# Neolib K

## Links

### WTO link

#### The Aff endorsement of the WTO as the actor in the plan text is bad- The WTO was created to further entrench us in Neolib- and values everything that’s wrong w Neolib

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/#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/#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/#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/#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/#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/#bibr52-0309816820982381))

### 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.

#### Capitalism causes extinction from climate change – outweighs nuke war – only transition solves.

Polychroniu, 21

[C. J., political economist who has taught at numerous universities in Europe and the United States and has worked at various research center, PhD Poly Sci @UDelaware, author/editor of several books: "Is Saving the Planet Under Capitalism Really Possible?," Global Policy Journal, 4-1-21. https://www.globalpolicyjournal.com/blog/20/04/2021/saving-planet-under-capitalism-really-possible]//AD

The theme of the 51st Anniversary of Earth Day is “Restore Our Earth.” To be sure, while there has been a growing level of environmental consciousness since the first Earth Day and environmental policies have changed dramatically over the last fifty years, we are really in a race to save the planet. As things stand, the world now faces two existential crises that threaten organized human life as we know it, and life in general on planet Earth. The first one stems from the continued presence of nuclear weapons. The second one comes from global warming. However, while a nuclear war is actually preventable, we are not sure about global warming. Allow me to elaborate. The world has been faced with a threat from a nuclear war since the end of the Second World War. It is an intolerable threat to humanity, and it may just be the case that we have managed so far to avoid a nuclear holocaust by sheer accident. But a nuclear war can be prevented by addressing the sources of conflict and going beyond arms control. We can actually abolish nuclear weapons. On the other hand, global warming is a certainty. It is already happening. According to the 2020 Global Climate Report from NOAA’s National Centers for Environmental Information, the global annual temperature has increased at an average rate of 0.08 degrees Celsius per decade since 1880, but the average rate of increase since 1981 (0.18 degrees Celsius) has been more than twice that rate. Moreover, the effects of global warming are already present and include excessive heat waves, frequent wildfires, more droughts, greater frequency, intensity and duration of hurricanes, and higher sea levels which will have profound impact on low-lying coastal areas. The effects of global warming will also be felt most severely on all categories of human movement: displacement, migration, and planned relocation. The data on human movement in the context of the climate emergency is already daunting. The Internal Displacement Monitoring Center (IDMC), which has been compiling data since 2008 on displacement due to natural disasters, estimated that between 2008 and 2019 there were 265 million new displacements associated with disasters such as storms, floods, and wildfires. This figure does not include estimates on displacement related to drought or estimates on migration and planned relocation associated with the climate emergency. The impact of human migration due to the climate crisis is expected to be simply overwhelming. A report released by the World Bank in 2018 estimates that three regions of the world (Latin America, sub-Saharan Africa, and Southeast Asia) will produce 143 million more environmental migrants by 2050. Make no mistake, global warming is the defining crisis of our time. Climate change has always happened on planet Earth, but there is overwhelming scientific evidence that the Earth’s globally averaged temperature surface temperature has been rising due to anthropogenic factors. According to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change’s (IPCC) fifth assessment report, human emissions and activities have caused 100% of the observed increase in temperature since 1950. Global warming is human-caused and the culprit is industrial capitalism and its addiction to fossil fuels. The burning of fossil fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas) releases carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases which trap heat in the atmosphere and contribute to temperature increases. Scientists have known for decades how exactly carbon dioxide causes global warming. Nuclear physicist Edward Teller warned the oil industry all the way back in 1959 that its product will end up having a catastrophic impact on human civilization. Moreover, scientific studies have established a proportional correlation between global mean surface air warming and cumulative carbon dioxide emissions. Unsurprisingly, therefore, the 2010s, in which emissions from greenhouse gases grew faster over this decade than they did over the previous three decades, were the hottest decade. So the heat is on, yet action to contain global warming has been very slow. At COP 21 in Paris, on December 12, 2015, nearly every nation on earth agreed to combat global warming by “holding the increase in the global average temperature well below 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels.” This goal is to be attained through substantial cuts in carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions. However, the Paris Agreement is a toothless climate accord. It lacks an enforcement mechanism and contains very few direct requirements. Most of the countries that signed the Paris Agreement are not on track to meet their pledge, and while some investors move away from coal, new coal-fired plants continue to be built in many parts of the developing world. Indeed, perhaps indicative of all of the above, a recent United Nations Environment Programme report suggests that we are on track for an average temperature rise well above 3 degrees Celsius. At this stage, while a quick wind-down of fossil fuel production is absolutely critical to slow the rate of global warming, we must accept the fact that the Earth’s temperature would continue to rise over the next several decades. At this point, even reducing carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases to zero won’t stop global warming. Nonetheless, zero emissions is a must if we don’t want to see human civilization crumble within a few decades from now - a distinct possibility if we don’t take immediate action this decade, according to a policy paper by the Breakthrough National Center for Climate Restoration in Melbourne.

