

Naomi: “Welcome to the Taxcast from the Tax Justice Network. I’m Naomi Fowler. This month on the Taxcast - the climate crisis and tax justice. Coming up later, we talk to Dr Gail Bradbrook, co-founder of Extinction Rebellion:”

Gail: “the majority of the public now understand that there is an emergency. But the other bit of it we haven't done strongly enough yet is to hold out the vision that change is possible. We know that tax is a really key issue.”

Naomi: “We’ll speak to Gail later in the programme. But before that here’s a quick tax justice news round-up. The Coronavirus crisis is exposing all the damage that neoliberal thinking and marketisation of public services are doing to our lives. If ever there was a time when governments needed to act urgently in the public interest to implement wealth taxes, take healthcare out of private hands and ensure corporations pay fair taxes, that time is now.

I’m not going to dwell on this too long because we’re going to talk soon about ways we can reform our economies in the public interest. While some countries have guaranteed to compensate workers for losing wages because of the coronavirus, giving them relief on mortgage, utility bills and other debts, and often not on rent. At the same time lots of people around the world have no protection, no rights to sick pay, so many people are living on the edge of survival, even if they’re working three jobs. What we’re likely to see I think are governments giving massive bailouts for supposedly ‘too big to fail’ multinational companies and banks while smaller businesses and those who work for them could be left to sink. This could mean complete state capture of governments by what could turn out to be multinational monopolies. But what should happen now is a restructuring of our economies as universal basic income payments become the new norm, universal basic services guarantee us a certain level of care, public services which should never have been private are requisitioned, just like Spain has done with its private hospitals. When this nightmare is over, before they hand them back, they should insist that they stop being parasites, pay fair taxes and contribute to healthcare worker training and emergency care.

More than 37 million US Americans don’t have any health insurance. For those who *can* afford it the cost has shot up in recent years. It’s not just an extortionate private levy. It’s also bad value for money if you compare it to more efficient public health systems elsewhere, even those that governments have been cutting back on. Economist Gabriel Zucman points out that universal healthcare “would lead to the biggest take-home pay increase in a generation for working families”

Healthcare is being undermined worldwide by powerful private interests. This month in the nation of Lesotho there’s a case at the high court there private investors are trying to salvage a so-called public private partnership which delivered just one hospital which is now swallowing up almost a third of the nation’s entire health budget. These so-called public private partnerships or Private Finance Initiatives – PFI – whole thing was an accounting scam really, cooked up by the Big Four accountancy firms in the UK. They’ve been draining Britain’s NHS of vital resources for decades. The Big 4 have exported that model around the world.

And in Britain just as the British government is closing down tax offices and firing tax office and customs workers with decades of experience, ministers have acknowledged that because of Brexit 50,000 more staff will be needed for all the extra paperwork. The Taxcast was at a recent demonstration outside the British Parliament with tax office workers, MPs and PCS union, here are some of those tax justice heroes who are about to lose their jobs:

“We’re very experienced people across the country and our jobs are valuable, we’re the best bargain that you will ever get, the money that we cost compared to the money that we raise for hospitals, for schools for the infrastructure, for the roads, we’re a great bargain.”

“We’re really needed more than ever now especially in the light of the coronavirus, we’ll need all the taxes we can get for all the extra care that people will need.”

“500 offices being closed, 50,000 staff being lost and yet you want the biggest budget to spend the most money, nobody’s going to be around to collect it. Stop this programme now. Support your tax staff, pay for us first, make sure we’re still around to do the job you want us to do.”

Naomi: “Unfortunately, governments around the world are tending to cut back on their tax offices and some are actually privatising them with some disastrous results.

But let’s talk about the climate crisis. The science is clear that we have less than a decade to avoid a tipping point of no return that will lead to even more disaster and displacement of people than there already is. There’s a battle of ideas which has now been accelerated by the coronavirus – after this unprecedented situation we must reform our economies and transition away from fossil fuels. Let’s talk to John Christensen now of the Tax Justice Network for his take:”

Naomi: “Okay. Let’s talk about fossil fuels subsidies. I mean, how big are they? If you look at different countries, I mean the EU isn’t setting much of a record. Britain has got the biggest fossil fuel subsidies in the whole of the EU. Um, there is some good practice in Germany, uh, Spain and Italy. They’re now giving more subsidies to renewable energy than to fossil fuels. But United States spends more on fossil fuels subsidies than it does on defence, which is quite something and 10 times what it spends on education, so, uh, you know, there’s a long way to go. Um, now if we only redirected 10% of subsidies, that alone just, that could unleash apparently a clean energy kind of revolution.”

