

The background of the cover is a photograph of a misty forest. In the upper right corner, there is a close-up of a tree branch with green leaves. The rest of the image shows a path leading into a foggy forest with various trees and a large tree trunk on the right side.

NAVIGATING THE POLYCRISIS

Mapping the Futures
of Capitalism and
the Earth

Michael J. Albert

NAVIGATING THE POLYCRISIS

NAVIGATING THE POLYCRISIS

MAPPING THE FUTURES OF CAPITALISM
AND THE EARTH

MICHAEL J. ALBERT

THE MIT PRESS CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS LONDON, ENGLAND

© 2024 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

This work is subject to a Creative Commons CC-BY-NC-ND license.

This license applies only to the work in full and not to any components included with permission. Subject to such license, all rights are reserved. No part of this book may be used to train artificial intelligence systems without permission in writing from the MIT Press.



The MIT Press would like to thank the anonymous peer reviewers who provided comments on drafts of this book. The generous work of academic experts is essential for establishing the authority and quality of our publications. We acknowledge with gratitude the contributions of these otherwise uncredited readers.

This book was set in Stone Serif and Stone Sans by Westchester Publishing Services.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Albert, Michael J., author.

Title: Navigating the polycrisis : mapping the futures of capitalism and the Earth / Michael J. Albert.

Description: Cambridge, Massachusetts : The MIT Press, [2024] | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2023021165 (print) | LCCN 2023021166 (ebook) | ISBN 9780262547758 (paperback) | ISBN 9780262378277 (epub) | ISBN 9780262378260 (pdf)

Subjects: LCSH: Forecasting. | Civilization, Modern—21st century.

Classification: LCC CB161 .A43 2024 (print) | LCC CB161 (ebook) | DDC 909.83/0112—dc23/eng/20230822

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023021165>

LC ebook record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2023021166>

To my parents,
who gave me a future

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ix

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS xi

INTRODUCTION 1

- 1 THE PLANETARY POLYCRISIS 17
 - 2 VISIONING AND SHAPING THE FUTURE: MODELS, SCENARIOS,
AND CRITICAL SOCIAL SCIENCE FUTURES 63
 - 3 PLANETARY SYSTEMS THINKING 87
 - 4 THE SOCIOECOLOGICAL PROBLEMATIC: CLIMATE, ENERGY,
FOOD, AND THE FUTURES OF CAPITALISM 113
 - 5 FUTURES OF GEOPOLITICS, SECURITY, AND THE PLANETARY
PROBLEMATIC 177
- CONCLUSION 225

NOTES 243

INDEX 291

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

There are many humans and nonhumans who made this book possible, though I'll focus mainly on the humans. This book was born from a dissertation project that would not have been possible without the support and guidance of Dan Deudney, Bentley Allan, and William Connolly. Few would have allowed such a sprawling and overambitious project to move forward under their supervision, and I have them to thank for believing in it and helping it come to fruition. Jane Bennett, Sam Chambers, and Jennifer Culbert had a significant influence on the evolution of my thinking during my time at Johns Hopkins as well, and I'm grateful to them for their input and support over the years. Beverly Silver, Simon Dalby, and David Scott also deserve thanks for their feedback and insights on the project. And I owe Mason Rayner, Jishnu Guha, Jay Mohorcich, Gregg Tourville, Nils Kupzok, Stephanie Erev, Jacob Kripp, Quinn Lester, CJ Higgins, Beth Mendenhall, Nathan Gies, and Casey McNeill deep gratitude for our friendship and wide-ranging conversations over the years, which made me a smarter human than I would have been otherwise.

This book was sharpened by workshops held at SOAS University of London in November 2021 and the University of Edinburgh in April 2023. I am deeply grateful to Meera Sabaratnam, Nick Srnicek, Alex Williams, Kerem Nisancioglu, Mathew Paterson, Phil Clark, Mathias Thaler, Troy Vettese, Claire Duncanson, and Thomas Homer-Dixon for taking the time to read

and give feedback on the manuscript. Felix Berenskoetter and Fiona Adamson provided much-needed help on the book proposal, and I'm deeply grateful to them for their support during my time at SOAS. Conversations with Taylor Borowetz, Chris Smaje, Gabriela Cabaña, Iñigo Capellán-Pérez, John Barry, Nafeez Ahmed, Carolyn Baker, Mihaela Mihai, Elizabeth Bomberg, Oliver Turner, and Cedric Durand also shaped my thinking and made the book better than it would have otherwise been. I also owe a big thanks to Beth Clevenger for her support for the project, to the MIT Press editorial team, and to Benedikt Büchel for his assistance with the index.

To close, I first want to thank my parents. The unconditional love and support they gave me, and their encouragement for me to find my own path through all its twists and turns, has been all that any human could hope for. I also owe the world and more to Taylor, who is simultaneously a loving partner, intellectual companion, and artistic genius who gave detailed comments on the manuscript and provided much needed help with the visuals in this book. Finally, some of the key nonhumans whose inspiration and energy helped me get through the book-writing process include Thea, Cadbury, and Grahams; the oak trees of Primrose Hill and Hampstead Heath; the Water of Leith; and (last but not least) the Earth.

Michael J. Albert

June 2023

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

AI	Artificial intelligence
BAU	Business-as-usual
BECCS	Bioenergy plus carbon capture and storage
BIS	Bank of International Settlements
CCP	Chinese Communist Party
CDR	Carbon dioxide removal
CL	Climate leviathan
DAC	Direct air capture
EP	Existential problematic
EROI	Energy return on energy investment
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FF	Fossil fuels
FIR	Fourth industrial revolution
GFANZ	Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero
GM	Genetically modified
IAMs	Integrated assessment models
IEA	International Energy Agency
IoT	Internet-of-Things
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
LNG	Liquefied natural gas
LtG	Limits to Growth

MEDEAS	modeling energy system development under environmental and socioeconomic constraints
NAS	National Academies of Sciences
NC3	Nuclear weapons command, control, and communication
NDCs	Nationally Determined Contributions
NIC	National Intelligence Council
PBs	Planetary boundaries
RE	Renewable energy
SEP	Socioecological problematic
SRM	Solar radiation management
SSPs	Shared Socioeconomic Pathways
UBI	Universal Basic Income
VI	Violence-interdependence
VP	Violence problematic
WMD	Weapons of Mass Destruction
WMO	World Meteorological Association

INTRODUCTION

The 2020s have gotten off to a rocky start (to put it mildly). Words like “permacrisis” and “polycrisis” have become common currency, reflecting a broadening awareness that ours is an age of interconnected systemic crises with no clear end in sight.¹ The year 2021 was already a year of stress in global energy and food markets, ratcheting geopolitical rivalries, record levels of global military spending, and accumulating risks for the world economy—trends that were all turbocharged by Vladimir Putin’s February 2022 invasion of Ukraine. It remains far from certain how these ongoing crises will unfold. But we know that deeper challenges loom on the horizon, from the climate and mass extinction crises to future pandemics, “net energy decline” for fossil fuels, an unsustainable and unstable global food system, the brewing new cold war between the United States and China, the simmering specter of far-right populism, the nascent threat of weaponized synthetic biology, and the destabilizing impacts of artificial intelligence on work, war, and human freedom.

This book asks where the world-system is headed as a result of these intersecting challenges. It makes three overarching arguments. First, I argue that that we must devote more systematic attention to the question of possible futures. “Business-as-usual” will come to an end—whether by choice or by disaster. Thus we need more future-oriented scholarship that can illuminate the possible roads ahead, their branching pathways, the

dangers that lurk, and the opportunities that may emerge for progressive transformation. Second, I argue that to illuminate the space of possible planetary futures, we need a holistic approach that highlights the relations and feedbacks between the numerous challenges that compose our planetary predicament. As more and more analysts recognize, we confront not simply a climate crisis, nor simply a collection of numerous isolatable problems that can be studied by separate disciplines, but rather a “polycrisis” or nexus of reciprocally entwined crises characterized by complex feedback loops, blurred boundaries, cascade effects, and (in many cases) mutual amplification.² Third, I argue that a theoretical framework informed by complexity theory and world-systems theory can provide a new form of critical-futures analysis capable of grappling with the polycrisis condition. But the point here is not to claim superiority for a single theoretical approach, but rather to develop a conceptual framework that can facilitate synthesis across numerous disciplines and theoretical traditions—including international relations (IR), critical political economy, ecological economics, energy studies, the earth system sciences, critical security studies, and many others.

The goal of this book is thus to develop a new way of thinking about planetary futures that can help us create more useful and comprehensive maps of the possibility space. Such an approach must be planetary in scope, voraciously synthetic, and utterly indifferent toward disciplinary boundaries. In a word, it must be “transdisciplinary,” in the sense of pragmatist scholarship that emerges directly from problems in the world demanding response (rather than from stale disciplinary debates) and that synthesizes knowledge across numerous disciplinary, theoretical, and methodological traditions.³ In this sense, as Sanders van der Leeuw writes, transdisciplinary research analyzes “that which is at once between the disciplines, across the different disciplines, and beyond each individual discipline.”⁴ Transdisciplinary research has its risks (as I elaborate below). But it is also the necessary precondition of rigorous futures analysis that can inform contemporary strategies for progressive socioecological transformation. As the late Immanuel Wallerstein wrote more than forty years ago, our “ability to participate intelligently in the evolution” of the world-system is “dependent on [our] ability to perceive the whole. The more difficult we acknowledge the task to be, the more urgent it is

that we start sooner rather than later.”⁵ In short, if we think the task is daunting, this is all the more reason to get started now.

PLANETARY FUTURES AND NAVIGATIONAL PRAXIS

In contrast to the vast majority of approaches in the social sciences, this book takes the future seriously as a focus of analysis. Most social scientific scholarship focuses overwhelmingly on the past and present, while occasionally making some speculations about the future (typically, if at all, in a book’s conclusion). This tendency is reasonable to some extent, since we cannot corroborate or falsify our present-day hypotheses about the future, and our future speculations always run the risk of making us look foolish in the long run.⁶ But this stance is far too limiting. Humans are temporally situated beings that act in relation to a future or set of possible futures that infuse the present and shape our hopes, fears, and projects.⁷ As Jens Beckert argues, “‘History matters,’ but the future matters just as much.”⁸ Heikki Patomäki develops a similar argument: “Anticipation of the future is a necessary part of social action. . . . Consequently, if the social sciences are to be relevant they should be able to also say something about possible and likely futures.”⁹ The majority of social scientists who do investigate futures are typically less interested in “the future” itself than in techniques through which powerful actors imaginatively construct and act on possible futures.¹⁰ This work is very important, and I also explore such futurological exercises (in chapter 2). But this book instead primarily follows Patomäki and others who develop what could be called a “realist” approach to planetary futures. From this view, the future is not solely made actual in the present through discursive construction, but also exists as a real though not-yet-actual possibility space composed of multiple possible trajectories and latent potentials.¹¹ The openness, uncertainty, and indeterminacy of the future is the main reason that social scientists tend to shy away from studying it directly, yet this indeterminacy is *precisely* why futures analysis is so important. As Patomäki writes, “Actions anticipating possible futures . . . shape the present and thereby also contribute toward the materialisation of a particular line of development in world history.”¹²

Following Patomäki, this book is less concerned with “predicting” the future than with illuminating possible lines of world historical development

in order to inform present-day strategies that can help shape the future in more progressive (or at least less catastrophic) directions. As I discuss in chapter 2, militaries, intelligence agencies, central banks, and corporations are all deeply engaged in various forms of future-scenario analysis, which they use to develop strategies that may “perform well under a range of future conditions.”¹³ Rather than allowing powerful actors to monopolize these techniques in their efforts to preempt and constrain the future possibility space, scholars and activists should engage in counter-hegemonic futures analyses in order to widen our imaginaries of possible futures and develop strategies to bring about more just futures. As John Urry says, the terrain of futures studies “is too important to be left to states, corporations and technologists, . . . and social science needs to be central in disentangling, debating and delivering those futures.”¹⁴

There are at least two main tasks for counter-hegemonic futures analysis. The first is to illuminate the most likely futures that may emerge following current tendencies and trends. As Mathias Thaler discusses, this involves “if-this-goes-on”-style scenarios that are common in dystopian science fiction.¹⁵ In the jargon of climate scientists and energy modelers, these are “business-as-usual” or “current-policies” scenarios in which trends in political economy, power relations, culture, energy consumption, greenhouse gas emissions, and technological change continue to follow their recent historical patterns.¹⁶ As should be evident to any clear-sighted analyst of our planetary predicament, these pathways would result in increasingly “dystopian” futures over time—at least for the majority of humanity—whether they take the form of deepening climate apartheid, techno-authoritarianism, social and ecological collapse, or (at their worst extreme) human extinction. As I show in chapters 4 and 5, even more ambitious policy reforms and technological breakthroughs—if constrained within a profit- and growth-oriented “ecomodernist” framework—would likely push the world-system down a dystopian trajectory (or at best a “ustopian” future, in Margaret Atwood’s sense, combining utopian and dystopian elements).¹⁷ From a counter-hegemonic perspective, the purpose of exploring these futures is to understand the mechanisms and elite strategies that may prevent global capitalism from decisively shifting away from its increasingly catastrophic trajectory, anticipate the different kinds of systemic crises and disruptions that would emerge, highlight both the

challenges and opportunities that these crises would create for progressive movements, and warn of the dangerous amplifying feedbacks that could make such trajectories self-reinforcing.

But this is obviously not the sole task of counter-hegemonic futures analysis. The second task is the work of developing “concrete utopias,” which involves the imagination of desirable futures that are “genuinely possible”—or that may plausibly emerge through the conjunction of ongoing structural trends and counter-hegemonic struggles seeking to transform the world-system.¹⁸ Concrete utopias are not idealized worlds in which all conflicts, inequalities, and forms of injustice have been eradicated. They are better understood, as Thaler puts it, as “temporary stations on a continuous, yet rocky journey” toward more just and sustainable futures.¹⁹ In Wallerstein’s terms, they are not “the face of the perfect (and inevitable) future, but the face of an alternative, credibly better, and historically possible (but far from certain) future.”²⁰ Concrete utopian speculation must negotiate the tension between radical imagination and rigorous social, political, and ecological analysis of the possible. In other words, it emerges from the always fraught encounter between utopianism and realism.²¹ The tension between utopianism and realism—or between our imagination of the desirable and clear-sighted analysis of the realistically achievable—is inescapable; it is simply impossible to objectively determine what is possible or impossible in any given political conjuncture.²² But unlike many utopian scholars and visionaries, I place a bit more emphasis on the *realist* side of the equation. In particular, in this book I am less interested in the precise contours of concrete utopian destinations than the *processes and mechanisms* by which they might emerge in practice. In the words of Kim Stanley Robinson, we must “imagine the bridge over the Great Trench, given the world we’re in and the massively entrenched power of the institutions that shape our lives.”²³ This is easily the most challenging aspect of concrete utopian speculation, but it is nonetheless essential if we want to truly inspire belief in the potential for new worlds. To do this well, in a way that moderates (but does not entirely avoid) the risk of wishful thinking, we need a rigorous, transdisciplinary approach that can illuminate the constraints, obstacles, opportunities, and mechanisms of change that structure the future possibility space. As Erik Olin Wright emphasizes, “Any plausible project of emancipatory transformation must adopt

a long time horizon” that explores “not simply the obstacles and openings for strategies in the present, but how those obstacles and opportunities are likely to develop over time.”²⁴ In this sense, one of the key goals of this book is to provide a futures map and “methodology”—one whose affirmation of the role of intuition, imagination, and speculation would make it hardly count as a “methodology” for most social scientists—that can deepen our understanding of how the obstacles and opportunities for progressive transformation are likely to evolve over time in an age of intersecting crises.

The main function of the futures analysis developed in this book can thus be described as a form of “navigational praxis”—praxis in the sense of combining thought and action. This concept is influenced by the work of Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams,²⁵ who understand “navigation” as a praxis of mapping and exercising agency within complex socioecological systems, a praxis that must constantly update itself as events in the world unfold and new information comes to light. Navigation requires modifying and adapting not just our maps, strategies, and tactics, but also the specific goals of counter-hegemonic praxis as opportunities for transformative agency arise, subside, and reemerge. Counter-hegemonic movements must navigate a constantly evolving planetary-political possibility space, seeking either to dislodge hegemonic configurations and navigate toward concrete utopian potentials, or to mitigate harm and prevent the worst-case scenarios from materializing if it seems we are caught in the whirlpool of a dystopian pathway. In other words, even if we are unlikely to avoid the more dystopian regions of the possibility space, we can at least take steps to make these futures less catastrophic—for instance, by fighting for a 2.5°C rather than a 3°C or 4°C world, or by creating systems of mutual aid to reduce suffering among those of us whose lives are deemed “disposable” to the state and capital, or organizing across political differences to reduce the risks of untrammelled techno-authoritarianism or (eco)fascism. Thus, navigation is not all or nothing—not “revolution or bust”—but a praxis of continuously struggling to realize the best possible future that is within “our” power. Of course, this must transpire across a geographically and intersectionally differentiated landscape of social justice movements in the global north and south, with highly uneven degrees of vulnerability and at times conflicting values and strategies

(including conflicts between more reformist and revolutionary, universalist and particularist, techno-modernist and degrowth factions or tendencies). To speak of social justice movements as a “we” is therefore both invitational and aspirational, expressing both potential and hope for a “movement of movements” that can become a planetary force capable of galvanizing and enacting global socioecological transformation.²⁶

While future-oriented scholarship is depressingly sparse, I am of course far from the first to investigate planetary futures. It is therefore worth clarifying in general terms how this book builds on and differs from existing approaches. The different futures or “world-system pathways” I discuss in chapters 4 and 5—which include variants of green Keynesianism, collapse, ecosocialism, and what I call “techno-leviathan”—can in many ways be understood as variations of “archetypal” futures that occur in the realms of utopian/dystopian literature and transdisciplinary scenario work.²⁷ But this book goes further than existing approaches by developing a more deeply synthetic and transdisciplinary approach to planetary futures, perhaps in a way that may be too “eclectic” for some. Rigorously mapping the future calls for nothing less than a pluralist and synthetic methodology that can include as many problems, processes, and systems as possible in our analysis while carefully investigating the relations and feedbacks between them. Yet most futures analyses leave out one or more crucial elements of our planetary predicament—whether climate change, the evolution of capitalism, energy markets, energy “transition minerals” like lithium and copper, food systems, AI and synthetic biology, far-right populism, war and geopolitics, or others. Of course all futures analyses must be selective, and this book is no different. But it goes further than existing approaches toward a more comprehensive analysis of the intersecting problems that structure the future possibility space. (To those who would criticize me in turn for not including every relevant variable, I would merely say: I agree, go further please!) The core challenge of futures thinking is to follow the coevolution of many different variables simultaneously; if we leave out a crucial problem or process, our analysis of the future possibility space remains at best narrow and one-sided, and at worst compromised.

Existing work on planetary futures is also limited by inadequate integration between critical social theory and political economy, on one side, and

quantitative modeling, on the other. On one hand, critical social theorists and political economists too often ignore quantitative modeling projections of integrated climate-food-energy-economic trajectories, thereby limiting their understanding of how these systems may coevolve and the constraints they place on the future possibility space. Quantitative models, on the other hand, are by their very nature unable to integrate variables of interest to critical social theorists—particularly the evolution of power relations and counter-hegemonic struggles, as well as other qualitative factors like geopolitical conflict, militarization, police power, race and racism, gender and hypermasculinity, emerging technological risks, identities and structures of feeling, and many others. Models also struggle to capture complex systemic risks that emerge from nonlinear feedback processes in socioecological systems—such as the risk of “domino-like cascades” of earth system tipping points—which means that many if not most of them likely have a “gradualist” bias that underestimates the risks we face (though this should not always be assumed, since many models also leave out sociotechnical innovations and adaptations that may reduce these risks).²⁸ We should certainly not take the projections of climate, energy, and other models as holy writ: as the common refrain goes, *all models are wrong, but some are useful*. Rather, like science fiction at its best (which I also draw on), models can be a “machine for thinking.”²⁹ In particular, they can deepen social scientific analyses of the climate, energy, food, land-use, and other parameters that constrain the future possibility space; the coevolutionary dynamics of different variables of interest; and the alternative futures that may unfold under a range of different “what if” assumptions and contingencies.³⁰ In sum, if we are to deepen our analysis of the future possibility space, we need to build bridges between seemingly incompatible theories and methodologies across the sciences and humanities.³¹ A theoretical framework that can facilitate transdisciplinary synthesis is thus required.

