#### [Malott 18] Capitalism is a bundle of contradictions strapped together by brutal expansion and violence – internal contradictions of labor and capital fuels the expansion and exploitation but simultaneously creates the tools of its own destruction
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What is Marx’s method? In developing his method, Marx challenged what he considered to be vulgar materialism for its tendency to ignore the totality and the relationship between consciousness and material reality. A philosophical term, the “totality” refers to the total of existence in any given moment. At the same time, Marx rejected pure idealism for substituting material reality with the idea of reality (i.e. with abstract thought). Idealism therefore leads to the false assumption that alienation or estrangement can be overcome in the realm of thought alone, as if we could change our material reality by changing our ideas and beliefs. Rather, Marx’s dialectical method is based on “the unifying truth of both” (1844/1988, 154). What this means is that “it is not enough that thought should seek to realize itself; reality must also strive toward thought.” In other words, Marx’s method entails the examination of the relationship between ideas and material reality, specifically as it pertains to class struggle and the emancipation of the proletariat. Marx’s dialectics are called “dialectical materialism” in contrast with Hegel’s dialectics. Marx wrote that he “discover[ed] the rational kernel within the mystical shell” (1867/1967, 29) of Hegel’s dialectics. To realize this revolution the working-class must not only understand the interaction of forces behind the development of society, but it must understand itself as one of those forces. The dialectic is a powerful weapon because it breaks through the capitalist illusion of individualism and atomism and disrupts the idea that isolated facts speak for themselves. Only by situating facts or ideas in the historical totality of society do they begin to make real sense. To comprehend this revolutionary movement we must conceive the interaction of forces as much more than the interaction of static and independent entities. When the parts of the totality change, their relationship to the totality changes, and they themselves change. Dialectics presents reality as an ongoing social process; nothing is ever static or fixed. Dialectics is both a method–or a way of investigating and understanding phenomena–and a fact of existence. For Engels, what is most central to dialectics is the tendency toward perpetual “motion and development” (1894/1987, 131). What follows is a summary of the dialectical theory of movement and change. The concept around which the dialectical understanding of development revolves is the negation of the negation, which will be taken up first, before turning to the concept of sublation. The unity of opposites or the interpenetration of opposites, a central driving force of the dialectic is then explored. Finally, we look at the tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality, which in turn allows us to understand the negation of the negation more deeply. The negation of the negation The tendency toward the negation of the negation is arguably at the heart of dialectical development. Engels, for example, notes that the negation of the negation is “extremely general—and for this reason extremely far-reaching and important” (1894/1987, 131). The negation of the negation refers specifically to the way that phenomena and structures produce their opposites. For example, in the first volume of Capital, Marx (1867/1967) writes that capitalist private property is the negation of individual private property, or property held by the proprietor or individual laborer. Peasant proprietors, as small-scale industrial producers, tended to own private property and produced their own means of subsistence. This small-scale, scattered, petty industry of the peasants was limited in terms of its ability to foster economic growth. The advent of the capitalist era included the expropriation of the peasants from their means of production. The logic of the feudal system and exchange created the agencies of its own annihilation. While feudalism was overcome in capitalism, aspects of it were preserved but reconfigured in a way to facilitate economic growth. For example, the private property of peasants was abolished, but private property itself was not. Capitalism concentrates and centralizes property, tending towards monopoly. Bigger capitalists buy out or otherwise out maneuver smaller capitalists. At the same time, capitalism creates its antagonist: the working class. As capital grows so too does the working class. These contradictions provide the basis for the second negation: the expropriation of the expropriators, or the transformation of capitalism into socialism. Under socialism the means of production that existed under capitalism are preserved. Instead of being held in private they are held in common. In place of exploitation the means of production are put in the service of meeting the many needs of the producers. This process is called sublation. When something is sublated it is both overcome yet preserved. We can also see sublation at work in Marx’s theory of monopoly. Monopolies create the material basis for socialism as they aggregate and concentrate productive forces. Socialist revolution expropriates these from the capitalists, but instead of breaking them up into smaller enterprises, the working class takes control of them as they are. If this is still a bit confusing at this point, it should be clearer after we go through the other components of dialectics. Of course, capitalism is not going to automatically transform into socialism, even though its own internal logic orients its development in that general direction. Capitalist crises and contradictions are necessary for socialist revolutions but they are not sufficient. If they were sufficient, then we would already be living under socialism! The interpenetration of opposites What compels entities to be in a constant state of motion are their internal contradictions, or the