



2020

Editors' Introduction: Radical Philosophy and Politics Amid the Climate Crisis and the Coronavirus Pandemic

Harry van der Linden

Reed M. Kurtz

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.butler.edu/facsch_papers



Part of the [Ethics and Political Philosophy Commons](#)

Editors' Introduction:

**Radical Philosophy and Politics Amid the Climate Crisis and the
Coronavirus Pandemic**

Reed M. Kurtz and Harry van der Linden

Citation: Kurtz, Reed M, and Harry van der Linden. 2020. "Editors' Introduction: Radical Philosophy and Politics Amid the Climate Crisis and the Coronavirus Pandemic." *Radical Philosophy Review* 23 (2): 161–74. <https://doi.org/10.5840/radphilrev2020232115>.

I. The Coronavirus Pandemic and the Climate Crisis: Intersections and Differences

When we, the editors of this special issue, decided on the theme of politics, radical philosophy, and climate change, we had not imagined that we would complete this project in a time of pandemic, a crisis that seems on “fast forward” as compared to the “slow violence” of the climate crisis. Yet epidemiologists and other observers had warned about the possibility.¹ Living amidst the COVID-19 pandemic and the conflictual responses to it, brings to the foreground questions such as the following: How is the pandemic related to the climate crisis as ecological crisis? Does the pandemic foreshadow the social harms of climate change? Are there commonalities between failed political responses to the two crises and do they demand similar political solutions? And, perhaps most urgently, how will the pandemic impact the struggle against climate change? We will provide here some tentative answers to these questions with the understanding that our answers are foremost suggestions for further research and critical analysis.

Some major global (or even existential) threats, such as asteroids, are of very low probability and faced by humanity without any involvement in their emergence, while others are of uncertain probability, such as nuclear war and the risks of artificial intelligence turning against

¹ Mike Davis warned in 2005 against the threat of an avian flu pandemic in *The Monster at the Door*, very recently reissued and expanded as *The Monster Enters*. He states here that this threat continues to be “imminent” (2). In *End Times*, published in 2019, Bryan Walsh warns presciently that Trump would be “dangerous in the face of a new disease” (193).

us, and fully our own doing, leaving nature as a “passive agent.” What sets COVID-19, and similar recent infectious outbreaks with pandemic potential, and climate change apart as global threats is that these threats have already materialized to some degree and emerge from the dynamic interaction between society and nature.²

A common conception of infectious diseases is that they are only nature’s doing: we are attacked by microbial pathogens and need vaccines to win the battle. The science journalist Sonia Shah discusses why this conception is misguided with regard to recent pandemics: “[I]f there is any invasion underway at all, it is spearheaded by us. The majority of pathogens that have emerged since 1940 originated in the bodies of animals and entered human populations not because they invaded us but because we invaded their habitats.”³ Contributing factors to the emergence of zoonotic infectious diseases include the destruction of wetlands and forests, industrial farming pushing small-scale farmers to move near forests, factory farms as incubators of new viruses, and increased wildlife consumption due to (among other causes) overfishing.⁴ Thus Shah comes to state that “the coronavirus, if cast as any kind of monster at all, would be a Frankenstein’s monster: a creature of our own making.” And the reason that this creature can bring about so much harm is that we have created social enabling conditions for its “success,” ranging from global travel and production networks to understaffed nursing homes, crowded jails, poor public health provisions, and infected workers staying on the job due to economic pressures. These conditions vary from society to society and so does the harm inflicted by the coronavirus.

It is widely recognized that our behavior toward nature is pivotal in the climate crisis – the enemy is not nature but “us” – and that how climate change will increasingly impact humans will vary with their economic condition, the specific policies of their society (including its adaptation measures), and their particular geographical location. Going beyond this view, we hold that the climate crisis results from the historically contingent and social structural dynamics of the limitless accumulation of capital and corresponding commodification of nature, including ecological disregard and extractivism (the Anthropocene versus the Capitalocene). The commodification of nature is also behind the environmental degradation and disruption central to the emergence of

² Cf. Walsh, *End Times*, 129-133.

