successful capital has generally been in managing the contradictions between monopoly and competition” and that “it uses crises to do so.”34

Such success, and the role played by crises or by threats thereof, are two of this book’s central, recurring themes. However, Harvey’s framing raises two vital questions that he fails, in his admittedly brief account of monopoly and competition, to answer.

First, how has this success been achieved? “Capital,” Harvey writes, “has organically arrived at a way to balance and rebalance the tendencies towards a monopolistic centralisation and decentralised competition through the crises that arise out of its imbalances.”35 Again, there is no objection here, except to press: “organically,” how? This book fashions an answer. This answer rests on the role of the law. When capital has become sufficiently overcentralized and monopolistic to threaten its own successful, profitable reproduction, antitrust law has been called upon to help restore the necessary degree of balance. This balance will never be perfect and at rest; in a dialectical relation, such as that between monopoly and competition, it never can be. When the dangerous excess has been of competition, by contrast, IP law has come to the rescue. Such laws, needless to say, have not effected this work of rebalancing by themselves, and this book documents their interaction with other pertinent dynamics; but their role has been paramount.

The other problematic question raised by Harvey’s framing brings us directly to our third point of divergence with the Baran and Sweezy or Foster and McChesney reading of capitalist development. Consider here the agency behind the successful, crisis-based management and rebalancing of monopolistic and competitive forces envisioned by Harvey: “capital has been successful . . .”; “capital has arrived at . . .” But what, or who, is this capital, and has its form remained constant? For Harvey, clearly, capital is the capitalist class: those that own the means of production. Yet this singularization of responsibility for regulating and reregulating the core dynamics of the capitalist economy raises all manner of questions that Harvey fails to address. Is this capitalist class homogeneous? Does it share consistent objectives in terms of economic development and management? And even if it does (and of course, it does not), what is its relation with the state and with the different tools of economic regulation, the law among them, that the state uses to govern and shape economic conduct?

If Harvey’s stimulating propositions call for circumspection on account of their simplifying structural abstractions, the connection to the “monopoly capital” thesis is that it too tends to rely upon just such totalizing, even reified, concepts. “Monopoly capital” is itself one such. One of the consistent themes of the tradition renewed by The Endless Crisis—one extending back through Baran and Sweezy’s Monopoly Capital to Rudolf Hilferding’s Finance Capital (1910) and even Lenin’s Imperialism (1917)—is its tendency not only to associate potent monopoly powers with a new stage or phase of capitalism but to depict the latter in terms of a consciously regulated and (centrally) planned system in which market-based competition largely disappears from view.36 For Lenin, this system fused the interests of capital and state (state monopoly capitalism); for Hilferding the fusion was tripartite, with finance capital also integral. But Marx, for all the stereotypes to the contrary, never saw capitalism as such. It was a totality, to be sure, but one that needs to be continually reproduced and reconstituted. This process occurs in and through the disparate actions of government, workers, consumers, businesses, and so on; when such reconstitution occurs in ways that imperil accumulation, crisis looms.

The point of saying all this is not simply to oppugn a totalizing view of “monopoly capital,” but to contrast with it the approach taken in this book, particularly to the law and its mobilization. There is not, and has not been, a single hand on the tiller, for all the obvious importance of the state as the law’s formal originator; there is no single, homogeneous entity pulling the levers, so to speak, of political-economic regulation— no consistent regime of conscious, systematic control. As with other modalities of economic regulation or governance, the law, in practice, does not “work” like that.

For one thing, there is an important difference between the written law and its interpretation. Two courts can interpret and apply the same law or laws in markedly different ways and with very different consequences. Perhaps the clearest example of this, at least in this book (Chapter 6), concerns U.S. antitrust law in the second half of the twentieth century: The nature and degree of enforcement of this law underwent a dramatic transformation in the late 1970s and early 1980s, but the law itself did not materially change. Intellectual training, social and political context, even judicial personality: These variables, and more, all matter to the law’s practical materialization. As such, we must remain constantly alive to the simple fact that, as Peter Carstensen has put it, “court doctrine is not the whole of the law in practice.”37 Relatedly, much of the enforcement of IP rights occurs at a significant remove from courts—specifically in, as argued by William T. Gallagher, the everyday practices of IP owners and their lawyers, whose “negotiations” with alleged infringers take place largely in the “shadow” of IP law.38

For another thing, just as the state never enacts new economic laws in total isolation from the influence and interests of capital, so both capital(s) and state—and indeed other economic agents—use the law to their own ends, and these ends are far from necessarily commensurate. Think, once again, about our two Apple cases. Who, in each case, instigated the legal action? Who put the law to work in their own interests? In the IP case it was Apple itself. In the class-action suit it was labor. But the latter suit was in fact itself based upon a prior government investigation launched by the Department of Justice’s Antitrust Division in 2010.39 Three legal cases, then, all driven by different actors with different motivations, but all revolving around the same political-economic locus: the knotty complex of profit generation and accumulation constituted by Apple Inc. And if the law, together with its agents, is so palpably nonsingular at the scale of the political economy of just one company, on what reasonable grounds could we ever envision it thus—as a vehicle of conscious, unified control—in relation to the political economy of capitalism more widely? The “great leveler” indicated in the book’s title, in short, is not some omnipotent regulator in charge of the law; it is the law per se.