MARXISM, COMPLEXITY THEORY, AND PLANETARY SYSTEMS THINKING

The theoretical framework developed in this book is situated at the intersection of Marxism and complexity theory. It begins with the recognition that no comprehensive analysis of the polycrisis condition can be done without

going through the Marxist tradition. Few thinkers have been as prescient as Marx in anticipating the broad contours of the evolution of capitalist modernity and its tendency toward cumulative political-economic and ecological crises. Rather than reducing Marxism to a teleological and economic reading of history, or a rigid theoretical framework with a set of pre-established theses, we should instead view it as an open-ended investigation of the dynamics, historical patterns, internal tensions and struggles, mechanisms of reproduction, and possible futures of global capitalism.³² Marxists instinctively grasp the fact that, as Nancy Fraser puts it, we face “not just a set of discrete punctual problems, but a deep-structural dysfunction lodged at the very heart of our form of life.”³³ Furthermore, with its synthetic ambition to study the “totality” of global socioecological relations—or the overarching system of planetary metabolism shaped and constrained by global capital—a Marxist framework alerts us to the inherent limits of isolationist analyses and proposed “solutions” that merely defer or displace various problems and contradictions, both in space and time, without genuinely resolving them.³⁴

However, while Marxist approaches are vital to the analytic task before us, they are insufficient on their own. Too often they perpetuate a form of what William Connolly calls “socio-centrism,” or the tendency to focus on political and economic factors alone—at best acknowledging but without deeply engaging with the earth system sciences, energy studies, ecological economics, and other fields that highlight the geophysical parameters that will constrain the possible futures of capitalism.³⁵ Ecological Marxists, on the other hand, go much further in this direction by foregrounding the socioecological relations of capitalist (re)production and their planetary consequences. Yet they give us only part of the story. At best these approaches analyze the links between the crises of capitalism and the earth system, at times integrating other problems like pandemic disease and the global food crisis. But they rarely investigate *how* these multiple crises will converge and amplify each other, instead focusing primarily on how capitalism fuels crises in different subsystems.³⁶ Furthermore, ecological Marxists typically ignore problems like net energy decline, digital surveillance, policing, and emerging technological risks in the realms of AI, synthetic biology, and nuclear weapons. This gives them only a partial glimpse of the planetary predicament as a whole, which is

fine for the purposes of more isolationist studies, but not if we want to rigorously investigate planetary futures.

In sum, while Marxist approaches are indispensable, I suggest that an alternative theoretical approach that is nonetheless indebted to Marxist frameworks can provide deeper insight into planetary futures. In particular, our framework should enable us to do the following: (1) situate global capitalism as merely one complex system that coevolves with a broader landscape of self-organizing systems (including ecological, security, ideological, and technological systems or assemblages), (2) map competing hegemonic and counter-hegemonic projects that advance opposed framings of and solutions to the crises we confront, and (3) develop a “methodology” (if that is the right word) that combines theory, history, modeling projections, and imagination to project a range of possible futures for the world-system.

These are the key goals of the theoretical framework that I call “planetary systems thinking.” This approach falls under the broad umbrella of what is often called “complexity theory.” But we should emphasize that there is not one single form of complexity theory, but rather a set of related approaches aiming to transcend the analytic reductionism, disciplinary isolationism, human/nature dualisms, and assumptions of linear change and causality that dominate the Newtonian scientific worldview.³⁷ Planetary systems thinking can thus be considered a variant of complexity theory—one that is particularly inspired by world-systems theory, ecological Marxism, Manuel Delanda’s framework of “assemblage theory,”³⁸ Edgar Morin’s notion of “planetary thinking,”³⁹ and the neo-Gramscian “complex hegemony” approach developed by Alex Williams.⁴⁰ Planetary systems thinking is the subject of chapter 3, but for now I’ll briefly elaborate two of the key concepts that form the foundation of this approach.

The first is the concept of a *complex system*: an open and dynamic system that emerges from a set of feedbacks between component parts but without negating the autonomy of the parts. Rather than the closed or tightly controlled homeostatic systems conceived in the traditions of cybernetics, Parsonian social theory, and Hegelian Marxism,⁴¹ complex systems should be understood as open systems or “dissipative structures” that are continuously exchanging matter and energy with their surrounding environments.⁴² They exhibit provisional and often fragile forms of stability that are reproduced through negative feedback mechanisms, though they are

liable to rapidly shift between alternative states in response to external shocks or slow shifts in key system parameters.⁴³ Complex systems also range on a *spectrum of systematicity*: from more heterogeneous and networked “assemblages” on one side, in which the parts retain a high degree of autonomy (e.g., ecosystems), to more tightly integrated and hierarchically ordered systems on the other (e.g., biological organisms).⁴⁴ Throughout this book I often use the term *assemblage* to refer to complex systems that are on the more loosely integrated and heterogeneous side of the spectrum (such as when I speak of security and ideological assemblages). But all complex systems in reality fall somewhere between these two poles, and over time they may shift in one direction or other. The capitalist world-system, for instance, became a more tightly integrated global system during the corporate-led hyperglobalization drive of the 1990s, though rising geopolitical tensions and calls for “decoupling” between the US and Chinese economies may be starting to reverse this trend.⁴⁵

The second key concept is less familiar but equally important to the argument of this book as a whole. This is the concept of the *problematic*, which refers to a nexus of problems that shape and constrain the possible trajectories of a complex system. My use of this concept comes from the work of Manuel Delanda,⁴⁶ though he borrows it from the philosopher Gilles Deleuze. I am interested in how Delanda’s reworking of this concept can deepen our understanding of the widely used but undertheorized notion of “problematique.” The Club of Rome, for instance, in its infamous *Limits to Growth* report spoke of a “World Problematique”: a conjunction of intersecting ecological and economic problems that constrains the possible trajectories of the world-system.⁴⁷ As William Watts wrote in his foreword to the report, “We continue to examine single items in the problematique without understanding that the whole is more than the sum of its parts, that change in one element means change in the others.”⁴⁸ Edgar Morin shares this notion of problematique when he writes that there “is no single vital problem, but many vital problems, and it is this complex intersolidarity of problems, antagonisms, crises, uncontrolled processes, and the general crisis of the planet that constitutes the number one vital problem.”⁴⁹

Following Delanda, Morin, and the Club of Rome, the concept of the problematique or problematic gives us a way to think about problem-spaces composed of numerous reciprocally determining dimensions. This

is exactly the sort of concept we need to analyze the unfolding polycrisis and understand the constraints it places on the possible futures of global capitalism and the earth system. The planetary polycrisis—or what I later call the “planetary problematic”—is the simultaneously singular and multiple crisis that emerges from the interlocking challenges we confront. It is the field of problems that collectively structure the future possibility space, though the future that ultimately emerges will be determined by struggles between competing hegemonic projects to frame, narrate, and provide “solutions” to the problematic. Like the Marxist concept of “totality,” the planetary problematic is an abstraction that can guide theoretical and empirical analysis, though its substantive content can emerge, as in Marx’s method, only by “ascending from the abstract to the concrete,” thereby elaborating the problematic as a “rich totality of many determinations and relations.”⁵⁰ This book will illuminate the intricate architecture of the planetary problematic in order to inform a counter-hegemonic praxis of navigation. The point is not to try to include everything in our analysis, but rather to highlight the key dimensions of the problematic that are most causally relevant to the planetary future, analyze the positive and negative feedbacks between them, and explore future trajectories that are “coherent” in the sense of following the feedback structure that entangles them.⁵¹

We should, however, acknowledge that this sort of transdisciplinary futures analysis carries risks. On one hand, there is the risk of oversimplification and mistakes as we venture into fields beyond our disciplinary expertise. The risks are real, but I make no apologies for taking them. To use an expression popularized by Dan Gardner,⁵² the “foxes” among us (rather than the “hedgehogs”) are more likely to successfully anticipate the broad contours of the future. In other words, rather than ultra-specialized experts, it is the agile and curious—those who venture far outside their disciplinary comfort zones, seeking out new insights from other fields and opposing perspectives that challenge their thinking—who are best placed to connect the dots and develop more realistic maps of the future.⁵³ Martin Wolf—the chief economics commentator at the *Financial Times*, and a recent convert to systems thinking—makes the point well: “We need to analyse within the [disciplinary] siloes, while also analysing across them. . . . It is bound to irritate professional experts working comfortably in their silos. But . . . it has become clear that such narrowness is folly. It is to be precisely wrong

rather than dare to be roughly right.”⁵⁴ In other words, specialization is still necessary; it provides the raw material with which the foxes among us can build a more synthetic narrative. But to develop more useful and comprehensive maps that will help us navigate the planetary polycrisis, we must get outside of our disciplinary comfort zones, remain agile, take risks, and be willing to continuously address our blind spots—no matter which fields of knowledge this forces us into—and revise our maps accordingly. If we “dare to be roughly right” about the future, then there is no other option.

But there is also a second key risk we must be mindful of: that by focusing on the “big picture” of world-system and planetary-scale futures, we may ignore or subsume diverse experiences and temporalities within a homogenized planetary narrative. As Carl Death writes, the risk is that analyses of planetary futures produce “visions of universal, homogeneous time,” which can close down “a sense of hetero-topic time, in which multiple timescales and trajectories exist simultaneously.”⁵⁵ Put differently, we do not want to pretend as if “the future” will involve one universally shared trajectory, or that the planetary problematic means the same thing for all peoples and places. Far from it. Instead we must emphasize, following Alex Anievas and Kerem Nisancioglu, that global historical processes “are always the outcome of a *multiplicity of spatially diverse nonlinear causal chains* that combine in any given conjuncture.”⁵⁶ In other words, the future—like the history of global capitalism—will be spatiotemporally uneven *and* combined, involving a multiplicity of local struggles and trajectories across the world-system *as well as* a planetary trajectory that emerges from the combination between them. This means, as Stefanie Fishel and company write, that our analysis of the planetary problematic should be “simultaneously singular and plural, combining the universality of a common entangled existence on planet Earth and the particular and multiple differences of culture, gender, privilege, location, species and temporality.”⁵⁷ Of course, in practice this is easier said than done. This book places a bit more accent on the *combined* rather than the *uneven* nature of the planetary problematic, which is in part simply the result of my own cognitive constraints, though it is also justified by the globally integrative tendencies of capitalism and the deepening reality of planetary entanglement. I also focus primarily on developments in the world-system “core”—mainly the US, China, and Europe—since what happens in the core will probably have

the most influence over the planetary future as a whole. I counterbalance this by showing how trajectories in the core will be shaped and constrained by political struggles across the periphery and semi-periphery (or global south). But this is a limitation of the present study, and further scholarship is needed to develop more fine-grained narratives of possible futures in diverse states, regions, and localities across the world-system.

OUTLINE OF THE BOOK

Chapter 1 explains the concept of the “planetary polycrisis” and provides an overview of its key dimensions, including crises of the earth system, capitalism, energy, food, global security, and identity (or what I call “existential crises”). It provides an empirical foundation that the subsequent tasks of theory construction and future-scenario analysis build upon.

Chapter 2 explores different approaches to the study of planetary futures. It begins by examining the use of quantitative models to develop scenarios—focusing in particular on the *Limits to Growth*, integrated assessment models, and the shared socioeconomic pathways. Next, it explores the role of qualitative scenario exercises in the military, intelligence, and corporate sectors—focusing mainly on the National Intelligence Council’s *Global Trends* reports. Finally, it engages with what I call “critical social science futures,” or approaches that use the tools of social science and critical theory to explore possible, probable, and desirable futures. The chapter argues that we need a theoretical approach that allows us to develop more synthetic and transdisciplinary futures methodologies, bringing together quantitative modeling projections with qualitative analyses of global political economy, power, and resistance.

Chapter 3 develops the conceptual foundations of planetary systems thinking. The chapter elaborates the book’s key concept—the planetary problematic—while also analytically distinguishing between three sets of problems within the overarching problematic: (1) the “socioecological problematic,” which refers to the nexus of problems encompassing the earth system crisis, the structural crisis of capitalism, net energy decline, food crises, and pandemic risk; (2) the “violence problematic,” which refers to the nexus of war, militarism, policing, “terrorism,” and emerging technological risks; and (3) the “existential problematic,” referring to the

problem of creating shared meaning and belonging, which is generative of problems like nationalism, race and racism, gender and hypermasculinity, and far-right populism. The chapter concludes by describing the futures “methodology” that I call “mapping,” which involves qualitative analysis of the key parameters and relations that structure the planetary problematic, using theory and model projections to anticipate how these parameters may coevolve, and imaginatively constructing possible future trajectories that are coherent in the sense of respecting the relations and feedbacks among these parameters. Readers who are less interested in theory may skip this chapter, but they would run the risk of confusion regarding my use of particular concepts in subsequent chapters.

Chapter 4 shifts to a direct investigation of the future possibility space by focusing on the socioecological problematic (SEP). The chapter unfolds in a way analogous to system dynamics models: First, it creates a qualitative “model” of the SEP by describing the relations and feedbacks between ecological, political-economic, energy, and food crises. Second, it develops multiple scenarios for how these crises may unfold following a series of “what if” questions. The chapter shows that both business-as-usual as well as green Keynesian reform trajectories would most likely end up in global collapse—that is, *unless* dramatic technological breakthroughs occur. On the other hand, if revolutionary technological breakthroughs *do* occur, then this would likely drive the emergence of what I call techno-leviathan⁵⁸ (elaborated more in chapter 5). The chapter thus challenges the conventional wisdom, at least among mainstream analysts, that policies to accelerate the renewable energy transition and catalyze a “green industrial revolution” would be sufficient to resolve our planetary predicament, even if they help stabilize global temperature increases at 2°C or below. It concludes by shifting to the concrete utopian mode by exploring how deepening crises of capitalism could also create the conditions for ecosocialist transitions, whether in the next fifteen to twenty years or later this century.

Chapter 5 investigates the intersections between the violence, socioecological, and existential problematics. As in chapter 4, I begin by describing the causal relationships between their key components and then explore how they may coevolve in the future. The chapter shows that worsening geopolitical tensions, militarization, and police repression would coincide with socioecological crises to push business-as-usual trajectories further

toward collapse. On the other hand, if both green Keynesian reforms *and* revolutionary technological innovations occur, I show that this would likely fuel the emergence of techno-leviathan by unleashing a vicious spiral between increasing insecurity (driven mainly by “democratized” weapons of mass destruction) and intensified military-police repression. Finally, the chapter again shifts to the concrete utopian mode by exploring the potential for what I call “abolitionist” security assemblages in an ecosocialist trajectory, which would entail new practices of security that focus on reducing the root causes of violence rather than relying on military-police responses.

The conclusion summarizes the trajectories sketched in chapters 4 and 5 by encapsulating them in seven main scenarios (what I call the “uneven and combined world-system pathways”), considers their implications for counter-hegemonic praxis, and concludes with some reflections on the role of hope and pessimism in collectively navigating our planetary predicament.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. Adam Tooze, "Welcome to the World of the Polycrisis," *Financial Times*, October 28, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/498398e7-11b1-494b-9cd3-6d669dc3de33>; Neil Turnbull, "Permacrisis: What It Means and Why It's Word of the Year for 2022," *The Conversation*, November 11, 2022, <https://theconversation.com/permacrisis-what-it-means-and-why-its-word-of-the-year-for-2022-194306>; Thomas Homer-Dixon, Michael Lawrence and Scott Janzwood, "What Is a Global Polycrisis? And How Is It Different from a Systemic Risk?," *Cascade Institute*, September 16, 2022, <https://cascadeinstitute.org/technical-paper/what-is-a-global-polycrisis/>.
2. Thomas Homer-Dixon, Walker Brian, Biggs Reinette, et al., "Synchronous Failure: The Emerging Causal Architecture of Global Crisis," *Ecology & Society* 20, no. 2 (2015): 1–16; Nafeez Ahmed, *Failing States, Collapsing Systems: Biophysical Triggers of Violence* (Cham: Springer, 2017); Mark Swilling, *The Age of Sustainability: Just Transitions in a Complex World* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2019); Paul Raskin, *The Journey to Earthland: The Great Transition to a Planetary Civilization* (Boston: Tellus Institute, 2016); Tooze, "Welcome to the World of the Polycrisis."
3. Swilling, *Age of Sustainability*.
4. Sander van der Leeuw, *Social Sustainability, Past and Future: Undoing Unintended Consequences for the Earth's Survival* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2020), 57.
5. Immanuel Wallerstein, *The Modern World-System: Volume I* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974), 10.
6. van der Leeuw, *Social Sustainability, Past and Future*, 79.
7. Heikki Patomaki, "A Realist Ontology for Future Studies," *Journal of Critical Realism* 5, no. 1 (2006): 1–30.

8. Jens Beckert, *Imagined Futures: Fictional Expectations and Capitalist Dynamics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2016), 6.
9. Patomaki, "Realist Ontology for Future Studies," 6.
10. Beckert, *Imagined Futures*; Carl Death, "Climate Fiction, Climate Theory: Decolonising Imaginations of Global Futures," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 50, no. 2 (2022): 430–455; Ben Anderson, "Preemption, Precaution, Preparedness: Anticipatory Action and Future Geographies," *Progress in Human Geography* 34, no. 6 (2010): 777–798.
11. Manuel Delanda, *Intensive Science and Virtual Philosophy* (London: Bloomsbury, 2005).
12. Patomaki, "Realist Ontology for Future Studies," 29.
13. Holger R. Maier, Joseph H. A. Guillaume, Hedwig van Delden, et al., "An Uncertain Future, Deep Uncertainty, Scenarios, Robustness and Adaptation: How Do They Fit Together?," *Environmental Modelling & Software* 81 (2016): 155.
14. John Urry, *What Is the Future?* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2016), 7.
15. Mathias Thaler, *No Other Planet: Utopian Visions for a Climate Changed World* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 44.
16. Keywan Riahi, Detlef P. Van Vuuren, Elmar Kriegler, et al., "The Shared Socio-economic Pathways and Their Energy, Land Use, and Greenhouse Gas Emissions Implications: An Overview," *Global Environmental Change* 42 (2017): 153–168; Climate Action Tracker, "Warming Projections Global Update: Massive Gas Expansion Risks Overtaking Positive Climate Policies," *Climate Action Tracker*, November 2022, https://climateactiontracker.org/documents/1094/CAT_2022-11-10_GlobalUpdate_COP27.pdf.
17. Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 249.
18. Ruth Levitas, *Utopia as Method: The Imaginary Reconstitution of Society* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013), 6.
19. Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 287.
20. Immanuel Wallerstein, *Utopistics: Or, Historical Choices of the Twenty-first Century* (New York: The New Press, 1998), 1–2. See also Hans Baer, *Democratic Ecosocialism as a Real Utopia: Transitioning to an Alternative World-System* (New York: Berghahn Books, 2018).
21. Levitas, *Utopia as Method*, 18–19.
22. Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 72.
23. Quoted in Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 220.
24. Erik Olin Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias* (London: Verso, 2010), 27.
25. Nick Srnicek and Alex Williams, *Inventing the Future: Postcapitalism and a World without Work* (London: Verso, 2015).
26. Valentine Moghadam, "What Is Revolution in the 21st Century? Towards a Socialist-Feminist World Revolution," *Millennium Journal of International Studies* 47, no. 3 (2019): 470–482.

