#### Interpretation – the affirmative may not specify a subset of conditions they choose to impletement

#### 1] Grammar – Medicines is a generic bare plural

Nebel 20 [Jake Nebel is an assistant professor of philosophy at the University of Southern California and executive director of Victory Briefs. He writes a lot of this stuff lol – duh.] “Indefinite Singular Generics in Debate” Victory Briefs, 19 August 2020. no url AG

I agree that if “a democracy” in the resolution just meant “one or more democracy,” then a country-specific affirmative could be topical. But, as I will explain in this topic analysis, that isn’t what “a democracy” means in the resolution. To see why, we first need to back up a bit and review (or learn) the idea of generic generalizations.

The most common way of expressing a generic in English is through a *bare plural*. A bare plural is a plural noun phrase, like “dogs” and “cats,” that lacks an overt determiner. (A determiner is a word that tells us which or how many: determiners include quantifier words like “all,” “some,” and “most,” demonstratives like “this” and “those,” posses- sives like “mine” and “its,” and so on.) LD resolutions often contain bare plurals, and that is the most common clue to their genericity.

We have already seen some examples of generics that are not bare plurals: “A whale is a mammal,” “A beaver builds dams,” and “The woolly mammoth is extinct.” The first two examples use indefinite singulars—singular nouns preceded by the indefinite article “a”—and the third is a definite singular since it is preceded by the definite article “the.” Generics can also be expressed with bare singulars (“Syrup is viscous”) and even verbs (as we’ll see later on). The resolution’s “a democracy” is an indefinite singular, and so it very well might be—and, as we’ll soon see, is—generic.

But it is also important to keep in mind that, just as not all generics are bare plurals, not all bare plurals are generic. “Dogs are barking” is true as long as some dogs are barking. Bare plurals can be used in particular ways to express existential statements. The key question for any given debate resolution that contains a bare plural is whether that occurrence of the bare plural is generic or existential.

The same is true of indefinite singulars. As debaters will be quick to point out, some uses of the indefinite singular really do mean “some” or “one or more”: “A cat is on the mat” is clearly not a generic generalization about cats; it’s true as long as some cat is on the mat. The question is whether the indefinite singular “a democracy” is existential or generic in the resolution.

Now, my own view is that, if we understand the difference between existential and generic statements, and if we approach the question impartially, without any invest- ment in one side of the debate, we can almost always just tell which reading is correct just by thinking about it. It is clear that “In a democracy, voting ought to be compul- sory” doesn’t mean “There is one or more democracy in which voting ought to be com- pulsory.” I don’t think a fancy argument should be required to show this any more than a fancy argument should be required to show that “A duck doesn’t lay eggs” is a generic—a false one because ducks do lay eggs, even though some ducks (namely males) don’t. And if a debater contests this by insisting that “a democracy” is existen- tial, the judge should be willing to resolve competing claims by, well, judging—that is, by using her judgment. Contesting a claim by insisting on its negation or demanding justification doesn’t put any obligation on the judge to be neutral about it. (Otherwise the negative could make every debate irresolvable by just insisting on the negation of every statement in the affirmative speeches.) Even if the insistence is backed by some sort of argument, we can reasonably reject an argument if we know its conclusion to be false, even if we are not in a position to know exactly where the argument goes wrong. Particularly in matters of logic and language, speakers have more direct knowledge of particular cases (e.g., that some specific inference is invalid or some specific sentence is infelicitious) than of the underlying explanations.

But that is just my view, and not every judge agrees with me, so it will be helpful to consider some arguments for the conclusion that we already know to be true: that, even if the United States is a democracy and ought to have compulsory voting, that doesn’t suffice to show that, in a democracy, voting ought to be compulsory—in other words, that “a democracy” in the resolution is generic, not existential.

Second, existential uses of the indefinite, such as “A cat is on the mat,” are upward- entailing.3 This means that if you replace the noun with a more general one, such as “An animal is on the mat,” the sentence will still be true. So let’s do that with “a democracy.” Does the resolution entail “In a society, voting ought to be compulsory”? Intuitively not, because you could think that voting ought to be compulsory in democracies but not in other sorts of societies. This suggests that “a democracy” in the resolution is not existential.

#### Violation – they only defend the COVID vaccine

#### Standards:

#### 1] Limits: There’s an infinite number of medicines and future medicines – hundreds of vaccines (Influenza, Coronavirus, Diptheria, Yellow Fever, etc.) and thousands of pharmaceutical drugs (Metformin, Lisinopril, Atorvastatin, and many more) – the negative could spec AND choose combinations – that’s supercharged by the fact that they can also spec countries. Kills neg burdens – it’s impossible for me to research every possible combination of medicines. Functional limits don’t check – each individual weapon has implications and articles as to why it is bad

#### 2] Prep hazard – there are an infinite number of medicines they could possibly spec exploding neg prep – generics and functional limits don’t apply because each medicine has different effects, capabilities, and implications which makes there infinite arguments for each weapon being bad

#### 3] TVA Solves – just read your aff as an advantage to a whole rez aff. We aren’t stopping them from reading new FWs, mechanisms, or advantages. PICs don’t solve – it’s ridiculous to say that neg potential abuse justifies the aff making it impossible for me to win

#### Fairness and education are voters – debate’s a game that needs rules to evaluate it and education gives us portable skills for life like research and thinking.

## 2

#### Capitalism’s collapse is inevitable it’s just a question of when. Your decision should be filtered through a Marxist lense by centering the valorization of productivity that the aff is wedded to.

