### Part 1- Come here

#### Covid slowed down the growth and the revolution on people’s minds! There can be no abolition of capitalism without internal contradiction, not external shock. Covid has exposed the contradiction to the mass.

M.I. Asma, 20 (M.I. Asma is an anonymous collective of writers, thinkers, and organizers in the imperialist metropoles, writing in order to use the COVID 19 pandemic as an occasion to think capitalism and communist alternatives. “Chapter Thirteen,” *On Necrocapitalism,* <https://necrocapitalism.wordpress.com>)

But we can imagine now, when the riots die down and are literally pacified, that there will be new policies derived from the ideological policing of those opposed to the police––who were policed by these police. In the hope that participating with the deputies of dominant state policy will bring change, the hopeful will become participants with policy––on community police relations initiatives, in a variety of reformist-oriented bodies––and yet, as Moten and Harney remind us, policy has a different understanding of “hope” and “change” (key slogans of the Obama regime, the perfect policy electoral mechanism) where hope for real change is channelled back into the capitalist imaginary. “This is the hope policy rolls like tear gas into the undercommons.” (Ibid., 80) As noted from the outset of this project, capitalism possesses a strong purchase on our imagination; it is difficult to think outside of its boundaries even when we know that what lies within its boundaries is utterly necrotic. Hope for reform rather than hope for the monstrous impossibility of revolution––“monstrous” and “impossible” because these are the terms set by the capitalist imaginary––is indeed a pacifying tear gas. Why not become participants, since being intransigent planners of revolution is to hope for something beyond the limits of this imaginary? As Dionne Brand puts it: This we fear––this we know––that all of our thoughts will be rushed into editorial pages, used up in committee meetings; all the rich imaginings of activists and thinkers who urge us to live otherwise may be disappeared, modified into reform and inclusion, equity, diversity, and palliation. These are policies that will also connect with whatever post-pandemic capitalist reality that awaits us. After all, just as the riots are being treated as an aberration, as a dystopian response to the rationality of liberal capitalism, COVID-19 is classified as a similar aberration. Although the coronavirus revealed capitalism’s inability to deal with crisis––laying bare its rotting foundations while simultaneously exposing how willing the ruling class is to spend more money terrorizing and murdering its most marginalized populations than on Personal Protective Equipment for hospital workers––the capitalist imaginary functions to make us think that the contradiction was merely external. That is, we are meant to believe that there are no meaningful internal contradictions to capitalism itself, and that it is quite capable of establishing a general equilibrium of capitalism and democracy, if only these pesky external forces didn’t show up to ruin everything. According to this perspective, the problem is not capitalism itself but only that capitalism had to deal with an “unprecedented” virus and that any social formation would similarly be affected. The multiple contradictions between the oppressed masses and the state, which should be evident to anyone participating in or observing the rebellions, have been détourned from above by policy-minded liberals who complain about “outside agitators” or “bad protesters” or agents that come from outside of the social contract in order to ruin it for everyone else. As Mao states in On Contradiction, though, the “fundamental cause of the development of a thing is not external but internal; it lies in the contradictoriness within the thing.” (Mao, On Contradiction, 6) This does not mean that there are not external contradictions that are significant (such as the existence of COVID-19 and its pandemic antagonism with capitalist states), only that they are not fundamental in uncovering the identity of an object of thought. As Mao writes a little bit later in the same treatise: “In a suitable temperature an egg changes into a chicken, but no [external] temperature can change a stone into a chicken, because each has a different basis.” (Ibid., 10) Similarly, the exogenous existence of the coronavirus and its affects upon various capitalist states do not explain how these states were equipped to deal with the internal health of their citizens; this external contradiction merely revealed particular aspects of contradictions internal to capitalism. This is evident due to the fact that the nation-states best equipped to deal with the pandemic (though still failing at multiple levels) were ones that had higher levels of social democracy and public infrastructure. A socialist social formation, because its state would concern the protection of citizens rather than the protection of the free market economy, would be even better equipped to deal with a pandemic: with no pressure to “re-open the economy”, with a responsive and needs-based system where housing and food is more important than wage-labour, a pandemic would not rip through its social fabric with the same velocity it has within the capitalist heartlands. When it comes to the rebellion in the US, though, the internal contradictions of racism, of the state’s violence levelled upon the oppressed and exploited, should be even clearer. The external contradiction of the COVID-19 state of emergency was merely the incubation chamber in which these riots, based on an already existing logic, erupted; the supposed external contradictions of “outside agitators”, though, were fabrications. So capitalist policy will rush in to stabilize the internal contradictions by blaming every disruption of social life––as if it was not always already disrupted––on the externality of COVID-19. Recalcitrant populations will be reined in, will be invited into reformist initiatives so as to be transformed into participants, and austerity measures will be unleashed. Capitalism will pacify. What will be the new capitalist policies following the pandemic and when the teargas has cleared? What will we be invited into as participants so as to reopen the economy and paper over the internal contradictions that were briefly laid bare? How will the necrotic aspects of this mode of production once again be pushed under the surface as we are demanded to transform ourselves into proper democratic citizens and thus to discipline our imaginations? Just as it is difficult for those who participate in the capitalist imaginary (either willingly or out of “common sense”) to conceive of a world in which a pandemic will not severely harm and greatly disrupt life, it is even more difficult to conceive of a world in which the police as such cease to exist. The assumption that society will fall apart––that chaos will reign supreme, and that people will fall upon each other as if they have entered the Hobbesian state of nature––demonstrates the strength of this imaginary. The fact that these police rarely solve crimes (unless it’s a bank robbery or the victim is a member of the bourgeoisie), that they have rarely helped victims of violent assault (including the sexual assaults that women routinely face), have escalated situations of violence in every situation in which they are involved, and in fact regularly assault and kill the most marginalized members of society, is dismissed out of hand despite books upon books of empirical data. Instead, the deputies of bourgeois policy cling to the fiction of the necessity of their given state’s repressive apparatus (along with its prisons and other carceral institutions), sometimes going so far as to claim that people making such radical statements are like “flat earthers” despite all of the empirical evidence that demonstrates the police do not “solve crime” but in fact police the parameters of criminalization. These parameters, of course, are determined by the real function of these police: the coercive wing (along with the military, prison guards, etc.) of bourgeois hegemony, the repressive state apparatus that protects the ruling class and its mode of production. But the capitalist imaginary’s strength in this particular situation is that it can still convince people who are horrified by police violence that they are simply watching a spectacle of excess, that the bourgeois repressive apparatus can be reformed and made into a humane creature, because the fantasy alternative of a Hobbesian war of all against all is even worse. “Just look at the looting!” But if we are entirely honest, even the calls to defund and abolish the police can still exist within the capitalist imaginary, just at the farthest edge where they push against the boundaries. Because what would it look like to defund and abolish the police when capitalism is left standing? Calls to replace the police with brigades of social workers seem to forget that the institution of social work has a long history of complicity with state power. Let us not forget, for example, the ways in which social workers and other “non-police” institutions were involved in the 60s Scoop in Canada that relocated Indigenous children with settler families, thus pushing the violent assimilationist logic that defines the particular “race regime”, in Patrick Wolfe’s terminology, to which Indigenous populations are subjected. Such social worker interventions necessitated collaboration with actual police forces, hence creating the kind of “war machine” amalgam (where various policing institutions interlink according to policy) examined by Mbembe. (Mbembe, Necropolitics, 85) Hence, it is not difficult to imagine that social worker institutions, still plugged into state power, will necessitate new forms of policing even if the old police institutions are dead. Shuffling around state institutions, and saying one can replace another because it is more humane, misses the point of why the police exist in the first place. It also fails to recognize that the immanent settler garrison, in settler-capitalist formations, will rush in to replace the official police: racist settlers are armed and prepared to institute settler policy; the official police, in these contexts, was actually generated from an informal state of settler-colonial emergency. The point, here, is that one cannot abolish the repressive state apparatus without first abolishing the state. And even thinking of such an abolition, and what must be constructed following it, leads us to think through other questions beyond the diktat of the capitalist imaginary. Because the violent necrocapitalist imaginary reins us in, demands we think abolition and the world beyond the pandemic according to the capitalist world order; abolitionist demands, delinked from a revolutionary program, can become the new policy. Angela Davis now demands that people vote for Joe Biden––just as she demanded voting for Hilary Clinton and Barack Obama––and people forget that she has been a reformist for a long time, that she emerged as a representative of the Communist Party of the USA and not the Black Panther Party or Black Liberation Army. A policy industry emerges around these kinds of éminence grise; liberal pundits, who ignore everything else such figures have to say, are more than happy to cite their thoughts about electoral policy as part of a general ideological pacification. Lenin’s The State and Revolution is instructive here, and it is worth noting that a number of Leninist radical thinkers contemporary abolitionists celebrate (i.e. George Jackson, Fred Hampton, Assata Shakur, etc.) upheld this text, which argued that following the abolition of the bourgeois state the proletarian state ought to set up its own repressive apparatus for the bourgeoisie. But this much more radical abolitionist language always slips the grasp of policy capture, especially if it leads us to think about what the abolition of capitalism and its bourgeois state will look like. We must imagine new ways of thinking where the structures of dominant power are reversed, where we can conceptualize the defense of socialism that does not allow bourgeois power to reassert itself. Indeed, the most radical articulations of abolitionism identify abolition with communism, as Moten and Harney do in The Undercommons: Not so much the abolition of prisons but the abolition of a society that could have prisons, that could have slavery, that could have the wage, and therefore not abolition as the elimination of any- thing but abolition as the founding of a new society. The object of abolition then would have a resemblance to communism. (HARNEY AND MOTEN, 42)