³ Shah, “It is Time to Tell a New Story about the Coronavirus.”

⁴ See *ibid.* See also Davis, *The Monster Enters*, 17, 76-79, and 101-13, and Spinney, “Is factory farming to blame for coronavirus?”

zoonotic infectious diseases such COVID-19, and climate change will increasingly contribute to this degradation, while fossil-fuel pollution worsens the health effects of COVID-19.⁵ Thus we may see COVID-19 as yet another warning sign on the road of the commodification of nature, a road leading not only to more (and perhaps more severe) pandemics but also toward an ever-deepening of the climate crisis with mass displacement due to rising sea levels, droughts and famines, more extreme weather events, greater societal instability and upheaval due to climate-induced stressors, and mass extinction events, with even greater catastrophes on the horizon. In Marxian terms, pandemics and climate change are both disruptions in the metabolism between society and nature, and in order to address effectively the “metabolic rift” caused by capitalism, radical changes must be made both to society and its interaction with nature.⁶

Natural disasters and health emergencies tend to exacerbate prevailing injustices and vulnerabilities, poverty, and food and income insecurity, while those with economic resources and political visibility and influence tend to be more able to protect themselves against such threats. Initially, SARS-CoV-2 may have disproportionately emerged among the more economic advantaged who as global travelers spread the virus, but, as has been widely reported, soon a very disproportionately high number of COVID-19 cases and deaths emerged among Black, Brown, and Indigenous communities, prisoners, migrants in detention centers, and the elderly and caretakers in nursing homes. Relatedly, essential workers in delivery, transit, food production and services, who are disproportionately people of color and are typically underpaid, inadequately insured, and lacking job security, continue to be subjected to much higher infection risks than top-earners who frequently are able to continue their jobs at home.

Increased heat waves, extended forest fire seasons, more intense hurricanes, decreased food and water security, and similar other harms of climate change will (with politics as usual) disproportionately impact vulnerable and exploited groups as well. This point has been rightfully stressed by the climate justice movement. This does not mean that individual disasters tend to have their own unique victims, but flawed policy and social conditions will have a great impact on

⁵ See Climate Reality Project, “Air Pollution and the Coronavirus.” This article emphasizes that “there is *no evidence* that climate change is itself playing a discernible role in the spread of COVID-19.” However, global warming will extend the seasons and geographical range of vector-borne and water-borne diseases.

⁶ Foster makes the same point in “Everything Affects and Is Affected by Every Other Thing.”

the size of the group of victims and its class and racial/ethnic composition. Thus it is the nature of COVID-19 that leads to more deaths among the elderly; it is flawed policy that has led people living in (privately owned, poorly managed) nursing homes to become by far the largest group of casualties, while class and race are factors in the disproportionate deaths in nursing homes serving communities of color. Likewise, flooding by rising sea levels or increased hurricanes caused by climate change will have its own kind of victims, but the actual impact is greatly magnified by conditions of poor adaptation and planning, inequality, poverty, patriarchy, and the like. Hurricane Katrina illustrates the point.

However, one salient difference between the impacts of the coronavirus pandemic and climate change is that it is anticipated that countries in the Global South will be much more devastated by worsening climate change than countries of the Global North, while (as of late July, 2020) the casualties of COVID-19 have been disproportionate in the Global North (about 50 percent of global fatal cases come from the U.S., the E.U. and the U.K.). This might be a temporary matter.⁷ It should also be noted that countries in the South with major for-export industries, such as the garment industry, have been hit hard,⁸ and lockdown is especially challenging in countries already facing economic austerity, food scarcity, limited educational opportunities, etc.

