# 1NC v Monta Vista

## 1NC – Off

### 1NC – 1

#### Reduce means permanent reduction – it’s distinct from “waive” or “suspend.”

**Reynolds ‘59** (Judge (In the Matter of Doris A. Montesani, Petitioner, v. Arthur Levitt, as Comptroller of the State of New York, et al., Respondents [NO NUMBER IN ORIGINAL] Supreme Court of New York, Appellate Division, Third Department 9 A.D.2d 51; 189 N.Y.S.2d 695; 1959 N.Y. App. Div. LEXIS 7391 August 13, 1959, lexis)

Section 83's counterpart with regard to nondisability pensioners, section 84, prescribes a reduction only if the pensioner should again take a public job. The disability pensioner is penalized if he takes any type of employment. The reason for the difference, of course, is that in one case the only reason pension benefits are available is because the pensioner is considered incapable of gainful employment, while in the other he has fully completed his "tour" and is considered as having earned his reward with almost no strings attached. It would be manifestly unfair to the ordinary retiree to accord the disability retiree the benefits of the System to which they both belong when the latter is otherwise capable of earning a living and had not fulfilled his service obligation. If it were to be held that withholdings under section 83 were payable whenever the pensioner died or stopped his other employment the whole purpose of the provision would be defeated, i.e., the System might just as well have continued payments during the other employment since it must later pay it anyway.  [\*\*\*13] The section says "reduced", does not say that monthly payments shall be temporarily suspended; it says that the pension itself shall be reduced. The plain dictionary meaning of the word is to diminish, lower or degrade. The word "reduce" seems adequately to indicate permanency.

#### Violation – they defend a waiver, which only temporarily reduces IP on vaccines.

#### Vote neg for limits and neg ground – re-instatement or waiving under any infinite number of conditions doubles aff ground – every plan becomes either temporary or permanent – you cherry-pick the best criteria and I must prep every aff while they avoid core topic discussions like reduction-based DAs which decks generics like Pharma Innovation and Bio-Tech – conditions counterplans should be core neg ground that their interp steals away.

**Independently, Precision is a voter – the counter-interp justifies them arbitrarily doing away with random words in the resolution which decks negative ground and preparation because the aff is no longer bounded by the resolution.**

**Fairness is a voter – debate is a competitive activity that requires fairness for objective evaluation.**

**Drop the debater – drop the arg is nonsense on T since you’d just be dropping the whole aff**

**Competing interps – [a] reasonability is arbitrary and encourages judge intervention since there’s no clear norm, [b] it creates a race to the top where we create the best possible norms for debate.**

#### No RVI’s – you shouldn’t win for being fair

### 1NC – 2

#### Capitalism is a system engendering massive violence and inevitable extinction – the foundational task is to find a way out – the Role of the Ballot is to endorse the best organizational tactics.

Badiou ‘18

[Alain, former chair of philosophy at the Ecole Normale Superiure, professor of philosophy at The European Graduate School. Translated by David Broder. 07/30/2018. “The Neolithic, Capitalism, and Communism,” <https://www.versobooks.com/blogs/3948-the-neolithic-capitalism-and-communism>] pat

Today, it has become commonplace to predict the end of the human race such as we know it. There are various reasons for such forecasts. According to a messianic kind of environmentalism, the excessive predations of a beastly humanity will soon bring about the end of life on Earth. Meanwhile, those who instead point to runaway technological advances prophesy, indiscriminately, the automation of all work by robots, grand developments in computing, automatically-generated art, plastic-coated killers, and the dangers of a super-human intelligence.

Suddenly, we see the emergence of threatening categories like transhumanism and the post-human — or, their mirror image, a return to our animal state — depending on whether one prophesies on the basis of technological innovation or laments all the attacks on Mother Nature.

For me, all such prophesies are just so much ideological noise, intended to obscure the real peril that humanity is today exposed to: that is to say, the impasse that globalised capitalism is leading us into. In fact, it is this form of society — and it alone — which permits the destructive exploitation of natural resources, precisely because it connects this exploitation to the boundless quest for private profit. The fact that so many species are endangered, that climate change cannot be controlled, that water is becoming like some rare treasure, is all a by-product of the merciless competition among billionaire predators. There is no other reason for the fact that scientific innovation is subject to the question of what technologies can sell, in an anarchic selection mechanism.

Environmentalist preaching does sometimes use persuasive descriptions of what is going on — despite the exaggerations typical of the prophet. But most of the time this becomes mere propaganda, useful for those states who want to show their friendly face. Just as it is for the multinationals who would have us believe — to the greater benefit of their balance sheets — in the noble, fraternal, natural purity of the commodities they are trafficking.

The fetishism of technology, and the unbroken series of "revolutions" in this domain — of which the "digital revolution" is the most in vogue — has constantly spread the beliefs both that this will take us to the paradise of a world without work — with robots to serve us, and us left to idle — and then, on the other hand, that digital "thought" will crush the human intellect. Today there is not one magazine that does not inform its astonished readers of the imminent "victory" of artificial over natural intelligence. But in most cases neither "nature" nor the "artificial" are properly or clearly defined.