#### Strikes are an articulation of worker power over production – they halt the operation of capitalist society and refuse capitalist organization of labor

Tronti 1966

“Workers and Capital.” Tronti, Mario. 1966. <https://libcom.org/book/export/html/42233>

Mario Tronti was the principal theorist of the radical political movement of the 1960s known in Italy as *operaismo* and in the Anglophone world as Italian workerism, a current which went on to inform the development of autonomist Marxism. His “Copernican revolution”—the proposal that working class struggles against exploitation propel capitalist development, which can only be understood as a reaction that seeks to harness this antagonism—has inspired dissident leftists around the world. // Park City NL

Adam Smith says - and Marx comments on the accuracy of his observation -that the effective development of the productive power of labour begins when labour is transformed into wage labour, that is, when the conditions of labour confront it in the form of capital. One could go further and say that the effective development of the political power of labour really begins from the moment that labourers are transformed into workers, that is, when the whole of the conditions of society confront them as capital. We can see, then, that the political power of workers is intimately connected to the productive power of wage labour. This is in contrast to the power of capital, which is primarily a social power. **The power of workers resides in their potential command over production**, that is, over a particular aspect of society. Capitalist power, on the other hand, rests on a real domination over society in general. But the nature of **capital** is such that it **requires a society based on production**. Consequently production, this particular respect of society, becomes the aim of society in general**. Whoever controls** and dominates **it controls** and dominates **everything**. Even if factory and society were to become perfectly integrated at the economic level, nevertheless, at a political level, they would forever continue to be in contradiction. One of the highest and most developed points of the class struggle will be precisely the frontal clash between the factory, as working class and society, as capital. **When** the development of **capital's interests in the factory** **is blocked, then the functioning of society seizes up: the way is** then **open for overthrowing** and destroying **the very basis of capital's power**. Those, however, who have the contrary perspective, of taking over the running of the "general interests of society", are committing the error of reducing the factory to capital by means of reducing the working class, that is, a part of society, to society as a whole. Now we know that the productive Dower of labour makes a leap forward when it is put to use by the individual capitalist. By the same token, it makes a political leap forward when it is organised by social capital. It is possible that this political leap forward does not express itself in terms of organisation, whereupon an outsider may conclude that it has not happened. Yet it still exists as a material reality, and the fact of its spontaneous existence is sufficient for the workers to refuse to fight for old ideals - though it may not yet be sufficient for them to take upon themselves the task of initiating a new plan of struggle, based on new objectives. So, can we say that we are still living through the long historical period in which Marx saw the workers as a "class against capital", but not yet as a "class for itself"? Or shouldn't we perhaps say the opposite, even if it means confounding a bit the terms of Hegel's dialectic? Namely, that the workers become, from the first, "a class for itself" - that is, - from the first moments of direct confrontation with the individual employer - and that they are recognised as such by the first capitalists. And only afterwards,after a long-terrible, historical travail which is, perhaps, not yet completed, do the workers arrive at the point of being actively, subjectively, "a class against capital". A prerequisite of this process of transition is political organisation, the party, with its demand for total power. In the intervening period there is the refusal - collective, mass, expressed in passive forms - of the workers to expose themselves as "a class against capital" without that organisation of their own, without that total demand for power. The working class does what it is. But it is, at one and the same time, the articulation of capital, and its dissolution. Capitalist power seeks to use the workers' antagonistic will-to-struggle as a motor of its own development. The workerist party must take this same real mediation by the workers of capital's interests and organise it in an antagonistic form, as the tactical terrain of struggle and as a strategic potential for destruction. Here there is only one reference point - only one orientation - for the opposed world views of the two classes - namely the class of workers. Whether one's aim is to stabilise the development of the system or to destroy it forever, it is the working class that is decisive. Thus the society of capital and the workers' party find themselves existing as two opposite forms with one and the same content. And in the struggle for that content, the one form excludes the 'other. They can only exist together for the brief period of the revolutionary crisis. The working class cannot constitute itself as aparty within capitalist society without preventing capitalist society from functioning. As long as capitalist does continue to function the working class party cannot be said to exist. Remember: "the existence of a class of capitalists is based on the productive power of labour". Productive labour, then, exists not only in relation to capital, but also in relation to the capitalists as a class. It is in this latter relationship that it exists as the working class. The transition is probably a historical one: it is productive labour which produces capital; it is the fact of industrial workers being organised into a class that provokes the capitalists in general to constitute themselves as a class. Thus we see that - at an average level of development - workers are already a social class of producers: industrial producers of capital. At this same level of development the capitalists, themselves, constitute a social class not of entrepreneurs so much as organisers: the organisers of workers through the medium of industry. A history of industry cannot be conceived as anything other than a history of the capitalist organisation of productive labour, hence as a working class history of capital. The "industrial revolution" necessarily I springs to mind: This must be the starting point of our research if we are to trace the development of The contemporary form of capital's domination over workers, as it increasingly comes to be exercised through the objective mechanisms of industry, and also the development of capital's capacity to prevent these mechanisms being used by workers. This would lead us to see that the development of the relationship between living labour and the constant part of capital is not a neutral process. Rather, it is determined, and often violently so, by the emerging class relationship between the collective worker and the whole of capital, qua social relations of production. We would then see that it is the specific moments of the class struggle which have determined every technological change in the mechanisms of industry. Thus we would achieve two things: one, we would break free of the apparent neutrality of the man-machine relationship; and two, we would locate this relationship in the interaction, through history, of working class struggles and capitalist initiative. It is wrong to define present day society as "industrial civilisation". The "industry" of that definition is, in fact, merely a means.' The truth of modern society is that it is the civilisation of labour. Furthermore, a capitalist society can never be anything but this. And, in the course of its historical development, it can even take on the form of "socialism". So.... not industrial society (that is, the society of capital) but the society of industrial labour, and thus the society of workers' labour. It is capitalist society seen from this point of view that we must find the courage to fight. **What are workers doing when they struggle against their employers?** Are they not they, above all else, **saying "No" to the transformation of labour power into labour**? Are they not, more than anything, **refusing to receive work from the capitalist**? Couldn't we say, in fact, that stopping work does not signify a refusal to give capital the use of one's labour power, since it has already been given to capital once the contract for this particular commodity has been signed. Nor is it a refusal to allow capital the product of labour, since this is legally already capital's property, and, in any case, the worker does not know what to do with it. Rather, stopping work - **the strike**, as the classic form of workers' struggle - **implies a refusal of the command of capital as the organiser of production**: it is a way of saying "No" at a particular point in the process and a refusal of the concrete labour which is being' offered; it is a momentary.' blockage of the work-process and it appears as a recurring threat which derives its content from the process of value creation. The anarcho-syndicalist "general strike", which was supposed to provoke the collapse of capitalist society, is a romantic naivete from the word go. It already contains within it a demand which it appears to oppose - that is, the Lassallian demand for a "fair share of the fruits of labour" - in other words, a fairer "participation" in the profit of capital. In fact, these two perspectives combine in that incorrect "correction" which was imposed on Marx, and which has subsequently enjoyed such success within the practice of the official working class movement - the idea that it is "working people" who are The true "givers of labour", and that it is the concern of workpeople to defend the dignity of this thing which they provide, against all those who would seek to debase it. Untrue...The truth of the matter is that the person who provides labour is the capitalist. The worker is the provider of capital. In reality, he is the possessor of that unique, particular commodity which is the condition of all the other conditions of production. Because, as we have seen, all These other conditions of production are, from the start, capital in themselves - a dead capital which, in order to come to life and into play in the social relations of production, needs to subsume under itself labour power, as the subject and activity of capital. But, as we have also seen, this transition into social relati9ns of production cannot occur unless the class relation is introduced into it as its content. And the class relationship is imposed from the very 'first moment and by the very fact that the proletariat is constituted as a class in the face of the capitalist.

#### Worker recognition of the power of refusal is the starting point for political organizing – tactics combined with mass passivity bring capital to its knees. History proves – Bolshevik and Spanish revolutionaries came from the trade union movement and organized into militant revolutions.

Tronti 1966

“Workers and Capital.” Tronti, Mario. 1966. <https://libcom.org/book/export/html/42233>

Mario Tronti was the principal theorist of the radical political movement of the 1960s known in Italy as *operaismo* and in the Anglophone world as Italian workerism, a current which went on to inform the development of autonomist Marxism. His “Copernican revolution”—the proposal that working class struggles against exploitation propel capitalist development, which can only be understood as a reaction that seeks to harness this antagonism—has inspired dissident leftists around the world. // Park City NL