The health and economic harms of the coronavirus pandemic were, and continue to be, immediate and visible. The harms of climate change are gradually unfolding and will be mostly visited on the young and future generations, while its economic costs are for the time being more manageable than the economic shock of lockdown. Or, at least, for most humans (especially in the Global North) it is still relatively easy to live with climate change, although not so for the numerous species currently facing extinction. Ironically, once the harms of climate change have become as widely vivid to most people as those of COVID-19, it might be too late to turn things around. Consider also the fact that individual choices matter greatly in a time of pandemic – careless acts of meeting others may lead to pathogen transmissions and avoidable death of fellow beings – while individual acts of carbon emission are materially insignificant (though they may have some

⁷ Davis writes (in April 2020) that “it seems inescapable that the great sickly slums of Africa and South Asia ... will soon be screaming.” See *The Monster Enters*, 35. He reminds us that during the Spanish flu pandemic of 1918-19 almost 60 percent of all deaths occurred in India (59). Similar worries have been expressed much more recently by the World Health Organization (WHO).

⁸ Chen, “Disaster Looms.”

symbolic relevance). In light of these differences between how climate change and the pandemic impact most people, it is not surprising that governments have responded relatively quickly to the pandemic crisis as compared to the climate crisis, which is still a low priority for most governments or ignored or denied altogether.

Neoliberal economic policy left the Trump administration poorly prepared for containing the pandemic through testing, tracking, and protective equipment, leading to many needless deaths. Matters have been made worse by Trump's denial and distortion of fact and science, mirroring his attitude to climate change. Unsurprisingly, many of the same actors and tactics behind climate denialism have also contributed to COVID-19 misinformation.⁹ Similarly, Trump's nationalist populist approach of blaming China and the World Health Organization (WHO) once the severity of the pandemic became impossible to ignore mirrors his withdrawal from the Paris Climate Accord on the ground that it was "very unfair" to the United States, as compared to China's commitments. Crises are often exploited for political and economic gain, and the Trump administration has followed this script by letting the EPA relax the enforcement of its pollution standards as soon as the pandemic became widespread and by weakening federal oversight of labor rights and of safety and health regulations in the meat processing industry.¹⁰ The pandemic has further been used by the Trump administration to undergird its anti-immigrant and asylum policies, and the worsening of the crisis may lead to voting obstruction and the questioning of the outcome of the presidential election in November. In other countries, containment and tracking measures have raised issues of an ever-growing mass-surveillance infrastructure. Thus the pandemic foreshadows how the climate crisis, once its disasters will hit humanity in much greater force and frequency, may lead to increasingly repressive and authoritarian societies.

From the perspective of maintaining the economic status quo, the Trump administration's response to the pandemic as economic crisis has arguably been more successful, at least in the short run. Whether the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act will be followed by a significant similar stimulus/relief bill is unsettled at the time that this introduction was written. A proposal to make CARES into a prelude to the Green New Deal was ignored by Congress.¹¹ In fact, carbon-intensive industries, such as airlines, have been much greater

⁹ DeSmog, "COVIDeniers: Anti-Science Coronavirus Denial Overlaps with Climate Denial."

¹⁰ Mayer, "How Trump Is Helping Tycoons Exploit the Pandemic."

¹¹ See Bozuwa et al., "Green Stimulus: An Open Letter to Congress."

beneficiaries of stimulus and recovery spending than green industries. The same is true of many other countries.¹² All this federal spending will place constraints on future public investment in climate change mitigation and adaptation. In the short run, organizing and direct action have become more difficult due to the risks of transmission. Thus we are led to what is perhaps the most urgent question concerning the pandemic and climate change: Is the pandemic a setback for the struggle for climate justice, or might it be a springboard for radical action to come?

