

Chapter 5: Corona, #BlackLivesMatter and the Climate Justice Movement

January – September 2020: The crisis and the intersectional, sustainable, global democratic project

Mynttorget is empty – the strike has been stopped

And so, the year begins in which we all learn what it means to treat a crisis as a crisis. And ourselves as incredibly vulnerable creatures, as part of a shared “fabric of integrity” which connects us with nature, a fabric which is so easy to damage and so difficult to patch up again.

The Mynttorget group has gathered once again. It is mid-March, and winter is gradually coming to an end. Or rather: it never really started. It was five degrees warmer than normal during the winter months; for the first time ever since records began in Stockholm in around 1750 (SU 2020).

Now the young people are putting the finishing touches to the plan for the biggest strike action of all time in Sweden, the global strike on the 24th of April. One hundred thousand people might come together; that is what they are hoping for. On the third floor of the trade union building named ABF, in the centre of Stockholm, the whole group is standing in front of some huge sheets of paper. The activists are sorting out police contacts, security arrangements, stage management and finances.

For the first time, the route will go right along the seafront, under the windows of the richest people in Stockholm, and up to the wild city park, “Gärder”. The team are well-practised, and the discussion focuses on the final details. Where exactly is the power socket in the middle of the park? Should they go public by announcing the musicians and call on civil society, “the people”, to strike, finally forcing the politicians to act? This year must bring change. A few activists who they are in contact with have joined together in a movement com-

binning FFF, XR and other civil disobedience movements and calling itself “by 2020 we rise up”, because now the year is coming in which global politics must change and emissions must fall.

And suddenly everything changes. A virus spreads across the globe, along with so much suffering and pain, in the form of the corona pandemic (on the connection between the spread of viruses and human domination of nature, see Malm 2020). The young activists immediately call off all their strike days and shift to the internet, with #ClimateStrikeOnline. A new kind of activism begins: they update each other twenty-four hours a day in Zoom meetings, arrange further training in countless webinars, and wait impatiently for further developments. A few of them organise help for the indigenous young people who are most affected by Covid19 in the Manaus area, in the Brazilian rainforest, who have long been active in the FFF chats. Donations are collected and painful experiences are shared.

And suddenly it becomes clearer what it could mean to treat a crisis as a crisis. I think back to the day in August 2018, when I met the Mynttorget group for the very first time, a year and a half ago. “What do you want to say to us?” “Treat the crisis as a crisis.” At this point, in early summer 2020, I sense what that could mean in concrete terms. Back then, I didn’t really understand. In a crisis, it is about taking extraordinary action, not undemocratically, on the contrary, democracy must be reinforced. New laws are now being passed in the face of the pandemic, at least in the states which are not ruled by authoritarian presidents. It is about protecting every life. And yet some lives seem to be worth less than others. Those of the roughly seven million victims who die every year due to air pollution, meaning due to the burning of fossil fuels (and forests), and which belong in particular to BIPOC populations far away from the Zurich Lake or the Stockholm seafront (WHO 2014).

At the time, I think to myself: the same thing needs to happen in response to the climate crisis. And many people say the same in our Zoom meetings, including older activists in the group focusing on the idea of a global contract to keep fossil fuels in the ground. We cannot wait for years for new elections in which environmentally conscious parties might manage to get a few percent more, meaning that they can then negotiate over several years for laws which will only have an effect years later. That would mean before anything happened, the ten years would pass in which societies across the world have to “change drastically”, according to the UN. We must treat the situation as a crisis and guarantee sustainability, dissolve contracts and establish a new global, democratic, fair societal contract so that emissions fall immediately worldwide.

The corona crisis highlights two aspects. Firstly, the fact that such a drastic interruption of the global economy does not even reduce emissions by the amount that would now be needed every year. Such a reduction would in any case have to be organised in quite a different way, democratically and sustainably. And: the economy is structured in a such way that it falls apart when people only buy what they actually need. It becomes easier to notice the badly paid core work of our economy (often carried out by women): the “care economy”. Plus, when energy is saved and less is consumed, tax revenue disappears, and with it the welfare state. Within this system, we cannot so much as start to tackle the climate crisis. But what should this systemic change look like? What does it mean to see ourselves as part of a fabric of integrity, woven together with each other and with nature?