Thus **the masses of working class demands** simplify and **unify into** one. There must come a point where all will disappear, except one - **the demand for** power, **all power**, **to the workers**, This demand is the highest form of the refusal. It presupposes already a de facto reversal of the balance of domination between the two classes. In other words, it presupposes that from that moment it will be the capitalist class putting positive demands, making their requests, presenting their Bill of Rights (in the name, naturally, of the general interests of society). And it will be the workers who are rejecting the pleas that are put to them. There must also be a point here, where all the requests and demands will come explicitly from the capitalists, and only the "No" will be openly working class. These are not stories of some far-distant future. The tendency is already under way, and we must grasp it from the start in order to control it. When capital reaches a high level of development it no longer limits itself to guaranteeing collaboration of the workers - i.e. the active extraction of living labour within the dead mechanism of its stabilisation - some-thing which it so badly needs. At significant points it now makes a transition, to the point of expressing its objective needs through the subjective demands of the workers. It is true - and we have seen - that this has already happened, historically. The spectre of capitalist necessities of production being imposed as working class demands, in the struggle, is a recurrent theme in the history of capital, and it can only be explained as a permanent working class articulation of capitalist society. But whereas in the past this happened as an objective functioning of the system (which was thereby virtually self-regulating), today it happens, on the contrary, by conscious initiative of the capitalist class, via the modern instruments of its power apparatus. And in between there has been that decisive experience of working class struggle, which no longer limited itself to asking for power, but actually conquered it. It was with 1917 and the Russian Revolution that the working class articulation of capital was subjectively imposed on the capitalists. What previously had functioned of itself, controlled by nobody, as a blind economic law, from that moment had to be moved from above, politically promoted by those who held the power: it was the only way to control the objective process, the only way to defeat the subversive threat of its possible consequences. This is the origin of that major development in capital's subjective awareness, which led it to conceive and put into practice a plan of social control over all the moments of its cycle, all conceived within a direct capitalist use of working class articulation. Thus, once again, an experience of working class struggle spurs a major advance in the capitalist point of view - an advance which it would never have made of its own accord. The demands of the working class are henceforth recognised by the capitalist~ themselves as objective needs of the production of capital: and as such they are not only taken on board, but are actively solicited; no longer simply rejected, but now collectively negotiated. The mediation of the institutional level of the working class movement, 'particularly at the trade union level, takes on a decisive and irreplaceable' importance. The platform of demands that the trade union puts forward is already controlled by those on whom it is supposed to be imposed: by the bosses who are supposed to "take it or leave it". Through the trade union struggle, working class demands can be nothing more than the reflection of capital's necessities. And yet capital cannot pose this necessity directly, of itself -not even if it wanted to, not even when it reaches its highest point of class awareness. Rather, at this point it acquires quite the reverse awareness: that it must find ways to have its own needs put forward by its enemies, it must articulate its own movement via the organised movements of the workers. We might ask a question: **what happens when** the form of **working class organisation** takes on a content which is wholly alternative; when it **refuses to function as an articulation of capitalist society**; when it refuses to carry capital's needs via the demands of the working class? The answer is that, at that moment and from that moment, **the systems whole mechanism of development is blocked**. This is the new concept of the crisis of capitalism that we must start to circulate: no longer the economic crisis, the catastrophic collapse, a Zusammenbruch, however momentary, arising from the impossibility of the system's continued functioning. Rather**, a political crisis [is] imposed by the subjective movements of the organised workers, via the provocation of a chain of critical conjunctures, -within the sole strategy of the working class refusal to resolve the contradictions of capitalism**. A tactic of organisation within the structures of capitalist production, but outside of, free from, its political initiative. Of course, it remains necessary to block the economic mechanism and, at the decisive moment, render it incapable of functioning. But the only way to achieve this is via the political refusal of the working class to act as active partner in the whole social process, and furthermore, the refusal of even passive collaboration in capitalist development: in other words, the renunciation of precisely that form of mass struggle which today unifies the movements led by the workers in the advanced capitalist countries. We must say clearly that this form of struggle - for such it is - is no longer enough. Non-collaboration, passivity (even on a mass scale), the refusal (insofar as it is not political, not subjectively organised, not inserted into a strategy, not practiced in tactical terms), the advanced font of spontaneity which has been forced on the class struggle for decades - not only is all this no longer enough to provoke the crisis, but it has become, in fact, an element of stabilisation of capitalist development. It is now one of those same objective mechanisms whereby capitalist initiative now controls and makes use of the class relationship that motivates it. We must break this process before it becomes yet another heavy historical tradition for the working class movement to bear. A transition to another process is necessary - without, however, losing the basic positive elements of this one. Obviously **non-collaboration must be one of our starting points, and mass passivity at the level of production is the material fact from which we must begin**. But at a certain point all this must be reversed into its opposite. When it comes to the point of saying '1No", **the refusal must become political**; therefore active; therefore subjective; **therefore organised**. It must once again become antagonism -this time at a higher level. Without this it is impossible to think of opening up a revolutionary process. This is not a matter of instilling in the mass of workers the awareness that they must fight against capital that they must fight for something which will transcend capital and lead into a new dimension of human society. What is generally known as **'class consciousness is**, for us, nothing other than **the moment of organisation**, the function of the party, the problem of tactics - the channels which must carry the strategic plan through to a point of practical breakthrough. And at the level of pure strategy there is no doubt that **this point is provided by the very advanced moment in which this hypothesis of struggle becomes reality: the working class refusal to present demands to capital**, the total rejection of the whole trade union terrain, the refusal to limit the class relationship within a formal, legal, contractual form. And this is the same as forcing capital to present the objective needs of capitalist production directly, as such. It cuts out working class mediation of development. It blocks the working class articulation of the mechanism. In the final event, this means depriving capital of its content, of the class relationship which is its basis. For a period the class relationship must be exercised by the working class, through its party - just as up till now it has been exercised by the capitalist class, through its State.