Since the origins of philosophy, the question of the real scope of the word "nature" has been constantly posed. "Nature" could mean the romantic reverie of evening sunsets, the atomic materialism of Lucretius (De natura rerum), the inner being of things, Spinoza’s Totality (Deus sive Natura), the objective underside of all culture, rural and peasant surroundings as counterposed to the suspicious artificiality of the towns ("the earth does not lie," as Marshal Pétain put it), biology as distinct from physics, cosmology as compared to the tiny location that is our planet, the invariance of centuries as compared to the frenzy of innovation, natural sexuality as compared to perversion… I am afraid that today "nature" most of all refers to the calm of the villa and the garden, the charm wild animals have for tourists, and the beach or the mountains where we can spend a nice summer. Who, then, can imagine man responsible for nature, when thus far he has just been a thinking flea on a secondary planet in an average solar system at the edge of one banal galaxy?

Since its origins philosophy has also devoted a great deal of thought to Technology, or the Arts. The Greeks meditated on the dialectic of Techne and Physis — a dialectic within which they situated the human animal. They laid the ground for this animal to be seen as "a reed, the weakest of nature, but … a thinking reed." For Pascal, this meant that humanity was stronger than Nature and closer to God. A long time ago, they saw that the animal capable of mathematics would do great things to the order of materiality.

Are these "robots" which they keep banging on about anything more than calculation in the form of a machine? Digits in motion? We know that they can count quicker than us, but it was we who invented them, precisely in order to fulfil this task. It would be stupid to look at a crane raising a concrete pillar up to some great height, use this to argue that man is incapable of the same feat, and then conclude by saying that some muscular, superhuman giant has emerged… Lightning-quick counting is not the sign of an insuperable "intelligence" either. Technological transhumanism plays the same old tune — an inexhaustible theme of horror and sci-fi movies — of the creator overwhelmed by his own creation. It does so either thrilled about the advent of the superman — something we have been expecting ever since Nietzsche — or fearing him and taking refuge under the skirt of Gaia, Mother Nature.

Let’s put things in a bit more perspective.

For four or five millennia, humanity has been organised by the triad of private property — which concentrates enormous wealth in the hands of very narrow oligarchies; the family, in which fortunes are transmitted via inheritance; and the state, which protects both property and the family by armed force. This triad defined our species’ Neolithic age, and we are still at this point — we could even say, now more than ever. Capitalism is the contemporary form of the Neolithic. Its enslavement of technology in the interests of competition, profit and concentrating capital only raises to their fullest extension the monstrous inequalities, the social absurdities, the murderous wars, and the damaging ideologies that have always accompanied the deployment of new technology under the reign of class hierarchy throughout history.

We should be clear that technological inventions were the preliminary conditions of the arrival of the Neolithic age, and by no means its result. If we consider our species’ fate, we see that sedentary agriculture, the domestication of cattle and horses, pottery, bronze, metallic weapons, writing, nationalities, monumental architecture, and the monotheist religions are inventions at least as important as the airplane or the smartphone. Throughout history, whatever has been human has always, by definition, been artificial. If that had not existed, there would not have been Neolithic humanity — the humanity we know — but a permanent close proximity with animal life; something which did indeed exist, in the form of small nomadic groups, for around 200,000 years.

A fearful and obscurantist primitivism has its roots in the fallacious concept of "primitive communism." Today we can see this cult of the ancient societies in which babies, men, women and the elderly supposedly lived in fraternity, without anything artificial, and indeed lived in common with the mice, the frogs, and the bears. Ultimately, all this is nothing but ridiculous reactionary propaganda. For everything suggests that the societies in question were extremely violent. After all, even their most basic survival needs were constantly under threat.

To speak fearfully of the victory of the artificial over the nature, of robot over man, is today an untenable regression, something truly absurd. It is easy enough to answer such fears, such prophesies. For judged by this standard, even a simple axe, or a domesticated horse, not to mention a papyrus covered in symbols, is an exemplary case of the post- or trans-human. Even an abacus allows quicker calculation than the fingers of the human hand.

Today we need neither a return to primitivism, or fear of the "ravages" the advent of technology might bring. Nor is there any use in morbid fascination for the science-fiction of all-conquering robots. The urgent task we face is the methodical search for a way out of the Neolithic order. This latter has lasted for millennia, valuing only competition and hierarchy and tolerating the poverty of billions of human beings. It must be surpassed at all cost. Except, that is, the cost of the high-tech wars so well known to the Neolithic age, in the lineage of the wars of 1914-1918 and 1939-1945, with their tens of millions of dead. And this time it could be a lot more.

The problem is not technology, or nature. The problem is how to organise societies at a global scale. We need to posit that a non-Neolithic way of organising society is possible. This means no private ownership of that which ought to be held in common, namely the production of all the necessities of human life. It means no inherited power or concentration of wealth. No separate state to protect oligarchies. No hierarchical division of labour. No nations, and no closed and hostile identities. A collective organisation of everything that is in the collective interest.