John: “I think you need to look at, um, subsidies in the broader sense of the term because most people probably just think about subsidies as price support mechanisms or tax rebates or state funded infrastructure. But these are actually just part of a huge and complex and largely hidden story. So fossil fuels come in many different forms. Now despite years of pressure to phase them out, some governments still subsidize the prices of petrol and diesel bought at the pump. And in some cases coal and gas prices are also subsidised to the consumers. And these forms of price subsidies on the, we’d call the demand side of the equation cost an astonishing 400 billion dollars \$400 billion every year worldwide, worldwide. But you need to add to that the cost of subsidies on the supply side of the equation. That’s mainly in the form of tax breaks to the big companies, government funded infrastructure, the building of the roads, the pipelines, the port facilities and so on, and the exploration and subsidy and production subsidies, which benefit exclusively the fossil fuel production companies. Uh, these subsidies aren’t as extensive as the price subsidies, but nonetheless, they still cost a whopping \$100 billion worldwide every year. So that all adds up to a half a trillion, half \$1 trillion of subsidies in 2018. But that’s not even half the story because when you bring all the related social and environmental costs into the equation, these are the so-called negative externalities, which are generally ignored by economic models, then an entirely different picture emerges. If as the IMF international monetary fund did in 2017, if you include all the health impacts of fossil for your production and the damage caused by extreme climate events linked to global warming, you know, the floods and the forest fires and the increased incidence of drought and so on. And if you bring all of those costs into the equation, the true cost of subsidies to the fossil fuel sector runs to an astonishing five point 2 trillion US dollars every year. Or get this, that’s 10 million US dollars every minute of every day of the year.”

Naomi: "Wow. That's, that's quite a statistic! And the UN secretary general quite memorably said what we're doing and I'm quoting, 'what we're doing is using taxpayer's money, which means our money to boost hurricanes to spread droughts, to melt glaciers, to bleach corals. In other words, to destroy the world!'"

John: "That pretty much sums it up."

Naomi: "Okay. And so, and these subsidies are skewing markets horribly, aren't they? And it's ironic because these oil gas and coal people supposedly believe in free markets and uh, you know, unfettered by the state and full-on competition and yet they're actually getting the biggest bungs of all, aren't they?!"

John: "Yup Yup. Um, I think the first thing to recognise about this is that the subsidies have been paid out for decades and they have reinforced the market dominance of the gigantic monopoly providers, the big oil production companies the giant coal and energy, electricity driven electricity producers. And these producers have been gouging themselves on subsidized markets for, for decades and have every reason to resist switching to renewables. And in fact, they've used their monopoly market powers to lobby for yet more subsidies and to block potential rival energy sources. So what the subsidies do is to distort the basic supply and demand of marketplaces across the entire world. And just remember that motor yacht fuel and jet fuel for the private jets, they're largely exempt from fuel duty. So the very wealthiest people are generally the biggest beneficiaries from the subsidies. But subsidies also encourage the production companies and their bankers and their financiers to keep on investing more and more into exploration and production. And it undermines the incentive to develop new renewable energy sources. And that explains why the major oil companies, the Exxons and the Shells and the BP and so on why these companies have been, um, whilst they've followed the science of climate change since the 1970s they have done so little to develop renewables over the course of those decades because the subsidies just keep them in business as usual. Now let's be clear about one aspect of the fossil fuel subsidies. The subsidies do not help the poorest people on the planet. People who don't drive cars, who don't have air conditioning or central heating, yet it's the poorest people who are being hit the hardest by the climate crisis. It's the richest 7% of the world's population who are responsible for half of all greenhouse gas emissions. And that gives you a sense of how these subsidies are mainly skewed towards benefiting the richest households."

Naomi: "Yes. And the question we must always ask ourselves is cui bono - who benefits? Who is investing in fossil fuels? How do we target them to, to stop it?"