BlackLivesMatter, racism, and justice

The transformation has to be fair. The young activists agree on that. But what is the right way to think about justice, and how can it be implemented in everyday structures and in laws?

One aspect becomes obvious in these days in the most painful way. On the 25th of May, when George Floyd is murdered by a white police officer in Minneapolis, choked to death, protests also take place in Stockholm: thousands of people take to the streets with #BlackLivesMatter and fight for justice and for equality between all people on a living planet. Enough is enough, as many people in the climate justice movements also say: police violence against Black people must be stopped, and so must discrimination and structural racism in societies worldwide. The history of the last four hundred years has to be on the table; the authoritarian thinking and murderous actions of white supremacists, who have more and more momentum due to the Trump regime, must be replaced with real democracy. In hundreds of cities across the world, thousands of people join demonstrations for weeks on end. In Stockholm, too, some of the young people from Mynttorget take part in the demonstrations, wearing masks. But how should we go about this shared struggle for a fairer world?

Both for the young people and for the older activists and scientists, this draws attention much more urgently to the fact that the ecological crisis and the way out of it are tied to another process of change, leading away from racist structures and oppression. The fabric of integrity which is so valuable, from which we are made and which we want to continue “weaving” by building a

sustainable global world, has a historical dimension which has led to its destruction in many places; the dimension of colonialism and racism. How can it be repaired? Or at least approached and addressed? Who leads this process and how can it look?

What is intersectionality? A new perspective

At the institute for youth studies and education at Stockholm University, my students are discussing theories of democracy (see chapter on education), using the tools of drama education. What would it mean to have democracy for everyone? Not discriminating, some of them reply, not based on gender, ethnicity, class, or sexual orientation. A few say: making diversity possible. Others say: including everyone, not just being “inclusive” or “diverse” by allowing people in, but ensuring that everyone has the resources they need. Meeting everyone on an equal footing. Distributing power. A debate arises over the question of how these structures and ways of oppressing people or acting unjustly relate to each other, “intersect”, and how we can deal with our problematic shared history.

Almost all students within education, social sciences and humanities in Sweden take at least one four-week program on “intersectionality”, no matter what they study, often designed together with the institutes for gender studies (see Fopp, 22.9.2021). This is very helpful to understand the relation between different dimensions of domination (gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, class etc.; see Collins 2019). It is above all Black and indigenous working-class women who often suffer the most from the consequences of climate change and the fossil industry in the hands of the Global North, as research shows (Sengupta 2020; WHO 2014).

Sometimes, the students ask if there is an internal logic for the way in which racism, heteronormativity, patriarchy, and the social class system are connected through the economic system. They wonder whether one of these intersectional dimensions is more central than the others (see the chapter on the “many fights”, and Fraser 2022)? Or are they based on one and the same system error? For some people in the group, this discussion is more of a thought experiment. For others, it is their life, and that makes them all the more actively involved in these seminars. They know what it means not to be able to rent a flat just because their names sound foreign, or because the market is tailored to the upper middle class. Or what it's like to study at an

institution as a Black person when all the management positions are occupied by white people.

During these debates, I wish that these courses had two additional parts. As important it is to understand the influence of one dimension of oppression (such as ethnicity) on another (such as gender and class; as Judith Butler, Stuart Hall and Angela Davis have shown), the discussions can easily become academic – and the basic phenomenon can disappear: the experience of being dominated, pushed down, neglected, hurt. Teaching about it, the “intra”-sectional core of oppression, would mean teaching in a transformative and regenerative way (see the chapter about education). It is more difficult and challenging than learning in an abstract way about intersections between dimensions of discrimination. And the same goes for the other aspect which is lacking: learning to treat one another in a humane way. Why should it be enough to be able to read texts about discrimination without learning the practice of creating humane, sustainable spaces (Fopp 2016; and see the chapter on education)? Spaces in which people affirm each other, and share resources and care? This is not only about theories in books, I say to myself, but about changing lives. It is one step to articulate injustice and another, equally important, to create together circumstances in which everyone feels affirmed as a person, beyond specific actions, attitudes, and structures. Or in terms of moral and political philosophy: the idea of (intersectional) justice needs – as a political compass – a complementary twin idea, that of being humane, and making everyone visible as people with dignity, even those who we see as perpetrating injustice. That is the foundational idea behind the most important concept of all, universal dignity, or the intact space and fabric of integrity as I try to re-frame it; otherwise the fight for justice threatens to result in its opposite, one could argue with Nussbaum (“on love”: 1992).