All this has a name, indeed a fine one: communism. Capitalism is but the final phase of the restrictions that the Neolithic form of society has imposed on human life. It is the final stage of the Neolithic. Humanity, that fine animal, must make one last push to break out of a condition in which 5,000 years of inventions served a handful of people. For almost two centuries — since Marx, anyway — we have known that we have to begin the new age. An age of technologies incredible for all of us, of tasks distributed equally among all of us, of the sharing of everything, and education that affirms the genius of all. May this new communism everywhere and on every question stand up against the morbid survival of capitalism. This capitalism, this seeming "modernity," represents a Neolithic world that has in fact been going on for five millennia. And that means that it is old — far too old.

#### TRIPS waivers is a neoliberal ploy to both legitimize the WTO as a governing apparatus while covertly authorizing economic retaliation against nations who invoke it.

Ferrer ‘19

[Cory, MFA Candidate, University of Colorado Department of Communication. 2019. “THE RHETORIC OF “BALANCE”: NEOCOLONIALISM AND RESISTANCE IN THE GLOBAL BATTLE FOR GENERIC DRUGS,” www.proquest.com/openview/5cbb5aa35aec157b3cdf8b03d5d269b7/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=18750&diss=y] Harun + pat

Recall also, that compulsory licensing is only a limited solution to the problem of accessing patented drugs in poorer countries. As the Doha Declaration explains: “We recognize that WTO Members with insufficient or no manufacturing capacities in the pharmaceutical sector could face difficulties in making effective use of compulsory licensing under the TRIPS Agreement” (2). As long as a country doesn’t have the means to produce the drugs, there is no one to whom the government could issue a compulsory license. So long as TRIPS restricts patented medicines from crossing international borders, compulsory licenses fall far short of addressing the need for patented medicines in countries that have little or no manufacturing capacity. In what is possibly the most depressing sentence of the Doha Declaration, the document goes on to offer, not a solution, but an instruction to the TRIPS Council to “find an expeditious solution to this problem and to report to the General Council before the end of 2002” (2). In other words, these negotiations were not able reach a compromise, and so they simply left this for future negotiations.

Also conspicuously absent from the Doha Ministerial declaration is any language addressing the rights of countries who take advantage of these flexibilities and remain free from bilateral pressure for doing so. While one could easily argue that if the US chooses to impose sanctions on a country of their own accord, rather than initiate dispute proceedings through the WTO, then this doesn’t necessarily concern the TRIPS agreement. However, given WTO secretary general Mike Moore’s stated concern with countries “feeling secure” in taking advantage of these flexibilities, and given that the issue of “bilateral pressure” was raised as an obstacle to this security during the TRIPS Council negotiations, the absence of any language addressing this issue appears to be a hard concession to the interests of the US and its allies, allowing them to continue holding the threat of economic sanctions over any nation that takes advantage of the flexibilities granted by this declaration (Moore; “Governments”).

Overall, the Doha declaration makes some significant concessions to the demands of the Global South’s coalition yet stops well short of fully authorizing WTO Members to take full advantage of all public health policies that would put affordable medicines into the hands of their people. The declaration recognizes that it falls short and puts a pin in the issue until the next negotiation, having failed to create a suitable compromise between nations who profit from IP protection and nations who suffer from it. The results of these later negotiations will be discussed in the conclusion to this thesis. Ultimately, the Doha Declaration—and WTO policy in general—are constrained by the demand for a standard of consensus which leaves ultimate veto power in the hands of powerful nations profiting at the others’ expense.

‌Conclusion: What does “Balance” Do?

In the context of the Doha round of negotiations, we see “balance” invoked towards several different ends. The TRIPS agreement invokes “balance” as a form of strategic ambiguity, attempting to please multiple stakeholders by allowing competing interpretations of the same international law to clear the procedural hurdles of consensus. The WTO officers and the EU’s position paper invoked “balance” to build legitimacy for the TRIPS agreement, the deliberative process that produced it, and by extension, the global patent system itself. If the TRIPS agreement strikes a carefully negotiated balance between health and IP protection, then the current balance is presumed sufficient. The paper submitted by the US and its allies invoked “balance” only as a description of strong and effective IP enforcement, a passing nod to balance that ultimately served to build the moral credibility of their strong IP enforcement agenda. For the coalition of the Global South, balance means mutual advantage, but one that must be demonstrated. Their position did not presume the benefit of IP to public health outcomes and argued that when IP protection conflicted with public health outcomes, governments have a standing right to choose public health.

Balance is therefore a deeply contested signifier: both a site of neo-colonial domination, and a site of counter-colonial resistance. However, all these conceptions of balance have one thing in common. They all, in some way, reinforce the legitimacy of the TRIPS agreement and the WTO as a governing institution of the global economy. Though the DCGP openly challenged Western Hegemony of these forums, it did so by drawing on specific provisions of the TRIPS agreement and claiming a position as an authoritative interpreter of international law to which Western nations are (on paper) equally beholden. Instead of challenging the legitimacy of the WTO and TRIPS agreements, the governments of the Global South are claiming that legitimacy for themselves in a counter-colonial push to assert themselves as equal governors and rightsholder of the neo-liberal world order. Though “balance” is typically invoked as a resolution to conflict, it is in fact the very site of that conflict it’s supposed to resolve.