27. Detlef van Vuuren, Marcel Kok, Bastien Birod, et al., “Scenarios in Global Environmental Assessments: Key Characteristics and Lessons for Future Use,” *Global Environmental Change* 22 (2012): 884–895; Geoff Mann and Joel Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future* (London: Verso, 2018); Riahi et al., “Shared Socioeconomic Pathways”; Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*.
28. Will Steffen, Katherine Richardson, Johan Rockstrom, et al., “Trajectories of the Earth System in the Anthropocene,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 115, no. 33 (2018): 8252–8259; William Connolly, *Facing the Planetary: Entangled Humanism and the Politics of Swarming* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2017).
29. Nick Dyer-Witford, Atle Kjoson, and James Steinhoff, *Inhuman Power: Artificial Intelligence and the Future of Capitalism* (London: Pluto Press, 2019), 28.
30. Brian O’Neill, Elmar Kriegler, Kristie L. Ebi, et al., “The Roads Ahead: Narratives for Shared Socioeconomic Pathways Describing Future Worlds in the 21st Century,” *Global Environmental Change* 42 (2017): 169–180.
31. Eduardo Brondizio, Karen O’Brien, Frank Biermann, et al., “Re-conceptualizing the Anthropocene: A Call for Collaboration,” *Global Environmental Change* 39 (2016): 318–327.
32. John Bellamy Foster, “Marx’s Open-Ended Critique,” *Monthly Review* 70, no. 1 (2018): 1–10.
33. Nancy Fraser and Rahel Jaeggi, *Capitalism: A Conversation in Critical Theory* (London: Verso, 2018), 3.
34. David Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions and the End of Capitalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014); John Bellamy Foster, Brett Clark, and Richard York, *Ecological Rift: Capitalism’s War on the Earth* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2011); Bob Jessop, *State Power: A Strategic-Relational Approach* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2008).
35. Connolly, *Facing the Planetary*.
36. Exceptions to this trend include James O’Connor, *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism* (London: Routledge, 1998); Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*.
37. Erika Cudworth and Stephen Hobden, *Posthuman International Relations: Complexity, Ecologism and Global Politics* (London: Zed Books, 2013), 13; David Byrne and Gill Callaghan, *Complexity Theory and the Social Sciences* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2013); Eoin Flaherty, *Complexity and Resilience in the Social and Ecological Sciences* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2019); Marten Scheffer, *Critical Transitions in Nature and Society* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009); Swilling, *Age of Sustainability*; Delanda, *Intensive Science*.
38. Manuel Delanda, *Assemblage Theory* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016).
39. Edgar Morin, *Homeland Earth: A Manifesto for the New Millennium* (New York: Hampton Press, 1999).
40. Alex Williams, *Political Hegemony and Social Complexity: Mechanisms of Power After Gramsci* (Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020).
41. For discussion, see Flaherty, *Complexity and Resilience*.

42. Ilya Prigogine and Isabelle Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos: Man's New Dialogue with Nature* (New York: Bantam, 1984).
43. Williams, *Political Hegemony*; Scheffer, *Critical Transitions*.
44. Delanda, *Assemblage Theory*.
45. Rana Farooq, "My Guide to a Deglobalizing World," *Financial Times*, October 20, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/f4c17c8c-9097-417e-94d6-36825fe85c24>.
46. See Delanda, *Intensive Science*, 157–159.
47. Donella Meadows, Dennis Meadows, Jurgen Randers, et al., *The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind* (New York: Universe Books, 1972).
48. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 10–11.
49. Morin, *Homeland Earth*, 74.
50. Karl Marx, *The Grundrisse*, trans. Ben Fowkes (New York: Penguin Press, 1993), 146, 145.
51. Delanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 119.
52. Dan Gardner, *Future Babble: Why Pundits Are Hedgehogs and Foxes Know Best* (New York: Dutton, 2012).
53. Ariel Colonomos, *Selling the Future: The Perils of Predicting Global Politics* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2016), 40.
54. Martin Wolf, "How to Think About Policy in a Polycrisis," *Financial Times*, November 29, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/a1918fec-2c8f-4051-ad78-c300b0fc9adb>.
55. Death, "Climate Fiction," 434, 441.
56. Alexander Anievas and Kerem Nisancioglu, *How the West Came to Rule: The Geopolitical Origins of Capitalism* (London: Pluto Press, 2015), 61; emphasis original.
57. Stefanie Fishel, Anthony Burke, Simon Dalby, et al., "Defending Planet Politics," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 46, no. 2 (2018): 209–219.
58. Which builds on Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*.

CHAPTER 1

1. In Deleuzian terms, it is a "multiplicity." See discussion in Michael Albert, "COVID-19 and the Planetary Crisis Multiplicity: From Marxist Crisis Theory to Planetary Assemblage Theory," *Theory & Event* 25, no. 2 (2022): 332–363.
2. E.g. Jason Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life*, 1.
3. World Economic Forum, *The Global Risks Report 2023*, 18th Edition (Geneva: World Economic Forum, 2023), 9.
4. We should however emphasize that while the term is relatively new, it partakes in a longer lineage of scholarship on systemic risk and converging crises. E.g. Homer-Dixon et al., "Synchronous Failure"; Ahmed, *Failing States, Collapsing Systems*; Swilling, *Age of Sustainability*; Morin, *Homeland Earth*.

5. Tooze, “Welcome to the World of the Polycrisis.”
6. These claims are attributed to Niall Ferguson and Gideon Rachman respectively. Quoted in Thomas-Homer Dixon, Michael Lawrence, and Scott Janzwood, “Dismissing the term ‘polycrisis’ has one inevitable consequence: reality always bites,” *The Globe and Mail*, February 18, 2023, <https://www.theglobeandmail.com/opinion/article-dismissing-the-term-polycrisis-has-one-inevitable-consequence-reality/>.
7. E.g. Noah Smith, “Against ‘Polycrisis,’” *Noahpinion*, November 13, 2022, <https://www.noahpinion.blog/p/against-polycrisis>.
8. Homer-Dixon et al, “What Is a Polycrisis?”
9. Albert, “COVID-19 and the Planetary Crisis”
10. James O’Connor, “The Meaning of Crisis,” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 5, no. 3 (1982): 301–329.
11. Scheffer, *Critical Transitions*, 104; Immanuel Wallerstein, *World Systems Analysis: An Introduction* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2004); Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times* (London: Verso, 2010).
12. Referring to the nexus of global capitalism and the earth. Adopted from Ilona Otto, Jonathan Donges, Roger Cremades, et al., “Social Tipping Dynamics for Stabilizing Earth’s Climate by 2050,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 117, no. 5 (2020): 2354–2365.
13. I acknowledge that the US-China rivalry could be viewed as a systemic crisis (e.g., from the perspective of realist hegemonic transitions theory). But barring all-out nuclear war, it is more causally relevant to the future possibility space in terms of how it will shape and constrain the efforts of states to address the core systemic crises of capitalism, ecology, energy, food, and violence-interdependence (as I show in chapter 5).
14. Johan Rockstrom, Will Steffen, Kevin Noone, et al., “A Safe Operating Space for Humanity,” *Nature* 461, no. 24 (2009): 472–475.
15. Rockstrom et al., “A Safe Operating Space for Humanity.”
16. Will Steffen, Katherine Richardson, Johan Rockstrom, et al., “Planetary Boundaries: Guiding Human Development on a Changing Planet,” *Science* 347, no. 6233 (2015): 726–738.
17. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, *Summary for Policymakers of the Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services* (Bonn: IPBES Secretariat, 2019), 3.
18. World Wildlife Fund, *Living Planet Report 2022: Building a Nature Positive Society* (Gland: WWF, 2022).
19. Francisco Sanchez-Bayo and Kris Wyckhuys, “Worldwide Decline of the Entomofauna: A Review of Its Drivers,” *Biological Conservation* 232 (2019): 8–27.
20. Dave Goulson, “The Insect Apocalypse: Our World Will Grind to a Halt without Them,” *The Guardian*, July 25, 2021, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2021/jul/25/the-insect-apocalypse-our-world-will-grind-to-a-halt-without-them>.

21. Matthew Smith, Nathaniel Mueller, Marco Springmann, et al., “Pollinator Deficits, Food Consumption, and Consequences for Human Health: A Modelling Study,” *Environmental Health Perspectives* 130, no. 12 (2022): 1–12.
22. Food and Agriculture Organization, *The State of the World’s Forests: Forests, Biodiversity and People* (Rome: FAO, 2020), xvii.
23. Luciana Gatti, Luana S. Basso, John B. Miller, et al., “Amazonia as a Carbon Source Linked to Deforestation and Climate Change,” *Nature* 595 (2021): 388–408; Tim Lenton, Johan Rockström, Owen Gaffney, et al., “Climate Tipping Points—Too Risky to Bet Against,” *Nature* 575 (2019): 592–595.
24. Thomas Lovejoy and Carlos Nobre, “Amazon Tipping Point,” *Science Advances* 4, no. 2 (2018): eaat2340; David Lapola, Patricia Pinho, Jos Barlow, et al., “The Drivers and Impacts of Amazon Forest Degradation,” *Science Advances* 379, no. 6630 (2023): eabp8622.
25. United Nations Environmental Programme, *Preventing the Next Pandemic: Zoonotic Diseases and How to Break the Chain of Transmission* (Nairobi: UNEP, 2020), 29.
26. United Nations Environmental Programme, *Preventing the Next Pandemic*, 16.
27. David Morens and Anthony Fauci, “Emerging Pandemic Diseases: How We Got to COVID-19,” *Cell* 182 (2020): 1077.
28. Walter Willett, Johan Rockstrom, Marco Springmann, et al., “Food in the Anthropocene: The EAT-Lancet Commission on Healthy Diets from Sustainable Food Systems,” *The Lancet* 393, no. 10170 (2019): 23.
29. Aruna Chandrasekhar, Daisy Dunne, Orla Dwyer, et al., “COP15: Key Outcomes Agreed at the UN Biodiversity Conference in Montreal,” *Carbon Brief*, December 20, 2022, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/cop15-key-outcomes-agreed-at-the-un-biodiversity-conference-in-montreal/>.
30. Chandrasekhar et al., “COP15.”
31. Eileen Crist, Helen Kopnina, Philip Cafaro, et al., “Protecting Half the Planet and Transforming Human Systems Are Complementary Goals,” *Frontiers in Conservation Science* 2 (2021): 1–9; OECD-FAO, “Agricultural Outlook 2021–2030,” *OECD and FAO*, 2019, accessed December 22, 2022, https://www.oecd-ilibrary.org/agriculture-and-food/oecd-fao-agricultural-outlook-2021-2030_19428846-en.
32. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), “Summary for Policymakers,” *Global Warming of 1.5°C*, 2018, accessed January 28, 2023, https://www.ipcc.ch/site/assets/uploads/sites/2/2019/05/SR15_Citation.pdf.
33. Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
34. Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
35. Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
36. Hayley Stevenson, “Reforming Global Climate Governance in an Age of Bullshit,” *Globalizations* 18, no. 1 (2021): 86–102.
37. Steffen et al., “Trajectories of the Earth System”; Lenton et al., “Climate Tipping Points”; Nico Wunderling, Jonathan Donges, Jurgen Kurths, et al., “Interacting

Tipping Elements Increase Risk of Climate Domino Effects Under Global Warming,” *Earth System Dynamics* 12 (2021): 601–619.

38. University of Leeds, “Tropical Forests’ Carbon Sink Is Already Rapidly Weakening,” *Phys.org*, March 4, 2020, https://phys.org/news/2020-03-tropical-forests-carbon-rapidly-weakening.html?utm_source=nwletter&utm_medium=email&utm_campaign=daily-nwletter. Other scientists fear that we may have already reached a tipping point for the Amazon, or at least parts of it. See Luciana Gatti, Luana Basso, Graciela Tejada et al., “Amazonia as a carbon source linked to deforestation and climate change,” *Nature* 595 (2021), 388–393.

39. Katharyn Duffy, Christopher Schwalm, Vickery Arcus, et al., “How Close Are We to the Temperature Tipping Point of the Biosphere?” *Science Advances* 7, no. 1052 (2021): 1–9.

40. Duffy et al., “How Close Are We to the Temperature Tipping Point?” 3.

41. Clive Cookson, “Wildfires in boreal forests release record levels of carbon, satellite study shows,” *Financial Times*, March 2, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/1a24a66d-854a-4c32-859b-b1ef4203e96a>.

42. Louise Farquharson, Vladimir Romanovksy, William Cable, et al., “Climate Change Drives Widespread and Rapid Thermokarst Development in Very Cold Permafrost in the Canadian High Arctic,” *Geophysical Research Letters* 46 (2019): 1–9; Ayesha Tandon, “Exceptional surge in methane emissions from wetlands worries scientists,” *Carbon Brief*, March 20, 2023, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/exceptional-surge-in-methane-emissions-from-wetlands-worries-scientists/>.

43. Mark Lynas, *Our Final Warning: Six Degrees of Climate Emergency* (London: 4th Estate, 2020), 161.

44. Steffen et al., “Trajectories of the Earth System,” 8255.

45. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 10–44.

46. Edward Byers, Matthew Gidden, David Leclere, et al., “Global Exposure and Vulnerability to Multi-Sector Development and Climate Change Hotspots,” *Environmental Research Letters* 13 (2018): 1–14.

47. Quoted in Leslie Hook, Christian Shepherd, and Nastassia Astrasheuskaya, “Extreme Weather Takes Climate Change Models ‘Off the Scale,’” *Financial Times*, July 23, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/9a647a51-ede8-480e-ba78-cbf14ad878b7>.

48. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 117, 142.

49. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 171–174.

50. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, ix; see also Daniel Steel, Tyler DesRoches, and Kian Mintz-Woo, “Climate Change and the Threat to Civilization,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science* 119, no. 42 (2022): 1–4; Luke Kemp, Chi Xu, Joanna Depledge, et al., “Climate Endgame: Exploring Catastrophic Climate Change Scenarios,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 119, no. 34 (2022): 1–9.

51. Helmut Haberl, Dominik Wiedenhofer, Doris Virag, et al., “A Systematic Review of the Evidence on Decoupling of GDP, Resource Use and GHG Emissions, Part II: Synthesizing the Insights,” *Environmental Research Letters* 15 (2020): 1–42.

52. Haberl et al., “A Systematic Review of the Evidence on Decoupling of GDP, Resource Use and GHG Emissions, Part II.”
53. John Asafu-Adaye, Linus Blomqvist, Stewart Brand, et al., “An Ecomodernist Manifesto,” 2019, accessed September 13, 2019, <http://www.ecomodernism.org>.
54. Corinne Le Quere, Jan Korsbakken, Charlie Wilson, et al., “Drivers of Declining CO₂ Emissions in 18 Developed Economies,” *Nature Climate Change* 9 (2019): 213–217; Andrew McAfee, “Why Degrowth Is the Worse Idea on the Planet,” *Wired*, October 6, 2020, <https://www.wired.com/story/opinion-why-degrowth-is-the-worst-idea-on-the-planet/>.
55. Our World in Data, “Energy Intensity,” 2022, accessed January 28, 2023, <https://ourworldindata.org/grapher/energy-intensity>.
56. International Energy Agency (IEA), *Net Zero by 2050: Roadmap for the Global Energy Sector* (Paris: IEA, 2021), 18.
57. Haberl et al., “Systematic Review of the Evidence”; Giorgos Kallis and Jason Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?,” *New Political Economy* 25, no. 4 (2020): 469–486; Timothy Parrique, Jonathan Barth, Francois Briens, et al., *Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and Arguments against Green Growth as Sole Strategy for Sustainability* (Brussels: European Environmental Bureau, 2019); James Ward, Paul Sutton, Adrian Werner, et al., “Is Decoupling GDP Growth from Environmental Impact Possible?” *PLoS ONE* 11, no. 10 (2016): 1–14; Thomas Wiedmann, Hanz Schandl, Manfred Lenzen, et al., “The Material Footprint of Nations,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 112, no. 20 (2015): 6271–6276.
58. Christian Dorninger, Alf Hornborg, David Abson, et al., “Global Patterns of Ecologically Unequal Exchange: Implications for Sustainability in the 21st Century,” *Ecological Economics* 179 (2021): 1–14.
59. Wiedmann et al., “Material Footprint,” 6273.
60. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?,” 473.
61. United Nations Environment Programme, *Assessing Global Resource Use* (Nairobi: UNEP, 2017), 42–45. For discussion, see Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”
62. Direct rebound effects refer to increases in the consumption of a particular product (e.g., cars) when efficiency improvements lead to lower costs; indirect rebound effects refer to increased consumption *elsewhere* when efficiency improvements free up resources that can be allocated in other sectors. See Parrique et al., *Decoupling Debunked*.
63. Paul Brockway, Steve Sorrell, Gregor Semieniuk, et al., “Energy Efficiency and Economy-Wide Rebound Effects: A Review of the Evidence and Its Implications,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 141 (2021): 2.
64. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?” 479–481; Kevin Anderson and Alice Bows, “Beyond ‘Dangerous’ Climate Change: Emission Scenarios for a New World,” *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society* 369, no. 1934 (2012): 23–41.
65. Laurence Delina, *Strategies for Rapid Climate Mitigation: Wartime Mobilization as a Model for Action?* (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2016).

66. IEA, *Net Zero by 2050*, 94.
67. Oxfam, *Tightening the Net: Net Zero Climate Targets—Implications for Land and Food Security* (London: Oxfam, 2021).
68. Oxfam, *Tightening the Net: Net Zero Climate Targets*, 14–15.
69. Vera Heck, Dieter Gerten, Wolfgang Lucht, et al., “Biomass-Based Negative Emissions Difficult to Reconcile with Planetary Boundaries,” *Nature Climate Change* 8 (2018): 151–155.
70. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”; International Energy Agency, “Direct Air Capture: Technology Deep Dive,” *International Energy Agency*, September 2022, <https://www.iea.org/reports/direct-air-capture>.
71. Ryan Hanna, Ahmed Abdulla, Yangyang Xu, et al., “Emergency Deployment of Direct Air Capture as a Response to the Climate Crisis,” *Nature Communications* 12 (2021): 4–5.
72. Hanna et al., “Emergency deployment of direct air capture,” 4.
73. CD Jones et al., “Simulating the Earth System Response to Negative Emissions,” *Environmental Research Letters* 11, no. 9 (2016): 95012.
74. Neil Grant, Adam Hawkes, Shivika Mital, et al., “Confronting Mitigation Deterrence in Low-Carbon Scenarios,” *Environmental Research Letters* 16 (2021): 1–14.
75. Bronson Griscom, Justin Adams, Peter Ellis, et al., “Natural Climate Solutions,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, no. 44 (2017): 11645–11650.
76. Willet et al., “Food Systems”; Crist et al., “Protecting Half.”
77. Matthew Hayek, William Ripple, Helen Harwatt, et al., “The Carbon Opportunity Cost of Animal-Sourced Food Production on Land,” *Nature Sustainability* 4 (2021): 21–24.
78. OECD-FAO, “Agricultural Outlook”; Neil Stephens et al., “Bringing Cultured Meat to Market: Technical, Socio-Political, and Regulatory Challenges in Cellular Agriculture,” *Trends in Food Science & Technology* 78 (2018): 155–156.
79. UNEP, *Assessing Global Resource Use*.
80. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”; Christopher Trisos, Cory Merow, and Alex Pigot, “The Projected Timing of Abrupt Ecological Disruption from Climate Change,” *Nature* 580 (2020): 496–501.
81. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”; UNEP, *Assessing Global Resource Use*; Haberl et al., “Systematic Review.”
82. Wiedmann et al., “Material Footprint”; Parrique et al., *Decoupling Debunked*; Brockway et al., “Energy Efficiency.”
83. Matthew Paterson and Peter Newell, *Climate Capitalism: Global Warming and the Transformation of the Global Economy* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 169–172.
84. Larry Summers, “The Age of Secular Stagnation: What It Is and What to Do About It,” *Foreign Affairs* 95, no. 2 (2016): 2–9. Regarding the ongoing slowdown in

China, see Ruchir Sharma, “China’s economy will not overtake the US until 2060, if ever,” *Financial Times*, October 24, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/cff42bc4-f9e3-4f51-985a-86518934afbe>.

85. Robert Gordon, *The Rise and Fall of American Growth: The U.S. Standard of Living since the Civil War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2016); Tim Jackson, “The Post-Growth Challenge: Secular Stagnation, Inequality, and the Limits to Growth,” *CUSP Working Paper No 12* (2015): 1–5; Brett Christophers, *Rentier Capitalism: Who Owns the Economy, and Who Pays?* (London: Verso, 2020).

86. Immanuel Wallerstein, “Structural Crisis in the World-System,” *Monthly Review Press* 62, no. 10 (2011): 31–39.

87. Martin Wolf, *The Shifts and the Shocks: What We’ve Learned—and Have Still to Learn—About the Financial Crisis* (New York: Penguin Press, 2014), 173.