#### 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

#### The alternative is to decentralize global trade. A pluralistic global system allows for flexible industrial development while avoiding the pitfalls of centralized neoliberalism. Alternative indicts are unfounded fearmongering.

Bello 99 [(Walden, Filipino academic, environmentalist, and social worker who served as a member of the House of Representatives of the Philippines.) “Why Reform of the WTO is the Wrong Agenda” Focus on Trade, No. 43, December 1999, <https://www.tni.org/my/node/6851>] TDI

Building a More Pluralistic System of International Trade Governance

If there is one thing that is clear, it is that developing country governments and international civil society must not allow their energies to be hijacked into reforming these institutions. This will only amount to administering a facelift to fundamentally flawed institutions. Indeed, today's need is not another centralized global institution, reformed or unreformed, but the deconcentration and decentralization of institutional power and the creation of a pluralistic system of institutions and organizations interacting with one another amidst broadly defined and flexible agreements and understandings.

It was under such a more pluralistic global system, where hegemonic power was still far from institutionalized in a set of all encompassing and powerful multilateral organizations that the Latin American countries and many Asian countries were able to achieve a modicum of industrial development in the period from 1950-70. It was under a more pluralistic world system, under a GATT that was limited in its power, flexible, and more sympathetic to the special status of developing countries, that the East and Southeast Asian countries were able to become newly industrializing countries through activist state trade and industrial policies that departed significantly from the free-market biases enshrined in the WTO.

The alternative to a powerful WTO is not a Hobbesian state of nature. It is always the powerful that have stoked this fear. The reality of international economic relations in a world marked by a multiplicity of international and regional institutions that check one another is a far cry from the propaganda image of a 'nasty' and 'brutish' world. Of course, the threat of unilateral action by the powerful is ever present in such a system, but it is one that even the powerful hesitate to take for fear of its consequences on their legitimacy as well as the reaction it would provoke in the form of opposing coalitions.

In other words, what developing countries and international civil society should aim at is not to reform the WTO but, through a combination of passive and active measures, to radically reduce its power and to make it simply another international insitution coexisting with and being checked by other international organizations, agreements, and regional groupings. These would include such diverse actors and institutions as UNCTAD, multilateral environmental agreements, the International Labor Organization (ILO), evolving trde blocs such as Mercosur in Latin America, SAARC in South Asia, SADCC in Southern Africa, and ASEAN in Southeast Asia. It is in such a more fluid, less structured, more pluralistic world with multiple checks and balances that the nations and communities of the South will be able to carve out the space to develop based on their values, their rhythms, and the strategies of their choice.

# Case

## WTO Cred Advantage

### 1NC – A/C

#### The US has structurally undermined WTO legitimacy

Baschuk 2/22 [(Bryce, reporter for Bloomberg Economics based in Geneva, Switzerland, has been published in Bloomberg, the Washington Times, United Press International and National Public Radio) “Biden Picks Up Where Trump Left Off in Hard-Line Stances at WTO,” Bloomberg, 2/22/2021] TDI

President Joe Biden’s administration dashed hopes for a softer approach to the World Trade Organization by pursuing a pair of his predecessor’s strategies that critics say risk undermining the international trading system.

The U.S. delegation to the WTO, in a statement Monday obtained by Bloomberg, backed the Trump administration’s decision to label Hong Kong exports as “[Made in China](https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-10-30/hong-kong-takes-formal-wto-action-on-u-s-made-in-china-order)” and said the WTO had no right to mediate the matter because the organization’s rules permit countries to take any action to protect their “essential security interests.”

“The situation with respect to Hong Kong, China, constitutes a threat to the national security of the United States,” the U.S. delegation said. “Issues of national security are not matters appropriate for adjudication in the WTO dispute-settlement system.”

Prior to 2016, WTO members generally steered clear of defending their trade actions on the basis of national security because doing so could encourage other nations to pursue protectionist policies that have little or nothing to do with hostile threats.

That changed in 2018, when the Trump administration triggered a cold war-era law to justify tariffs on foreign imports of steel and aluminum. In response, a handful of U.S. trade partners, including Canada, the EU, and China filed disputes at the WTO and a ruling in those cases is expected later this year.

Since then, more nations -- including Saudi Arabia, India, Russia and others -- have cited the WTO’s national-security exemption in regional trade fights, leading trade experts to warn that such cases could erode the organization’s ability to mediate disputes.

The Biden administration on Monday said the U.S. has consistently argued that national-security disputes are not subject to WTO review because it would infringe on a member’s right to determine what is in its own security interests.

In spite of the U.S. objection, the WTO granted Hong Kong’s dispute inquiry and will establish a panel of experts to deliberate the matter and render a decision, which could take two to three years.