forces generated by the unity of opposites. The most central or essential contradiction within capitalism is between labor and capital. Labor and capital are opposites because they have contradictory drives. For example, historically, labor has spontaneously sought to decrease the rate of exploitation by collectively bargaining for higher wages, better conditions, benefits, and so on. When successful, these decrease profit margins. Capital, on the other hand, seeks to always increase the rate of exploitation. Labor and capital are therefore compelled by opposite and antagonistic drives. This antagonism can be managed and mediated by unions and state regulation, but it can only be overcome through the negation of the negation. Labor and capital, as such, do not have an independent existence apart from each other. To be a worker is by definition to be exploited by capital, and to be a capitalist is by definition to exploit workers. The relationship between labor and capital is therefore internal and constitutes the totality. As a relation of exploitation, capital is a unity of contradictions. The dialectical development of this relationship over time is the movement of the balances of forces within capitalism. A common mistake is to conceptualize the movement generated from antagonistically-related social classes as the interaction of separate forces external to each other. This leads to the false belief that the role of the working-class revolution today is to destroy capitalism and replace it with socialism. Socialism can only be created out of what already exists. Marx and Engels believed that socialism would first emerge out of the most developed capitalist countries. This did not turn out to be true, as socialism emerged first in Russia, an underdeveloped, predominantly feudal-based country. Socialism, nevertheless, was ushered in by the producers and created out of an old society, not separate from it. Quantity into quality The tendency toward the transformation of quantity into quality offers deeper insight into the negation of the negation. So far, we have seen how the essential contradiction within capitalism is the labor/capital relationship, which is an example of the unity of opposites. We also saw the sublation of private property from one negated mode of production to the next. Investigating the interrelationship of these two issues will provide the basis for our example of the transformation of quantity into quality. The inherently unequal relationship between labor and capital was established, in part, through the violence of expropriating peasants from their means of production. Without direct access to the means of production, former peasants were forced to sell their ability to work for a wage, thereby becoming part of the working class. Although beyond the scope of this short introduction, it’s crucial to note that the violence of slavery, colonialism, and settler colonialism were equally important in establishing capitalism. The competition between capitalists drives technological development. Because the price of any given commodity tends to center around the average amount of time its production requires, devising new technologies that can reduce the number of labor hours it takes to produce whatever commodity is a tendency internal to capitalism. In the short term this gives the capitalist at the technological forefront a competitive advantage because they can sell the commodity below its social value. But as soon as the new technology gets integrated into the entire branch or branches of industry, the average amount of time that it takes to produce whatever commodity lowers, and the competition begins anew. While new labor-saving technologies can be super profitable for individual capitalists in the short term, in the long term it reduces the number of labor hours simultaneously set into motion. It also means that more capital is invested into machinery rather than workers. And since workers produce value and machines do not, this contributes to the tendency of the falling rate of profit. When the amount of labor hours it takes to transform a given quantity of raw materials into whatever commodity is reduced, the composition of capital shifts quantitatively, by degree. Historically, individual capitalists have countered the falling rate of their profit margins in many ways such as devising schemes to reduce the price they pay for labor even while its value remains the same thereby pushing the laborer into depravity and impoverishment. The capitalist, driven to counter the falling rate of profit by extracting more and more value from the laborer, thereby deepens capital’s crisis. The internal drive of capital to forever expand the accumulation of surplus value brings the unity of opposites, labor and capital, into growing conflict with each other. This movement is the developmental process at the heart of the dialectics of capitalism. While the capitalist has an interest in maintaining the contradiction and creating the illusion of capital’s permanence, the objective interest of labor is to resolve the contradiction, thereby changing the quality of production relations. This is quantity into quality and the center of struggle between labor and capital. The quantitative changes provide the basis or possibility of qualitative change. Conclusion One of the reasons why dialectical materialism is so important is because it embodies a deep revolutionary optimism. Drawing attention to the fact that the future already exists as an unrealized potential within the present demystifies the seeming permanence of capitalism. In other words, it reveals the defeat of imperialism as a real potential and not a fantasy. For example, it is a fact that the most advanced means of production, labor saving technologies, as they currently exist, are able to meet the basic needs of every person in the world. In this way, the future liberation of humanity from exploitation and material oppression already exists. The practicality of the aforementioned optimism resides in the fact that Marx’s method correctly locates the agent of revolutionary transformation within the working class, the many.

