

The Ruptural Harvest

Climate Emergency,
Food Sovereignty, and the Organizing
Mandate for Systemic Rupture

The logo consists of a red circle with a white-to-red gradient. Inside the circle, the text "All In." is written in a bold, black, sans-serif font.

All In.

What is this booklet about?

In *All In*, the authors are very explicit about their point of view, rooted in their own organizing experience. Right at the beginning, we read

“There are several ways of starting the argument. At the end of the day, they all boil down to the same thing. [Here they give a short description of what climate emergency means for transformative politics.] ...

“Now, you may be coming from a different political background. Perhaps you have been involved in labor rights, housing and urban rights, global justice, racial justice or feminism. Perhaps most of your activist time was about doing actions, or perhaps it was filled with talking to the general public or with organizing. Maybe what moves you is a different topic that doesn’t fit into the “climate” box.

Understanding the climate crisis is not about understanding greenhouse gas emissions, it is about understanding deadlines to win our fight against the system.”

(§1.4. The Anchor)

One’s specific politicization pipeline and the surrounding context in which one gets politicized result in unique stories for each one of us — stories about the same reality.

Many revolutionary movements around the world had **food sovereignty** as their starting point. So, a small group of people decided to **go through All In with the food sovereignty lens** and explore how the main arguments and proposition of *All In* would look like from this point of view. In the next pages, you will see the results of this exercise, which we hope helps us build bridges with our latent comrades.

Introduction: The emergency is here, the criminal is clear

We are not facing a crisis of energy management and sustainability. We are facing a crisis of power structures destroying our lives.

The scientific consensus is unambiguous: we are at the brink of runaway climate collapse, and the window to keep warming within survivable limits is closing by the month. The 2020s are not a decade for incremental adjustments. They are the decade for rupture.

Yet, social movements remain trapped between two paralyzing narratives. On one side, a liberal current believes that markets, green technology, and policy tweaks will deliver a just transition. On the other, a fragmented anti-capitalist current diagnoses the disease but lacks an organizational model, a delivery deadline, or a coordinated theory of change capable of matching the scale of the crisis.

This booklet aims to contribute to bridge that gap. It builds on the transnational organizational framework of *All In: A Revolutionary Theory to Stop Climate Collapse* and abridges it with the decolonial, agrarian, and corporate-power analysis established in the intersecting fields of climate justice and food sovereignty. Together, they reveal a unified reality:

The climate emergency is a food-system emergency on a daily basis. The food-system emergency is a corporate-colonial destruction process impacting our lives day by day. And the only viable response is a globally coordinated, ruptural movement of movements that treats transnational capital as the declared architect of both crises.

What follows is a political and organizational manual for organizers who refuse to wait for permission to win. It revisits and updates the book's core propositions, integrates the structural role of transnational corporations (TNCs), grounds climate justice in food sovereignty, and provides a concrete architecture for building a transnational movement capable of dismantling capitalism within climate deadlines.

This is not an academic text. It is a field manual for our movements. It draws on living struggles, maps capabilities, and demands operational clarity.

If you are reading this, you are already inside the emergency. The task now is to organize accordingly.

Part I: The Diagnosis – Climate, Food, and Corporate Power

1.1. The Climate Emergency: Science, Deadlines, and Political Reality

The United Nations scientific mechanisms do not mince words. Climate change is rapid, human-induced, and accelerating. Current trajectories threaten severe, widespread, and irreversible impacts. The UN Secretary-General has called it a “code red for humanity.” The physical reality is non-negotiable: to have a reasonable chance of staying below 2°C warming, industrialized nations must reach net-zero emissions by 2030. The Global South must follow swiftly, respecting historical responsibility and material capabilities.

But scientific bodies answer *what* is happening and *how* fast. They do not answer *why* it is happening, *who* benefits, or *how* power must shift. That is where political economy enters.

The emergency is not a meteorological accident. It is the logical outcome of a socioeconomic system that treats the atmosphere, the soil, and human labor as infinite inputs for accumulation. Climate deadlines are not bureaucratic targets; they are the material boundaries of our organizing mandate. Any strategy that ignores them is climate denial in activist clothing. We need to acknowledge that climate gives us a deadline for all our struggles, independently of their specific thematic focus.

PRAXIS GROUNDING:

Mekong River Defense, Southeast Asia

The Mekong cascade of dams, coal plants, and ASEAN energy integration projects materializes the gap between physical urgency and political paralysis. Communities across Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Thailand face cascading fisheries collapse, saltwater intrusion, and indigenous displacement. Climate science identifies these as high-risk adaptation zones, and local movements name them as structural violence. Cross-border river coalitions have combined youth narrative campaigns, territorial blockades, and transnational litigation to halt specific projects. This struggle proves that environmental degradation is not a “natural disaster” but a deliberate corporate-state infrastructure build-out. It validates the need for spontaneous uprising triggered by ecological collapse, paired with regional coordination that maps value chains rather than isolated campaigns.