John: "Until very recently fossil fuel production companies and the electricity generators who consume most of that output, they were regarded as blue chip investments. It's only really very recently indeed that some investors have started to pull out of these investments. So almost every class of investor-held fossil fuel shares of one sort or another, and of course that applies to most pension funds, almost all the big banks have been lending to oil and gas production companies. And in many cases, remember this, governments have also been huge investors and some of the largest oil companies are state owned. They still are state owned. So governments are involved as well. Now banks have been amongst the least responsible of the investors. But trying to persuade bankers and other financiers to divest from fossil fuels has been a tortuous experience, mainly because they know that as long as all those subsidies continue to pour into the sector, profitability will remain high and they won't be left holding what are known as stranded assets. Stranded assets in this context are big oil and gas and coal resources that have been explored and are identified on the

reserves of the production companies, but which don't represent a profitable investment at current market prices. And with wind and solar energy costs tumbling more and more coal and oil reserves are falling into this stranded gas unprofitable category, so I think we can reasonably expect to see that more banks, more private equity investors and others will be pulling out because the long term profits simply don't justify the investment, particularly if the G20 goes ahead with its commitment to phase out the fossil fuel subsidies.

Naomi: Yeah. And there was some very targeted actions just earlier this month actually across the UK, just under a hundred Barclay's bank branches got shut down by people and they are the worst in Europe. I think they put in \$85 billion into fossil fuels in just a few years between 2016 and 2018, so we do need to target these people. But it's not just the banks is it? It's the big four, pension funds, CEOs directly, there's all kinds of people that, uh, seem to slink into the shadows and they need bringing into the spotlight don't they?"

John: "Yeah, they do need to be brought into the spotlight and you can find this information online, the 100 companies that contribute most to greenhouse gas emissions. And there's a site online which identifies not only those companies but also their chief executive officers. That map is available at the de-colonization Atlas. What I think we are advocating is pressure on those chief execs, you know, identify them, write to them. At the end of the day, this is a human generated crisis and we know who the human beings are who are perpetuating the crisis."

Naomi: "In many ways the best ways to hit the investors and the whole sort of financial, uh, side of the problem that we have is to take away these subsidies in one massive hit that's immediately, almost overnight going to stop making it a worthwhile investment, that's priority number one right?"

John: "It certainly seems to me that if, if we reshape the markets simply by withdrawing the fossil fuel subsidies, and I'm talking about that in the roundest thing which includes making the fossil fuel companies pay for the health costs and the environmental costs which are currently not reflected in the market price. If that was achievable, then you would see such a rapid shift of investment away from fossil fuels into renewable energy. Then I think we could realistically talk about a transition happening, you know, within a much, much shorter time period that governments are currently talking about, they're talking about the transition happening, but you know, up to the year 2050, I think it's time to get ambitious, say 2030 needs to be the time horizon. That's the very latest. We've really, we've only got about eight years to get this seriously underway, and that will require a complete phasing out of all the subsidies and making the fossil fuel industry responsible for the wider social health and environmental costs that they impose upon this planet."

Naomi: "And what can we do to make other companies more transparent about their greenhouse gas outputs? Because we don't even have transparency on that."

John: "You know, up to now we've talking about the big fossil fuel companies and the electricity generators, but the vast majority of companies have ignored their own contributions to greenhouse gas emissions and they haven't accepted that they have a responsibility for reducing it and ultimately eliminating their own use of fossil fuels. Now, we've seen some recent initiatives to bring greater transparency to the corporate risk exposure in this area, but by and large, corporate accounting gives little or no information out about particular company's greenhouse gas emissions. But this could be about to change because there's a new group, it's called the Corporate Accountability Network. We're talking about our very own professor Richard Murphy, and I suppose I should disclose I'm on the board of this new Corporate Accountability Network. What Richard's

aiming to achieve is to create a new and mandatory accounting standard, which will require businesses to disclose their greenhouse gas emissions. And that includes emissions that arise from the goods or services which the business sells on downstream to other customers. So it's taking a look upstream where they source their electricity and all the rest of it but it's also saying, okay, but what happens about the goods and services which you then sell on and what greenhouse gases, gas emissions might they be responsible for? And this information needs to be revealed on the company accounts. And then most importantly, the company must disclose its plans to move to net carbon zero emissions and to reveal the cost of achieving this on its balance sheet. In other words, there's a liability here and there's a risk here and you must now reveal that."

Naomi: "Thanks John! John Christensen of the Tax Justice Network. This month the Tax Justice Network released a special series on financing climate justice which you can find on our website www.taxjustice.net You're listening to the Taxcast from the Tax Justice Network. Make sure you never miss an episode, drop me an email on naomi@taxjustice.net and I'll add you to the subscriber's list, I'll ping you an email once a month. Tell me what you think of the show. Let's talk to Gail Bradbrook now, co-founder of Extinction Rebellion. She was on the Tax Justice Network board for quite a while. That's not surprising because the solutions to the climate crisis we're living through are inseparable from tax justice and economic reform. Gail, let's kick off with looking at where Extinction Rebellion is right now, can you give us a kind of snapshot of how you see it?"