#### The aff’s response to Covid-19 papers over the logics of capital that made it inevitable while simultaneously granting the US moral ammunition to continue it’s economic-imperial war against China and the global south.

Foster and Suwandi ‘20

[John Bellamy Foster, professor of sociology at the University of Oregon and editor of Monthly Review, and Intan Suwandi, author of “The New Economic Imperialism” and assistant professor of sociology at Illinois State University. 06/01/2020. “COVID-19 and Catastrophe Capitalism,” https://monthlyreview.org/2020/06/01/covid-19-and-catastrophe-capitalism/] pat – note: “SARS-CoV-2”=Covid-19

SARS-CoV-2, like other dangerous pathogens that have emerged or reemerged in recent years, is closely related to a complex set of factors including: (1) the development of global agribusiness with its expanding genetic monocultures that increase susceptibility to the contraction of zoonotic diseases from wild to domestic animals to humans; (2) destruction of wild habitats and disruption of the activities of wild species; and (3) human beings living in closer proximity. There is little doubt that global commodity chains and the kinds of connectivity that they have produced have become vectors for the rapid transmission of disease, throwing this whole globally exploitative pattern of development into question. As Stephen Roach of the Yale School of Management, formerly chief economist of Morgan Stanley and the principal originator of the global labor arbitrage concept, has written in the context of the coronavirus crisis, what the financial headquarters of corporations wanted was “low-cost goods irrespective of what those cost efficiencies entailed in terms of [the lack of] investing in public health, or I would also say [the lack of] investing in environmental protection and the quality of the climate.” The result of such an unsustainable approach to “cost efficiencies” is the contemporary global ecological and epidemiological crises and their financial consequences, further destabilizing a system that was already exhibiting an “excessive surge” characteristic of financial bubbles.

At present, rich countries are at the epicenter of the COVID-19 pandemic and financial fallout, but the overall crisis, incorporating its economic as well as epidemiological effects, will hit poor countries harder. How a planetary crisis of this kind is handled is ultimately filtered through the imperial-class system. In March 2020, the COVID-19 Response Team of Imperial College in London issued a report indicating that in a global scenario in which SARS-CoV-2 was unmitigated, with no social distancing or lockdowns, forty million people in the world would die, with higher mortality rates in the rich countries than in poor countries because of the larger proportions of the population that were 65 or older, as compared with poor countries. This analysis ostensibly took into account the greater access to medical care in rich countries. But it left out factors like malnutrition, poverty, and the greater susceptibility to infectious diseases in poor countries. Nevertheless, the Imperial College estimates, based on these assumptions, indicated that in an unmitigated scenario the number of deaths would be in the range of 15 million in East Asia and the Pacific, 7.6 million people in South Asia, 3 million people in Latin America and the Caribbean, 2.5 million people in Sub-Saharan Africa, and 1.7 million in the Middle East and North Africa—as compared with 7.2 million in Europe and Central Asia and around 3 million in North America.

Basing their analysis on the Imperial College’s approach, Ahmed Mushfiq Mobarak and Zachary Barnett-Howell at Yale University wrote an article for the establishment journal Foreign Policy entitled “Poor Countries Need to Think Twice About Social Distancing.” In their article, Mobarak and Barnett-Howell were very explicit, arguing that “epidemiological models make clear that the cost of not intervening in rich countries would be in the hundreds of thousands to millions dead, an outcome far worse than the deepest economic recession imaginable. In other words, social distancing interventions and aggressive suppression, even with their associated economic costs, are overwhelmingly justified in high-income societies”—to save lives. However, the same is not true, they suggested, for poor countries, since they have relatively few elderly individuals in their populations as a whole, generating, according to the Imperial College estimates, only around half the mortality rate. This model, they admit, “does not account for the greater prevalence of chronic illnesses, respiratory conditions, pollution, and malnutrition in low-income countries, which could increase the fatality rates from coronavirus outbreaks.” But largely ignoring this in their article (and in a related study conducted through the Yale Economics Department), these authors insist that it would be better, given the impoverishment and vast unemployment and underemployment in these countries, for the populations not to practice social distancing or aggressive testing and suppression, and to put their efforts into economic production, presumably keeping intact the global supply chains that primarily start upstream in low-wage countries. No doubt the deaths of tens of millions of people in the Global South is considered by these authors to be a reasonable tradeoff for the continued growth of the empire of capital.

As Mike Davis argues, twenty-first-century capitalism points to “a permanent triage of humanity…dooming part of the human race to eventual extinction.” He asks:

But what happens when COVID spreads through populations with minimal access to medicine and dramatically higher levels of poor nutrition, untended health problems and damaged immune systems? The age advantage will be worth far less to poor youth in African and South Asian slums.

There’s also some possibility that mass infection in slums and poor cities could flip the switch on coronavirus’s mode of infection and reshape the nature of the disease. Before SARS emerged in 2003, highly pathogenic coronavirus epidemics were confined to domestic animals, above all pigs. Researchers soon recognized two different routes of infection: fecal-oral, which attacked the stomach and intestinal tissue, and respiratory, which attacked the lungs. In the first case, there was usually very high mortality, while the second generally resulted in milder cases. A small percentage of current positives, especially the cruise ship cases, report diarrhea and vomiting, and, to quote one report, “the possibility of SARS-CoV-2 transmission via sewage, waste, contaminated water, air conditioning systems and aerosols cannot be underestimated.”