How much justice is there within the climate justice movements?

The BlackLivesMatter demonstrations also bring about a reaction within the climate movements themselves. Isn't there also sexism, racism, colonial thinking, and oppression among activists? How can structures be built which don't rely on domination? What does “allyship” mean, and what does it mean to say that the “most affected people and areas” (MAPA) should take the lead?

This question already comes up in January in Davos. Greta is once again on her way to the World Economic Forum, but this time she is joined by Luisa from

Germany, Loukina from Switzerland, Isabelle from Mynttorget, and Vanessa from Uganda. Vanessa had started her climate strike in Kampala almost at the same time, literally in the same weeks of winter 2018/9, as Loukina left her school in Lausanne and Isabelle went for the first time to Mynttorget. In her texts and public speeches, she often links the climate crisis to dimensions of poverty, of children's and women's rights, but also to questions of education and a globally unjust system which relies on fossil fuels (Nakate 2021). Together, they are taking a stand against the passivity of the economic and political power elite and trying to draw attention to the fact that it is not enough to talk about "climate neutrality" by 2050. Emissions really must be reduced immediately; and that is something we have to organise together worldwide, through measures such as ending the financing of fossil infrastructure. That is what they write in a joint article in the *Guardian* (Thunberg et al. 2020).



From far away in Stockholm, I try to stay up to date with the local climate activists who are striking in Davos and preparing for their citizens' assembly. As a counterweight to the elitist concentration of power, Loukina and other young activists want to make real democracy happen, and involve the inhabitants of the village outside the conference centre in the big questions of the future. How can we reach a sustainable society together in ten years? In the meantime, in France and the United Kingdom, government-organised assemblies are taking place: a representative group of people are chosen at random and asked to suggest, with the help of scientists, changes to the law in the light of the climate crisis (Chrisafis 2020).

The young climate activists Loukina and Isabelle switch between the rooms – the glamorous world of the WEF and the citizens' assembly – and end up in a crucial picture. The international press agency sends a photo around the world which has been cropped to remove Vanessa, who was sitting

next to Greta, Luisa, Loukina, and Isabelle. With her dark skin, Vanessa Nakate does not fit into the picture of the white climate movement. This expression of racism becomes visible to everyone when Vanessa refuses to accept being made invisible and shares the unedited picture on Twitter. She describes this experience, the reaction to it and the societal forces involved as well as her way into climate activism in her book *A Bigger Picture* (2021). And she talks about it when she visits Mynttorget some months later.



Many of the Swedish activists travel north during these weeks to their friends and fellow strikers who are exposed, as members of the indigenous population, to similar forms of structural discrimination and oppression.

In the weeks that follow, it becomes increasingly clear that Black activists – and BIPOC activists in general – are not given enough space in the movement, even though many activists are aware that the climate crisis affects people in the Global South much more severely and that racist structures, including within the economic system, have partly caused the whole problem (Hickel 2020). “No climate justice without racial justice”, the Mynttorget activists also write. Many of us try to change, sometimes feeling ashamed and guilty, reacting to the underlying structures, every day. And so, young and older activists from the climate movements work together across the generations to read texts from the workshop book *Me and White Supremacy*, by Layla Saad (2020), and the ideas of Mary Annaïse Heglar and Leah Thomas (communicated via Twitter) on an intersectional climate movement. They read classics by bell hooks (2000) and Angela Davis (1983), and try to understand their own privileges and their own contribution to structural racism more clearly and – as a life-long task – to fight against it.

Sustainability and democracy – a systemic approach

Even during the debates at the university, it seems more and more clear: sustainability is not just linked to ecology or economics, but also to social relations and society. And democracy is not only about formal processes of collective decision-making but about the same “substance” of treating everyone on eye level as free and equal.

Sustainability seems not only to be – as the Brundtland report proposes already in 1987 – about “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (Brundtland 1987). It should be redefined as a way of relating to each other and the world, as a “being towards the world” (Merleau-Ponty 1974). In this sense, “sustainable” and “democratic” share the core “substance” of actively affirming each other, treating no one as more “valuable”; providing together the resources which enable a dignified life. It is about so much more than psychological categories such as “empathy” or “compassion” (even if the use of them is so desperately needed): it is about a stance or attitude and worldview of being humane; this is what I argue for in my lectures.