Gail: "So we've launched in the autumn of 2018 and we've been named as the number one influencer in the globe on the climate crisis, which is incredible. We've got into 72 countries, got over 700 groups across the world. Our initial goal was to shift the Overton window. People now accept we're in an absolute state of emergency. So I feel really proud of that and our contribution to that and obviously there are other movements have been part of that. There's been a whole shift in the consciousness and I think the fact that we centred our movement on grief and emotion and really feeling these times has been a really important part of that move. Obviously we've made some mistakes, we've been trying to figure out organising a social movement while it's growing under our feet at rapid scale and we stand on the shoulders of so many other movements and a history of resistance. Extinction Rebellion came out of a network called Rising Up. And actually you can trace its origin back to a conversation, from my perspective at least, with John Christensen at the Tax Justice Network. I would say a really pivotal moment as I saw it in the tax justice movement was UK Uncut and when they occupied things like Starbucks and so on, that really put that this agenda into the public consciousness. And I think it's really important that the tax justice movement, cause it involves people doing deep research and so on, understand the importance of civil disobedience for change, that you have to have those moments of confrontation, and confrontation doesn't mean violence. It can be done very peacefully and beautifully and respectfully, but it is a way of saying no."

Naomi: "The climate crisis deniers have kind of been pushed back quite a lot now, for the moment. Do you think there's not enough fear about the future somehow?"

Gail: "Well actually if you look at some of the data, the majority of the public now understand that there is an emergency. But the other bit of it we haven't done strongly enough yet is to hold out the vision that change is possible. People need to know that there's something that can be done. And because Extinction Rebellion doesn't talk about specific policies, and that's for good reason, you know, we say, how could we possibly have all the answers? There's always a debate to be had about, you know, how much is this about renewable energy or carbon taxation or carbon budgeting or you know, going vegan or telling people not to fly or you know, there's a whole pile of things - we've opened the space for those conversations. So whenever I meet people working in this field in some way they say, goodness, you guys have changed the discourse. So, we don't have to be all things to

all people. Our job is to open the window for conversations and for other people to present ideas. The solutions exist. The problem is the lack of political will. Same in the tax justice movement, right? You guys know how to solve tax dodging and you've got it nailed. The issue is a lack of political will isn't it? How do you get political will? Through civil disobedience. So that's where the focus needs to stay."

Naomi: "Let's talk about the types of justice movements and, uh, climate crisis movements and how do they bolster each other? How do they intersect?"

Gail: "I think it's really crucial this year that we make these linkages between the tax justice movement, the wider movement for economic justice and the climate crisis. So, um, we know that tax is a really key issue, for example, you can reprice natural resources, the idea of whether it's carbon taxes or carbon rationing. We know that fossil fuels are subsidised by a horrendous amount. That means that fossil fuels are mispriced through these subsidies, and that's anti-competitive to renewables. Though I would say that renewables should be subsidised because for obvious reasons, we need to transition to a green energy. We know that tax can be used to redistribute wealth. And we know from the sort of spirit level analysis of inequality that people are more willing and able to tackle the climate and ecological crisis when there's less inequality around, there's a direct correlation. That taxation is needed for bringing in revenue for tackling the crisis, so how are we gonna pay for free public transport, how are we going to pay farmers to transition to more agro-ecological solutions? It needs money - that kind of green new deal, based in ecological and climate justice needs money. And you know, for folks that are listening to this that maybe more from the climate side of things, I don't know if they realise the extent of the tax injustice issue, that you've got these major corporations and rich people that go offshore with the money. It's breathtaking. And I think the only reason people get away with it is that people don't understand it, so you know, one of the issues is how we share this information so people can get it. I mean there's lots of kind of complicated jargon in the tax and economics field that put people off, and I think we have to come up with a new narrative. And I think also, you know, part of that is this whole idea around corporate accountability. And you know, that's part of the tax movement isn't it? It's looking at what the - as Prem Sikka calls them the pinstripe Mafia are up to, the big four accountancy firms and the law firms, etcetera. And I think they need to be a major target this year."

Naomi: "Let's talk about the role of business, 'cos for a long time there's been this conversation, it always comes back to the economy versus the planet, growth versus the planet, and you know, debates about capitalism, anti-capitalism, pro-capitalism. And there's so much to unpack there isn't there?"