II. Moving Forward: Beyond Green Capitalism and Trajectories of Hope

Shah argues that the invasion paradigm of infectious diseases makes drugs and vaccinations into “magic bullet cures,” a paradigm that nicely fits with the “logic of industrial capitalism, in which the division between us and them ... could be managed through the buying and selling of biomedical commodities.” On her account, we should instead adopt a “good health” paradigm, linking together the good health of livestock, the good health of wildlife and ecosystems, and the good health of human communities. A case could be made that Shah understates the importance of medical advances and fails to recognize how such advances are blocked by Big Pharma and short-term profit considerations,¹³ but she is correct to stress the importance of creating conditions that reduce the chance of transmission of pathogens from animals to humans and subsequently between humans. In our view, these conditions include a transformation of agriculture, an end to factory farming, as well as universal health care, food security, economic security, adequate housing, and universal sanitation.

Similar observations apply to the role of green technology in addressing climate change. Consider solar panels and wind turbines. Green capitalism treats these as “magic bullets,” selling the (for many) “comfortable” illusion that with these technologies high consumption can continue its march across the globe. Green capitalism sidesteps the fact that capitalism has been an obstacle to the development and introduction of solar and wind, which required public funding and tax

¹² One exception has been Germany’s national stimulus plan. The more recently adopted EU stimulus plan has a strong green component. See Krukowska and Lombrana, “EU Approves Biggest Green Stimulus.”

¹³ See Davis, *The Monster Enters*, 2, and 178-79, and Bee, “Would We Have Already Had a Covid-19 Vaccine Under Socialism?”

breaks to arrive at their currently growing share of the global energy market. Green capitalism as panacea for the climate crisis also assumes that through market mechanisms “green capital” will fairly soon come to prevail over “fossil capital,” implausibly assuming that capital will leave huge fossil fuel reserves untapped without being forced to do so through government mandate or some other form of coercive, collective action (such as blockades and occupations on a massive scale). But grant the scenario. There remains then the problem that it may take quite some time before the benefits of solar, now disproportionately going to affluent consumers who have the resources to invest in it, will extend through society. Moreover, proponents of green capitalism tend to ignore the environmental costs of the production of green technology, including a significant carbon footprint. Additionally, extraction of the rare metals necessary for the production of solar panels and wind turbines (as well as batteries) raises concerns of the exploitation of labor and the infliction of environmental degradation especially on frontline communities in the Global South. Overall, countries of the Global North will have the advantage in buying these metals in the global market. Accordingly, justice, environmental protection, and resource limits demand that solar and wind are community centered and controlled and are distributed among communities across the globe. The commodification of nature and human relations hamper these goals. All in all, we should not deny the promise of science and technology in creating reduced or net-zero carbon practices in all sectors of the economy, but it is also an error to think that we can avoid the deepening of the climate crisis without fundamental changes in society and its interaction with nature. And these changes must be worldwide and require international solidarity because climate change, even more than pandemics in our time, is by its very nature a global problem.¹⁴

What will the coronavirus pandemic mean in terms of action toward such a radical transformation? Political will, not economic resources or technological capabilities, is the main problem holding back humanity from moving toward a green society. In this regard, the pandemic may have a longer term positive impact along five trajectories: public investment, environmental racism, recognition of essential work, greener cities, and remote work.

¹⁴ What Davis claims with regard to a potential avian flu pandemic is clearly also true of the coronavirus pandemic: “avian flu is a fundamental test of human solidarity.” *The Monster Enters*, 179. The discussion here of green capitalism draws from the review essay on the Green New Deal included in this *RPR* issue.

Having seen how the privatization of public services and health has left the government unable to deal effectively with the coronavirus pandemic as health crisis, we may hope for growing public support for strong public health programs and medical access for all. Similarly, the pandemic as economic crisis has shown the crucial importance of economic security and food security. Thus we may hope for growing support for public comprehensive climate adaption and mitigation programs, say, as exemplified by the Green New Deal with its strong focus on economic and environmental justice, creating political space for pushing this proposal more to the left.

