



EDITORIAL

THE URGENCY OF REINVENTING THE COMMON

“We are at war! I don't know why you're looking at me with such a nice face”
(Ailton Krenak).

“... war is the continuation of politics by other means” (Focault).

“... politics must be the art of making the impossible possible” (Marta Harnecker).”

For at least half a century, humanity has recognized that the planet burns. From Stockholm in 1972, through Rio-92, the Kyoto Protocol, to the Paris Agreement and successive COPs, we have accumulated diagnoses and resolutions that attest to the obvious: climate change is not a future threat, but a present reality. And yet, the paradox repeats itself like a wound that refuses to heal: while international conferences multiply, promises pile up and reports thicken, the engine of industrial-financial development continues to advance, fed by the same fuel as always — unlimited accumulation, the commodification of life, the transformation of nature itself into a market asset. The wealth produced from this devastation continues to be appropriated in a very unequal way. Inequalities are only deepening, globally and locally. The gap between what is needed and what has been done is increasingly abysmal.

The reason for this gap is political and structural. Industrial capitalism — and later its contemporary phase of financialization — is not just a technical arrangement of production; it is a value machine that internalizes private gains and *Outsource* social and ecological costs. In the last decade, the phenomenon has been accurately described. Land, forests, ecosystem services and even the atmosphere (via the idea of "credits") are transformed into financial instruments. The financialization of nature promises to correct market failures, while often replicating and amplifying appropriation practices. In practice, the right to pollute is sold, a market for climate remedies is created and, with this, a new front of speculation on territories and lives is opened.

The latest scientific data has left no room for complacency. It is not new that the IPCC's assessment reports synthesize evidence that climate impacts are already manifesting themselves with increasing intensity and that avoiding catastrophic scenarios requires rapid, deep and simultaneous



transformations in energy, agricultural, urban and financial systems. Environmental degradation has daily impacts on the lives of the population. It is a problem that affects public health in all corners of the globe. Air, soil and water pollution translates into avoidable mortality and morbidity (respiratory diseases, cardiovascular diseases, heavy metal poisoning, etc.). There is no shortage of studies that estimate that pollution is among the leading causes of death that could be avoided in the world, with millions of lives lost annually and significant economic impacts on communities and health systems.

In the Amazon, the expansion of agribusiness and mining threatens indigenous territories and provokes direct violence against leaders. In the Cerrado, quilombola communities lose their territories to soy and sugarcane monocultures. Riverine communities face fish die-offs and loss of livelihoods due to dams and industrial pollution. The consequences, therefore, are not abstract. They insinuate themselves into the plate and the lungs, in drought and flood, in contaminated food and polluted water. They materialize in the bodies of indigenous populations expelled from their lands, of riverside dwellers who see their rivers transformed into sewage, of quilombolas besieged by the advance of agribusiness. These are devastated biomes, mutilated territories and entire cultures put at risk. There is no possible separation between ecology and social justice. The defence of the environment is inseparable from the defence of the peoples who inhabit and preserve it. What economists call negative "externalities" are not collateral accidents, but the very heart of a model that rests on the depredation of life.

The impacts, however, are not equally distributed. Indigenous populations, quilombolas, riverside dwellers and peasant communities usually pay the highest price. They are the ones who face forced displacement, the poisoning of water resources, the loss of food and cultural practices, the criminalization of resistance, and direct violence against their bodies, violence that often results in death. In Brazil, tragedies such as the rupture of the tailings dams in Mariana (2015) and Brumadinho (2019) have exposed the confluence between extractive industry, regulatory fragility, and massive social-environmental damage — they remind us that "externality" there means the destruction of entire ways of life. The effective protection of these rights is linked both to international instruments and to local mobilization and restorative justice capacity; In many cases, however, the judicial system and compensatory negotiations have repeatedly proved insufficient to restore lives and ecosystems.

In institutional discourses and in the market, with each movement of organized society in the sense of demanding and seeking solutions, solutions that promise to reconcile conservation and



capital are presented, with new makeup — always following the same logic — solutions, which promise to reconcile conservation and capital: carbon markets, Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation/REDD+, biodiversity credits, payment mechanisms for ecosystem services. But critical evidence is growing, and the most recent analyses point out that many projects overestimate reductions, create incentives that pervert the stated logic of ecosystem protection, and can result in rights violations, displacement, or instrumentalized conservation — a commodification that, in addition to being fragile in terms of climate integrity, tends to reproduce inequalities.

Market mechanisms are instruments for the production and reproduction of inequalities. The river of a poor community is polluted because it has less political power to resist. The market's solution often deepens injustice. The rich pay to pollute and the poor bear the costs of degradation or are removed from their territories for the creation of conservation units or compensation projects. In short, financialization and its market mechanisms preserve power structures while transferring responsibility for the degradation produced to already vulnerable territories.