How, then, might we more accurately characterize the human and institutional agency analyzed in the following pages in relation to the law, its mobilization, and its political-economic effects? At a general level, the conclusion reached by Paul David in his examination of the history of IP law fits particularly well: “The complex body of law, judicial interpretation, and administrative practice that one has to grapple with in this field was not created by some rational, consistent, social welfare-maximizing public agency. What one is faced with, instead, is a mixture of the intended and unintended consequences of an undirected historical process on which the varied interests of many parties, acting at different points (some widely separated in time and space), have left an enduring mark.”40 More specifically, however, we will see that although IP and competition laws have indeed performed their work under the influence of varied individuals and groups, the vast majority of the latter are ultimately committed to, and institutionally invested in, the reproduction, in as smooth a fashion as possible, of capitalism in more or less its existing form. And even more specifically, the “smoothness” here alluded to means the reproduction of capitalism especially without the kinds of problems—identified in Chapter 3—that tend to emerge when the necessary balance between monopoly and competition is substantially disrupted.

On all the above grounds, therefore, this book’s argument diverges from that which we find in the all-too-common narrative of competitive capitalism historically segueing into monopoly capitalism. Of course, none of this is to suggest that nothing has changed historically in the capitalist constellation of monopoly-competition structures and dynamics. Far from it. But the book’s fourth and final quarrel with the conventional narrative is that what has substantively, perhaps irrevocably, changed is not the relative levels of competitive intensity and monopoly power—as in, that era had more competition, this one has more monopoly—so much as the source of monopoly powers and the degree of defensibility thereof.

Capitalism, this argument runs, is always characterized by competitive undercurrents; were it not, it would not be capitalism. Meanwhile, and arising partly out of these competitive dynamics (the Marxian argument), there is an endemic drive to fashion monopoly powers. Yet the means of assembly of such powers do not remain constant, and neither does the ability of monopolistic capitalists to defend the powers thus amassed. Capitalists—and indeed the states committed to stabilizing capitalism, with the law one obvious apparatus at their disposal—must constantly find new ways of putting monopoly in place and keeping it there. “As monopoly privileges from one source diminish,” Harvey observes, “so we witness a variety of attempts to preserve and assemble them by other means.”41 Mindful, thus, of Marx’s dictum that the monopoly-versus-competition dualism is a red herring that confuses a dialectical relation for an oppositional one, this book focuses instead on the ways in which the unstable balance between the two forces is maintained—and it posits the law as the primary, necessarily mutable, instrument of such maintenance.

#### The aff is co-opted by an agenda of “health diplomacy” that only further expands capitalist imperialism

Andrea Patanè 21. Marxist, Published: 15 May 2021. “COVID-19 pandemic: patents and profits” <https://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm> brett

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.

### Impact

#### Neolib capitalism is the greatest impact—root cause of Covid-- it’s the greatest existential threat and the biggest affront to human rights and causes catastrophic healthcare crises, climate change, structural racism, and value to life deprivation. Litany of recent studies prove that transition is possible and would save humanity, but requires urgent divestment from current modes of politics

Ahmed 20 (Nafeez Ahmed -- Visiting Research Fellow at the Global Sustainability Institute at Anglia Ruskin University's Faculty of Science & Technology + M.A. in contemporary war & peace studies + DPhil (April 2009) in international relations from the School of Global Studies @ Sussex University, “Capitalism is Destroying ‘Safe Operating Space’ for Humanity, Warn Scientists”, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2020-06-24/capitalism-is-destroying-safe-operating-space-for-humanity-warn-scientists/, 24 June 2020, EmmieeM)

The COVID19 pandemic has exposed a strange anomaly in the global economy. If it doesn’t keep growing endlessly, it just breaks. Grow, or die.

But there’s a deeper problem. New scientific research confirms that capitalism’s structural obsession with endless growth is destroying the very conditions for human survival on planet Earth.

A landmark study in the journal Nature Communications, “Scientists’ warning on affluence” — by scientists in Australia, Switzerland and the UK — concludes that the most fundamental driver of environmental destruction is the overconsumption of the super-rich.

This factor lies over and above other factors like fossil fuel consumption, industrial agriculture and deforestation: because it is overconsumption by the super-rich which is the chief driver of these other factors breaching key planetary boundaries.

The paper notes that the richest 10 percent of people are responsible for up to 43 percent of destructive global environmental impacts.

In contrast, the poorest 10 percent in the world are responsible just around 5 percent of these environmental impacts:

The new paper is authored by Thomas Wiedmann of UNSW Sydney’s School of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Manfred Lenzen of the University of Sydney’s School of Physics, Lorenz T. Keysser of ETH Zürich’s Department of Environmental Systems Science, and Julia K. Steinberger of Leeds University’s School of Earth and Environment.

It confirms that global structural inequalities in the distribution of wealth are intimately related to an escalating environmental crisis threatening the very existence of human societies.

Synthesising knowledge from across the scientific community, the paper identifies capitalism as the main cause behind “alarming trends of environmental degradation” which now pose “existential threats to natural systems, economies and societies.” The paper concludes:

“It is clear that prevailing capitalist, growth-driven economic systems have not only increased affluence since World War II, but have led to enormous increases in inequality, financial instability, resource consumption and environmental pressures on vital earth support systems.”