1.2. Food Sovereignty: Decolonial Self-Determination in a Broken System

Food sovereignty is not a technical farming model. It is a political claim to collective control over food, land, water, and knowledge. It asserts the right of peoples to define their own agricultural, food, land, and trade policies; to produce in ways consistent with their ecological, social, and cultural realities; and to prioritize local nourishment over export extraction.

Historically, colonial and neo-colonial development models deliberately reorganized food systems for extraction, not nourishment. Subsistence farming was replaced by export monocultures. Indigenous seed systems were criminalized or patented. Land tenure was privatized. Post-colonial “development” perpetuated this through structural adjustment, trade liberalization, and debt-driven conditionalities. The result was not food security, but food dependence.

Development must be people-centered, self-determined, and rooted in sovereign equality over natural resources. Food sovereignty operationalizes this perspective in the agrarian sphere. It is inherently decolonial because it dismantles the legacy of external control over life-sustaining systems.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: AFSA and Navdanya

The Alliance for Food Sovereignty in Africa (AFSA) and India’s Navdanya network demonstrate that food sovereignty is decolonial infrastructure in practice. AFSA resists the so-called Alliance for a Green Revolution in Africa (AGRA), corporate seed patents, and synthetic input dependency by scaling farmer-to-farmer agroecology training, community seed banks, and sovereign trade policy drafting. Navdanya similarly builds decentralized knowledge commons, protecting biodiverse seed systems against Intellectual Property regimes while framing seed saving as metabolic labor defense. Both movements validate the principle that development must center the human person as an active participant, not a passive recipient. They prove that prefigurative capability (building alternatives) and institutional capability (drafting policy, shifting public procurement) are not secondary to rupture; they are its reproductive backbone.

1.3. Transnational Corporations: The Structural Architects of Crisis

Historically, colonial and neo-colonial development models deliberately reorganized food systems for extraction, not nourishment. Subsistence farming was replaced by export monocultures. Indigenous seed systems were criminalized or patented. Land tenure was privatized. Post-colonial “development” perpetuated this through structural adjustment, trade liberalization, and debt-driven conditionalities. The result was not food security, but food dependence.

- **Seed Control and Intellectual Property:** Patent regimes criminalize seed saving, lock farmers into high-input dependency, and destroy agro-biodiversity essential for climate resilience.
- **Industrial Agriculture and Extractivism:** Monocultures, synthetic inputs, fossil-fuel machinery, and global supply chains drive deforestation, soil degradation, and massive emissions while displacing small-scale producers.
- **Land Grabbing and “Green Enclosures”:** Transnational corporations acquire vast tracts for export crops, biofuels, and carbon-offset plantations, often through opaque contracts and state-backed expropriation. “Climate solutions” become new forms of dispossession.
- **Trade and Investment Regimes:** Private dispute settlement mechanisms (like ISDS clauses), free trade agreements, and subsidy restrictions legally punish states that implement land reform, protect local markets, or regulate corporate pollution.
- **Financialization of Nature and Food:** Speculation turns food, water, and carbon into financial assets. “Nature-based solutions” are designed for investor returns, not community survival.

- **Narrative Capture:** Corporate-funded research and public relations campaigns promote “climate-smart agriculture” and “sustainable intensification”, marginalizing agroecology and preserving power structures.

Transnational corporations are not isolated bad actors. They are the operating system of a corporate-led development model that externalizes ecological and social costs, concentrates decision-making, and restricts democratic choice. Their impunity is structural, not accidental.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: Ogoni Struggle and MOSOP

The Ogoni movement in Nigeria materializes the corporate impunity architecture. Shell’s extraction caused catastrophic soil/water contamination, health crises, and militarized repression. Ken Saro-Wiwa and the Movement for the Survival of the Ogoni People (MOSOP) mobilized mass civil disobedience, international legal pressure, and narrative framing linking ecological destruction to colonial extraction. A 2021 Dutch court ruling established extraterritorial liability, yet full accountability remains blocked by jurisdictional fragmentation and state-corporate collusion. This case validates the claim that corporate environmental violence is slow war. It demonstrates that narrative capability (naming extraction as warfare) and disruptive capability (civil disobedience, supply-chain targeting) must be paired with transnational legal infrastructure and power struggle. Without it, local rupture is contained.