One of the striking features of the pandemic is how widely it has been reported in the mainstream media that the victims of the pandemic are disproportionately people of color. This has also led to more attention being paid to environmental racism since greater pollution found in communities of color is an important factor in creating greater vulnerability to COVID-19. It is a sign of hope that major climate change organizations have supported the Black Lives Matter protests, recognizing police brutality and environmental racism as two aspects of structural racism, and emphasizing the need for racial justice and frontline communities of color to be at the center of the struggle for climate justice. We may also assume that growing appreciation for essential workers and recognition of their often precarious position has added to the support of the protest since essential workers are disproportionately people of color. The recognition of essential workers may lead to better labor rights and greater economic security, factors important to increasing support among labor and unions behind the transition away from fossil fuel to green energy.¹⁵

The lockdown temporarily cleared the air in cities, reduced greenhouse gas emissions, and restored canals and other waterways. The gradual re-opening of many cities went hand in hand with more space for walking, eating outside, etc., and more bike lanes were created (appropriately called “corona pistes” in France). Local people in some cities (such as Amsterdam, Venice, and Barcelona) celebrated being free of overwhelming crowds of tourists. These developments offer a glimpse of how cities can become more livable in a low-carbon society. Relatedly, the lockdown led to a huge increase in remote work, cutting down on car travel as well as air travel. The lockdown has erased the presumption that brick and mortar presence is essential for business, and so it points to the climate friendly possibility of much remote work in the future without the cost

¹⁵ The huge fall in oil prices during the lockdown has made Big Oil a less attractive investment option in the short run. This may benefit renewables, but it is hard to tell what the long term impact will be in light of the political and economic clout of Big Oil.

of isolation. What would increase the effectiveness of this change is that the energy supply of internet services would become carbon neutral. Added benefits would be that remote work would facilitate a better integration of work, leisure, and caring for others.

From a left Kantian perspective, we have a duty to find sources of hope as undergirding radical praxis. There are clear sources of hope in this period of crisis, trajectories which enable radical action to build on and have success. However, limited time casts a shadow over hope: politics as usual will within one or two decades significantly reduce the chances of avoiding catastrophic climate change, creating futures much harder to travel. Intergenerational justice alone should have moved humanity faster toward drastic reductions in carbon emissions. If the harms of the coronavirus pandemic do not awaken the world and the trajectories of hope will not motivate humanity to act with urgency towards climate change, what will?

III. Contributions

The contributions in this volume share the view that not only does climate change present an urgent threat for life on Earth, but that just and sustainable solutions to the crisis cannot be realized through the existing system. That is, more “radical” approaches, ones that go to the “roots” of the crisis in the social and political structures that organize our relations within nature, are necessary. Traditionally, there are three clusters of issues that radical theorists seek to address. The first set of issues (1) concerns the root *causes* of oppression and injustice in the world. Radicals generally agree that these root causes are structural, i.e., they are in the systemic and historical relations among humans rather than reducible to individual behaviors or mentalities or an ahistorical “human nature.” However, among radicals there is less consensus regarding the significance of capitalism as a root cause for these problems versus other historical structures or systemic relations (such as patriarchal relations or anthropocentrism, for example). A second area of inquiry for radicals is (2) reflecting on the *means* to challenge, resist, and ultimately overcome these structures or problems. These questions concern the agency of change: what motivates and enables people to struggle for radical change, or, alternatively, what are the primary obstacles or constraints to radical action? Here, a key question concerns to what extent it is feasible to achieve radical aims working within existing institutions and structures (whether representative democracy, capitalism,

or the state). Finally, a third line of inquiry (3) pursues questions regarding the alternative structures enabling emancipation and/or the resolution of injustices, i.e., regarding the *ends* sought. That is, if capitalism (or the patriarchy, or anthropocentrism) is identified as the source of the injustices, then this is about articulating the alternative society (e.g., socialism, feminist society, ecological democracy).