#### [Bachand 20] Attempting to resolve the inherent contradictions within capitalism through international organizations in order to “fix” the crisis exasperate the continuation of capitalist contradictions. The affirmative acts as a regulatory measure to ensure the regime of accumulation is constantly stabilized
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Drawing on Italian activist and intellectual Antonio Gramsci, the neo-Gramscian school of IR strives to explain the development and reproduction of a social order. Specifically, it focuses on the reason for which social classes that are disadvantaged and exploited by a social order nevertheless adhere to it without attempting to reverse it. Gramsci qualifies this situation by using the concept of ‘hegemony’ which designates, among other things, the capacity of a dominant group to convince, using ideological procedures, other groups that a social order is good for them even if this is not objectively the case. Transposing this analysis at the global level, Robert Cox explains that hegemony: … means dominance of a particular kind where the dominant state creates an order based ideologically on a broad measure of consent, functioning according to general principles that in fact ensure the continuing supremacy of the leading state or states and leading classes but at the same time offer some measure or prospect of satisfaction to the less powerful.43 Criticizing the focus put by mainstream approaches in IR, Cox claims that hegemony is not essentially the supremacy of the leading state(s), but of the dominant classes of these state(s).44 Moreover, coming from the Marxist’s tradition and emphasizing the economic aspect of any social organization, he argues that hegemony ‘is an order within a world economy with a dominant mode of production which penetrates into all countries and links into other subordinate modes of production’.45 In other words, hegemony is the capacity of the dominant classes of the dominant state(s) to expand, reproduce and legitimize the mode of production that is favourable to their interests. Cox sees an important relation between international organizations (and institutions) and hegemony. In his mind: International institutions and rules are generally initiated by the state which established the hegemony. At the very least they must have that state’s support. The dominant state takes care to secure the acquiescence of other states according to a hierarchy of powers within the inter-state structure of hegemony.46 More precisely, they have many roles in the reproduction of hegemony: (1) [T]hey embody the rules which facilitate the expansion of hegemonic world orders; (2) they are themselves the product of the hegemonic order; (3) they ideologically legitimate the norms of the world order; (4) they co-opt the elites from peripheral countries and (5) they absorb counter-hegemonic ideas.47 Stephen Gill, Cox’s colleague at York University, adds an interesting dimension to these roles. With the concept of ‘new constitutionalism’ that is supported by international organizations, he refers to … political and legal reforms to redefine the political via a series of precommitment mechanisms. These include constitutions, laws, property rights and various institutional arrangements, designed to have quasi-permanent status. A central objective of new constitutionalism is to prevent future governments from undoing commitments to a disciplinary neoliberal pattern of accumulation.48 The important aspect underlined by Gill is the capacity of international organizations to exclude from the political discussion, from what is commonly sensed as ‘possible’, some aspects that are incompatible with the social order promoted by the dominant groups and social classes. Globally, the neo-Gramscian contribution is useful to emphasize the link between an international organization and a specific social order based on the reproduction of dominant social classes’ interests. Hence, an international organization (it is at least true for the most important of them) cannot be understood if not situated inside the political and economic order to which it belongs. It is also presumably the case that when this order is not functioning well any longer, the international organization will also enter into crisis, or be radically transformed. B Théorie de la régulation and Social Structure of Accumulation Theory The second step relates to a ‘mode of regulation’ that supports and legitimizes the regime of accumulation. It is constituted by ‘institutional forms’ whose functions are notably to ‘reproduce the fundamental social relations of the mode of production’ and to ‘pilot’ the reproduction of the regime of accumulation.53 To explain their argument, the SSAT claim that capitalism is ‘an inherently conflictual system’ but that its contradictions can be attenuated through the construction of sets of institutions that mitigate and channel class conflict and stabilize capitalists’ long-run expectations. Institutions in this sense are conceived of broadly and can be economic, political, ideological, or cultural in character. […] [These institutions] are mutually compatible and generally supportive of each other as well as supportive of the accumulation process.54 Joining this assessment to our earlier analysis of the neo-Gramscians, we may now deduce that hegemony does not simply represent the expansion of a ‘mode of production’ (as Cox claims) but of the ‘regime of accumulation’ that is adopted by the dominant classes of the dominant state(s) because it is felt that it is the best one to defend their interests. In fact, international organizations on which Cox and Gill focus may be interpreted as being part of what the école de la régulation calls the ‘mode of regulation’. Their function becomes clearer with the input of the SSAT and the école de la régulation: to ensure the efficiency, the legitimacy and the permanency of the regime of accumulation. C The Importance of the Rate of Profit and the Counteracting Factors to Its Fall Our last theoretical influence comes directly from Marx, who explained that the inevitable change in the organic composition of capital (that is the relation between constant capital55 and variable capital56) implies a tendency of the rate of profit to fall,57 a phenomenon that Marx strongly associates with overproduction and over accumulation of capital.58 For Marx, this fall is only a long-term tendency because of the existence of some counteracting factors that can be put in play to countervail the fall of profit. Marx enumerates six of these counteracting factors: the intensification of labour exploitation, the reduction of wages, the cheapening of the price of elements of constant capital, the relative surplus population, foreign trade (to which we can associate foreign investment) and the increase in share capital (that will here be associated to financialization59).60 The theoretical explanation for the law of the tendential fall in the rate of profit is controversial, even though some authors continue to defend it and use it in a somewhat convincing way.61 Now, even without defending Marx’s theoretical explanation, many Marxist-oriented authors put the evolution of the rate of profit (and generally its fall) at the core of their work.62 For us, the usefulness of this type of analysis is that evolution of the rate of profit is obviously an essential part of capitalism, whose single aim is to ensure capital accumulation. Geographer David Harvey’s New Imperialism offers a particularly important contribution for any international lawyer wishing to understand the link between capitalism and international law. In this book (as well as elsewhere), Harvey develops a theory of ‘capital fix’. As he explains: The central point of this argument concerned a chronic tendency within capitalism, theoretically derived out a reformulation of Marx’s theory of the tendency for the rate of profit to fall, to produce crises of overaccumulation. Such crises are typically registered as surpluses of capital (in commodity, money, or productive capacity forms) and surpluses of labour side by side, without there apparently being any means to bring them together profitably to accomplish socially useful tasks. […] Since it is the lack of profitable opportunities that lies at the hearth of the difficulty, the key economic (as opposed to social and political) problem lies with capital. If devaluation is to be avoided, then profitable ways must be found to absorb the capital surpluses.63 Capital has to find solutions to face this fall of opportunities and the fall of the rate of profit. Harvey introduces the double meaning of the concept of ‘fix’: A certain portion of the total capital is literally fixed in and on the land in some physical form for a relative long period of time (depending on its economic and physical lifetime). […] The spatio-temporal ‘fix’, on the other hand, is a metaphor for a particular kind of solution to capitalist crises through temporal deferral and geographical expansion. […] The production of space, the organization of wholly new