PRAXIS GROUNDING:

CGLTE-OA and West African Land/Water Grabbing

The Global Convergence of Land and Water Struggles – West Africa (CGLTE-OA) exposes how transnational corporations operationalize green enclosures across sub-regional borders. When palm oil company SOCFIN acquired 18,000+ hectares in Sierra Leone's Malen Chiefdom (2011), communities formed the Malen Affected Land Owners and Users Association (MALOA) to defend customary tenure. State security responded with arrests, imprisonment, and the 2019 killings of two activists. CGLTE-OA's response — spanning 15 countries and 300+ organizations — proves that land/water grabbing is not isolated but structurally coordinated through state agencies, AGRA, and regional trade regimes. The movement's cross-border caravans, legal accompaniment networks, and ECOWAS-level advocacy demonstrate that corporate impunity requires sub-regional coordination, not just national resistance.

1.4. Convergence: Why Climate Justice and Food Sovereignty Are Becoming One Struggle

Climate justice movements argue that climate change is a historical, political, and economic injustice rooted in capitalism, colonialism and extractivism. Food sovereignty movements argue that hunger and ecological breakdown are symptoms of external control over life systems. These are not parallel struggles. They are the same struggle, analyzed from different fronts.

Shared Diagnosis: Both identify capitalism, colonialism, neo-colonialism, corporate control, and unequal trade regimes as root causes. Both recognize that vulnerability is produced, not natural.

Shared Demands: Protection of land/territories, agrarian reform, just/agroecological transitions, climate debt/reparations, community control, opposition to green grabbing.

Agriculture as the Site of Convergence: Agroecological food sovereignty reduces emissions, sequesters carbon, preserves biodiversity, strengthens local livelihoods, and builds climate resilience. It addresses mitigation, adaptation, and justice simultaneously. Industrial agriculture does the opposite.

The UN's scientific advisory body on climate, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), does not name "food sovereignty," but it identifies food systems as among the most urgent and fragile domains affected by "climate change". It treats industrial agriculture as a major emissions source and warns that current systems increase vulnerability. Climate justice and food sovereignty movements do not claim that food sovereignty or corporate regulation are "emergencies" in the IPCC's physical-science sense.

We identify climate change as the emergency, food systems as the critical impact zone, corporate dominance as the structural driver, and justice-based transformation as the only viable response architecture. Dismantling this structure in the short-term therefore becomes the common task of both of the movements.

Part II: The Political Framework

— From Rupture to Liberation

2.1. The Ruptural Imperative: Why Reform is Mathematically and Politically Impossible

The climate calendar eliminates incrementalism. No country has emission trajectories compatible with climate deadlines. No energy corporation has a genuine decarbonization plan. Global trade and investment regimes actively penalize systemic regulation. The inside-the-system model (lobbying, green deals, electoral reform) is structurally blocked or framed by transnational capital. The outside-the-system model (cooperatives, mutual aid, local alternatives) is vital for survival but, by design, does not scale to dismantle a globally integrated corporate architecture.

We need a **ruptural movement**: one that directly confronts the power structures sustaining climate collapse and food dispossession. Rupture does not mean chaos. It means recognizing that the existing system cannot be reformed into livability, and organizing strategically to break its key pillars: corporate control of land/seeds/finance, fossil fuel expansion, and the trade regimes that lock states into extraction.

PRAXIS GROUNDING:

Indian Farmers' Protest and MST

The 2020–21 Indian farmers' mobilization and Brazil's Landless Workers' Movement (MST) prove that institutional channels are structurally blocked. Indian farmers combined highway blockades, supply-chain disruption, digital narrative campaigns, and women-led community kitchens to force legislative repeal of corporate agricultural laws. MST combined land occupations, agroecological settlement building, farmer cooperatives, and public food procurement to push agrarian reform. Both validate Proposition 3 of *All In*, arguing for the ruptural model: direct confrontation plus prefigurative institution-building is non-negotiable. They demonstrate that rupture requires logistical prefiguration (food distribution, medical camps, legal defense) and narrative framing that names corporate law as climate/food dispossession. Without these, disruption collapses under state repression.

PRAXIS GROUNDING:

CGLTE-OA Caravan and the Green Booklet

In 2016, West African Caravan for Land, Water and Peasant Seeds of the Global Convergence of Land and Water Struggles – West Africa (CGLTE-OA) crossed Burkina Faso, Mali, and Senegal, stopping in 11 towns to hold debates, field visits to grabbed territories, and direct appeals to ministers and ECOWAS representatives. The caravan culminated in Dakar with the public delivery of the *Green Booklet*, a movement-drafted advocacy document translating peasant agroecology, food sovereignty, and community tenure into binding policy language. This validates the ruptural imperative: when parliamentary and judicial channels are captured by corporate-state alliances, movements must build parallel governance, deploy cross-border disruption, and translate territorial defense into institutional pressure.