For society to become socially sustainable, just and democratic, don't we need much deeper changes? Once again: the destroyed fabric of integrity must be mended at so many levels: historical reparations, if they are even possible; structural changes to power relations; ethical processes; individual statements. Where is the space in which all this can be discussed? Who can lead these processes? How can we make sure they are rooted in institutions?

Then Tonny Nowshin gets in touch and helps us with this search. We had met in Madrid at the COP conference and had begun similar discussions at that time. Tonny comes from Dhaka, in Bangladesh. She grew up there, came to the West as a young adult and now works for a small climate NGO in Berlin. She is closer in age to the FFF activists, and could be seen as one of them, but at the same time she is able to interact with them as an experienced person. She, too, has had bad experiences within the climate movement because of her dark skin. A larger NGO excluded her from a picture of the protests taking place against the brand-new coal power station "Datteln4", which was approved by the German government and built in cooperation with the Finnish state. How can we change this injustice within the movements and find our way to a different, more supportive culture?

And so, on a Thursday evening in the virtual Zoom room, some of the most active young people from FFF worldwide meet with Tonny. There are so many questions: who should they approach when organising local protests? How can they set up the FFF network in general so that BIPOC activists are really part of it and have leadership roles?

During the conversation, the following thoughts come up (see also Tonny's own article in the *taz*: Nowshin 2020). Tonny tells the FFF activists that they should start early, forming a working group to focus on this specific topic. That they could approach BIPOC people and actively listen to what they say. And then one thing will lead to another: they just need to start and publicly form a group, make the first steps, and consciously approach people and pass leadership roles on to them. The activists talk about privilege, feelings of shame and guilt, and above all about the prejudices which many of them have, whether they want to or not, images which they have to change actively. They ask Tonny how she reacts when someone asks her about her skin colour or where she comes from, or when she hears someone else being asked this.



She tells them that inner values count, and explains that she does talk about how hurtful it is, and also talks about the climate crisis. She doesn't want people to have a distorted view of her as only being an expert on racism. She wants to talk about the climate crisis and about the activism she is involved in, so that people will see who she is. In this meeting, some of the concrete work of change begins, as well as a kind of joint search for a way of living together beyond structural domination. Striking on Fridays does not work in Bangladesh, for example, because there is no school on Fridays. So, everyone has to show consideration when planning global protest actions. The young people express the fear that in a few weeks everything will go back to the status quo and oppression will again become invisible. Have the BlackLivesMatter demonstrations really led to a social "tipping point"? Structural oppression might be named as such. People who simply want to carry on as normal cannot do so quite as easily. As

with the MeToo movement, values are beginning to shift, across society. Could that also happen in relation to the climate crisis and its effects?

Tonny talks about her fear and grief for Bangladesh, the unimaginable floods which destroy the border region with India, especially during these summer months; and the new coal power stations which are to be built with the help of German firms. Bangladesh is literally under threat of being swept into the sea and is at the same time afflicted by terrible heatwaves. During these weeks, an article appears in the respected journal PNAS (Xu et al. 2020) which seems almost absurd. It says that by 2070, up to three billion people could be living in regions which are uninhabitable, and the area around Bangladesh is one of them. Tonny is asked one more question: What should we do about the dilemma that the clothes we are buying are made by people in Bangladesh for low pay and damage the environment, but at the same time guarantee jobs? Does that make sense? Should we be boycotting clothes from H&M?

And that brings us back to the question of justice and what is right. Tonny replies that something is fundamentally wrong here. Something about the system itself; something we cannot avoid. It is about something deeper than the question of whether to buy or not to buy. A racist element is built in: millions of women work in Bangladesh and make a few white men unbelievably rich, in Sweden, America, and so on. Tonny says that we can't correct that only by buying or not buying the clothes. We also have to work even on a whole different project together to point out these structures and replace them, so that everyone is looked after equally and power is shared. After all, there are one hundred corporations, often owned and run by white men in the Global North, which are responsible for most of all emissions and are therefore at the core of the ecological crisis. This shows that all the dimensions of domination (gender, ethnicity, class) and the climate crisis are connected with each other (see Fraser 2022; Bellamy Foster 2010).