Capitalism and the pandemic

Thanks to the way capitalism works, the paper shows, the super-rich are incentivised to keep getting richer — at the expense of the health of our societies and the planet overall.

The research provides an important scientific context for how we can understand many earlier scientific studies revealing that industrial expansion has hugely increased the risks of new disease outbreaks.

Just last April, a paper in Landscape Ecology found that deforestation driven by increased demand for consumption of agricultural commodities or beef have increased the probability of ‘zoonotic’ diseases (exotic diseases circulating amongst animals) jumping to humans. This is because industrial expansion, driven by capitalist pressures, has intensified the encroachment of human activities on wildlife and natural ecosystems.

Two years ago, another study in Frontiers of Microbiology concluded presciently that accelerating deforestation due to “demographic growth” and the associated expansion of “farming, logging, and hunting”, is dangerously transforming rural environments. More bat species carrying exotic viruses have ended up next to human dwellings, the study said. This is increasing “the risk of transmission of viruses through direct contact, domestic animal infection, or contamination by urine or faeces.”

It is difficult to avoid the conclusion that the COVID19 pandemic thus emerged directly from these rapidly growing impacts of human activities. As the new paper in Nature Communications confirms, these impacts have accelerated in the context of the fundamental operations of industrial capitalism.

Eroding the ‘safe operating space’

The result is that capitalism is causing human societies to increasingly breach key planetary boundaries, such as land-use change, biosphere integrity and climate change.

Remaining within these boundaries is essential to maintain what scientists describe as a “safe operating space” for human civilization. If those key ecosystems are disrupted, that “safe operating space” will begin to erode. The global impacts of the COVID19 pandemic are yet another clear indication that this process of erosion has already begun.

“The evidence is clear,” write Weidmann and his co-authors.

“Long-term and concurrent human and planetary wellbeing will not be achieved in the Anthropocene if affluent overconsumption continues, spurred by economic systems that exploit nature and humans. We find that, to a large extent, the affluent lifestyles of the world’s rich determine and drive global environmental and social impact. Moreover, international trade mechanisms allow the rich world to displace its impact to the global poor.”

The new scientific research thus confirms that the normal functioning of capitalism is eroding the ‘safe space’ by which human civilisation is able to survive.

The structures

The paper also sets out how this is happening in some detail. The super-rich basically end up driving this destructive system forward in three key ways.

Firstly, they are directly responsible for “biophysical resource use… through high consumption.”

Secondly, they are “members of powerful factions of the capitalist class.”

Thirdly, due to that positioning, they end up “driving consumption norms across the population.”

But perhaps the most important insight of the paper is not that this is purely because the super-rich are especially evil or terrible compared to the rest of the population — but because of the systemic pressures produced by capitalist structures.

The authors point out that: “Growth imperatives are active at multiple levels, making the pursuit of economic growth (net investment, i.e. investment above depreciation) a necessity for different actors and leading to social and economic instability in the absence of it.”

At the core of capitalism, the paper observes, is a fundamental social relationship defining the way working people are systemically marginalised from access to the productive resources of the earth, along with the mechanisms used to extract these resources and produce goods and services.

This means that to survive economically in this system, certain behavioural patterns become not just normalised, but seemingly entirely rational — at least from a limited perspective that ignores wider societal and environmental consequences. In the words of the authors:

“In capitalism, workers are separated from the means of production, implying that they must compete in labour markets to sell their labour power to capitalists in order to earn a living.”

Meanwhile, firms which own and control these means of production “need to compete in the market, leading to a necessity to reinvest profits into more efficient production processes to minimise costs (e.g. through replacing human labour power with machines and positive returns to scale), innovation of new products and/or advertising to convince consumers to buy more.”

If a firm fails to remain competitive through such behaviours, “it either goes bankrupt or is taken over by a more successful business. Under normal economic conditions, this capitalist competition is expected to lead to aggregate growth dynamics.”

The irony is that, as the paper also shows, the “affluence” accumulated by the super-rich isn’t correlated with happiness or well-being.

Restructure

The “hegemonic” dominance of global capitalism, then, is the principal obstacle to the systemic transformation needed to reduce overconsumption. So it’s not enough to simply try to “green” current consumption through technologies like renewable energy — we need to actually reduce our environmental impacts by changing our behaviours with a focus on cutting back our use of planetary resources:

“Not only can a sufficient decoupling of environmental and detrimental social impacts from economic growth not be achieved by technological innovation alone, but also the profit-driven mechanism of prevailing economic systems prevents the necessary reduction of impacts and resource utilisation per se.”

The good news is that it doesn’t have to be this way.

The paper reviews a range of “bottom-up studies” showing that dramatic reductions in our material footprint are perfectly possible while still maintaining good material living standards.

In India, Brazil and South Africa, “decent living standards” can be supported “with around 90 percent less per-capita energy use than currently consumed in affluent countries.” Similar possible reductions are feasible for modern industrial economies such as Australia and the US.

By becoming aware of how the wider economic system incentivises behaviour that is destructive of human societies and planetary ecosystems critical for human survival, both ordinary workers and more wealthy sectors — including the super-rich — can work toward rewriting the global economic operating system.

This can be done by restructuring ownership in firms, equalising relations with workers, and intentionally reorganising the way decisions are made about investment priorities.