2.2. The Global Working Class: Ecofeminist, Agrarian, and Decolonial

Capital is globalized. Its grave-diggers must globalize with it. But the “working class” is not just unionized industrial labor in the Global North. It is an ecofeminist, metabolically integrated class that includes:

- **Unionized and non-unionized wage labor** in carbon-intensive and service sectors;
- **Informal (popular) economy workers** whose labor is extracted without protections;
- **Reproductive and care labor** that sustains human life and enables production;
- **Metabolic/Earthcare labor**: peasants, Indigenous communities, fishers, forest defenders, and agroecological producers who repair ecological cycles and oppose extractivism.

Historically, reproductive and metabolic labor were marginalized through gendered, racialized, and colonial violence. Today, all these categories produce or reproduce value that is appropriated by global financial capital. Their shared class interest lies in abolishing private corporate control over the means of production, reproduction, and ecological regeneration.

Genuine class solidarity against global capital must begin and end with an integrated understanding of class consciousness. The peasant defending seeds, the migrant worker packing food, the Indigenous youth blocking a pipeline, and the urban caregiver are not “allies.” They are the same class, fragmented by design, imposed by a criminal class.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: Marikana and Rana Plaza

The Marikana miners' strike (South Africa, 2012) and the Rana Plaza garment workers' struggle (Bangladesh, 2013–present) map the ecofeminist working class in action. Marikana exposed how wage labor, precarious subcontracting, and racialized violence intersect under corporate-led, financialized extractivism. Rana Plaza revealed how predominantly women and informalized workers enable global consumption while facing union suppression and wage theft. Both cases validate Proposition 2 of *All In*: class solidarity must explicitly name racialized and gendered labor hierarchies. They demonstrate that transnational institutional capability (binding safety accords, extraterritorial litigation) can disrupt corporate value chains when mapped strategically. Class business is not abstract; it is value-chain disruption paired with cross-border labor-peasant alliance building.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: CGLTE-OA and Metabolic Labor

CGLTE-OA's membership explicitly centers women (60%+ of West African agricultural labor), youth, pastoralists, and artisanal fishers — validating the nested-labor framework. The *Green Booklet* demands gender parity in land committees, protection of women's seed-saving knowledge, and youth access to agroecological training, demonstrating that class solidarity requires dismantling patriarchal and generational marginalization. This proves that metabolic and reproductive labor are not “add-ons” to class struggle; they are its material foundation. Any rupture that excludes them reproduces the colonial-capitalist division it seeks to overthrow.

2.3. The War Framework: Disarmament, Reparations, and Sovereignty

The most accurate framing of our moment is this: **Governments and transnational corporations have declared war on the people and the planet.** Their preferred weapon of mass destruction is climate collapse, operationalized through corporate food regimes, extractive land grabs, and financialized nature.

This framing shatters the illusion of peace. It clarifies agency: the state and corporate apparatus are not responsible for solving the crisis; they are guilty of it. Responsibility for disarmament and survival rests with the people.

In *All In*'s implementation section, the **Disarmament Plan** mirrors nuclear non-proliferation, with non-proliferation and reduction. Some examples of what this would look like from a food sovereignty perspective are:

- **Non-proliferation:** Halt new fossil fuel projects, stop new corporate land acquisitions, ban new seed patents, end subsidies for industrial agriculture, suspend ISDS claims against public-interest policies.
- **Disarmament:** Achieve carbon neutrality by 2030 in the Global North countries and by 2050 globally, including sectoral phaseouts of high-emission agribusiness; debt cancellation for climate-vulnerable states; dismantle corporate control over trade regimes; criminalize greenwashing and offset fraud.

The **Peace Plan** then outlines rehabilitation/reconstruction of society after war. Some examples of this on the terrain of food sovereignty would include:

- **Land and Seed Sovereignty:** Radical agrarian reform, collective land tenure, public seed banks, recognition of Indigenous and peasant knowledge systems.
- **Climate Debt and Reparations:** Direct finance, technology transfer, and policy space from high-emitting states and TNCs to frontline communities. Not loans. Not offsets. Reparations.
- **Agroecological Transition:** Public procurement for local food systems, support for peasant-led agroecology, democratic control over water and energy, just transition for rural and urban workers.
- **Democratic Food Governance:** Community-led food councils, peasant representation in trade negotiations, abolition of corporate capture over agricultural policy.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: COPINH and Sarayaku vs. Repsol

The legacy of Berta Cáceres and the Council of Popular and Indigenous Organizations of Honduras (COPINH), and the Sarayaku Kichua vs. Repsol litigation in Ecuador, materialize the war framework and Disarmament/Peace Plans in practice. COPINH's defense of water sovereignty against the Agua Zarca dam combined territorial blockades, feminist care networks, and international legal accompaniment. After Cáceres's assassination, the movement survived through distributed leadership and rapid-response protection mechanisms. Sarayaku invoked UNDRIP (United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples), biocultural rights, and climate debt to challenge oil extraction, securing Inter-American Court rulings that recognized collective tenure. Both validate the need for legal pluralism, transnational protection infrastructure, and narrative sovereignty.

