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**Our interpretation is that you should WEIGH THE BENEFITS of the affirmative vs the harms --- all impacts need to be contextualized to the desirability of the plan.**

### 1AC --- Transition

**Clean energy transition is inevitable but must be faster.**

**Worland 21** [Justin Worland, Senior Correspondent @ Time & BA in History from Harvard University, 7-15-2021, The Energy Transition Is in Full Swing. It’s Not Happening Fast Enough, TIME, https://time.com/6106341/green-energy-transition-iea/, Willie T.]

Even if you follow these things closely, it can be hard to understand where the world’s fight against climate change stands. On the one hand, news abounds of the clean energy revolution, as wind farms and solar panels pop up in communities across the globe and automakers promise to go electric. On the other hand, scientists continue to warn that fossil fuels have placed the planet and everyone who lives on it on an unavoidable collision course with catastrophe.

A new report from the International Energy Agency (IEA) published Wednesday explains the dynamic in sharp detail: the world has begun a **momentous shift** in how we power the economy that will touch virtually every corner of human society, with investment in oil and gas slowing and spending on clean energy rising. But it’s **not happening fast enough** to avoid dangerous levels of warming.

“A new global energy economy is emerging,” IEA Executive Director Fatih Birol tells TIME. But when it comes to the necessary levels of investment in clean energy, there is “a **gross mismatch.”**

The IEA’s annual World Energy Outlook is designed to inform policymakers about the state of global energy markets as well as the emerging trends expected to define energy in the years to come. Its origins are undeniably wonky, but this year’s report takes on new significance with climate change on the rise in public consciousness and on the international stage. The agency released the 2021 report a month early to help inform talks among the delegates who will gather in Glasgow, Scotland, in early November for the biggest United Nations climate summit in years.

Perhaps nothing is more urgent than the report’s key message that countries need to dramatically accelerate their efforts to cut emissions for the world to have any hope of limiting temperature rise to 1.5°C, the level at which scientists say we might expect to see widespread catastrophic effects of climate change. Current pledges from countries to cut emissions only reduce carbon pollution by 20% of what’s necessary to avoid reaching that marker, according to the report’s analysis.

The report offers no shortage of solutions to make up the gap. Climate politics can often end up mired in debates about controversial topics like carbon capture and nuclear energy, but the report highlights four straightforward areas that would address the problem: electrification, energy efficiency, tackling methane emissions and advancing innovation. To make all of those happen, the world needs to grow annual investment in clean energy by close to $4 trillion by the end of the decade, according to the report. “Finance is the **missing ingredient** to accelerate,” says Birol.

Looming energy crises

The analytical work that underpins the report began long before the energy crunch gripping Europe and China and threatens to spread across the globe. Nonetheless, the report warns that the energy crisis—which the IEA attributes to a rise in energy demand amid the economic recovery from the pandemic, among other things—may presage **future energy crises** that could occur if governments fail to plan carefully.

At the heart of the agency’s concern is an underinvestment in clean energy. Investment in oil and gas has stalled in a way that is consistent with **limiting warming** to 1.5°C. At the same time, spending on clean energy infrastructure remains **far below** what it needs to be, creating the possibility of **volatility** and supply disruptions much like the world is facing today. “The longer this mismatch persists, the greater the risk for increased volatility,” says Birol. “**What we need is very clear**: to increase investment in clean energy technologies.”

Even as investment in oil and gas has slowed, the IEA warns that the economic recovery from the worst of the COVID-related downturn has failed to live up to the promises of a “green recovery” that was commonly touted as governments spent trillions to help prop up their economies in 2020. Just 2% of $16 trillion spent by countries around the world on COVID economic support was spent on clean energy, according to the report. As a result, the world is now experiencing the second largest uptick in carbon emissions in history, in large part as a result of growth of coal use to power the economic recovery. “We are now witnessing an unsustainable recovery,” says Birol.

**Indeed,**

**Weise 24** [Zia Weise, senior reporter covering climate policy @ POLITICO & B.A. in journalism from Kingston University, 11-6-2024, Climate world absorbs a reality they’d hoped to avoid: Trump is back, POLITICO, https://www.politico.eu/article/climate-world-diplomats-donald-trump-victory-clean-energy-fossil-fuels-greenhouse-emissions/, Willie T. + sumzom]

The morning of his victory, however, officials and climate campaigners talked down Trump’s likely impact on plans to slow greenhouse gas emissions, hoping to calm nervous clean technology markets and present the transition as a **fait accompli***.*

“Those investing in clean energy are already enjoying huge wins in terms of jobs and wealth, and cheaper, more secure energy. This is because the global energy transition is **inevitable** and gathering pace, making it among the **greatest economic opportunities** of our age,” said United Nations climate chief Simon Stiell.

The challenge is that the world **isn’t moving quickly enough** to prevent dangerous global warming, and any slowdown from the world’s **second-largest emitter** — itself a major driver of the global shift to clean energy — is bound to throw a wrench into global climate efforts.

Trump hinted at what was coming in his victory speech early Wednesday morning, touting America’s abundant supplies of “liquid gold.” Addressing Robert F. Kennedy Jr., the environmental lawyer who appears likely to bring his unorthodox views on healthcare to the heart of a Trump administration, Trump said: “Bobby, leave the oil to me.”

**Only nuclear energy solves --- investment is key.**

**Grossi 24** [Rafael Mariano Grossi, PhD in History, International Relations and International Politics from the Graduate Institute of International Studies, 1-17-2024, 5 reasons we must embrace nuclear energy in the fight against climate change, World Economic Forum, https://www.weforum.org/stories/2024/01/nuclear-energy-transistion-climate-change/]

Globally, nuclear energy is also playing a **key role** in the transition to net zero. Fears about nuclear are slowly giving way to fact-based understanding. This year, for the first time, the document agreed at COP backed nuclear energy investment among low-emissions technologies.

One of nuclear’s key attributes is its energy intensity. A **thimble**-sized pellet of uranium produces as much energy as almost **3 barrels** of oil, more than 350 cubic metres of natural gas and about half a tonne of coal.

5 reasons we cannot ignore nuclear energy

Nuclear power, which has 20,000 reactor years of experience across the world, has five distinct advantages.

1. From cradle to grave, nuclear energy has the **lowest carbon footprint** and needs **fewer materials** and less land than other electricity source. For example, to produce one unit of energy, **solar** needs more than **17 times as much material and 46 times as much land.**

2. **Uranium in the earth's crust and oceans is more abundant** than gold, platinum and other rare metals. It is going to take us about 100 to 150 years to get through the uranium resources we deem economically recoverable today.

3. Nuclear power **doesn’t rely on the weather**. Well-run nuclear power plants, including for example those in the US, operate at least **two to three times as reliably** for two to three times as many years as intermittent low-carbon sources. As a flexible baseload for wind and solar that provides more energy when it is needed and less when it is not, nuclear power plants displace coal and enable renewables.

4. Each year, nuclear power plants produce a quarter of the world’s low-carbon electricity, saving many lives that would otherwise be cut short by the lethal pollution fossil fuels pump into the air. Nuclear energy is about as safe as solar. It is far safer than coal, gas and oil, and safer than almost every other alternative energy source.

5. It is true that spent fuel is highly radioactive and emits heat. But it is also relatively compact, and extremely carefully managed and regulated. Nuclear energy generation is so efficient that the amount of all spent fuel ever produced would — in theory — fit into 42 Olympic-sized swimming pools. Today, it is carefully stored in pools and dry storage systems or recycled. Countries like Finland and Sweden are close to putting into place deep geological repositories to dispose of spent fuel. France is also progressing in the implementation of a deep geological repository for high-level waste from spent fuel recycling.

Nuclear is one of the safest, cleanest, **least environmentally burdensome** and — ultimately, over the lifetime of a nuclear power plant — one of the cheapest sources of energy available.

But for all of nuclear energy’s positive attributes, there are hurdles to overcome. The accidents at Chernobyl and at the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Station left long shadows of mistrust and **underinvestment**. The upfront cost of building a nuclear power plant is considerable and budget overruns and long delays have made it more difficult to **gain support for new construction**.

Three levers to catalyze investment in nuclear energy

Three main levers will need to be pulled if we are to triple today’s investment levels and build the nuclear capacity that will help get us to net zero.

Lever 1: Nuclear must be acknowledged for what it is: a reliable, scalable, safe and highly affordable low-carbon source of energy. It must be treated that way when it comes to investment incentives. Today’s energy markets are not the same as those of the 1970s and 1980s. Nuclear needs private investment, even in markets where governments still take on much of the financing. Governments need to shoulder the **risk of the high capital costs at the start**. But that alone is not enough. They need to attract private financing through assured revenues and an enabling investment environment over the longer term. That means levelling the playing field nationally and internationally, including by changing the policies preventing investment in nuclear energy by many key international financial institutions and development banks.

**Repurposing ensures fast deployment.**

**Abdussami 24** [Muhammad R. Abdussami, M.A. in Nuclear Engineering from Ontario Tech University & PhD from University of Michigan, June 2024, Investigation of potential sites for coal-to-nuclear energy transitions in the United States, Energy Reports, https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2352484724002993, Willie T.]

1.2. Literature review

The U.S. government has undertaken various initiatives to assess the potential for coal-to-nuclear (C2N) transitions at coal sites across the country. Hansen et al. drafted an extensive report for the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) that examined key factors influencing viable transitions for a hypothetical coal plant, considered the techno-economic aspects of C2N conversions, and evaluated the potential effects on local communities during this transition (Hansen et al., 2022). Similarly, Griffith et al. investigated different nuclear reactor technologies and provided **valuable insights** into the considerations for siting and replacing coal plants with nuclear alternatives (Griffith, 2021). A few technical studies have also been carried out in the field of C2N transitions. One investigation (“Gone with the Steam How new nuclear, 2021) discovered that repurposing coal plants with advanced reactors could offer economic advantages and benefits for host communities compared to renewable energy generation. A technical report published by NuScale SMR technology highlighted the capability of NuScale SMR technology to **repurpose retired coal plants** while **ensuring the economic stability** of communities and workers (“An Ideal Solution for Repurposing U.S, 2021). Bartela et al. conducted a case study on a 460 MWe supercritical coal-fired plant in Poland, demonstrating the techno-economic benefits of replacing it with a nuclear reactor incorporating thermal energy storage (Bartela et al., 2022), (Bartela et al., 2021). Furthermore, Lukowicz et al. performed a techno-economic analysis on the same Polish coal plant, proposing the replacement of the plant's steam cycle with a small-scale modular Pressurized Water Reactor (PWR) (Łukowicz et al., 2023). Simonian et al. evaluate the potential of C2N transition at the Limestone coal plant in Texas, comparing small modular, high-temperature gas-cooled, and molten salt nuclear reactor technologies. Each technology's pros and cons are weighed against cost, risk, and C2N integration complexity. The study concludes no one-size-fits-all solution exists for C2N transitions, and specific nuclear designs and transition schemes must be carefully considered for each project based on technical specifications and feasibility (Simonian and Kimber, 2023). Notably, although these studies focused on specific candidate coal plants, comprehensive siting analyses for C2N transitions were not addressed.

The potential for advanced nuclear reactors to replace coal plants has been discussed in (“Coal-to-Nuclear Transitions, 2024), **emphasizing their compatibility** with variable renewable technologies and their capability to provide both electricity and process heat. The document (“Coal-to-Nuclear Transitions, 2024) examines economic impacts, job creation, and revenue benefits in host communities, noting **significant increases in employment and income** following a coal-to-nuclear transition. It discusses workforce requirements, educational needs, and training for transitioning workers, outlining the overlap and distinct roles between coal and nuclear plants. Policy and funding aspects, including **tax incentives** and loans, are also addressed, with a focus on achieving net-zero emissions targets by 2050 and supporting disadvantaged communities. The document emphasizes the critical role of utilities in managing transitions and presents a comprehensive outlook on infrastructure reuse and community engagement strategies for successful coal-to-nuclear conversions. In another paper, the advantages of repurposing existing site infrastructure, including transmission infrastructure, environmental permits, and water usage rights, have been examined. Repowering coal plant sites with nuclear power offers **clean, reliable, and dispatchable energy**, addressing the twin challenges of decommissioning and transitioning to low-carbon energy sources. The paper guides utilities through the key considerations and steps involved in evaluating and repurposing coal plant sites for advanced nuclear generation, focusing on the potential to retain jobs, tax bases, and community support.

In contrast to the technoeconomic analyses described above, the siting of advanced nuclear reactors within operating or retired CPPs has received relatively little attention in the literature. Belles et al. conducted an analysis using the Oak Ridge Siting Analysis for Power Generation Expansion (OR-SAGE) tool to evaluate the suitability of 13 coal power plants in the Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA) service territory for the deployment of advanced nuclear reactors (Belles et al., 2013). A similar approach was adopted in another study (Belles et al., 2021), where OR-SAGE was utilized to assess the retrofitting of advanced nuclear reactors in existing or retired coal plants. Furthermore, Omitaomu et al. employed the OR-SAGE tool to investigate the siting of advanced nuclear reactors across the contiguous United States (Omitaomu et al., 2022). In a separate study, Toth et al. employed the Advanced Nuclear Site Locator (ANSL) tool to evaluate 304 coal sites in the U.S., identifying **79** potentially feasible sites for coal-to-nuclear transitions (Toth et al., 2021). However, they reported that state-level policies could pose challenges to the demonstration of advanced nuclear reactors. Therefore, a comprehensive assessment of all coal plants in the United States, encompassing operational and retired facilities, is necessary to gain an understanding of the most suitable coal sites for transitioning to nuclear power. While the existing literature provides some valuable insights into the siting potential of advanced nuclear reactors in coal plants, the number of studies on this subject remains limited.