These sets of questions can, and indeed must, also be framed in terms of the climate crisis and climate (in)justice. First, regarding the causes of the crisis (1): what are the social, political, and economic sources of the drive for greenhouse gas emissions and fossil fuel consumption? What are the structural factors contributing to climate injustices, including the disproportionate impacts across class, race, gender, geographical location, and generations? Next, regarding the means of addressing the crisis (2): how should structural changes to address the crisis in a just manner take place? What are the most promising sources of agency for this change? What is the role for state institutions, such as elections, or even sovereignty itself? Last, but certainly not least, there is the question of what a just resolution to the climate crisis could or should (or must) look like (3). This line of inquiry is least developed by radicals, perhaps because of the traditional Marxist reticence to articulate the socialist future or (relatedly) because of the difficulty of imagining how society can solve the unprecedented scope, scale, and nature of the climate crisis within such a short time frame. Despite these challenges, more work is needed to interrogate *how* a socialist society must be organized to solve the climate crisis and, more broadly, create environmental justice. We can, however, identify some tentative and promising directions in this line of inquiry when we consider how radicals respond to questions regarding the “means” of addressing climate change.

Most of the contributions to this special issue identify capitalism, as a system defined by endless accumulation and exploitation of nature on a finite planet, as a primary cause or determining factor in the climate crisis, but only two of these contributions focus on this argument. In “Direct Action and the Climate Crisis: Interventions to Resist and Reorganize the Metabolic Relations of Capitalism,” Reed M. Kurtz, building off Marxist ecological theory, explicitly defines climate change as a crisis in the metabolic relations of capitalism, which has important implications for his conceptualization of direct action as attempts to re-organize the social metabolism between humans and nature. In “Revolution or Ecocide: Ecological and Environmental Themes in Situationist Thought,” Eric Fattor discusses the more heterodox anti-

capitalism of Guy Debord, who argued in his posthumously published article “A Sick Planet” that capitalism creates the consumer culture and society of the spectacle that drives humans to deplete the Earth’s resources, thereby provoking the ecological crisis we face.

For others (notably, the articles by Michael J. Sukhov and by Russell Duvernoy and Larry Alan Busk), capitalism is also explicitly identified as the source of the crisis, but this is more of a necessary context for understanding how capitalism obstructs radical change and progress on the climate front. One exception to the emphasis on capitalism as the source of the climate crisis comes from L. Brooke Rudow in her “Environmental Ignorance”: for Rudow, capitalism certainly is a major factor in climate change but less the source of the crisis than the underlying metaphysical commitments of Western culture that posit society and nature as separate and hierarchical. In a word, it is environmental ignorance produced by these metaphysical commitments that enables destruction of the planetary ecosystem.

Nearly all of the contributions to this volume discuss questions regarding the agency of addressing climate change, whether concerning the primary obstacles that obstruct more radical changes from taking place, or potential sources of radical and emancipatory action. In “Climate X or Climate Jacobin? A Critical Exchange on Our Planetary Future,” Duvernoy and Busk each offer an opposed account of the role and place of sovereignty in struggles for a just climate future. Duvernoy’s anti-state climate politics is informed by indigenous political traditions and struggles in North America, which he argues offer political models based on horizontal forms of organizing that are pluralist, based on principles of reciprocity rather than private property, and sees the state as a source of colonization rather than a legitimate source of power. On the other hand, Busk insists that the urgency of the climate crisis and the immediate need to keep carbon underground themselves represent obstacles that only the coercive apparatuses and centralized agency of the state can provide.

In “Climate Disruption, Political Stability, and Collective Imagination,” Ole Martin Sandberg locates obstacles for the struggle toward more just and emancipatory climate futures in apocalyptic narratives of climate change based on a distorted conception of human nature as antagonistic and narrowly self-interested which manipulates our affective capabilities. Instead, Sandberg argues that we should look to how communities actually self-organize against natural disasters (and disaster capitalists) according to principles of solidaristic cooperation and mutual aid. In a similar vein, Fattor highlights Debord and the situationists’ identification of capitalism’s

society of the spectacle as only allowing for the illusion of progress towards resolving its social and environmental problems. This means that solutions are not to be found within the realm of technocratic or electoral politics, but rather the “revolution of everyday life” that individuals and movements must embrace to reject the conformity of consumer capitalism and articulate new ways of being.