They prove that decolonial climate justice requires operationalizing the Peace Plan through binding reparations, ISDS suspension, and community-controlled agroecology.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: CGLTE-OA and West African Disarmament/Peace

Operationalization CGLTE-OA call to halt new land/water concessions to TNCs, suspend ISDS claims against community tenure laws, and ban seed patents that criminalize farmer saving operationalizes the Disarmament Plan in West Africa. Simultaneously, their *Green Booklet* proposals—public procurement for peasant agroecology, recognition of customary tenure, gender parity in land committees, and climate reparations via debt cancellation—provide concrete Peace Plan templates. This proves that movement-drafted advocacy documents can function as binding political programs when paired with cross-border mobilization and regional institutional pressure.

Part III: The Organizational Architecture

— Building the Movement-as-Party

3.1. Movement Ecology: Grand Strategies for Rupture

A ruptural movement cannot rely on a single tactic, model, or theory of change. It requires a movement ecology where different organizations prepare for different scenarios while sharing a common vision. We identify three grand strategies, each essential:

1. **Spontaneous Uprising:** Mobilizes around abrupt social/economic shocks, environmental disasters, or outrageous acts of corporate/state violence. High participation, lower formal organization. Risks: power vacuums, co-optation. Requires: rapid narrative framing, pre-existing community networks, clear post-uprising institutional demands.
2. **Mass Agitation:** Builds popular support through sustained campaigning, radicalization, and vanguard guidance in mass organizations. Balanced participation/organization. Risks: vanguardism, substitutionism. Requires: deep community roots, transparent accountability, continuous feedback loops with grassroots bases.

3. Ideological Mobilization: Educates, recruits, and trains a committed membership base to lead systemic transformation. High organization, deep theory. Risks: sectarianism, isolation. Requires: open communication channels, willingness to engage broader movements, prefigurative practices that demonstrate alternatives.

These are not mutually exclusive. They are complementary preparations for a VUCA (Volatile, Uncertain, Complex, Ambiguous) reality. A heatwave that destroys crops may trigger a spontaneous uprising. A corporate land grab may be met with mass agitation. A seed sovereignty campaign may require ideological mobilization. The movement must fund, train, and coordinate across all three.

3.2. Capabilities: Narrative, Disruption, Institutional, and Coordination

Capabilities are the movement's muscles. Action-based intersectionality represents articulations. They must be developed at the movement level, not just organizationally.

- 1. Narrative Capability:** Shift public understanding from “individual consumption” to “corporate power and colonial extraction.” Frame food as a commons, seeds as heritage, climate debt as a historical obligation. Counter corporate greenwashing with grounded, peasant-led storytelling.
- 2. Disruptive Capability:** Block fossil fuel infrastructure, occupy corporate headquarters, disrupt land-grab auctions, sabotage green-offset plantations, organize strikes in supply chains. Pressure must be material, not just symbolic.

3. Institutional Capability: Draft model legislation for land reform, seed sovereignty, and ISDS abolition. Build peasant food councils. Create public procurement frameworks for agroecology. Consolidate victories into law and popular practice.

4. Coordination Capability: The most critical and underdeveloped. Requires permanent international congresses, shared strategy mandates, resource pooling, and decision-making spaces that transcend NGO-ization and summit diplomacy.

We can also develop support capabilities:

5. Resilience Capability: Build Transnational Protection and Legal Infrastructure. Since criminalization is routine, movements must institutionalize rapid-response legal defense, international accompaniment, and extraterritorial accountability mechanisms.

6. Prefigurative Capability can also provide strategic infrastructure. An example of investing in this capability could be to Fund Knowledge and Seed Commons – Community seed banks, farmer research networks, and decolonial curricula are climate resilience and food sovereignty simultaneously.

Movements fail when they treat capabilities as isolated silos. They win when narrative enables disruption, disruption creates space for institutional consolidation, and coordination ensures all three feed each other strategically.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: Les Soulèvements de la Terre and MST Training Networks

France's Les Soulèvements de la Terre and Brazil's MST farmer schools have demonstrated capability pooling at scale. Les Soulèvements unified peasants, climate strikers, and ZADists around a common narrative ("defend water, reclaim territories, reject extractivism"), seasonal coordinated campaigns, and prefigurative sabotage actions that shifted public discourse on disarmament. MST's national agroecology training networks combine ideological mobilization (political education), disruptive capability (land occupations), and institutional capability (PNAE public procurement contracts). Both validate that movement capabilities must be pooled across organizations, with intentional delegation and strategic complementarity. Isolation breeds vulnerability; pooled capability breeds rupture.