Kuang 20 [Da Kuang and Changyi Huang are professors at the Huazhong University of Science and Technology, College of Marxism in Wuhan 430074, China. A Study of Marx’s Thought on the Speed of Capital Accumulation, Presented at the 2020 International Conference on Social Science, Economics and Education Research (SSEER 2020), Atlantic Press: Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research Volume 455, 8-22-21, amrita]

III. CONTEMPORARY ENLIGHTENMENT: **CAPITALISM IS BOUND TO DIE OUT IN THE LONG-TERM STAGNATION OF CAPITAL ACCUMULATION** As we all know, Marx and Engels reached a most important scientific conclusion in the Manifesto of the Communist Party: **the death of the bourgeoisie and the victory of the proletariat are equally inevitable.** This is the famous “Two Necessities” principle of Marxism. If we study **Marx’s thought of the speed of capital accumulation, we will come to the conclusion that capitalism is bound to die out in the long-term stagnation of capital accumulation.** Wallerstein believes that **although the production for the purpose of pursuing profits has a history of thousands of years, this mode of production has never occupied a dominant position in these historical systems. Only capitalism regards the endless accumulation of profits as the fundamental feature of its own system**. Wallerstein pointed out that the capitalist system has been maintained for more than 500 years, and the fundamental policy of endless capital accumulation has been quite successful. However, **the historical stage based on this has come to an end, and the late capitalism is coming to an end.** Andrew Kleiman made **an empirical study on the change trend of American profit margin from 1929 to 2009. He believed that after the boom period of World War II, the capital profit margin of the whole economic system was indeed declining irreversibly.** Robert Brenner calculated the declining trend of manufacturing profit margin in the United States and Japan since the 1950s. Among them, **the average profit margin of manufacturing industry in the United States has more than doubled, and the average profit margin of manufacturing industry in Japan has more than tripled**. These empirical studies **confirm Marx’s idea that the rate of capital profit keeps falling and the rate of capital accumulation tends to stagnate.** The global financial crisis that broke out in 2007-2008 is the most serious crisis of capitalism since the great depression in the 1930s. **Although the crisis is presented in the form of finance, the underlying law is still “relative overproduction”, that is, trying to expand credit consumption to alleviate the contradiction between the expansion of production and the relative reduction of consumption capacity, accelerating the real estate and finance** The development of bubbles. But **this contradiction is only temporarily covered by bubbles, and after a long period of accumulation and fermentation, the crisis finally broke out**. After 10 years of evolution**, the capitalist world has not recovered from crisis and stagnation, but has expanded into a structural crisis of capitalism along the path of financial crisis → economic crisis → financial crisis → debt crisis.** At the same time, **contemporary capitalism also faces the absolute limit of capital accumulation caused by the crisis of population aging and ecological crisis**. According to statistics, in 2014, the total population of 28 countries in the EU was 508 million, of which 18.5% were aged over 65, 19.9% were aged between 50 and 64, and 38.4% were aged between 50 and 64. **The trend of population aging will inevitably lead to the extreme shortage of labor force, increase labor cost, and further reduce the profit margin of capital; and the ecological crisis will gradually become the same or even more serious problem as the economic crisis.** As the existing capital accumulation models all go bankrupt, **the speed of capital accumulation will inevitably further decline. The economic cycle theory of western mainstream economics interprets the capitalist economic crisis as a kind of normal economic fluctuation, and holds that capital can always overcome the crisis and stagnation, and then accelerate the accumulation again. This kind of circular movement, which only attributes capital accumulation to quantitative change, conceals a historical fact: the final result of the crisis and stagnation of capital accumulation is the qualitative change of capitalist ownership, which is an irreversible linear process**. Over the past 200 years, **the world economic crisis has occurred more than 20 times, some of which directly triggered the proletarian revolution**, some of which first broke out in war and then triggered the proletarian revolution. **For example,** the result of **the capitalist economic crisis in 1847 was the final explosion of the French Revolution in June;** The capitalist economic crisis of 1867-1868 first triggered the Franco Prussian War, and finally triggered the Paris Commune Revolution; the capitalist economic crisis of 1907-1908 first triggered the first World War, and finally triggered the October Revolution of Russia which opened a new era of human history in 1917; the capitalist economic crisis of 1929-1933 gave birth to the second World War, and finally the war As a result, Eastern European countries including East Germany, Yugoslavia, Poland, Hungary, Romania and other countries, as well as China, North Korea, Vietnam, Cuba, Albania and other countries have embarked on the socialist road. **In addition to the proletarian socialist revolution caused by the economic crisis, the capitalist internal system of ownership has also made major adjustments in response to the economic crisis.** From individual private capital to stock system, this is the first adjustment of capitalist ownership; from stock system to monopoly, this is the second adjustment of capitalist ownership; from private stock monopoly to capitalist state monopoly, this is the third adjustment of capitalist ownership; from capitalist state monopoly to international monopoly, this is the fourth adjustment of capitalist ownership. As a result, the capitalist ownership of means of production is becoming more and more like public ownership rather than private ownership. It is getting further and further away from the original private ownership and closer to public ownership. It can be predicted **that capitalism will inevitably die out in the long-term stagnation of capital accumulation. The ultimate fate of capitalism is to be replaced** by socialism.

