### Part 1- I need those drugs

#### Covid slowed down the growth and the revolution is coming now! There can be no abolition of capitalism without internal contradiction, not external shock. Covid has exposed the contradiction to the mass- ensuring the revolution will happen.

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)

#### Intellectual property allows capitalism to evolve from material commodity to a higher level of knowledge, signs, and metaphysics that allows capitalism to avoid its destruction. Taking away IPR in medicine allows cap to die from its own contradiction.

Peter Drahos, 4-11-2019, "- A Philosophy of Intellectual Property," No Publication, http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml?referer=&amp;page=9

The argument we have put can be stated in the following propositions. The existence of physical commodities does not depend on law. The existence of abstract objects does. Commerce in physical commodities and abstract objects depends on a scheme of property rights and contract. Marx’s contradiction is that he sees labour as a value-producing commodity and yet does not recognise it as such when it is provided as a service or when it takes the form of an abstract object (in our sense of the term). Now we are in a better position to see how intellectual property accomplishes the task of integrating creative labour into the capitalist mode of production. Marx more clearly than anyone sees that capitalism is a mode of production in which commodities are amassed on a historically unprecedented scale. Capitalism is not, however, the only mode of production which produces commodities. This is true of earlier forms of production. Where capitalism is distinctive is that it is a system in which the labour power of one class has become a circulating commodity available for purchase by another class, the members of both classes being formally free to buy and sell commodities.[61](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-311) It is the condition of being able to readily acquire labour power that gives capitalism its Midas touch in economic production. Our argument has been that capitalism increasingly comes to depend on creative labour. Individual, rational capitalists, subject to competitive pressures, begin to seek out creative labour, for it is creative labour that is the source of much-wanted innovation. We have deliberately steered away from trying to explain this search in terms of the theory of surplus value. Rather our position is this: the search by individual capitalists for creative labour is motivated by the desire for control and ownership of the abstract object so as to gain a competitive edge over a rival. In the next chapter we shall see that the ownership of abstract objects can function to relieve individuals from competitive pressures. This provides another incentive for individual capitalists to chase the ownership of abstract objects. Clearly, if abstract objects exist under conditions of positive inclusive community (that is, they belong to all) the incentives for individual capitalists to pursue them will be considerably reduced. So one task of intellectual property law, from the perspective of the industrialist, is to create conditions of negative community so that the ownership of abstract objects is possible. Intellectual property, in commodifying universal mental constructs, dramatically increases the commodity horizons of capitalism. Intellectual property is perhaps a sign that the commodity nature of capitalism never stops evolving. Marx thought that the commodity of labour power was the form of commodity that was distinctive to capitalism. Our analysis suggests that understanding the productive powers of capitalism does not stop with the commodification of labour power. Through the creation of abstract objects, intellectual property law provides capitalism with another distinctive commodity form and, potentially at least, another means to its further expansion. By creating abstract objects intellectual property brings creative labour directly into the relations of production. Capitalism can continue its historically spectacular commodity production run because through intellectual property law it has re-engineered the possibilities of commodity production. Not only that, creative labour, through the creation of more efficient means of production, actually diminishes the role of physical labour. The aim of the industrialist is no longer to control physical labour through contract and industrial relations law but to control creative labour through intellectual property law. One last remark before we close this section. Intellectual property, we have argued, is fundamental to the task of integrating creative labour and abstract objects into capitalism’s production processes. This argument does not mean that we abandon Marx’s view about the fundamental materiality of production. Much of the literature on post-industrial society or post-capitalist society tends to over-emphasise the role of knowledge in production in order to obtain a convenient and bright dividing line between capitalist and post-capitalist epochs.[62](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-310) Drucker offers a typical characterisation of this: ‘The basic economic resource – “the means of production”, to use the economist’s term – is no longer capital, nor natural resources (the economist’s “land”), nor “labour”. It is and will be knowledge.’[63](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-309) However, our analysis of the role of the abstract object in production, when placed in the context of Marx’s overall theory, suggests that perhaps good old-fashioned industrial capitalism has a way to run before it is given its last rites by scholars. Our reasons for thinking this are these. When he comes to discuss the role of physical forces (the laws of nature) Marx says that these cost the capitalist nothing once they are discovered.[64](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-308) But in order for these laws to enter the productive life of capital they must be consumed productively and that, for Marx, requires that they be mediated by or be embodied in some item of hardware, some industrial article: ‘A water-wheel is necessary to exploit the force of water, and a steam-engine to exploit the elasticity of steam.’[65](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-307) Abstract objects cannot just simply step into production.We now have the makings of a paradox. The greater the role of abstract objects in capitalist production, the greater the production of the hardware of technology there needs to be. Abstract objects propel capitalism into ever-higher levels of industrial production of physical objects. Furthermore it is clear that for Marx each new generation of technologies carries with it greater and greater investment costs. Manual tools are cheap. Machine tools are not – and computer-controlled machine tools, even less so. The rough shape of our paradox is that abstract objects, which once in existence cost nothing or little, when absorbed into capitalist production cost capitalists a great deal in terms of investment. Intangible objects generate ever-higher levels of tangible commodities. It is industrial commodity production that abstract objects help stimulate, with the result that fewer workers are employed in that production directly (because of automation) and more services are required to match the higher levels of production. For the individual capitalist there is no choice about the levels of investment needed to stay in what has become a technological race. Investment is forced upon him by competition.[66](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-306) In language not intended to comfort, Marx says, ‘one capitalist always kills many’.[67](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-305) The upshot of our remarks is this. We must not make intellectual property reveal more than is there. For post-industrial scholars, the intellectual property phenomenon seems to offer support for their pronouncements of radical social transformation. Our position is a more cautious one. Through intellectual property law, capitalism engineers new production possibilities for itself.[68](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-304) Creative labour is brought into the fold of productive labour, but the transformative possibilities of this remain for the time being grounded in a paradigm of commodity accumulation. So-called ‘knowledge societies’ have, through new communications and information technologies, the opportunity to reorganise the work patterns of their individual citizens in ways that liberate those citizens from conditions of alienated labour. But capitalist knowledge societies, if Marx is right about the commodity nature of capitalism, will not take that opportunity. Abstract objects are absorbed into production as part of a cycle of commodity production. Abstract objects are used to continue capitalism’s obsession with, to use modern parlance, the hardware of technology. Inequalities of an apparently new kind (for example, the information-poor versus the information-rich) appear, but in essence they are old forms of inequalities patterned around the ownership of productive forces. ‘Knowledge workers’ end up more like other workers, for like other wage-labourers they come to find themselves in conditions of alienated labour. The impact of intellectual property norms upon the activities of the scientific community provides an example of the way in which the positive expressive activity of scientific research and discovery becomes alienated labour. Natural science becomes part of the natural forces of production because individual capitalists realise they cannot survive without constantly ‘revolutionising the instruments of production’.[69](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-303) Modern industry draws on scientific knowledge to produce a ‘science of technology’.[70](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-302) This science of technology is derived from many earlier separate forms of production such as trade guilds and craft industries. Modern industry takes the knowledge and know-how which has been locked away in these secretive, almost ritualistic enterprises and applies it to improving production. The modern form of the science of technology as we know it seems to be, for Marx, born out of industry.[71](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-301) Once in existence, its utility is apparent to all capitalists who are all constantly seeking to improve their production techniques. Science now finds itself press-ganged into capital’s service. The normative practices of scientists begin to change. Traditionally, scientists organised themselves around the goal of extending knowledge. This goal is served by an ethos of science which consists of four key values: universalism, communism, disinterestedness and organised scepticism.[72](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-300) Intellectual property, we have argued, plays a critical role in integrating creative labour into production. Through this process, intellectual property norms come to change the ethos of science.[73](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-299) (For Marx the change would only be a symptom of deeper causes.) The ethos of science rewards the sharing of information, the public communication of ideas (the incentives being prizes, scientific immortality, recognition and so on). The existence of an intellectual commons is seen to be crucial to successful individual work. This public domain attitude of science begins to change as intellectual property norms come to govern scientific labour. Open communication and the exchange of ideas are no longer so strongly endorsed by scientists because they might, amongst other things, defeat a proprietary claim to the knowledge.[74](http://press-files.anu.edu.au/downloads/press/n1902/html/ch05.xhtml#footnote-298) The direction of scientific research becomes increasingly determined by state-based priorities expressed through intellectual property rights. The fact that ideas can in one way or another be owned is itself symbolic of the fact that scientific labour has become alienated labour.