At the same meeting, the Biden administration said it would not agree to appoint new members to the WTO’s appellate body, a seven-member panel of experts who until 2019 had the final say on trade disputes involving billions of dollars worth of international commerce.

The Biden administration said it could not do so because the U.S. “continues to have systemic concerns” with the functioning of the appellate body as have all previous administrations over the past 16 years.

Though the statement was not entirely unexpected, it confirms America’s bipartisan frustration with the functioning of the WTO appellate body and the new administration’s willingness to block new panelists until changes can be agreed.

Once Katherine Tai is confirmed as the U.S. Trade Representative, her office “looks forward to working with” WTO Director-General Ngozi Okonjo-Iweala to tackle the problems with WTO dispute settlement, including the unresolved issues over appellate-body overreach, USTR spokesman Adam Hodge said in an email. “These are long-standing, bipartisan concerns that we hope our trading partners will work with us to address,” he said.

The Trump administration broke precedent when it refused to consider any nominees to fill vacancies on the panel until there weren’t enough to sign off on new rulings. As a result, the WTO’s dispute-settlement system has been critically damaged because WTO members are now free to veto any adverse dispute rulings by appealing them into a legal void created by the appellate body’s paralysis.

### 1NC – No ! 2 Trade

#### Trade is irrelevant for war

Katherine Barbieri 13, Associate Professor of Political Science at the University of South Carolina, Ph.D. in Political Science from Binghamton University, “Economic Interdependence: A Path to Peace or Source of Interstate Conflict?” Chapter 10 in Conflict, War, and Peace: An Introduction to Scientific Research, google books

How does interdependence affect war, the most intense form of conflict? Table 2 gives the empirical results. The rarity of wars makes any analysis of their causes quite difficult, for variations in interdependence will seldom result in the occurrence of war. As in the case of MIDs, the log-likelihood ratio tests for each model suggest that the inclusion of the various measures of interdependence and the control variables improves our understanding of the factors affecting the occurrence of war over that obtained from the null model. However, the individual interdependence variables, alone, are not statistically significant. This is not the case with contiguity and relative capabilities, which are both statistically significant. Again, we see that contiguous dyads are more conflict-prone and that dyads composed of states with unequal power are more pacific than those with highly equal power. Surprisingly, no evidence is provided to support the commonly held proposition that democratic states are less likely to engage in wars with other democratic states.¶ The evidence from the pre-WWII period provides support for those arguing that economic factors have little, if any, influence on affecting leaders’ decisions to engage in war, but many of the control variables are also statistically insignificant. These results should be interpreted with caution, since the sample does not contain a sufficient number wars to allow us to capture great variations across different types of relationships. Many observations of war are excluded from the sample by virtue of not having the corresponding explanatory measures. A variable would have to have an extremely strong influence on conflict—as does contiguity—to find significant results. ¶ 7. Conclusions This study provides little empirical support for the liberal proposition that trade provides a path to interstate peace. Even after controlling for the influence of contiguity, joint democracy, alliance ties, and relative capabilities, the evidence suggests that in most instances trade fails to deter conflict. Instead, extensive economic interdependence increases the likelihood that dyads engage in militarized dispute; however, it appears to have little influence on the incidence of war.

### 1NC – COVID Reduces Conflict

#### COVID reduces the risk of conflict.

Gul 20. [(Ayaz Gul) “Kashmiri Leader: COVID-19 Lowers Chances of Pakistan-India War” VOA News. April 28, 2020. <https://www.voanews.com/south-central-asia/kashmiri-leader-covid-19-lowers-chances-pakistan-india-war>] TDI

ISLAMABAD - Pakistan and India are locked in almost daily military clashes across their Kashmir frontier, but the president of the Pakistani-ruled part of the disputed territory says the coronavirus pandemic has for now **diminished chances, if any, of the tensions escalating into a full-blown war.** Islamabad and New Delhi routinely accuse each other of firing the first shot that started the clashes in violation of a 2003 mutual truce across what is referred to as the Kashmir Line of Control (LoC). Critics say the increased violence in recent years, however, already has rendered the truce ineffective. The clashes have caused dozens of casualties on both sides, mostly civilians living in villages close to the LoC. “**I don’t foresee a war in the near future**,” said President Masood Khan of Azad (independent) Jammu and Kashmir (AJK), the official name Pakistan uses for the part of the divided region it administers. India controls the remaining two-thirds of the largely Muslim Himalayan region, claimed by both of the nuclear-armed rival nations. “Right now, the world is **preoccupied with the COVID-19 pandemic**, and nobody **seriously expects India and Pakistan to go to war**. And we do not know what the world would look like once this pandemic is over,” Khan told VOA in an interview at his camp office in the Pakistani capital.