#### Collective trade union movements organized into political parties succeed – Greece proves.

Dean 16

Dean, Jodi. Crowds and Party. United Kingdom, Verso, 2016. I don’t have a link just ask for the document.

Jodi Dean is an American political theorist and professor in the Political Science department at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in New York state. // Park City NL

**The new cycle of struggles has demonstrated the political strength that comes from collectivity**. Common names, tactics and images are bringing the fragments together, making them legible as many fronts of one struggle against capitalism. Where the proliferation of issues and identities disperses and weakens us -- inciting the snark that glorifies itself as critique even as it undermines solidarity -- the crowd events of the last decade are forcing a new sense of collective power. They have pushed expectations of multiplicity into experiences of collectivity. The question that emerges from these experiences pose is how they might endure and extend, how the momentary discharge of equality crowds unleash might become the basis for a new process of political composition. **Syriza, Greece’s coalition of the** radical **left,** is perhaps the most inspiring example of the potential for such a process today. Formed through a series of splits and re-combinations in the Greek communist movement, the coalition is an electoral alliance with distinct and heterogeneous currents. [[1]](#endnote-1) Synaspismos, the largest party in Syriza, **folds responsiveness to social movements into its communist framework.** As Stathis Kouvelakis explains, ‘It is a party that’s at ease among feminist movements, youth mobilizations, alter-globalization, and antiracist movements and LGBT currents, while also continuing **to make a considerable intervention in the trade union movement**.’ What makes Syriza more than just a combination of multiple elements is its assertion of a fundamental antagonism. Its elements come together in a class struggle against the current system. For this reason, Kouvelakis refers to Syriza as a ‘synthesis’ party. The Greek legacy of intense party politics is a unique feature of its political culture. Nevertheless, **Syriza’s success stems** in part **from** innovations in **communist party organizing: commitment to social movements**, respect for movements’ autonomy, **support of local solidarity network**s, **and** enough **involvement in institutions** ‘to seem capable of transforming the balance of forces at the level of national political life.’ For some Lefts, particularly in the US and UK, it is this last feature that has been conspicuously absent. Hence, our actions fail to gain momentum. Crowds amass, but they don’t endure. In contrast, Syriza demonstrates a dynamic relation between crowd and party: the crowd that pushes the party to exceed expectations, the party that finds the courage of the people in the haste of the crowd. Two additional aspects of Syriza’s political opening are indispensable to rethinking the party today. The first concerns the limits of political victory confined to the level of the nation-state. The institutions not only of Europe but of global finance and governance restrict national governments’ range of maneuver. This poses challenges to the Left internationally suggesting, at a minimum, the necessity of strong left alliances and coordinated institutional strategies. More maximally it directs us toward the party as an infrastructure for such alliances and strategies. The second aspect of Syriza’s political opening instructive for the Left concerns political will. Kouvelakis writes, ‘The Podemos experience in Spain as well as Syriza in Greece shows that if the radical Left makes suitable proposals, then it can arrive at an understanding with these movements and provide a credible political “condensation” of their demands.’ The making of ‘suitable proposals’ depends on political will, a Left able to put aside its differences and think strategically about the pursuit of political power. The problem posing itself today concerns less the details of party organization (membership requirements, centralization versus networked structure, mechanisms for accountable leadership) than it does solidary political will. Can the Left’s wide array of associations come together in a way that will achieve a real political advance? The supposition of *Crowds and Party* is that we have no choice but to answer ‘yes.’ To help us get to yes, to make a party of communists seem compelling to more of us again, I offer an approach to the party inspired by the crowd. **Faithful to egalitarian rupture of the crowd event, the party holds open the gap through which the people appear as the political subject**. Readers anchored in the classics of revolutionary socialism might balk at what seems at first glance to be an abandonment of Marxist terms. They shouldn’t. The ‘people’ has a rich legacy in Marxism-Leninism-Maoism: the ‘people’ are the revolutionary alliance of the oppressed. Under conditions of communicative capitalism, crowds are the proletarianized many, those whose communicative engagements are expropriated from them in processes of accumulation and dispossession that benefit capital as a class. Readers inspired by radical democratic, anarchist and post-Marxist theories might balk at a return to the party. They shouldn’t. The party is a basic form of political struggle. If innovation is necessary for finding our way out of the current political impasse, then the party, too, can be a site for experimentation and change. Different in structure and program, Syriza and Podemos already demonstrate such experimentation. Typically, socialist and communist discussions of the party gel around the themes of reform or revolution, mass or vanguard, factory or state. These discussions are too limiting. Missing is the affective dimension of the party, the way that the perspective of the party operates through or across different organizational structures. The party knots together a set of unconscious processes that enable a communist political subjectivity. To think through these processes as the effects of collectivity back upon itself, I draw out the psychodynamics of the party. Providing a strength and direction we would otherwise lack, the party generates the practical optimism through which struggles endure. Many eschew the party as a form for political power, decision and organization. They fall back into the affirmation of individual autonomy, reasserting capitalist ideology. Discarding the party form, they jettison the possibility of building collective power. I seek to demonstrate how the power the party unleashes is the power we already have to change the world.