88. Adam Tooze, *Crashed: How a Decade of Financial Crises Changed the World* (New York: Penguin Books, 2018), 453.

89. Mohammed El-Erian, “Not Just Another Recession: Why the Global Economy May Never Be the Same,” *Foreign Affairs*, November 22, 2022, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/world/not-just-another-recession-global-economy>.

90. Tooze, *Crashed*, 453, 316.

91. Oxfam, *Survival of the Richest: How We Must Tax the Super-Rich Now to Fight Inequality* (London: Oxfam International, 2023); John Bellamy Foster, Jamil Jonna, and Brett Clark, “The Contagion of Capital,” *Monthly Review* 72, no. 8 (2021): 1–17.

92. International Monetary Fund, *World Economic Outlook: Countering the Cost-of-Living Crisis* (Washington, DC: IMF, 2022).

93. Isabella Weber and Evan Wasner, “Sellers’ Inflation, Profits and Conflict: Why can Large Firms Hike Prices in an Emergency?” *University of Massachusetts Amherst Working Paper Series* (2023), 1–51.

94. Weber and Wasner, “Seller’s Inflation”, 1–2; Also see Josh Bivens, “Corporate Profit Have Contributed Disproportionately to Inflation. How Should Policymakers Respond?” *Economic Policy Institute*, April 21, 2022, <https://www.epi.org/blog/corporate-profits-have-contributed-disproportionately-to-inflation-how-should-policymakers-respond/>.

95. International Monetary Fund, *World Economic Outlook: A Rocky Recovery* (Washington D.C.: IMF, 2023), xiv.

96. Nouriel Roubini, *Megathreats: Ten Dangerous Trends That Imperil Our Future, and How to Survive Them* (New York: Little Brown & Company, 2022).

97. Cedric Durand, “The End of Financial Hegemony?” *New Left Review* 138 (2022): 48, 42.

98. World Bank, *Global Economic Prospects*, 53–54; Roubini, *Megathreats*, 104–107; El-Erian, “Not Just Another Recession.”

99. El-Erian, “Not Just Another Recession.”

100. Roubini, *Megathreats*, 86.

101. International Energy Agency (IEA), *World Energy Outlook 2022* (Paris: IEA, 2022), 3.
102. IEA, *World Energy Outlook 2022*, 3.
103. David Sheppard, “Gas Shortages: What Is Driving Europe’s Energy Crisis?,” *Financial Times*, October 10, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/72d0ec90-29e3-4e95-9280-6a4ad6b481a3>.
104. IEA, *World Energy Outlook 2022*, 34–35; The Economist, “The Age of Fossil Fuel Abundance Is Dead,” *The Economist*, October 4, 2021, <https://www.economist.com/finance-and-economics/the-age-of-fossil-fuel-abundance-is-dead/21805253>.
105. Roger Harrabin, “Record Drop in Energy Investment, Warns International Energy Agency,” *BBC News*, May 27, 2020, <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-52812709>.
106. Justin Jacobs, “US Oil Majors Hold Down Spending Despite White House Threats,” *Financial Times*, November 3, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/4192caf1-8626-4131-9777-ceb82860fdb3>.
107. Derek Brower, “Chevron Chief Blames Western Governments for Energy Crunch,” *Financial Times*, October 20, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/83d93bdd-659a-47b3-96bf-40884ef46a09>.
108. IEA, *World Energy Outlook 2022*, 36.
109. Charles Hall, *Energy Return on Investment: A Unifying Principle for Biology, Economics, and Sustainability* (Cham: Springer, 2017).
110. David Murphy and Charles Hall, “Energy Return on Investment, Peak Oil, and the End of Economic Growth,” *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences* 1219 (2011): 52–72.
111. Murphy and Hall, “Energy Return on Investment.”
112. *The Economist*, “Age of Fossil Fuel Abundance Is Dead.”
113. Andrew Jackson and Tim Jackson, “Modelling Energy Transition Risk: The Impact of Declining Energy Return on Investment,” *Ecological Economics* 185 (2021): 1–27.
114. Hall, *Energy Return*, 93; Todd Gillespie, “Energy Costs Set to Reach Record 13% of Global GDP this Year,” *Bloomberg*, March 16, 2022, <https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2022-03-16/energy-costs-set-to-reach-record-13-of-global-gdp-this-year?leadSource=uverify%20wall>.
115. Jackson, “Post-Growth Challenge”; Ahmed, *Failing States*, 27.
116. Paul Brockway, Anne Owen, Lina Brand-Correa, and Lukas Hardt, “Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return-on-Investment for Fossil Fuels with Comparison to Renewable Energy Sources,” *Nature Energy* 4 (2019): 612–621.
117. Jackson and Jackson, “Modelling Energy Transition Risk,” 2.
118. Brockway et al., “Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return-On-Investment.”
119. Brockway et al., “Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return-On-Investment,” 616.
120. Jackson and Jackson, “Modelling Energy Transition Risk.”

121. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 51–52.
122. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 61.
123. British Petroleum (BP), *Energy Outlook 2023 Edition* (London: BP, 2023), 40.
124. See Brockway et al., “Energy Efficiency,” 14.
125. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 61.
126. Smith, “Against ‘Polycrisis.’”
127. Eban Goodstein and Hunter Lovins, “A Pathway to Rapid Global Solar Energy Deployment? Exploring the Solar Dominance Hypothesis,” *Energy Research & Social Science* 56 (2019): 1–6; Kingsmill Bond, Harry Benham, and Ed Vaughan, *The Sky’s the Limit: Solar and Wind Energy Potential Is 100 Times as Much as Global Energy Demand* (London: Carbon Tracker, 2021).
128. IEA, *Renewables 2022: Analysis and Forecast to 2027* (Paris: IEA, 2022).
129. Bond et al., *Sky’s the Limit*.
130. Michael Liebreich, “After Ukraine—The Clean Energy Acceleration,” *BloombergNEF*, September 30, 2022, <https://about.bnef.com/blog/after-ukraine-the-great-clean-energy-acceleration/>.
131. Richard Heinberg and David Fridley, *Our Renewable Future: Laying the Path for One Hundred Percent Clean Energy* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2016); Inigo Capellán-Peréz, Carlos de Castro, and Luiz Gonzalez, “Dynamic Energy Return on Energy Investment (EROI) and Material Requirements in Scenarios of Global Transition to Renewable Energies,” *Energy Strategy Reviews* 26 (2019): 1–26; Vaclav Smil, *How the World Really Works: A Scientist’s Guide to Our Past, Present, and Future* (New York: Penguin Books, 2022); Christopher Clack, Staffan Qvist, Jay Apt, et al., “Evaluation of a Proposal for Reliable Low-Cost Grid Power with 100% Wind, Water, and Solar,” *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 114, no. 26 (2016): 6722–6725.
132. Jorg Friedrichs, *The Future Is Not What It Used to Be: Climate Change and Energy Scarcity* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2013).
133. See discussion in Michael Albert, “The Global Politics of the Renewable Energy Transition and the Non-Substitutability Hypothesis: Towards a ‘Great Transformation?’” *Review of International Political Economy* 29, no. 5 (2022): 1766–1781.
134. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 61.
135. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 163–164.
136. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 99.
137. Brett Christophers, “Fossilised Capital: Price and Profit in the Energy Transition,” *New Political Economy* 27, no. 1 (2021): 146–159.
138. Christophers, “Fossilised Capital,” 2.
139. Mekala Krishnan, Hamid Samandari, Jonathan Woetzel, et al., *The Net-Zero Transition: What It Would Cost, What It Could Bring* (New York: McKinsey Global Institute, 2022), 20.
140. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 23.

141. Maria Sharmina, Oreane Y. Edelenbosch, Charlie Wilson, et al., “Decarbonizing the Critical Sectors of Aviation, Shipping, Road Freight and Industry to Limit Warming to 1.5–2C,” *Climate Policy* 21, no. 4 (2021): 455–474.
142. IEA, *Net Zero by 2050*, 96–97.
143. Adrian Odenweller, Falko Ueckerdt, Gregory Nemet, et al., “Probabilistic Feasibility Space of Scaling Up Green Hydrogen,” *Nature Energy* 7 (2023): 854–865.
144. Odenweller et al., “Probabilistic Feasibility Space of Scaling Up Green Hydrogen,” 861.
145. Quoted in Nathalie Thomas, David Sheppard, and Neil Hume, “The Race to Scale Up Green Hydrogen,” *Financial Times*, March 7, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/7eac54ee-f1d1-4ebc-9573-b52f87d00240?desktop=true&segmentId=d8d3e364-5197-20eb-17cf-2437841d178a#myft:notification:instant-email:content>.
146. Smil, *How the World Really Works*, 5.
147. IEA, *The Role of Critical Metals in Clean Energy Transitions* (Paris: IEA, 2022), 8–9.
148. Christos Zografos and Paul Robbins, “Green Sacrifice Zones, or Why Green New Deals Cannot Ignore the Cost Shifts of Just Transitions,” *One Earth* 3 (2020): 543–547.
149. IEA, *Role of Critical Metals in Clean Energy Transitions*, 11.
150. IEA, *Role of Critical Metals in Clean Energy Transitions*, 129.
151. IEA, *Role of Critical Metals in Clean Energy Transitions*.
152. Greg Calloway, Cherry Ding, Tim Fitzgibbon, et al., “Could Supply-Chain Issues Derail the Energy Transition?” *McKinsey and Company*, December 5, 2022, <https://www.mckinsey.com/industries/oil-and-gas/our-insights/could-supply-chain-issues-derail-the-energy-transition>.
153. Smil, *How the World Really Works*.
154. Eric Larson, Chris Geig, Jesse Jenkins, et al., *Net Zero America: Potential Pathways, Infrastructure, and Impacts, Final Report Summary* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University, 2021), 56.
155. Quoted in Andreas Malm, and The Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel: On the Danger of Fossil Fascism* (London: Verso, 2021), 86.
156. Nichola Groom, “Special Report: US Solar Expansion Stalled by Rural Land-Use Protests,” *Reuters*, April 7, 2022, <https://www.reuters.com/world/us/us-solar-expansion-stalled-by-rural-land-use-protests-2022-04-07/>.
157. Adam Tooze, “Europe’s Decarbonization Challenge,” *Social Europe*, March 22, 2021, <https://www.socialeurope.eu/europes-decarbonisation-challenge-wir-schaffen-das>.
158. Kate Abnett, “EU Plans One-Year Renewable Energy Permits for Faster Green Shift,” *Reuters*, May 9, 2022, <https://www.reuters.com/business/sustainable-business/eu-plans-one-year-renewable-energy-permits-faster-green-shift-2022-05-09/>.
159. Brockway et al., “Final Stage Energy Return.”

160. David Murphy, Marco Raugéi, Michael Carbakales-Dale, et al., “Energy Return on Investment of Major Energy Carriers: Review and Harmonization,” *Sustainability* 14 (2022): 1–20.
161. Carlos de Castro and Inigo Capellán-Peréz, “Standard, Point of Use, and Extended Energy Return on Energy Invested,” *Energies* 13 (2020): 1–42.
162. de Castro and Capellán-Peréz, “Standard, Point of Use, and Extended Energy Return,” 10–11. Also discussed in Albert, “The Global Politics of the Renewable Energy Transition.”
163. Capellán-Peréz et al., “Dynamic Energy Return.”
164. Capellán-Peréz et al., “Dynamic Energy Return.”
165. Isabel Schnabel, “A New Age of Energy Inflation: Climateflation, Fossilflation and Greenflation,” *Speech at The ECB and Its Watchers XXII Conference*, March 17, 2022, https://www.ecb.europa.eu/press/key/date/2022/html/ecb.sp220317_2-dbb3582f0a.en.html.
166. Capellán-Peréz et al., “Dynamic Energy Return”; Jackson and Jackson, “Modeling Energy Transition Risk”; Lewis King and Jeroen C. J. M. van den Bergh, “Implications of Net Energy-Return-On-Investment for a Low-Carbon Energy Transition,” *Nature Energy* 3 (2018): 334–340; Ruchir Sharma, “‘Greenflation’ Threatens to Derail Climate Change Action,” *Financial Times*, August 1, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/49c19d8f-c3c3-4450-b869-50c7126076ee>; Alojisa Slamersak, Giorgos Kallis, and Daniel O’Neill, “Energy Requirements and Carbon Emissions for a Low-Carbon Energy Transition,” *Nature Communications* 13, no. 6932 (2022): 1–15.
167. King and van den Bergh, “Implications of Net Energy”; Louis Delannoy, Pierre-Yves Longaretti, David Murphy, et al., “Peak Oil and the Low-Carbon Energy Transition: A Net Energy Perspective,” *Applied Energy* 304 (2021): 1–17.
168. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 116–117.
169. Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO), *The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World* (Rome: FAO, 2022).
170. Emiko Terazono and Valentina Romei, “War and Adverse Weather Set to Keep Food Prices High,” *Financial Times*, December 4, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/8fa961a0-1d21-45f6-b15e-3fdc8e16c093>.
171. FAO, *State of Food Security*, xv.
172. Hannah Ritche, “How Much of Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions Come from Food?” *Our World in Data*, 2021, accessed February 20, 2022, <https://ourworldindata.org/greenhouse-gas-emissions-food>.
173. John Foley, “Can We Feed the World and Sustain the Plant?,” *Scientific American*, November 2011, https://web.mit.edu/12.000/www/m2019/pdfs/Foley_2011_ScientificAmerican.pdf.
174. Jason Rohr, Christopher B. Barrett, David J. Civitello, et al., “Emerging Human Infectious Disease and the Links to Global Food Production,” *Nature Sustainability* 2 (2019): 445–456.

175. Rob Wallace, *Big Farms Make Big Flu* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2016).
176. Lester Brown, *Full Planet, Empty Plates: The New Geopolitics of Food Scarcity* (Washington, DC: Earth Policy Institute, 2012); FAO, *The Future of Food and Agriculture: Alternative Pathways to 2050* (Rome: FAO, 2018).
177. Brown, *Full Planet*, 60.
178. FAO, *Future of Food*, 27.
179. Haroon Akram-Lodhi, “The Ties That Bind? Agroecology and the Agrarian Question in the Twenty-First Century,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 48, no. 4 (2021): 693.
180. Philip McMichael, *Food Regimes and Agrarian Questions: Agrarian Change & Peasant Studies* (Halifax: Fernwood Publishing, 2013).
181. IPCC, “Global Warming of 1.5 C,” 236.
182. FAO, *Future of Food*.
183. IPCC, “Global Warming of 1.5 C,” 237.
184. Curtis Deutsch, Joshua Tewksbury, Michelle Tigchelaar, et al., “Increase in Crop Losses to Insects in a Warming Climate,” *Science* 361, no. 6405 (2018): 916–919.
185. John Lienhard, Madramootoo Chandrea, Moniar Erwan, et al., “Climate Change, Agriculture, Water, and Food Security: What We Know, and What We Don’t Know,” Report of a workshop conducted at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, May 8–9, 2018, https://jwafs.mit.edu/sites/default/files/imce/publications/Climat_Ag_Report_New.pdf.
186. Monica Caparas, Zachary Zobel, Andrea Castanho, et al., “Increasing Risks of Crop Failure and Water Scarcity in Global Breadbaskets by 2030,” *Environmental Research Letters* 16 (2021): 1–13.
187. Anthony Janetos, Christopher Justice, Molly Jahn, et al., *The Risk of Multiple Breadbasket Failures in the 21st Century: A Science Research Agenda* (Boston: Boston University/Pardee Center Research Report, 2017), 5.
188. Caparas et al., “Increasing Risks of Crop Failure.”
189. Caparas et al., “Increasing Risks of Crop Failure.”
190. Akram-Lodhi, “The Ties That Bind”; Ian Scoones, Rebecca Smalley, Ruth Hall, et al., “Narratives of Scarcity: Framing the Global Land Rush,” *Geoforum* 101 (2019): 231–241; Marcus Taylor, “Climate-Smart Agriculture: What Is It Food For?” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 45, no. 1 (2018): 89–107.
191. Klaus Schwab, *The Fourth Industrial Revolution* (New York: Currency, 2017), 1.
192. William Robinson, “Global Capitalism Post-Pandemic,” *Race & Class* 62, no. 2 (2020): 3–13.
193. Peter Dauvergne, *AI in the Wild: Sustainability in the Age of Artificial Intelligence* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2020); Gavin Bade, “‘A Sea Change’: Biden Reverses Decades of Chinese Trade Policy,” *Politico*, December 26, 2022, <https://www.politico.com/news/2022/12/26/china-trade-tech-00072232>.

194. I expand on this point in Michael Albert, “The Dangers of Decoupling: Earth System Crisis and the ‘Fourth Industrial Revolution,’” *Global Policy* 11, no. 2 (2020): 245–254.
195. Kate Crawford, *Atlas of AI: Power, Politics, and the Planetary Costs of Artificial Intelligence* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2021), 42.
196. E. G. Mohamed Kande and Murat Sonmez, “Don’t Fear AI: It Will Lead to Long-Term Job Growth,” *World Economic Forum*, October 26, 2020, <https://www.weforum.org/agenda/2020/10/dont-fear-ai-it-will-lead-to-long-term-job-growth/>.
197. Daniel Susskind, *A World without Work: Technology, Automation, and How We Should Respond* (New York: Metropolitan Books, 2020), 4.
198. Kai-Fu Lee, *AI Superpowers: China, Silicon Valley, and the New World Order* (Boston: HM Harcourt, 2018), 164.
199. Cornelia Daheim and Ole Wintermann, “2050: The Future of Work,” *Bertelsmann Stiftung*, 2016, accessed January 28, 2023, https://www.bertelsmann-stiftung.de/fileadmin/files/BSt/Publikationen/GrauePublikationen/BST_Delphi_E_03lay.pdf.
200. Susskind, *World without Work*, 127–129.
201. Lee, *AI Superpowers*, 20–21.
202. Dyer-Witheford et al., *Inhuman Power*.
203. Daniel Deudney, *Bounding Power: Republican Security from the Polis to the Global Village* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).
204. Deudney, *Bounding Power*; see also Gabriella Blum and Benjamin Wittes, *The Future of Violence: Robots and Germs, Hackers and Drones: Confronting a New Age of Threat* (New York: Basic Books, 2015); Audrey Cronin, *Power to the People: How Open Technological Innovation Is Arming Tomorrow’s Terrorists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press); Albert, “Dangers of Decoupling.”
205. Kolja Brockman, Sibylle Bauer, and Vincent Boulanin, *Bio Plus X: Arms Control and the Convergence of Biology and Emerging Technologies* (Stockholm: Stockholm International Peace Research Institute, 2019).
206. Amy Webb and Andrew Hessel, *The Genesis Machine: Our Quest to Rewrite Life in the Age of Synthetic Biology* (New York: Public Affairs, 2022), 92.
207. National Academies of Sciences, *A Proposed Framework for Identifying Potential Biodefense Vulnerabilities Posed by Synthetic Biology: Interim Report* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2017), 7–8.
208. National Academies of Sciences, *A Proposed Framework*.
209. Jesse Kirkpatrick, Gregory Koblentz, Megan Palmer, et al., *Editing Biosecurity: Needs and Strategies for Governing Genome Editing* (Fairfax, VA: George Mason University, 2018), 54.
210. Filippa Lentzos, “Ignore Bill Gates: Where Bioweapons Focus Really Belongs,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists*, July 3, 2017, <https://thebulletin.org/2017/07/ignore-bill-gates-where-bioweapons-focus-really-belongs/>.