Gail: "I think it's an utterly crucial issue and we have to get this right this year. Absolutely. And the first thing I would say is, let's not jump into ideological camps. I'm anti this, I'm pro that. All of these words have got baked-in ideas and different people mean different things by them. The minute you state yourself as an anti-capitalist, you're, you're in a camp and other people think you're against them. It's completely arguable that we haven't even got capitalism because half of all world trade goes through secrecy jurisdictions. And my understanding of capitalism is you're supposed to have transparency of markets."

Naomi: "We've got subsidising of basically monopolies as well through giving these enormous tax breaks. So that's not even proper competition."

Gail: "Exactly! And I think, um, that there isn't one consensus, I know there's the Washington consensus around neo-liberalism, but there isn't one consensus about what a good economic system

looks like. And so I think that's where we need to have the conversation and I think a really good starting point for it is what is the intention of an economic system - and it should have a moral intention, right? And interesting, Milton Friedman says something along the lines of, um, because the market based system will ensure that no power is concentrated, the kind of harm that can be done by concentrated power will not be done. So, Milton Friedman wants a system whereby there's no power concentrated and no harm done. And Mrs Thatcher actually said something similar. And when we know that eight people have got the same wealth as half of the world's population, right? And we know there's all this rigging and corruption and I don't think, you know, outside the tax justice movement, people know half of what goes off, you know what's happening in a secrecy jurisdiction. So, let's start with a discussion about what the economy is actually for. We are undoubtedly killing life on earth. Goodness me, the debate needs to be what are we doing wrong? And we've heard the elites at Davos talking about planting a trillion trees. Well, great. Yes. And where's the actual plan? Is that a distraction that we'll be planting trees while they're buying up real estate in the mountains? You know, where's the actual plan that we all get through this or are we just going to throw Africa to the dogs? You know, that's what it feels to me this is about is shoring up some people's safety, I mean the UN have talked about the collapse of civilisation, the committee on climate change have said that we can't manage four degrees of warming, we won't be able to adapt to it. And that's the pathway we're on. This system's finished, so the conversation should be let's get real. This is finished, it's going to kill itself off anyway, and it's killing us anyway. So what we going to do instead? Let's rewire humanity. Extinction Rebellion at the minute we're working on the plan to push that agenda forward."

Naomi: "Right, I want to ask you, what is the role of business? Because, you know, we can have growth that is a desirable kind of growth, it doesn't have to be all about GDP."

Gail: "Yeah, I think if we start to have a narrative about what the economic system is like right now, the one that we're working on is to use cancer as an analogy. So a healthy body, bits of it will grow and replenish and bits of it will be more like steady state, you know, bodies grow up and things like that, so some growth is good but this but growth for the sake of growth is the logic of the cancerous tumour. And at the minute you can think of the investment community as being the heart that pumps resources around the system. It's perfectly willing to pump them through the arteries of the finance system into a cancer - that needs to stop. You need an immune system to tackle diseases like you know, like cancer and the immune system normally deals with cancer. However, when it goes wrong, when the regulatory system, the legal system that we are sitting under is all, you know, offshore, if you don't like the regulations here, let's have law avoidance and go offshore and get a different form of law, your actual immune system is attacking your body. So we've got to deal with that. In Extinction Rebellion, we're very much in support of the stop ecocide campaign, that we need to bring in the fifth crime against peace at the Rome statute level, alongside the crimes of genocide, war crimes and so on. And the crime of ecocide would criminalise mass damage and destruction of the environment and would put the onus on us all to repair the harm being done through this crisis. And I think business leaders as a constituency need to start pointing out some of the systemic issues that mean that they are trapped in unhelpful behaviours. You know, one of the issues is that we generally, in terms of the environment, only have civil laws to protect us. And if you even get caught and if you even get found guilty and if you even get fined, you know, it's a cost of doing business. You'll think 10 times about doing mass damage and destruction if you can be criminal, if you're going to be criminalised, so we need criminal law in that space. I'm not totally sure on this one, you might be able to tell me Naomi, but then when they get these fines, sometimes they write them off against their tax bills don't they? I'm mean, you know!!"

Naomi: "They're like parking tickets, you know, if you're rich enough then you can park anywhere, you like!"

Gail: "Yeah, yeah. And we, we cannot afford that, things like tar sands and, and fracking and we know there's a tipping point for the climate into a different state from which you cannot reverse. What cognitive dissonance is going on that people think they can get away with that?"

