

## CONTENTS

- Preface ix
- 1** The Pivotal Generation: “You Are Here” 1
- Illusions of Separation* 2
- The Context That Makes Us Pivotal* 5
- Arbitrary Demands?* 8
- Unique Historical Period, Incomparable Moral Responsibility* 10
- Heavier Burdens* 13
- Unlimited Threats* 17
- Tipping Points* 23
- Conclusion* 26
- 2** The Presence of the Past 28
- Owning Our National Past* 31
- Disowning Our National Past* 34
- The Pure Fairness Argument* 36
- The Wrongful Imposition Arguments* 43
- Conclusion* 54
- 3** Engagement across Distance and Engagement across Time 58
- The Phenomenology of Agency* 60
- The Danger of Transition* 61

viii CONTENTS

	<i>Contemporary “Strangers” and the Affordability of Alternative Energy</i>	66
	<i>Future “Strangers” and Tipping Points</i>	75
	<i>The Date-of-Last-Opportunity to Prevent Disaster</i>	77
	<i>Further Reasons? Past Sacrifice, Hope, and Continuity</i>	82
	<i>Conclusion</i>	87
4	Are There Second Chances on Climate Change?	89
	<i>Fix It Later?</i>	89
	<i>Contrasting Purposes of CO<sub>2</sub> Removal</i>	94
	<i>Scaling Up in Time?</i>	98
	<i>Bequeathing Risks</i>	103
	<i>The Reversible and the Irreversible</i>	111
5	Taking Control of Our Legacy	117
	<i>Powerful Enemies, Allied Masses</i>	117
	<i>Planning the “Final Harvest”: Deceptive Delay</i>	124
	<i>Enabling the “Final Harvest”: Banks’ BAU</i>	128
	<i>Preventing the “Final Harvest”: The Active Many vs. the Ruthless Few</i>	130
	Acknowledgments	137
	Appendix on Inequality	139
	Notes	143
	Index	175

# 1

## The Pivotal Generation

### “YOU ARE HERE”

The crucial role we fill, as moral beings, is as members of a cross-generational community, a community of beings who look before and after, who interpret the past in the light of the present, who see the future as growing out of the past, who see themselves as members of enduring families, nations, cultures, traditions.<sup>1</sup>

We continue to live on a stage where there is nothing but the present. Past and future alike have dissolved into a perpetual now, leaving us imprisoned in a moment without links backwards or forwards.<sup>2</sup>

Every decade is consequential in its own way, but the twenty-twenties will be consequential in a more or less permanent way. Global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are now so high—in 2019, they hit a new record of forty-three billion metric tons—that ten more years of the same will be nothing short of cataclysmic.<sup>3</sup>

## Illusions of Separation

Climate change is a matter of time. As we ordinarily think of time, now is the critical time for vigorous action to try to impose some limit on climate change. Human action or inaction during the next decade or so is likely to determine how severe climate change finally becomes. It is still—only barely—possible for us to act just in time to prevent the worst in spite of the fact that invaluable time has been thrown away by callous and corrupt political leaders who have largely wasted the last three decades since the Framework Convention on Climate Change was adopted with much fanfare in 1992 and by the executives in the fossil-fuel industry who have deceived and tricked the public and corrupted our politics so that they can continue business-as-usual for as long as possible.<sup>4</sup> That we still have the opportunity to act just in time makes us here and now the most important generation of humans to have lived with regard to the conditions of life on this planet for us and all the other species. We can be the “greatest generation” for the climate struggle or the miserably self-preoccupied and easily manipulated ones who failed to rise to the occasion and whom future generations will recall, if at all, with contempt. “Time is of the essence,” as the lawyers phrase it in the contracts. The time is now, and the time is short. So those of us alive now are the pivotal generation in human history for the fate of our planet’s livability.

Yet climate change is also a matter of time in a deeper, more philosophically interesting and morally consequential respect. Ordinarily, we divide time into past, present, and future, taking the here and now for ourselves as the reference point. In Hume’s words, we “imagine our ancestors to be, in a manner, mounted above us, and our posterity to lie below us.”<sup>5</sup> Nothing is wrong in general with time seeming to be a succession of my todays leading gradually out of my past and into my future. It is difficult enough to get out of bed in the morning when one’s focus is simply on the day ahead. If one also always needed immediately to confront the ups and downs of the past as well as the likely ups and downs of

the future, it might seem, or indeed be, overwhelming. The neat conventional divisions into a long past and an indefinite future, separated by a manageably short present, is often helpful and for many purposes perfectly appropriate.

To some degree, we understand, however, that the segregation of our consciousness into present, past, and future is both a fiction and an oddly self-referential framework; your present was part of your mother's future, and your children's past will be in part your present. Again, nothing is generally wrong with structuring our consciousness of time in this conventional manner, and it often works well enough. In the case of climate change, however, the sharp division of time into past, present, and future has been desperately misleading and has, most importantly, hidden from view the extent of the responsibility of those of us alive now.<sup>6</sup> The narrowing of our consciousness of time smooths the way to divorcing ourselves from responsibility for developments in the past and the future with which our lives are in fact deeply intertwined. In the climate case, it is not that we face the facts but then deny our responsibility. It is that the realities are obscured from view by the partitioning of time, and so questions of responsibility toward the past and future do not arise naturally. Other times seem distant, and the people who then lived or will live in them appear to be irrelevant strangers. Acknowledgment of responsibility rests on recognition of connection. The climate connections are often not obvious.

Chapters to come will explore more fully some of the deep continuities inherent in climate change, but one obvious fact is the enormously long lead time built into some of the causal connections within climate. Carbon emissions injected into the atmosphere in a given year can contribute to forcing sea-level rise in not merely later centuries, but later millennia, dozens of centuries after the source of those emissions has disappeared from the earth. Some carbon emissions released early in the Industrial Revolution are yet to have their full effect, which still lies in the future. Present and future emissions matter as much as they do only because of

#### 4 CHAPTER 1

past emissions and their long-lasting effects stretching far beyond the date of their release and on through the present. These long-lived connections provide a radically different example of the insight about psychology and culture from one of the characters created by my fellow Southerner William Faulkner: “The past is never dead—it is not even past.”<sup>7</sup>

And similarly long chains reach from the present into the future. Conventionally, we tend to think that the future is yet to be born or is even only just beginning to be conceived. But the climate future was already beginning to take shape when humans started centuries ago to inject more carbon into the atmosphere than the usual climate dynamics could handle in the usual ways, and climate parameters were forced to start changing. The vast and accelerating carbon emissions of the late twentieth century and the early twenty-first century are building minimum floors under the extent of climate change in future centuries, barring radically innovative corrections of kinds that may or may not be possible and that we will discuss more fully in chapter 4. “The modes of common life that have arisen largely within the last one hundred years, and whose intensity has accelerated only since 1945, are shaping the planet for the next one thousand years, and perhaps the next 50,000.”<sup>8</sup> The future is not inaccessible—we hold its fundamental parameters in our hands, and we are shaping them now. In this respect, the future is not unborn—it is not even future.