The paper points out that citizens and communities have a crucial role to play in getting organised, upgrading efforts for public education about these key issues, and experimenting with new ways to work together in bringing about “social tipping points” — points at which social action can catalyse mass change.

While a sense of doom and apathy about the prospects for such change is understandable, mounting evidence based on systems science suggests that global capitalism as we know it is in a state of protracted crisis and collapse that began some decades ago. This research strongly supports the view that as industrial civilization reaches the last stages of its systemic life-cycle, there is unprecedented and increasing opportunity for small-scale actions and efforts to have large system-wide impacts.

The new paper shows that the need for joined-up action is paramount: structural racism, environmental crisis, global inequalities are not really separate crises — but different facets of human civilization’s broken relationship with nature.

Yet, of course, the biggest takeaway is that those who bear most responsibility for environmental destruction — those who hold the most wealth in our societies — urgently need to wake up to how their narrow models of life are, quite literally, destroying the foundations for human survival over the coming decades.

#### Global Capitalism is the root cause of ecological crisis and makes extinction and ongoing violence inevitable – only total rejection of the system solves

Yonghong Zhang 13 is a professor at School of Marxism Studies at the Research Center for Marxist Theory, “Capitalism and Ecological Crisis”, pg online@ wscholars.com/index.php/jss/article/download/440/pdf