#### From the occupation of Tahrir Square in Egypt, the Indignados movement in Spain, and the 2012 Quebec student strike, the ability to strike has been able to create collective expressive spaces that combat the alienation experienced in the panicked world. Embodied engagement within assemblages produces indescribable feelings within ourselves that allow for love, friendship and care antithetical to the depressive nature of capital. As state violence impedes on our ability to organize, we find solutions like the plan to ensure the ability to empathize with one another.

Thorburn 15, Elise D., "Human-Machinic Assemblages: Technologies, Bodies, and the Recuperation of Social Reproduction in the Crisis Era" (2015). Electronic Thesis and Dissertation Repository. 2897. <https://ir.lib.uwo.ca/etd/2897> |Harun| \*bracketed for gendered language

Interpreting the recuperation of social reproduction through the assembly, broadly defined, requires contemplating the very act of assembling. Participation in the Quebec assemblies required a coming together, an embodied engagement with others. Such minimally-mediated interactions in collectively created sites constituted an affective space wherein encounters of the body could involve discussions, positions, analysis, ideas, and traditions. These all merged to create collaborative networks of solidarity. These personal and collective networks are necessary for organising large, powerful, and resistant events such as strikes. As Gerbraudo (2012) noted with regard to the Egyptian struggle, the size of the occupation of Tahrir square was due in no small part to the faceto-face interactions of people in their neighbourhoods and communities, in spaces of communal interaction. The militancy, determination, and longevity of the Quebec student strike is owed, almost entirely, to the insistence upon shared spaces of discussion and dissent. The strike offers us important lessons in the necessity of embodied and affective encounters in assembly movements – for the human component of the human-machinic assemblage. These encounters with others are fundamental in creating the foundations of an autonomous social reproduction: empathy, community, and care. Being together creates potential moments for the demonstration of collective care as well as collective resistance. Intimacies are developed in illegally taking up space in the streets, and these foster sense of shared resistance and risk-taking. These intimacies forge a sense of care and community that was reflected in one demonstrator loudly announcing, at a night march, “this movement is about love! It’s always been about love!” (Milstein, 2012c: np). Care and empathy are developed in the mere act of standing next to a stranger as you face down riot police, or as Milstein (2012c) asserts, pulling a stranger out of harm’s way and 210 then running into them again later at a random place and having the sense that you are old friends because of the experience you had shared. The creation of communities of care and empathy enacted in the streets was also reflected in the actual assemblies. For example, at UQAM people with children were encouraged to bring them to meetings, but further, the striking students collaborated with the UQAM daycare to provide a place for children to play while parents participated in assemblies. A forum was organised at UQAM on the idea of a social strike and a daycare was organised for this event also.103 Having a variety of spaces for embodied encounter was key to constituting socially reproductive spaces in the strike. Creating such varied sites – street demonstrations alongside assemblies, or day cares alongside forums and night marches, for example – for collective expression can serve to combat the alienation, exclusion, cynicism, and apathy often experienced in highly digitised, individualistic societies (Berardi, 2009; Berardi and Lovink, 2011; Hardt and Negri, 2012, Lazzarato, 2014). These shared moments of expression can deepen already existing networks of support and solidarity, and expand the possible agents of struggle. Such networks are deepened not only in joyful moments, but also in the moments of resistance to state violence. For many strike participants the violence experienced in facing police armed with tear gas, rubber bullets, flash bang grenades, and sound cannons catalyzed both emotional and political responses. In an interview Francois Grenier, a student who lost vision in one eye from a rubber bullet, stated that his experience of police brutality during the strike had changed his views of police and state authority. Of police, he said, “I see them as an armed person. A person who can be potentially dangerous” (Lakoff, 2013: np). Standing against these assaults strengthened a sense of 103 Interview with N. Jun 4, 2012. Montreal, QC. 211 solidarity amongst strike participants as well as those on the sidelines. In his diary entries charting his experience of the strike, Vincent Roy writes of his CEGEP’s struggle to maintain a hard picket and subsequent confrontations with police. The visceral togetherness of the struggle makes [them] him feel a part of a collective, a “we” who owe each other their allegiances. “From now on I belong to this movement” he writes, frustrated after a day of angry confrontations. Of his striking friends he says, “I can’t let them down because I know they wouldn’t let me down. And that’s our strength.”104 In together resisting the violences of the state, Milstein says, people begin to remember what they are capable of “from solidarity to courage, from mutual aid to direct action, from collective illegality in the face of repression to sharing this moment – the many exquisite moments – with each other in so many intimate ways” (Milstein, 2012c). This solidarity, mutual aid, and courage draws attention to an affective condition of the politics of assembling, and gestures towards expanding minoritarian politics. Such affective conditions can be encapsulated in Hardt and Negri’s (2000) invocation of communist joy. In Empire they note that there is an “irrepressible lightness and joy of being communist” (Hardt and Negri, 2000: 413), staking claim to constitutive being together as an affirmation of life and love against the misery of power (Thoburn, 2003). Such constitutive being together is concretised in assembly movements: being-together creates a collective assemblage which circulates through the flows, channels, and networks of an urban landscape without being subsumed into a singular hegemonic unity. This assembly, broadly construed as an assembly movement, is an entity both for and against, open to chance encounters and possibilities, and it is constitutive of new potential infrastructures. In the mere act of being together, of assembling, a foundation is 104 Roy’s diaries are published in the online e-book This is Fucking Class War. Available online at: http://thisisclasswar.info/roy.html (Accessed 26 Feb 2015). 212 laid for the reconstitution of an autonomous political sphere and the recuperation of care and social reproduction. Vincent Roy’s journal entries, published in the online post-strike collection This is Fucking Class War and entitled “The Joy of Striking,” demonstrate this exuberant for and against that is the product of resistant being-together. At the outset of the strike he writes in his journal (dated Feb 28, 2012) that he is simply a student who wants to “finish his CEGEP as quickly as possible” but will attend a General Assembly at the behest of a friend. Under a month later he has attended the large demonstration in Montreal and writes: “What a memorable day! I had never lived anything that gratifying, heartwarming, and stressful in my life.” His feelings of joy emerge from the assemblage that the strike has created – not just students in the march, he notes, he sees “workers, union members, ‘construction guys,’ young people and old people, English and French” all constituting a new class shared in their struggle against the state and for a different possible future. “It’s a day I am happy to have lived” Roy writes on March 22nd. 105 As the strike carried on, new assemblages of constituent resistance emerged, in the form of “casseroles” and neighbourhood assemblies, the Aseemblées Populaires Autonomes de Quartiers (APAQs). These assemblages contributed to a sense of spatial democracy: the casseroles were audio assemblies, the APAQs literal ones. Both asserted a democratic control over community space and contributed to processes of collective subject formation. The APAQs in particular, Lakoff (2013a) notes, kept alive the spirit of the student strike “in the hearts of many communities across the island of Montreal” (np). 105 The online text, This is Fucking Class War is neither copyrighted and dated, nor paginated. All quotations come from Roy, Vincent “The Joy of Striking” and is available at http://thisisclasswar.info/roy.html (accessed 26 Feb 2012) 213 Such embodied assemblages can also be read through Hardt and Negri’s visceral communist joy, as they reinstate the notions of community autonomy and power against the miserable authority of the state (Thoburn, 2003). The autonomously-organised casseroles followed the implementation of Bill 78 in May of 2012, when resistance to state authority became a community concern. In several Montreal neighbourhoods people took to the streets at 8pm and began to beat on pots and pans. In open defiance of government statutes, people paraded through the city reclaiming both urban and aural space. These “orchestrolls” were a sonic embodiment of the assembly, and helped celebrate resistance to power. They formed low-tech humanmachinic assemblages: simple tools of pots and pans carried into collected crowds to make noisy dissent, these casseroles formed temporary bubbles of affect. In this way they constituted some of the threads necessary for a broader autonomous social reproduction. The casseroles were opportunities for an “outpouring of emotion and relief,” and a “weighty sentimentality” (Sterne, 2012: np) that could be enacted publicly, as an assertion both of the commonality of feeling and the commonality of the space they claimed. They asserted the city as common, and made embodied “care” central to maintaining a collective ownership of the social and public space of the urban environment. As momentary adventures in creative protest, the casseroles created a foundation for a social reproduction. Such sentiments were even conveyed in one letter to the editor of Le Devoir: Now people greet and talk. Now neighbourhood meetings, discussions, vigils start up casually among neighbours on the steps and balconies of Montreal. The neighbourhood will be less and less alien. This is a true political victory! 214 We should repeat this friendly beating [the evocation of tapage doesn’t quite work as well in English] possibly in other forms, until the land is occupied by neighbours who recognize one another, encounter one another each day by chance, and have known one another over the years. That is how we live in a place that is how we become citizens. My heart swells with joy. As both assemblages of social reproduction, the casseroles expanded the struggle of students outwards throughout the city and the social, reclaiming public space, public education, and a sense of being together. They helped anchor recuperative social reproduction in process of class struggle. While incorporating myriad individuals into a collective space, they confirmed “the existence of something like a democratic public sphere” (Barney, 2012: np), a site of autonomous social reproduction wherein people act in embodied forms and do not just “talk (or link, or like, or tweet)” (Barney, 2012: np).