### 1NC – No Indo-Pak Impact

#### Deterrence solves Indo-Pak war.

Ganguly 19 [(Sumit, Rabindranath Tagore Chair in Indian Cultures and Civilizations at Indiana University, has been a Fellow at the Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars in Washington, DC, a Visiting Fellow at the Center for International Security and Cooperation and at the Center on Democracy, Development and the Rule of Law at Stanford University) “Why the India-Pakistan Crisis Isn’t Likely to Turn Nuclear,” Foreign Affairs, 3/5/2019] TDI

No one can say for sure, but history suggests that there is cause for optimism. During the Kargil War, India worked to contain the fighting to the regions around Pakistan’s original incursions and the war concluded with no real threat of nuclear escalation.

Less than two years later, the two countries plunged into crisis once again. In December 2001, five terrorists from the Pakistan-based groups Lashkar-e-Tabia and Jaish-e-Mohammed attacked the parliament building in New Delhi with AK-47s, grenades, and homemade bombs, killing eight security guards and a gardener. In response, India launched a mass military mobilization designed to induce Pakistan to crack down on terrorist groups. As Indian troops deployed to the border, terrorists from Pakistan struck again. In May 2002, three men killed 34 people in the residential area of an Indian army camp in Kaluchak, in Jammu and Kashmir. Tensions spiked. India seemed poised to unleash a military assault on Pakistan. Several embassies in New Delhi and Islamabad withdrew their nonessential personnel and issued travel advisories. The standoff lasted for several months, but dissipated when it became apparent that India lacked viable military options and that the long mobilization was taking a toll on the Indian military’s men and materiel. The United States also helped ease tensions by urging both sides to start talking. India claimed victory, but it was a Pyrrhic one, as Pakistan failed to sever its ties with a range of terrorist organizations.

Other nuclear states have also clashed without resorting to nuclear weapons. In 1969, China, then an incipient nuclear weapons state, and the Soviet Union, a full-fledged nuclear power, came to blows over islands in the Ussuri River, which runs along the border between the two countries. Several hundred Chinese and Soviet soldiers died in the confrontation. Making matters worse, Chinese leader Mao Zedong had a tendency to run risks and dismissed the significance of nuclear weapons, reportedly telling Indian Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru that even if half of mankind died in a nuclear war, the other half would survive and imperialism would have been razed to the ground. Yet despite Mao’s views, the crisis ended without going nuclear, thanks in part to the efforts of Soviet Prime Minister Alexei Kosygin, who took the first step by travelling to Beijing for talks.

There’s reason to believe that the current situation is similar. Pakistan’s overweening military establishment undoubtedly harbors an extreme view of India and determines Pakistan’s policy toward its neighbor. The military, however, is not irrational. In India, although Prime Minister Narendra Modi has a jingoistic disposition, he, too, understands the risks of escalation, and he has a firm grip on the Indian military.

Another source of optimism comes from what political scientists call the “nuclear revolution,” the idea that the invention of nuclear weapons fundamentally changed the nature of war. Many strategists argue that nuclear weapons’ destructive power is so great that states understand the awful consequences that would result from using them—and avoid doing so at all costs. Indian and Pakistani strategists are no different from their counterparts elsewhere. Even Pakistani Prime Minister Imran Khan, a political neophyte, underscored the dangers of nuclear weapons in his speech addressing the crisis last week. And Modi, for all his chauvinism, has scrupulously avoided referring to India’s nuclear capabilities.

The decision by India and Pakistan to allow their jets to cross the border represents a major break with the past. Yet so far both countries have taken only limited action. Their principal aim, it appears, is what the political scientist Murray Edelman once referred to as “dramaturgy”—theatrical gestures designed to please domestic audiences. Now that both sides have gone through the motions, neither is likely to escalate any further. Peering into the nuclear abyss concentrates the mind remarkably.

Disclosure:

## 2NC OV

### Aff leads to other forms of neolib

The Aff restricting medicines directly affects other WTO’s policies which effect other polices generally such as healthcare, climate change, labor laws, ect. Which create a world entrenched in Neoliberal ideas. Also allows for other WTO and other orgs open and close for sectors which creates for democracies to have and support open markets and neoliberalism. That’s Debra 01

### WTO= Neoliberal org

Aff endorses the plan through the WTO which goals are to enhanced transnational capitalist power and profits create a cost of growing economic instability and deteriorating working and living conditions. Hart-Landsberg 06

### Aff is done for efficeny+innovation

Aff false supports that restricting IP for innovation is a neoliberal way of thinking and gives more power to big pharma and other capitalist entities which is a link. Also proves that social states are better at dealing w pandemics- That’s Kassabov-21

### IP- Cap is the RC of Pandemics

Capitalism commodification creates own social and natural preconditions appear as the structural causes of the pandemic- a few implications.