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

Patane [Patanè, Andrea. COVID-19 Pandemic: Patents and Profits, 15 May 2021, [www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm.]//nagisatm](http://www.marxist.com/covid-19-pandemic-patents-and-profits.htm.%5d//nagisatm)

A “calculated risk” Far from an act of ‘international solidarity', [Vaccine Waivers] this latest move from the US government is a calculated political risk, and will be implemented in the interests of US imperialism. A section of the more serious wing of the bourgeoisie understands that a proper economic recovery can happen only if the pandemic is suppressed worldwide. As we have explained elsewhere, wealthy countries risk losing billions of dollars if the pandemic is brought under control only within their own borders, because new variants (like those in India and Brazil) can always mutate elsewhere and reinfect their populations, causing further economic disruption. Therefore, even on a capitalist basis, it is expedient in the long-term for the rich countries to facilitate a global vaccination campaign. Even Pope Francis anointed the demand from his seat in Rome! Biden’s announcement is also an act of vaccine diplomacy. America’s main rivals, China and Russia, have been shoring up their spheres of influence by distributing their Sinopharm and Sputnik V vaccines to poor countries left out by the vaccine nationalism of the US and Europe. Chinese and Russian vaccines have been exported into countries traditionally under western spheres of influence, including Brazil and Hungary. Pushing to waive IP protections on COVID-19 vaccines is therefore partly an effort to push back against the encroachment of rival imperialist powers, which have so far outcompeted Washington in the global vaccination drive. Biden’s announcement is also an attempt to restore the standing and authority of US imperialism on the world stage, which has been bruised by the ‘America First’ vaccine nationalist policy started by Donald Trump, and continued by Biden. According to the FT, Katherine Tai (top US trade envoy) and Jake Sullivan (national security adviser) made the case to Biden that pushing for the waiver “was a low-risk way to secure a diplomatic victory”, after coming under fire for not “respond[ing] quickly enough to the unfolding COVID-19 crisis in India”. Here you have it, straight from the horse’s mouth. Under capitalism, vaccines – rather than providing a way out of the pandemic – are tools for ‘low-risk diplomatic victories’. As if this was some sort of football match between world leaders! In short, Biden is stepping in to prioritise the interests of US imperialism as a whole over the immediate interests of the Big Pharma capitalists. But we should say clearly: this cynical attempt to claim the moral high ground came only after the US used its massive economic clout to secure enough vaccines to inoculate its own population several times over.

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

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

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

#### Capitalism causes extinction from climate change – 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.

Refuse to return to normal – their COVID analysis naturalizes the financial instruments of death and economic nationalism that have subtended the whole crisis – the impact is centuries of genocidal global violence that have made possible the financialization of PPE supply chains, pandemic bonds, and the imbrication of global racial capitalism with colonial death-making systems – turns their advantage

Mitropoulos 20 [Angela Mitropoulos is a political theorist whose corpus spans the registers of radical movements and sustained philosophical enquiry. Her writing has appeared in numerous journals, including Social Text, South Atlantic Quarterly, Mute, Cultural Studies Review, Borderlands, and ephemera; and it has been widely translated, disseminated and taught in both academic and activist contexts. *Pandemonium: Proliferating Borders of Capital and the Pandemic Swerve*, Pluto Press //tjb]

**How we make sense of the pandemic is based on assumptions about the origins of the virus, the causes of disease and death with which it is associated, and contested views regarding what it exposed or revealed or is known.** Understandings of disorder, like perceptions of chaos, or definitions of crisis and threat, depend a great deal on perspective and assumptions of what an orderly world might otherwise be. John Milton coined ‘Pandæmonium’ for his epic, mid-seventeenth-century poem Paradise Lost. It means ‘all demons’—from the Greek ‘pan’ for ‘all.’ His use marked a shift from the meaning of ‘daemon’ as ministering oracle to that of fallen angel or malign supernatural being. In Paradise Lost, Pandæmonium is the name of the capital city of Hell—an infernal gathering on the shore of the Lake of Fire, where disobedient angels deliberate on whether there is hope of regaining heaven or whether to believe in ancient prophecies of a new creation. **Here, ‘pandemonium’ instead describes the emergence of an order from treatments of chaos—and it does so without the nostalgic assumption that what went before the pandemic was a paradise undone by disobedience and sin. How and whether the pandemic presents a turning-point or swerve, and toward what, is the question to which this book is addressed.**

In terms of scale, the microbial event of a new virus will arguably come to represent the largest intensive swerve of the first quarter of the twenty- first century. By the end of April 2020, New York City hospital mortuaries, crematories, and city-run morgues had run out of space. Some were resorting to refrigerated trailers. **More than 17,000 people had died from the disease—almost five times more than died in the Twin Towers on September 11, 2001.**

A swerve, or clinamen, was how the ancient Roman poet Lucretius described the cascading effects from one molecular movement in his epic poem On the Nature of Things—and in his deliberations on the plague that accompanied the fall of Athenian empire. There, he offers a theory of natural causes at odds with the major traditions in so-called Western philosophy which holds that it is within the nature of things to realize a destiny that was present at their origins and according to their rank. Lucretian philosophy points elsewhere. It refutes the subordination of lives to the assumptions of an idealized Way of Life and, by setting aside the sorting between unruly matter and eternal forms on which that idealization depends, the unaccountable, transcendent fatalism implicit in the terminology of the natural disaster. **But if the precise, contingent base point from which a swerve happens cannot be known in advance— the molecular change in the protein spike that sets SARS-CoV-2 apart from other coronaviruses and which, among the numerous mutations for which viruses have a remarkable capacity, managed to survive repeated encounters with human immune systems—both responses to the pandemic and the conditions of human health have been** centuries in the making**.**

**Some of those responses have drawn on understandings of health and disease that are models of social order recast as an eternal nature, rendering those responses ineffective in stemming the transmission of disease.** **Despite drawing on the analogy of contagion to redescribe crises, much the same is true of the risk analyst Nassim Taleb’s black swan, in which the question becomes how to convert an unforeseeable event and spreading crisis into an opportunity for financial gain.** The black swan is simply the name for a programmable response to uncertainty that treats nonlinear effects as if they were a universal repeating pattern found in nature. These approaches redefine what an effective response to a pandemic means. **Bluntly, while some responses have been turned toward saving lives, others have sought to enhance and preserve the very system that has conditioned the patterning of illness and deaths. As with the biosecurity and disaster apparatus elaborated after 9/11, definitions of threat and security, however implicit, can convene and justify actions that multiply death and suffering along certain lines.**