“The evil that men do lives after them, the good is oft interred with their bones,” declared Shakespeare’s character Mark Antony.<sup>9</sup> As an old man who, on the probabilities, ought to die fairly soon himself, I take considerable comfort in the knowledge that this dark assertion is an overbroad and skewed generalization (spoken as part of Mark Antony’s maneuvers at Caesar’s highly political funeral). The reach of the present—what we who are alive can set into motion—extends far across time for good as well as evil. In some cases—climate change is one—our reach will be long and deep, millennial and profound, whether we wish it or not. And we can make its outcomes good—or, at worst, far better than they

would have been had we continued as we are headed now. One does better to heed what seems more likely to be Shakespeare's own voice and "to love that well which thou must leave ere long."<sup>10</sup>

The generation alive now is the pivotal generation in human history with regard to climate change, because of three features of our historical context. And our responsibilities are awesome especially because of the implications of the third feature. We can first glance at the context and then begin to explore the grounds of responsibility.

### **The Context That Makes Us Pivotal**

First, previous generations of humans have for around two centuries been changing our climate unintentionally and have left us with a global energy regime that now profoundly, progressively, and systematically forces the climate to change. The massive emissions of greenhouse gases (GHGs) that have resulted from the Industrial Revolution (and from the changes in the use of land, such as deforestation and the draining of wetlands, produced by the industrialization of agriculture) are disrupting the climate to which we and other living species had adapted over the previous ten thousand years of the Holocene.

Second, we are the first humans to understand the essential dynamics of our planet's climate; consequently, we have become aware of humanity's unintended subversion of its own environment through its uninformed past choices of energy sources. Scientists whose work is relevant to climate have produced remarkable—sometimes stunning—results. Much uncertainty remains, of course, but the basic outlines of climate science are clear—and far more advanced than they were only a few decades ago.<sup>11</sup> This impressive new knowledge puts us for the first time in a position to affect the climate intentionally by escaping from our inherited energy regime and to act on transition plans that have a reasonable chance of accomplishing their goals. Humans have been and still are in fact radically changing the planet's climate

6 CHAPTER 1

without any plan, but we are newly in the position to try to get a grip on the effects of our own behavior and attempt to exercise some intentional control.

Third, specifically what the science shows is that the default outcome is that the situation will become progressively worse, and human economic business-as-usual will make the future more threatening than the past for most living species—certainly including many humans, especially those with the fewest resources with which to adapt to the rapid, interacting changes.<sup>12</sup> Our unintended changes are rapidly undermining our own security. Therefore, we are not only the first to be able to understand what to do, but—most importantly—we may also be the last to be in a position to act before we exacerbate some major threats. This gives us an awesome responsibility. Humans have accidentally set our own house on fire, and if we do not douse the flames while they are no more extensive than they are now, it may not be possible ever to extinguish them. It is urgent for humans to get a grip on what we in aggregate are doing to the planet on which we live by blindly continuing the combustion of fossil fuels (and the destruction of natural ecosystems by industrial agribusiness) and instead to employ our recently gained knowledge of the climate system to design a transition to an energy regime that does not undermine our civilization.

Annual global carbon emissions in 2019 were the highest ever,<sup>13</sup> after a quarter century of mostly empty talk about tackling climate change, and the long-term trajectory of carbon emissions is at present sharply upward. Accordingly, the cumulative atmospheric accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> reached its highest point in human history of 421.21 ppm in April 2021.<sup>14</sup> If other greenhouse gases like methane are also counted, the atmospheric accumulation was already in December 2020 the equivalent of about 500 ppm of CO<sub>2</sub>.<sup>15</sup> The pre-Industrial-Revolution level was around 270 ppm, so doubling is well within sight. The explanation of why inaction would see matters worsen, and action is therefore urgent, is empirical and draws on various aspects of science. It is briefly summarized in



the first chapter of a special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, *Global Warming of 1.5 °C*, usually referred to informally as the “Special Report on 1.5.”<sup>16</sup> Here is the short version: because climate change is primarily driven by the cumulative atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), and CO<sub>2</sub> that reaches the atmosphere is extraordinarily persistent, climate change will not stop becoming more severe until injections of CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere completely stop—that is, until human society reaches net zero carbon. For any given degree of climate change, there is a budget of cumulative atmospheric carbon: more carbon, more change. To limit average global temperature rise to 1.5°C, annual global net anthropogenic CO<sub>2</sub> emissions must decline by about 45% from 2010 levels by 2030 and reach net zero around 2050; to limit the rise to below 2°C, CO<sub>2</sub> emissions must decline by about 25% by 2030 and reach net zero around 2070.<sup>17</sup>

If one follows the science, one can see why carbon emissions must rapidly be brought to net zero globally if future generations are to live securely. Every society’s energy system needs to be completely decarbonized by totally eliminating the use of fossil fuels in order to stop the accumulation of carbon in the atmosphere within a relatively tolerable cumulative carbon budget. The *minimum* necessary for the safety of future generations, then, is a prompt global Energy Revolution. We are the pivotal generation, the only ones who can set the revolution strongly into motion while there is still time.

What I want to begin to explore a bit here, and elaborate in later chapters, is why we current humans ought to take the actions that are urgently necessary to stop climate change from becoming increasingly dangerous. The philosophically uninteresting reasons are self-interested, and there are tons of those. For example, the kind of megawildfires recently experienced in California and Australia as a result of climate-change-induced drought and heat produced horrifying human deaths and misery and monumental economic costs, including the contentious bankruptcy of the largest California utility, PG&E, which in turn threatens important

8 CHAPTER 1

renewable energy firms that were counting on long-term contracts with PG&E, which in turn undermines the firms' efforts to stay in business and provide energy without producing the damaging carbon emissions that contributed to the conditions for the wildfires—one downward social cascade.<sup>18</sup> We obviously need to protect ourselves from such economic vicious circles that undermine our own current interests.

### **Arbitrary Demands?**

The focus in this book will instead be the converging moral reasons for action, which turn out to be multiple. I will concentrate on why we ought to act urgently and vigorously enough to protect future people from what will otherwise be the effects of perpetuating our present way of life permeated by an energy regime dominated by fossil fuels—why we ought to change to a way of life fit for a future on the carbon-sensitive planet we happen to live on.<sup>19</sup> The science demonstrates that if robust and extensive action is not taken, conditions for living things will be progressively more challenging and threatening. The remaining practical question is, why should we now have to do more than the very substantial amount that is already in our own interest? Climate change will worsen until it is limited, but a global Energy Revolution in the next couple of decades sounds like a heavy lift. Why should we in the here and now be expected to do so much? Does this not seem arbitrarily demanding?

For a start, that particular reaction seems at least as arbitrary as the situation might seem. One can focus on oneself and feel sorry for oneself: why poor me? But short-term and narrow self-interestedness is not inevitable, however easy, and it is no less reasonable to have a broader focus, on the rest of the planet besides oneself and on time beyond the immediate future, and to embrace the situation as an exciting opportunity to lead a meaningful and valuable life that could benefit people in the future—perhaps even all future people—or at least avoid depriving them of good

options. How should one feel? Which attitude should one adopt? Should one resent the “burden” or embrace the “challenge”? Does the task demand inordinate sacrifice, or is it a historic opportunity to do something exceptionally worthwhile?

Our historical circumstances open up an intriguing prospect: what if some generations are called upon to meet challenges, or even to make sacrifices, that are unique to them? That do not fit any standard formula? Could this be? Climate scientists are telling us that we are now moving through an utterly crucial juncture. For a century and a half, carbon emissions were steadily climbing. Then, for the last three decades, they have been soaring: more than half of all the emissions since 1850 have occurred since 1986.<sup>20</sup> Now we must quickly make emissions level off and then “bend the emissions curve downward”—launch a steady decline in emissions at an angle across time that will bring the world to net zero carbon in two or three decades—certainly within the middle years of the lives of those who are now under forty years old.