1.3. Contribution

This paper aims to assess the feasibility of converting each operational coal site to nuclear power using a tool called Siting Tool for Advanced Nuclear Development (STAND). The studied coal plants are classified into two different groups (Group-01 and Group-02) based on their capacity. Since advanced nuclear reactors are divided into various classes, such as micro-reactors, medium-scale reactors, and Small Modular Reactors (SMRs), it is necessary to categorize coal plants accordingly to match their capacity for a smooth transition to nuclear power. Categorization will also help in presenting the research findings and data clearly, considering the substantial amount of data involved in the analysis. To conduct this analysis, our first step was to gather information on all operational coal sites in the U.S. until January 2023. The operational coal sites are the focus of this study to **take advantage** of the existing Balance of Plant (BOP) equipment, such as transmission lines and power system protection components, which can **reduce construction time and costs**. Analyzing operational coal plants will also guide policymakers, state-level governments, and energy modelers in determining the prioritization of coal plant retirements. Furthermore, we limit our study to operational coal sites in the U.S. as many retired coal sites lack the necessary technical infrastructure for an attractive coal-to-nuclear transition. Next, we classify all operational coal sites into two clusters based on their nameplate capacity. The CPPs located in non-contiguous states (e.g., Alaska and Hawaii) are not considered due to the lack of sufficient data in STAND. Each cluster is then individually simulated in STAND using selected attribute values, as mentioned in Section 2, specifically in Table 1, Table 2, Table 3. Section 3 discusses the clustering of CPPs. Section 4 provides additional information about the STAND tool. Section 5 presents the results of the study, while Section 6 concludes the study with discussion. This paper presents a comprehensive approach for utilizing STAND in evaluating the feasibility of transitioning from coal to nuclear energy across the U.S. The detailed results and investigation will provide a clear idea on which factors one should consider for a particular region/area to C2N transitions.

**Scenario ONE is CLIMATE CHANGE.**

**Nuclear energy is key for climate goals.**

**Matthew 22** [M.D. Matthew, Professor @ Saintgits College of Engineering (India), January 2022, Nuclear energy: A pathway towards mitigation of global warming, Progress in Nuclear Energy, https://aben.com.br/wp-content/uploads/2022/02/Nuclear-energy-a-pathway-towards-mitigation-of-global-warming.pdf] sumzom

The clean energy transition means shifting from fossil energy to energy resources that **release little or no greenhouse gases** such as nuclear power, hydro, wind and solar. About a **third of the world’s carbonfree electricity** comes from **nuclear energy.**

Nuclear power has a **great potential** to contribute to the 1.5 ◦C Paris climate change target. Nuclear power plants produce **no greenhouse gas** emissions during their operation; only very low emissions are produced over their full life cycle. Even after accounting for the entire life cycle from mining of nuclear fuel to spent fuel waste management, nuclear power is proven to be a low carbon electricity source. During operation and maintenance, nuclear power plants produce different levels of solid and liquid waste and are **treated and disposed-off safely**. While conventional fossil-fueled power plants cause emissions almost exclusively from the plant site, the majority of greenhouse gas emissions in the nuclear fuel cycle are caused in processing stages upstream (exploration and processing of the uranium ore, fuel fabrication etc.), and downstream from the plant (fuel reprocessing, spent fuel storage etc.). Over the course of its life-cycle, the amount of CO2-equivalent emissions per unit of electricity produced by nuclear power plants is comparable with that of wind power, and **only one-third** of the emissions by solar. The greenhouse gas emissions correspond to 10–15 gm of CO2 per kilowatt hour electricity produced in comparison with the emission from a fossil fueled plant of 600–900 gm, 15–25 gm from wind turbines and hydroelectricity, and around 90 g from solar power plants (Fig. 8) (Carbon Dioxide Emissions, 2021).

Nuclear power delivers reliable, affordable and clean energy to support economic growth and social development. **Without a larger role for nuclear energy, it would not be possible to combat climate change.**

Nuclear power can be **deployed on a large scale**. So, nuclear power plants can directly replace fossil fueled power plants. As of end December 2020, global nuclear power capacity was 393 GW(e) and accounted for around 11% of the world’s electricity and around 33% of global low carbon electricity. Currently, there are 442 nuclear power reactors in operation in 32 countries. There are 54 reactors under construction in 19 countries, including 4 countries that are building their first nuclear reactors according to the IAEA reports (Nuclear Power Proves its, 2021; Climate Change and Nuclea, 2020a, 2020b). Nuclear power is reducing CO2 emissions by about **two gigatons per year**. Therefore, nuclear power will be imperative for achieving the low carbon future. In France, nuclear power plants accounted for 70.6% of the total electricity generation in 2019, the largest nuclear share for any industrialized country. About 90% of France’s electricity comes from low carbon sources (nuclear and renewable combined). Nuclear power contributes 20% of electricity generation in the United States over the past two decades and it remains the single largest contributor of non-greenhouse-gas-emitting electric power generation out of 1,117, 475 MWe total electricity generating capacity of which 60% is from fossil fuel.

The second-largest source of low carbon energy in use today is nuclear power, after hydropower. Nuclear power plants provide **continuous and stable** energy to the grid whereas solar and wind energy require back-up power during their output gaps, such as at night or when the wind stops blowing. The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has proposed at least doubling of nuclear power generation by 2050 to meet the Paris agreement. Nuclear power has compensated about 60 Gt of CO2 emissions over the past 50 years, nearly equal to **2 years** of global energy-related CO2 emissions and can help to conquer the challenges of climate change.

Existing reactors and future advanced nuclear technologies, like Small Modular Reactors (SMRs), can meet base load power needs and also **operate flexibly** to accommodate renewables and respond to demand. SMRs are a recent concept to accelerate the construction and commissioning of large nuclear power projects. By adopting the concept of modular manufacture of components, significant reduction in on-site construction time can be achieved. This can also help in reducing the capital costs. Several types of SMRs are currently under development and these offer improved economics, operational flexibility, enhanced safety, a wider range of plant sizes and the ability to meet the emerging needs of sustainable energy systems. Some of these reactors are designed to operate up to 700–950 ◦C (for gas cooled reactors) compared to LWRs, which operate at 280–325 ◦C. The electrical efficiency is higher and it can supply high temperature heat to industrial processes. High temperature SMRs can generate hydrogen through more energy efficient processes such as high temperature steam electrolysis or thermochemical cycles. Their smaller size and easier siting are expected to be a better fit for most non-electric applications, which require an energy output below 300 MWe.

**Climate change is existential.**

**Nogue 23** [Sandra; Lecturer in Paleoenvironmental Science @ the University of Southampton; 3-23-2023; OUP Academic; “Catastrophic climate change and the collapse of human societies,” https://academic.oup.com/nsr/article/10/6/nwad082/7085016; DOA: 3-24-2025] nikhil \*\*brackets in original\*\*

The scientific community has focused the agenda of studies of climate change on lower-end warming and simple risk analyses, because more realistic complex assessments of risk are more difficult, the benchmark of the international targets is the Paris Agreement goal of limiting warming to <2°C, and the culture of climate science is to try to avoid alarmism [1]. Current fires, prolonged droughts, floods and heat waves, together with the consequent **food insecurity**, **civil unrest** and **migrations**, however, are opening the eyes not only of most scientists but also of most people all over the world to the need for considering, at least, the potential catastrophic effects of the collapse of ecosystems and society due to the current **emergency** of climate change.

The projections for the climate of the coming decades are, as we all know, worrying. The worst-case scenarios in the 2022 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report project temperatures by the next century that last occurred in the Early Eocene, reversing 50 million years of cooler climates within two centuries. The Pliocene and Eocene provide the best analogues for near-future climates [2]. Climates like those of the Pliocene are likely to prevail as soon as **2030** and unmitigated scenarios of emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) will produce climates like those of the **Eocene** for the coming decades. This situation is particularly alarming because human societies are locally adapted to a specific climatic niche with a mean annual temperature of ∼13°C [3]. We can thus logically expect that current and future warming may **easily overwhelm** societal adaptive capacity.

These climate projections could be even more detrimental if models would not neglect, as they currently do, **feedback in the carbon cycle** and potential **tipping points** that could generate higher GHG concentrations [4]. Examples include the apparent slowing of dampening feedbacks such as the natural carbon-sink capacity [5,6], the loss of carbon due to increasing frequencies and intensities of fire at northern latitudes [7], **droughts and fires** in the Amazon [8] or the thawing of Arctic permafrost that releases methane and CO2 [9]. This feedback is also likely not proportional to warming, as is sometimes assumed. Instead, abrupt and/or irreversible changes may be triggered at a temperature threshold [7]. Particularly worrying is a ‘tipping cascade’ in which **multiple tipping elements** interact in such a way that tipping one threshold increases the likelihood of **tipping another** [4,10].

Climate change also interacts with **other anthropogenic stressors** such as changes in **land use**, loss of **biod**iversity, **nutrient imbalances**, **pollution** and an **overuse** of available resources that are crossing the planetary safety boundary limits and operating as a possible **catastrophic** mix. This mix may exacerbate society vulnerabilities and cause multiple indirect stresses such as economic damage, loss of land and water, and food insecurity that can merge into system-wide synchronous failures. These cascading effects are not only biophysical or biogeochemical, but they also affect human society, generating **conflicts**, **political instability**, systemic financial risks, the spread of **infectious diseases** and the **risk of spillover**. For example, there is evidence that the 2007−10 drought contributed to the conflict in Syria [11].

Anthropogenic climate change interacting with these other stressors could thus cause a global catastrophe, in a **worldwide societal collapse**. Kemp et al. [1] have reminded us that although we have reasons to suspect it, such potential collapsing futures are rarely studied and poorly understood. The closest research is the search for evidence of tipping dynamics and estimating thresholds, timescales and impacts of potential tipping points [4]. We advocate for considering them while using the available knowledge acquired from historical and prehistorical examples of local and regional collapses, transformations and resilience of human societies also driven by climate and unsustainable use of resources (Fig. 1).

**Scenario TWO is PEAK OIL.**

**Peak oil guarantees economic collapse --- only accelerated transition solves.**

**Ahmed 23** [Nafeez Ahmed, PhD in International Relations from the University of Sussex’s School of Global Studies, 3-29-2023, America’s Fossil Fuel Economy is Heading for Collapse – It Signals the End of the Oil Age, resilience, https://www.resilience.org/stories/2023-03-29/americas-fossil-fuel-economy-is-heading-for-collapse-it-signals-the-end-of-the-oil-age/, tristan]

US oil production is about to peak, but the world is unprepared for the tremendous economic and political consequences. The only path through is **energy and economic transformation**.

The global economy is currently teetering **on** the **edge** of a banking crisis. The IPCC has just released its final major report warning that global carbon emissions need to peak and decline immediately if we are to avoid plunging into dangerous global warming by breaching the 1.5C ‘safe limit’. And in recent weeks and months, industry leaders have announced that the US shale oil and gas **revolution is over.**

Yet few if anyone is talking about why these things are happening at the same time, and what they really mean.

One of our biggest problems is that we tend to think in silos and sectors. But in the real world, the sectors we assume operate separately are in fact **fundamentally interconnected**. We ignore and downplay these systemic interconnections at our peril.

The persistence of global inflation has taken many economists by surprise. While they recognise that the impact of Russia’s war in Ukraine on energy and food supplies has been the biggest driver, that silo-ed assumption has led to a failure to understand why inflation is unlikely to simply disappear anytime soon.

We have good reason to believe that the underlying drivers of inflation go beyond just the war in Ukraine. Although it’s extremely difficult to quantify, climate change and environmental degradation is driving inflation by eroding agricultural productivity leading to higher food costs. The impact of extreme weather events is also creating larger and larger damages to infrastructure which in turn is incurring greater costs. As these costs feed into the system, the supply of goods and services becomes more expensive.

Less difficult to quantify is the fact that inflation is historically linked to energy price hikes. And there is mounting evidence that the world is experiencing a major shift in the global fossil fuel system that entails rising costs and diminishing returns, which will end up having a major inflationary effect for far longer and deeper than conventionally assumed.

The end of the shale boom

Since late last year, there have been a growing number of reports pointing out that the US shale revolution is coming to an end. Yet the massive global consequences of this are not being discussed.

“US Shale Boom Shows Signs of Peaking as Big Oil Well **Disappear**” read one headline in the Wall Street Journal. “The **aggressive growth era** of US shale is **over**,” Scott Sheffield, CEO of top independent shale firm Pioneer told the Financial Times. “The shale model definitely is no longer a swing producer.” And according to Bloomberg: “The specter of peak oil that haunted global energy markets during the first decade of the 21st century is once again rearing its head”.

US **industry executives are** now **openly acknowledging** that US oil production is likely to peak within the next five or six years, or perhaps in 2030. But there is mounting evidence that the peak will come much earlier, with some industry observers pinpointing its arrival as early as within the **next one or two years.**

What’s extraordinary about these admissions is how little they are impacting public debate. The implications are seismic. They contradict bullish overinflated forecasts of the industry made two decades ago – in 2005, for instance, Washington DC think-tank RAND Corp was forecasting that the US had enough shale oil to last some 400 years; and in 2012, a senior ExxonMobil executive claimed that the US has “about 100 years of natural gas supply”.

These grand claims were often breathlessly reported as unimpeachable fact by some of the most respected media institutions in the world.

Naysayers (like myself) warning that shale oil and gas would offer at best a temporary boost that was bound to peak and decline in the near-term with major global economic consequences, were dismissed as ‘doomers’.

Now, it turns out, we were right all along.