211. NAS, *Biodefense in the Age of Synthetic Biology* (Washington, DC: The National Academies Press, 2018), 18–19.
212. Gaymon Bennett, Nils Gilman, Anthony Stavrianakis, et al., “From Synthetic Biology to Biohacking: Are We Prepared?” *Nature Biotechnology* 27, no. 12 (2009): 1110.
213. Statista, “Internet of Things (IOT) and Non-IOT Active Device Connections Worldwide from 2010 to 2025,” *Statista*, September 6, 2020, <https://www.statista.com/statistics/1101442/iot-number-of-connected-devices-worldwide/>.
214. Seyom Brown, “The New Nuclear MADness,” *Survival* 62, no. 1 (2020): 63–88; James Johnson, “Artificial Intelligence: A Threat to Strategic Stability,” *Strategic Studies Quarterly* 14, no. 1 (2020): 16–40.
215. Cronin, *Power to the People*, 211–222.
216. Trevor Johnston, Troy Smith, and Luke Irwin, *Additive Manufacturing in 2040: Powerful Enabler, Disruptive Threat* (Los Angeles: RAND Corporation, 2018), 2.
217. Albert, “Dangers of Decoupling.”
218. Steven Feldstein, *The Global Expansion of AI Surveillance* (Washington, DC: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 2019); Darren Byler, *In the Camps: China’s High-Tech Penal Colony* (New York: Columbia Global Reports, 2021).
219. Crawford, *Atlas of AI*, 153.
220. Will Douglas Heaven, “Predictive Policing Algorithms Are Racist. They Need to Be Dismantled,” *MIT Technology Review*, July 1, 2020, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2020/07/17/1005396/predictive-policing-algorithms-racist-dismantled-machine-learning-bias-criminal-justice/>.
221. Heaven, “Predictive Policing Algorithms Are Racist.”
222. Byler, *In the Camps*, 31–34, 55–56.
223. Feldstein, *Global Expansion of AI*; Shoshana Zuboff, *The Age of Surveillance Capitalism: The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power* (New York: Public Affairs Books, 2019); Ronald Deibert, *Reset: Reclaiming the Internet for Civil Society* (Toronto: House of Anansi Press, 2020); Catherine Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020).
224. Luke Kemp, Laura Adam, Christian Boehm, et al., “Bioengineering Horizon Scan 2020,” *eLife*, May 29, 2020, <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC7259952/>.
225. Matthew Adams, *Ecological Crisis, Sustainability and the Psychosocial Subject: Beyond Behavior Change* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
226. Anne Case and Angus Deaton, *Deaths of Despair and the Future of Capitalism* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020), 40; Marina Marcus, M. Taghi Yasamy, Mark van Ommeren, et al., *Depression: A Global Crisis* (Geneva: World Health Organization, 2012).
227. Ruth Wodak, *The Politics of Fear: What Right-Wing Populist Discourses Mean* (London: Sage Publications).

228. Michael Kimmel, "Globalization and Its Mal(e)contents: The Gendered Moral and Political Economy of Terrorism," *International Sociology* 18, no. 3 (2003): 603–620.
229. Cara Daggett, "Petro-Masculinity: Fossil Fuels and Authoritarian Desire," *Milennium: Journal of International Studies* 47, no. 1 (2018): 25–44.
230. Wodak, *Politics of Fear*, 2.
231. Wodak, *Politics of Fear*, 35–36.
232. Sophia Siddiqui, "Racing the Nation: Towards a Theory of Reproductive Racism," *Race & Class* 63, no. 2 (2021): 3–20.
233. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 171–175.
234. Albenaz Azmanova, *Capitalism on Edge: How Fighting Precarity Can Achieve Radical Change without Crisis or Utopia* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2020), 177.
235. Robert Paxton, *The Anatomy of Fascism* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2004), 218.
236. Paxton, *Anatomy of Fascism*, 41.
237. David Neiwert, *Alt-America: The Rise of the Radical Right in the Age of Trump* (Verso: London, 2017).
238. Angelos Varvarousis, "Crisis, Liminality and the Decolonization of the Imaginary," *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* 2, no. 3 (2019): 493–512.
239. Azmanova, *Capitalism on Edge*.

CHAPTER 2

1. Colonomos, *Selling the Future*, 9.
2. Bell, *Foundations of Futures Studies*, 182, 73.
3. Silke Beck and Martin Mahony, "The IPCC and the Politics of Anticipation," *Nature Climate Change* 7 (2017): 312; see also Becker, *Imagined Futures*.
4. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*.
5. Manuel Delanda, *Philosophy and Simulation: The Emergence of Synthetic Reason* (London: Continuum, 2011), 35.
6. Donella Meadows, Dennis Meadows, and Jurgen Randers, *The Limits to Growth: The Thirty Year Update* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2004), 3–4.
7. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 102.
8. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 89.
9. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 124–125.
10. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 126–127.
11. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 132–133.
12. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*, 160–163.
13. See discussion in Kerryn Higgs, *Collision Course: Infinite Growth on a Finite Planet* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2014), 258–261.
14. Meadows et al., *Thirty Year Update*, 51.

15. Tim Jackson and Robin Webster, "Limits Revisited: A Review of the Limits to Growth Debate," *All-Party Parliamentary Group on Limits to Growth*, 2016, accessed January 28, 2023, <http://limits2growth.org.uk/revisited/>.
16. Jackson and Webster, "Limits Revisited"; Gaya Herrington, "Update to Limits to Growth: Comparing the World3 Model with Empirical Data," *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 25, no. 3 (2021): 614–626.
17. Lisette van Beek, Maarten Hajer, Peter Pelzer, et al., "Anticipating Futures through Models: The Rise of Integrated Assessment Modelling in the Climate Science-Policy Interface since 1970," *Global Environmental Change* 65 (2020): 1–14; William Nordhaus, "Projections and Uncertainties about Climate Change in an Era of Minimal Climate Policies," *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 10, no. 3 (2018): 333–360.
18. Steve Keen, "The Appallingly Bad Neoclassical Economics of Climate Change," *Globalizations* 18, no. 7 (2021): 1149–1177.
19. IPCC, *Global Warming of 1.5C*, 100.
20. Beck and Mahony, "IPCC and Politics."
21. Brian O'Neill, Timothy R. Carter, Kristie Ebi, et al., "Achievements and Needs for the Climate Change Scenario Framework," *Nature Climate Change* 10 (2020): 1074–1084.
22. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways."
23. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways," 158–159.
24. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways."
25. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways."
26. O'Neill et al., "Roads Ahead," 173–174.
27. O'Neill et al., "Roads Ahead," 174.
28. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways," 158–159.
29. Riahi et al., "Shared Socioeconomic Pathways," 155.
30. Inigo Capellán-Peréz, Ignacio de Blas, Jaime Nieto, et al., "MEDEAS: A New Modeling Framework Integrating Global Biophysical and Socioeconomic Constraints," *Royal Society of Chemistry* 13 (2020): 1000–1001.
31. Capellán-Peréz et al., "MEDEAS."
32. IPCC, *Global Warming of 1.5C*, 108–109.
33. Patrick McCully, Lara Cuvelier, Alix Mazounie, et al., "It's not What You Say, It's What You Do: Making the Finance Sector's Net Zero Alliances Work for the Climate," *Reclaim Finance*, November 2021, https://reclaimfinance.org/site/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/FINAL_GFANZ_Report_02_11_21.pdf.
34. Lukas Braunreiter, Lisette van Beek, Maarten Hajer, et al., "Transformative Pathways—Using Integrated Assessment Models More Effectively to Open Up Plausible and Desirable Low-Carbon Futures," *Energy Research & Social Science* 80 (2021): 3.
35. Capellán-Peréz et al., "MEDEAS."

36. Capellán-Peréz et al., “MEDEAS.”
37. Capellán-Peréz et al., “MEDEAS”; Keen, “Appallingly Bad Neoclassical Economics.”
38. Braunreiter et al., “Transformative Pathways.”
39. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, xii.
40. Patrick Bolton, Morgan Despres, and Luis Da Silva, *The Green Swan: Central Banking and Financial Stability in the Age of Climate Change* (Basel: Bank of International Settlements, 2020), 10.
41. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*, 23.
42. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*, 26–29.
43. Bell, *Foundations of Futures Studies*, 32.
44. Shell, “40 Years of Shell Scenarios,” 2013, accessed June 7, 2023, https://www.shell.com/energy-and-innovation/the-energy-future/scenarios/what-are-the-previous-shell-scenarios/new-lenses-on-the-future/earlier-scenarios/_jcr_content/root/main/section_2095191679/promo/links/item0.stream/1652289755448/a0e75f042fee5322b72780ee36e5ba17c35a4fc6/shell-scenarios-40yearsbook080213.pdf.
45. K. Campbell, J. Gullledge, J. R. McNeill, et al., *The Age of Consequences: The Foreign Policy and National Security Implications of Global Climate Change* (Washington, DC: Center for a New American Security, 2007), 6.
46. NIC (National Intelligence Council), *Global Trends 2040: A More Contested World* (Washington, DC: National Intelligence Council, 2022), v.
47. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, v–vi.
48. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 110.
49. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 111.
50. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 113.
51. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 114–115.
52. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 116.
53. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*.
54. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 118.
55. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 119.
56. For example, Alexander Cooley and Daniel Nexon, *Exit from Hegemony: The Unravelling of the American Global Order* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2020).
57. Quoted in Patrick O’Neill, “Meet the NSA Spies Shaping the Future,” *MIT Technology Review*, February 1, 2022, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/02/01/1044561/meet-the-nsa-spies-shaping-the-future/>.
58. Colonomos, *Selling the Future*, 50.
59. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 111.
60. Thomas Ansell and Steve Cayzer, “Limits to Growth Redux: A System Dynamics Model for Assessing Energy and Climate Change Constraints to Global Growth,” *Energy Policy* 120 (2018): 514–525.

61. Anna Zalik, "Oil 'Futures': Shell's Scenarios and the Social Constitution of the Global Oil Market," *Geoforum* 41 (2010): 553–564.
62. Nafeez Ahmed, Ben Hayes, and Nick Buxton, "A Permanent State of Emergency: Civil Contingencies, Risk Management and Human Rights," in *The Secure and the Dispossessed: How the Military and Corporations Are Shaping a Climate-Changed World*, ed. Buxton and Hayes (London: Pluto Press, 2015), 87–110.
63. Azmanova, *Capitalism on Edge*, 37.
64. For example, Robert Cox, "Social Forces, States and World Orders: Beyond International Relations Theory," *Millennium: Journal of International Studies* 10, no. 2 (1982): 126–155.
65. Urry, *What Is the Future*, 3–4.
66. Wallerstein, "Structural Crisis," 37.
67. Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis*, 87–88.
68. Wolfgang Streeck, *How Will Capitalism End? Essays on a Failing System* (London: Verso, 2017), 13–14.
69. Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions*, 220.
70. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 130, 134.
71. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 133.
72. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 151.
73. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 125.
74. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 148.
75. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 30.
76. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 31.
77. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 151–152.
78. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 38–39.
79. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 44–45.
80. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 176.
81. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 30.
82. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 25–26.
83. For example, Murphy and Hall, "Energy Return"; Ahmed, "Failing States."
84. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 6.
85. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 194.
86. van Vuuren et al., "Scenarios in Global Environmental Assessments."
87. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 23.
88. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 26.
89. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 42–43.
90. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 27.

91. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 49.
92. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 73.
93. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 74.
94. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 84.
95. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 101–104.
96. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 29.
97. Newell and Paterson, *Climate Capitalism*; Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*; Peter Frase, *Four Futures: Life After Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2016); Heikki Patomaki, *The Political Economy of Global Security* (London: Routledge, 2008); Holly Jean Buck, *After Geoengineering: Climate Tragedy, Repair, and Restoration* (London: Verso, 2018).

CHAPTER 3

1. Bell, *Foundations of Futures Studies*, 81.
2. Quoted in Brondizio et al., “Re-Conceptualizing the Anthropocene,” 322.
3. Quoted in Flaherty, *Complexity and Resilience*, 3.
4. Flaherty, *Complexity and Resilience*; Swilling, *Age of Sustainability*; Scheffer, *Critical Transitions*; Prigogine and Stengers, *Order Out of Chaos*; Delanda, *Intensive Science*; Williams, *Political Hegemony*; Cudworth and Hobden, *Posthuman International Relations*.
5. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 45.
6. Cudworth and Hobden, *Posthuman International Relations*.
7. Delanda, *Intensive Science*, 5.
8. Meadows et al., *Limits to Growth*.
9. Delanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 119–120.
10. Delanda, *Assemblage Theory*, 120.
11. Steven Bernstein and Matthew Hoffman, “Climate politics, metaphors and the fractal carbon trap,” *Nature Climate Change* 9 (2019), 919.
12. Scheffer, *Critical Transitions*.
13. Albert, “COVID-19 and Planetary Crisis.”
14. Wallerstein, “Structural Crisis”; Williams, *Political Hegemony*, 138.
15. Levi Bryant, *Onto-Cartography: An Ontology of Machines and Media* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2014).
16. Williams, *Political Hegemony*, 58–59. See also Albert, “COVID-19 and Planetary Crisis.”
17. Williams, *Political Hegemony*.
18. Byrne and Callaghan, *Complexity Theory*, 45.
19. Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis*, 24.
20. Jessop, *State Power*, 31.
21. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 126.

22. Andreas Malm, *How to Blow Up a Pipeline* (London: Verso, 2021), 68.
23. Wallerstein, *World-Systems Analysis*.
24. Dorninger et al., “Ecologically Unequal Exchange”; Jason Hickel, Christian Dorninger, Hanspeter Wieland, et al., “Imperialist Appropriation in the World Economy: Drain from the Global South through Unequal Exchange, 1990–2015,” *Global Environmental Change* 73 (2022): 1–13.
25. Alf Hornborg, “Zero-Sum World: Challenges in Conceptualizing Environmental Load Displacement and Ecologically Unequal Exchange in the World-System,” *International Journal of Comparative Sociology* 50, nos. 3–4 (2009): 237–262; Robert Biel, *The Entropy of Capitalism* (Boston: Brill, 2012); Moore, *Capitalism in the Web of Life*.
26. Christopher Chase-Dunn and Thomas Hall, *Rise and Demise: Comparing World-Systems* (London: Routledge, 1997).
27. Neil Smith, *Uneven Development: Nature, Capital, and the Production of Space* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008), 6–7.
28. Bob Jessop, *The Capitalist State: Marxist Theories and Methods* (Oxford: Martin Robertson, 1982), 168.
29. Robyn Eckersley, *The Green State: Rethinking Democracy and Sovereignty* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004).
30. Jessop, *State Power*.
31. Bryant, *Onto-Cartography*, 265.
32. Morin, *Homeland Earth*, 131.
33. The distinction between the socioecological, violence, and existential problematics is inspired in part by the work of Kojin Karatani, who identifies three primary “modes of exchange” that structure world history: economic exchange, the exchange of protection, and the exchange of community/belonging. It is also influenced by Michael Mann’s work on the sources of social power—particularly economic, military, and ideological power. See Kojin Karatani, *The Structure of World History: From Modes of Production to Modes of Exchange* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2015); Michael Mann, *The Sources of Social Power: Volume 4: Globalizations, 1945–2011* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2013).
34. Karatani, *Structure of World History*, 224.
35. Fraser and Jaeggi, *Capitalism*.
36. Homer-Dixon et al., “Synchronous Failure.”
37. Williams, *Political Hegemony*, 152.
38. Wallerstein, *Modern World-System*; Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*.
39. Beverly Silver and Corey Payne, “Crises of World Hegemony and the Speeding Up of Social History,” in *Hegemony in World Politics: Reimagining Power in Global Politics*, ed. Jan Aart Scholte and Tom Casier (Abingdon, UK: Routledge, 2020), 18.
40. Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*, 1.
41. Jairus Banaji, *Theory as History: Essays on Modes of Production and Exploitation* (Chicago: Brill, 2010).

42. Malm, *Fossil Capital*.
43. Elliot Diringer and Bob Perciasepe, "The Climate Awakening of Global Capital," *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 76, no. 5 (2020) 233–237.
44. Reclaim Finance, "Throwing Fuel on the Fire: GFANZ Members Provide Billions in Finance for Fossil Fuel Expansion," *Reclaim Finance*, January 17, 2023, <https://reclaimfinance.org/site/en/2023/01/17/throwing-fuel-on-the-fire-gfanz-members-provide-billions-in-finance-for-fossil-fuel-expansion/>.
45. K. Surprise and J. P. Sapinski, "Whose Climate Intervention? Solar Geoengineering, Fractions of Capital, and Hegemonic Strategy," *Capital & Class* (2022): 10–11, <https://doi.org/10.1177/03098168221114386>. Emphasis original.
46. Srnicek and Williams, *Inventing the Future*; Frase, *Four Futures*; Matthew Huber, "Ecosocialism: Dystopian and Scientific," *Socialist Forum*, 2019, accessed November 28, 2022, <https://socialistforum.dsausa.org/issues/winter-2019/ecosocialism-dystopian-and-scientific/>.
47. Jason Hickel, *Less Is More: How Degrowth Will Save the World* (London: Windmill, 2020); Giorgos Kallis, Susan Paulson, Giacomo D'Alisa, et al., *The Case for Degrowth* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 2020), Max Ajl, *A People's Green New Deal* (London: Pluto Press, 2021); Arturo Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics: The Real and the Possible* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2020).
48. Huber, "Ecosocialism: Dystopian and Scientific."
49. Keith Krause and Michael Williams, eds., *Critical Security Studies: Concepts and Cases* (London: University College London Press, 1997); Deudney, *Bounding Power*.
50. For example, Thomas Szayna, Angela O'Mahony, Jennifer Kavanagh, et al., *Conflict Trends and Conflict Drivers: An Empirical Assessment of Historical Conflict Patterns and Future Conflict Projections* (Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation, 2017).
51. Willem de Haan, "Violence as an Essentially Contested Concept," in *Violence in Europe*, ed. Sophie Body-Gendrot and Pieter Spierenburg (Cham: Springer, 2009), 28.
52. Michael Williams, "Global Security Assemblages," in *Routledge Handbook of Private Security Studies*, ed. Rita Abrahamsen and Anna Leander (London: Routledge, 2016), 131–132.
53. The quote is from Mark Neocleous, *War Power, Police Power* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012), 12; emphasis original. See also Caroline Holmqvist, Jan Bachman, Colleen Bell, et al., "Assemblages of War: Police: An Introduction," in *War, Police and Assemblages of Intervention*, ed. Jan Bachman, Colleen Bell, and Caroline Holmqvist (London: Routledge, 2015), 1–14.
54. Didier Bigo, "Internal and External Aspects of Security," *European Security* 15, no. 4 (2006): 385–404.
55. Giuseppe Zappala, "Killing by Metadata: Europe and the Surveillance-Targeted Killing Nexus," *Global Affairs* 1, no. 3 (2015): 251–258.
56. Williams, "Global Security Assemblages"; Crawford, *Atlas of AI*.

57. Williams, "Global Security Assemblages."
58. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*, 19.
59. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*, 120.
60. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*, 120–121.
61. William Robinson, *The Global Police State* (London: Pluto Press, 2020), 3.
62. Robinson, *Global Police State*, 72.
63. Andreas Bieler and Adam Morton, *Global Capitalism, Global War, Global Crisis* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2018), 194.
64. Bob Jessop, *State Theory: Putting the Capitalist State in Its Place* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1990).
65. Bigo, "Internal and External."
66. Peter Phillips, *Giants: The Global Power Elite* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2018), 91.
67. Jessop, *State Theory*, 336.
68. George Rigakos, *Security/Capital: A General Theory of Pacification* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016), 99.
69. Angela Davis, *Are Prisons Obsolete?* (New York: Seven Stories Press, 2003); Ruth Gilmore Wilson, *Abolition Geography: Essays Towards Liberation* (London: Verso, 2022).
70. Adam Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance to British Policing* (Manchester, UK: Manchester University Press, 2021), 5.
71. Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance to British Policing*, 141; see also Movement 4 Black Lives (M4BL), "2020 Policy Platform," 2021, accessed December 4, 2021, <https://m4bl.org/policy-platforms/>.
72. Arun Kundnani, "Abolish National Security," *Transnational Institute*, May 2021, <https://longreads.tni.org/stateofpower/abolish-national-security>.
73. Rigakos, *Security/Capital*, 121–122.
74. Stephen Wertheim, "Responses to Aziz Rana," *Dissent Magazine*, Summer 2022, <https://www.dissentmagazine.org/article/responses-to-aziz-rana>.
75. The Economist, "As Violent Crime Leaps, Liberal Cities Rethink Cutting Police Budgets," *The Economist*, January 15, 2022, <https://www.economist.com/united-states/2022/01/15/as-violent-crime-leaps-liberal-cities-rethink-cutting-police-budgets>.
76. Mann, *Sources of Social Power*, 1–2.
77. Williams, *Political Hegemony*, 165–166.
78. Althusser, *On the Reproduction*.
79. Thomas Homer-Dixon, Jonathan Leader Maynard, Matto Mildemberger, et al., "A Complex Systems Approach to the Study of Ideology: Cognitive-Affective Structures and the Dynamics of Belief Systems," *Journal of Social and Political Psychology* 1, no. 1 (2013): 337–363.