In “Herbert Marcuse on Radical Subjectivity and the ‘New Activism’: Today’s Climate and Black Lives Matter Movements,” Michael J. Sukhov locates sources of agency for radical change to address climate change in social movements beyond the confines of the traditional political apparatuses. Drawing from Marcuse’s analysis of protest movements of the 1960s and 1970s, including the new ecological movement, Sukhov articulates a notion of “radical subjectivity” that he sees embodied in the school strikes of Greta Thunberg as well as the Black Lives Matter movement. Kurtz also analyzes the school strikes and views them as a form of intervention in the organization of relations between humans and nature because direct action at the sites of social reproduction is necessary for reorganizing these relations in a more socially just and ecologically sustainable manner. Rudow, while focusing less on the particular agents or sites of change, emphasizes the potential for “encounters,” based on an expanded conception of “home,” as a means of fostering a more intimate relationship with the Earth that can overcome our epistemological barriers to action on climate change.

Unlike the other contributions, Jared Houston’s “Contingency Planning for Severe Climate Change” is not focused on the question of how to radically reduce greenhouse gas emissions (the issue of mitigation); rather his main argument is that it is our duty to begin planning for the possibility of severe climate change. While neoliberal militarism in the United States pursues such “contingency planning” with the aim of maintaining capitalism and military supremacy, Houston argues we should reject these values and objectives while reorienting contingency planning towards enabling “human rights, social justice, and participatory democracy” under conditions of severe climate change, such as increased scarcity, conflict, and displacement. Thus we are left with a sobering but essential question: What forms can the socialist project take under conditions of worsening climate change?

The review essays and book reviews for this issue explore similar themes of ecological crisis, resistance, and justice. In his review essay of John P. Clark’s *Between Earth and Empire: From the Necrocene to the Beloved Community*, Karsten J. Struhl engages with Clark’s eco-

anarchist analysis of our planetary crisis, informed by his experience with radical community organizations such as “Common Ground” in his native New Orleans in the wake of Hurricane Katrina. Struhl helpfully expands upon Clark’s engagement with Buddhist philosophy, offering insight into how the Buddhist critique of the ego can inform revolutionary praxis and the production of a “new radical social imaginary” capable of resisting the Necrocene and creating the Beloved Community. In his review essay, Harry van der Linden assesses three recent books on the Green New Deal (GND) written, respectively, by Naomi Klein, Jeremy Rifkin, and Kate Aronoff and a few other democratic socialists. He sides with those who seek to radicalize the GND, and in this context addresses economic, political, and environmental obstacles that an effective and just GND must overcome, not least of which come from the military.

Elsewhere in the book reviews, Brookes Hammock emphasizes the pedagogical value of Julia Sze’s recent study on environmental justice struggles against the Dakota Access Pipeline, environmental racism in Flint, Michigan and the Central Valley of California, and community-led responses to Hurricanes Katrina and Maria. Chase Hobbs-Morgan examines Charles Reitz’s reinvigoration of Herbert Marcuse’s ecological thought, including Reitz’s calls for a universalizable humanism and the GreenCommonWealth as a political systemic alternative to capitalism and its multiple crises. In his review, Zachary T. King summarizes the contributions of Tamra Gilbertson and Brian Tokar’s edited volume on climate justice politics by frontline community organizations, while calling for more work on climate justice politics at the national level. Finally, Andrew Scerri reviews Anne Fremaux’s argument for a critical green republicanism, highlighting her contributions to the critique of ecomodernism and rethinking citizenship in the Anthropocene while considering the limits of her emphasis on positive freedom. The question of the role of the state (and sovereignty) in enabling, or obstructing, an ecologically sustainable and socially just politics of the global environment is a key point of contention in almost all of these contributions, underscoring the centrality of this question for radical philosophy and politics of the climate crisis.