Mistakes of forecasting

That’s not to say that the traditional ‘peak oilers’ at the time were spot on. They wrongly expected that following the plateauing of conventional oil around 2005, oil prices would rocket up permanently into triple digits as global oil production would go into terminal decline. That didn’t happen. Instead, global demand shifted to the more expensive forms of unconventional oil and gas – especially US shale – which made-up much of the short-fall as conventional oil production slowed down.

But this was a recessionary environment, so global demand was much lower than expected. The massive 2005-2008 global oil price spikes helped induce a banking collapse. After the 2008 financial crash, this meant that there was much less demand for oil – but as oil production projects are planned years in advance pegged to expectations of demand, the oil just kept pumping despite much lower demand due to economic recession.

The result was a glut of shale oil and gas on world markets that allowed oil prices to drop and fuelled widespread belief in a new era of ‘Made in America’ cheap oil.

The US shale boom had a good run, no doubt about it – but its ‘healthy’ lifespan appears to be around two decades. If US shale oil and gas is about to peak and decline in the next few years, what does this mean for the US and global economy?

Coming economic contraction

Given that the US shale revolution played the key role in keeping global oil prices down and lubricating the energy requirements of continued economic activity, the retraction of the US shale revolution will have **massive economic impacts**.

US production has accounted for around **70% of the total increase** in global oil capacity since 2019, and 75% of growth in liquified gas supplies. So as US shale oil and gas peaks, plateaus and declines, global oil and gas production **will do so too very shortly after.**

Gulf oil and gas producers, however, will not be able to step-in to fill the shortfall. US oil production is currently averaging around 11 million barrels per day (mbd).

A 2022 analysis of production data among the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) which include the biggest powerhouses such as Saudi Arabia and the UAE, suggests that the maximum OPEC could collectively increase production is around 4.5 mbd – that is, **less than half of current US shale production.**

It’s also not clear how long OPEC can deploy spare capacity to maintain maximum levels of production. This suggests that OPEC will not be able to meaningfully fill the supply gap as US shale declines, which is a clear indicator that total global oil production will eventually begin to peak and decline.

In 2017, I assessed these trends in Failing States, Collapsing Systems. I predicted that US oil and gas production would probably peak and plateau **around 2025**, and that major Middle East producers would peak and plateau around the 2030s. This scenario now appears to be **unfolding before our eyes**. Yet no one is talking about it.

The near-term **economic and financial consequences** will be devastating, and they could lead to permanent long-term consequences without significant transformative action. The impact on the US economy will be profound.

Shale production accounted for **10% of GDP growth** in the United States from 2010-2015, which means that the next decade of shale’s plateauing and decline will gradually **wipe this** out. This will be experienced as a protracted inflationary economic crisis which, in turn, will contribute to volatility in global financial markets. Pundits will likely fail to understand these systemic interlinkages, focusing instead on failing banks, financial institutions and debt, without understanding its energetic triggers.

All this implies that we are **sleepwalking into a global energy crisis** that will, without accelerating the clean transformation of the energy system, create severe economic and financial consequences by undercutting the fundamental energetic basis of global economic flows. This will compound accumulated vulnerabilities in the banking system linked to unsustainable forms of debt.

The reverberations and bailouts seen in the cases of the Silicon Valley Bank, Credit Suisse and others are merely the opening cracks, that will become widening fissures in the absence of root-and-branch economic restructuring linked to the rapid development of a new energy system.

While that new system is still emerging, it is perhaps unavoidable that we will hit a number of bottlenecks. The danger is that instead of using these bottlenecks to restructure and adapt positively, we may end up regressing, with a loss of capital and energy that forestalls the full potential of transformation.

The window for action is extremely short: we need to act within this decade. Along the way, we need to be aware of the major trends which are likely to emerge as a result of the end of the US shale boom:

1. The illusion of cheap oil is evaporating

While we may still see fluctuating prices, it is becoming clearer that the glut of cheap oil this last decade was not a permanent feature of the energy system, but a temporary symptom of highly specific circumstances as the energy system moves deeper into a state of increasing inputs and diminishing returns. The immediate impact of the peak and plateau of US shale will be sustained high oil prices.

2. The near-term beneficiaries of this will be Gulf oil and gas producers

They currently appear to be the only fossil fuel energy suppliers with sufficient capacity to maintain production. They will therefore not only begin to dominate market share, they will also of course continue to reap higher profits from this more advantageous market position amidst high oil prices.

3. Some capital will move into OPEC for safety, but this is a mirage

Just as this last decade created the illusion of fossil fuel abundance due to the US shale boom, we may see that OPEC’s near-term ability to ramp up spare capacity as shale production declines perpetuates this illusion. We can expect to see lots of bullish statements from Gulf oil producers vindicating grand plans to expand their oil and gas production. Capital will move rapidly into OPEC countries, seen as a last safe space for investors looking for stability and growth. However, OPEC producers will also begin experiencing their twilight very shortly after the decline of US shale, which means that investors will begin to make serious losses as a result far sooner than they imagine.

4. Oil prices will **fluctuate within a higher range** as US shale peaks

While we can expect significant oil price volatility due to the recessionary impact of high oil prices which would lower demand and therefore allow prices to drop, as we move further into the era of plateau and decline across US and OPEC production, the overall decline in supply is likely to lead oil price fluctuations to narrow within a far higher range which will become a ‘new normal’ as long as oil demand remains high. This may also incentivise near-term conviction in the idea that new oil and gas investments are economical. That would be a colossal mistake, though, as we will see below due to coming reductions in oil demand in the latter half of this decade that will ameliorate high prices and make fossil fuel enterprises increasingly unprofitable.

5. We can expect heightened political polarisation

Incumbent industry ideology will likely blind many energy actors from recognising the writing on the wall – which explains the regressive self-defeating actions of the Biden administration in committing to Arctic drilling. This is like betting on the losing horse after being told it’s about to be overtaken by cars. It illustrates the power of America’s oil lobbies in their last ditch desperate attempt to stay alive on the back of taxpayer subsidies – flying in the face of hard economic realities (a few years ago I broke the story of the British military study which concluded that Arctic drilling was pointless for economic reasons because the costs are so high and returns so low as to make it commercially infeasible). That in turn suggests the political battleground between fossil fuel lobbies and clean energy advocates will become more fraught as the incumbency seeks to double-down in demanding more government subsidies. **Millions of jobs** will be at risk as the US shale industry declines, and this could create further negative economic and cultural consequences as the US returns to net import status.

6. Clean energy transformation will be critical to stabilise the global **economy and restore prosperity**

The **only viable pathway** through this crisis will be to accelerate the clean energy transformation focused on the deployment of exponentially improving technologies which are already scaling because they are cost-competitive with fossil fuels – namely, solar, wind and batteries. This will lay the groundwork for other potential applications such as e-fuels or green ammonia from green hydrogen. This transformation is already underway, and provides the opportunity for the US and others to produce larger quantities of energy at a fraction of the costs of fossil fuels. In Rethinking Climate Change, a RethinkX report for which I was contributing editor, we found that even in the absence of appropriate policy-decisions and major institutional barriers, economic factors will inevitably drive incumbent industries to collapse by 2040 as they are replaced by new solar, wind and battery systems. Unfortunately, while this is far faster than conventional analysts acknowledge, this is **not fast enough** to avoid dangerous climate change.

**It’s irreversible, and instant.**

**Towne 09** [Gorden Towne, scholar @ Boston University A&S Writing Program, 2009, Peak Oil: Priorities in Alternative Energy Development, Boston University, https://www.bu.edu/writingprogram/files/2009/11/wrjournal1towne.pdf, Willie T.]

As more oil is extracted from existing wells, it also becomes **more difficult** to locate the remaining oil deposits. Newly discovered oil fields generally contain **significantly lower quantities** of oil than past discoveries, based on the principle that the bigger deposits are easiest to find, and thus were found and harvested first. Thus, the problem of diminishing oil production from a single field over time is compounded by the fact that it becomes **increasingly costly** to locate progressively smaller oil deposits. Modern oil exploration is conducted using **seismic detectors** aboard large trucks or **ocean-going ships**.11 These oil-prospecting vehicles have **high operating costs** per unit area explored, so as oil becomes more scarce, the overhead cost for locating any one deposit increases. When oil becomes sufficiently scarce and expensive to locate and extract, the amount that can be produced will begin to decline year over year. The point of transition from increasing to decreasing production is known as the oil peak.

The economic, political, and sociocultural implications of peak oil, when it occurs, will be **dramatic and pervasive**. At the peak and **immediately thereafter**, burgeoning world oil demand will surpass the quantity that can possibly be supplied. This discrepancy will cause the cost of oil to **skyrocket**, which will be readily visible in the price at the pump. Because transportation is embedded in the cost of nearly all goods and services, rising fuel costs will place direct **pressure on a broad range of businesses**. This effect will manifest itself in increasing unemployment, along with rising consumer costs in everything from food to clothing and electronics. Domestically, the resulting ripple effect will be sufficient to set the economy on a **cycle of stagflation**, that is, simultaneous economic recession and monetary inflation. On its surface, this is not dissimilar from the effects of previous oil shortages, most notably that resulting from the **OPEC embargo** of the **early 1970s**.1213 In this instance, a temporary, artificial supply shortage was sufficient on its own to catalyze a cycle of stagflation, sending the U.S. economy into recession. In the case of peak oil, however, once this cycle begins, oil production will only continue a downward trend. In an unmitigated situation, this will cause the supply-and-demand discrepancy to grow ever wider. Where previous fluctuations in oil supply have triggered cyclic rises and falls in domestic economic health, problems spawned by falling oil supply will only worsen as production continues to decrease.

**Nuclear energy insulates shocks.**

**Lee 10** [Chien-Chiang Lee, Professor of Finance @ National Sun Yat-sen University (Kaohsiung, Taiwan) & Ph.D. in International Economics @ Chung Cheng University, 6-24-2010, Nuclear energy consumption, oil prices, and economic growth: Evidence from highly industrialized countries, Energy Economics, https://sci-hub.ru/10.1016/j.eneco.2010.07.001, Willie T.]

This study utilizes the Johansen cointegration technique, the Granger non-causality test of Toda and Yamamoto (1995), the generalized impulse response function, and the generalized forecast error variance decomposition to examine the dynamic interrelationship among nuclear energy consumption, real oil price, oil consumption, and real income in six highly industrialized countries for the period 1965–2008. Our empirical results indicate that the relationships between nuclear energy consumption and oil are as substitutes in the U.S. and Canada, while they are complementary in France, Japan, and the U.K. Second, the long-run income elasticity of nuclear energy is larger than one, indicating that nuclear energy is a luxury good. Third, the results of the Granger causality test find evidence of unidirectional causality running from real income to nuclear energy consumption in Japan. A bidirectional relationship appears in Canada, Germany and the U.K., while no causality exists in France and the U.S. We also find evidence of causality running from real oil price to nuclear energy consumption, except for the U.S., and causality running from oil consumption to nuclear energy consumption in Canada, Japan, and the U.K., suggesting that changes in price and consumption of oil influence nuclear energy consumption. Finally, the results observe transitory initial impacts of innovations in real income and oil consumption on nuclear energy consumption. In the long run the impact of real oil price is relatively larger compared with that of real income on nuclear energy consumption in Canada, Germany, Japan, and the U.S.

1. Introduction

During the two energy crises in the 1970s, the price of oil **doubled, even tripled** in some countries, resulting in an increase of production cost and sharply reducing export competitiveness, which may have reduced imported-energy-dependent countries' economy performance and international competitiveness. Fossil fuels including coal, oil, and gas nowadays provide **85% of energy needs**, and fossil-fuelled economic growth is the **main factor for global warming** through the release of carbon dioxide (CO2) into the atmosphere. In December 1997 the third session of the Conference of Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in Kyoto, Japan adopted the Kyoto Protocol. Annex I countries agreed to reduce their collective greenhouse gas emissions by 5.2% from their 1990 level by 2008 to 2012. The U.S. President Obama's New Energy for America plans to reduce 10 million barrels of oil consumption per day by 2030 and to cut the country's collective greenhouse gas emissions by 80% from the 1990 level by 2050.

To combat these energy and environmental configurations, one of the important priorities of energy and environmental policy is to **diversify the sources of energy** and to find a **secure, cheap, and nonGHG**-emitting energy supply (Fiore, 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008; Wolde-Rufael, 2010). As noted by the International Energy Agency (IEA, 2008), nuclear energy may **answer these conditions**, as it **reduces the instability** of oil prices, the dependence on oil imports for many countries, and greenhouse gas emissions. Therefore, nuclear energy (non-carbon energy) may be a **crucial substitute** energy for oil, and whether imported-energy-dependent countries can adopt nuclear energy to replace the majority of fossil fuels in their economy has become an important issue

**Absent action, world war ensues.**

**Bunzel 18** [Theodore Bunzel; Head of Lazard Geopolitical Advisory; 5-30-2018, "Do High Oil Prices Mean More International Conflict?", American Interest, https://www.the-american-interest.com/2018/05/30/do-high-oil-prices-mean-more-international-conflict/] sumzom

Does the relationship between oil prices and Russian behavior to which Bush alluded hold true? The higher the price of oil, the more aggressive Russia becomes? And what about other petrostates? Might it be true for those as well?

We may soon have more evidence for the proposition. Oil prices are brushing off 2016 lows and hitting three-year highs. Brent crude has been hovering above $70 a barrel since April, up from lows of around $30 in early 2016, fueled by OPEC production cuts and rising geopolitical tensions (over issues like the Iran deal). Though nuances, complications, and exceptions abound, the academic and historical evidence on balance tells us that, as we transition from a lower to a higher oil price regime, we can generally expect a darker geopolitical outlook. As rising oil revenues gives Russia, Saudi, Iran, and other oil-exporters an **added sense of confidence**, it may at least selectively inflame interstate tensions and lead to more aggressive behavior. That possibility, alongside an increasingly **hawkish U.S. national** security team and a President who appears to feel rather “unchained” of late, points to a potentially combustible mix just ahead.