PRAXIS GROUNDING: CGLTE-OA and Sub-Regional Capability Pooling

CGLTE-OA operationalizes capability pooling across 15 West African countries. National platforms coordinate local defense; the 2016 Caravan delivers disruptive and narrative capability; the *Green Booklet* and ECOWAS advocacy exercise institutional capability; transnational solidarity networks provide resilience under repression (e.g., rapid response to MALOA arrests and 2019 killings). This proves that coordination capability is not bureaucratic overhead—it is strategic survival against transnational capital. Movements that fail to pool narrative, disruptive, institutional, and resilience capabilities across borders will be fragmented and contained.

3.3. Global enemy, Global coordination

The enemy – which, as we've seen, is the same in the food sovereignty struggle as in the climate justice struggle – operates globally. National or regional strategies are necessary but insufficient without global alignment. This conclusion leads to one of the core propositions in *All In's* book and to one of the main reasons for this booklet: **We need a ruptural global movement ecosystem. For that, we need global coordination.** By Coordination Capability, we mean the movement's capacity to build coherent interactions between its strengths and weaknesses to guide the movement as a whole towards victory.

If the capitalist system is global and if its grave-diggers are to be organized globally, then we need a party model that corresponds to that reality. **We need organizational structures that can build intentions, programs, and plans at the global level**, while at the same time harvesting the contextual diversities (through grand strategies and movement capabilities). This is because:

1. **If we aren't talking to each other, we will fail.** We will fail because we will lose important aspects of the full picture of the global movement – learnings, intuitions, recent developments in the different fronts we are betting on – which could lead us to make different decisions. And we will fail because we will lose effectiveness, missing the ability to see important synergies that could be created; and, perhaps more importantly, losing sight of vacuums that need to be filled and emerging opportunities that parts of the movement could grab.
2. **To dare to Win, we need a common and globally coordinated plan that aims for victory.** That plan will have different implications for different organizations that are betting

on different scenarios and investing in different capabilities. That plan will not be rigid; it will need to be flexible and responsive to the rapidly changing reality we're living in.

When we say we need “organizational structures that can build intentions, programs and plans at the global level”, we are not saying the movement coordination should be made by some kind of Politburo or Central Committee structure. We should explore more complex and organic ways to coordinate, but the need for the coordination of the ruptural movement, as a whole, still exists. And perhaps we don't need to create something entirely from scratch. We should look at what are some of the existing global networks that already provide some of the infrastructure that could contribute to this global coordination.

The Food Sovereignty and resistance against TNCs movement-ecosystem includes some of the most promising global networks currently alive – such as the Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples' Sovereignty, La Via Campesina, or Nyeleni Forum (to name just the ones we are most aware of). All of these represent real mass movements, encompass a diversity of different actors pursuing different grand strategies, carry decades of movement learning, are in dialogue with each other, and are evolving and responsive to new challenges. Not only do these structures provide a strong coordination capability within the food sovereignty and counter corporate power movements that doesn't exist in most movements, but perhaps some part of these infrastructures, in some form, could offer at least part of the capacity we will need to plan and coordinate our strategies towards rupture. We don't know. We would like to explore and dream together with organizers active in these platforms who are committed to winning and who carry decades of learnings and experiences of movement-building.

Part IV: Planning for Victory

Lose, lose, lose, lose, lose, lose, fuck it — win.

— Kim Stanley Robinson, *The Ministry For The Future*.

4.1. Coming to terms: Declaring a State of Climate Emergency

In Kim Stanley Robinson's sentence, from the 6th "lose" to "win", there was an awareness of the failure up to that point. Otherwise, nothing would have changed. There was also the decision to try again by doing something different.

The very first step in order to Win is to tell the truth to ourselves: **We need to dismantle capitalism in the short term in order to achieve food sovereignty and climate justice; it's our task to do it; and we are failing, for the moment.** But failure is not the enemy of eventual victories; it must be the antidote for conformism.

- **Transference:** Examples of transference are applying 20th-century organizational models to 21st-century climate deadlines; or imposing euro-centric activism models on the Majority world.
- **Distraction:** This can look like focusing on sociological subgroups instead of the global working class, or aligning with liberal "democratic" forces against fascism while ignoring that fascism is a product of climate-capitalist collapse.

- **Faking Responsibility:** When we measure success by activities delivered rather than systemic shifts achieved, when we say we are “Doing our part” without a victory plan and without taking into account climate deadlines as deadlines, we are faking responsibility.

An effective, rooted, honest hope is the direct enemy of habits, rationalizations, transference, and masked distrust. We can only harvest hope if we know we will tell each other and ourselves when something is not working and if we are committed to learn.