80. Ashley Bohrer, *Marxism and Intersectionality: Race, Gender, Class and Sexuality under Contemporary Capitalism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2019), 247.
81. Anievas and Nisancioglu, *How the West*, 123; see also Barry Buzan and George Lawson, *The Global Transformation: History, Modernity, and the Making of International Relations* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2015).
82. Cedric Robinson, *Black Marxism: The Making of the Black Radical Tradition* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2000).
83. Sylvia Wynter, “Unsettling the Coloniality of Being/Power/Truth/Freedom: Towards the Human, After Man, Its Overrepresentation—An Argument,” *New Centennial Review* 3, no. 3 (2003): 257–337; Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*; Arrihi, *Long Twentieth Century*.
84. Wynter, “Unsettling the Coloniality”; Buzan and Lawson, *Global Transformation*.
85. Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*.
86. Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*; Audra Mitchell and Aadita Chaudhury, “Worlding beyond ‘the’ ‘End’ of ‘the World’: White Apocalyptic Visions and BIPOC Futurisms,” *International Relations* 34, no. 3 (2020): 309–332.
87. Protevi and Bonta, *Deleuze and Geophilosophy*.
88. Srnicek and Williams, *Inventing the Future*, 14.
89. Bryant, *Onto-Cartography*, 259–266.
90. Patomaki, *Political Economy of Global Security*, 4.
91. Kathryn Yusoff and Jennifer Gabrys, “Climate Change and the Imagination,” *WILEY Climate Change* 2, no. 4 (2011): 519.
92. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 134.
93. Swilling, *Age of Sustainability*; Flaherty, *Complexity and Resilience*.

CHAPTER 4

1. Homer-Dixon et al, “What Is a Polycrisis?”
2. Wallerstein, *Modern World-System*, 10.
3. Wunderling et al., “Interacting Tipping Elements.”
4. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 161; Steffen et al., “Trajectories of the Earth”; Lenton et al., “Climate Tipping Points”; Duffy et al., “How Close to the Temperature Tipping Point.”
5. Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
6. Trisos et al., “Projected Timing of Abrupt Ecological Disruption.”
7. UNEP, *Preventing the Next Pandemic*; Colin Carlson, Gregory Albery, Cory Merow, et al., “Climate Change Increases Cross-Species Viral Transmission Risk,” *Nature* 607 (2022): 555–562.
8. Morens and Fauci, “Emerging Pandemic Diseases.”

9. IPCC, *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation of Climate Change. Contribution of Working Group III to the Sixth Assessment Report* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2022), 22–23.
10. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*.
11. This formation is also similar to what Mann and Wainwright call “climate behe-moth.” See Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 44.
12. Michael Lowy, *Ecosocialism: A Radical Alternative to Capitalist Catastrophe* (Chi-cago: Haymarket Books, 2022); Angus, *Facing the Anthropocene*; Foster et al., *Ecologi-cal Rift*.
13. Faster rates of decarbonization are no doubt possible for individual countries, par-ticularly for those who offshore some of their emissions. But for global capitalism as a whole, a speed limit of roughly 4% emissions reductions per year on average, sustained over decades, is a reasonable (though contestable) assumption. See Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”; Anderson and Bows, “Beyond ‘Dangerous’ Climate.”
14. IEA, *WEO 2022*; Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
15. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*.
16. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*; see also Mahalingam et al., *Impacts of Severe Natural Catastrophes on Financial Markets* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge Centre for Risk Stud-ies, 2017).
17. Swiss Re Institute, *The Economics of Climate Change: No Action Not an Option* (Zurich: Swiss Re Institute, 2021), 12.
18. Jean-Francois Mercure, H. Pollitt, J. E. Vinuales, et al., “Macroeconomic Impact of Stranded Fossil Fuel Assets,” *Nature Climate Change* 8 (2018): 588–593.
19. Network for Greening the Financial System (NGFS), “A Call for Action: Climate Change as a Source of Financial Risk,” April 2019, https://www.ngfs.net/sites/default/files/medias/documents/synthese_ngfs-2019_-_17042019_0.pdf.
20. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*, 7.
21. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*, 18–19, italics added.
22. Streeck, *How Will Capitalism End?*
23. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 21.
24. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 239.
25. Kallis and Hickel, “Is Green Growth Possible?”; Parrique et al., *Decoupling Debunked*; Brockway et al., “Energy Efficiency”; Haberl et al., “Systematic Review.” See also Gregor Semeniuk, Lance Taylor, Armon Rezai, et al., “Plausible Energy Demand Patterns in a Growing Global Economy with Climate Policy,” *Nature Climate Change* 11 (2021): 313–318.
26. Brockway et al., “Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return.”
27. Kjell Kuhne, Nils Bartsch, Ryan Tate, et al., “‘Carbon Bombs’—Mapping Key Fossil Fuel Projects,” *Energy Policy* 166 (2022): 1–10.

28. IEA, *WEO 2022*.
29. Lorenzo Rosa, Maria Rulli, Maria Kyle Davis, et al., “The Water-Energy Nexus of Hydraulic Fracturing: A Global Hydrologic Analysis for Shale Oil and Gas Extraction,” *Earth’s Future* 6 (2018): 745–756.
30. Rosa et al., “Water-Energy Nexus of Hydraulic Fracturing.”
31. IEA, *Role of Critical Metals*, 127–128.
32. World Meteorological Organization (WMO), *2022 State of Climate Services: Energy* (Geneva: World Meteorological Organization, 2022).
33. Will Nichols and Rory Clisby, “40% of Oil and Gas Reserves Threatened by Climate Change,” *Verisk Maplecroft*, December 16, 2021, <https://www.maplecroft.com/insights/analysis/40-of-oil-and-gas-reserves-threatened-by-climate-change/>.
34. WMO, *2022 State of Climate Services*, 5.
35. Anjana Ahuja, “Lazy Winds Could Blow Europe’s Renewable Future Off Course,” *Financial Times*, November 8, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/a9a1ee0e-ad7e-416c-85b7-43f70ae44855>.
36. As stated by Robert Gross, Quoted in Madeleine Cuff, “Extreme Weather Threat to Energy Security Is as Serious as Ukraine War,” *New Scientist*, October 11, 2022, <https://www.newscientist.com/article/2341877-extreme-weather-threat-to-energy-security-is-as-serious-as-ukraine-war/>.
37. Bas van Ruijven, Enrica De Cian, and Ian Sue Wing, “Amplification of Future Energy Demand Growth Due to Climate Change,” *Nature Communications* 10, no. 2762 (2019): 1–13; Francesco Pietro Colelli, Johannes Emmerling, Giacomo Marangoni, et al., “Increased Energy Use for Adaptation Significantly Impacts Mitigation Pathways,” *Nature Communications* 13, no. 4964 (2021): 1–12.
38. Hanna et al., “Emergency Deployment of Direct Air Capture.”
39. Lex, “Desalination: Worth Its Salt in an Increasingly Water-Scarce World,” *Financial Times*, August 21, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/3cacc3c1-523b-4aa4-80cc-481c2c8a405a>.
40. Colelli et al., “Increased Energy Use for Adaptation”; Robert McSweeney, “How IS ARCTIC WARMING LINKED to the ‘Polar Vortex’ and Other Extreme Weather?,” *Carbon Brief*, January 31, 2019, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/qa-how-is-arctic-warming-linked-to-polar-vortex-other-extreme-weather/>.
41. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*.
42. Thomas Chaloner, Sarah Gurr, and Daniel Bebbler, “Plant Pathogen Infection Risk Tracks Global Crop Yields under Climate Change,” *Nature Climate Change* 11 (2021): 710–715; Caparas et al., “Increasing Risks of Crop Failure”; Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 140–142, 195–296.
43. Based on projections by Deutsch et al., “Increase in Crop Losses to Insects.”
44. FAO, *Future of Food*.
45. Julian Cribb, *Food or War* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 78.

46. Willett et al., “Food Systems in the Anthropocene”; Marco Springmann, Michael Clark, Keith Wiebe, et al., “Options for Keeping the Food System within Environmental Limits,” *Nature* 562 (2019): 519–525.
47. Scoones et al., “Narratives of Scarcity.”
48. McMichael, *Food Regimes*; Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*.
49. McMichael, *Food Regimes*; Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*; Jennifer Clapp and Ryan Isakson, *Speculative Harvests: Financialization, Food & Agriculture* (Rugby: Practical Action, 2018).
50. Ajl, *People’s Green New Deal*, 120–121; McMichael, *Food Regimes*, 46.
51. Clapp and Isakson, *Speculative Harvests*, 14.
52. Taylor, “Climate Smart Agriculture,” 102.
53. Akram-Lodhi, “The Ties That Bind,” 692.
54. Ajl, *People’s Green New Deal*; Chris Smaje, *A Small Farm Future* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2020); Troy Vettese and Drew Pendergrass, *Half-Earth Socialism: A Plan to Save the Future from Climate Change, Extinction, and Pandemics* (London: Verso, 2022); Benjamin Bodirsky, David Chen, Isabelle Weindl, et al., “Integrating Degrowth and Efficiency Perspectives Enables an Emissions-Neutral Food System by 2100,” *Nature Food* 3 (2022): 341–348.
55. David Victor, Frank Geels, and Simon Sharpe, *Accelerating the Low Carbon Transition: The Case for Stronger, More Targeted and Coordinated International Action* (London: Energy Transitions Commission, 2019).
56. Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*; Bodirsky et al., “Integrating Degrowth and Efficiency.”
57. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 142.
58. Homer-Dixon et al., “Synchronous Failure.”
59. IEA, *Net Zero by 2050*; Oxfam, *Tightening the Net*.
60. Wallace, *Big Farms Make Big Flu*; Jennifer Clapp and William Moseley, “This Food Crisis Is Different: COVID-19 and the Fragility of the Neoliberal Food Security Order,” *Journal of Peasant Studies* 47, no. 7 (2020): 1393–1417.
61. Daggett, “Petro-Masculinity,” 29–32.
62. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 275–276.
63. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, ix.
64. Adams, *Ecological Crisis*, 112.
65. Felix Salmon, “America’s Continued Move toward Socialism,” *Axios*, June 25, 2021, <https://www.axios.com/2021/06/25/americas-continued-move-toward-socialism>.
66. Joshua Jackson and Michele Gelfand, “Could Climate Change Fuel the Rise of Right-Wing Nationalism?,” *The Conversation*, September 25, 2019, https://theconversation.com/could-climate-change-fuel-the-rise-of-right-wing-nationalism-123503?mc_cid=d231e3fe5d&mc_eid=0d70a348da.

67. Immo Fritsche, Christopher Cohrs, Thomas Kessler, et al., “Global Warming Is Breeding Social Conflict: The Subtle Impact of Climate Change Threat on Authoritarian Tendencies,” *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 32 (2012): 1–10.
68. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 335.
69. Varvarousis, “Crisis, Liminality,” 501.
70. Rana Foroohar, “The New Rules for Business in a Post-Neoliberal World,” *Financial Times*, October 10, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/e04bc664-04b2-4ef6-90f9-64e9c4c126aa>.
71. Foroohar, “New Rules for Business”; Bade, “A Sea Change.”
72. Kate MacKenzie and Tim Sahay, “A new foreign policy,” *Phenomenal World*, 2023, <https://www.phenomenalworld.org/series/the-polycrisis/>.
73. Kevin Rudd, *The Avoidable War: The Dangers of a Catastrophic Conflict between the US and Xi Jinping’s China* (New York: Public Affairs, 2022), 121–126.
74. Williams, *Political Hegemony*, 199.
75. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 21; IMF, *World Economic Outlook 2022*.
76. World Bank Group, *Global Economic Prospects June 2022*, 58–59.
77. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 10.
78. Christophers, “Fossilized Capital.”
79. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 24–25; Brockway et al., “Energy Efficiency,” 14.
80. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 24–25.
81. Clapp and Isakson, *Speculative Harvests*; OECD-FAO, “Agricultural Outlook.”
82. Chandrasekhar et al., “COP15: Key Outcomes.”
83. Deibert, *Reset*.
84. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 327; BP, *Energy Outlook 2023*, 40.
85. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 337.
86. David Hughes, *Shale Reality Check: Drilling into the US Government’s Rosy Projections for Shale Gas & Tight Oil Production through 2050* (San Francisco: Post Carbon Institute, 2021); Derek Brower and Myles McCormick, “What the End of the US Shale Revolution Would Mean for the World,” *Financial Times*, January 15, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/60747b3b-e6ea-47c0-938d-af515816d0f1>.
87. Nafeez Ahmed, “The Great Contraction: How the End of Cheap Money and Energy Will Degrade or Renew Civilization,” *Byline Times*, November 28, 2022, <https://bylinetimes.com/2022/11/28/the-great-contraction-how-the-end-of-cheap-money-and-energy-will-degrade-or-renew-civilisation/>.
88. Justin Mikulka, “Peak US Oil Production Looms as the Domestic Shale Boom Ends,” *DeSmog*, December 7, 2022, <https://www.desmog.com/2022/12/07/peak-us-oil-production-shale-boom-ends-bakken-permian/>.
89. Justin Jacobs and Amanda Chu, “The Oil Futures Price Predicament,” *Financial Times*, September 20, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/7af73416-6963-4b49-994b-29e1ddfcce78>.

90. Nichols and Clisby, "40% of Oil and Gas Reserves Threatened."
91. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 383.
92. Hughes, *Shale Reality Check*; Ahmed, "The Great Contraction."
93. BP, *Energy Outlook 2023*, 29.
94. Edison Electric Institute, "26.4 million Cars Will Be on US Roads in 2030," *Edison Electric Institute*, June 20, 2022, <https://www.eei.org/News/news/All/eei-projects-26-million-electric-vehicles-will-be-on-us-roads-in-2030>.
95. World Bank Group, *Global Economic Prospects*; El-Erian, "Not Just Another Recession"; Roubini, *Megathreats*.
96. Roubini, *Megathreats*, 86.
97. Liebrich, "After Ukraine."
98. Daggett, "Petro-Masculinity."
99. Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 235.
100. Paxton, *Anatomy of Fascism*, 291.
101. IEA, *WEO 2022*.
102. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 340.
103. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 382.
104. De Castro and Capellán-Peréz, "Standard, Point of Use, and Extended Energy Return"; Brockway et al., "Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return"; Delannoy et al., "Peak Oil and the Low-Carbon Transition."
105. Delannoy et al., "Peak Oil and the Low-Carbon Transition," 9.
106. Richard Heinberg, "After the Ukraine Invasion: Sobering New Global Energy-Economic-Political Terrain," *Resilience*, March 18, 2022, <https://www.resilience.org/stories/2022-03-18/after-the-ukraine-invasion-sobering-new-global-energy-economic-political-terrain/>.
107. Delannoy et al., "Peak Oil and the Low-Carbon Transition"; Brockway et al., "Estimation of Global Final-Stage Energy-Return."
108. Friedrichs, *The Future*; Richard Heinberg, *The Party's Over: Oil, War and the Fate of Industrial Societies* (Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2005).
109. Slamersak et al., "Energy Requirements and Carbon Emissions."
110. Capellán-Peréz et al., "Dynamic Energy Return."
111. Delannoy et al., "Peak Oil and the Low-Carbon Transition"; Lewis and van den Bergh, "Implications of Net Energy-Return-On-Investment"; Ugo Bardi, *The Seneca Effect: Why Growth Is Slow but Ruin Is Rapid* (Cham: Springer, 2018).
112. Roubini, *Megathreats*.
113. Streeck, *How Will Capitalism End*, 68.
114. Climate Action Tracker, "Warming Projections Global Update"; Hanna et al., "Emergency Deployment of Direct Air Capture."
115. Smil, *How the World Really Works*; Gordon, *End of American Growth*.

116. De Castro and Capellán-Pérez, “Standard, Point of Use, and Extended Energy Return”; Jackson and Jackson, “Modelling Transition Risk.”
117. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 44.
118. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 30.
119. Odenweller et al., “Probabilistic Feasibility Space of Green Hydrogen.”
120. Peter Lovegrove, “Hydrogen at Risk of Being the Great Missed Opportunity of the Energy Transition,” *Det Norsk Veritas (DNV)*, June 14, 2022, <https://www.dnv.com/news/hydrogen-at-risk-of-being-the-great-missed-opportunity-of-the-energy-transition-226628>.
121. See Adam Tooze’s excellent discussion in “Carbon Notes #5: Green hydrogen, the ‘gas of the future’?,” *Chartbook*, May 16, 2023, <https://adamtooze.substack.com/p/carbon-notes-5-green-hydrogen-the>.
122. IEA, *Role of Critical Metals*.
123. Ahuja, “Lazy Winds”; Guilia Carbonaro, “Solar Panels Are Feeling the Heat too: How Heatwave Temperatures Are Hampering Solar Power,” *Euronews*, July 18, 2022, <https://www.euronews.com/next/2022/07/18/solar-panels-feel-the-heat-too-how-higher-temperatures-are-undermining-solar-power>.
124. IPCC, *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation*, 22.
125. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 78–90.
126. WMO, *State of Climate Services 2022*; Colelli et al., “Increased Energy Use”; van Ruijven, “Amplification of Energy.”
127. Mahalingam et al., *Impacts of Severe Catastrophes*; Swiss Re Institute, *Economics of Climate Change*.
128. Jones et al., “Simulating the Earth System Response”; Grant et al., “Confronting Mitigation Deterrence.”
129. Chaloner et al., “Plant Pathogen Infection Risk”; Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 195–196.
130. Akram-Lodhi, “The Ties That Bind.”
131. Caparas et al., “Increasing Risks of Crop Failure.”
132. Trevor Maynard, *Food System Shock: The Insurance Impacts of Acute Disruption to Global Food Supply* (London: Lloyd’s Emerging Risk Report, 2015).
133. Heck et al., “Biomass-Based Negative Emissions”; Oxfam, *Tightening the Net*.
134. Lenton et al., “Climate Tipping Points”; Duffy et al., “Is There a Temperature Tipping Point.”
135. Lynas, *Our Final Warning*, 67.
136. David Keith and Douglass MacMartin, “A Temporary, Moderate and Responsive Scenario for Solar Geoengineering,” *Nature Climate Change* 5 (2015): 201–207.
137. Kevin Surprise, “Preempting the Second Contradiction: Solar Geoengineering as Spatiotemporal Fix,” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 108, no. 5 (2018): 1228–1244.