Otherwise, the only ways to hold total cumulative emissions to any total compatible with any remotely tolerable amount of temperature rise, and of all the other manifestations of climate change, would be either a later precipitous plunge in carbon emissions that is probably politically and economically impossible and would be utterly catastrophic socially if it actually occurred; or miraculous amounts of carbon capture and storage (CCS), carbon dioxide removal (CDR), or solar radiation management (SRM), technologies in which the fossil-fuel companies have for decades steadfastly refused to invest, preferring to pour capital into exploration and production of more and more of the fuel that must never be burned without some such technologies. The choices, then, are in fact only four: dangerous levels of climate change from too much CO<sub>2</sub> accumulated in the atmosphere; a steady and sharp decline in emissions starting immediately; an unmanageable collapse in emissions later; or infeasible levels of CCS, CDR, SRM, or other geo-engineering technologies.<sup>21</sup> I am obviously omitting the shading in the picture, but this is the general outline.

Any way you slice it, it is absolutely crucial what the current generation does now. This is it. We face what in another context Martin Luther King Jr. called “the fierce urgency of Now.”<sup>22</sup> But this may seem to ask too much of the current generation, each member of which is living the only life she will ever live and has some rights to enjoy. How, in the Churchillian phrase, could so much be asked of so few? Isn’t the burden of promptly and firmly initiating a global Energy Revolution too heavy for the current generation alone to be expected to bear?

### **Unique Historical Period, Incomparable Moral Responsibility**

This question about the perhaps exceptional extent of this generation’s responsibility is difficult to consider in a sensible manner, and I explore this topic further in the second half of chapter 3 and in chapter 4. As people ordinarily think of generations, at any given time three generations are alive: grandparents, parents, and children. From here on, I refer to these three together, however, simply as “the current generation”—those alive now. The heart of one implicit complaint seems to be that it is somehow unfair to the current generation that the challenges we face are so much greater than what one might think is “the average burden for the average generation”—it’s altogether too much to ask.

That, however, is an oddly ahistorical way of thinking, a bit like asking why I couldn’t have been born into some other, pleasanter century. Perhaps the allusion to Churchill provides a hint. Was it fair that the so-called greatest generation of the 1940s had to confront the Nazis by themselves? Wouldn’t it have been fairer if the task could have been shared with, say, the people of the laid-back 1960s (when I was “military age”)? But the people of the 1960s could have helped to defeat the Nazis only if the Nazis were still undefeated in the 1960s, presumably by then much more entrenched. It is a good thing for all the rest of us who have

followed that the generation of the 1940s rose fully to the occasion, and we remember them proudly.

Decades and centuries are not standardized, and we have no reason to expect the challenges they bring to be comparable. While reasonable sacrifices by individuals certainly have some limit, that limit seems to have nothing to do with any notion of standard generational burdens, a notion that could only be made to seem plausible by ignoring historical context. A complaint that burdens are unfair makes sense only if those burdens could be redistributed and thereby made fairer, but most large-scale historical challenges cannot be postponed, rescheduled for a more convenient time, or subdivided among different generations. Of course, some threats, if ignored, die away on their own. Other threats, if not met when their outcome is still up for grabs, build momentum or become entrenched and create radically new realities on the ground. Defeating them later may be harder than defeating them now, if it is even still possible. Contingent facts matter, and one must choose one's fights knowledgeably.

For better or for worse, you live at the time when you live. You confront what you confront. "You are here," as the street maps say. You can embrace your historical location or curse it—you are free in your response—but this response will have the effects that such a response has in such circumstances, at this point in history. You choose your response, but history, made by the earlier responses of others to their own circumstances, provides your social circumstances, which interact with your response to produce your effects and the different social circumstances to be faced by future generations.

We youths of the 1960s could not help with the battles of the 1940s because one cannot reach backward through history. The Hubble Telescope can show us what happened millions of years ago, but it does not enable us to intervene retroactively and change the universe's course. For purposes of action, time—for us humans, history—moves only forward. A complaint about generational

12 CHAPTER 1

unfairness in the case of historically embedded current challenges fundamentally makes no sense: no lighter schedule of imminent tasks is possible. The only alternatives we have are the responses actually available now. Historical context matters.

Moreover, while one cannot reach back to effect change, one can reach forward. In fact, one cannot avoid reaching forward! It is not that we could decide, if we wished, to stretch out and change future history, as if “history itself” were somehow already going to go in one direction of its own until people bent around and diverted it into a different direction from the one originally set. Unavoidably, we are partly making the future, like it or not: the human future, the planet’s future, will head in the direction we set.

Historical context matters, but so do human action and choice. More precisely, future people’s starting place will be where we leave off. The future is partly in the present. History is a continuing drama with narrative threads running through many generations, and we humans are powerful players in the drama. If we leave a planet with a climate still dominated by a fossil-fuel regime, the next generations will have to struggle to escape from this regime within the far worse climate that continuous combustion of fossil fuels will have produced by then, because we did not arrange a timely escape. Future people cannot reduce our challenges, but we—and only we—can reduce theirs. Or, we can indulge existing consumption habits and energy practices to make their challenges worse—our choice, their inheritance.

In the remainder of this introductory chapter, I want to separate out three closely connected reasons why it is especially important that our generation makes an exceptionally robust effort on climate change: (1) future generations will very likely face burdens and dangers greater than ours, (2) the worsening dangers are currently unlimited, and (3) less effort by us may well allow climate change to pass critical tipping points. In sum, the burdens and dangers for future generations will probably be worse and are now worsening, are still without limit, and are potentially unbearable.

That is why the struggle to stop the destabilization of the climate is our generation's fight.

### **Heavier Burdens**

In the past, when philosophers and economists have thought about principles of intergenerational justice, they have usually assumed that there must be some kind of standard formula—for example, a single discount rate—that can be applied reiteratively. John Rawls, for example, originally wrote that when we are considering what principle should guide the current generation's relation to the next, we should ask what principle we could have expected the previous generation to have adopted with regard to us—a kind of slightly asymmetric intergenerational Golden Rule.<sup>23</sup> The previous people should have done such-and-such for the current people, and the current people should do about the same, but perhaps a bit more or a bit less, for the next people.<sup>24</sup>

Rawls's approach seems to me unhelpful for climate change because of three of its assumptions. The first is the one criticized in the previous section: that one can adequately characterize the situation faced by every generation in general terms in the abstract as if history had no integral fabric with periods of war and periods of peace, times of stability and times of disruption. Different generations may confront radically different circumstances demanding incommensurable types and levels of burdens and opportunities. His comment that “presumably this rate changes depending upon the state of society” does not seem to capture with sufficient vividness how extreme the differences between even adjacent generations can be in the wake of some exponential change.<sup>25</sup> Ideal theory cannot guide us.

Second, he formulates the obligations as exclusively between adjacent generations (with reiterations), without serious examination of possible direct obligations now to whoever lives in the distant future, whose situation needs to be taken seriously by current planning in the context of a phenomenon like climate change

that locks in effects over millennia. The time lags between cause and effect in the dynamics of the climate system are far longer than most causal connections we ordinarily encounter.