1. it means that pandemics will spread faster as a result of unprecedented physical connectivity in the word of global supply chains and low-cost flying
2. worldwide supply systems and national trade that the WTO facilities through things like the industrial and other private sector trade- which means pathogens spread more easily and kill more
3. Creates land grabs that lead to deforestation and using all resources on earth which creates land grab and resource wars+ a lack of resources in the future will lead to resource wars, warming, climate change, and exinction
4. Gov’t’s reaction to outbreak is ‘epidemiological neoliberalism’- 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’. This creates meaningless death everywhere a pandemic comes.
5. When pandemics happen- Neolib is screwed as countries and neoliberal actors trade and supply chnages die meaning that we can’t solve pandemics efficiently as we lose a lot of money. Only soc,aism can solve apndemics since collab and it’s a givts and actor moral hazard to solve while cap entites don’t have one.

### at: perm both – topline

#### The perm fails - it links to key distinctions between the 1ac and the alt and severs the aff – reject it because severance incentivizes aff conditionality which independently decks our ground

### AT Perms

#### This debate is a question of methods --- the aff justified their performance with a method as opposed to a plan which means they should be prepared to defend it --- anything else creates the worst form of aff conditionality where it’s impossible to respond and kills clash and education

#### Combining methods defeats the purpose and create a focus that is not on material concerns but on an ununified confusion which means even if the link to the plan isn’t mutually exclusive, the permutation can’t resolve the aff or the alt.

#### All of the links are disads to the perm- the way Cap treats humans as a mean to an end kills a good V2L as they are treated as commodities that are expendable+ dehumanizing ruse of solvency that orients energy away from the real proletariat or human struggle of prouduction and the idea of proudutivity.

#### Cooption DA --- including any analysis of solely anything other than cap means they re-inscribe structurally violent formations within the prevailing logic of capitalist social relations which creates a pluralistic focus that lets capitalists exploit the movement and destroy effectiveness. A unified movement is key.

#### Alt is mutually exclusive: The alt is a rejection of capitalist material in favor of historical materialism. Without a rejection of capitalist material, it is not historically materialist. The material in this instance is the AC, which we reject.

### at: transition wars

#### The crackdown won’t happen, capital can’t afford to attack its labor – and it would only increase the success of the transition away from the status quo

**Meszaros 95** (Istvan, Prof @ U of Sussex, Beyond Capital P 725-727)

Another argument which is often used in favour of permanent accommodation is the threat of extreme authoritarian measures that must be faced by a socialist revolutionary movement. This argument is backed up by emphasizing both the immense destructive power at capital's disposal and the undeniable historical fact that no ruling order ever cedes willingly its position of command over society, using if need be even the most violent form of repression to retain its rule. The weakness of this argument is twofold, despite the factual circumstances which would seem to support it. First, it disregards that the antagonistic confrontation between capital and labour is not a political/military one in which one of the antagonists could be slaughtered on the battlefield or riveted to chains. Inasmuch as there can be chains in this confrontation, labour is wearing them already, in that the only type of chains compatible with the system must be 'flexible' enough to enable the class of labour to produce and be exploited. Nor can one imagine that the authoritarian might of capital is likely to be used only against a revolutionary socialist movement. The repressive anti-labour measures of the last two decades — not to mention many instances of past historical emergency characterized by the use of violence under the capital system —give a foretaste of worse things to come in the event of extreme confrontations. But this is not a matter of either/or, with some sort of apriori guarantee of a 'fair' and benevolent treatment in the event of labour's willing accommodation and submission. The matter hinges on the gravity of the crisis and on the circumstances under which the antagonistic confrontations unfold. Uncomfortable as this truth may sound to socialists, one of the heaviest chains which labour has to wear today is that it is tied to capital for its continued survival, for as long as it does not succeed in making a strategic break in the direction of a transition to a radically different social metabolic order. But that is even more true of capital, with the qualitative difference that capital cannot make any break towards the establishment of a different social order. For capital, truly, 'there is no alternative' — and there can never be — to its exploitative structural dependency on labour. If nothing else, this fact sets well marked limits to capital's ability to permanently subdue labour by violence, compelling it to use, instead, the earlier mentioned 'flexible chains' against the class of labour. It can use violence with success selectively, against limited groups of labour, but not against the socialist movement organized as a revolutionary mass movement.

### ---at: solves warming

#### Capitalism makes technology a commodity, where exchange- value is prioritized over use- value, ensuring an ecological crisis— only the alternative’s understanding of the intrinsic value of technology can solve.