The pandemic has now reached the slums of Africa and South Asia, where fecal contamination is everywhere: in the water, in the home-grown vegetables, and as windblown dust. (Yes, shit storms are real.) Will this favor the enteric route? Will, as in the case of animals, this lead to more lethal infections, possibly across all age groups?

Davis’s argument makes plain the gross immorality of a position that says social distancing and aggressive suppression of the virus in response to the pandemic should take place in rich countries and not poor. Such imperialist epidemiological strategies are all the more vicious in that they take the poverty of the populations of the Global South, the product of imperialism, as the justification for a Malthusian or social Darwinist approach, in which millions would die in order to keep the global economy growing, primarily for the benefit of those at the apex of the system. Contrast this to the approach adopted in socialist-led Venezuela, the country in Latin America with the least number of deaths per capita from COVID-19, where collectively organized social distancing and social provisioning is combined with expanded personalized screening to determine who is most vulnerable, widespread testing, and expansion of hospitals and health care, developing on the Cuban and Chinese models.

Economically, the Global South as a whole, quite apart from the direct effects of the pandemic, is destined to pay the highest cost. The breakdown of global supply chains due to canceled orders in the Global North (as well as social distancing and lockdowns around the globe) and the refashioning of commodity chains that will follow, will leave whole countries and regions devastated.

Here, it is crucial to recognize as well that the COVID-19 pandemic has come in the middle of an economic war for global hegemony unleashed by the Donald Trump administration and directed at China, which has accounted for some 37 percent of all cumulative growth of the world economy since 2008. This is seen by the Trump administration as a war by other means. As a result of the tariff war, many U.S. companies had already pulled their supply chains out from China. Levi’s, for example has reduced its manufacturing in China from 16 percent in 2017 to 1–2 percent in 2019. In the face of the tariff war and the COVID-19 pandemic, two thirds of 160 executives surveyed across industries in the United States have recently indicated that they had already moved, were planning to move, or were considering moving their operations from China to Mexico, where unit labor costs are now comparable and where they would be closer to U.S. markets. Washington’s economic war against China is currently so fierce that the Trump administration refused to drop the tariffs on personal protection equipment, essential to medical personnel, until late March. Trump meanwhile appointed Peter Navarro, the economist in charge of his economic war for hegemony with China, as head of the Defense Production Act to deal with the COVID-19 crisis.

In his roles in directing the U.S. trade war against China and as policy coordinator of the Defense Production Act, Navarro has accused China of introducing a “trade shock” that lost “over five million manufacturing jobs and 70,000 factories” and “killed tens of thousands of Americans” by destroying jobs, families, and health. He is now declaring that this has been followed by a “China virus shock.” On this propagandist basis, Navarro proceeded to integrate U.S. policy with respect to the pandemic around the need to fight the so-called “China virus” and pull U.S. supply chains out of China. Yet, since about a third of all global intermediate manufacturing products are currently produced in China, most heavily in the high-tech sectors, and since this remains key to the global labor arbitrage, the attempt at such restructuring will be vastly disruptive, to the extent that it is possible at all.

Some multinationals that had moved their production out of China learned the hard way later that the decision did not “free” them from their dependency on it. Samsung, for example, has started flying electronic components from China to its factories in Vietnam—a destination for companies that are eager to escape the trade-war tariffs. But Vietnam is also vulnerable, because they rely heavily on China for materials or intermediate parts. Similar cases have happened in neighboring Southeast Asian countries. China is Indonesia’s biggest trading partner, and roughly 20 to 50 percent of the country’s raw materials for industries come from China. In February, factories in Batam, Indonesia, already had to deal with raw materials from China drying up (which counts for 70 percent of what was produced in that region). Companies there said that they considered getting materials from other countries but “it’s not exactly easy.” For many factories, the feasible option was to “cease operations completely.” Capitalists like Cao Dewang, the Chinese billionaire founder of Fuyao Glass Industry, predicts the weakening of China’s role in the global supply chain after the pandemic but concludes that, at least in the short term, “it’s hard to find an economy to replace China in the global industry chain”—citing many difficulties from “infrastructure shortcomings” in Southeast Asian countries, higher labor costs in the Global North, and the obstacles that “rich countries” have to face if they want to “rebuild manufacturing at home.”

The COVID-19 crisis is not to be treated as the result of an external force or as an unpredictable “black swan” event, but rather belongs to a complex of crisis tendencies that are broadly predictable, though not in terms of actual timing. Today, the center of the capitalist system is confronted with secular stagnation in terms of production and investment, relying for its expansion and amassing of wealth at the top on historically low interest rates, high amounts of debt, the drain of capital from the rest of the world, and financial speculation. Income and wealth inequality are reaching levels for which there is no historical analogue. The rift in world ecology has attained planetary proportions and is creating a planetary environment that no longer constitutes a safe place for humanity. New pandemics are arising on the basis of a system of global monopoly-finance capital that has made itself the main vector of disease. State systems everywhere are regressing toward higher levels of repression, whether under the mantle of neoliberalism or neofascism.