It is generally taken for granted that aspects of geopolitics can function as a key input into oil prices. Trump’s mere threat of a U.S. strike in Syria, for example, caused oil to spike by 2 percent on April 11. In addition to short-term effects, geopolitical competition can influence prices in other ways. To give just one general example, as Soviet power spread into parts of the Third World after the independence era, some states felt safer nationalizing their oil industries to escape Western company control (Iraq in 1961, for example), and prices rose as a consequence.

But the relationship may also work the other way around: Oil prices can also be a key input into geopolitics. Many studies have demonstrated that oil prices have a direct effect on the domestic stability of petrostates. This makes ample intuitive sense: Higher prices **fill public coffers**, allowing governments to **palliate needy populations** and **potential elite opposition groups** by dispensing more largesse. Some regime elites may reason that a firmer grip on power may free them to carry out more assertive foreign policies without fear of being undermined at home.

There are, however, several complications to this general intuition. Some states already have sufficiently buoyant revenues relative to their small populations to satisfy their publics and feed clientelistic networks. Providing largesse can also backfire if prices drop; taking away something valuable that people have grown used to is a dangerous game, especially when elites aren’t ready to play it. And then of course there is the famed “oil curse”: For all sorts of reasons, from “Dutch disease” economic distortions to the derangement of normal citizen-state relationships, oil riches can in time undermine regimes, weakening and even destroying them.

That said, a more recent body of research has empirically demonstrated the intuitive twin of this conclusion: Higher prices cause greater interstate aggression by oil-producing countries. Why would this be the case? Greater oil revenue flushes petrostates with confidence and also cash that they can put toward military spending or foreign adventures. To take one obvious example, we need only look to Iran’s using its oil revenue to **fund proxy groups** such as Hamas and Hezbollah. Furthermore, military spending by one regional oil producer can beget spending by others, fueling regional **arms races** that can make **aggression** and conflict by **miscalculation** more likely. The onset of the **Iran-Iraq War** in September 1980 may be a **prime example** of that dynamic.

Most prominent among the empirical studies is Cullen S. Hendrix’s 2014 paper, which shows a statistically significant relationship between higher oil prices and “dispute behavior” (military actions short of actual war) by oil-exporters. (Hendrix also summed it up nicely in this Washington Post piece.) He found that “all things being equal, a one standard deviation ($18.60) increase in the price per barrel of oil from the sample mean ($33.81) is associated with a **13 percent** increase in the frequency of [dispute behavior]” in oil-exporting states. He also found that, above $77 a barrel, oil-exporters are significantly more dispute prone than non-oil exporters.

Hendrix also explores the potential complication of reverse causality: Could dispute behavior by oil-exporting countries be driving prices higher, rather than the other way around? A key analytical consideration here is timing. We can all agree that geopolitical activity affects prices in the short-term (such as the Syria example mentioned above), but is this reverse causality true on a sustained basis? Parsing out long-term signal from short-term noise, Hendrix examines whether elevated aggregate dispute behavior affects oil prices at the yearly—rather than daily or weekly—level, and finds that this relationship does not hold. His explanation here is that other players typically step in to redress markets: “While dispute behavior may drive prices changes in the short term . . . the **strategic significance** of oil prices and oil-exporting states encourages major powers to act in ways that stabilize markets, either through market intervention . . . or **direct, armed intervention**.”

Jeff Colgan of Brown University has also touched on this topic, finding through his research that oil has fueled—in some way—**one quarter to one half of interstate wars since 1973**. He also notes that oil-producers are **50 percent more likely** to engage in conflict than non-oil producers. Colgan identifies eight, non-mutually exclusive causal mechanisms for how oil fuels international conflict, most of which are **implicitly exacerbated** by higher prices. They are: “(1) **resource wars**, in which states try to **acquire oil reserves by force**; (2) petro-aggression, whereby oil insulates aggressive leaders such as Saddam Hussein or Ayatollah Ruhollah Khomeini from domestic opposition and therefore makes them more willing to engage in risky foreign policy adventurism; (3) the externalization of civil wars in oil-producing states (“petrostates”); (4) financing for insurgencies—for instance, Iran funneling oil money to Hezbollah; (5) conflicts triggered by the **prospect of oil-market domination**, such as the U.S. war with Iraq over Kuwait in 1991; (6) clashes over control of oil transit routes, such as shipping lanes and pipelines; (7) oil-related grievances, whereby the presence of foreign workers in petrostates helps extremist groups such as al-Qaeda recruit locals; and (8) oil-related obstacles to multilateral cooperation, such as when an importer’s attempt to curry favor with a petrostate prevents multilateral cooperation on security issues.”

Though he doesn’t substantiate statistically that higher prices lead to more conflict through these channels, he implies it heavily. For example, he writes that, “the low oil prices of the 1990s have given way to higher and more volatile prices, increasing the magnitude of the consequences one can expect from oil-conflict linkages.”

While the emerging academic evidence may validate the claim that higher oil prices lead to more aggression, the historical and anecdotal evidence is somewhat mixed, and understandably so. Oil price is clearly only one of many inputs into foreign policy decision-making, and an indirect one at that. No leader thinks, “Now that oil is at $X, I’m going to invade my neighbor.” Context obviously matters, too: No one imagines that Ecuador or Norway is going to invade or try to blackmail a neighbor just because spot prices rise 15 or 30 percent in a given six-month period. Price levels seep into decision-making more subtly, affecting interlocking beliefs about strategic behavior generally and specific cases more particularly; they may fuel self-confidence by shoring up budget outlooks and funding the tools of more aggressive behavior in contexts where such behavior could conceivably make sense.

Moreover, there are many contravening (and occasionally countervailing) complications. Prominent among these is the fact that low oil prices can incentivize states to “wave the flag” in order to distract from domestic difficulties—so the impact of low oil prices might lead to more aggressive behavior in some cases. That suggests that neither high nor low prices per se may be the trigger affecting behavior, but rather notable changes in price that become politically salient in one way or another.

And there’s also the tricky issue of timing: Over what timeframe does increased oil revenue fuel aggression? Is it in anticipation of higher prices, in direct response to the current pricing levels, or is there more of a lag in effect as oil revenue slowly shores up—or is expected to shore up—budgets and military spending over time? The answer might depend on specific cases and leadership cadres.

There is also a scaling problem. If a 20 percent rise in oil prices makes a more assertive foreign policy more likely in a given country, does a 40 percent rise make it twice as likely? Or put differently, how much of a difference in price, and presumably in expected revenues, does it take to cross a threshold where it might have an impact on decision-making? Are there multiple thresholds?

Russia **exemplifies these issues**. Taking the same long view as George W. Bush in his interview, it seems self-evident that rising oil prices and higher government revenues over the course of the 2000s **gave Putin confidence**, funded military expansion and modernization, and helped enable Russia’s **most revanchist tendencies**. Between 2003 and 2013, **Russian military expenditure doubled** as the price of Brent crude rose from a low of around $20 a barrel in 2001 to a high of more than $140 a barrel in 2008. Russia, as the saying goes, is a gas station with nuclear weapons; a higher pump price thus means more weapons, nuclear and otherwise.

But when you cross reference this conclusion with specific acts of Russian aggression over the past roughly twenty years, the picture gets much more complicated. When Russia invaded **Georgia** in August 2008, oil was above $100 a barrel. Same with **Russia’s invasion of Crimea** in 2014. But Russia also dramatically intervened in Syria in September 2015, when oil had dropped to around $50 a barrel and the economy was sputtering due to both low energy prices and Western sanctions. Here, many analysts plausibly described these interventions as a way of rallying Russians to the flag and distracting them from domestic hardship. More likely, Putin saw an emergency in Syria that simply had to be dealt with, no matter the cost or risk; the Assad regime was in danger of collapsing, and Syria is Russia’s only ally offering ports and bases in the Mediterranean basin. So Russia is a bit of a mixed bag, but on balance its behavior—especially over a long timeframe—appears to support the thesis.

Saudi Arabia’s role in the 1973 Yom Kippur war also illustrates the tricky question of timing. Saudi funding of the effort was enabled by a financial buffer created by a rise in revenues from the late 1960s, and was likely justified by an expected rise in revenues due to an oil price increase that was anticipated, in part, because of the very war it was in the process of financing. Its reserves had already grown so large that, for the first time, Saudi Arabia could ride out a supply (and revenue) disruption and still finance a war. But the Saudis helped finance a war that they themselves did not participate in. So if rising oil prices led to greater interstate aggression, it did so in this case in a particularly indirect way.

These are all interesting and important nuances that attenuate any direct causal connection one might be tempted to draw between oil prices and conflict. So it would be nice to know if historical studies have shown any significant statistical relationship between fluctuations in key sources of government revenue (and what memoirs and archives tell us about how those situations were perceived) and interstate behavior. It would be even nicer to drill down into such studies to find cases where specific lucrative commodities—for example, European colonial profits such as from British opium sales in China, or cotton grown in Egypt—made any difference in the behavior of the relevant governments. Alas, such studies do not exist.

But regardless of the timeframe and mechanism, academic and historical studies alike do suggest that higher oil prices have generally lead to more aggressive, or at least riskier, behavior in recent decades—whether in anticipation of higher prices, immediately in their wake, or only after sufficient revenue stores are built up.

So are we at a point in the energy price cycle where, all else equal, we should expect greater interstate conflict? We’re close to Hendrix’s $77 a barrel threshold, above which oil-exporters are significantly more dispute-prone than non-oil exporters. But given the nuances just described, this specific price threshold is probably too cute. The more realistic argument to make is about the effect of a higher-price vs. lower-price paradigm over a multi-year horizon (particularly in light of the timing issue and potential lag). And if the period of the past two years (when Brent largely hovered between $40 and $60) was a lower-price paradigm, 2018-19 is potentially gearing up to be a higher-price paradigm driven by continued supply cuts by OPEC, tight global inventories, and—in a coincidental way—heightened geopolitical risks. We’ll see how these factors play out, but if oil prices remain elevated we may begin to subtly feel their effects on behavior by Iran, Saudi Arabia, Russia, and perhaps others.

None of this is to say that oil prices are the most important factor in the geopolitical outlook over the near, medium, or long-term. The reputed hawkishness of Mike Pompeo and John Bolton, the effect of the upcoming mid-term elections on Trump’s decision-making, and reactions to potential exogenous shocks (for example, a major clash in Syria between U.S. or Israeli and Iranian or Russian forces) will play a much more direct and important role in shaping the geopolitical landscape. But a higher oil price regime (if it holds) could well make petrostates like Iran, Saudi, and Russia more aggressive—either in **challenging the United States and Europe** in the case of Russia, or by exacerbating ongoing proxy conflicts in and around the Middle East in the cases of Iran and Saudi Arabia. Given these and other dynamics, we should expect a bumpy ride ahead.

**Extinction!**

**Clare 23** [Stephen Clare; Effective Altruism writer and existential risks researcher; June 2023; "Great power war"; 80000 Hours; https://80000hours.org/problem-profiles/great-power-conflict/; accessed 12-05-2024, BZ + Willie T. + sumzom]

A modern great power war could see **nuclear weapons**, **bioweapons**, **autonomous weapons**, and other destructive **new** technologies deployed on an unprecedented scale.

It would probably be the most destructive event in history, shattering our world. It could even threaten us with **extinction**.

<<TEXT CONDENSED NONE OMITTED>>

We’ve come perilously close to just this kind of catastrophe before.¶ On October 27, 1962 — near the peak of the Cuban Missile Crisis — an American U-2 reconnaissance plane set out on a routine mission to the Arctic to collect data on Soviet nuclear tests. But, while flying near the North Pole, with the stars obscured by the northern lights, the pilot made a navigation error and strayed into Soviet airspace.1¶ Soviet commanders sent fighter jets to intercept the American plane. The jets were picked up by American radar operators and nuclear-armed F-102 fighters took off to protect the U-2.¶ Fortunately, the reconnaissance pilot realised his error with enough time to correct course before the Soviet and American fighters met. But the intrusion enraged Soviet Premier Nikita Khrushchev, who was already on high alert amidst the crisis in Cuba.¶ “What is this, a provocation?” Khrushchev wrote to US President John F. Kennedy. “One of your planes violates our frontier during this anxious time when everything has been put into combat readiness.”¶ If the U-2’s path had strayed further west, or the Soviet fighters had been fast enough to intercept it, this incident could have played out quite differently. Both the United States and the USSR had thousands of nuclear missiles ready to fire. Instead of a nearly-forgotten anecdote, the U-2 incident could have been a trigger for war, like the assassination of Franz Ferdinand.

<<LINE BREAKS CONTINUE>>

**Competition** among the world’s most powerful countries shapes our world today. And whether it’s through future incidents like the lost U-2, or something else entirely, it’s plausible that it could **escalate** and lead to a major, devastating war.

Is there anything you can do to help avoid such a terrible outcome? It is, of course, difficult to imagine how any one individual can hope to influence such world-historical events. Even the **most powerful** world leaders often **fail to predict** the global consequences of their decisions.

But I think the **likelihood** and **severity** of great power war makes this among the **most pressing problems** of our time — and that some solutions could be impactful enough that working on them may be one of the highest-impact things to do with your career.

By taking action, I think we can create a future where the threat of great power war is a distant memory rather than an ever-present danger.

Summary

Economic **growth** and **technological progress** have **bolstered** the arsenals of the world’s most powerful countries. That means the next war between them could be far worse than World War II, the deadliest conflict humanity has yet experienced.