Capitalism is the Root Cause of Ecological Crisis Before the birth of the capitalist mode of production, environmental problem was but a regional one, which, in most cases, had only a minor and partial negative impact on the human society. But, in several hundred years of capitalist globalization and in the process of “conquering nature” by the capitalist mode of production, the environmental problem has been becoming more and more serious and ravaging the world. Nature occasionally brings up its sword of Damocles and retaliates on humanity. With the progress of the Western-dominated globalization, some global environmental problems become increasingly serious. According to 1998 data from World Wide Fund For Nature, the Earth lost 1/3 of the natural resources from 1970 to 1995; freshwater index decreased by 50%; the marine ecosystem index fell by 30%; the world's forest area declined by 10%.According to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization statistics, the annual tropical deforestation rate is about 0.7% and still in constant acceleration. Rain forest reduction results in floods and climate change, especially the rampant El Nino Phenomenon, as well as the destruction of biodiversity, and so on. The extensive use of Freon and other substances results in the growing Antarctic ozone hole, which makes creatures on earth facing more and more serious threat from solar ultraviolet radiation; massive emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases exacerbate the existing “greenhouse effect”, causing global climate to rise and making glaciers melt and sea levels rise; the earth’s organisms are being destroyed and desertification is developing rapidly. In this case, human beings are probably losing natural respiratory organs and their survival base. That Hundreds of years of capitalist accumulation of capital has damaged or destroyed the natural ecological environment is obvious. No one has made specific statistics of this destruction. Today’s economic and technological achievements the Western world has reached, result, in a certain sense, from the plundering of the Third World resources and destruction of the Third World ecology by the West monopoly bourgeoisie for several centuries. The Western capitalist industrial civilization has created a global economy and brought the world into an unprecedented new era of rapid economic development, and has also brought unprecedented “ecological deficit” and “environmental overdraft” to humans, especially to the Third World. The price the Third World countries have paid for the development and prosperity of the West is innumerable. In a world with limited supply, the more the West demands, the less the Third World will be left, either in natural resources or social needs. The irrational and unlimited expansion of social product demands of the West has not only caused a lot of pressure on their own environment, but also lead to the destruction of the environment of the third world countries by recklessly plundering natural resources. Currently, the West, with 20% of the world's population, consumes 80% of the world's total resources and continues to leave the major negative impacts of ecological damages to the Third World. According to a World Wide Fund For Nature report on October 1, 1998, the world lost nearly 1/3 of the natural wealth from 1970 to 1995.Human production activities and consumption on natural resources such as land, minerals, fish, timber and fresh water, as well as emissions of carbon dioxide and other pollutants, have led to natural environment pressures, most of which have been caused by the Western countries. The British magazine New Statesman issued an article on October 16, 1998 saying that “It’s the poor that do the suffering...while the rich do all the protesting”. The environmental toll of poverty is enormous and growing. All over the world, the poor account for the most deaths from pollution, and are by far the greatest victims of the degradation of the natural world. The wood consumption in papermaking in the 1990s only was twice as much as that in the 1950s. The consumption of paper products in U.S., Japan and Europe accounts for 2/3 of the world's total, while the lumber used comes almost entirely from the Third World. The best example might be that Japan has the highest forest coverage rate in the world, while its needs for woods are being met mainly through the rain forest deforestation of Southeast Asia. With the enhancement of environmental protection consciousness and the improvement of environmental standards, some sunset industries with high energy consumption and heavy pollution in the Western countries are difficult to survive, so the Western developed countries capitalize the desires of the third world countries to eagerly develop the economy, to make cross-border transfers of pollution industries, resulting in the global expansion of contamination. The Third World countries thus become the “pollution havens”. In order to pursue development, the Third World countries are forced to swallow the bitter pill of the ecological crisis ∂ both at home and abroad. They have already got into trouble because of lack of resources and environmental pollution before achieving a highspeed, high-quality development. U.S. futurist Alvin Toffler made a profound description of the capitalist ecological crisis caused by the capitalist civilization: “Never before did any civilization create the means for literally destroying not a city but a planet. Never did whole oceans face toxification, whole species vanish overnight from the earth as a result of human greed or inadvertence; never did mines scar the earth's surface so savagely; never did hair-spray aerosols deplete the ozone layer, or thermo pollution threaten the planetary climate”. Toffler’s description shows us the devastating ecological consequences brought about by the capitalist-led globalization. Numerous facts have proved that the capitalist system is the real root cause of human environmental crisis. Awareness of this issue will affect the prospects for mankind. As the American scholar Paul Sweezy said: “Already, a very large section of the world’s scientific community is fully aware of the seriousness of the ecological threat facing the planet, but what is not widely recognized is that the cause of the threat is capitalism itself. Bourgeois economics seeks to hide or deny this fact. No wonder. If it were generally understood, capitalism would soon be identified for what it is, the mortal enemy of human kind and many other forms of life on the planet. In these circumstances, our responsibility is not only to help the ecologists to get their message across, important as it is, but to convince the ecologists themselves as well as the public at large of the truth about capitalism, that it must be replaced by a social system that puts the life giving capacity of the earth as its first and highest priority. As the unfolding of capitalism's deadly consequences proceeds, more and more people, including 'bourgeois ideologists who have raised themselves to the level of understanding the historical movement as a whole,' will come to see what has to be done if our species is to have any future at all. Our job is to help bring this about in the shortest possible time”. A New Social Order is needed Capitalism is an economic system that pursues endless growth, which requires the use of ever-greater quantities of resources. Thus, the tendency of capital is to violate the natural conditions, undermining the base on which ecological and human sustainability depends. The global reach of capital is creating an ecological crisis all over the world. But, capitalism can't solve this problem by itself. Just as Brett Clark and Richard York (2008) clearly revealed: “A fundamental structural crisis cannot be remedied within the operations of the system”. This is because that “capital shows no signs of slowing down, given its rapacious character. The current ecological crisis has been in the making for a long time and the most serious effects of continuing with business as usual will not fall on present but rather future generations”. “Capitalism is incapable of regulating its social metabolism with nature in an environmentally sustainable manner. Its very operations violate the laws of restitution and metabolic restoration. The solution to each environmental problem generates new environmental problems (while often not curtailing the old ones). One crisis follows another, in an endless succession of failure, stemming from the internal contradictions of the system”. In this case, “if we are to solve our environmental crises, we need to go to the root of the problem: the social relation of capital itself, given that this social metabolic order undermines the vital conditions of existence.” Brett Clark and Richard York, then, came to a conclusion that to resolve the ecological crisis “requires a complete break with the logic of capital and the social metabolic order it creates”. They are not alone in this conclusion. Professor Fred Magdoff (2013) stated more categorically that capitalism, “the system of the accumulation of capital, must go—sooner rather than later.” He further pointed out: “just radically transcending a system that harms the environment and many of the world’s people is not enough. In its place people must create a socio-economic system that has as its very purpose the meeting of everyone’s basic material and nonmaterial needs, which, of course, includes healthy local, regional, and global ecosystems.” This system, without doubt, will has the creation of a harmonious civilization as its goal; it will get rid of all the troubles and problems capitalism causes. In Fred Magdoff's opinion (2012), the harmonious civilization exactly consists in socialism, in which economy and politics are under social control. It’s characteristic of this civilization and socialism that communities strive for self regulation by meaningful democratic processes; self sufficiency for critical life needs; economic equality in which everyone has their basic human material needs—but no more—met; and application of ecological approaches to production, living, and transportation. In construction of a harmonious civilization, to correctly handle the relationship between man and nature is closely related to human survival and development, and also involves the country's sustainable economic development. One of the main problems of the highly developed western countries is that they can't effectively handle the conflict between the boundless demands of man and the environmental carrying capacity and the finiteness of natural resources. Only by properly handling the relationship between man and nature, and scientific development and planned control, could we find a way out for the ∂ future. This, indeed, is the very reason why humans take socialism as the necessary and inevitable alternative to capitalism. Conclusion Contemporary ecological crisis has caused a series of serious global problems: global warming, ozone depletion, acid rain, water shortages, soil degradation, solid waste pollution, species extinction, loss of forests and so on; All these problems have threatened human survival and development. The harsh reality forces people to re-examine the relationship between man and nature, rethink the behavior of human beings, to explore the root causes of the ecological crisis. The appearance of the ecological crisis is not only linked with natural relations in practice, but also with social relations. In the primitive communist society, people lived in the original relationship of equality and there was no interest differentiation. People worked together and enjoyed things together. In this social relationship, antihuman phenomenon generally didn't occur in nature, so there existed no ecological crisis. With the emergence of private ownership, the society split up into a variety of social classes, strata and groups, and each person could do anything for his own interests, thus inevitably strengthening nature's anti-human tendency and leading to ecological crisis. This situation has developed to its peak under capitalism. By its very nature, capitalism is an expansive system, so capitalism's pursuit of capital and value accumulation is limitless. To eliminate the ecological crisis, human beings must try to eliminate private ownership, class divisions, and interest antagonism. In such a social relationship, all the people's activities will be aimed at human free and allaround development, resulting in a harmonious relationship between man and nature, and in the long run, the ecological crisis will be controlled and overcome.