The third is that what Rawls sees as called for on behalf of future people are mainly positive contributions: how much should we save for them? However, our current effects with regard to climate change on whichever people live in future is in fact quite different and potentially much more negative. All decisions about the degree of ambition for emissions mitigation in the present are unavoidably also decisions about how to distribute risks and burdens forward among this generation and multiple future generations, as we will see more clearly in the section on “Bequeathing Risks” in chapter 4. The less risk we bear, the more risk others bear. The avoidance of damage—and protection against damage—looms larger than the provision of savings, although the provision of alternative energy technology, which is a kind of embodied savings, is a crucial element in avoiding damage and disruption.<sup>26</sup>

Mitigation is more ambitious insofar as it contributes to reaching zero emissions of CO<sub>2</sub> globally at an earlier date—and therefore at a lower level of cumulative atmospheric accumulation of CO<sub>2</sub> and resultant climate change. That the extent of our efforts profoundly affects future climate dangers is fairly obvious. Even if there were one fixed quantity of risks that had to be dealt with by some combination of people now and people later, the fewer the risks that were dealt with by people now, the more of those same tasks would remain to be dealt with by people later, along with the tasks that would in any case arise only later. Of course, tasks for which now is the last chance may simply go forever unfulfilled.

But since over time the climate risks specifically are in fact expanding in number, increasing in severity, and in some cases feeding upon each other, that fewer of the present tasks are tackled means not only that relatively more of them may remain to be tackled in the future, if it is not then already too late, but also that the number and seriousness of the dangers will be absolutely greater than if we had acted decisively, because our failure to deal



with current threats will leave open doors to danger that we could have closed. Not only may some of the original risks remain still to be tackled, but additional risks that could earlier have been headed off entirely will instead have emerged and need to be confronted too.

Positive feedbacks cause some climate risks to reinforce others. For instance, when the white Arctic sea ice melts, the dark ocean water uncovered absorbs more heat than the white ice used to, and so the warming water melts the remaining sea ice faster still, revealing even more dark water. This is the primary reason the Arctic has warmed far faster than the remainder of the planet (which scientists call “polar enhancement” of temperature rise). I will look at feedbacks later in this chapter. For now, let us simply note that unless climate change is stopped, it will grow worse because, for one thing, in crucial respects it feeds on itself.

If we allow climate change to grow by unpredictable increments of severity over an unspecified further expanse of time, the burdens that fall upon some future generations may vastly exceed the burdens that we face now. And they will become heavier than they would have been if we had acted more energetically now. Thus, the threats to whoever lives in future generations will be more severe by two distinguishable standards: more serious than ours are now and more serious than the burdens then would have become if we had acted otherwise. Is it fair to leave future people to face a much harder, and increasingly hard, challenge because we refused to face an easier one?

These heavier climate burdens also come in two distinguishable varieties: the biophysical and the sociopolitical. On the one hand, as long as CO<sub>2</sub> continues to be emitted by human economic activities, physical climate change will become progressively worse because it is the long-lived cumulative concentration of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere that is the primary driver of climate change. (1) The more cumulative CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere, the greater climate change. In addition, climate change feeds on itself through positive feedbacks. (2) The more climate change, the greater climate change still. These are physical sources of heavier burdens

for future humans for as long as the carbon emissions that drive climate change are not brought under control.

On the other hand, the current sociopolitical situation in at least the nations with the wealth and power—not in Yemen, not in Syria, not in Eastern Congo, but in most affluent countries—is relatively malleable, or at least not desperate, compared to the situation that is likely to arise in the future if climate change is permitted to worsen unabated. The current situation is unfavorable to climate action in important respects; for example, fossil-fuel interests now control the legislative branch of the US federal government and the Russian, Saudi, Australian, and Brazilian governments. The United States in particular confronts migrants fleeing oppression and poverty in Central America that is exacerbated by droughts and hurricanes worsened by climate change. US social discourse is increasingly uncivil and bitterly partisan, repeated local massacres are carried out with unregulated guns including military weapons, and Black citizens are regularly murdered by White police. Nevertheless, major nonviolent social change, including radical change in the energy system, still appears to be possible and recently to have become likely, although extremist violence is also growing. Neither the sociopolitical situation, which I discuss more fully in chapter 5 in the context of what action to take next, nor the physical climatic situation is yet completely out of control or impossible to change through essentially normal political action.

At some unpredictable time, if climate change continues to worsen, some phenomenon such as genuinely massive migrant flows—external or internal, from flooded coastal cities—may come to seem so threatening that the prospects for civil, cooperative, constructive responses are likely to decline much further and perhaps give way to social conflict. These are highly complex social phenomena, and I do not want to speculate. The fact is simply that, however unfavorable to cooperative action on climate change one thinks the political situation is now, politics could become much more dysfunctional, with social disruptions that would further

smooth the path for demagogues with pseudosolutions and nationalists blind to global solutions, and such domestic deterioration could create higher obstacles to constructive international cooperation on problems that cannot be dealt with by individual societies. If we cannot accomplish positive multilateral action on climate change in our present situation, however absolutely good or bad one thinks it is, there is good reason to believe that positive action could become relatively much harder precisely when the physical/climatic threats themselves worsen. Future people, in sum, could face worse climate threats in less favorable sociopolitical circumstances with more violent and misinformed opposition. The challenges for future people will be greater than ours almost no matter what. The challenges will be greater still than they would have been if we do not do what urgently needs to be done now.

### **Unlimited Threats**

More telling still is the crucial fact that, so far, we have failed to place any outer limit on the severity of climate change, either its physical manifestations or its sociopolitical effects. For now, physical climate change can simply worsen indefinitely. If certain tasks must be done sooner or later, and if we complete fewer of them, other people in future will need to do more. But climate change is not so benign. It is not merely that we may leave work against the dangers unfinished—the dangers are multiplying, thanks to our continuing profligate combustion of fossil fuel. If we do less now, the worst in future will not only be worse than it otherwise would have been, but, as of now, worse without constraint. Specifically, until CO<sub>2</sub> emissions reach net zero, there will be no limit on how severe climate change must become. It is intolerable that we should acquiesce in contributing to a potential runaway global danger.

If any human duty is unconditional, it is the duty to preserve the fundamental conditions, including the physical preconditions, of human society by avoiding dangerous threats to those

conditions. Yet in blindly toying with the climate, we are daring to experiment with modifying these very preconditions of human physical and social life, in a manner famously noted well over half a century ago by Roger Revelle and Hans E. Suess: “Human beings are now carrying out a large scale geophysical experiment of a kind that could not have happened in the past nor be reproduced in the future. Within a few centuries we are returning to the atmosphere and oceans the concentrated organic carbon stored in sedimentary rocks over hundreds of millions of years.”<sup>27</sup> Equally famously, and more sardonically, another great climate scientist, Wallace Broecker, quipped, “The climate system is an angry beast and we are poking it with sticks.”<sup>28</sup>

No responsible scientist believes that climate change is yet fixed on a trajectory toward human extinction. But numerous scientists have embraced the idea that we should think of the period of history that we have recently entered as the “Anthropocene” because this has become an age in which the most powerful force changing our planet is aggregate human activity, including centrally the anthropogenic emissions that are increasingly modifying the planet’s climate.<sup>29</sup> Without intending to, we are gradually wresting control of the climate, among other things, from the natural forces that used to determine it. Like someone who knocks the rider out of the saddle of a galloping horse and climbs on without knowing how to ride, we are taking control away without gaining control ourselves or, chillingly, having any good plan about how to keep it. The planet’s climate is being thrown into confusion by the originally unpredicted and unintended effects of growing human consumption powered by expanding carbon energy.

The most elementary advice given to people who planned to visit a casino in the days before ubiquitous credit cards and phone banking was to decide while they were still at home how much was the maximum amount they could afford to lose and take only that much cash with them. In other words, put a firm limit on maximum losses in the face of uncertainty. Those who opt for less ambitious mitigation than is readily possible are ignoring this

basic advice with regard to the well-being of future generations. They are leaving potential absolute losses for people in the future unbounded.