Berg ‘16-- (Macauley, Media Specialist, Major in ethics and philosophy or science at the University of San Diego, “An Ecological Critique of Capitalism”, Spring 5-22-2016, pg. 16-26) kb

The logic of capitalism is such that there are sectors of industry (the extractive, agricultural, information, technology, etc.) and a supply chain (raw materials, manufacturing, distribution, retailer, consumer). When a problem arises (e.g., a manufactured good is not generating the desired revenue for a company), it is localizable to one of these sectors. Either the product isn’t being advertised well, the raw materials have risen in price, consumers aren’t spending as much, or something else along those lines. Each industry operates largely independently from one another, and occupies its own sphere. This is not to say that independent industries have no bearing on one another, but for all intents and purposes, the various industries stand on equal ground. They freely compete. Corporations and the industries they belong to are left to, on the whole, sink or swim on their own according to the logic of the market (bailouts, subsidies, and specialized government industries—like the military—excluded). Czech notes a problem in this logic when we take a closer look at the origin of money and its distribution across various economic sectors. There is a foundational base of the economy, or productive sector, which is namely the agricultural sector. All production requires energy, and all energy in earth’s ecosystem comes from the sun. Solar energy is what is taken up by producers like plants, which is consumed by predators in a food chain. Everything humans produce (be it a salad, a cabin, or even an idea) requires energy. Even production from labor requires caloric intake and thus is sustained first and foremost by an energy supply. Nothing we do is extricable from the supply of earth’s energy. The economy and market are no exception. Czech, then, wisely applies the laws of thermodynamics and the concept of trophic levels to the economy—something he calls the “trophic theory of money.” This idea is plain and simple, but its implications are huge. In general, the degree of difference between trophic levels is approximate to a degree of 10. So, for a very rough sketch, in an ecosystem with 1,000 plants (producers), we might expect to see 100 deer (low consumers), and only 10 lions (high consumers). Energy cannot be created or destroyed (first law of thermodynamics—E=mc^2), and because no transfer of energy is 100% efficient (second law of thermodynamics—Entropy Law), it is clear that the “supply” of plants limits the “supply” of deer which in turn limits the “supply” of lions. The numbers are never this clean, but obviously in this ecosystem there could not be 1,000 plants, 1,000 deer, and 1,000 lions. Much less possible would be the presence of 10 plants, 100 deer, and 1,000 lions. So, it is puzzling in modern society when there is such a “mismatch between trophic levels and GDP,”21 a criticism to be further developed later. The fault that his trophic theory of money points out is this: the foundation of the global economy (agriculture) represents the producers in the natural order. Above this foundation is heavy manufacturing (infrastructural building, heavy metals, etc.) and above that level is light manufacturing (e.g., computer chips). Ultimately, despite the lessons of thermodynamics and trophic levels, the most profitable industries in terms of GDP are those which are the furthest removed from the foundational level. The impossibility should be obvious—such an arrangement is never nowhere sustainable. It doesn’t occur in nature and it cannot occur without disastrous consequences. Even if there is enough built up biomass (fossil fuels) stored away underneath earth’s surface now just waiting for the extractive industries to come dig it up, it will eventually deplete. The math just doesn’t add up. Keep in mind the relevant thermodynamic principles. The first law of thermodynamics makes clear that energy cannot be created ex nihilo. In earth’s closed ecosystem, all energy originates from the sun. So even the fossil fuels which we are so eager to extract will, undeniably, deplete. Fossil fuels take hundreds of millions of years to form (from the decomposition of incredibly old biomass).22 We deplete this extremely concentrated energy source at a rate that easily outstrips the rate at which these fuels can form. “It takes almost 26 tons of raw petroleum to produce 1 liter of gas. It takes almost 800 pounds of coal to power a light bulb 24/7 for an entire year. It would take the natural process of decomposition of materials 422 years to replace what we currently consume in a year in fossil fuels.”23 Nobody should believe that 1 year of consumption (at the rate of 422 years of production) is sustainable. In any case, capitalism is not wont to see this inconsistency, and so continues to “split” the ecological crisis. Rather than seeing an ecological crisis with which we are involved in a deep relationship (via our global economic systems, individual practices, etc.), capitalism paints a divisive and illusory picture of individual impacts (each with individual solutions). As Parr states, “the collective crisis is splintered into a disparate and confusing array of individual choices in competition on how to best solve the crisis.”24 The effect is that before we even get started, we’ve already wrongly conceptualized the crisis (or, conversely, used the environmental framework rather than the ecological framework). The result is an unsuccessful attempt to kill the hydra by infinite decapitations. Rather than changing our global patterns of production, consumption, and accumulation, we seek instead to “solve” oil spills by making BP clean them up, to “solve” waste-production by increasing recycling, to “solve” rising carbon dioxide emissions by purchasing hybrid cars, etc. Again, it is worth restating that this is not incidental, this is how capitalism works. We are allowed, as it were, to combat climate change, or rising emissions, or whichever environmental impact is on the capitalistic chopping block, just not in a radical or efficacious way. We have options to consume green, but not to consume less. Speaking of consumption, capitalism converts