The extraordinarily exploitative and destructive nature of the system is evident in the fact that blue-collar workers everywhere have been declared essential critical infrastructure workers (a concept formalized in the United States by the Department of Homeland Security) and are expected to carry out production mostly without protective gear while the more privileged and dispensable classes socially distance themselves. A true lockdown would be much more extensive and would require state provisioning and planning, ensuring that the whole population was protected, rather than focusing on bailing out financial interests. It is precisely because of the class nature of social distancing, as well as access to income, housing, resources, and medical care, that morbidity and mortality from COVID-19 in the United States is falling primarily on populations of color, where conditions of economic and environmental injustice are most severe.

#### Vote neg to join the party – dual power organizing is the only path to revolutionary change.

Escalante ‘18

[Alyson, philosophy at U of Oregon. 08/24/2018. “Against Electoralism, For Dual Power!” <https://theforgenews.org/2018/08/24/against-electoralism-for-dual-power/>] pat

I am sure that at this point, the opportunists reading this have already begun to type out their typical objection: the world is different than it was in 1917, and the conditions of the United States in no way echo the conditions which enabled the Bolsheviks to achieve revolutionary success.

To this tried and true objection, there is one simple answer: you are entirely correct, and that is why we need to abandon electoralism and working within the bourgeois state.

What were the conditions which allowed the Bolsheviks to successfully revolt? The conditions were that of Dual Power. Alongside the capitalist state, there existed a whole set of institutions and councils which met the needs of the workers. The soviets, a parallel socialist government made up of individual councils, successfully took over many governmental responsibilities in some parts of Petrograd. In the radical Viborg district, the Bolshevik controlled soviets provided government services like mail, alongside programs that could meet the needs of workers. When a far right coup was attempted against the provisional government, it was troops loyal to the Bolshevik factions within the soviet who repelled the coup plotters, proving concretely to the workers of Petrograd that the socialists could not only provide for their needs, but also for their defense.

In short: the Bolsheviks recognized that instead of integrating into the bourgeois state, they could operate outside of it to build dual power. They could establish programs of elected representatives who would serve the workers. They would not bolster the capitalist state in the name of socialism, they would offer an alternative to it.

And so, when the time came for revolt, the masses were already to loyal to the Bolsheviks. The only party who had never compromised, who had denounced the unpopular imperialist wars, who had rejected the provisional government entirely, was the party who successfully gained the support of the workers.

And so, many of us on the more radical fringes of the socialist movement wonder why it is the the DSA and other socialist opportunists seem to think that we can win by bolstering the capitalist state? We wonder, given this powerful historical precedent, why they devote their energy to getting more Ocasios elected; what good does one more left democrat who will abandon the workers do for us?

The answer we receive in return is always the same: we want to win small changes that will make life for the workers easier; we want to protect food stamps and healthcare.

And do this, we reply: what makes you think reformism is the only way to do this. When the bourgeois state in California was happy to let black children go to school unfed, the Black Panthers didn’t rally around democratic candidates, they became militant and fed the children themselves. In the 40s and 50s, socialists in New York saw people going without healthcare and instead of rallying behind democratic candidates, they built the IWO to provide healthcare directly. Both these groups took up our pressing revolutionary task: building dual power.

Imagine if all those hours the DSA poured into electing Ocasio were instead used to feed the people of New York, to provide them with medical care, to ensure their needs were met. Imagine the masses seeing socialism not as a pipe dream we might achieve through electing more imperialists, but as a concrete movement which is currently meeting their needs?

The fact is, we are not nearly ready for revolution. Socialists in the United States have failed to meet the needs of the people, and as long as their only concrete interaction with the masses is handing them a voter registration form, they will continue to fail the people. Our task now is not to elect representatives to advocate for the people; it is much more gruelingly laborious than that. Our task is to serve the people. Our task is to build dual power.

The movement to do this is underway. Members of the DSA refoundation caucus have begun to move the left of the DSA in this direct, socialist groups like Philly Socialists have begun to build dual power through GED programs and tenants unions, many branches of the Party For Socialism and Liberation have begun to feed the people and provide for their concrete needs, and Red Guard collectives in Los Angeles have built serve the people programs and taken on a stance of militant resistance to gentrification. The movement is growing, its time is coming, and dual power is achievable within our life time.

The opportunists are, in a sense, correct. We are not where we were in 1917, but we can begin to move in that direction and dual power can take us there. In order to achieve dual power we have to recognize that Lenin was right: there will be no socialist gains by working within state institutions designed to crush socialism. Furthermore, we must recognize that the strategies of the electoral opportunists trade off with dual power. Electing candidates drains resources, time, and energy away from actually serving the people.

And so, we should commit to undertake the difficult and dangerous task of building dual power. We must reject opportunism, we must name the democratic party as our enemy, we must rally around power directly in the hands of the socialist movement. We do not have a parallel system of soviets in the United States. We can change that. Someday the cry “all power to the soviets” will be heard again. Lets make it happen.