The operational proposal here is a **Declaration of a State of Climate Emergency**, in the movement and in our organizations (which would also change our lives radically). We are not proposing paperwork. We are proposing a radical shift in organizational culture, an agreement to continuously and systematically reject conformism and alienation in the movement. This declaration is about taking responsibility into our hands, breaking habits, and keeping us focused and agile. It’s also a tool to continuously evaluate if we are closer to stopping climate collapse.

Declaring a state of climate emergency is not a proposal only for groups that are mainly working on climate. And it also doesn’t mean that the “climate topic” should become the priority of all movements. It means that, **regardless of the movement one is coming from, we need to create plans that are climate realist** – if we don’t dismantle capitalism and halt fossil fuel emissions within climate deadlines, we are set to fail.

We are aware of the fact that there are plenty of serious emergencies in our movements, such as the increase of the brutal attacks carried out by the US imperial hunger. Declaring a State of Climate Emergency doesn’t mean we should be focusing on “climate issues” while treating other issues as secondary. It means that, living in a state of emergency and in a rapidly changing reality, we have to embrace agility, flexibility, responsiveness, adaptiveness, and speed as paramount virtues. Our cycles of learning must be intentional, vision-oriented, and fast.

Our climate emergency declaration needs to be based on our operational question: **“Knowing what we know, what is our plan to keep us below 2 degrees warming?”**. Given that we need to execute system change in this decade, what is our commitment for next year? That commitment will be different for every organization/platform according to its strengths, weaknesses, and what it’s most useful for the movement as a whole. This decision needs to be informed by a global analysis of the movement, in permanent articulation with other actors dedicated to the same task.

4.2. Global Coordination: Mandates, Resources, Decision-Making, and Movement-Learning processes

There’s another thing that happens from the 6th “lose” to “win”: a risk taken. “Fuck it”. There is a risk in trying something new, and there is the risk that the win could have been another loss.

To Win, we need to risk big.

Deciding to coordinate with others we don’t know that well yet is a risk. It requires a leap of faith. At least, it requires taking the time to try to understand others, meeting with them, reading them, building a common language, looking over some aspects we don’t particularly like or would do the same way they are doing, because we see some potential. And it’s a risk to invest resources in a potential rather than in concrete experiences. But if we don’t risk it, we won’t have a new experience.

Deciding to adapt, change, or create new habits, organizations, or networks is an even bigger risk. We’ll risk it not working out (e.g. extremely valuable movement resources wasted), and we’ll risk being

right (e.g. failing to seize the opportunity despite investing so much in it).

Even so, to dare to Win, we need to risk to try to create a common and globally coordinated plan, and we need to risk to invest in the creation of ruptural organizational structures that can build intentions, programs, and plans at the global level. This will imply:

- **Resource Allocation:** At least 25% of core organizational capacity must be dedicated to international coordination. This is not bureaucratic overhead; it is strategic survival.
- **Decision-Making Mandates:** The essential axis of strategic alignment should emerge from international coordination spaces. This does not mean top-down control. It means that local campaigns are verified against global power dynamics, resource flows, and movement priorities. What works in Brazil must be understood in relation to EU trade policy, African land grabs, and Asian seed markets.
- **Global-Local Dialectic:** Every local action must be mapped against global power structures. Every global campaign must be rooted in local territorial struggles. Coordination spaces must bridge the two continuously.

And it's exactly because we will risk so many things at once that we must make sure we are not repeating errors: learning from our mistakes and from past movements, we shall step into uncharted territory. Marikana, Lago Agrio, and Berta Cáceres's assassination show rupture carries extreme risk. Movements must institutionalize learning cycles, share tactical/post-mortem analyses openly, and rebuild coordination after repression. Within the existing networks, we need to systematize and share our learnings and find creative ways to carry the knowledge within the movement.

4.3. Planning for victory together

We keep saying throughout this booklet that we need to create a common and globally coordinated plan, so what is that plan?

We don't know. If we knew, we would probably be writing something else.

Our invitation to you, and to ourselves, is to get on with failure, invest in building a ruptural movement that is globally coordinated, and create the plan for how the hell to do this – and what to do next – together.

If you've come this far, we can start by talking to each other to create a common terminology and build trust, exploring agreements and disagreements, while making the kindest interpretation possible of what each of us is trying to do.

We – organizers, organizations, movements, networks that agree that it's our task to dismantle capitalism in the short term – can then come together to try to create a shared analysis of the movement and an analysis of the monster we are fighting. On one hand, we can look at current movement actors and networks to explore our strengths and weaknesses, possible synergies that could be created, gaps that could be filled, and opportunities that we could grab. On the other hand, we should look at the enemy's strengths and weaknesses (E.g. mapping value chains: identifying where TNC profit flows, where labor/metabolic labor is extracted, and where disruption yields maximum systemic leverage) to explore possible intervention points.