It is well established that as long as the atmospheric concentration of greenhouse gases—and especially CO<sub>2</sub>—continues to expand, climate change will continue to become more severe.<sup>30</sup> And as long as CO<sub>2</sub> is emitted in amounts that produce net additions to the atmospheric concentration, that concentration will of course continue to expand. Accordingly, until global carbon emissions reach net zero, no outer limit on the maximum severity of climate change has been set. The severity of climate change can worsen indefinitely until carbon emissions reach zero. Decarbonization must be thorough and prompt to cap the atmospheric concentration, which requires vastly more ambitious mitigation than nations are currently committed to. The less ambitious mitigation is, the later the date that the atmospheric accumulation will stabilize. As long as climate change remains unbounded, the costs of the gamble inflicted upon future generations has no upper limit. This imposed gamble is explored more fully in “Bequeathing Risks” in chapter 4.

I should be more explicit about what I mean here by “unlimited,” by which I am not claiming that the climate will change an infinite amount. And by “limited” climate change I do not mean a climate that completely stops changing and never changes again. As some opponents of action to slow the current climate change like to point out, the climate has always changed and will always change. The climate of the earth will always be influenced by changes in the earth’s orientation toward the sun, and many other nonhuman factors.<sup>31</sup> I restrict “limited” and “unlimited” to anthropogenic change. Unlimited anthropogenic climate change is the maximum climate change that humans can cause. Limited climate change is less change than humans could have caused. So when I say that climate change is currently unlimited, I mean that nothing currently stands in the way of anthropogenic climate change becoming maximum anthropogenic climate change. We

20 CHAPTER 1

are currently on course to do however much damage to the climate of our own planet humans are capable of doing. But “anthropogenic” is a long word, so I will not keep repeating this qualifier.

The sociopolitical downside also remains unlimited. This is chilling. Unbounded danger is difficult to judge judiciously. Human beings at their best are inexpressibly remarkable, with their indomitable spirits and their unrelenting resilience. I do not recommend generally betting against the human race. And yet, human civilization can be surprisingly fragile. Remember the armed looters in the British Virgin Islands and St. Martin after Hurricane Irma in 2017, stealing food and water from their neighbors, as often happens after disasters. Remember how quickly the Hungarian government of authoritarian Victor Orbán fenced out all Syrian refugees. Remember the rabid insurrectionists at the US Capitol in 2021, beating fallen police with flag poles. Somewhere in the shadows of stress, the social norms begin to tear.

That physical stresses lead to conflicting political demands, which themselves can rend the social fabric, is hardly a new insight. One may have supposed that Thomas Hobbes was displaying a capacity for dystopian imagination when he wrote, “There is no place for industry, because the fruit thereof is uncertain, and consequently no culture of the earth; no navigation, nor use of the commodities that may be imported by sea; no commodious building; . . . no arts; no letters; no society. And, which is worst of all, continual fear and danger of violent death; and the life of man, solitary, poor, nasty, brutish and short.”<sup>32</sup> But according to Geoffrey Parker’s monumental global history, *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change & Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century*, Hobbes actually needed only to look around at the state of the world in what we now have understood as the heart of “the Little Ice Age”—roughly, the 1640s to the 1690s.<sup>33</sup>

The Little Ice Age consisted of climate change of only a single degree of average global temperature—downward, not upward, of course—but this modest bit of climate change, and especially the resultant disturbances to agricultural production and food prices,

were one side of what Parker aptly calls a “fatal synergy” that was an exacerbating factor in a global *mélange* of troubles, ranging from the Thirty Years War in Europe to the violent Ming/Qing transition in China. Well before large numbers of individual people will collapse from heat stress from climate heating in the twenty-first century, their societies will be liable, at some unpredictable point, to become incapable of farsightedness, fairness, or even cooperation, and to disintegrate into conflicts over places to live and places to grow food, and over priorities for the distribution of these places.<sup>34</sup>

Yale historian Timothy Snyder has marked one more recent pathway steeply downward:

When an apocalypse is on the horizon, waiting for scientific solutions seems senseless, struggle seems natural, and demagogues of blood and soil come to the fore. A sound policy for our world, then, would be one that keeps the fear of planetary catastrophe as far away as possible. This means accepting the autonomy of science from politics, and making the political choice to support the pertinent kinds of science that will allow conventional politics to proceed. . . . As Hitler demonstrated during the Great Depression, humans are able to portray a looming crisis in such a way as to justify drastic measures in the present.<sup>35</sup>

In the sociopolitical arena too, it is wise to call a halt well short of any cliff edges.

Let me be explicit about what I am not suggesting. In recent decades, it has become almost a reflex among moral philosophers to assert that climate action is urgent because otherwise the apocalypse is around the corner. I do not think that the apocalypse is around the corner—nor is human extinction, nor even—just yet—is the Hobbesian unraveling of civilization that I am invoking.<sup>36</sup> For now, I am appealing only to the solid fact that all such threatening possibilities (and many others less serious than these, but still serious) persist until we stop feeding climate change. Each

22 CHAPTER 1

kind of disaster is possible and can be reached easily from the route that we are now on, until limits make it impossible. A climate that is worsening indefinitely leaves all bad options open. We have inadvertently opened the barn door, and some of the horses have bolted. But other valuable horses, for reasons of their own, have lingered in the barn. For now, nothing is stopping them from leaving too. It is past time, then, to relock the barn door securely and save all that can still be saved.<sup>37</sup>

It would be reprehensible to take no action even if indefinitely worsening climate change were a purely natural phenomenon. (If it were purely natural, it would be more difficult to figure out how to go about slowing it down.) Yet, for us simply to sit idly by and watch anthropogenic climate change become progressively worse and prepare to engulf future people would be even more shameful and pathetically weak. And since we are in fact driving climate change with our own GHGs, especially our carbon emissions, we do at least understand what needs to be done for us to stop making conditions worse by our own behavior. And it is obviously all the more our responsibility—a negative one simply not to wreak havoc—for its being driven by our own actions.

Scientists have clearly explained various mechanisms by which climate change could escalate in severity, and empirical findings show that we are provoking, or coming near to provoking, particular ones of these mechanisms. I have previously tried to establish that if one understands the mechanisms, and one is finding evidence that one of them is being activated, that is all one needs to know for action to be required.<sup>38</sup> Lauren Hartzell-Nichols has developed this kind of argument extensively in her book *A Climate of Risk*.<sup>39</sup> One strength of this argument is that it has relatively weak premises: only the theoretical claim that mechanisms are understood, and the empirical claim that evidence is accumulating that the mechanisms are being engaged.

When one adds to the satisfaction of those two premises the fact that no limit has been established on how dangerous climate change may become,<sup>40</sup> it is utterly irresponsible for those of us



alive now not to do our utmost to limit, at the very least, our own contributions to the future danger and instead to continue the present practices—most notably, casually burning vast quantities of fossil fuel—that are adding continuously to the mushrooming danger. On the one hand, how much, if anything, the people alive at a given time ought to do positively with regard to whichever people are yet to come, numbers and identities of whom are of course unknown because neither numbers nor identities have yet been determined by events including our choices, is a contested matter. Ought we to try only to see that they are no worse off than we are?<sup>41</sup> Should we try to make their lives better than ours, with or without discounting? And so forth.