#### Medicine can and must be revolutionary – voting negative aligns with a view of healthcare militantly opposed to capitalist power accumulation in favor of social views of health and broad coalitions among health workers and patients.

Yamada et al ‘20

[Seiji Yamada, MD, MPH; Arcelita Imasa, MD, Gregory Gabriel Maskarinec, PhD, all health professionals (and all committed anti-capitalists). 2020. “Revolutionary Medicine.” <https://www.socialmedicine.info/index.php/socialmedicine/article/view/1075>] pat – gendered language [replaced]

The revolutionary medicine espoused here is grounded in social medicine. As noted by Anderson, Smith, and Sidel, the fundamental precepts of social medicine are that

1. Social and economic conditions profoundly impact health, disease, and the practice of medicine.

2. The health of the population is a matter of social concern.

3. Society should promote health through both individual and social means.

In The Second Sickness, Howard Waitzkin identifies the forerunners of social medicine to be Friedrich Engels, Rudolf Virchow, and Salvador Allende. Social medicine counts among its practitioners Ernesto “Che” Guevara, the Barefoot Doctors of Revolutionary China, and Cuban doctors around the world. The Declaration of Alma Ata, i.e. The Declaration on Primary Health Care of the Joint WHO/UNICEF Conference in Alma-Ata, USSR, 1978, drew on these forerunners as the key to attaining the goal of Health for All by the Year 2000.

Obviously 2000 has come and gone, and we do not yet have Health for All. Unfortunately, we are no longer in a position to hanker for Health for All. Rather, we must focus on the survival of the human species.

Why we need revolutionary medicine now. Climate catastrophe, threat of nuclear war, inequality.

Noam Chomsky (who calls himself a libertarian socialist or an anarchist) points to two existential threats to the survival of the human species: climate catastrophe and the threat of nuclear war. The effects of global warming caused by human activity, the loss of ice, the rise in sea levels, and altered weather patterns with more severe weather events are already evident. Our planet has crossed a tipping point at which the greenhouse gases already in the atmosphere will affect the climate for the remainder of the Anthropocene age. Will it be called the Anthropocene after human civilization has collapsed? The time scale for that collapse draws ever closer, with an Australian think tank predicting that it may occur before 2050.14

The Doomsday Clock, which appears on the cover of the Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists, is currently set at 100 seconds to midnight. While the position of the minute hand takes into account worsening climate security, the clock is largely known for indicating the proximity of the threat of nuclear war. The Bulletin currently cites the U.S. withdrawal from the Iran nuclear agreement and the Intermediate Nuclear Forces Treaty (INF), the unresolved North Korea situation, and the turn toward high-tech, automated weaponry.15

Another, mediating threat to human survival is severe inequality – among nations and within nations. For having contributed little historically to the greenhouse gases in the atmosphere – many developing states are most vulnerable to climate catastrophe. Sea-level rise poses a threat to the very existence of small island states and low-lying coastal regions. States in the pathway of tropical cyclones are particularly vulnerable. Those who experience racial discrimination, and the poor are particularly vulnerable to severe weather events. They live in inadequate dwellings. Their houses are in low-lying areas which experience more flooding. Large regions of the world also face deteriorating social, political, economic, and environmental conditions due to conflict, pollution, corruption, famine, population displacement. The Anthropocene Age is characterized by catastrophic loss of biodiversity whose global consequences will be disastrous for all species, including our own. Possible unanticipated consequences of synthetic biology and artificial intelligence conjure unimaginable future threats to all humanity.

Globally, health, health care, and health delivery systems are in crisis. Despite major advances throughout the last two centuries extending life-spans, reducing infant mortality, and eliminating smallpox, the promise of improved health and better health care for all people everywhere recedes. Individuals and communities, particularly the poorest and most marginalized in every country, continue to suffer from avoidable infectious diseases such as tuberculosis, malaria, HIV, cholera, Zika, dengue, Ebola, and COVID-19, even as antimicrobial resistance increases and vaccination refusal results in a resurgence of preventable childhood diseases; populations everywhere (not just the poorest and least privileged, though they are less likely to receive treatment) have rising rates of chronic noncommunicable diseases, including diabetes, cancer, heart disease, and obesity. Other threats urgently needing to be addressed include the surveillance state, automation and job loss, imperialism, racism and xenophobia, sexism, LGBTQ exclusion, and reproductive injustice.

Incremental reforms will not be enough to mitigate these existential threats to human survival. It is increasingly evident that we cannot eliminate these threats unless we throw off capitalism as the fundamental basis of our economic and social life. This situation demands of us that we adopt revolutionary thinking and revolutionary practice.

The scientific basis – against reductionism.

The perspective of most who work in medicine is a scientific one. Throughout our primary and secondary education, we become familiar with the scientific world view. The perspective is also a materialist one. An aside: Both Bakunin and Marx wrote extensively about their commitment to materialism and atheism. Of course, there are many people who are deeply religiously committed and who disagree with the philosophically materialist viewpoint. Yet many religious people are anticapitalist and participate in revolutionary action.