The title of this book is also a gesture to Michel Foucault’s The Order of Things—the English title of the work in which he presents his theory of how the production of knowledge is always a matter of power relations. It points, moreover, to debates and assumptions concerning neoliberalism. **Against the conventional view of neoliberalism, not only did borders proliferate, but they did so largely without challenging the assumption that they are a means of protection against the ravages of capitalist exploitation rather than the arbitrage which makes exploitation possible. This facilitated the turn between neoliberal government and the resurgence of the far Right.**1

This is not to suggest that the approach taken here follows Foucault— except in foregrounding these debates and the epistemological question of how we know what we know, or think we know.2 More so, it is to point out that The Order of Things is an allusion to the eighteenth-century political economist Adam Smith’s repeated turn of phrase: “the natural course and order of things.” **In Smith’s economic liberalism, that presumably natural economic order could not be realized through sovereign rule but, instead, would be providentially manifested by the self-interest of property-owners, whose decisions would be guided by knowledge of the “wealth of nations.”** **This is the figure of homo economicus, or ‘rational economic man.’ The invisible hand is revealed to economic man, in other words, by the Gross Domestic Product (GDP)—a metric that Smith envisaged but that did not quite emerge until the twentieth century.** **For Smith’s contemporary, the reactionary cleric and political-economist Thomas Malthus, the natural economic order could only be revealed by eliminating the moral hazard of parish welfare. For him, the price of bread would be the spur to individual moral-economic decisions.** The misery that ensued as the result of the withdrawal of welfare would serve as a proxy for the biblical plagues and famines by re-enacting a purportedly natural means of death for large segments of the ‘unproductive’ population. Much has been made of the contrast between these crucial thinkers whose prolonged influence cannot be overstated, irrespective of whether they are still read. **Yet these prototypical approaches to economic liberalism and authoritarian government are both** premised on the idea of the household (oikos) as the primordial economic unit and presumably natural justification of exploitation. **Put simply, they were both moral economists from whom the idealized (patriarchal) household served as the model of a proper law and order.**

**Briefly, the idea of a natural economic hierarchy is the assumption, derived from medieval estates and ancient texts on household management, of a heritable patriarchal authority over women, children and, not least, bonded servants and bound slaves. It is the source of contemporary (mis)understandings of gender and race and, in their abstraction from the history of the feudal estates and plantation economies from which capitalism emerged, their disconnection from distinct understandings of class.** The false choice between liberal and reactionary forms of economic management premised on the hierarchical household (oikos)—**and its indivisible personification in a politics from which its subordinates are excluded—has become the model for almost all systems of modern political authoritarianism and economic liberalism. Because it naturalizes the asymmetries of surplus-value extraction, it is not outside the circuit of capital but integral to its systems of accumulation, particularly in moments of that circuit’s crises.**3

**Understanding this systematic logic helps in theorizing the politics of the pandemic in a way that highlights the centrality of the economic unit of ‘the household’—as well as the infrastructures and supply chains of healthcare, communication and food without which no private household could survive the lockdown.** **It also makes it possible to see how stay-at-home orders have not made the lives of those trapped with abusers or those without affordable or any housing safer, even as in other instances it has amplified the outsourcing of gendered conflicts over household work to domestic service and supply workers— and to link the entitlements that foster intimate violence to those of macroeconomic policy and geopolitics.** As, for instance, in the discussions of epidemiological mathematics and money below suggests, the practices of statistical knowledge and workings of national currencies are pivotal to the naturalization and extraction of surplus value. **These overlapping practices of governance, no less than overt articulations of racism, ableism or sexism,** point to neoliberalism’s endogenous turning-points to authoritarian and fascist politics**.** **At the same time, this book presents a warning against treating economic liberalism and economic nationalism as fundamentally irreconcilable—particularly when the crisis to which solutions are addressed is that of capitalism rather than health.**

**Moreover, the appearance of the virus in China in late 2019 and its later spread to ‘the West’ makes it important to address the idea of a natural economy in its national and geopolitical scales, even where ‘natural economy’ is rendered as an anthropological aesthetics of cultural differences and units.** Chief among these is the return of the East-West dichotomy and insinuations of Eastern uniformity. As comparisons of epidemiological curves suggest however, the dichotomy is an imaginative orientalist fiction. Singapore, the Philippines and Bangladesh had comparable peaks to those of Sweden, Hungary, the United Kingdom and the United States. Malaysia’s arc was similar to the Netherlands. The peaks and falls in Thailand, China, Taiwan and Vietnam approximated those of New Zealand, Norway and Austria. While this does not describe the uneven conditions within each of those countries, it nevertheless illustrates the absence of generic Eastern or Western approaches and experiences.

Despite this, for some the global pandemic prompted a return to discredited imperialist maps of geocultural uniformity and division. In one increasingly popular rendition there is a nostalgia for a “deep structure” of Western philosophy’s ancient categorical teleology that is said to give rise to a necessary law and order. Having regrettably been lost in the West, it is fortuitously rediscoverable in the East’s “Confucian ways of thinking” and its presumably unique respect for professional expertise and “hyper- sensitivity to disorder.”4 Informed by Kantian geopolitical anthropology (the source of the idea of distinct ‘continental’ races), and nurturing a Machiavellian preoccupation with having the ear of aspiring princes, the ascription of cultural uniformity is an attempt to circumscribe class conflict to an implicitly ethnonationalist orbit of geocultural ‘self-regulation’ or discipline.