Could such a war actually occur? We can’t rule out the possibility. Technical **accidents** or diplomatic **misunderstandings** could spark a conflict that **quickly escalates**. Or international **tension** could cause leaders to decide they’re **better off fighting than negotiating**.

<<TEXT CONDENSED NONE OMITTED>>

It seems hard to make progress on this problem. It’s also less neglected than some of the problems that we think are most pressing. There are certain issues, like making nuclear weapons or military artificial intelligence systems safer, which seem promising — although it may be more impactful to work on reducing risks from AI, bioweapons or nuclear weapons directly. You might also be able to reduce the chances of misunderstandings and miscalculations by developing expertise in one of the most important bilateral relationships (such as that between the United States and China).¶ Finally, by making conflict less likely, reducing competitive pressures on the development of dangerous technology, and improving international cooperation, you might be helping to reduce other risks, like the chance of future pandemics.¶ Our overall view¶ Recommended¶ Working on this issue seems to be among the best ways of improving the long-term future we know of, but all else equal, we think it’s less pressing than our highest priority areas (primarily because it seems less neglected and harder to solve).¶ Scale ¶ There’s a significant chance that a new great power war occurs this century.¶ Although the world’s most powerful countries haven’t fought directly since World War II, war has been a constant throughout human history. There have been numerous close calls, and several issues could cause diplomatic disputes in the years to come.¶ These considerations, along with forecasts and statistical models, lead me to think there’s about a one-in-three chance that a new great power war breaks out in roughly the next 30 years.¶ Few wars cause more than a million casualties and the next great power war would probably be smaller than that. However, there’s some chance it could escalate massively. Today the great powers have much larger economies, more powerful weapons, and bigger military budgets than they did in the past. An all-out war could kill far more people than even World War II, the worst war we’ve yet experienced.¶ Could it become an existentially threatening war — one that could cause human extinction or significantly damage the prospects of the long-term future? It’s very difficult to say. But my best current guess is that the chance of an existential catastrophe due to war in the next century is somewhere between 0.05% and 2%.¶ Neglectedness ¶ War is a lot less neglected than some of our other top problems. There are thousands of people in governments, think tanks, and universities already working on this problem. But some solutions or approaches remain neglected. One particularly promising approach is to develop expertise at the intersection of international conflict and another of our top problems. Experts who understand both geopolitical dynamics and risks from advanced artificial intelligence, for example, are sorely needed.¶ Solvability ¶ Reducing the risk of great power war seems very difficult. But there are specific technical problems that can be solved to make weapons systems safer or less likely to trigger catastrophic outcomes. And in the best case, working on this problem can have a leverage effect, making the development of several dangerous technologies safer by improving international cooperation and making them less likely to be deployed in war.¶ At the end of this profile, I suggest five issues which I’d be particularly excited to see people work on. These are:¶ Developing expertise in the riskiest bilateral relationships¶ Learning how to manage international crises quickly and effectively and ensuring the systems to do so are properly maintained¶ Doing research to improve particularly important foreign policies, like strategies for sanctions and deterrence¶ Improving how nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction are governed at the international level¶ Improving how such weapons are controlled at the national level¶ Profile depth¶ In-depth ¶ This is one of many profiles we've written to help people find the most pressing problems they can solve with their careers. Learn more about how we compare different problems, see how we try to score them numerically, and see how this problem compares to the others we've considered so far.¶ Why might preventing great power war be an especially pressing problem?¶ A modern great power war — an all-out conflict between the world’s most powerful countries — could be the worst thing to ever happen to humanity.¶ Historically, such wars have been exceptionally destructive. Sixty-six million people died in World War II, likely the deadliest catastrophe humanity has experienced so far.¶ Since World War II, the global population and world economy have continued to grow, nuclear weapons have proliferated, and military technology has continued to advance. This means the next world war could be even worse, just as World War II was much deadlier than World War I.¶ It’s not guaranteed that such a war will break out. And if it does, it may not escalate to such a terrible extent. But the chance can’t be ignored. In fact, there are reasons to think that the odds of World War III breaking out this century are worryingly high.¶ A modern great power war would be devastating for people alive today. But its effects could also persist long into the future. That’s because there is a substantial chance that this century proves to be particularly important. Technologies with the potential to cause a global catastrophe or radically reshape society are likely to be invented. How we choose to develop and deploy them could impact huge numbers of our descendants. And these choices would be affected by the outcomes of a major war.¶ To be more specific, there are three main ways great power conflict could affect the long-term future:¶ High international tension could increase other risks. Great power tensions could make the world more dangerous even if they don’t lead to war. During the Cold War, for example, the United States and the USSR never came into direct conflict but invested in bioweapons research and built up nuclear arsenals. This dynamic could return, with tension between great powers fueling races to develop and build new weapons, raising the risk of a disaster even before shots are fired.¶ War could cause an existential catastrophe. If war does break out, it could escalate dramatically, with modern weapons (nuclear weapons, bioweapons, autonomous weapons, or other future technologies) deployed at unprecedented scale. The resulting destruction could irreparably damage humanity’s prospects.¶ War could reshape international institutions and power balances. While such a catastrophic war is possible, it seems extremely unlikely. But even a less deadly war, such as another conflict on the scale of World War II, could have very long-lasting effects. For example, it could reshape international institutions and the global balance of power. In a pivotal century, different institutional arrangements and geopolitical balances could cause humanity to follow different long-term trajectories.¶ The rest of this profile explores exactly how pressing a problem great power conflict is. In summary:¶ Great power relations have become more tense. (More.)¶ Partly as a result, a war is more likely than you might think. It’s reasonable to put the probability of such a conflict in the coming decades somewhere between 10% and 50%. (More.)¶ If war breaks out, it would probably be hard to control escalation. The chance that it would become large enough to be an existential risk cannot be dismissed. (More.)¶ This makes great power war one of the biggest threats our species currently faces. (More.)¶ It seems hard to make progress on solving such a difficult problem (more) — but there are many things you can try if you want to help (more).¶ International tension has risen and makes other problems worse¶ Imagine we had a thermometer-like device which, instead of measuring temperature, measured the level of international tension.2 This ‘tension metre’ would max out during periods of all-out global war, like World War II. And it would be relatively low when the great powers3 were peaceful and cooperative. For much of the post-Napoleonic 1800s, for example, the powerful European nations instituted the Concert of Europe and mostly upheld a continental peace. The years following the fall of the USSR also seem like a time of relative calm, when the tension metre would have been quite low.4¶ How much more worried would you be about the coming decades if you knew the tension metre would be very high than if you knew it would be low? Probably quite a lot. In the worst case, of course, the great powers could come into direct conflict. But even if it doesn’t lead to war, a high level of tension between great powers could accelerate the development of new strategic technologies, make it harder to solve global problems like climate change, and undermine international institutions.¶ During the Cold War, for instance, the United States and USSR avoided coming into direct conflict. But the tension metre would still have been pretty high. This led to some dangerous events:¶ A nuclear arms race. The number of nuclear warheads in the world grew from just 300 in 1950 to over 64,000 in 1986.¶ The development of new bioweapons. Despite signing the Biological Weapons Convention in 1972, the search for military advantages motivated Soviet decision makers to continue investing in bioweapon development for decades. Although never used in combat, biological agents were accidentally released from research facilities, resulting in dozens of deaths and threatening to cause a pandemic.5¶ Nuclear close calls. Military accidents and false alarms happened regularly, and top decision makers were more likely to interpret these events hostilely when tensions were high. On several occasions it seems the decision about whether or not to start a nuclear war came down to individuals acting under stress and with limited time.¶ This makes international tension an existential risk factor. It’s connected to a number of other problems, which means reducing the level of international tension would lower the total amount of existential risk we face.¶ The level of tension today¶ Recently, international tension seems to have once again been rising. To highlight some of the most salient examples:¶ China-United States relations have deteriorated, leading to harsh diplomatic rhetoric and protectionist trade policies that aim to reduce the countries’ economic interdependence.¶ Russia’s invasion of Ukraine has killed about a hundred thousand people so far, raised the risk of nuclear war, and sent United States-Russia relations to their lowest point since the Cold War.¶ Chinese and Indian soldiers fought deadly skirmishes along their countries’ disputed border in 2020–21.¶ These dynamics raise an important question: how much more dangerous is the world given this higher tension than it would be in a world of low tension?¶ I think the answer is quite a bit more dangerous — for several reasons. First, international tension seems likely to make technological progress more dangerous. There’s a good chance that, in the coming decades, humanity will make some major technological breakthroughs. We’ve discussed, for example, why one might worry about the effects of advanced artificial intelligence systems or biotechnology. The level of tension could strongly affect how these technologies are developed and governed. Tense relations could, for example, cause countries to neglect safety concerns in order to develop technology faster.6¶ Second, great power relations will strongly influence how nations do, or do not, cooperate to solve other global collective action problems. For example, in 2022, China withdrew from bilateral negotiations with the United States over climate action in protest of what it perceived as American diplomatic aggression in Taiwan. That same year, efforts to strengthen the Biological Weapons Convention were reportedly hampered by the Russian delegation after their country’s invasion of Ukraine raised tensions with the United States and other western countries.¶ And third, if relations deteriorate severely, the great powers could fight a war.¶ How likely is a war?¶ Wars are destructive and risky for all countries involved. Modern weapons, especially nuclear warheads, make starting a great power war today seem like a suicidal undertaking.¶ But factors like the prevalence of war throughout history, the chance that leaders make mistakes, conflicting ideologies, and commitment problems, make me think that conflict could break out anyway.¶ On balance, I think such an event is somewhat unlikely but hardly unthinkable. To quantify this: I put the chance we experience some kind of war between great powers before 2050 at about one-in-three.7¶ War has occurred regularly in the past¶ One reason to think a war is quite likely is that such conflicts have been so common in the past. Over the past 500 years, about two great power wars have occurred per century.8¶ Naively, this would mean that every year there’s a 2% chance such a war occurs, implying the chance of experiencing at least one great power war over the next 80 years — roughly until the end of the century — is about 80%.9¶ This is a very simple model. In reality, the risk is not constant over time and independent across years. But it shows that if past trends simply continue, the outcome is likely to be very bad.¶ Has great power war become less likely?¶ One of the most important criticisms of this model is that it assumes the risk is constant over time. Some researchers have argued instead that, especially since the end of World War II, major conflicts have become much less likely due to:¶ Nuclear deterrence: Nuclear weapons are so powerful and destructive that it’s just too costly for nuclear-armed countries to start wars against each other.10¶ Democratisation: Democracies have almost never gone to war against each other, perhaps because democracies are more interconnected and their leaders are under more public pressure to peacefully resolve disputes with each other.11 The proportion of countries that are democratic has increased from under 10% in 1945 to about 50% today.¶ Strong economic growth and global trade: Global economic growth accelerated following World War II and the value of global exports grew by a factor of almost 30 between 1950 and 2014. Since war disrupts economies and international trade, strong growth raises the costs of fighting.12¶ The spread of international institutions: Multilateral bodies like the United Nations General Assembly and Security Council promote diplomatic dialogue and facilitate coordination to punish transgressors.13¶ It is true that we are living through an unusually long period of great power peace. It’s been about 80 years since World War II. We just saw that a simple model using the historical frequency of great power wars suggests there was only a 20% chance of going that long without at least one more war breaking out. This is some evidence in favour of the idea that wars have become significantly less common.¶ At the same time, we shouldn’t feel too optimistic.¶ The numerous close calls during the Cold War suggest we were somewhat lucky to avoid a major war in that time. And a 20% chance of observing 80 years of peace is not that low.14 Structural changes might have dramatically reduced the likelihood of war. Or perhaps we’ve just been lucky. It could even be that technological advances have made war less likely to break out, but more deadly when it occurs, leaving the overall effect on the level of risk ambiguous. It just hasn’t been long enough to support a decisive view.15¶ So while the recent historical trend is somewhat encouraging, we don’t have nearly enough data to be confident that great power war is a thing of the past. To better predict the likelihood of future conflict, we should also consider distinctive features of our modern world.16¶ One might think that a modern great power war would simply be so destructive that no state leader would ever choose to start one. And some researchers do think that the destruction such a war would wreak globally makes it less likely to occur. But it would be hard to find anyone who claims this dynamic has driven the risk to zero.¶ First, a war could be started by accident.¶ Second, sometimes even prudent leaders may struggle to avoid a slide towards war.¶ We could blunder into war¶ An accidental war can occur if one side mistakes some event as an aggressive action by an adversary.¶ This happened several times during the Cold War. The earlier example of the wayward American reconnaissance plane shows how routine military exercises carry some escalation risk. Similarly, throughout history, nervous pilots and captains have caused serious incidents by attacking civilian planes and ships.17 Nuclear weapons allow for massive retaliatory strikes to be launched quickly — potentially too quickly to allow for such situations to be explained and de-escalated.¶ It is perhaps more likely, though, that an accidental war could be triggered by a technological malfunction. Faulty computers and satellites have previously triggered nuclear close calls. As monitoring systems have become more reliable, the rate at which such accidents have occurred has been going down. But it would be overconfident to think that technological malfunctions have become impossible.¶ Future technological changes will likely raise new challenges for nuclear weapon control. There may be pressure to integrate artificial intelligence systems into nuclear command and control to allow for faster data processing and decision making. And AI systems are known to behave unexpectedly when deployed in new environments.18¶ New technologies will also create new accident risks of their own, even if they’re not connected to nuclear weapon systems. Although these risks are hard to predict, they seem significant. I’ll say more about how such technologies — including AI, nuclear, biological, and autonomous weapons — are likely to increase war risks later.¶ Leaders could choose war¶ All that said, most wars have not started by accident. If another great power war does break out in the coming decades, it is more likely to be an intentional decision made by a national leader.¶ Explaining why someone might make such a costly, destructive, unpredictable, and risky decision has been called “the central puzzle about war.” It has motivated researchers to search for “rationalist” explanations for war. In his 2022 book Why We Fight, for example, economist Chris Blattman proposes five basic explanations: unchecked interests, intangible incentives, uncertainty, commitment problems, and misperceptions.19¶ Blattman's Five (Rationalist) Explanations for War¶ This section discusses how great power tensions may escalate to war in the next few decades. It focuses on three potential conflicts in particular: war between the US and China, between the US and Russia, and between China and India. These are discussed because each of these countries are among the world’s largest economies and military spenders, and seem particularly likely to fight. At the end, I briefly touch on other potential large conflicts.¶ Projected real GDP of the US, China, India and Russia according to a 2022 Goldman Sachs analysis Source: Author’s figure using data from: Kevin Daly and Tadas Gedminas, “Global Economics Paper The Path to 2075 — Slower Global Growth, But Convergence Remains Intact,” Global Economics Paper (Goldman Sachs, December 6, 2022), https://www.goldmansachs.com/intelligence/pages/gs-research/the-path-to-2075-slower-global-growth-but-convergence-remains-intact/report.pdf.¶ United States-China¶ The most worrying possibility is war between the United States and China. They are easily the world’s largest economies. They spend by far the most on their militaries. Their diplomatic relations are tense and have recently worsened. And their relationship has several of the characteristics that Blattman identifies as causes of war.¶ At the core of the United States-China relationship is a commitment problem.¶ China’s economy is growing faster than the United States’. By some metrics, it is already larger.20 If its differential growth continues, the gap will continue to widen between it and the United States. While economic power is not the sole determinant of military power, it is a key factor.21¶ The United States and China may be able to strike a fair deal today. But as China continues to grow faster, that deal may come to seem unbalanced. Historically, such commitment problems seem to have made these kinds of transition periods particularly dangerous.22¶ In practice, the United States and China may find it hard to agree on rules to guide their interactions, such as how to run international institutions or govern areas of the world where their interests overlap.¶ The most obvious issue which could tip the United States-China relationship from tension into war is a conflict over Taiwan. Taiwan’s location and technology industries are valuable for both great powers.¶ This issue is further complicated by intangible incentives.¶ For the United States, it is also a conflict over democratic ideals and the United States’ reputation for defending its allies.¶ For China, it is also a conflict about territorial integrity and addressing what are seen as past injustices.¶ Still, forecasts suggest that while a conflict is certainly possible, it is far from inevitable. As of 8 June 2023, one aggregated forecast23 gives a 17% chance of a United States-China war breaking out before 2035.24¶ A related aggregated forecast of the chance that at least 100 deaths occur in conflict between China and Taiwan by 2050 gives it, as of 8 June 2023, a much higher 68% chance of occurring.25¶ United States-Russia¶ Russia is the United States’ other major geopolitical rival.¶ Unlike China, Russia is not a rival in economic terms: even after adjusting for purchasing power, its economy is only about one-fifth the size of the United States’.¶ However, Russia devotes a substantial fraction of its economy to its military. Crucially, it has the world’s largest nuclear arsenal. And Russian leadership has shown a willingness to project power beyond their country’s borders.¶ Country Military spending in 2021 (2020 USD, PPP adjusted)¶ United States 801 billion¶ China 293 billion¶ India 76.6 billion¶ United Kingdom 68.4 billion¶ Russia 65.9 billion¶ Top five countries by estimated military spending, 2021. Source: SIPRI¶ Russia’s 2022 invasion of Ukraine demonstrated the dangers of renewed rivalry between Russia and the United States-led West. The war has already been hugely destructive: the largest war in Europe since World War II, with hundreds of thousands of casualties already and no end to the conflict in sight. And it could get much worse. Most notably, Russian officials have repeatedly refused to rule out the use of nuclear weapons.¶ Unchecked interests and intangible incentives are again at play here. Vladimir Putin leads a highly-centralised government. He has spoken about how his desire to rebuild Russia’s reputation played in his decision to invade Ukraine.¶ Given their ideological differences and history of rivalry, it is reasonable to expect that the United States and Russia will continue to experience dangerous disagreements in the future. As of 8 June 2023, an aggregated forecast gives a 20% chance that the United States and Russia will fight a war involving at least 1,000 battle deaths before 2050.¶ China-India¶ India is already the world’s third-largest economy. If national growth rates remain roughly constant, the size of the Indian economy will surpass that of the United States’ sometime this century. India also has nuclear weapons and is already the world’s third-largest military spender (albeit at a much lower level than China or the United States).¶ One reason to worry that China and India could fight a war is that they already dispute territory along their border. Countries that share a border, especially when it is disputed, are more likely to go to war than countries that do not. By one count, 88% of the wars that occurred between 1816 and 1980 began as wars between neighbours.26¶ In fact, China and India already fought a brief but violent border war in 1962. Deadly skirmishes have continued since, resulting in deaths as recently as 2020.¶ Forecasters agree that a China-India conflict seems relatively (though not absolutely) likely. An aggregated forecast gives a 19% chance of war before 2035.¶ Other dangerous conflicts¶ These three conflicts — United States-China, United States-Russia, and China-India — are not the only possible great power wars that could occur. Other potential conflicts could also pose existential risk, either because they drive dangerous arms races or see widespread deployment of dangerous weapons.¶ We should keep in mind India-Pakistan as a particularly likely conflict between nuclear-armed states and China-Russia as a potential, though unlikely, conflict between great powers with a disputed border and history of war. Plus, new great powers may emerge or current great powers may fade in the years to come.¶ While I think we should prioritise the three potential conflicts I’ve highlighted above, the future is highly uncertain. We should monitor geopolitical changes and be open to changing our priorities in the future.¶ Overall predictions¶ Below is a table listing relevant predictions from the forecasting platform Metaculus, including the number of predictions made, as of 10 March 2023. Note the different timescales and resolution criteria for each question; they may not be intuitively comparable.¶ Prediction Resolution criteria Number of predictions Metaculus prediction¶ World war by 2151 Either:¶ A war killing >0.5% of global population, involving >50% of countries totalling >50% of global population from at least 4 continents.¶ Or:¶ A war killing at least >1% of global population, involving >10% of countries totalling >25% of global population¶ 561 52%¶ World War III before 2050 Involving countries >30% of world GDP OR >50% of world population¶ AND¶ >10M deaths¶ 1640 20%¶ Global thermonuclear war by 2070 EITHER:¶ 3 countries each detonate at least 10 nuclear warheads of at least 10 kt yield outside of their territory¶ OR¶ 2 countries each detonate at least 50 nuclear warheads of at least 10 kt outside of their territory¶ 337 11%¶ When will be the next great power war? Any two of the top 10 nations by military spending are at war¶ “At war” definition:¶ EITHER¶ Formal declaration¶ OR¶ Territory occupied AND at least 250 casualties¶ OR¶ Media sources describe them as “at war”¶ 25th percentile: 2031¶ Median: 2048¶ 75th percentile: 2088¶ Never (not before 2200): 8%¶ No non-test nuclear detonations before 2035 No nuclear detonation other than controlled test¶ [Note the negation in the question. It resolves negatively if a warhead is detonated]¶ 321 69%¶ At least 1 nuclear detonation in war by 2050 Resolves according to credible media reports 476 31%¶ I have previously independently estimated the likelihood of seeing a World War III-like conflict this century. My calculation first adjusts historical base rates to allow for the possibility that major wars have become somewhat less likely, and uses the adjusted base rate to calculate the probability of seeing a war between now and 2100.¶ This method gives a 45% chance of seeing a major great power war in the next 77 years. If the probability is constant over time then the cumulative probability between now and 2050 would be 22%. This is aligned with the Metaculus predictions above.¶ We can also ask experts what they think. Unfortunately, there are surprisingly few expert predictions about the likelihood of major conflict. One survey was conducted by the Project for the Study of the 21st Century. The numbers were relatively aligned with the Metaculus forecasts, though slightly more pessimistic. However, it seems a mistake to put too much stock in this survey (see footnote).27¶ We now have at least a rough sense of a great power war’s probability. But how bad could it get if it occurred?¶ A new great power war could be devastating¶ At the time, the mechanised slaughter of World War I was a shocking step-change in the potential severity of warfare. But its severity was surpassed just 20 years later by the outbreak of World War II, which killed more than twice as many people.¶ A modern great power war could be even worse.¶ How bad have wars been in the past?¶ The graph below shows how common wars of various sizes are, according to the Correlates of War’s Interstate War dataset.28¶ The x-axis here represents war size in terms of the logarithm of the number of battle deaths. The y-axis represents the logarithm of the proportion of wars in the dataset that are at least that large.¶ Using logarithms means that each step to the right in the graph represents a war not one unit larger, but 10 times larger. And each step up represents a war that is not one unit more likely, but 10 times more likely.¶ Cumulative frequency distribution of severity of interstate wars, 1816-2007 Source: Author’s figure. See the data here. Data source: Correlates of War Interwar dataset, v4.029¶ What the graph shows is that wars have a heavy tail. Most wars remain relatively small. But a few escalate greatly and become much worse than average.¶ Of the 95 wars in the latest version of the database, the median battle death count is 8,000. But the heavy tail means the average is 334,000 battle deaths. And the worst war, World War II, had almost 17 million battle deaths.30¶ The number of battle deaths is only one way to measure the badness of wars. We could also consider the proportion of the population of the countries involved who were killed in battle. By this measure, the worst war since 1816 was not World War II. Instead, it’s the Paraguayan War of 1864–70. In that war, 30 soldiers died for every 1,000 citizens of the countries involved. It’s even worse if we also consider civilian deaths; while estimates are very uncertain, it’s plausible that about half of the men in Paraguay, or around a quarter of the entire population, was killed.31¶ What if instead we compared wars by the proportion of the global population killed? World War II is again the worst conflict since 1816 on this measure, having killed about 3% of the global population. Going further back in time, though, we can find worse wars. Ghengis Khan’s conquests likely killed about 9.5% of people in the world at the time.¶ The heavy tail means that some wars will be shockingly large.32 The scale of World War I and World War II took people by surprise, including the leaders who initiated it.¶ It’s also hard to know exactly how big wars could get. We haven’t seen many really large wars. So while we know there’s a heavy tail of potential outcomes, we don’t know what that tail looks like.¶ That said, there are a few reasons to think that wars much worse than World War II are possible:¶ We’re statistically unlikely to have brushed up against the end of the tail, even if the tail has an upper bound.¶ Other wars have been deadlier on a per-capita basis. So unless wars involving countries with larger populations are systematically less intense, we should expect to see more intense wars involving as many people as World War II.¶ Economic growth and technological progress are continually increasing humanity’s war-making capacity. This means that, once a war has started, we’re at greater risk of extremely bad outcomes than we were in the past.¶ So how bad could it get?¶ How bad could a modern great power war be?¶ Over time, two related factors have greatly increased humanity’s capacity to make war. 33¶ First, scientific progress has led to the invention of more powerful weapons and improved military efficiency.¶ Second, economic growth has allowed states to build larger armies and arsenals.¶ Since World War II, the world economy has grown by a factor of more than 10 in real terms; the number of nuclear weapons in the world has grown from basically none to more than 9,000, and we’ve invented drones, missiles, satellites, and advanced planes, ships, and submarines.