On the other hand, the additional consideration here is comparatively and absolutely less controversial: we ought not to continue to increase dangers to future people—potentially, all future people—without limit when we understand the mechanisms by which the dangers can increase and have evidence that the mechanisms are in motion. I cannot imagine a plausible moral view that would not embrace this imperative. To deny this negative imperative would accord zero value, worth, and respect to numberless future people. To reject it would constitute calmly contemplating the possible undermining of the necessary conditions for civilized societies and even the possible creation of the sufficient conditions for human extinction, since climate change can produce levels of heat and other phenomena that humans cannot endure.

### **Tipping Points**

We have in addition another compelling reason for robust immediate action in recently acquired understanding of the dynamics of the planetary climate. While we are discussing climate change that is anthropogenic, it is crucial to keep in mind that whenever human action sets off positive feedbacks, what was originally anthropogenic to some degree takes on a life of its own.<sup>42</sup> Andreas Malm characterizes it nicely: “Society having touched

off climate change, nature does the rest of the work. . . . Global warming is not built but triggered.”<sup>43</sup> We are confronting climate change that is initiated by humans, but this increasingly includes the positive feedbacks produced by the already operative climate dynamics into which we are recklessly intruding. Extensive theoretical understanding and solid evidence suggest that we are in fact approaching a number of critical “tipping points,” such as threshold ocean surface temperatures that will precipitate the collapse of massive Antarctic ice sheets and Greenland ice sheets, driving sea levels much higher and gradually inundating sea coasts around the world and driving populations out of cities with locations like Mumbai, Shanghai, Miami, and New York—and, of course, much of The Netherlands and Bangladesh.<sup>44</sup> While the current climate change is anthropogenic—driven by society’s failure to mobilize against the primitive and dirty energy sources of coal, oil, and gas—the direct changes provoke natural responses that feed into further change. In short, while humans began the process, it could run away. Notoriously but horribly, natural species have been rapidly crashing for years.<sup>45</sup>

If enough positive feedbacks fed into each other to launch what the scientists call a cascade of positive feedbacks, it could lead to a “Hothouse Earth.”<sup>46</sup> These scientists are now suggesting that a cascade is liable to begin soon if we persist in our failure to take prompt and serious measures to reduce carbon emissions. In my argument here, however, I pull back to the simple fact that for now cascades remain possible because climate change remains unlimited. I do not rely on an assumption that a cascade of positive feedbacks is definitely about to begin or even that it is likely to begin, although this may very well be true. I assume only that an anthropogenically launched cascade is entirely possible because various individual tipping points are likely to be passed as long as climate change continues without restraint.

It is, then, *likely* that the near future is the last chance to avoid passing significant tipping points and entirely *possible* that the near future is the last chance to avoid provoking a cascade of tipping

points.<sup>47</sup> These tipping points are significant because they unleash either or both of two conceptually separable but often empirically inseparable processes. Passing a tipping point means triggering irreversible change, and frequently these irreversible changes themselves also become long-term positive feedbacks, sometimes exacerbating other processes of climate change so that they become exponential, a “cascade.” Conceptually, a change’s being irreversible and a change’s being a positive feedback are two different matters. (And changes’ being at any given time unlimited in number is a third matter.)

Obviously, even an irreversible change that was not a positive feedback would still by itself contribute to making climate change worse until it ran its course. If the melting of an ice sheet becomes irreversible, the melting will contribute to sea-level rise (because the water in ice sheets now rests on land) until the ice has all melted. When the ice is all gone, that particular process will stop. This melting may be irreversible, but the process need not continue indefinitely. So a particular process could be irreversible, but also be limited, and not be the source of positive feedback.<sup>48</sup>

Nevertheless, if one process after another will contribute to making climate change worse, the overall climate change would worsen without limit, even if each contributing process would run a limited course, until all contributing processes had run their various courses. If the West Antarctic Ice Sheet melts, that will make sea-level rise worse until that ice is gone. If the Greenland Ice Sheet melts, it in turn will make sea-level rise worse until that ice is gone. So too the East Antarctic Ice Sheet.<sup>49</sup> Each case of melting is obviously constrained by the amount of ice available to melt, but the quantities are staggering. Recent calculations show “that Earth lost 28 trillion tonnes of ice between 1994 and 2017. . . . The rate of ice loss has risen by 57% since the 1990s.”<sup>50</sup> Climate change—here, sea-level rise—can continue until all the ice in all the ice sheets is gone. At some point, many millennia from now, the residual effects of humans might fade out, especially if humans are gone. Or perhaps the course of geological history would have

been forever diverted from the path it would otherwise have followed if humans had not existed and created an Industrial Revolution based on moving carbon from under the earth into the air. Either way, the damage caused would be immeasurable.

## Conclusion

I have separated out three conceptually distinct strands of the basis for urgent and robust action to stop climate change from worsening: inevitably more difficult challenges for future people, no limit yet on the extent to which humans will modify the climate, and the danger of passing critical points of no return: tipping points that launch irreversible change. What is truly scary is empirical combinations of two or more of these factors, especially if one of the factors is the third: passing tipping points for abrupt worsening. For instance, it is already worrying that we have so far imposed no limit on the disruption that we are causing to the climate, but that could mean only that we were very slowly and incrementally making matters worse for a while. But if we leave the disruption unlimited for long enough that we meanwhile pass critical tipping points like initiating irreversible melting of additional major ice sheets, then the most limited that the damage can possibly ever be will be far worse than otherwise. The other side of the coin, of course, is that if we throw ourselves into the effort, we can make a huge positive difference for the lives of virtually every future person who lives on this planet.

The processes sketched just above are concrete embodiments of the reality that time is continuous, not partitioned, except for practical convenience in our own consciousness. Any attempted separation of the flow of human history, its causes, its effects, and the responsibilities of those of us who will unavoidably contribute to the future direction of the flow into discrete periods is at best an oversimplification and often an illusion or an evasion. I live amid the wealth, ease, and technological wonders of a postindustrial society only because of the fossil-fuel combustion that drove the

Industrial Revolution in my past and created my present standard of living. My present immersion in a growth-obsessed, plastic-strangled consumerist society that still burns ever more fossil fuels each year (except the pandemic year of 2020) is locking in critical and dangerous features of the future climate of people I erringly tend to think of as distant strangers. For me to deny that this past and this future are part of who I am and what I do would be to fail to acknowledge fundamental realities and to shirk inescapable responsibilities. Or so I will try further to show in what follows.