the vast majority of earth’s ecosystem into commodities. It goes like this: nature has intrinsic value in that ecological integrity (the flourishing of life, the integration of parts to whole, the lack of extinctions) is itself valuable. From this intrinsic value, humans derive use-value, which is basically just utility (e.g., humans use trees to build shelters). Use-value is not the same as intrinsic value, but it has a basic respect for intrinsic value. The first humans who needed shelter valued the elements of nature that afforded them that shelter. Trade can occur based on use-value, and I could trade you the lumber you need for the flint that I need (a transaction based on utility and quality). But it is surplus products (say, shelters) and tokens of value (say, dollars), the very building blocks of a “market,” that establish the rudimentary rules of capitalism. If there exists some common token of value (again, dollars), then by producing many shelters I may trade (or now, sell) each one I don’t have any use for (leaving use-value and quality behind) in the interest of accumulating more tokens of value (dollars) for myself. It really is a quick hop, skip, and a jump from use-value to exchange-value. Once the process of commodification begins, even on a very small scale, the commodity tends to race toward exchange-value over use-value, leaving no consideration for intrinsic value at all. This commodifying process distorts the real intrinsic value to be respected in nature, and appropriated in an ecologically sound manner by utility. Quality is overshadowed by quantity, utility is overshadowed by the drive for continued accumulation, and nature is eclipsed by “natural resources.” Then production is carried out for the sake of production itself, without regard for utility or sustainability. Take for example a house built of wood. The wood beams cost more than the tree they were cut from, and the house built of the wood beams costs more than both the wood and the tree. Value is “added,” theoretically, by the labor that went into converting the tree into wood and the wood into a house. But remember the trophic theory of money: a given trophic level cannot have more biomass than the one beneath it (e.g., plants, deer, and lions). When the natural capital (trees) have less value than the wood they are cut for, which in turn has less value than the house built of wood, then the highest trophic level (houses) has more value than the trophic levels below it (trees) which support its foundation. This is a recipe for the liquidation of natural capital. This “mismatch between trophic levels and GDP figures”25 represents the domination of exchange-value over use-value and the complete abandonment of considerations for intrinsic value. But the natural world isn’t the only thing that is commodified by capitalism. It is far from it. Under capitalism, humans become the ultimate commodity. Humans are the cornerstone of the entire value-generating regime. Again, humans are naturally evaluative beings and, rather naturally, assign value to certain things which provide certain utilities, but when value is generated ex nihilo, that is cause for concern. In the house-building example, it is the labor of the human that “adds value” to the wood, and to the house, which make both more valuable than the wood they are constructed from. In a truly trophic sense, this is to be expected because turning a tree into lumber requires a lot of energy; much more still is required for turning lumber into a house. All energy comes from the sun so the amount of energy in the ecosystem is limited. But, the rate at which exchange-value increases is not proportional to the increased energy output in the production process, but rather it is largely contrived from nothing, for no other purpose than to maximize the producer’s accumulation. This point is obvious. Humans keep the whole commodification process going by first selling their labor (energy) for wages (tokens of value) on a market. Certain jobs pay more or less depending on arbitrary conditions. Some of the most necessary jobs in society pay nearly nothing (think garbage truck drivers, mail deliverers, construction workers, etc.) whereas others are heinously valued in the opposite direction (think CEOs who make 600x what the entry-level employee makes). This isn’t simply the way things are. This is the result of capitalism. The effect of this fact is also very obvious: when the natural world isn’t properly valued, we tarnish it. Through the process of commodification, an alienating effect also occurs. The more distanced from true relationships we become, the easier it is for the artificial ones to set in. In modern society, “money makes the world go ‘round” and we relate to one another as economic agents. If you live in modern society, you interact with others via the market. Everything is commodified (including both the natural world, and yourself via your wage labor). Keeping in mind an important feature of the ecological framework mentioned earlier, appropriate and integrative relationships between parts and whole are crucial to the proper framing of the ecological crisis. The more alienated we become from these true relations, the harder it becomes to fully cognize the crisis at hand (e.g., when we hear of a BP oil spill, we might think first about the impact on gas prices and second about the impact on the natural world). When nature is commodified, we relate not to it, but to a skewed conception of nature. This “skewing” is of course dubbed alienation. When we value nature environmentally, we conceive of nature as “natural resources” whose only purpose is to conform to human whims. When we value nature ecologically, however, we conceive of nature as that which sustains all of life on earth and as the foundation of every facet of human development, progress, and economy. As we become further alienated from nature it becomes reflexive to ignore our dialectical and integrated relationship with it. It’s a fancy way of saying that we have left use-value far behind and are no longer connected to our work, our products, or our ecosystem. Alienation is what makes most people feel like they’re “working for the weekend” – the idea that labor is inherently unpleasant and cumbersome. When the only way for