Ghengis Khan’s conquests killed about 10% of the world, but this took place over the course of two decades. Today that proportion may be killed in a matter of hours.

First, nuclear weapons could be used.

Today there are around 10,000 nuclear warheads globally.34 At the peak of nuclear competition between the United States and the USSR, though, there were 64,000. If arms control agreements break down and competition resurges among two or even three great powers, nuclear arsenals could expand. In fact, China’s arsenal is very likely to grow — though by how much remains uncertain.

Many of the nuclear weapons in the arsenals of the great powers today are at least 10 times more powerful than the atomic bombs used in World War II.35 Should these weapons be used, the consequences would be catastrophic.

By any measure, such a war would be by far the **most destructive**, dangerous event in human history, with the potential to cause billions of deaths.

The probability that it would, on its own, lead to humanity’s **extinction** or unrecoverable collapse, is contested. But there seems to be some possibility — whether through a **famine** caused by **nuclear winter**, or by **reducing** humanity’s resilience enough that something else, like a **catastrophic pandemic**, would be far more likely to reach **extinction**-levels (read more in our problem profile on nuclear war).

**Nuclear weapons** are **complemented** and **amplified** by a **variety** of other **modern military** technologies, including **improved missiles**, **planes**, **submarines**, and **satellites**. They are **also not** the only **military technology** with the **potential** to cause a **global catastrophe** — **bioweapons**, too, have the potential to cause massive harm through accidents or unexpected effects.