In health professional schools, we delve into the basic biological sciences. The perspective of much of Western science is reductive and Cartesian. If a phenomenon can be explained by the more reductionist science (e.g., a biological phenomenon via biochemical mechanisms) – that makes it more scientifically plausible. Physicists are thus wont to see themselves as having a front seat to reality. The underlying assumption is that science is “the paradigmatic human activity, and that natural science discovers truth rather than makes it.”

As Marx noted, however, in his eleventh thesis on Feuerbach: “The philosophers have only interpreted the world, in various ways; the point is to change it.” For the practitioner of revolutionary medicine, there may be reasons to think not reductively, but rather dialectically, as in Levins and Lewontin’s The Dialectical Biologist. In the most public health of the chapters, “Research needs for Latin community health,” Levins notes

For instance, a man's decision to smoke may increase his risk of heart disease and cancer in the long run, but as one of the few ways he has of coping with stress, it may save the lives of his wife and children. Our assumption of conditional rationality means that we cannot expect to change behavior by education alone: rather, we must alter those circumstances that make such harmful choices seem optimal.

From the reductionist, individualist perspective, we might say in the name of harm reduction, “Go ahead and smoke.” From the revolutionary perspective, we need to work with the [person] man, the woman, their workplaces, and their societies to combat alienation, addictions, and violence against women and children. Revolutionary medicine is the medicine wherein health workers understand the social origins of illness and the need for social change to improve health conditions. It is created from the practice of the people’s struggles against their oppressive conditions. Revolutionary medicine serves the oppressed classes in advancing their struggles.

Proletarianization of health workers.

Writing in the New York Times, Danielle Ofri notes that the increasing complexity of patient care and administrative burdens, including the electronic health record, are accomplished by nurses and doctors who work harder and longer hours. She wonders if this exploitation of health workers is simply the business plan of the corporations that increasingly control the health care system. In Marx’s labor theory of value, difference between the price that a good (in this case, health care) commands in the marketplace - and the cost of producing this good, which is largely labor – is the profit margin, that is the surplus labor that is extracted from the worker. Thus, commodified medicine leads to the proletarianization of health workers. That is to say, they find themselves alienated from their patients, the products of their work (better health for their patients), and their workplace. Consequently, we become alienated from our fellow workers, and ultimately, from ourselves. Health worker alienation from oneself is sometimes described as "burnout," but a more accurate term would be "moral injury." Health as a commodity is unacceptable, not only diminishing the health care of individual patients but causing the entire society to be ill, dis-eased.

We have less and less control over how we work: insurance corporations require adherence to their specific formularies. They pile burdensome prior authorization work on us. They deny treatments we order for our patients. Our employers escalate their documentation demand in a coding arms race with insurance corporations. Granted, nurses and doctors are professionals who command salaries far higher than trades workers or unskilled workers – they are increasingly proletarianized. Nonetheless, we health professionals need to develop class consciousness as a class of workers that is having surplus labor value extracted from us, that is increasingly alienated from the service we perform, and from our own humanity.

Solidarity among health care workers will ensure that health is recognized as a human right, not something to be bought and sold, that surplus labor should not be extracted for profit within the health care profession, but used by the health care workers themselves to ensure healthy lives for themselves and their communities. In the future, electronic algorithms may do much of the diagnosis, treatment, and "curing" of common complaints, allowing health care workers to once more focus on patient-centered "healing," not on electronic charts, billing, and administrative hoops, instead aiming for a healthier population in its widest sense, and at the individual level of the health care team themselves.

For as soon as the distribution of labour comes into being, each man has a particular, exclusive sphere of activity, which is forced upon him and from which he cannot escape. He is a hunter, a fisherman, a herdsman, or a critical critic, and must remain so if he does not want to lose his means of livelihood; while in communist society, where nobody has one exclusive sphere of activity but each can become accomplished in any branch he wishes, society regulates the general production and thus makes it possible for me to do one thing today and another tomorrow, to hunt in the morning, fish in the afternoon, rear cattle in the evening, criticise after dinner, just as I have a mind, without ever becoming hunter, fisherman, herdsman or critic. The post-revolutionary health care worker will not be limited to being a neurosurgeon or a nurse anesthetist. She will be a family doc that just has to upload a program. One can imagine a scene taking place in the near future in a remote hospital:

Nurse Neo to family doctor Trinity: Can you fix this subarachnoid hemorrhage?

Dr. Trinity: Not yet. (She speaks into her phone.) Tank, I need a program for the surgical approach to clipping an aneurysm. Hurry. (Her eyelids quiver briefly.) Let’s go.

She will not waste her evenings and weekends remotely accessing her EHR. She might write some science fiction, or she might kick some counter-revolutionary agent butt.

Throughout history, empires have flourished and collapsed without threatening the existence of the entire human population. Epidemics typically (with notable exceptions) had very limited geographic distribution. Neither scenario now fits the world today. We are now global citizens, who need to create cohesive, equitable, socially just societies that address health everywhere, or all of us will face increasing threats to our own health and well-being. Revolutionary medicine is required to create such a society.