This is how the recent history of conflicts over healthcare, pensions and work in China that preceded and shaped the impact of the disease have been erased, including by much of the Anglophone and European left. For instance, there is little discussion of the ways in which China’s hukou or household welfare registration system fostered the geographic (and often gendered) inequalities in which coastal cities were privileged, as compared to inland cities such as Wuhan, the privatization and commercialization of its healthcare system, or the waves of strikes throughout China over the years that might shake the idea of a unique cultural bond between governments and populations.5

Yet **geoculturalism is also a diagram that, in seeking to derive a law and order from imputed anthropological variations, converges with far-right ethnopluralism**—such as that promoted in the 1960s and ’70s by Alain de Benoist and France’s Nouvelle Droite**.** It is an important ideological inspiration of today’s global far-right insurgency—particularly those who insist they are not white supremacists but, merely, adherents of the idea of unique ethnological or cultural differences which must be preserved through global segregation. **Simply because they draw on seventeenth- century European anthropological and cultural understandings of race—as distinct from more recent biological or ‘scientific’ concepts of race—does not mean that geocultural paradigms are any less concerned than seventeenth-century European colonists and powers with using race as the predicate of law and order and the justification for an associated imperial cartography.** In their preoccupation with the geopolitics of race, order and chaos, these thinkers are far from alone. **Speculation about the post-Covid world and the new world borders it is shaping are informed by perceptions of chaos that are manipulated into the seemingly self-evident intuition for a new geopolitical order. That geopolitical order assumes a modular system of economic nationalism that draws on ethnopluralism.**

**The stakes, however, concern the very logic of capital, which requires the assignment and enforcement of well-defined property rights so as to proceed through and conclude its asymmetric, exploitative circuit. The actual system to which this gives rise is far more archipelagic in its spatial and temporal arrangements than diagrams of global nationalism assert.** It is turned to creating groups of workers and populations placed outside citizenship or the full scope of political and economic rights.6 **Contrary to the economic nationalist idea of self-sufficient (re)production, all** borders have always been porous**.** Accumulation involves filtering, not a fixed impermeable line. **In practice, then, geocultural approaches simply convert the logic of capital, through the repertoire of cultural aesthetics, into a global political predicate of capitalist lawmaking exclusive of large swathes of workers.** **In treating culture as an inherited and unique property, cultural nationalism, economic nationalism and geocultural approaches implicitly treat nations and economic management as analogous to an idealized familial and patriarchal household.** **From that point on, they mystify the quest to install a boundary between ‘proper’ political representation of the nation and a purportedly ‘proper’ economic policy which regulates the movement of workers.** In the orientalist version promulgated during the pandemic, the ‘lost’ system of a classical (‘Western’) exclusion of slaves, women, and children from politics is simply projected onto and rediscovered in a generic, contemporary ‘Asia’ as its fortuitous manifestation.

On the other side of the Pacific, in what we are told is a world away, Donald Trump’s seemingly chaotic rule in the US has involved a systematic effort to remove the political rights of large parts of the workforce (through disenfranchisement, limits on citizenship and the cudgel of detention and deportation). However frustrated or incompetent that effort has been, it has been consistent and consistently shaped his response to the pandemic. **For all their differences, the Chinese and American governments’ responses have been shaped by a similar logic.** **In the US case, the dream of a workforce stripped of political rights and relegated to economic subordination (the oikos in the classical formulation) has animated Trump as much as it has shaped the US administration’s geopolitical affinity toward authoritarian government elsewhere.**

All taxonomies involve a theory of origins and epistemology—which is where this book begins. Exotic explanations of the virus and the pandemic project a fixed, idealized version of economic, social and political arrangements onto nature. It is an idea of nature at odds with what is known of the virus or biological, microbial and evolutionary processes—including human evolution and biology. Much like exogenous theories of crisis, exoticist explanations of the virus and disease engage in a preliminary polemical and metaphysical division, and go on to advance an argument about the assignment and displacement of liabilities. **During the pandemic, while much of the risk of the disease was displaced onto private households —and therefore the patterning of (heritable) assets and liquid wages—those households were linked through an assumed racial genealogy to larger (national and geopolitical) taxonomies of populations and the management of their health and welfare.** **However,** the viability of locked-down households was physically contingent upon and linked by the unpaid and low-paid work in which women, migrants, and Black and Brown people predominate**. The way in which these designated essential services routinely function is through low and below-subsistence wages.** **During the pandemic, they were maintained, then, by the lurking possibility of hunger and homelessness— against which workers had to weigh the chances of infection, in many cases in the absence of adequate protective equipment and healthcare.**

As the final parts of this book go on to argue, **elisions of these contingencies establish the preliminary steps and momentum of post- pandemic economic policy.** **That trajectory foreshadows a post-Malthusian argument and offer of a political-economic social contract, according to which the crises of national productivity (falls in the GDP, rising unemployment) wrought by lockdowns should be solved by the ‘restoration’ of boundaries that restores a growing rate of capital accumulation.** **This is by no means inevitable.** Yet rather than render a vast and diverse opposition to and movements against that trajectory into an object, the approach here is concerned with highlighting the limits to that movement and the points on which force might be exerted so that there is, indeed, movement in another direction.

The second and third parts of this book discuss the quarantine and population theory. The seemingly self-evident retrieval of the quarantine from the medieval past and colonial margins figures prominently as a practice-run in merging authoritarian governance with private, selective healthcare. It suggests that **the priority accorded to the language of quarantine—and the travel bans that encouraged a disingenuous conflation of quarantines with case isolation and therefore the geographic association of groups of people with a disease—cannot be explained as a consequence of the urgent need to stem the transmission of the virus since there is little evidence of quarantine’s efficacy in this regard. Rather, the apparently spontaneous retrieval of the quarantine crystallized a decades-long, endogenous shift within neoliberalism. What prevailing understandings of** neoliberalism have obscured is the importance to capitalist extraction and accumulation of a political-economic boundary between the demos (the ostensibly proper subject of political representation and lawmaking) and the practices of managing (properly) productive populations.