## INDEX

- accelerated depreciation, 168n31
- action, immediate: bank financing and, 129–130; CDR versus mitigation and, 97–103; duty and, 47; future generations and, 12, 75–76; human equality and, 79–80; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 76; rapid scaling up and, 98–103; science and, 6–7, 8–9, 21–22; self-interested reasons and, 7–8; socio-political situation and, 16–17; and that means now, 135–136; unlimited danger and, 22–24, 76, 86–87, 163n41. *See also* agency; duties: promotional; Energy Revolution; historical context and historic opportunity; inaction; pivotal (present) generation; scaling up, rapid; second chances
- adaptation: date-of-last-opportunity and, 6; future generations and, 76, 85; historical context and, 5; international inequality and responsibility and, 124; sea-level rise and, 49; sovereign externalization and, 50, 72; temporal externalization and, 114
- Africa, 74, 121. *See also* Niger Delta
- agency: generations and, 79–80; local versus global, 60, 69, 79, 150n25; responsibility and, 60–61. *See also* action, immediate; individual agency, responsibility and rights; duties: promotional; pure fairness argument; responsibility, generational; social movements
- agriculture and agribusiness: BECCS and, 101–102; Brazil and, 99; causal responsibility and, 33; CO<sub>2</sub> and, 37; fossil-fuel combustion and, 6; industrialization of, 5; Little Ice Age and, 20–21; trees, land, and water and, 99–100. *See also* food
- air carbon capture and storage, 100
- air pollution, 33
- Alaska, 79
- Alliance for the Shenandoah Valley, 172n73
- alternative/noncarbon/renewable energy: affordability of, 66–75, 110; avoidable necessity and, 47; avoidance of danger versus savings and, 14; CCS and, 156n32; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions rise and, 120; coronavirus pandemic and, 126–127; cost-sharing and, 40–41; fossil fuel energy and, 7–8; India and, 158n49; infrastructure and transmission of, 124; investments in, 66–67, 110; new global electricity and, 132; prices of, 67, 70–71, 72–73, 129, 132; 2050 and, 63. *See also* Energy Revolution; solar energy; wind energy
- Amazon rainforest, 78, 81, 99, 164n56. *See also* Brazil
- AMOC (Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation), 78–79, 159n59
- Antarctic ice sheets, 24, 49, 147nn44 and 49, 164nn51 and 54; East Antarctic Ice Sheet (EAIS), 25, 112–113; West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS), 25, 59, 76–79, 81, 82, 85, 111–113, 147n52
- Anthropocene period, 18, 54–55, 145n29
- apocalypses, 21

176 INDEX

- the Arctic, 49, 79, 155  
artificial intelligence (AI), 38, 71  
assault analogy, 46  
asset retirement obligations (AROs), 121–122  
Atlantic Coast Pipeline, 172n73  
Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation (AMOC), 78–79, 159n59  
Augusta County Alliance, 172n73  
Australia, 7, 16, 67, 99, 105, 118, 131, 157n43  
autonomy, 48. *See also* individual agency, responsibility, and rights  
avoidable necessity, 47
- Baier, Annette, 114  
Bangladesh, 62  
*Banking on Climate Change* (Rainforest Action Network), 128  
banks, 118, 123, 128–130, 132, 133, 171n54  
Bassey, Nnimmo, 65  
BECCS (bioenergy with carbon capture and storage), 100–103. *See also* carbon capture and storage (CCS)  
beef-raising, 99, 100  
beer-drinkers, 162n31  
Bellamy, Rob, 101  
Belt and Road Initiative (China), 52, 71, 152n39, 157n42  
benefits: costs and, 62, 150n18; international inequalities and, 51; sovereign externalization and, 48; US government and, 33; violation of rights and, 47. *See also* fairness; international inequalities and responsibilities  
Berners-Lee, Mike, 161n16  
Betts, Richard, 146n42  
bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS), 100–103. *See also* carbon capture and storage (CCS)  
BlackRock, 123, 167n26  
Blake, William, 116, 165n56  
blame, 41–42. *See also* causal responsibility; moral reasons and responsibility  
boycotts, 129, 134  
BP, 132, 170n45  
Brazil: accountability and, 57; agribusiness and, 99, 100, 102; contributions of, 56; political power and policy and, 16, 118, 131, 173n76. *See also* Amazon rainforest  
breathing, 99  
Britain and Great Britain, 32, 70, 134  
Broecker, Wallace, 18  
Buckley, Tim, 158n49  
burdens and harms: CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 15–16; fairness and, 10–11; nontransferable, 145n26. *See also* costs; international inequalities and responsibilities; moral reasons and responsibilities; risk structure; threats, unlimited; wrongful imposition arguments  
*The Burning Question* (Berners-Lee and Clark), 161n16  
Bush, George H.W., 90  
business as usual. *See* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual  
Butt, Daniel, 150n17
- California, 99  
Canada, 126, 128  
Caney, Simon, 143n6, 149n9, 152n43  
cap-and-dividend, 64, 65–66. *See also* regulation  
capital. *See* banks; subsidies, fossil fuel capitalism, 130, 171n56  
carbon, price of, 64–75  
carbon budget: affordability of non-carbon energy and, 38, 66–75; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 29, 63; cumulative, 93, 133, 160n75; decomposition of CO<sub>2</sub> and, 30; economic development and, 70; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 70, 75; nations at a disadvantage and, 38; overshoot and, 93–95, 96, 97, 112, 113, 114–115; price of electricity and, 68–75; richest individuals and, 139–140; temperature rise and, 7, 70, 92. *See also* overshoots  
carbon capture and storage (CCS), 9, 119, 120–121, 156n32; fossil fuel

- interests and, 95, 119, 121, 156n32.  
*See also* bioenergy with carbon capture and storage (BECCS)  
“carbon footprint,” 170n45  
carbon neutrality. *See* net zero emissions  
carbon tax, 65–66. *See also* regulation  
Carbon Tracker Initiative, 132–133, 166n20  
Caribbean coral reefs, 164n56  
causal responsibility, 118; ability to pay and, 152n43; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 71–72, 80–81; moral responsibility versus, 37–42. *See also* Industrial Revolution; nations with an advantage  
Center for Responsive Politics, 167n27  
Central America, 16  
the Cerrado, 100  
Chesapeake Energy, 121–122  
Chevron, 132  
children’s lawsuit, 164n47  
China: accountability and, 56, 57; banks and, 128–129; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 43, 70, 161n9; coal and, 39, 52, 69, 70, 71, 152n39, 156n36, 172n76; cumulative emissions and, 161n9; deforestation and, 100; fossil fuel interests and, 122, 126, 128, 129; global electricity grids and, 157n43; India compared to, 59; state-owned fossil fuel companies and, 122; US policy and, 172n76. *See also* Belt and Road Initiative; international inequalities and responsibilities  
“choke-points,” 134  
Churchill, Winston, 10  
civilized societies, 23  
Clark, Duncan, 161n16  
climate change, anthropogenic versus natural, 22. *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; science  
“Climate Change and Non-Ideal Theory: Six Ways of Responding to Non-Compliance” (Caney), 143n6  
climate models, 29  
*A Climate of Risk* (Hartzell-Nichols), 22  
coal: Anthropocene period and, 54–55; bank financing of, 129; China and, 39, 52, 152n39, 156n36; costs of, 46–47, 65; electric utilities and, 124–125, 167n26; Energy Revolution and, 63–64; health costs and, 65; inaction and, 24; India and, 59, 62; policies and, 120. *See also* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; Industrial Revolution and industrialization  
coal miners, 38, 46, 79, 106, 134  
coastal flooding, 16, 24, 78. *See also* floods  
Coleman, Jules, 38  
Coll, Steve, 169n33  
compound injustice, 71, 74, 75, 158n45  
Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (2018) (COP24), 30  
consciousness, 3, 26  
consumption, 18, 26–27, 60–61, 119–120, 139–140, 170n45  
contraception, 71  
Cooper, Gregory S., 164n56  
cooperation, 16–17, 83  
COP24 (Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in 2018), 30  
coral reefs, 164n56  
coronavirus pandemic, 110, 120, 123–124, 126–127, 128, 153n10, 171n59  
*Corrupted Democracy, Rogue State Russia, and the Richest, Most Destructive Industry on Earth* (Maddow), 167n24  
corruption, 123, 133, 168n31  
corrupt law, 151n38  
costs: absence of fault and, 38–39; benefits and, 62, 150n18; carbon regime and, 33–34; cleanup, 121–122; Energy Revolution and, 37–38, 40–41, 52–53, 80; externalization and, 154n20; mitigation versus CDR and, 96; US government and, 33. *See also* fairness; international inequalities and responsibilities; ordinary costs; sovereign externalization; wrongful imposition arguments