#### Our critique independently outweighs the case - neoliberalism causes extinction and massive social inequalities – the affs single issue legalistic solution is the exact kind of politics neolib wants us to engage in so the root cause to go unquestioned. Farbod 15

( Faramarz Farbod , PhD Candidate @ Rutgers, Prof @ Moravian College, Monthly Review, http://mrzine.monthlyreview.org/2015/farbod020615.html, 6-2)

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

### Alt

#### Vote negative to endorse an authentic grassroots movement centered on class – only by exposing the neoliberal thinking and governance can we achieve a sustainable model.

Matthews-Trigg 13 - Nathaniel Matthews-Trigg Member of Radical Public Health. Graduate student in the University of Washington's Department of Global Health Master of Public Health program. Nathaniel Matthews-Trigg “The Peace Corps Capitalism and US Empire”. Popular Resistance. October 10, 2013. <https://popularresistance.org/the-peace-corps-capitalism-and-us-empire/> AGM

There are no clear-cut solutions to these global problems, only the re-examination of this oppressive knowledge and its systems of control. Arundati Roy, in her book Walking with the Comrades, proposes a redefinition of words like “progress”, illustrating that today’s “progress” is synonymous with business and profit, only obtainable through social, environmental and cultural destruction. “Progress” however is far from the only terminology manipulated to conflate today’s problems with the expression of its solution. By redefining words such as progress, freedom and globalization in terms of equality, autonomy, solidarity and democracy, we can start to look for alternative relationships which will allow for sustainable solutions to the catastrophes humanity finds itself confronted with. Roy explains that any sort of comprehensive, egalitarian “progress” will most likely come from those imaginations that have continued to resist the global hegemony of imperialism and capitalism — not from those that are so thoroughly immersed within it. So, if our goals are to find sustainable, democracy-based solutions to capitalist globalization, it would be a good idea to start by preserving the communities that have been able to hold out against this capitalist infiltration. Through the realization that others’ struggles for survival are intimately bound up with our own, we can start to recognize why organizations such as the American Peace Corps constitute a threat to our collective future. Egalitarian grassroots movements are mass movements rooted in compassion for other people, and it is for this reason that we must expose how today’s structures of authority are able to time and time again manipulate these feelings of love and comradeship to wage war on the poor of our world. If we really want to help others, we must first realize that we are far from free ourselves, and that our own fight for freedom and equality is part of a much larger global struggle against all hierarchical relationships. Without recognizing this, we risk not only hurting the very people we strive to help, but we end up also hurting ourselves. As a group of aboriginal activists in Queensland famously put it back in 1970, “if you have come to help me, you are wasting your time. But if you have come because your liberation is bound up with mine, then let us work together.”

#### The alt is to decentralize global chains, the free markets and neoliberalism- we support Democratisation of capitalism through the Keynesian state

Miloš ŠUmonja, 21- June"Neoliberalism is not dead – On political implications of Covid-19," PubMed Central (PMC), https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/ (LHS IB))

Nationalist states and neoliberal solutions

Surprisingly, after all the historical experiences from the 1970s onwards, and all the theoretical work done to explain the neoliberal counter-revolution, its common sense ‘small state’ ideology still haunts the Left, in particular Keynesian critics of austerity. Even works accentuating the conflict between capitalism and democracy, like [Wolfgang Streeck’s (2014)](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr56-0309816820982381) widely read Buying Time, describe neoliberalism as ‘a general rollback of the state and its intervention in the markets’ (p. 124). Thus, it is worth recalling the lessons of the Marxist State Debate ([Clarke 1991](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr11-0309816820982381)), particularly the insight that the apparent self-isolation of the state from the economy, which seems to be taken for granted in obituaries written for neoliberalism since 2008, is a function of its class nature. The modern state is capital’s home court in its struggle against the masses because it sets the limits to democracy around capitalist social relation of production – although in a way that also depends on the outcome of political and class conflict. Its welfarist incarnation projected and restricted an unprecedented egalitarian change in those relations across the post-war West to the level of distribution. Democratisation of capitalism through the Keynesian state – meaning strong trade unions, politically guaranteed full employment, redistribution of wealth and life chances to the dispossessed, and extensive social services and benefits for all citizens – was a mode of class rule based on compromise rather than outright conflict with the workers. This accumulation regime began to crumble during the late 1960s and early 1970s due to the fall of the rate of profit, when struggles over distribution started to erode the relations of production ([Davidson 2018](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr16-0309816820982381); [Streeck 2014](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr56-0309816820982381)), and capital owners lost confidence in the social and democratic state of capitalism. In these circumstances, neoliberalism appeared as capital’s solution to the economic crisis of 1973, and as a long-term project of class rule.