#### The plan strips the reformist content of the topic from the revolutionary form of the demand in a dialectical ambivalence towards debate’s prevailing bourgeois institutionalism. The plan is an insurgent break from the capitalist imaginary where demands are linked to a revolutionary internationalist program capable of resisting the capitalism. We will pay no head to the lies of the oppressor nor platform fascism’s processes. No violence but revolutionary violence; no war but the people’s war!

Dean and Heron, 20 (Jodi, communist party organizer and Professor of Political Science at Hobart and William Smith Colleges in Geneva, NY; Kai Heron editor at ROAR Magazine and a casualized academic with research interests in political theory, ecology, psychoanalysis, and political economy. “Revolution or Ruin,” *E-Flux*, Journal #110 - June 2020, <https://www.e-flux.com/journal/110/335242/revolution-or-ruin/>) \*emphasis original accessed:2021/1/3

For Riofrancos, a politics of pure negation is unhelpful because it mistakes the GND for a “prepackaged solution” to the climate crisis that one either accepts or rejects wholesale. She proposes that the plan is better thought of as an ever-changing “terrain of struggle” with “the potential to unleash desires and transform identities” and reasons that if the final shape of the GND is still to be decided, then to reject it is to cede important territory to fossil capital. As an alternative, she suggests that we “take our cue from social movements that adopt a stance of critical support, embracing the political opening afforded by the Green New Deal while at the same time contesting some of its specific elements, thus pushing up against and expanding the horizon of possibility.” “Critical support” for the GND is as unsatisfactory as a politics of “pure negation.” Like all democratic socialist strategy, it subordinates working class struggle to the task of electing progressive candidates. It gives up on the left’s revolutionary tradition to focus instead on the more “realistic” task of agitating for gradual leftward shifts in the Overton window. As with all political strategies, the efficacy of democratic socialism rests on the achievability of its aims. While Jeremy Corbyn’s election as Labour’s leader in 2015 and Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s success in 2018 gave democratic socialism a boost, the Democratic National Committee’s opposition to Bernie Sanders and the 2019 UK election have shown the limits of mainstream parties’ tolerance for socialism. To think it possible to implement a progressive GND with the DNC that we have, the Supreme Court that we have, the House of Lords that we have, or the patterns of property and land ownership that we have—that is to say, with the capitalist state that we have—is to assume that the institutions of ruling class power can be used for mass benefit without removing the ruling class. Riofrancos proposes that “extra-parliamentary, disruptive action from below” should be combined with “creative experimentation with institutions and policies,” but surely by now—in the midst of compounding crises—we should be beyond experimenting with bourgeois institutions on bourgeois terms. Riofrancos’s “critical support” excludes the option of building towards revolution. As her argument unfolds, it moves from defending the GND as an important site of struggle to arguing that it is the site of struggle. To question the GND’s electoralism is to make a choice for “resignation cloaked in realism,” to acquiesce to an endless “waiting for [the] ever-deferred moment of rupture.” The obvious but unspoken third option here, though, is to build toward the moment of “rupture,” or more concretely the seizure of power, outside of the Democratic or Labour Parties. No doubt this option remains unspoken because it is too “unrealistic,” too undemocratic, and too “authoritarian” for democratic socialists to countenance. Let’s look at this third option more closely. To build towards an eco-communist revolution, we need to avoid both a politics of pure negation and a politics of “critical affirmation.” As Marx argued, revolutions need dialectics. They need us to find what Fredric Jameson calls the “dialectical ambivalence” in capitalism. This means training ourselves to locate aspects of the present that point beyond themselves and towards the communist horizon. Lenin did precisely this after the outbreak of the First World War. Rather than joining with the majority of the socialist parties of the Second International in capitulating to imperialist war, and rather than wallowing in melancholia following the betrayal of so many of his German comrades as they voted for war credits, Lenin saw in the war an opportunity for revolutionary advance. Those interested in the emancipation of the working class needed to fight not for peace but for the dialectical conversion of nationalist war to civil war. The war, and the collapse of the Second International, was the opportunity for something new. What would it mean to think dialectically about the GND? We think it would mean stripping the policy’s reformist *content* away from its revolutionary *form*. For decades environmental movements in the capitalist core have busied themselves fighting for local solutions to global problems: cooperatives, local currencies, urban agriculture, and ethical consumerism. As these experiments blossomed, the climate crisis continued unabated. More pipelines were built, more indigenous land was stolen, more fires raged, and more species flickered out of existence. In their form the GND and GIR put localism aside. Both recognize that the climate crisis demands a state-led, centrally planned, and global response. They take for granted that we need a state to intervene on behalf of nature and workers against capital. The fact that the GND and GIR promise to do this is what makes capitalists fear them. Those who are excited about the promise of the GND—such as Riofrancos—have similarly turned towards the state as a terrain of struggle and a locus of power. Consciously or not, these movements have learned from the failures of Climate Camp, Occupy, and the Movement of Squares. It is not enough to suspend the normal running of things. Taking responsibility means taking power and organizing society in what Marx called the interests of “freely associated workers,” or more controversially, the “dictatorship of the proletariat.” The struggles to implement the GND and GIR tell us that environmentalists are increasingly aware of the need to seize the state—and the need to develop a fighting organization with the capacity to do so.