**The third part of the book traces the history of “herd immunity” through the history of population theory. It highlights the importance of a boundary between the economic concept of populations (whose value is defined and measured in terms of production and reproduction) and the political idea of a demos (the boundary of the political contract). This history is linked to the emergence of the national welfare state and the epidemiological statistical reformulation of a Malthusian constraint or ‘natural limits’ which abstractly encoded racial and immigration restrictions and justified limits on healthcare expenditure.** In doing so, it underlines the varied influences of cultural nationalism and early fascism on statistical knowledge and understandings of population health and eugenics—and contrasts these with Marx’s understanding of class.

The fourth part begins with the first political philosopher of eugenics, Plato—for whom prescribed drugs were both a eugenic instrument and a metaphor for acceptably mendacious political speech. The principal focus, here, is on the promotion of hydroxychloroquine as an attempt to circumvent the clinical trial and restrictions on drug prescription and advertising. It suggests that the two key uncertainties in pharmacological capital are those of the drug trial and the sale of the product (the creation of a growing market). Yet it also underscores the importance of the Platonist exemption for intuitive, patriarchal knowledge to the history of philosophical rationalism, of charismatic or entrepreneurial uncertainty during a perceived time of political disorder, and in overcoming key obstacles to the ordered realization of the capitalist circuit.

The fifth section begins with a discussion of the collapse of GDP during the pandemic, and goes on to focus on financial and insurance instruments and supply-chains. Specifically, it takes up the World Bank’s pandemic bond and the logistics of personal protective equipment (PPE) supply. **The pandemic bond points to a financialization of the imagination of disaster, as do all catastrophe bonds.** **When compared with another relevant catastrophe bond (the extreme mortality bond) issued by a reinsurer, however, the pandemic bond more clearly represents the transformation of intergovernmental disaster aid to cash-strapped governments into the effective purchase of insurance on capital markets by the bond’s sponsoring governments (Australia, Germany and Japan). It preserved austerity as regular policy.** **Moreover, the stipulations of the pandemic bond froze the supply of money at the moment in which it would have been most effective in stemming disease transmission.**

While the cash was destined to pay for PPE, global private markets for PPE were being reshaped by public-private consortia working in tandem to monopolize lucrative supply-lines and those markets. **This suggests that the collapse of the pandemic preparedness policies of, for instance, previous US administrations was less a problem of which politicians were in power than the securitization of disaster and the commercialization of health and disease.** On the one hand, those policies were highly amenable to a merger of insurance with financial speculation—as with catastrophe bonds. On the other, manufacturers had scaled back on production of devices because they did not think that the products would find a market. **The problem is less the absence of preparation or just-in-time systems than that preventative and life-saving equipment is a commodity.** **In that regard, the claims of economic nationalism around PPE supply-chains has far less to do with ensuring that needs are met than with mercantilism and facilitating the monopolistic carving-up of global markets through the combined action of states and corporations.** **At the same time, the involvement of corporations such as DuPont illustrates the indistinction of states and markets and, moreover, the highly contradictory positions that corporations can hold in relation to health because each of those positions is a financial measure of risk that can be hedged (or insured against).**

The final section looks forward to the terms of post-Covid-19 policy. **The overly-familiar mechanisms of resolving a defined crisis in national productivity are summarized as** austerity**. They include a contraction of wages and social incomes so as to increase profit margins as well as the elaboration of authoritarian governance over populations. The current include immigration restrictions, which make labour market arbitrage possible and furnish a reservoir of hyper-exploitation, and the expansion of surveillance, which accomplishes much the same thing.** Yet the current circumstances present this familiar scenario with a dilemma. Malthus had sought to characterize poverty and unemployment as a function of ‘overpopulation.’ Those characterizations are not immediately available in circumstances of a declining population, rises in unemployment as a result of lockdowns (not migration) and the preponderance of migrant workers in what, during the pandemic, had been designated as critical infrastructure. Nevertheless, **the gathering momentum is toward a reckoning of (national economic) debts owed in the form of surplus labor—presented as heroic sacrifice, justified as the presumably natural thresholds of political and economic rights.** **Not least,** it is made possible by the selective prohibitions on mourning that desensitizes against a eugenic trimming of the ‘unproductive’ or ‘surplus’ populations.

**At the same time however, the pandemic also presents us with another understanding of debt as an acknowledgment of the interdependent conditions of survival and care. It is a moment in which what it takes to live, to be healthy and flourish, vividly clashes with the capitalist mystique of economic productivity, of the idealized household and the metrics of the Gross National Product.**

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

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

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

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

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

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

#### Solves Medical Innovation – Cuba Proves. But only a sustained commitment to Marxism can secure the revolutionary future.

Khan 15 [K Khan, September 24 2015, "Capitalism's Sickness and its Cure," In Defence of Marxism, [https://www.marxist.com/capitalisms-sickness-and-its-cure.htm]//raunak](https://www.marxist.com/capitalisms-sickness-and-its-cure.htm%5d/raunak) dua

This stands in stark contrast with the kind of work done for decades in Cuba. That small, isolated, island nation is leading the way in research towards cures. It has already proven it is possible to stop the transmission of HIV from mother to child and is boldly working on an HIV vaccine. Cuba is by no means a truly socialist society. “Socialism in one country” is a concept conclusively debunked by history. Socialism must be international or it is nothing, and must include direct democratic planning and control over the economy and the state by the working class. Nonetheless, the Cuban health care system is example of what can be done on the basis of a nationalized, planned economy. It is a harbinger of what humanity will be capable of when it focuses on cures instead of profits, of what genuine socialism will look like once it spreads across the entire world.

Under socialism the vast resources humanity has developed under capitalism could be harnessed towards providing real cures. Under socialism, the for-profit Pharma companies will be dispensed with and replaced by a massive, publicly owned, and rationally planned pharmaceutical industry under democratic workers' control. The noble professions of medicine and scientific research will be freed from the twisted "logic" of capital, and will serve to meet the needs of the many, not the profits of the few.