territorial divisions of labour, the opening up of new and cheaper resources complexes, of new regions as dynamic spaces of capital accumulation, and the penetration of pre-existing social formation by capitalist social relations and institutional arrangements (such as rules of contract and private property arrangements) provide important ways to absorb capital and labour surpluses.64 Hence, with the theory of ‘capital fix’, Harvey develops Marx’s own concept of ‘counteracting factors’ (a concept we will continue to use in the following pages), underlying the necessity for capital to find strategies to face its inherent contradictions. The importance of this theoretical finding is that many counteracting factors can be put at work with the help of international law and international organizations. Put together, the ideas of this section lead us to propose the following conclusion. Capitalism is wrought with strong and inherent contradictions that have the long-term tendency to bring down the rate of profit. Even if the theorization proposed by Marx of this fall has not been explicitly accepted by all, several authors have factually shown its existence and its implications. The sustainability of the rate of profit is an important, if not the main aspect of a regime of accumulation,65 and when a fall occurs, the regime of accumulation must react. In such a situation, the function of a mode of regulation (to use the concept of the école de la régulation) is actually to find ways to operationalize enough counteracting factors to re-establish a satisfying rate of profit, at least for leading state(s)’ dominant classes. Finally, if we follow the neo-Gramscian argument and admit that the purpose of international organizations is to promote the well-functioning of a regime of accumulation (and consequently the sustainability of the rate of profit), we can conclude that an international organization’s (and especially one with economic functions like the WTO) existence is linked with its capacity to put the counteracting factors at work to ensure that the dominant classes of the leading state(s) can rake satisfying profit. Consequently, if it is not able to achieve this goal, one can predict that, one day or another, its very existence will be challenged.

#### [Vanni 21] Their own author negates – Reformism not only fails but also perpetuate global inequality – the aff is a weaponization of medicines that increases Global South dependency in service of the corporate giants – it doesn’t matter the intention of the aff, it’s a question of how the aff will be used and the consequences of the plan being passed
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These events – the corporate capture of the global pharmaceutical IP regime, state complicity and vaccine imperialism – are not new. Recall Article 7 of TRIPS, 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, and as Carmen Gonzalez 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. Concluding Remarks What this pandemic makes clear is that the development discourse often touted by developed nations to help countries in the Global South ‘catch up’ is empty when the essential medicines needed to stay alive are deliberately denied and weaponised. Like the free-market reforms designed to produce ‘development’, IP deployed to incentivise innovation is yet another tool in the service of private profits. As this pandemic has shown, the reality of contemporary capitalism – including the IP regime that underpins it – is competition among corporate giants driven by profit and not by human need. The needs of the poor weigh much less than the profits of big business and their home states. However, it is not all doom and gloom. Countries such as India, China and Russia have stepped up in the distribution of vaccines or what many call ‘vaccine diplomacy.’ Further, Cuba’s vaccine candidate Soberana 02, which is currently in final clinical trial stages and does not require extra refrigeration, promises to be a suitable option for many countries in the global South with infrastructural and logistical challenges. Importantly, Cuba’s history of medical diplomacy in other global South countries raises hope that the country will be willing to share the know-how with other manufactures in various non-western countries, which could help address artificial supply problems and control over distribution. In sum, this pandemic provides an opportune moment to overhaul this dysfunctional global IP system. We need not wait for the next crisis to learn the lessons from this crisis.