Naomi: "I wanna go back to the idea about growth and the fact that we can have growth, but we can have growth in social terms. Um, you know, there are lots of things like social care, growth in social care, growth in education."

Gail: "What I thought was a really great concept was private restraint and public luxury. So I don't need a car if we've got free public transport and, you know, obviously you have to have different transport forms depending on which communities you're in. There are solutions that exist and I think that it's moving into that space of public luxury, of universal basic services that's the kind of thing that we need to be aiming for. But obviously that requires governments to have money to spend and deploy. And that means we have to have a functional tax system, which we don't have at the minute."

Naomi: "Yes. It's really interesting that the real radicals that are never highlighted as radicals, right? So we've got people running governments who are doing extreme things, extremist things, which are very damaging for people, for the environment and all the rest of it. And yet Extinction Rebellion was put on a terrorism organisation watch list by the police. How do you react to that?"

Gail: "Utterly unsurprised, that's what's been happening to activists for many years. But you're quite right. Where are the real extremists here? In years to come, we'll look at people like Bolsonaro and Trump and Putin and the Australian prime minister etc as criminals that pushed genocide, because we're on a trajectory to four degrees of warming and [inaudible] of the Potsdam Institute says about half the world will die according to him. Billions and billions of people, that's genocidal policies that are being pushed. That's where the extremism lies. When they put us on those kinds of lists, everybody's like, outraged and to an extent it's quite useful to the movement because it's like, yeah, this is what the State's force really looks like."

Naomi: "What are Extinction Rebellion's plans for this year?"

Gail: "So at the time of recording Naomi, we are in a strategic process, so what I'm going to say is not nailed down. And so it's more my take on things, how things need to unfold. There needs to be a deep focus on the role of the economy in this crisis and an understanding of that and a rewiring of the system and also on the role of certain bits of the media that are acting against, uh, the climate and ecological crisis with how they're messaging. In terms of focusing on the economic system, what I'm hoping we'll bring forward this year is a focus on debt refusal. You know, debt is something that people hold with shame and struggle with. And the debt based economy fuels the cancerous-type growth that's unhealthy. We're talking about something like XR money rebellion where we would be taking actions to banks and to the big four accounting firms and all that type of stuff. And alongside of that, we might refuse debts. Now that can be done by some people can do debt disputing, which is not illegal, but it's a way of saying, is this debt really legitimate? And some of us may take on debts or may already have debts and we say we're not paying it back to the system, really force this conversation about the economic system that we have. My great desire for this year is that we announce our own, if the government won't do it, our own international citizens assembly to rewire

humanity. And the way that would look is you have what you call a multi-stakeholder panel, which would have economists on it, you use convergent facilitation to look at what people feel is important in a market based economy, what businesses need and what's not working and what could be upcycled if you like, from this system. And you present that to experts, opinions presented to this representative panel of citizens, and they make a decision. If, when people in the elites and business world start to call for that, then we'll know that things have shifted."

Naomi: "Right. You were saying that sometimes you speak with bankers and all sorts of people, which is great. And they're getting hassled by their kids, and it's just very interesting 'cause the younger generation are managing to connect with them."

Gail: "Well, literally round their own dining table, right? So, yeah, I was, I've been told in a number of ways that they're getting hassle from their kids. So, do not underestimate your power, you have got serious power to influence the people in your own families and far wider, by the way. And that's really important because all of us in this system that we live in are running in some form of cognitive dissonance, we care deeply about the future and our children. And yet we're sitting in some form of complacency, some form of denial, and some form of idea that well, we can just do something from within our box and things will get better. Well, sometimes the box is a problem, isn't it? And some people are even trying to make sure the box is nice and solid and can't get changed. I think it's quite correct for the young people to be saying, this is about our future. We've been willing in the West to let this crisis run and for the problems to be felt by people who have done the least to cause the crisis. The fact that we have had so much injustice in that way is now coming home as an intergenerational injustice. It's not for everybody to join us on the streets and get arrested, but if it's for you, join us on the streets because another initiatory emotion to feel is the emotion of being in your true power."

Naomi: "You've been listening to Gail Bradbrook of Extinction Rebellion on the Taxcast. For all those listening who are in lockdown because of the Coronavirus, we're thinking of you. Stay safe, let's look after our elders, and let's make this unprecedented crisis the time for reform in the public interest. Thanks for listening. We'll be back with you next month."