## 2AC

### AT: Framework

**Comparing opportunity costs is best for clash and argument refinement, which is a prerequisite.**

**Fairclough and Fairclough**, **18**—emeritus Professor of Linguistics at Lancaster University AND School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Central Lancashire (Norman and Isabela, “A procedural approach to ethical critique in CDA,” Critical Discourse Studies Volume 15, 2018 - Issue 2, 169-185, dml)

\*CDA = critical discourse analysis

The term ‘discourse ethics’ is Habermas’s (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 30-34), but we are using it here in a general sense: for the view that an **adequate framework for ethical evaluation** and **critique must include the comparison** and **evaluation of different arguments for different lines of action** in a process of deliberation. Such assessments of arguments pose difficult problems, and deliberation is by no means guaranteed to produce consensus. Nevertheless, deliberation can **contribute to the quality of ethical critique** by ensuring that a **wide range of arguments are considered** in making decisions, that all alternatives are **taken into account** and **thoroughly criticized**, and that people have to (at least) **moderate their own partialities** in evaluating a range of arguments collectively. To illustrate this, we shall refer to two ethically contentious political decisions and the courses of action which they led to. The first is the decision by the British Prime Minister Tony Blair to advocate Britain’s participation in the invasion of Iraq in 2003 (we have discussed this in Fairclough & Fairclough 2012: 96-97). The second is the decision by the German Chancellor Angela Merkel to open Germany’s borders to the refugees coming from the Middle East in the autumn of 2015. In so doing, we will illustrate the relevance of ethical critique from all three of the major ethical positions: deontological, consequentialist and virtue ethics. CDA and practical argumentation CDA is mainly concerned with critical analysis of discourse which is **oriented to action**, including political discourse, but also managerial, organisational and other forms of discourse. The **primary activity** in such discourse is **practical argumentation**, argumentation over action, over **what is to be done** (e.g. **what policies should be adopted**). Practical argumentation should accordingly be the **primary analytical focus** in CDA (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012). This **does not exclude other** familiar **forms of analysis** (such as **analysing representations**) but subsumes them. The point of representing (or ‘framing’) an issue in a particular way is to **create particular public attitudes** and **opinions**, and thus **legitimize** or **facilitate a particular course of action**. Critique of discourse is the focal concern for CDA, but critique of discourse is by no means exclusive to CDA. On the contrary, critique of discourse is a normal part of all discourse. It is a **normal part of everyday practical argumentation**: people **find reasons in favour** and **against proposals for action**, they **consider alternatives**, **adopt them** or **discard them**, and so on. A course of action **worthy of being adopted** is **one that has withstood criticism**. Agents may decide to discard proposals either because they are **likely to be instrumentally inadequate** in relation to the goals they are supposed to achieve, or because they find them **ethically problematic**, for example because the values or goals they are motivated by are unacceptable. Ethical critique is a concern for CDA at three levels: as an aspect of agents’ reasoning, for example as an aspect of politicians’ deliberation over what policy to adopt; as an aspect of the normative critique of those deliberative practices which CDA carries out; as an aspect of the critique that CDA itself is open to. There are therefore three main places where ethical values come into the picture: what values are arguers (e.g. politicians) arguing from? what are the values that CDA analysts are espousing, from the perspective of which they are evaluating the arguments of those arguers? what are the values of other critics (including critics of CDA)? CDA is itself a form of discourse, which is specialized for academic critique of social actions, events, practices and structures, with a focus on discourse. It can itself be viewed as a **form of practical argumentation** (Fairclough 2013), open to the **same critical questions** that it directs at the discourse it subjects to critique. CDA practitioners are bound by an obligation to address ethical evaluations that are critical of their work. Moreover, the ethical judgement which is part of the normative critique carried out in CDA **does not come out of thin air**, but is built upon elements drawn selectively from ethical judgement and critique in public discourse. And CDA needs to rethink its own critique in response to shifts in public discourse and political reality, such as the emergence of controversy over ‘political correctness’ (Fairclough 2003). We have argued that the **primary focus** of critical analysis in CDA should be **practical argumentation** and **deliberation** (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012). This was based upon a claim about the character of political discourse, which we saw as primarily concerned with the question of **what is to be done**. Deliberation is an abstract genre in which **(alternative) proposals are being tested**. The **framework** for critical analysis of **practical argumentation** and **deliberation** which we have developed since 2012 provides CDA with an **effective way of evaluating** and **critiquing discourse** from an **ethical point of view**. One of its strengths is that it allows **different approaches** to thinking about ethical questions (deontological, consequentialist and virtue ethics) to be combined within an **ethical deliberative procedure for achieving impartiality**. In a more recent version of this framework (Fairclough, I. 2016, 2018), deliberation is modelled as a critical procedure designed to **filter out those practical conclusions** (and corresponding decisions) that **would not pass the test of critical questioning**. Two distinct argument schemes are involved in deliberative activity types: an argument from goals, circumstances and meansgoal relations, and an argument from (negative or positive) consequences. Proposals are **tentatively supported** by **practical arguments from goals**, and are **tested in the light of their potential consequences**, via **practical arguments from consequence**. Goals are generated by various sources of normativity, and these can be what conventionally is called ‘values’, but can also be obligations, rights and duties. Critical questioning seeks to **expose potential negative consequences** of proposals and thus evaluate them in terms of their **acceptability** or **reasonableness**: if the consequences are **on balance unacceptable** for those affected, then it would be **more reasonable not to engage in the proposed course of action**. Unacceptable consequences are **critical objections** which can **conclusively rebut a proposal**. Where two or more proposals survive critical testing, one may be **chosen as the better proposal** on nonarbitrary grounds (e.g. being simpler to enact). In our view, the **most significant perspective** in the light of which proposals are to be tested is a **consequentialist** one (Fairclough & Fairclough 2012, Fairclough, I. 2016). The term ‘consequence’ is however used here broadly to refer to several types of states-of-affairs: the goals of the proposed action (the intended consequences); the potential unintended consequences (or risks) involved; various known and predictable impacts, including impacts on institutional, social facts. If a proposal is **likely to result in a situation** that is illegal or **unjust**, then the proposal can be **evaluated as unacceptable** from both a **consequentialist ethics** and a **deontological ethical position**. Our framework can therefore **accommodate** deontological **ethical issues** within a **broader consequentialist perspective**. By inquiring into the motives of action, the framework can also accommodate a virtue-ethical perspective.

#### Epistemology is secondary to the plan’s harm reduction.

**Jarvis 2k** [Darryl; 2000; Former Senior Lecturer in International Relations at the University of Sydney; *International Relations and the Challenge of Postmodernism*, *University of South Carolina Press*, “Continental Drift,” p. 128-129, https://www.jstor.org/stable/j.ctv2321hxj; GR] \*\*brackets in original\*\*

More is the pity that such irrational and obviously abstruse debate should so occupy us at a time of great global turmoil. That it does and continues to do so reflect our lack of judicious criteria for evaluating theory and, more importantly, the lack of attachment theorists have to the real world. Certainly, it is right and proper that we ponder the depths of our theoretical imaginations, engage in **epistemological and ontological debate**, and analyze the sociology of our knowledge. But to support that this is the **only task** of international theory, let alone the most important one, smacks of **intellectual elitism** and displays a certain **contempt** for those who search for guidance in their **daily struggle** as actors in international politics. What does Ashley’s project, his **deconstructive efforts**, or valiant fight against positivism say to the truly marginalized, **oppressed**, and destitute**?** How does it help solve the plight of the poor, the displaced refugees, the **casualties of war**, or the émigrés of death squads**?** Does it **in any way speak** to those whose actions and thoughts comprise the **policy and practice** of international relations? On all these questions one must answer **no**. This is not to say, of course, that all theory should be judged by its technical rationality and problem-solving capacity as Ashley forcefully argues. But to support that **problem-solving** technical theory is not necessary—or in some way bad—is a **contemptuous position** that **abrogates** any **hope of solving** some of the **nightmarish realities** that **millions confront daily**. As Holsti argues, we need ask of these theorists and their theories the ultimate question, “So what?” To what purpose do they deconstruct, problematize, destabilize, undermine, ridicule, and belittle modernist and rationalist approaches? Does this get us any further, make the world any better, or enhance the human condition? In what sense can this “debate toward [a] **bottomless pit** of **epistemology and metaphysics”** be judged pertinent, relevant, **helpful**, or cogent to **anyone** other than those **foolish enough** to be scholastically excited by **abstract** and recondite debate.

### AT: Settler Colonialism

#### 1. Settler colonialism is ahistorical---elimination was not a totalizing drive AND far from locked-in.

**Greer ’19** [Allan; July; professor of history and Canada Research Chair in Colonial North America at McGill University; The William and Mary Quarterly, “Settler Colonialism and Empire in Early America,” vol. 76 no. 3 p. 383—390; DML]

The most rigorous of the settler colonial theorists in my opinion, Wolfe insisted that his subject was not an ideology or a set of ideas but rather a logic. “Although predicated on land rather than on human bodies,” he writes, “**settler colonialism** is premised on a cultural **logic of elimination** that insistently seeks the removal of indigenous humans from the land in question.”4 The “logic of elimination” is a basic **drive** to get rid of the Indigenous presence by one means or another and to replace it with a new society. This approach encompasses material as well as discursive aspects; **massacre**, **removal**, **assimilation**, and **immigration** are part of its repertoire, and so too are various forms of racism, legal instruments of **dispossession**, and historical narratives denying violence.5 Heavily indebted to Marxism and postcolonial theory, Wolfe grounded his concept in material considerations: the basic **distinction** between settler colonialism and the “**ordinary**” **colonialism** of the sort one finds in nineteenth-century India or Africa is that the latter depends on the **exploitation** of native labor while the former had no real need for the natives’ work and only wanted their **land**.6

Extending this basic analysis, Wolfe developed a highly suggestive, if somewhat **schematic**, **theory** of race formation.7 With the United States mainly in mind, he argued that the racism directed at African Americans and that focused on Native Americans were different species of exclusion. Whereas the one had to do with denigrated, unfree labor, the other targeted peoples whose very existence stood as an obstacle to the expansion of settler society—it was the racism of work versus the racism of land. Wolfe pointed to the divergent treatment of African Americans and Indigenous people where “race mixing” was concerned, arguing that the “one-drop rule” that treated anyone with the slightest African ancestry as black reflected the colonizer’s concern to maximize the laboring population, whereas the tendency to assimilate people of European and Indigenous ancestry to the white category (particularly characteristic of Australian practice) stemmed from an impulse to reduce and eliminate the Native population.

All very well where the nineteenth century is concerned, but readers of the Quarterly may legitimately ask whether the concept of settler colonialism helps us to understand North America prior to the late eighteenth century. Or is Wolfe’s framework stuck in the modern? Is it indeed a theory of modernity? Wolfe did have much to say on early America and settler colonialism, but insightful though his writings on that subject are, they are quite different from the reflections he derived from the Australian case. The materialism has faded, replaced by a preoccupation with colonialist doctrines and discourses. He emphasized an imperialist legal notion, the “doctrine of discovery,” whereby European monarchies supposedly asserted both sovereignty and dominium from the moment of contact, reducing Indigenous peoples to mere occupants of the land. This he saw as the basis for a future physical dispossession and replacement by settlers.8 On this point, Wolfe seems to be swallowing the historical fable promulgated in the 1820s by Chief Justice John Marshall to justify Indian removal and other legal techniques of dispossession. Marshall notoriously propounded the view that “discovery” was tantamount to conquest and that the United States had inherited Britain’s claim not only to rule but also to own vast portions of the continent.9 Wolfe took this breathtaking **distortion** of the **colonial past** as a description of early modern colonization rather than as a more modern ideological justification for contemporary practices of dispossession. More generally, he tended to exaggerate the importance and **misconstrue** the thrust of the arrogant pronouncements of sixteenth- and seventeenth-century **imperialists**, reading into their **vague** territorial pretensions a **real program** for **replacing** Natives with settlers. Apart from the fact that **colonial charters** and other early assertions of **sovereignty** were more likely to suggest the **incorporation** than the **elimination** of Indigenous peoples, these expressions of imperialist chutzpah cannot be taken as guides to what actually happened, any more than the Epistles of Saint Paul can explain the Crusades.

In Wolfe’s wake, a whole school of settler colonial history has arisen with the aim of reexamining world history through this lens. This intellectual movement has spawned many valuable studies of modern colonialism, notably in applying the concept to the case of Israel as well as to numerous other nineteenth- and twentieth-century contexts. Insofar as more remote periods are concerned, however, results have been less impressive. A recently published handbook attempts to sum up the history of settler colonialism over the millennia and around the world through an array of essays on topics ranging from ancient empires to present-day New Caledonia.10 Readers of the volume learn about the Portuguese settlement of the islands of Madeira and the Azores (where there were no indigenous populations to eliminate) and about Roman colonia, which reinforced Roman presence on the edges of their multiethnic empire but which only pushed aside natives from small enclaves. Some of the premodern cases show affinities to **settler colonialism** à la Wolfe, but the contributors generally conclude that the fit is partial at best. The scholarship on display is very good but in most cases fairly conventional in approach, and it is hard to see what value settler colonial theory adds. In this volume and in other programmatic publications, definitions of settler colonialism are rather **amorphous**, generally **lacking** the **theoretical bite** of Wolfe’s early writings.

In my own field, attempts to reconceive New France’s history on a settler colonial basis have led to lamentable results. Emboldened by theory and unencumbered by substantial knowledge of the topic, Edward Cavanagh argues that early New France needs to be understood as a “corporate” colony founded on the principle of **terra nullius**.11 That legal notion had long served as a justification for the colonization of Australia, so why not New France? Aware of, but undeterred by, Lauren Benton and Benjamin Straumann’s demonstration that this phrase was **unheard** of before the **nineteenth century**, Cavanagh constructs a new, ad hoc definition of the term by which it comes to stand for a failure to recognize “Aboriginal title” (which is actually a twentieth-century concept) linked to a willingness to settle land without purchase or cession. “The practice of terra nullius—whereby settlers acquire title, improve, and alienate, in a colonized region where no purchases, cessions, or conquests take place—was prevalent in New France.”12 In fact, the French never maintained that North America was empty; to the contrary, their program of colonization was all about incorporating Indigenous nations into their empire. In **New France**, as in **New Spain**, officials repeatedly proclaimed Indigenous lands **inviolable**, and the layered land tenures of Canada left **considerable room** for settler-Indigenous **coexistence**. That said, French settlers did indeed dispossess and displace Natives (if not on a large scale, given the demographics); however, purchases and cessions are neither here nor there. The practice of purchase and cession, initiated in some of the English colonies in the seventeenth century and later enshrined in the Royal Proclamation of 1763, was an instrument of unusually thoroughgoing dispossession.13 It was a quintessential settler colonial technique for utterly eliminating Indigenous property, and so the fact that the French took a less absolutist approach makes a poor justification for equating them with the colonizers of Australia.