#### [Kleiner 10] The Alt is to embrace copyleft activism and the building of venture communist societies – creates the conditions necessary for the overthrow of capitalism and a new society free from oppression
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VENTURE COMMUNISM Venture communism provides a structure for independent producers to share a common stock of productive assets, allowing forms of production formerly associated exclusively with the creation of immaterial value, such as free software, to be extended to the material sphere. Part of the apparatus that allowed the free software community to grow and spread was the creation of copyleft, a type of license that allows for the re-use of the software it covers, so long as the derived works are also licensed under compatible terms. By releasing software under such licenses, the work becomes a collective stock for all free software developers. The core innovation of copyleft was to turn the copyright system against itself. The chief vehicle of asserting control under copyright is the license a work is released under, which establishes the terms under which others are permitted to use the copyrighted material. Copyleft effectively hijacks the existing apparatus that enforces privilege over intellectual assets, using the authority granted by the copyright license to guarantee access for all, and require that this freedom is passed on. This is consistent with copyright laws, and dependent on them, because without copyright and the institutions that protect it, there could be no copyleft. Venture communism requires that this same freedom be extended to material productive assets. The chief vehicle for asserting control over productive assets is the ﬁrm. Venture communism is therefore based on a corporate form: the venture commune. Employing a venture commune to share material property hijacks the existing apparatus that enforces privilege, to instead protect a common stock of productive assets that is available for use by independent producers. Legally, a venture commune is a ﬁrm, much like the venture capital funds of the capitalist class. However, the venture commune has distinct properties that transform it into an effective vehicle for revolutionary workers’ struggle. The venture commune holds ownership of all productive assets that make up the common stock employed by a diverse and geographically distributed network of collective and independent peer producers. The venture commune does not coordinate production; a community of peer producers produce according to their own needs and desires. The role of the commune is only to manage the common stock, making property, such as the housing and tools they require, available to the peer producers. The venture commune is the federation of workers’ collectives and individual workers, and is itself owned by each of them, with each member having only one share. In the case that workers are working in a collective or co-operative, ownership is held individually, by the separate people that make up the collective or co-operative. Ownership in a venture commune can only be acquired by contributions of labor, not property. Only by working is a share in the commune earned, not by contributing land, capital or even money; only labor. Property is always held in common by all the members of the commune, with the venture commune equally owned by all its members. Thus, each member may never accumulate a disproportionate share of the proceeds of property. Property can never be concentrated in fewer and fewer hands. The function of the venture commune is to acquire material assets that members need for living and working, such as equipment and tools, and allocate them to its members. The commune acquires this property when requested to do so by a member of the commune. The members interested in having this property offer a rental agreement to the commune, giving the terms they wish to have for possession of this property. The commune issues a series of bonds to raise the funds required to acquire the property, which then becomes collateral for the bondholders. The rental agreement is offered as a guarantee that the funds will be available to redeem the bonds. Should this guarantee not be met, the property can be liquidated with the proceeds going to the bondholders. This series of bonds are sold in a public auction setting. If the bond sale clears, the commune acquires the property, and the rental agreement is executed transferring possession to the renter. The property returns to the commune whenever those renting it no longer require it, or are unable to meet the agreed terms, at which point the commune offers it once again at auction to its members, who bid on new rental terms. If there is no more demand for the asset it is liquidated. After the bonds that were issued to acquire an asset are fully redeemed, it becomes fully owned by the commune. The remaining rental income the property earns is from then on divided up equally among all members of the commune and paid out to them. Proceeds from liquidated property are likewise divided. Because all the rent collected from property rental is divided up evenly among the members of the commune, those members who pay rent for property that is equal to the amount they would receive in return essentially get to use an equal