Then we can make hypothesis and tests, while creating the necessary articulation that enables us to learn from our mistakes and adapt our plans according to reality.

POSSIBLE INTERVENTION EXERCISE: Adopting the war framework and expanding the Disarmament and Peace Plan

An example of a possible intervention across different movement actors that would aim to bridge the climate and the food sovereignty movement would be to **adopt the war framework** – treating climate collapse and food insecurity as an active declaration of war by corporate and state powers, and move away from treating TNCs as “bad actors” to name them as structural architects of climate/food collapse. In fact, the war framework is not a novelty for indigenous, decolonial and food sovereignty movements, which for decades have been saying that there is an attack waged by governments and international corporations and that the people under attack must unite to defend life. The novelty would be to consolidate this framework internationally and across movements, while **expanding the Disarmament and Peace Plan** (we can draw some examples of how to broaden it from section 2.3. of this booklet), using the process of elaborating the Plan to create a global common agenda for the climate and food sovereignty movements.

Adopting the war framework could increase the narrative capability of the movement while consolidating the ruptural direction. The process of expanding the Disarmament and Peace Plan could be an opportunity to foster debates that could help to bridge the gap between the “climate” and food sovereignty movements. Having global guidelines for an expanded Disarmament and Peace plan could create a cross-movement agenda, possibly also providing common campaigns to explore.

However, our goal with this example is not to create a detailed proposal. The creation of both a common war framework narrative to be widely used by movements, as well as a disarmament and peace plan that could provide global guidelines to be adapted regionally and nationally, would necessarily have to be the result of a movement-building process.

There are, of course, several interventions we can think of, and we believe we can reach much better interventions if this thought exercise is done together. The task now is to take the risk of trying out something new, starting by talking to each other.

Conclusion: Daring to Win, Organizing to Live

The climate emergency is real. The food-system emergency is real. The corporate-colonial architecture driving both is real. The window for reform is closed. The path forward is rupture.

Food sovereignty is not an add-on to climate justice. It is one of its most concrete, grounded expressions.

Transnational corporations are not merely polluters or exploiters. They are the structural engineers of a system that must be dismantled for the sake of our survival. The IPCC's emergency framing gives us the clock. Decolonial and climate justice movements give us the map. The ruptural movement-as-party gives us the engine.

We do not need permission to win. We need coordination, courage, and clarity.

We need organizations that bet on scenarios, invest in capabilities, and coordinate globally. We need movements that treat failure as data, not defeat. We need organizers who find courage inside fear and build power inside crisis. We need a declaration that the war is already here, and our duty is to disarm the enemy and feed the people.

The task is magnificent, horrifying, and emboldening. It requires us to transform ourselves as we transform society. It demands that we stop waiting, accept the task, take full responsibility for humanity's future, and start being the movement.

Climate deadlines do not negotiate. Capital does not yield. Hunger does not wait.

Grab our hands. Build the ecology. Coordinate globally. Risk everything. Dare to win.

We are heading toward climate hell with capital's foot on the accelerator. Our task is to break the accelerator, reclaim the harvest, and build a world where life reproduces itself freely.

All in. Or nothing.

References

Rodrigues, M. & Eden, S. (2025). All In: A Revolutionary Theory to Stop Climate Collapse. CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.

UN (1986). Declaration on the Right to Development.

UN (2018). UN Declaration on the Rights of Peasants and Other People Working in Rural Areas (UNDROP).

IPCC AR6 (2021-2023). Climate Change 2021-2023: The Physical Science Basis, Impacts, Adaptation, and Mitigation.

FAO/HLPE (2021-2024). Food Systems and Nutrition Reports.

Global Campaign to Reclaim Peoples' Sovereignty, Dismantle Corporate Power and Stop Impunity.

Transnational Institute (2021). Energy Transition or Energy Expansion?

Environmental Justice Atlas. (2024). Case Database: Africa, Latin America, Asia.

La Via Campesina. (2018–2025). International Declarations on Food Sovereignty & Climate Justice.

AFSA. (2022). Agroecology in Africa: Policy & Practice Briefs.

Navdanya. (2019). Seed Sovereignty & Climate Resilience: Community Knowledge Systems.

CGLTE-OA. (2016). West African Caravan for Land, Water and Peasant Seeds & Green Booklet.

Wright, E.O. (2010). Envisioning Real Utopias.

Tüfekçi, Z. (2017). Twitter and Tear Gas.

Malm, A. (2016). Fossil Capital.

Klein, N. (2014). This Changes Everything.

Cabral, A. (2016). Unity and Struggle.

Fanon, F. (2005). The Wretched of the Earth.