But such a society will not arise on its own. It requires the hard work of building of a mass revolutionary Marxist international that intervenes actively in the struggles of the world working class. If you find yourself disgusted by capitalism and are sickened by the fact that Turing Pharma can get away with vampirism, you need to do something. Join the International Marxist Tendency and the struggle to build a world that isn’t driven by the lust of wealth for the few and misery for the rest of humankind.

## Case

#### Removing patents fails – knowledge is key but patents don’t force it, and manufacturing disparities exist which the plan DOESN’T SOLVE

**Rutschman, Barnes-Weise, 21,** Harvard Law: Bill of Health, “The COVID-19 Vaccine Patent Waiver: The Wrong Tool for the Right Goal”, Ana Santos Rutschman is an Assistant Professor of Law at Saint Louis University School of Law. Julia Barnes-Weise is Executive Director of the Global Healthcare Innovation Alliance Accelerator.URL: <https://blog.petrieflom.law.harvard.edu/2021/05/05/covid-vaccine-patent-waiver/>, KR

In order to understand the practical limitations of a waiver of intellectual property rights when a vaccine is involved, it may be useful to think of patents as informational mechanisms akin to the information and tools needed to turn a recipe into an edible product. One or more patents will provide a recipe for a process or a component needed to produce a vaccine. But, just as with a culinary recipe, the informational power of a patent does not cover any tips or instructions that have not been memorialized in writing, nor does it provide any access to the raw materials needed to put a vaccine together. Waivers, therefore, temporarily remove exclusionary rights, but do not address two fundamental sources of the current vaccine scarcity problem.

First, we are still left with a significant informational problem: as many commentators have remarked, knowledge disclosed through patents alone is often insufficient for a third party to actually be able to replicate a vaccine.

From a scientific perspective, vaccines are biological products, and, as such, their relative complexity makes them highly dependent on specific manufacturing processes and practices, many of which are not disclosed in a patent — think of it as the unwritten tips or instructions for a particular recipe. Some of this information may be kept secret by a company for competitive reasons; in these cases, lifting patent rights will not result in increased informational disclosure, unless the patent holders themselves are willing to collaborate. A waiver thus solves the exclusivity problem, but not the information problem that undergirds competition in vaccine manufacturing. To revisit the analogy introduced above, a waiver allows third parties to freely use the recipe. It does not, however, provide all the information that may be needed to manufacture the desired good, nor does it provide manufacturers with the tacit knowledge that only the original manufacturer possesses and is not disclosed elsewhere.

Second, even if all types of legal restrictions on the use of vaccine technology were lifted — or had never existed in the first place — there is simply not enough infrastructure (manufacturing facilities and equipment) nor raw materials (the components needed to manufacture and deliver vaccines) to produce and distribute COVID-19 vaccines as predicted under current waiver proposals. We have long faced a global vaccine manufacturing problem that will not be fully resolved during the current pandemic. In the case of vaccines that need to be kept at ultra-cold temperatures, these problems intensify.

One of us (Barnes-Weise) has been involved in the contractual negotiations for the development, manufacturing and transfer of technology related to COVID-19 vaccines. In addition to the informational gaps described above, COVID-19 vaccine manufacturers are most concerned about how well the recipients of the technology transfer will understand and be able to implement such knowledge in making vaccines of the necessary quality. Shortages do not merely affect materials necessary to manufacture vaccines and facilities adequate to manufacture the vaccines; they also affect the availability of personnel qualified to instruct the licensee and recipient of this information. Sending an employee of this caliber out of the original manufacturing site to a partner site risks reducing the capacity of the first site. And remote instruction, necessitated by the pandemic, has its own shortcomings.

In relation to the patents on the vaccines themselves, most of the concerns that the vaccine manufacturers express are around the protection of their vaccine platforms for the purposes of making future or non-COVID-19 vaccines. Moderna shared information about its patents in summer 2020. The manufacturers, as evidenced by the number of licenses to manufacture granted to date, are eager to find partners with the capabilities to expand production. It is not to their benefit to produce an inadequate supply of a highly sought-after vaccine. However, even willingness to transfer patented vaccine technology has faced numerous practical hurdles to date: 1) infrastructural limitations; 2) scarcity of raw materials; 3) concerns about licensees having the ability to actually manufacture effective vaccines in light of the infrastructural and product scarcity, even in situations in which there might be no informational gaps.

A patent waiver would not address any of the practical concerns currently at the root of tech transfer negotiations involving COVID-19 vaccine technology. Compounding these problems is the fact that, should a waiver be issued, there is no legal mechanism that can compel the transfer of certain types of know-how or trade secrets should a company be unwilling to license its intellectual property — which, again, at this point in the pandemic, is not a problem we have observed.

#### Companies will keep complex production steps secret if forced to forgo patents – that shuts down cooperation.

Silverman 3/21 Rachel Silverman -- a policy fellow at the Center for Global Development, “Waiving vaccine patents won’t help inoculate poorer nations”, 15 March 2021, <https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/15/vaccine-coronavirus-patents-waive-global-equity/> | MU

According to some activists, the solution to this inequity is relatively simple: By suspending protections on covid-19 vaccine patents, the international community “could help break Big Pharma monopolies and increase supplies so there are enough doses for everyone, everywhere,” [claims](https://peoplesvaccine.org/take-action/)the People’s Vaccine Alliance. Indeed, 58 low- and middle-income countries have mobilized in support of a proposed World Trade Organization [waiver](https://docs.wto.org/dol2fe/Pages/SS/directdoc.aspx?filename=q:/IP/C/W669.pdf&Open=True) that would temporarily exempt [coronavirus](https://www.washingtonpost.com/coronavirus/?itid=lk_inline_manual_4)-related intellectual property from normal international rules and protections. And while the effort to waive IP protections has been a global health hot topic for months, it gained a high-profile endorsement in the United States recently from Sen. Bernie Sanders (I-Vt.). In a March 10 video statement, Sanders [called upon President Biden](https://twitter.com/GlobalJusticeUK/status/1369734275818549252?s=20) to support the IP suspension while slamming “huge, multibillion-dollar pharmaceutical companies [that] continue to prioritize profits by protecting their monopolies.”