share of the collectively owned property for free. What they pay in rent for the property is equal to the rent they receive back as a member of the commune. Members renting more than their per-capita share of the collective property will pay more, and presumably be choosing to pay because they are employing the property as a productive asset, and thus earning enough to pay. Conversely, members using less than their per-capita share receive more in payment than they pay in rent, thus being rewarded for not hoarding property. The main activities of the venture commune, managing bonds and rental agreements, do not impose a high level of coordination and, just like the computer networks that manage the allocation of immaterial goods, are activities that are well suited for computerized automation. Many venture communes could exist, and as they become interrelated, merge together forming larger, and more stable and sustainable communities of commons-based producers. Any change that can produce a more equitable society is dependent on a prior change in the mode of production that increases the share of wealth retained by the worker. The change in the mode of production must come ﬁrst. This change cannot be achieved politically, not by vote, or by lobby, or by advocacy, or by revolutionary violence, not as long as the owners of property have more wealth to apply to prevent any change by funding their own candidates, their own lobbyists, their own advocates, and ultimately, developing a greater capacity for counter-revolutionary violence. Society cannot be changed by a strike, not as long as owners of property have more accumulated wealth to sustain themselves during production interruptions. Not even collective bargaining can work, for so long as the owners of property own the product, they set the price of the product and thus any gains in wages are lost to rising prices. Venture communism should not be understood as a proposal for a new kind of society. It is an organizational form with which to engage in social struggle. Venture communes are not intended to replace labor unions, political parties, NGOs and other potential vehicles of class conﬂict, but to compliment them, to tilt the economic balance of power in favor of the representatives of workers’ class interest. Without venture communism, these other organized forms are always forced to work against opposition with much deeper pockets, and are thus doomed to endless co-option, failure and retreat. The only way is to stop applying our labor to property owned by non-producers and instead form a common stock of productive assets. Venture communism is taking control of our own productive process, retaining the entire product of our labor, forming our own capital, and expanding until we have collectively accumulated enough wealth to achieve a greater social inﬂuence than those that defend exploitation. This new economic balance allows for change that is far greater than the modest goals of venture communism. A truly free society would have no need for copyleft, or venture communism; these are only practices around which workers can unite towards the realization of their historic role of building a classless society, a society of equals. WORKERS OF THE WORLD UNITE! YOU HAVE NOTHING TO LOSE BUT YOUR CHAINS. YOU HAVE A WORLD TO WIN.

#### [Landis 21] Capitalism causes warming and extinction – prioritization of profits, commodification of nature, and its impulse to expand – only the alt solves

Landis 8-10 [(Tina Landis is the author of a new book entitled “[Climate Solutions Beyond Capitalism](https://store.pslweb.org/Climate-Solutions-Beyond-Capitalism_p_69.html).”) (2021, August 11). “Code red” climate report and the failure of capitalism. Retrieved September 26, 2021, from Liberation News website: <https://www.liberationnews.org/code-red-climate-report-and-the-failure-of-capitalism/>] Comrade PW

The [UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change](https://www.nytimes.com/2021/08/09/climate/un-climate-report-takeaways.html) report released August 9 warns of a “code red for humanity” if we fail to drastically cut greenhouse gas emissions by 2050. Compiled by 234 scientists and based on analysis of 14,000 studies, the new report states that even rapidly cutting emissions immediately means warming will continue beyond 2040 — meaning adaptation measures, as well as immediate mitigation efforts, are crucial. The [report](https://www.ipcc.ch/report/sixth-assessment-report-working-group-i/) states: “Global surface temperature will continue to increase until at least the mid-century under all emissions scenarios considered. Global warming of 1.5°C and 2°C will be exceeded during the 21st century unless deep reductions in carbon dioxide (CO2) and other greenhouse gas emissions occur in the coming decades.” We are currently on track to reach 3 C warming based on global emissions reduction pledges, which would be catastrophic. The report’s [Interactive Atlas](https://interactive-atlas.ipcc.ch/) forecasts various scenarios for each degree of temperature increase and its impact on precipitation and temperatures in different regions globally and shows the dire impacts if we fail to act now. Every corner of the globe is already experiencing ever worsening impacts of the climate crisis — from droughts and wildfires, to