138. Olaf Corry, "The International Politics of Geoengineering: The Feasibility of Plan B for Tackling Climate Change," *Security Dialogue* 48, no. 4 (2017): 297–315.
139. Catriona MacKinnon, "The Panglossian Politics of the Geoclique," *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy* 23, no. 5 (2020): 584–599.
140. Aaron Tang and Luke Kemp, "A Fate Worse Than Warming? Stratospheric Aerosol Injection and Global Catastrophic Risk," *Frontiers in Climate* 3 (2021): 1–17.
141. Tang and Kemp, "Fate Worse Than Warming?," 12.
142. OECD-FAO, "Agricultural Outlook"; Stephens et al., "Bringing Cultured Meat to Market."
143. Wallace, *Big Farms*.
144. Carly Phillips, Astrid Caldas, Rachel Cleetus, et al., "Compound Climate Risks in the COVID-19 Pandemic," *Nature Climate Change* 10 (2020): 586–588.
145. Tang and Kemp, "Fate Worse Than Warming?"
146. Joseph Tainter, *The Collapse of Complex Societies* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 193.
147. Miguel Centeno, Peter Callahan, Paul Larcey, Thayer Patterson, "Globalization and Fragility: A Systems Approach to Collapse," in Miguel Centeno et al (eds.) *How Worlds Collapse: What History, Systems, and Complexity Can Teach Us about Our Modern World and Fragile Future* (New York: Routledge, 2023), 5–24.
148. Craig Collins, "Catabolism: Capitalism's Frightening Future," *Counterpunch*, November 1, 2018, <https://www.counterpunch.org/2018/11/01/catabolism-capitalisms-frightening-future/>.
149. For a discussion, see Roubini, *Megathreats*, 49–55.
150. Beth Stratford, "The Threat of Rent Extraction in a Resource-Constrained Future," *Ecological Economics* 169 (2020): 1–11.
151. Christophers, *Rentier Capitalism*, xxiv; see also Frase, *Four Futures*; Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions*, 235–237; Stratford, "Threat of Rent Extraction."
152. Christophers, *Rentier Capitalism*, 421.
153. John Barry, "A Genealogy of Economic Growth as Ideology and Cold War Core State Imperative," *New Political Economy* 25, no. 1 (2020): 18–29.
154. Harvey, *Seventeen Contradictions*, 237.
155. John Michael Greer, *The Long Descent: A User's Guide to the End of the Industrial Age* (Gabriola Island: New Society Publishers, 2003).
156. Branwen Gruffydd Jones, "The Political Economy of Social Crisis: Towards a Critique of the 'Failed State' Thesis," *Review of International Political Economy* 15, no. 2 (2008): 180–205.
157. Octavia Butler, *Parable of the Sower* (New York: Grand Central Publishing, 1993).
158. Minqi Li, *China and the 21st Century Crisis* (London: Pluto Press, 2016), 184.
159. Mark Duffield, "Total War as Environmental Terror: Linking Liberalism, Resilience, and the Bunker," *South Atlantic Quarterly* 110, no. 3 (2011): 757–769.

160. John Lanchester, *The Wall* (London: Faber, 2014).
161. Guy Middleton, *Understanding Collapse: Ancient History and Modern Myths* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2017).
162. Middleton, *Understanding Collapse*, 211.
163. Glen Kuecker and Thomas Hall, “Resilience and Community in the Age of World-System Collapse,” *Nature and Culture* 6, no. 1 (2011): 18–40.
164. See Chris Smaje’s discussion of what he calls a “supersedure state,” or make-shift modes of local governance cobbled together in the wake of state decline; *A Small Farm Future*, 233–245.
165. Neiwert, *Alt-America*, 153–157.
166. NGFS, “A Call for Action.”
167. Liebrich, “After Ukraine.”
168. Nicholas Stern and Joseph Stiglitz, *Report of the High-Level Commission on Carbon Prices* (Washington, DC: World Bank, 2017).
169. Victor et al., *Accelerating the Low Carbon Transition*; IEA, *WEO 2022*; Josh Gabbatiss, “Explainer: How Can Climate Finance Be Increased from ‘Billions to Trillions?’,” *Carbon Brief*, November 4, 2022, <https://www.carbonbrief.org/explainer-how-can-climate-finance-be-increased-from-billions-to-trillions/>.
170. Otto et al., “Social Tipping Dynamics,” 2.
171. Climate Action Tracker, “Warming Projections Global Update.”
172. Newell and Paterson, *Climate Capitalism*, 172–175.
173. Moore, *Capitalism in the Web*.
174. Slamersak et al., “Energy Requirements and Carbon Emissions.”
175. Capellán-Peréz et al., “Dynamic Energy Return.”
176. Schnabel, “A New Age”; Sharma, “Greenflation.”
177. Jean Pisani-Ferry, “Climate Policy Is Macroeconomic Policy, and the Implications Will Be Significant,” *Peterson Institute for International Economics*, August 2021, pp. 6–7.
178. Pisani-Ferry, “Climate Policy,” 7; Sgouris Sgouridis, Christian Kimmich, Jordi Sole, et al., “Visions Before Models: The Ethos of Energy Modeling in an Era of Transition,” *Energy Research & Social Science* 88 (2022): 1–15.
179. For example, IEA, *Net Zero*.
180. Helen Thomas, “Workers Need More Than Platitudes about ‘Green Jobs,’” *Financial Times*, December 7, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/8f2212ac-5142-499b-a324-ad18f32065b5>.
181. Thomas, “Workers Need More Than Platitudes.”
182. Bolton et al., *Green Swan*; NGFS, “Call to Action.”
183. IEA, *Strategic Metals*.

184. These numbers are based on IEA projections of recycling potential for transition metals by 2040. See IEA, *Strategic Metals*, 15.

185. This projection of 30%–50% cost increases is based on multiple estimates of how reshoring solar and battery supply chains will raise costs. See Seaver Wang, Juzel Lloyd, and Guido Nunez-Mujica, “Sins of a Solar Empire: Confronting the Solar Manufacturing Industry’s Human Rights Problem,” *Breakthrough Institute*, November 15, 2022, <https://thebreakthrough.org/issues/energy/sins-of-a-solar-empire>. Also Yuan Yang, Alice Hancock, and Laura Pitel, “Solar Industry Warns EU Rules Would Hamper Clean Energy Transition,” *Financial Times*, March 17, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/2f876e67-8aa1-4776-a783-bcf5d5ea76eb>.

186. As the IEA shows, even an “announced pledges” scenario in which FF demand declines would likely witness rising prices (due to underinvestment). See IEA, *WEO 2022*, 356.

187. Mark Maslin, Liivia Van Heerde, and Simon Day, “Sulfur: A Potential Resource Crisis That Could Stifle Green Technology and Threaten Food Security as the World Decarbonises,” *Geographical Journal*, August 21, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12475>.

188. See discussion in Deibert, *Reset*, 117–121.

189. Malmand the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 286–287.

190. A new study warns that “pulses” of rapid ice-sheet collapse, detected in the earth’s past, mean that the level of sea rise “expected over 200 years could actually occur in 20 years,” though this remains contested. See Damian Carrington, “Ice sheets can collapse at 600 meters a day, far faster than feared, study finds,” *The Guardian*, April 5, 2023, <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2023/apr/05/ice-sheets-collapse-far-faster-than-feared-study-climate-crisis>.

191. While green industrial policies are already expanding across the world-system core, spending remains far too low, and policies to actively steer firms towards experimentation with entirely new technologies and production processes remain too weak, to galvanize the necessary technological transformation (at least within the time-frame needed). See IEA, *World Energy Outlook 2022*, 61; also Charles Sabel and David Victor, “Beyond Biden’s Climate Plan, A New Industrial Revolution is Needed,” *Yale Environment 360*, September 26 2022, <https://e360.yale.edu/features/biden-climate-bill-industrial-policy>.

192. Sgouris Sgouridis, Christian Kimmich, Jordi Sole, et al., “Visions before Models: The Ethos of Energy Modeling in an Era of Transition,” *Energy Research & Social Science* 88 (2022): 1–15.

193. June Yoon, “Lex in Depth: A Solid Case for the Next Generation of Batteries,” *Financial Times*, April 6, 2021, <https://www.ft.com/content/c4e075b8-7289-4756-9bfe-60bf50f0cf66>.

194. Gregory Wilson, Mowafak Al-Jassim, Wyatt K. Metzger, et al., “The 2020 Photovoltaic Technologies Roadmap,” *Journal of Physics D: Applied Physics* 53 (2020): 4–48.

195. For example, Heinberg and Fridley, *Our Renewable Energy Future*.
196. Arturo Escobar, “Degrowth, Postdevelopment, and Transitions: A Preliminary Conversation,” *Sustainability Science* 10 (2015): 451–462.
197. Michael Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists: Transitions, Trade-Offs, and Authoritarian Dangers,” *Capitalism Nature Socialism* 34:1 (2023), 11–30.
198. Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists”; Lowy, *Ecosocialism*; Angus, *Facing the Anthropocene*; Baer, *Democratic Ecosocialism*.
199. Jason Hickel, “Is It Possible to Achieve a Good Life for All Within Planetary Boundaries?” *Third World Quarterly* 40 (2018): 18–35; Kate Raworth, *Doughnut Economics: Thinking Like a 21st Century Economist* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2017).
200. Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists.”
201. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 321.
202. George Lawson, *Anatomies of Revolution* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2019), 78–82, 228.
203. Otto et al, “Social tipping.”
204. This is comparable to E.O Wright’s theory of post-capitalist transformation. See Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, section III.
205. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*.
206. Charles Stevenson and Ellen Helker-Nygren, “Degrowth Can End the Cost of Living Crisis,” *Resilience*, December 14, 2022, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2022-12-14/degrowth-can-end-the-cost-of-living-crisis/?mc_cid=6615e38c73&mc_eid=cbbf13f15.
207. Durand, “End of Financial Hegemony?”
208. Hickel, *Less Is More*, chapter 5; Ann Pettifor, *The Case for a Green New Deal* (London: Verso, 2019); Hadas Thier, “What a Socialist Response to Inflation Should Look Like,” *Jacobin*, January 6, 2022, <https://jacobin.com/2022/01/prices-wages-covid-fed-biden-class>.
209. Arnulf Grubler, Charlie Wilson, Nuno Bento, et al., “A Low Energy Demand Scenario for Meeting the 1.5C Target and Sustainable Development Goals without Negative Emissions Technologies,” *Nature Energy* 3 (2018): 515–527; Thea Riofrancos, Alissa Kendall, Kristii Dayemo, et al., “Achieving Zero Emissions with More Mobility and Less Mining,” *Climate + Community Project*, January 2023, <https://www.climateandcommunity.org/more-mobility-less-mining>.
210. Delina, *Strategies*.
211. Christopher Olk, Colleen Schneider, and Jason Hickel, “How to Pay for Saving the World: Modern Monetary Theory for a Degrowth Transition,” *Social Science Research Network*, July 25, 2022, https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=4172005.
212. Vasco Brummer, “Community Energy—Benefits and Barriers,” *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 94 (2018): 187–196.

213. Comparable to the post-growth economies imagined by Herman Daly and Tim Jackson. See Herman Daly, *Steady State Economics: Second Edition with New Essays* (Washington D.C: Island Press, 1991); Tim Jackson, *Prosperity Without Growth: Economics for a Finite Planet* (Abingdon: Routledge, 2011).

214. This should not be overstated. But the experience of the May 2023 “Beyond Growth” conference organized by EU parliamentarians—which received deeper support and engagement from high-ranking EU officials, at least compared to earlier iterations—suggests that the ideological hegemony of growth may be slowly weakening in the EU. See Martin Sandbu, “‘Degrowth’ starts to move in from Europe’s policy Fringes,” *Financial Times*, May 23, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/e2f96618-081f-41de-b7a0-a682017c8d11>.

215. Referring to the fiscally conservative grouping of Sweden, the Netherlands, Denmark, and Austria.

216. Salmon, “America’s Continued Move Towards Socialism.”

217. This would be unlike the first civil war. Rather, it would be a period of distributed far-right insurgencies across the rural US, and deadly clashes between far-right and leftwing protesters in cities, that leads to at least 1,000 fatalities in a given year (the threshold that distinguishes civil strife from civil war). See Stephen Marche, *The Next Civil War: Dispatches from the American Future* (New York: Avid Reader Press, 2022).

218. As Yifei Li and Judith Shapiro show, ecological Marxism provides a key source of inspiration for the CCP’s nascent discourse of Ecological Civilization. See Yifei Li and Judith Shapiro, *China Goes Green: Coercive Environmentalism for a Troubled Planet* (London: Polity Press, 2020), 6–7.

219. Li, *China and the 21st Century Crisis*, 183.

220. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*, 119.

221. Olufemi Taiwo and Patrick Bigger, “Debt Justice for Climate Reparations,” *Climate+Community Project*, April 2022, <https://www.climateandcommunity.org/debt-justice-for-climate-reparations>.

222. Albert, “Geopolitics of Renewable Energy.”

223. Newell and Paterson, *Climate Capitalism*, 175.

224. Kuhne et al., “Carbon Bombs.”

225. Jason Hickel, “How to Achieve Full Decolonization,” *New Internationalist*, August 9, 2021, <https://newint.org/features/2021/08/09/money-ultimate-decolonizer-fjf>.

226. Michael Stott, “State Looms Over Latin America’s Hopes to Exploit ‘White Gold’ of Lithium,” *Financial Times*, 2022, accessed January 23, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/359d5287-d0ab-46ae-9c6b-09517ec9fb0c>.

227. Kate Aronoff, Alyssa Battistoni, Daniel Aldana Cohen, and Thea Riofrancos, *A Planet to Win: Why We Need a Green New Deal* (London: Verso, 2019), 142–153.

228. Michael Barnard, “Morocco, Algeria, Egypt: Assessing EU Plans to Import Hydrogen from North Africa,” *Transnational Institute*, May 17, 2022, <https://www.tni.org/en/publication/assessing-eu-plans-to-import-hydrogen-from-north-africa>.

229. Stott, “State Looms.”
230. Fadhel Kaboub, “Africa’s Path Towards Resilience and Sovereignty: the Real Wakanda is Within Reach,” *Tax Justice Network*, March 30, 2021, <https://taxjustice.net/2021/03/30/africas-path-towards-resilience-and-sovereignty-the-real-wakanda-is-within-reach/>.
231. Max Ajl, “The NIEO in a State of Permanent Insurrection,” *Progressive International*, October 1, 2022, <https://progressive.international/blueprint/dffe4ca0-4dc6-478c-9e49-7bc8d18aa989-ajl-the-nieo-in-a-state-of-permanent-insurrection/en>.
232. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 190.
233. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 315.
234. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 220–221.
235. Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists.”
236. Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*, 373.
237. For a useful discussion of what this might entail, see Robin Hahnel and Erik Olin Wright, *Alternatives to Capitalism: Proposals for a Democratic Economy* (London: Verso, 2016), chapters 1 and 2.
238. See MacKenzie & Sahay, “A new foreign policy”; also Delphine Strauss, “Global economy: will higher wages prolong inflation?,” *Financial Times*, May 1, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/0097fbd7-96ae-4a75-876d-8df4d4379651>.
239. Hickel, *Less is More*.
240. Keir Milburn, *Generation Left* (London: Polity, 2019).
241. Harry Dempsey, “China leads rise in export restrictions on critical minerals, OECD says,” *Financial Times*, April 11, 2023, <https://www.ft.com/content/198b6824-21d6-4633-9a97-00164d23c13f>.
242. Srnicek and Williams, *Inventing the Future*; Moghadam, “What Is Revolution.” For an insightful analysis of problems within leftwing organizations, see Maurice Mitchell, “Building resilient organizations,” *The Forge*, November 29, 2022, <https://forgeorganizing.org/article/building-resilient-organizations>.
243. For examples of this position, see Aronoff et al, *A Planet to Win*; Robert Pollin, “De-Growth vs. a Green New Deal,” *New Left Review* 112 (2018): 5–25; Matthew Huber, *Climate Change as Class War* (London: Verso, 2022); Leigh Philips and Michael Roszowski, “Planning the Good Anthropocene,” *Jacobin*, August 15, 2017, <https://jacobin.com/2017/08/planning-the-good-anthropocene>.
244. I assume here that a more severe crisis of capitalism, involving more drastic and prolonged reductions in living standards, would be necessary to facilitate the kind of post-consumerist tipping point needed for degrowth transitions in the world-system core.
245. Mariana Mazzucato, *Mission Economy: A Moonshot Guide to Changing Capitalism* (New York: Penguin, 2020).
246. Aaron Bastani, *Fully Automated Luxury Communism* (London: Verso, 2020).

247. Scoones et al., “Narratives of Scarcity.”
248. Gaia Vince, *Nomad Century: How to Survive the Climate Upheaval* (New York: Allan Lane, 2022).
249. Buck, *After Geoengineering*.

CHAPTER 5

1. Jessop, *State Theory*.
2. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*, 120.
3. Jerry Harris, “The Conflict for Power in Transnational Class Theory,” *Science & Society* 67, no. 3 (2003): 329–339.
4. Davis, *Are Prisons Obsolete?*; Kundnani, “Abolish National Security”; Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance*; M4BL, “2020 Policy Platform.”
5. Richard Godfrey, Jo Brewis, Jo Grady, et al., “The Private Military Industry and Neoliberal Imperialism: Mapping the Terrain,” *Organization* 21, no. 1 (2014): 106–125.
6. Scoones et al., “Narratives of Scarcity.”
7. Johan Galtung, “Violence, Peace, and Peace Research,” *Journal of Peace Research* 6, no. 3 (1969): 167–191.
8. Dorninger et al., “Ecologically Unequal Exchange.”
9. Hector Rufrancos et al., “Income Inequality and Crime: A Review and Explanation of the Time Series Evidence,” *Sociology and Criminology* 1, no. 1 (2013): 1–9; Ruth Blakeley, Nisha Kapoor, Arun Kundnani, et al., *Leaving the War on Terror: A Progressive Alternative to Counter-Terrorism Policy* (Amsterdam: Transnational Institute, 2019).
10. Patomaki, *Political Economy of Global Security*; Tooze, *Crashed*.
11. Szayna et al., *Conflict Trends*.
12. David Kilcullen, *Out of the Mountains: The Coming Age of the Urban Guerilla* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 247.
13. Paul Rogers, *Global Security and the War on Terror: Elite Power and the Illusion of Control* (London: Routledge, 2008).
14. Besteman, *Militarized Global Apartheid*, 126.
15. Godfrey et al., “The Private Military Industry”; Robinson, *Global Police State*; Deibert, *Reset*; Williams, “Global Security Assemblages.”
16. Robinson, *Global Police State*, 75–81.
17. Robinson, *Global Police State*.
18. Rigakos, *Security/Capital*, 114.
19. Deudney, *Bounding Power*.
20. Daniel Deudney, “Turbo Change: Accelerating Technological Disruption, Planetary Geopolitics, and Architectonic Metaphors,” *International Studies Review* 20 (2018): 223–231.
21. Blum and Wittes, *Future of Violence*, 39, 7–8.

22. Bade, “A Sea Change.”
23. Dyer-Witthof et al., *Inhuman Power*, 46; For a useful discussion of diminishing returns in the field of generative AI, see Nafeez Ahmed, “AI Doomers Are Wrong. The ‘Existential Threat’ Is About Who Controls Information—Not the Singularity,” *Age of Transformation*, May 11, 2023, <https://ageoftransformation.org/aidoommyth/>.
24. Solomon Hsiang, Marshall Burke, and Edward Miguel, “Quantifying the Influence of Climate on Human Conflict,” *Science* 341 (2013): 1212.
25. Alexander De Juan and Niklas Hanze, “Climate and Cohesion: The Effects of Droughts on Intra-Ethnic and Inter-Ethnic Trust,” *Journal of Peace Research* 58, no. 1 (2021): 151–167.
26. Jan Selby, “Positivist Climate Conflict Research: A Critique,” *Geopolitics* 19 (2014): 829–856; Jon Barnett, “Global Environmental Change I: Climate Resilient Peace?” *Progress in Human Geography* 43, no. 5 (2019): 927–936.
27. Campbell et al., *Age of Consequences*.
28. Katharine Mach, Neil Adger, Halvard Buhaug, et al., “Directions for Research on Climate and Conflict,” *Earth’s Future* 8, no. 7 (2020): 1–7.
29. Michael Klare, “How Rising Temperatures Increase the Likelihood of Nuclear War,” *The Nation*, January 13, 2020, <https://www.thenation.com/article/nuclear-defense-climate-change/>.
30. Muhammah Qamar, Muhammad Azmat, and Pierlugi Claps, “Pitfalls in Transboundary Indus Water Treaty: A Perspective to Prevent Unattended Threats to Global Security,” *Nature Clean Water* 2, no. 22 (2019): 1–9.
31. Francesco Femia and Caitlin Werrell, “Climate Change, the Erosion of State Sovereignty, and World Order,” *Brown Journal of World Affairs* 22, no. 2 (2016): 221–235.
32. Barnett, “Global Environmental Change.”
33. Neta Crawford, *Pentagon Fuel Use, Climate Change, and the Costs of War* (Providence, RI: Watson Institute, 2019).
34. Olivier Belcher, Patrick Bigger, Ben Neimark, et al., “Hidden Carbon Costs of the ‘Everywhere War’: Logistics, Geopolitical Ecology, and the Carbon Footprint of the US Military,” *Transactions of the Institute of British Geography* 45, no. 1 (2020): 65–80.
35. Stuart Parkinson and Linsey Cottrell, “Estimating the Military’s Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions,” *Conflict and Environment Observatory*, November 2022, https://ceobs.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/SGR-CEOBS_Estimating_Global_Military_GHG_Emissions.pdf.
36. Leonard de Klerk, Anatolii Shmurak, Olga Gassan-Zade, et al., “Climate Damage Caused by Russia’s War in Ukraine,” *Climate Focus*, November 2022, <https://climafocus.com/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/ClimateDamageinUkraine.pdf>.
37. Quoted in Mark Akkerman, Deborah Burton, Nick Buxton, et al., *Climate Collateral: How Military Spending Accelerates Climate Breakdown* (Amsterdam: Transnational Institute, 2022), 27.