That is why it is important for me to be working at the universities on theories, for instance on the concept of a "shared fabric of integrity," which could throw new light on the concrete processes through which we can weave this fabric together and stop destroying it. Ethics, politics, sustainability, movement organisation and history must be viewed in conjunction with each other, in very concrete processes. For me, these conversations lead to the realisation: if we want to develop a program that could be called "People For Future", we have to take on the challenge and make it clear that reshaping our fossil so-

ciety is also a movement away from these systemic mistakes. But how can we formulate this “democratisation principle” more precisely?

What is the core of the new politics? The young activists and scientists write their manifestos

Suddenly all the activists are writing statements about how the world should look – partly because the opportunities for real protest actions are limited. We are still in the time of corona. Use the chance, many people are saying: if billions are being invested in getting out of the corona crisis, they should be invested in “green” projects. These strategy papers by NGOs have titles like “Build Back Better” and “Green Recovery.” But why should some fine words from a few NGOs suddenly get politicians like Merkel, Macron and Bolsonaro to change their way of thinking and acting? I ask myself this at the weekly meetings with the movements and the “global communication directors” of these organisations. It should be about building a real movement which believes that we can change the political framework. But how? How should the manifesto of this movement look? We need a platform to gather everyone, I think; and we need to focus on two or three core points of a new framework which everyone can get behind.

During these months, two different groups come up with ideas for how this text could look, working in parallel. On the one hand, some young activists across the world. And on the other, a group of older activists and scientists. The results are presented by the young people in their open letter to the EU; they call it #FaceTheClimateEmergency (climateemergencyeu.org). Within a few days, it has been signed by more than one hundred thousand people, including the most well-known climate scientists. And Scientists For Future produces several texts, including an official statement to the EU, which is developing a new climate law at this time.

Quickly, it becomes clear that both approaches share the same core. Both groups aim for a middle way between overly specific (party) politics and abstract demands. Both present two or three principles which ought to guide policy, as well as two or three ethical values for how policies should be realised. What is this core which defines them both and underlies a movement that could be called “we, the People For Future”?

There should be fair emissions budgets, globally, nationally, and locally, starting from the 350 Gt which is roughly what we have left (in 2021); they

should also be fair in historical terms. And all governments must immediately present plans for how these budgets can be realised in all sectors – a new framework must emerge and shape all political decisions. Secondly, as of now, fossil infrastructure should no longer be financed and developed, but should be reduced and replaced by a sustainable energy system, financed through “fair shares”, in accordance with the Emissions Gap Report by the UN. And thirdly, this should take place fairly. The Global South should move into the centre of this global reshaping of society, in quite a different way. Because fourthly, structures of domination must be dismantled in all these steps, when it comes to gender, class, and ethnicity. This is roughly where the different papers overlap. If this framework is established, there must be further discussion in democratic arenas of what that means in concrete terms: for instance, how it could be combined with debt cancellation, a global basic income (an overview on the political theories of basic income: Bidadanure 2019), and so on.

Most importantly, what we need immediately is a realisation that this is a crisis, the young activists write, and we need systemic change. Greta talks about that on her summer program on Swedish radio, with a million listeners, and about a democracy in which we look after each other globally (Thunberg 2020/3). And once again, I think: it is one thing to make injustice visible and dismantle it. The other complementary project is actively guaranteeing a dignified life for everyone. It is not enough to make sure that people are not exploited. Again, the argument is that we need more than justice. The idea of (intersectional) justice must be complemented by that of caring for everyone's dignity and being humane: we all have to have enough to eat and a roof over our heads which will not be swept away by floods; we can provide each other with enough resources as global universal “basic services” without people having to pay for them individually. That is why I talk about this fabric of integrity and keep coming back to its historical dimension and to how fascinating and valuable it is. (The appendix of this book develops these joint principles further into a shared program.)

The S4F statement on the new EU climate law

But these thoughts also have to be expressed in concrete policies. As Scientists for Future, we have also been working on a statement that aims to change European policy directly, for the next ten years. This year, the EU is planning to in-

roduce a new climate law which will shape all of policy in this part of the world (Jakubowska 2021). Judith Hardt, one of my research colleagues from Berlin, gets in touch to say that we as research institutions and academics have a humanist task, and with that also a responsibility within global society. If we see that policy does not match the Paris Agreement or our research, we ought to react. And after all, the two of us belong to the advisory board of Scientists For Future, which now consists of about a hundred professors, among them the heads of university institutions and gigantic research centres. We also have contacts among the climate specialists in the EU parliament. It is the EU commission which will propose the new law in March, but it is the parliament which then has to change and approve it in a six-month process. Here, a point of leverage emerges.