The logic of the argument seems clear and intuitive — at first. Without patents, which serve narrow commercial interests, companies all over the world could freely produce the vaccine. Sure, Big Pharma would lose money — but this is a pandemic, and human life comes before private profit, especially when vaccines receive substantial public financing to support research and development. As with HIV drugs in years past, widespread generic production would dramatically increase supply and drive down prices to levels affordable even in the developing world.

Reality is more complicated, however. Because of the technical complexity of manufacturing coronavirus vaccines, waiving intellectual-property rights, by itself, would have little effect. It could even backfire, with companies using the move as an excuse to disengage from global access efforts. There are more effective ways to entice — and to pressure — companies to license and share their intellectual property and the associated know-how, without broadly nullifying patents.

The Moderna vaccine illustrates the limits of freeing up intellectual property. Moderna [announced in October](https://investors.modernatx.com/news-releases/news-release-details/statement-moderna-intellectual-property-matters-during-covid-19) that it would not enforce IP rights on its coronavirus vaccine — and yet it has taken no steps to share information about the vaccine’s design or manufacture, citing commercial interests in the underlying technology. Five months later, production of the Moderna vaccine remains entirely under the company’s direct control within its owned and contracted facilities. Notably, Moderna is also the only manufacturer of a U.S.- or British-approved vaccine [not yet participating in Covax](https://www.washingtonpost.com/world/coronavirus-vaccine-access-poor-countries-moderna/2021/02/12/0586e532-6712-11eb-bf81-c618c88ed605_story.html?itid=lk_inline_manual_9), a global-aid-funded effort (including a [pledged $4 billion from the United States](https://www.npr.org/2021/02/18/969145224/biden-to-announce-4-billion-for-global-covid-19-vaccine-effort)) to purchase vaccines for use in low- and middle-income countries.

It is true, however, that activist pressure — including threats to infringe upon IP rights — can encourage originators to enter into voluntary licensing arrangements. So the global movement to liberate the vaccine patents may be useful, even if some advocates make exaggerated claims about the effects of waivers on their own.

[We focused on covid. Now our other patients are suffering.](https://www.washingtonpost.com/outlook/2021/03/08/covid-hospital-addiction-cancer/?itid=lk_interstitial_manual_11)

One reason patent waivers are unlikely to help much in this case is that vaccines are harder to make than ordinary drugs. Because most drugs are simple chemical compounds, and because the composition of the compounds is easily analyzable, competent chemists can usually reverse-engineer a production process with relative ease. When a drug patent expires, therefore — or is waived — generic companies can readily enter the market and produce competitive products, [lowering prices dramatically](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-drug-evaluation-and-research-cder/generic-competition-and-drug-prices).

Vaccines, in contrast, are complex [biological](https://www.fda.gov/about-fda/center-biologics-evaluation-and-research-cber/what-are-biologics-questions-and-answers#:~:text=What%20is%20a%20biological%20product,tissues%2C%20and%20recombinant%20therapeutic%20proteins.) products. Observing their contents is insufficient to allow for imitation. Instead, to produce the vaccine, manufacturers need access to the developer’s “soft” IP — the proprietary recipe, cell lines, manufacturing processes and so forth. While some of this information is confidentially submitted to regulators and might theoretically be released in an extraordinary situation (though not without legal challenge), manufacturers are at an enormous disadvantage without the originator’s cooperation to help them set up their process and kick-start production. Even with the nonconsensual release of the soft IP held by the regulator, the process of trial and error would cause long delays in a best-case scenario. Most likely, the effort would end in expensive failure. Manufacturers also need certain raw ingredients and other materials, like glass vials and filtration equipment; overwhelming demand, paired with disruptive export restrictions, has constricted the global availability of some of these items.

#### In the age of globalization multilateral cooperation is necessary to prevent outbreaks.
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Even non-neighbouring countries can experience huge gains from every country’s efforts. India’s smallpox eradication programme, which was supported by a global effort including the United States, failed initially because of an ineffective strategy, despite the long-term economic incentive. But the United States benefited by not having to carry out in-country vaccinations once smallpox was eradicated worldwide. [3]

When non-infected countries invest in vaccination efforts for infected countries, enhanced herd immunity in the long term benefits the global population. The Lubombo Spatial Development Initiative, which covered eastern Swaziland, southern Mozambique and the northeastern KwaZulu-Natal province in South Africa, is one example in which a richer country (South Africa) financed the elimination of malaria in poorer countries (Swaziland and Mozambique).

The first step in achieving global benefit is to achieve regional benefits. And since the world is increasingly connected, the benefits of regional control usually extend to non-neighbouring countries — for example, by avoiding introductions of malaria from endemic to disease-free regions.

To effectively target diseases that extend across borders, cooperation — among countries, external funders and international organisations — is essential. In practical terms, this begins with understanding the origins of the disease and is facilitated through coordinated logistical and administrative efforts, long-term funding and targeting disease in infected populations.

The importance of transboundary incentives suggests that malaria elimination, for instance, has as much to do with a neighbouring country’s stance against malaria — and its effect on the number of incoming cases — as the endemic country’s control efforts. International programmes should pay attention to these incentives and explicitly consider them in financing measures to control infectious diseases that span countries.