38. IEA, *WEO 2022*.
39. For example, Michael Davidson, Valerie Karplus, Joanna Lewis, et al., “The Risks of Decoupling from China on Low-Carbon Technologies,” *Science* 377, no. 6612 (2022): 1266–1271.
40. Hal Brands, “Economic Chaos of a Taiwan War Would Go Well Past Semiconductors,” *Bloomberg*, June 23, 2022, https://www.bloomberg.com/opinion/articles/2022-06-23/economic-chaos-of-a-taiwan-war-would-go-well-past-semiconductors?utm_source=substack&utm_me.
41. Brands, “Economic Chaos of a Taiwan War Would Go Well Past Semiconductors”; Charlie Vest, Agatha Kratz, and Reva Goujon, “The Global Economic Disruptions from a Taiwan Conflict,” *Rhodium Group*, December 14, 2022, <https://rhg.com/research/taiwan-economic-disruptions/>.
42. Michal Meidan, “China: Climate Leader and Villain,” in *The Geopolitics of the Global Energy Transition*, ed. Manfred Hafner and Simone Tagliapietra (Cham: Springer, 2020), 75–92.
43. Bade, “A Sea Change.”
44. IEA, *Net Zero*.
45. Jürgen Scheffran, Anna Leidreiter, John Burroughs, et al., “The Climate-Nuclear Nexus: Exploring the Linkages between Climate Change and Nuclear Threats,” *World Future Council*, November 27, 2015, <https://www.worldfuturecouncil.org/climate-nuclear-nexus/>.
46. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), *A New World: The Geopolitics of the Energy Transformation* (Abu Dhabi: IRENA, 2019), 57–58.
47. Herbert Lin, *Cyber Threats and Nuclear Weapons* (Palo Alto: Stanford University Press, 2021), 91.
48. James Acton, “Cyber Warfare and Inadvertent Escalation,” *Daedalus* 149, no. 2 (2020): 133–149.
49. Lin, *Cyber Threats*.
50. Brown, “New Nuclear MADness”; Acton, “Cyber Warfare.”
51. Johnson, “Artificial Intelligence,” 17.
52. Johnson, “Artificial Intelligence,” 27.
53. Brown, “New Nuclear MADness,” 79.
54. Herbert Lin, “The Existential Threat from Cyber-Enabled Information Warfare,” *Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists* 75, no. 4 (2019): 187–196.
55. Marina Favaro, *Weapons of Mass Distortion: A New Approach to Emerging Technologies, Risk Reduction and the Global Nuclear Order* (London: Centre for Science and Security Studies, King’s College London, 2019), 12; James Johnson, “Artificial Intelligence, Autonomy, and the Risk of Catalytic Nuclear War,” *Modern War Institute*, March 18, 2021, <https://mwi.usma.edu/artificial-intelligence-autonomy-and-the-risk-of-catalytic-nuclear-war/>.

56. Chengxin Pan, "The 'China Threat' in American Self-Imagination: The Discursive Construction of Other as Power Politics," *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political* 29, no. 3 (2004): 305–331.
57. Sam Moore and Alex Roberts, "Ecofascism and Indian Nationalism," *The Ecologist*, February 7, 2022, <https://theecologist.org/2022/feb/07/ecofascism-and-indian-nationalism>.
58. Kundnani, "Abolish National Security"; Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance*; Blakeley et al., *Leaving the War on Terror*.
59. Kundnani, "Abolish National Security"; Pan, "The 'China Threat.'"
60. Eleanore Pauwels, *The New Geopolitics of Converging Risks: The UN and Prevention in the Era of AI* (New York: United Nations University Centre for Policy Research, 2019), 11.
61. Lin, "The Existential Threat."
62. As John Rathbone writes, one of the "big lessons" of the Russian invasion—at least according to military strategists and arms manufacturers—is that "big war is back" . . . and with that the need for countries to have the industrial capacity and massive weapons stocks to sustain high-intensity fighting." The climate implications are not good. See John Rathbone, "'Big War Is Back': 5 Lessons from Russia's Invasion of Ukraine," *Financial Times*, December 25, 2022, <https://www.ft.com/content/b01669cb-5be8-4f69-8d18-8eef0c0c2088>.
63. Thane Gustafson, *Klimat: Russia in the Age of Climate Change* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2021), 53–54.
64. Heinberg, "After the Ukraine Invasion."
65. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 337, 366.
66. Matthew Burrows and Robert Manning, "How Will the Russia-Ukraine War End? Here Are Four Scenarios," *Atlantic Council*, 2022, accessed January 29, 2023, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/the-big-story/how-will-the-russia-ukraine-war-reshape-the-world-here-are-four-possible-futures/>.
67. Liana Fix and Michael Kimmage, "Putin's Last Stand: The Promise and Perils of Russian Defeat," *Foreign Affairs*, December 20, 2022, <https://www.foreignaffairs.com/russian-federation/putin-last-stand-russia-defeat>.
68. Mary Aylward, Peter Engelke, Uri Friedman, et al., "Global Foresight 2023," *Atlantic Council*, 2022, accessed January 29, 2023, <https://www.atlanticcouncil.org/content-series/atlantic-council-strategy-paper-series/welcome-to-2033/>.
69. Joseph Glauber and David Laborde, "How Sanctions on Russia and Belarus Are Impacting Exports of Agricultural Products and Fertilizers," *International Food Policy Research Institute*, November 9, 2022, <https://www.ifpri.org/blog/how-sanctions-russia-and-belarus-are-impacting-exports-agricultural-products-and-fertilizer#:~:text=Russia%20accounts%20for%20about%2015,compound%20products%20in%20other%20countries>.
70. Fix and Kimmage, "Putin's Last Stand."

71. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 56.
72. Nafeez Ahmed, "Putin's War on Net Zero: Controlling 'Europe's Breadbasket' to Prevent Russia's Fossil Fuel Collapse," *Byline Times*, April 21, 2022, <https://bylinetimes.com/2022/04/21/putins-war-on-net-zero-controlling-europes-breadbasket-to-prevent-russias-fossil-fuel-collapse/>.
73. Andrea Kendall-Taylor and Michael Kofman, "Russia's Dangerous Decline: The Kremlin Won't Go Down Without a Fight," *Foreign Affairs* 101, no. 6 (2022): 28–35.
74. Fix and Kimmage, "Putin's Last Stand."
75. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 366.
76. Quoted in Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 107–108.
77. Hal Brands and Michael Beckley, *Danger Zone: The Coming Conflict with China* (New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2022), 24–50.
78. Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 359–360.
79. Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 359–360; Brands and Beckley, *Danger Zone*.
80. Vest et al., "Global Economic Disruptions."
81. Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 352–353.
82. Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 354–355.
83. Paul Dabbar, "Potential energy challenges from a China-Taiwan conflict scenario," *Columbia Center on Global Energy Policy*, January 25, 2023, <https://www.energypolicy.columbia.edu/publications/potential-energy-challenges-from-a-china-taiwan-conflict-scenario/>.
84. Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 354–357.
85. Akkerman et al., *Climate Collateral*.
86. Rudd, *Avoidable War*.
87. Robinson, *Global Police State*; Rogers, *Global Security*.
88. This is also anticipated by Patomaki; see *Political Economy of Global Security*, 154.
89. Gustafson, *Klimat*, 213–215.
90. IEA, *WEO 2022*, 379.
91. Adam Goldstein and Constantine Samaras, "Dire Straits: Strategically-Significant International Waterways in a Warming World," *Center for Climate and Security*, June 2017, https://climateandsecurity.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/4_dire-straits.pdf.
92. As also argued by Corry, "International Politics of Geoengineering"; MacKinnon, "Panglossian Politics"; Tang and Kemp, "Fate Worse Than Warming."
93. Leonie Nimmo and Hana Manjusak, "Environmental CSR Reporting by the Arms Industry," *Conflict and Environment Observatory*, December 2021, <https://ceobs.org/environmental-csr-reporting-by-the-arms-industry/>.
94. This is what Michael Klare anticipates. See "China 2049," *Tom Dispatch*, August 24, 2021, <https://tomdispatch.com/china-2049/>.

95. Todd Miller, Nick Buxton, Mark Akkerman, et al., *Global Climate Wall: How the World's Wealthiest Nations Prioritise Borders over Climate Action* (Amsterdam: Transnational Institute, 2021); Associated Press, "Global \$600+ Billion Homeland Security and Public Safety Market 2020–2024," *Associated Press News*, December 10, 2019, <https://apnews.com/press-release/business-wire/technology-middle-east-c23b8f801ae04057aa10a990700eea08>.
96. Rigakos, *Security/Capital*, 114.
97. David Harvey, "Value in Motion," *New Left Review* 126 (2020): 103.
98. Harvey, "Value in Motion."
99. Associated Press, "Global \$600+ Billion Homeland Security."
100. Ulrich Brand and Markus Wissen, "Global Environmental Politics and the Imperial Mode of Living: Articulations of State-Capital Relations in the Multiple Crisis," *Globalizations* 9, no. 4 (2012): 547–560.
101. Duffield, "Liberalism, Resilience, and the Bunker"; Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*.
102. Butler, *Parable*; Margaret Atwood, *Oryx and Crake* (London: Bloomsbury, 2003).
103. Kilcullen, *Out of the Mountains*, 66; Greer, *Long Descent*.
104. A growing number of leftwing (and rightwing) scholars claim that "neofeudalism" is already a present-day reality, particularly in the digital technology sector characterized by rentier control of platforms. But as Evgeny Morozov rightly says, while we are clearly witnessing limited tendencies toward "re-feudalization," made evident by the rising power of rentiers across the world economy, it is nonetheless the case that "full-blown 'neo-feudalism' is nowhere on the horizon." The world-system today remains capitalist, in the sense that profit and growth remain the driving forces of the economy, and wage labor (at least in the core) is still the dominant mode of survival for proletarianized workers. It would be far more accurate to describe the world-system as neofeudalist only in the context of global collapse. See Evgeny Morozov, "Critique of Techno-Feudal Reason," *New Left Review* 133/134 (2022), 95.
105. Kemp et al., "Bioengineering Horizon Scan," 2.
106. NAS, *Biodefense*, 57–58.
107. Webb and Hessel, *Genesis Machine*, 262–263.
108. Benjamin Trump et al., "Building Biosecurity for Synthetic Biology," *Molecular Systems Biology* 16 (2020): 1–16; Bade, "A Sea Change."
109. As Cronin says, "prices of small [unmanned aerial vehicles] will continue to drop. . . . The private sector is driving this innovation, with strong incentives to offer an array of powerful new features"; see *Power to the People*, 221.
110. Silver and Payne, "Crises of World Hegemony," 18.
111. Lee, *AI Superpowers*.
112. Susskind, *World without Work*.
113. Case and Deaton, *Deaths of Despair*, 4.
114. Lee, *AI Superpowers*, 20–21.

115. Srnicek and Williams, *Inventing the Future*.
116. Kemp et al., “Bioengineering Horizon Scan.”
117. Kemp et al., “Bioengineering Horizon Scan,” 5–8.
118. Ian Shaw, *Predator Empire: Drone Warfare and Full Spectrum Dominance* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2016).
119. Michael O’Hanlon, *Forecasting Change in Military Technology, 2020–2040* (Washington, DC: Foreign Policy at Brookings, 2019).
120. Quoted in Gregg Allen and Taniel Chan, *Artificial Intelligence and National Security* (Cambridge, MA: Belfer Center Study, Harvard University, 2017), 14.
121. Albert, “Dangers of Decoupling.”
122. Wodak, *Politics of Fear*.
123. Melissa Heikkila, “Europe Throws Down Gauntlet on AI with New Rulebook,” *Politico*, April 21, 2021, <https://www.politico.eu/article/europe-throws-down-gauntlet-on-ai-with-new-rulebook/>.
124. Zeyi Yang, “China Just Announced a New Social Credit Law. Here’s What It Means,” *MIT Technology Review*, November 22, 2022, <https://www.technologyreview.com/2022/11/22/1063605/china-announced-a-new-social-credit-law-what-does-it-mean/#:~:text=Initially%2C%20back%20in%202014%2C%20the,figured%20out%20the%20financial%20part.>
125. Shaw, *Predator Empire*, 16.
126. Mann and Wainwright, *Climate Leviathan*, 31.
127. Feldstein, *Global Expansion of AI*; Rudd, *Avoidable War*, 293–300; Brands and Beckley, *Danger Zone*, 116–117; Byler, *In the Camps*.
128. Shaw, *Predator Empire*, 239–240.
129. Zuboff, *Surveillance Capitalism*, 414–415.
130. Zuboff, *Surveillance Capitalism*, 478.
131. Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 249.
132. Jessop, *State Power*; Wright, *Envisioning Real Utopias*.
133. Jessop, *State Theory*, 333.
134. Andreas Malm, *Corona, Climate, Chronic Emergency: War Communism in the Twenty-First Century* (London: Verso, 2020).
135. Jinghan Zeng, “Artificial Intelligence and China’s Authoritarian Governance,” *International Affairs* 96, no. 6 (2020): 1443.
136. In other words: A reversal of the trend by which the Western imperial powers forced capitalist industrialization on the rest of the world; see Anievas and Nisancioğlu, *How the West Came to Rule*, 46.
137. Jairus Grove, “From Geopolitics to Geotechnics: Global Futures in the Shadow of Automation, Cunning Machines, and Human Speciation,” *International Relations* 34, no. 3 (2020): 432–455.

138. For a comparable argument, see Cronin on the difference between “open” innovation driven by the private sector, and “closed” innovation in which states “control access to major technological developments”; Cronin, *Power to the People*, 11–12.
139. Mark Neocleous, *Critique of Security* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008).
140. Ken MacLeod, *Star Fraction: A Fall Revolution Novel* (Croydon: Orbit, 1995).
141. Atwood, *Oryx*.
142. Nick Bostrom, *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2014).
143. Discussed in Jessop, *Capitalist State*, 170.
144. Kundnani, “Abolish National Security”; Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance*.
145. Rigakos, *Security/Capital*, 121–122.
146. As I show in Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists.”
147. Hickel, “Possible to Achieve a Good Life.”
148. Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*.
149. As discussed in Albert, “Geopolitics of Renewable Energy.”
150. Taiwo and Bigger, “Debt Justice”
151. Ceyhun Elgin, Adem Elveren, Gokcer Ozgur, et al., “Military Spending and Sustainable Development,” *Review of Development Economics* 26, no. 3 (2022): 1466–1490.
152. Li, *China in the 21st Century*; Klare, “China 2049.”
153. Akkerman et al., *Climate Collateral*; Blakeley et al., *Leaving the War on Terror*.
154. Davis, *Are Prisons Obsolete?*; Elliot-Cooper, *Black Resistance*; M4BL, “Policy Platform.”
155. Deudney, *Bounding Power*, 255–259; Union of Concerned Scientists, “Reducing the Risk of Nuclear War: Taking Nuclear Weapons Off High Alert,” February 2016, 2021 <https://www.ucsusa.org/sites/default/files/attach/2016/02/Reducing-Risk-Nuclear-War-full-report.pdf>.
156. Tim Di Muzio, *Carbon Capitalism: Energy, Social Reproduction, and World Order* (London: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2015).
157. Ronald Deibert, “Divide and Rule: Republican Security Theory as Civil Society Cyber Strategy,” *Georgetown Journal of International Affairs: International Engagement on Cyber* 3 (2014): 39–50.
158. Thomas Birtchnell and John Urry, “Fabricating Futures and the Movement of Objects,” *Mobilities* 8, no. 3 (2013): 388–405.
159. Kundnani, “Abolish National Security.”
160. Bill Hogseth, “Why Democrats Keep Losing Rural Counties Like Mine,” *Politico*, December 1, 2020, https://www.politico.com/news/magazine/2020/12/01/democrats-rural-vote-wisconsin-441458?mc_cid=988bb52047&mc_eid=0d70a348da.
161. Albert, “Ecosocialism for Realists.”

CONCLUSION

1. Bell, *Foundations of Futures*.
2. IPCC, *Climate Change 2022: Mitigation*, 18–19.
3. Raskin, *Journey to Earthland*, 27.
4. James Lovelock, *The Vanishing Face of Gaia: A Final Warning* (Philadelphia: Basic Books, 2010).
5. Robinson, *Global Police State*.
6. Morozov, “Critique of Technofeudal Reason.”
7. Arrighi, *Long Twentieth Century*, 208.
8. NIC, *Global Trends 2040*.
9. Webb and Hessel, *The Genesis Engine*, 163, 206–213.
10. Zografos and Robbins, “Green Sacrifice Zones”.
11. For example, Bastani, *Fully Automated Luxury*.
12. Matthew Huber’s proposals may plausibly enable something like this scenario; see “Ecosocialism: Dystopian and Scientific.”
13. Escobar, *Pluriversal Politics*.
14. See Malm and the Zetkin Collective, *White Skin, Black Fuel*, 167–168.
15. As Gaia Vince proposes. See Vince, *Nomad Century*, 105.
16. Buck, *After Geoengineering*.
17. Buck, *After Geoengineering*, 34.
18. Victor et al., *Accelerating the Low Carbon Transition*; Klein, *On Fire*.
19. Thaler, *No Other Planet*, 249.
20. Deibert, *Reset*, 277–299.
21. Jonathan Franzen, “What If We Stopped Pretending?,” *New Yorker*, September 8, 2019, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/cultural-comment/what-if-we-stopped-pretending>.
22. Ben Hayes, “Colonising the Future: Climate Change and International Security Strategies,” in *The Secure and the Dispossessed: How the Military and Corporations Are Shaping a Climate-Changed World*, ed. Buxton and Hayes (London: Pluto Press, 2015), 55.
23. Jem Bendell, “Deep Adaptation: A Roadmap for Navigating Climate Tragedy,” IFLAS Occasional Paper 2, July 27, 2018, <https://www.lifeworth.com/deepadadaptation.pdf>.
24. Neiwert, *Alt-America*.
25. As Warren Wagar imagines in *A Short History of the Future* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
26. Ahmed, *Failing States*, 88–89.
27. Yusoff and Gabrys, “Climate Change and the Imagination,” 5.

28. Mitchell and Chaudhury, "Worlding Beyond 'the' 'End,'" 327.
29. Bendell, "Deep Adaptation."
30. Bendell, "Deep Adaptation"; see also Carolyn Baker and Andrew Harvey, *Savage Grace: Living Resiliently in the Dark Night of the Globe* (Bloomington, IN: iUniverse, 2017).
31. Roy Scranton, "Beginning with the End," *Emergence Magazine*, April 24, 2020, https://emergencemagazine.org/story/beginning-with-the-end/?mc_cid=5db6ee138c&mc_eid=0d70a348da.
32. Jairus Grove, *Savage Ecology: War and Geopolitics and the End of the World* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2019), 25.
33. Dark Mountain Project, *Walking on Hot Lava: Selected Works for Uncivilized Times* (White River Junction, VT: Chelsea Green, 2017), 14.
34. Among the pessimists, the work of Carolyn Baker and Andrew Harvey provides one of the deepest and most genuine reckonings with our predicament; see *Savage Grace*.
35. Scranton, "Beginning with the End."
36. Scranton, "Beginning with the End."
37. Elizabeth Grosz, *The Incorporeal: Ontology, Ethics, and the Limits of Materialism* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2017), 151, 134.
38. Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus* (London: Continuum, 2004).
39. Joanna Macy and Chris Johnstone, *Active Hope: How to Face the Mess We're in Without Going Crazy* (Novato, CA: New World Library, 2012).