And on top of that, a specific event is coming up: some of the young activists are travelling to Brussels to meet their fellow activists from across Europe in front of the parliament. As Scientists For Future, we could publish a statement at the same time; that is our idea. And while the virus spreads round the world with terrible consequences, we get the hundred scientists on the S4F advisory board on side. A working group is formed. We all read the EU commission's suggested law and come up with concrete changes. The political framework must match the science. A challenging working process emerges under extreme time pressure. We all edit a google doc at the same time; we frequently have to lock it for hours in order to summarise all the comments; then we continue working; we circulate the final version; change it; circulate it again – and find our way to a common position.

Of course, the specialists, world-leading climate researchers, have the biggest say, but this is still about a systemic way of thinking which connects all academic disciplines, climate science with ethics, economics with political philosophy. The core points are: the goals have to be much stricter; a 50 or 55 percent reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2030 is not enough; especially not since these numbers only actually mean 35 percent, because the comparison is with the past rather than with the current level. And Europe needs to make a more drastic transformation than the one in the proposed law, for reasons of global justice.

Thus, we put the aspect of justice in the foreground. And for us, it is crucial that the text of the law includes the idea of a scientific committee which will constantly assist in EU policy development. Gone is the time when politicians could avoid facing up to the facts of the ecological and climate crisis – or at least, it should be gone. The statement is published and the activists tweet

it into the world. Meanwhile, Kevin Anderson and Isaak Stoddard of Uppsala University calculate (Anderson et al. 2020) that with the official goals the EU would emit about double the amount of greenhouse gases that would be compatible with the Paris Agreement – if it even stuck to these goals. We have to make that clear to the public, I think to myself. This would lead to a world that is two or three degrees warmer, with all the disastrous consequences.

All these thoughts lead to an idea. We could become the People For Future: we scientists could join together with parents, artists, workers, economists and so on; each of these groups have set up their own networks by now in various countries, with thousands of active members. So that a gigantic global, continuous popular movement emerges. One which is guided by the two or three shared basic principles which the young activists and the scientists have come up with in two years, and which we will defend as long as it takes for the political framework to change.

Debt cancellation and reparations for the Global South would be a possible beginning of the work on weaving the shared historical “fabric of integrity.” But then comes a change which is just as important: how can we reshape our economic approach so that the Global North no longer makes a profit at the expense of the Global South? More and more ideas about this come out of the movements (Hickel 2018 and 2020). Through the demonstrations and the court case against the police officer who killed George Floyd, a discussion also develops over these months about the role of the state, the exercise of power, and violence. A discussion about abolition emerges (Loick/Thompson 2022), which also becomes topical due to stricter laws affecting activists, which are being introduced in many countries during these weeks, including Switzerland and England, so that climate protests can almost be treated as terrorism. Arrests are becoming possible based only on suspicion, without a warrant.

What is becoming palpable during these months, in relation to the reaction to corona virus and to racism: how important it would be to put the dignity of everyone in the centre of political and economic action, to create structures which are not treating some lives as less valuable, and to make the shared fabric of integrity visible, as our common task.

Back at Mynttorget

At the end of August 2020, the time has come. Exactly two years have passed since the beginning of the strike. The activists gather once again in Mynttor-

get, between parliament and the palace – with safety measures, including social distancing and masks. They lean on the wall, as usual, and look across at the parliament. And in that same August week, all the climate movements join together, led by Extinction Rebellion, to block the centre of Stockholm, first the bridges around the parliament, and then the central shopping streets. This time there are not 100 of us, as there were two years ago, but hundreds.

And finally: on the 25th of September, the first global strike takes place since the outbreak of the pandemic. The young activists have agreed in their chats that they will change the communicative structures of FFF in such a way that people from the Global South and BIPOC communities can take over leadership, under the name MAPA (“Most Affected People and Areas”). The central theme of the strike: the climate crisis and global social justice. Tens of thousands of young activists across the world return to the streets of this wondrous planet.