Capitalism, as a system, depends on the production of inequalities. The externalization of environmental costs is key in this process. It is not a flaw, but a characteristic. Capital treats nature as an infinite mine of resources and at the same time as a sewer, an infinite sink of waste. This is a structural premise, it is not an error that can be corrected, fixed, equated. There is no possibility of "green growth" or decoupling from the logic of accumulation and expanded reproduction on a scale that matters, that makes a difference in the global. The mechanisms of financialization employed in the so-called socio-environmental protection do the opposite of what they announce, they subordinate life, and everything that serves as its basis, to financial valorization. Far from being a solution, it is the supreme stage of commodification. It represents the final colonization of the planetary commons by the logic of the reproduction of capital.

If the diagnosis is severe, there is also an accumulation of practical and political alternatives — not just abstract ideas. Social movements (La Via Campesina, the Landless Workers' Movement among the most visible), agroecology networks, community experiences of food sovereignty, proposals for "good living" and theoretical currents of degrowth and regenerative economy present concrete repertoires based on peasant production practices that reduce industrial inputs; envision models of community governance; they build breaches, such as the rights of nature embodied in



constitutions (as in Andean experiences); work with just transition strategies that articulate jobs, training and social protection in the transition to low-carbon economies. These experiences share a common trait. They strive to reframe value as reciprocity and care rather than mere profit extraction. But we also need to imagine others not yet tried.

The immediate horizon may seem narrow and saturated by the empty promises of the market, but it is precisely in this impasse that we need to exercise the political imagination. Donna Haraway reminds us that theory is not a mere description of reality, but also fabulation, the creation of figures that authorize us to think the unthinkable. His "cyborg" and his "Chthuluceno" are not ornamental metaphors, but gestures of rupture that can break naturalized dualisms and, perhaps, have the strength to summon us to inhabit other possibilities of existence. At the heart of the ecological crisis, imagining is a radical act. It is through the invention of worlds — worlds of multispecies cooperation, of reciprocity instead of accumulation, of care instead of expropriation — that we make room for alternatives that are now a minority to become viable. Without this critical fabulation, we will remain confined to the vicious circle of capital, unable to conceive of ways out beyond its devastating grammar. Imagining, as Haraway insists, **is not an escape, it is a condition** for survival.

But the challenge is titanic. The forces that feed the current model are powerful, globalized, entrenched in political and economic institutions that capture not only the environmental agenda, but strive to keep our minds locked to ontologically bankrupt alternatives. International Conferences, Panels, Summits, in many cases, are stages of rhetoric without consequence. These are promises that are not fulfilled, commitments that do not cross paper. The COPs continue to highlight the strategy of "much ado about nothing" and the holding of COP 30 in Brazil is just one more act in this theater of farces. Between the lucid diagnosis of science and the inertia of politics, time slips away — and with it the chance to avoid the irreversible.

And the paths to other possible worlds are also political paths. necessary transformations are, by definition, political. There are power negotiations, disputes over agendas, the design of public instruments and — above all — the democratization of decisions about resources and the future. Technical instruments without democratic bases or without real participation of the affected populations tend to be captured by corporate interests. The "just transition" category is an example of an attempt to institutionalize equity in the process of change — requiring social dialogue, industrial plans, and labor protection — but its realization depends on political will and targeted public funding.



In other words: without a radically redistributive policy, technologies alone do not untie the structural knots of the problem.

The crux of the matter remains — and here we must be clear and without euphemisms: as long as the expanded reproduction of capital depends on continuous extraction, the coexistence between infinite accumulation and biophysical limits will be less and less possible. This does not mean that one-off changes are useless; it means that they will not be sufficient or socially just if they are not part of a larger restructuring project. The real alternative requires redesigning investment flows, restricting the private capture of common goods, guaranteeing effective territorial rights, promoting economies of care, and instituting mechanisms that place the preservation of life as a normative priority.

It is therefore necessary to call a spade a spade: the environmental crisis is not a technical problem, nor an accident along the way. It is the wound produced by a civilizational model that devours the possibilities of the future. It is a wound that bleeds. With each tree felled, each river poisoned, each species extinct, we not only lose biodiversity, we lose the possibility of the near future and the future of the human species. How long will we continue to seek the impossible reconciliation between capital accumulation and the preservation of life? How long will we naturalize devastation in the name of a progress that no longer promises a future?

These questions are both an invitation and a warning. Invitation to critical reflection and, above all, to collective action. He warns that there is no longer time for conciliatory illusions. If we want to exist as humanity, we will have to reinvent the very meaning of development, refuse the desert that is being announced, and affirm, with courage, that another world is not only possible: it is urgent. Earth's time does not wait. And political action can no longer hesitate.

Morrinhos, September 17, 2025.

Vilma de Fátima Machado