Unarguably, there are places and periods in the early modern history of North America where the “logic of elimination” was operative in both its material and its discursive aspects, where Natives were massacred and pushed aside to make way for colonists who proclaimed the land rightfully and exclusively theirs. For readers of this journal, it is hardly necessary to enumerate the sites along the Atlantic coast where colonists displaced Indigenous peoples and established jurisdictions, sovereignties, and property regimes for themselves, for the basic outlines of this story of appropriation and dispossession have long been familiar to historians. It is not entirely clear that labeling it an instance of settler colonialism adds much to our understanding of the phenomenon. More importantly, it is not obvious that settler colonial studies have much to contribute to the study—central to current work in the field—of the broader, continental context in which North American colonies took shape.

The European invasion of America was extensive and **variegated**; settler colonies were but one dimension of the larger process and, until the nineteenth century, not the most spatially significant. North of **New Spain** and east of the narrow English and **French settlements** lay the **vast bulk** of the North American continent, Indigenous country that was neither **conquered** nor **colonized**. Yet even in the absence of the **eliminationist** workings of settler colonialism, it was **strongly affected** by the European presence, more so in some periods and regions than in others. Consider, for example, the large southeastern region often referred to as the “**shatter zone**,” where waves of violence and disease succeeded one another, beginning with Hernando de Soto’s entrada of 1539–42 and continuing through successive slave raids and the rise of militaristic coalescent societies that Robbie Ethridge and others have tracked.14 **Trade** with South Carolina, especially of guns for slaves, was the **main driver** of this destructive upheaval, and so, of course, colonization was centrally implicated. Something generally similar was occurring in the southwestern borderlands due to the presence of the colony of New Mexico.15 Only in a **settler** national **narrative** of the most **providentialist sort** could the emergence of these regional **shatter zones** be seen as **simply** paving the way for **settlement** and colonization.

Further north, the **Great Lakes** region was similarly shaken by more than a century of wars and migrations following Haudenosaunee and French intrusions that started in the 1660s. This was a site where **French**, and later **British**, intruders played a transformative role through trade, religious evangelism, diplomatic negotiation, sex, and war. They did not **conquer or rule**—and they certainly **did not settle**, except in the tiniest enclaves—but they did exert influence and claim **imperial** sovereignty.16 Coming to terms with French sovereignty claims to the Great Lakes and Upper Mississippi requires us to recognize a more complex, less fully territorialized and exclusive concept of political authority than the modern definition that dominates Wolfe’s thinking on the subject. **French** imperial **sovereignty** here was a matter of **infiltration** rather than **full takeover**; certainly it had nothing to do with **eliminating** the Native, for it was entirely **dependent** upon that **Indigenous presence**. As was the case in the Southeast, there was a colony in the picture, in this case French Canada on the Saint Lawrence River, the source of commercial supplies, missionaries, coureurs de bois, and military officers. The whole pays d’en haut phenomenon was unimaginable in the absence of this European settlement (and vice versa). Consequently, it would be problematic to isolate the colonized colonies from the interior zones of influence and subject them to analysis as instances of settler colonialism. Canada and the pays d’en haut were inextricably connected. In this respect, New France was exceptional only in the scale of its imperial hinterland. All across the trans-Appalachian interior in the eighteenth century, Indigenous territories were affected by direct and indirect Euro-American infiltration, without conquest or real colonization. **S**ettler **c**olonial **t**heory seems **ill-equipped** to deal with the **complexities** of these **commercial**/**imperial** incursions except as a prelude to settlement.

To take full account of the larger continental field and the upheavals occasioned by European intrusion, we need to think about empires as well as settler colonies—or rather we need to consider settler colonialism as an aspect of early modern imperialism. Recent work on the history of empires underscores the wide variety of spatial practices employed in the creation of overseas empires in the early modern period, the nodes and networks, the reliance on sea-lanes and interior waterways to extend power and extract wealth.17 Colonial settlements were one element of a broader pattern of imperial expansion, especially prominent in the British American Empire. **S**ettler **c**olonial **t**heory, valid and useful though it may be in certain settings, has the effect of isolating processes of colonization from larger processes of imperial penetration. It also has the effect of **flattening** long-term **historical change** by assimilating early modern colonialism to patterns of settlement and dispossession more characteristic of the nineteenth century.

That said, let me acknowledge one of the important contributions of settler colonial theory to the practice of history. Regardless of the period we study, historians inhabit the modern world (call it postmodern if you prefer; it makes no difference to the present point), and many of us are non-Indigenous residents of settler colonial countries. Since, as Patrick Wolfe never tired of **repeat**ing, settler colonialism is “a **structure** not an **event**,” we are the beneficiaries of eliminationist practices that continue to victimize Native peoples.18 As citizens and as **scholars**, we should be **mindful** of our subject **positionality** in this respect. And surely that means **scrutinizing** the past for **differences** and transformations, not for pieces of evidence taken **out of context** to suggest an **eternal** always-already **condition**.

#### 2. Decolonization is either a move to innocence or resource impossible—causes mass violence.

**Schuller 21**, Professor of Anthropology and Nonprofit and NGO Studies at Northern Illinois University and affiliate at the Faculté d’Ethnologie, l’Université d’État d’Haïti, Ph.D., University of California-Santa Barbara. (Mark, 2021, “Humanity’s Last Stand: Confronting Global Catastrophe,” Rutgers University Press, ISBN: 9781978820883)

More **radical** (which simply means getting **at the root**) solutions were proposed by a group of Indigenous scholar-activists and compiled by Waziyatawin and Yellow Bird.75 Their book, For Indigenous Minds Only, offers several approaches to **free the mind** and body from **colonialism** and also prepare for the **collapse** of the **carbon economy** and hence the **settler world system** dependent on it. We know this new world is coming; coal and oil are finite resources, and although some people are going to extraordinary lengths, like fracking and mining tar sands, to squeeze the last drops from inside the earth, eventually there will be nothing left for them to take. The contributors to For Indigenous Minds Only argue for a return to, and protection of, **sacred ancestral land**.

This is most definitely not the same as the survivalism increasingly depicted in pop culture dystopias. From Survivor to the seemingly endless fascination with the “zombie apocalypse,” the message seems to be clear: rugged individual, save thyself. Kill or be killed. The reality is that there are now over **seven billion human lives** on this planet, and this number will **only increase**. It is **irresponsible** to retreat into **survivalist mode**, trying to revive a **foraging way of life** and living “**off the grid**.” There just **isn’t enough land** to sustain the **hunting and gathering** necessary to fill **that many stomachs**. At best this scenario is **blind to this fact**. This dream of a survivalist retreat requires a certain level of **privilege** to imagine it. Worse, it reproduces a **genocidal**, **settler logic**: whose land will (white) folks learn to live off of?

The human race needs **forward-thinking solutions**, **not a retreat** into settler, **genocidal fantasies**. Anthropological research has shown that indeed necessity is often the mother of invention. Facing the **limitations** of our **resources** offers us an opportunity to **rethink** our priorities and fix, once and for all, our **unequal system** of distribution. We have the capacity to feed **eleven billion people**, and that’s without assuming a **change in diet**. Changing to a vegan diet would not only be more equitable, but is also one of the best ways to cool the planet, even if more foundational **changes to agribusiness** are not made. A global consciousness that takes seriously the possibility that we will not be around if we don’t **make major changes**—species thinking or using an anthropological imagination—could be useful in actually coming together, to take seriously the belief that we are all connected. We need to make **inequalities** and hunger in a world of plenty part of the **old regime**, when we thought the sky was our limit. Unfortunately, we have been polluting that sky. We need to look for **alternative energy sources**, but we also need to ask why we want more in the first place. Are we as a species happier under capitalism? Working longer hours, accumulating more stuff, investing ever greater resources in guarding that stuff? Creating massive prisons and increasing state violence rather than fixing the structural inequalities?

Our anthropological imagination helps us loosen the vise of consumption so we can see alternatives. Anthropological research has uncovered a plethora of other models. Bhutan, in the Himalayas, sandwiched between the world’s two most populous nations, is the only country in the world that is “carbon negative,” pulling more carbon dioxide from the atmosphere than it emits. The country also scores the highest on the “Gross National Happiness” index, a term coined by Bhutan’s King Jigme Singye Wangchuck in 1972 and developed into a philosophy of holistic development enshrined in their 2008 constitution.76

These models aren’t some New Age romanticizing of poor folks who have to make do with less, putting them forward as more “spiritual” or “salt of the earth.” As discussed in chapter 1, the !Kung San (also called the Dobe Ju’Hoase), in the Kalahari Desert in southern Africa spent only twenty hours a week on survival, which leaves plenty of time for other things like leisure, enjoying time with family and building community.77 Feminists correctly pointed out the gender bias in this research.78 And we must always remember that the !Kung were placed in reservations by European colonial governments. Even with these obvious shortcomings in the anthropological record, the !Kung offer lessons in sustainability desperately needed now.

Even societies with what anthropologists call rank inequality, with differences in status and prestige, managed to figure out ways of channeling status consciousness into distributing rather than accumulating things like the “potlatch” from First Nations in the Pacific Northwest.79These ceremonies were highly public displays of leaders’ power and prestige by giving goods to neighboring communities. The archaeological record is also full of examples of societies resisting incorporation into larger empires. The Maya “collapse” is usually reported on by Spanish conquistadores to justify their plunder: they’re gone, and/or they were also empires, so what’s the big deal? All across the Yucatán and Guatemala, millions of descendants beg to differ: their linguistic diversity and their many livelihoods offer a dif­ferent reading. While they practiced sustainable swidden agriculture, the “collapse” was more likely folks’ decision to abandon cities, scale down, and live more sustainably.80 We too can decide to reduce our footprint.

Given advances in technology, archaeologists have increasingly more precise carbon dating, zooming into the past, being able to pinpoint when an artifact was created or settlement used to within a decade. A more complex picture emerges, a more precise snapshot of a given space and its occupants: How long was a site occupied? How was the site used? When during the year was it habited? Humans have faced climate change in the past, such as during El Niño events, as well as longer periods such as the Ice Age (the last of which ended 13,700 years ago) that literally bridged the Americas and the so-called Old World in what is now the Bering Strait. Those who survived must have been doing something right, evolutionarily speaking. Every human alive is a descendent of these survivors. Evidence shows that societies that were flexible, able to adapt to change, have been able to survive. Importantly, human societies with high degrees of cooperation did well. And, in truth, being on the move has been one of the surest adaptation and survival strategies we’ve come up with. Settler colonialism has cut this strategy off by imposing borders: as species migrate, humans, particularly Indigenous communities, can no longer migrate with them. One of the most memorable scenes from the movie The Day After Tomorrow depicted hordes of people trying to cross south at the U.S.-Mexico border. If migration is our only hope, that reproduces the same genocidal logic of settler colonialism, unless we leave the earth like in the movie Interstellar or the Netflix series Lost in Space. And in those stories, we’re explicitly colonizers. The term itself is reclaimed and positive. The film Elysium presents a more complex tale, focusing on those left behind.81

Our anthropological imagination **offers us the tools** needed to **face head on** the changes in store. Our anthropological imagination **respects** our different local **realities** and understandings while seeing the global scale, “**species thinking**”—seeing the forest and the trees. While **respecting and tapping** into local knowledge, including what Dan Wildcat calls “**indigenuity**,” our anthropological **imagination** helps us identify a **politics** of solidarity, something to fight for.82 So to recap what using our anthropological **imagination** offers to our understanding of **climate change**,

• Within an anthropological timeline, which began millions of years ago, we can see that this contemporary **climate change is real** and significant.

• Truly and **without exaggeration** we can acknowledge that our species itself is at **risk of annihilation**.

• It becomes clear that contemporary climate change is a **human-created phenomenon**.

• But it is not some distant **dystopian future**—climate change is **already happening** now to many in tropical coastal areas, not to mention it has been happening for **several hundred years** as Indigenous populations were murdered, taken from their land, and **forced to assimilate** into settler society, their **climate** already irrevocably **destroyed**.

• We can see that the **roots of climate change** are anchored within the **global economic order** and the racism inherent to it, needed to justify the widescale murder, theft, forced removal, and enslavement necessary to make it run.

• Therefore, we know that **climate change** is always about justice, since societies most at risk of losing their lands and resources are usually the survivors of colonialism and slavery.

• We can tell the struggle is always local and always global and that localized struggles tend to have dif­ferent languages, dif­ferent terms of the debate, and dif­ferent and multiple strategic foci besides the ones that we may think are important.

• We understand that we need to learn lessons about adaptation on a massive scale and that our flexibility, cooperation, and diversity have helped us to survive.

• Anthropological evidence can identify societies that have rejected hypercompetition and short-term gain and have adapted, resisted, and survived.

The **rules of the game** set up by the **global capitalist class** blind us to alternative ways of living, and with a combination of fear and cultural programming we are made to think that we need to literally buy into the system to survive and that this competitive, shortsighted, violent approach is a reflection of human nature.83 It’s not. While we have the capacity for **violence and destruction**, we also have the capacity for love and **creativity**. Our anthropological **imagination** can help us identify **moments** in human history and contemporary examples that **encouraged** these greater **capacities**. And hopefully our anthropological imagination can **help us come together**, identifying **common cause** and mustering the will to make the **necessary changes** if we are to survive.