Theoretically and practically, neoliberalism is committed not only to the protection of markets from society and democracy but also to the transformation of society in the image of markets at the expense of egalitarian democracy ([Munck 2005](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr39-0309816820982381)). That explains why neoliberalism requires a strong and active state, which is capable of reorganising social relations, in particular those characteristic to its Keynesian predecessor, in a way that deepens and entrenches the inequalities of capitalism – through the crushing of the trade unions, cuts in social provision, privatisation of public industries and services, deregulation of financial markets, monetary policies predicated on price stability and so on. Therefore, the so-called ‘roll-back of the state’ is just an ideological misnomer for the process of its neoliberal restructuring in the course of the capital’s efforts to restore the rate of profit:

Projects of neoliberalisation . . . have never been synonymous with a simple diminution, or withdrawal, of the state, but instead have been variously concerned with its capture and reuse, albeit in the context of a generalized assault on social-welfarist or left-arm functions, coupled with an expansion of right-arm roles and capacities in areas like policing and surveillance. ([Peck & Theodore 2019](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/#bibr42-0309816820982381): 249)

Here, the point is to note that the coronavirus crisis is being managed by the neoliberal state, whose purpose was, and still is, ‘the creation and maintenance of a politico-economic order which actively defends itself against impulses towards greater equality and democratisation’ ([Bruff 2016](https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7770495/" \l "bibr8-0309816820982381): 110). No doubt, the fact that it has been forced to shut down the economy and break open the Keynesian toolbox it was meant to bury forever, speaks of an organic crisis in the whole social order. For, paradoxically, in conditions of emergency, when states demonstrate their full commitment to the survival of markets, even if it means temporarily prioritising the survival of the people, the laws of capitalism show themselves as a matter of political choice, and not of natural necessity. By the same token, however, there is nothing contradictory in neoliberal ‘disaster socialism’. Depending on the future, the coronavirus crisis might, in retrospect, appear as just another capitalist crisis, an integral part of its life cycle, or a round of ‘creative destruction’ – and, therefore, another reorganisation, that is further de-democratisation of social relations. As a matter of fact, the crucial question of who is paying for the crisis is already being answered in practice.

### 1NC – Climate Innovation

#### The United States should publicly repudiate a COVID vaccine waiver.

#### Current IP protections protect investment in climate change reduction – COVID waiver spills over to reduce innovation

Brand 5/26 [Melissa Brand is Assistant General Counsel and Director of Intellectual Property at the Biotechnology Innovation Organization (BIO), a major trade association with over 1,000 members in the biotechnology industry. May 26, 2021, “TRIPS IP Waiver Could Establish Dangerous Precedent for Climate Change and Other Biotech Sectors,” ipwatchdog, www.ipwatchdog.com/2021/05/26/trips-ip-waiver-establish-dangerous-precedent-climate-change-biotech-sectors/id=133964//lhs-ap]

While the discussions around waiving intellectual property (IP) rights set forth in the Agreement on Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights (TRIPS) are currently (and somewhat amorphously) limited to COVID-19 related drug and medical products, it is probably shortsighted to ignore the implications for other technologies critical to sustaining our environment and advancing a more healthful world. In fact, if we want to ensure continued investment in these technologies, we should be very concerned about the message conveyed by the international political tide: if you overcome a challenging scientific problem and your solution has the potential to save lives, be prepared to be subjected to intense political pressure and to potentially hand over your technology without compensation and regardless of the consequences.

The biotech industry is making remarkable advances towards climate change solutions, and it is precisely for this reason that it can expect to be in the crosshairs of potential IP waiver discussions. President Biden is correct to refer to climate change as an existential crisis. Yet it does not take too much effort to connect the dots between President Biden’s focus on climate change and his Administration’s recent commitment to waive global IP rights for Covid vaccines (TRIPS IP Waiver). “This is a global health crisis, and the extraordinary circumstances of the COVID-19 pandemic call for extraordinary measures.” If an IP waiver is purportedly necessary to solve the COVID-19 global health crisis (and of course we dispute this notion), can we really feel confident that this or some future Administration will not apply the same logic to the climate crisis? And, without the confidence in the underlying IP for such solutions, what does this mean for U.S. innovation and economic growth? United States Trade Representative (USTR) Katherine Tai was subject to questioning along this very line during a recent Senate Finance Committee hearing. And while Ambassador Tai did not affirmatively state that an IP waiver would be in the future for climate change technology, she surely did not assuage the concerns of interested parties.

International Pressure May Be Influencing Domestic IP Policy

The United States has historically supported robust IP protection. This support is one reason the United States is the center of biotechnology innovation and leading the fight against COVID-19. However, a brief review of the domestic legislation arguably most relevant to this discussion shows just how far the international campaign against IP rights has eroded our normative position. The Clean Air Act, for example, contains a provision allowing for the mandatory licensing of patents covering certain devices for reducing air pollution. Importantly, however, the patent owner is accorded due process and the statute lays out a detailed process regulating the manner in which any such license can be issued, including findings of necessity and that no reasonable alternative method to accomplish the legislated goal exists. Also of critical importance is that the statute requires compensation to the patent holder. Similarly, the Atomic Energy Act contemplates mandatory licensing of patents covering inventions of primary importance in producing or utilizing atomic energy. This statute, too, requires due process, findings of importance to the statutory goals and compensation to the rights holder.

A TRIPS IP waiver would operate outside of these types of frameworks. There would be no due process, no particularized findings, no compensation and no recourse. Indeed, the fact that the World Trade Organization (WTO) already has a process under the TRIPS agreement to address public health crises, including the compulsory licensing provisions, with necessary guardrails and compensation, makes quite clear that the waiver would operate as a free for all.

Forced Tech Transfer Could Be on The Table

When being questioned about the scope of a potential TRIPS IP waiver, Ambassador Tai invoked the proverb “Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day. Teach a man to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.” While this answer suggests primarily that, in times of famine, the Administration would rather give away other people’s fishing rods than share its own plentiful supply of fish (here: actual COVID-19 vaccine stocks), it is apparent that in Ambassador Tai’s view waiving patent rights alone would not help lower- and middle-income countries produce their own vaccines. Rather, they would need to be taught how to make the vaccines and given the biotech industry’s manufacturing know-how, sensitive cell lines, and proprietary cell culture media in order to do so.