#### TRIPS are used by capitalist hegemons to advance their imperialist goal in the name of development

Sujithxavier, 3-23-2021, "On Intellectual Property Rights, Access to Medicines and Vaccine Imperialism," TWAILR, https://twailr.com/on-intellectual-property-rights-access-to-medicines-and-vaccine-imperialism/

These events – the corporate capture of the global pharmaceutical IP regime, state complicity and vaccine imperialism – are not new. Recall [Article 7 of TRIPS](https://www.wto.org/english/docs_e/legal_e/27-trips_01_e.htm), which states that the objective of the Agreement is the ‘protection and enforcement of intellectual property rights [to] contribute to the promotion of technological innovation and to the transfer and dissemination of technology’. In similar vein, Article 66(2) of TRIPS further calls on developed countries to ‘provide incentives to enterprises and institutions within their territories to promote and encourage technology transfer to least-developed country’. While the language of ‘transfer of technology’ might seem beneficial or benign, in actuality it is not. As I discussed in [my book](https://www.bloomsburyprofessional.com/uk/patent-games-in-the-global-south-9781509927401/), and as [Carmen Gonzalez](https://digitalcommons.law.seattleu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?referer=&httpsredir=1&article=1631&context=faculty) has also shown, when development objectives are incorporated into international legal instruments and institutions, they become embedded in structures that may constrain their transformative potential and reproduce North-South power imbalances. This is because these development objectives are circumscribed by capitalist imperialist structures, adapted to justify colonial practices and mobilized through racial differences. These structures are the essence of international law and its institutions even in the twenty-first century. They continue to animate broader socio-economic engagement with the global economy even in the present as well as in the legal and regulatory codes that support them. Thus, it is not surprising that even in current global health crisis, calls for this same transfer of technology in the form of a TRIPS waiver to scale up global vaccine production is being thwarted by the hegemony of developed states inevitably influenced by their respective pharmaceutical companies. The ‘emancipatory potential’ of TRIPS cannot be achieved if it was not created to be emancipatory in the first place. It also makes obvious the ways international IP law is not only unsuited to promote structural reform to enable the self-sufficiency and self-determination of the countries in the global south, but also produces asymmetries that perpetuate inequalities.

#### the ROB is to contest capitalism. CX checks any questions about ROB. 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- Expect the unexpected

#### Advocacy- resolved: The member nations of the World Trade Organization ought to reduce intellectual property protections for medicines.