temperature extremes, floods and severe storms. Our [climate is unraveling](https://www.liberationnews.org/inaction-from-government-as-climate-unravels-coast-to-coast/) and still little is being done to turn the tide despite decades of warnings from the scientific community and the existence of actual solutions. The Earth’s systems are rapidly destabilizing faster than previous IPCC reports warned, which tend to be conservative in their predictions. If our so-called “leaders” continue to fail to act, humanity’s future is very uncertain as the life-sustaining systems of the planet falter. The endless growth model of capitalism, that treats everything on the planet as a commodity to be exploited with complete disregard for future generations, is the root cause of climate change. The capitalist “expand-or-die” model is incompatible with sustainability and is rapidly driving the majority of species toward extinction — including our own. Meanwhile, the billionaires play “astronaut” in their “space race” as the working class around the globe suffers in the real world from climate change. And the millionaires in Congress waste precious time debating the bandaid passive solutions in Biden’s infrastructure bill that may achieve some minor reductions in greenhouse gas emissions, but do nothing to steer the train off course from hurtling over the cliff. These millionaire “representatives” have proven time and again to be completely out of touch and unconcerned with the plight of those they claim to represent. From COVID relief and eviction moratoriums to an increased minimum wage, they squabble over even throwing tiny crumbs to the working class while they eagerly hand out trillions to the banks, corporations and military industrial complex. These wealthy politicians, and their billionaire corporate backers, can continue life as usual largely free of the climate impacts that the working class deals with in our “new normal.” They can just go to their second or third home if one burns down or gets washed away in a flood. They can shift their investments so that they actually make profits off these disasters. And they likely don’t even notice the increased costs for food and clean water as droughts impact availability — beyond perhaps seeing an increase in their return on investments in these sectors. Their economic status protects them from the reality that the rest of us face. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in inadequate housing that isn’t weatherized to withstand temperature extremes or to keep out wildfire smoke. It is working-class people who froze to death in their homes in the deep freeze in Texas in February and working-class people in the Pacific Northwest who died in the severe heatwave in June. It is low-income residents in the rural West whose wells are running dry, unable to afford to drill deeper wells, while Big Agriculture drains the precious aquifer for cash crops. It is the immigrant farmworkers who face lethal heatwaves and wildfire smoke working in the fields of California. It is poor communities and communities of color that are forced to live in floodplain areas where the affordable housing is, who have their homes washed away from the ever increasing severe storms. It is working-class urban communities that live in sweltering heat islands where temperatures are up to 7 F higher than in wealthy neighborhoods with trees and vegetation — which during prolonged heat waves can mean life or death. It is working-class people who are priced out of flood and fire insurance, who are left homeless when climate disasters occur. It is indigenous communities and low-income rural communities that bear the brunt of pollution and ecological destruction from extractive industries that make profits while continuing to fuel the climate crisis. The climate crisis is a class war. The rich can install state-of-the-art air filtration in their mansions so they can breathe easily while the world burns. They can move to higher elevation while the coastal areas are inundated by sea level rise. The 1% richest, the capitalist owners, have caused the climate crisis and their wealth should be used to solve it. We must stand up and demand that the government take action to protect the people from the unfolding catastrophe and do everything possible to stem the crisis. We cannot allow fear to demobilize us. There are real solutions and must join together and demand real action. And if our “leaders” continue to stall and make excuses, we must rise up and replace them with people and a system that truly does represent us. And that system is socialism, where the resources and knowledge of society are used for the benefit of all of humanity and the planet. Under socialism, our representatives would be those most qualified and knowledgeable to do the job, not those who have the millions needed to pay for campaign ads and a marketing team. Our representatives would be scientists, ecologists, engineers, medical doctors, educators, farmers and other leaders from our communities, who understand the problems and the solutions. These are the people we need in leadership — people who are workers themselves — who can mobilize all sectors of society to make the transition to an equitable and ecologically-regenerative society where humanity and all life have a positive, livable future.