#### Extinction

Marques; 2020

* Famine
* Climate change
* Deforestation
* Overfishing
* Biodiversity loss/species extinction
* Ocean acidification/ eutrophication
* Pollution
* War/nuke
* Facism
* Pandemic- covid

(Luiz; Ambiente & Sociedade; Vol. 23; “Pandemics, existential and non-existential risks to humanity”; https://www.scielo.br/pdf/asoc/v23/1809-4422-asoc-23-e0126.pdf)

These crises demand undelayable, globally orchestrated political reactions of our societies that are, at the same time, being divided into two evermore hardened and incommunicative groups. On one hand, the state-corporative establishment, determined to maintain the machinery of business as usual at all costs, is advancing its pawns on the international chessboard to guarantee that nothing changes in post-pandemic energy and food systems. On the other, the perception of scientists and growing sectors of society that we have reached a limit beyond which we can no longer advance, given that the harmful effects of globalized capitalism increasingly supersede their benefits. Observation of the concurrence of combined regressions in human security contribute to that perception: (1) after decades of progress in the struggle against food insecurity, the number of people battling acute hunger and suffering from malnutrition has been on the rise over the last four years (FAO, 2019, p. 6). According to the fourth annual Global Report on Food Crises (GRFC, 2020), around 183 million people in 47 countries were classified as being in Stressed (IPC/CH Phase 2) conditions, at risk of slipping into Crisis or worse (IPC/CH Phase 3 or above) if confronted by an additional shock or stressor. The current pandemic is precisely this additional shock; (2) the six most recent years (2014-2019) and the current one have been the hottest of the last twelve millennia; (3) the globalized food system drove the loss of 3.61 million km2 of tree cover between 2001 and 2018, according to Global Forest Watch; (4) the heavily subsidized industrial fishing system is now sacrificing the oceans’ future (PAULY, 2019); (5) the catastrophic decline in biodiversity is annihilating vertebrate populations (Living PIanet Index, 2018) and may lead to the extinction of one million species over the next few decades (IPBES, 2019); (6) acidification and eutrophication of the oceans and of various bodies of fresh water is creating marine dead zones and threatening ruptures of trophic chains in the aquatic environment; (7) industrial pollution poisons, sickens, and kills tens of millions of people worldwide each year (WHO Report on Cancer, 2020, for instance); (8) growing geopolitical tensions are seen, with the intensification of endemic conflicts focused on water and energy resources and the anguishing resumption of the nuclear arms race. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) estimates that the nine nuclear armed countries spent US$ 72.9 billion (US$ 35.4 billion was spent by the U.S. alone) on their 13,000+ nuclear weapons in 2019, an increase of US$ 7.1 billion compared to 2018 (ICAN, 2019); (9) democracy and tolerance are increasingly threatened by waves of more or less orchestrated fake and hate news, by flareups of fascism, irrationality, and physical and psychic violence.

3. Existential and non-existential risks These crises are interlinked and act in synergy, that is, they reciprocally strengthen one another. And precisely because they are interdependent and reciprocally strengthening each other, it is senseless to deal with them separately. It makes no sense, for example, to understand the current pandemic as simply a health emergency, isolated from other ongoing crises. Most of all, we should not classify these crises in an hierarchical order according to the greater or lesser risk they represent for humanity, as proposed by the University of Cambridge’s Centre for the Study of Existential Risk, or by Toby Ord, from the University of Oxford’s Future of Humanity Institute, in his recent book, The Precipice. Existential Risk and the Future of Humanity (2020).

The considerations proposed by these centers and researchers are very momentous. But they start from the false premise of dividing the risks to which humanity and other species are increasingly exposed into existential and non-existential ones. That dividing line does not exist. An existential risk is, frequently, made from a conjunction of crises that, separately, do not existentially threaten humanity but that, together, have the potential to do so. Will Steffen and colleagues (2018), for example, explored the possibility that “a 2°C warming could activate important tipping elements, raising the temperature further to activate other tipping elements in a domino-like cascade that could take the Earth System to even higher temperatures”. That domino effect can lead us to what the authors called a Hothouse Earth, that is, a largely uninhabitable planet. And, once again, there is no clear dividing line between a planet that is largely uninhabitable and one that is completely uninhabitable for humans and innumerous other species. A chapter written for the English edition of my book, Capitalism and Environmental Collapse (2020), titled “Climate Feedbacks and Tipping Points”, shows how devoid of meaning we find the question, frequently debated in the scientific community and taken up again by Toby Ord, of the probabilities of a warming capable of generating what is called runaway climate change. Let us remember what is truly at stake here for the destiny of humanity. The runaway global warming conjecture, feared by a growing number of scientists (but still rejected by the IPCC3 ), would be able to lead the Earth toward conditions that prevail today on Venus. This conjecture may be interesting from a strictly scientific point of view, but it is totally useless from the point of view of the fate of animals and forests, because both would cease to exist under conditions that are much less extreme. Yangyang Xu and Veerabhadran Ramanathan (2017) have thus categorized the risks implicated at three levels of global warming: “>1.5°C as dangerous; >3°C as catastrophic; and >5°C as unknown, implying beyond catastrophic, including existential threats”. As established by a host of the next-generation climate models, a global warming of 5°C or even more above the pre-industrial period can be reached by 2100, because “even if coal use doesn’t rise in a catastrophic way, 5°C of warming could occur by other means, including thawing permafrost” (TOLLEFSON, 2020, p. 446).