Acknowledgements

This project would not have been possible without the work of the referees who produced detailed and thoughtful comments that led to stronger articles. The books discussed in the review essays

and book reviews were selected by the editors, but Richard Peterson, the book review editor of the *RPR*, was kind enough to rigorously edit all of them. Reed Kurtz would like to thank Macarena Guerrero, Drew Rosenberg, Lauren Muscott, Ruthie Pertsis, José Pérez, Inés Valdez, Jennifer Mitzen, and Sara Watson for their support that enabled his work on this issue, as well as the Western Political Science Association for allowing us to table and share our CFP at their annual convention. Harry van der Linden would like to thank Andy Lamas for supporting his editorial work, Margaret McLaren and Mark Woods for comments on an earlier draft of the Editors' Introduction, and Anne van der Linden for her proofreading.

References

- Bee, Vanessa A. Bee, "Would We Have Already Had a Covid-19 Vaccine Under Socialism?" April 20, 2020, <https://inthesetimes.com/features/covid-19-coronavirus-vaccine-capitalism-socialism-innovation.html>. Printed in the May 2020 issue of *In These Times*.
- Chen, Michelle, "Disaster Looms as the Coronavirus Disrupts the Garment Supply Chain." *The Nation*, July 7, 2020, <https://www.thenation.com/article/economy/garment-supply-chain-coronavirus/>
- Climate Reality Project, "Air Pollution and the Coronavirus: The Connection Explained," April 16, 2020, <https://www.climateRealityProject.org/blog/air-pollution-and-coronavirus-connection-explained>
- Davis, Mike. *The Monster Enters: Covid-19, Avian Flu and the Plagues of Capitalism*. New York: OR Books, 2020.
- DeSmog. "COVIDeniers: Anti-Science Coronavirus Denial Overlaps with Climate Denial." <https://www.desmogblog.com/covidieniers-anti-science-covid-19-denial-overlaps-climate-denial>
- Foster, John Bellamy. "Everything Affects and Is Affected by Every Other Thing." ROAR Roundtable: COVID19 and the climate crisis. June 23, 2020. <https://roarmag.org/essays/roar-roundtable-covid-19-and-the-climate-crisis/>

“A Green Stimulus to Rebuild Our Economy: An Open Letter and a Call to Action to Members of Congress,” Posted on March 22, 2020, https://medium.com/@green_stimulus_now/a-green-stimulus-to-rebuild-our-economy-1e7030a1d9ee

Krukowska, Ewa, and Laura Millan Lombrana. “EU Approves Biggest Green Stimulus in History With \$572 Billion Plan.” *Bloomberg*, 7/21/2020, <https://www.msn.com/en-us/money/other/eu-approves-biggest-green-stimulus-in-history-with-572-billion-plan/ar-BB170zjl>

Mayer, Jane. “How Trump Is Helping Tycoons Exploit the Pandemic,” *The New Yorker*, July 13, 2020, [https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/07/20/how-trump-is-helping-tycoons-exploit-](https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2020/07/20/how-trump-is-helping-tycoons-exploit-the-pandemic)
the-pandemic. Published as “Back to Jungle” in the print issue of July 20, 2020.

Shah, Sonia. “It is Time to Tell a New Story about the Coronavirus – Our Lives Depend on It.” Posted on July 14, 2020, at <https://www.thenation.com/article/society/pandemic-definition-covid/>. Published as “How to Define a Plague” in *The Nation*, July 27 / August 3, 2020.

Spinney, Laura, “Is factory farming to blame for coronavirus?,” *The Guardian*, March 28, 2020, <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2020/mar/28/is-factory-farming-to-blame-for-coronavirus>

Walsh, Bryan. *End Times: A Brief Guide to the End of the World*. New York: Hachette Books, 2019.