us to exist in modern society is by selling our labor on a market, to consume products from the market, to put back more money into the market, then we are just cogs in a system which we are very unlikely to reject. We’re so far removed from our true nature as integral parts of the whole (the natural world) and real relationships (dialectical, authentic, human relationships) that we reflexively obey the laws of the market. We become Homo Economicus and relate to fellow humans not as inherently valuable agents but as economic agents. As Parr puts it, capitalism is “a mechanism of repression, a repressive system, and a displacement activity which we reflexively obey”26 all at once! We become insulated from real relationships by artificial market relationships which, while effective, are deeply unnatural. Through capitalism, we become alienated from (1) ourselves, (2) others, and (3) the natural world. We conceive of ourselves as a repository for “human capital” so that we may get better jobs with higher pay and accumulate more of the goods and wealth we have been conditioned to seek. We think of others as customers or merchants, baristas or financiers. We adopt the roles we are given in the global marketplace. And we conceive of the natural world as either merely a backdrop against human activity or, worse, as a means to the end of financial success (e.g., oil tycoons, fracking corporations, deforestation industry, etc.). Such a conception is clearly indicative of the environmental (not the ecological) framework. In any case, it is certainly not conceived as something with which we are deeply connected. It is because we are so insulated and alienated from true relationships with the natural world that the industries of the most-intense production occupy a much higher trophic level/GDP figure than the natural capital on which those industries are based. The culmination of the splitting, commodifying, and alienating effects of capitalism establishes capitalism as a disintegrating force, fundamentally opposed to the integrative ecological framework. Capitalism creates the illusion of discrete, isolated entities and prefers to deal in these even when inappropriate. Whether dealing with distinct sectors of industry, parts of the supply chain, or simply individual agents, the logic of capitalism is disintegrative. In other words, the successful capitalist stands alone on their own merit. Relationships and circumstances are downplayed, merit is highlighted, and the individual and their accomplishments are valorized. The wealthy capitalist who appears to have “earned” all their wealth fairly (although this appearance is rarely ever accurate) is celebrated as a more successful capitalist than the capitalist who inherited their fortune. The fact of the matter is however that we all exist in the constitutive relationships of the ecosystem, and in relationship with each other. No capitalist has ever achieved what they have truly and wholly of their own accord, despite their likely insistence of that point. Zuckerberg couldn’t have created Facebook without the prior contributions of Jobs and Gates, Leonardo Da Vinci couldn’t have created the Mona Lisa without the subject Lisa Gherardini, and the ideas of Socrates wouldn’t have been propagated without Plato’s writings. Social reality truly is a nexus of interrelationships and capitalism is fundamentally opposed to conceiving of it as such. There is no denying that we are individual entities, but disintegration deals with isolated individual entities whereas integration deals with deeply connected individual entities. Individuality is not denied on the ecological framework, but it does not pretend that our connections are irrelevant. The difference between integration and disintegration is not trivial. As Kovel states, “humans can be a part of nature that catalyses nature’s own exuberance so that the combined human-natural ecosystem is integral and differentiated rather than disintegrated and split.”27 To use a simple analogy, we can think of an economy like a garden. It is comprised by various individual crops (industries/corporations) which can all strive and grow and be healthy in their own individual right. But if one crop (or industry) grows so much that there’s no more nutritious soil (or natural capital) for the others, the whole garden can fall into disarray. On the contrary, if the flourishing of the individual crops is integrated and proportional, then a “flourishing garden” emerges from the aggregate of flourishing individual crops. The preferred garden is not the one with the most vertical growth, or the most competition for resources, or the largest plot upon which it is situated, but rather the one with the most overall health as represented by ecological integrity. That’s essentially how our modern society must be structured: without an overarching system of regulation, each industry is left to its own motivations and devices (profit, accumulation, etc.) to destabilize the entire global ecosystem at the expense of everybody. Without integration, we clash with natural systems. Think of the popular acronym “NIMBY” (Not In My Back Yard) which is an apt description of the common response to modern development. We produce waste which fills up landfills, we extract fossil fuels which pollute our atmosphere, we create toxins that poison organic life and so on. It seems to be the case that development and production under business-as-usual in the status quo coproduce all kinds of harms for society and the farthest we can get away from them is by pushing them off on someone else and saying Not In My Back Yard! In contrast, and with integration, we can enhance and catalyze natural systems like Kovel recommends (e.g., using tidal waves to capture energy, or solar panels to harness solar energy, etc.). Klein also has high hopes for this prospect and characterizes it with a new acronym to reflect the health that arises from integration: “POOL” (Please, On Our Land!).28 Our production and our development, even our business, could potentially catalyze natural systems and not leave behind a trail of waste and byproducts that will take hundreds of years to dissipate into a wrecked ecosystem. However, the strongest enemy of an integrated world is a disintegrated (and disintegrative) market.