In other words, Ambassador Tai acknowledged that the scope of the current TRIPS IP waiver discussions includes the concept of forced tech transfer. In the context of climate change, the idea would be that companies who develop successful methods for producing new seed technologies and sustainable biomass, reducing greenhouse gases in manufacturing and transportation, capturing and sequestering carbon in soil and products, and more, would be required to turn over their proprietary know-how to global competitors.

While it is unclear how this concept would work in practice and under the constitutions of certain countries, the suggestion alone could be devastating to voluntary international collaborations. Even if one could assume that the United States could not implement forced tech transfer on its own soil, what about the governments of our international development partners? It is not hard to understand that a U.S.-based company developing climate change technologies would be unenthusiastic about partnering with a company abroad knowing that the foreign country’s government is on track – with the assent of the U.S. government – to change its laws and seize proprietary materials and know-how that had been voluntarily transferred to the local company.

Necessary Investment Could Diminish

Developing climate change solutions is not an easy endeavor and bad policy positions threaten the likelihood that they will materialize. These products have long lead times from research and development to market introduction, owing not only to a high rate of failure but also rigorous regulatory oversight. Significant investment is required to sustain and drive these challenging and long-enduring endeavors. For example, synthetic biology companies critical to this area of innovation raised over $1 billion in investment in the second quarter of 2019 alone. If investors cannot be confident that IP will be in place to protect important climate change technologies after their long road from bench to market, it is unlikely they will continue to invest at the current and required levels.

Next on the Chopping Block

It is quite reasonable to be worried about the broad implications of a TRIPS IP waiver precedent. International campaigns to weaken IP rights seem to be taking hold in U.S. domestic policy. The TRIPS IP waiver discussions will not conclude in the near term and will not yield more shots in people’s arms. This is not even truly disputed, as our own administration acknowledges that the goal here is technology transfer abroad. Given the signaling that our Administration believes waiving IP rights is an appropriate measure to end global crises, it is proper to worry that facets of the biotech sector addressing climate change may be next on the chopping block.

#### Extinction

Dr. Yew-Kwang Ng 19, Winsemius Professor of Economics at Nanyang Technological University, Fellow of the Academy of Social Sciences in Australia and Member of Advisory Board at the Global Priorities Institute at Oxford University, PhD in Economics from Sydney University, “Keynote: Global Extinction and Animal Welfare: Two Priorities for Effective Altruism”, Global Policy, Volume 10, Number 2, May 2019, pp. 258–266

Catastrophic climate change Though by no means certain, CCC causing global extinction is possible due to interrelated factors of non-linearity, cascading effects, positive feedbacks, multiplicative factors, critical thresholds and tipping points (e.g. Barnosky and Hadly, 2016; Belaia et al., 2017; Buldyrev et al., 2010; Grainger, 2017; Hansen and Sato, 2012; IPCC 2014; Kareiva and Carranza, 2018; Osmond and Klausmeier, 2017; Rothman, 2017; Schuur et al., 2015; Sims and Finnoff, 2016; Van Aalst, 2006).7 A possibly imminent tipping point could be in the form of ‘an abrupt ice sheet collapse [that] could cause a rapid sea level rise’ (Baum et al., 2011, p. 399). There are many avenues for positive feedback in global warming, including: • the replacement of an ice sea by a liquid ocean surface from melting reduces the reflection and increases the absorption of sunlight, leading to faster warming; • the drying of forests from warming increases forest fires and the release of more carbon; and • higher ocean temperatures may lead to the release of methane trapped under the ocean floor, producing runaway global warming. Though there are also avenues for negative feedback, the scientific consensus is for an overall net positive feedback (Roe and Baker, 2007). Thus, the Global Challenges Foundation (2017, p. 25) concludes, ‘The world is currently completely unprepared to envisage, and even less deal with, the consequences of CCC’. The threat of sea-level rising from global warming is well known, but there are also other likely and more imminent threats to the survivability of mankind and other living things. For example, Sherwood and Huber (2010) emphasize the adaptability limit to climate change due to heat stress from high environmental wet-bulb temperature. They show that ‘even modest global warming could ... expose large fractions of the [world] population to unprecedented heat stress’ p. 9552 and that with substantial global warming, ‘the area of land rendered uninhabitable by heat stress would dwarf that affected by rising sea level’ p. 9555, making extinction much more likely and the relatively moderate damages estimated by most integrated assessment models unreliably low. While imminent extinction is very unlikely and may not come for a long time even under business as usual, the main point is that we cannot rule it out. Annan and Hargreaves (2011, pp. 434–435) may be right that there is ‘an upper 95 per cent probability limit for S [temperature increase] ... to lie close to 4°C, and certainly well below 6°C’. However, probabilities of 5 per cent, 0.5 per cent, 0.05 per cent or even 0.005 per cent of excessive warming and the resulting extinction probabilities cannot be ruled out and are unacceptable. Even if there is only a 1 per cent probability that there is a time bomb in the airplane, you probably want to change your flight. Extinction of the whole world is more important to avoid by literally a trillion times.