Understanding this, one can ask if the current pandemic represents an existential or a non-existential risk for humanity. Having now, through the month of June, infected more than eight x million people and reaped more than 450 thousand officially confirmed fatalities (according to preliminary estimates, the real numbers are much higher), the current pandemic has not yet shown signs of cooling off. Nothing lets us state that the worst is over. In fact, it continues accelerating in the southern hemisphere, and can still affect a quarter billion people in Africa alone, according to a recent model (McVEIGH, 2020). Beyond this, new waves of contagion are taking place in the north where it had begun to weaken, and new outbreaks can continue occurring in 2021. That said, as bad as it may be, we know that, in and of itself, Covid-19 obviously does not represent an existential threat for humanity. But if the pandemic can turn society’s attention away from what is in play, society will be paralyzed to the point of keeping it from reacting to the above-mentioned socioenvironmental crises. Most importantly, if the post-pandemic economy gives way to even more desperate and destructive attempts at economic recovery, it may become a decisive link in the chain of factors that are already leading us to cross tipping points conducive to a world largely or completely uninhabitable by humans and numerous other species.

4. Overcoming the vicious cycle that imprisons globalized capitalism Even though at this moment it is the most apparent aspect, the pandemic is, in short, only one facet of the great existential threat represented by globalized capitalism. The mother of all threats is the vicious cycle of destructive intensification that imprisons globalized capitalism: the more that system struggles to reverse the decline in rates of growth, the more environmentally destructive it becomes, and the more destructive it becomes, the more the impacts of that destruction will impede its growth. Covid-19 is, in large part, one of the results of that trap, since global warming, deforestation, the destruction of wildlife habitats, the domestication and raising of poultry and mammals on an industrial scale destroy the evolutionary balance among species, facilitating the conditions for numerous viruses to jump from one species to another, including our own. The current pandemic offers the chance for a civilizational turn, probably the last chance before environmental imbalances spin beyond societies’ control. The project of globalized capitalism, the only possible one for it, is to continue advancing blindly in its logic of destruction. Pollution and greenhouse gas emissions are already nearly within normal ranges in China again and James Temple (2020, p. 56) analyzed how: the threat of rapidly accelerating climate change will remain. And we’ll be living in a much poorer world, with fewer job opportunities, less money to invest in cleaner systems, and deeper fears about our health, our financial futures, and other lurking dangers. These are ripe conditions to further inflame nationalist instincts, making our global challenges even harder to solve.

### Part 2- Cap has no cap

#### Advocacy- resolved: A just government ought to recognize an unconditional right of workers to strike.

#### As an educator, the role of your ballot is to link your social location to the broader struggle against capitalism. To clarify, vote for the debater who presents the best strategy to combat capitalism. Educational spaces like debate are uniquely key to creating future revolutionaries, and judges are responsible for facilitating the conversations that create class-consciousness.

McLaren and Farahmandpur ‘01

Peter **McLaren and** Ramin **Farahmandpur** 20**01 (**Peter McLaren, Distinguished Professor in Critical Studies at Cambridge University, Ramin Farahmandpur, Phd at Portland State University, “TEACHING AGAINST GLOBALIZATION AND THE NEW IMPERIALISM: TOWARD A REVOLUTIONARY PEDAGOGY,” Journal of Teacher Education, Vol. 52, No. 2, March/April 2001) //Feng

This requires that students are able to see themselves in relation to their role as workers and to be provided with an opportunity to develop class consciousness. This does not mean that class consciousness excludes other aspects of identity. As Reed (2000) points out, The claim that being a worker is not the most crucial identity for members of marginalized groups is debatable. To say the least. But even if that claim were true, what it means simply is that people see themselves in many ways simultaneously. We all have our own sets of experiences fashioned by our social position, our family upbringing, our local political culture, and our voluntary associations. Each of these goes into the mix, modifying, cross-cutting, even at times overriding identities based on race or ethnicity, gender, or sexual orientation. . . . The fact of the existence of a capitalist economic order doesn’t automatically tell us how people interpret their positions within it. Class consciousness, no less than other identities, is contingent, the product of political debate and struggle. (p. 137) It is imperative in our view that the struggles of teachers in schools are linked to the struggles of other workers. A revolutionary workingclass pedagogy of labor stresses that the empowerment of workers (i.e., teachers, postal workers, factory workers) can be successfully achieved through organizing labor unions that committed to anticapitalist struggle and a proletarian praxis. Yet, we must also emphasize that the political and economic empowerment of workers will depend on their active participation and self-education. Here we oppose the tradition of “workerism” that is often anti-intellectual and looks on theory with suspicion and often contempt. Instead, we applaud the recent struggles of intellectuals such as Pierre Bourdieu of France to coordinate the efforts of numerous European social movements through his organization, Raisons d’Agir. **The ability of teachers and prospective teachers to interpret contemporary social relations of production as a set of interconnected social and material practices helps them to understand that success in a capitalist society is not the result of individual capacities but rather is constrained and enabled by asymmetrical relations of power linked to race, class, gender, and sexual economies of privilege**. We believe that workers committed to social justice have the opportunity to become liberatory intellectuals (what Antonio Gramsci, 1971, referred to as “organic” intellectuals) who possess the capacity to make meaningful choices and decisions in their lives (McLaren, Fischman, Serra, & Antelo, 1998). Thus, **teachers who are central to the process of raising students’ political consciousness must themselves become theoreticians of their own teaching practices.** Accordingly, **our task as organic and committed intellectuals is to create the conditions for the development of a revolutionary consciousness among** the working class in general and teachers and **students** in particular. In developing a framework for forging solidarity and collective action among workers and students, we find the three conditions that Weinbaum (1998) proposes to be particularly instructive. First**, the central role of critical educators must be directed at facilitating dialogues among** workers and **students** concerning everyday labor practices at the workplace and teaching practices within schools. Second**, teachers and workers must be presented with opportunities for transforming** those **relationships that link their individual interests and issues at the local and community level to broader social and economic relations at a global level**. And finally, Weinbaum stresses the active political role that critical educators in labor unions and schools must play both in their communities and in progressive organizations.

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-1)