178 INDEX

- CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage (CCS), 9, 29.  
  *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> removal (CDR)
- CO<sub>2</sub>, compensatory, 162n24
- CO<sub>2</sub> emissions: acceleration of, 91–92; alternative energy impacts on, 120; anthropogenic, 18; cumulative, 1, 6–7, 19, 62–63, 91, 139–140, 161n9; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 74–75; international law and, 151n34; price of carbon and, 72, 123; since 1850, 9; tipping points and, 76; in 2019, 6; 2050 and, 63; unlimited threats and, 17, 19–20. *See also* action, immediate; adaptation; benefits; carbon budget; costs; fossil fuels; greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; international inequalities and responsibilities; mitigation; net zero emissions; political leaders and policies; *and individual countries*
- CO<sub>2</sub>eq, 161n19
- CO<sub>2</sub> levels, annual, 99
- CO<sub>2</sub>, net negative, 162n24
- CO<sub>2</sub> removal (CDR): asset-rescue, 95, 148n4; carbon budget and, 93; enhancement, 95–96, 98; fossil fuel interests and, 9, 95; IPCC and, 144n21; limited warming and, 94–95; mitigation now versus, 97–103; remedial, 95–98, 111–113, 115, 162n25. *See also* BECCS (bio-energy with carbon capture and storage); carbon capture and storage (CCS); CO<sub>2</sub> capture and storage (CCS)
- CO<sub>2</sub> Rising: The World's Greatest Environmental Challenge* (Volk), 162n31
- credit unions, 129
- Cripps, Elizabeth, 165n8
- Crutzen, Paul, 54–55
- Cullenward, Danny, 155n31
- “current generation,” 10
- date-of-last-opportunity: fossil fuel regime lies and, 130; generational responsibility and, 145n26; inaction and, 87–88; international responsibilities, 77–82; mitigation and, 14–15; overshoot and, 114. *See also* inaction; irreversible changes; second chances; tipping points
- Dearing, John A., 164n56
- deaths and misery, 7, 20, 33, 46, 62, 65, 123. *See also* health
- deceptions, lies, and secrecy, 2, 118–119, 124–128, 130–136, 160n7, 167n25, 170n45. *See also* transparency
- deforestation, 5, 37, 99–100
- demand, peak, 132
- demonstrations and strikes, 121, 134
- denial, 31, 89, 125
- Denman Glacier, 164n54
- Dill, Janina, 148n7
- distributive mechanism, fair, 14, 105
- divestment, 134–135
- Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform law (2010), 131, 133
- Dominion Energy, 172n73
- Doyle, Julie, 170n45
- drilling, 168n31
- drought, 7
- Duke Energy, 152n40, 172n73
- duties: promotional, 165n8; unconditional, 17–18
- duty of care, 109
- duty to stop immediately, 105
- economic factors: development, 7–8, 58–59, 66–67, 70, 75–76, 99, 150n24; fossil fuel regime and, 131–132; mitigation and, 94, 109–110; pension funds, 95; Russia and, 168n31; supply-side, 64, 72, 74, 92, 122, 126, 127, 130, 154n19. *See also* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; market mechanisms; political leaders and policies; self-interested reasons; sovereign externalization; subsidies, fossil fuel
- education, 71, 78
- electricity grids, 38, 66, 68, 75, 132, 157n43. *See also* One Sun One World One Grid (India)
- electric vehicles, 38, 120
- Emissions Gap* reports, 170n42
- Enbridge (Line 3 tar sands oil pipeline in Minnesota), 129

- energy-business-as-usual. *See* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual
- energy poverty, 58–59, 62
- Energy Revolution: coal and, 63–64; costs of, 37–38, 40–41, 52–53, 80; fair allocation of costs and, 38–42; fossil fuel interests and, 59, 61–62; international inequalities and responsibility and, 61–66, 73, 124; limited dangers and, 114; nations at a disadvantage and, 66–75; transition plans and, 5. *See also* action, immediate; alternative/noncarbon/renewable energy; future generations; moral reasons and responsibilities; pivotal generation; self-interested reasons
- environmental costs, 64–65
- equality, human, 80, 139–141. *See also* international inequalities and responsibilities
- Equatorial Guinea, 168n31
- Europe, 72, 79, 128
- Evangelical Christians, 171n56
- exploitation, conscious, 56, 108
- exports and imports, 71, 134
- externalization, 43–44, 121–122, 133, 154n24. *See also* sovereign externalization; temporal externalization
- ExxonMobil, 125, 130, 132, 167n24, 168n31, 169n33
- fairness: blame versus, 41–42; burdens and, 10–11; camel-bearing-four-trunks analogy and, 40; cost allocation and, 150n18; mitigation costs and, 105–106; sovereign externalization and, 47–57; transferable burdens and, 145n26; unseen difficulties and, 42. *See also* benefits; costs; intergenerational justice; international inequalities and responsibilities; pure fairness argument; “*wrong person*” objection
- “Fair-Share Carbon Dioxide Removal Increases Major Emitter Responsibility (Fyson et al.), 162n25
- Faulkner, William, 4, 35
- feedback, positive, 23–25, 115, 146n42
- feed-in tariffs, 66
- Fifth Assessment Report (IPCC) (2014), 94–95
- fires, 7, 99
- floods, 15, 28, 47, 61, 62. *See also* coastal flooding
- food, 100. *See also* agriculture and agribusiness
- foresight, 41
- fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual: bankruptcies and, 7–8, 121–122; capital, capital investments and capital expenditures, 35, 57, 110, 123, 127–128, 168n31; divestment and, 129; future dangers and, 115; historical context and, 91; inaction and, 9; individual responsibility and, 170n45; negative duties and, 118–119; projected production and, 125–126; renewables and, 8; responsibility and, 33–42, 61; risk structure and, 104; social movements and, 119, 130–136; solar radiation management and, 163n40; stranded assets and, 95, 126, 132, 133, 166n20, 169n41; stranded liabilities and, 122, 166n20; top executives’ incentives and, 154n27. *See also* agriculture and agribusiness; banks; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; deceptions, lies, and secrecy; economic factors; externalization; fossil fuels; historical context and historic opportunity; international inequalities and responsibilities; political leaders and policies; pure fairness argument; science; subsidies, fossil fuel; *and individual countries*
- fossil fuels: action now and, 6; percent of total energy supply of, 92; price of, 64–67, 71, 72–73, 74. *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; coal; consumption; fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; gas; greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions; historical context and historic opportunity; hydrogen; responsibility, generational
- fracking, 65, 121, 122, 129, 132, 172n73

180 INDEX

- Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992), 2, 90
- Francis I (pope), 75, 158n53
- future generations: arbitrary demands and, 8–9; burdens and, 12–17, 26; choices and, 9, 23, 26; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 7; fossil fuel interests and, 119; Pope Francis I on, 158n53; responsibilities of, 149n13; selfishness and, 141. *See also* burdens and harms; inaction; mitigation; responsibility, generational; threats, unlimited
- Fyson, Claire L. et al., 162n25
- G-20 governments, 64
- Gardiner, Stephen, 105
- gas, 38, 52, 122, 123, 125, 166n19.  
*See also* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; fracking; pipelines
- Gazprom, 130
- Geden, Oliver, 101
- “genealogy of the carbon economy,” 150n26
- generational responsibility. *See* responsibility, generational
- generation of 1940s, 10–11
- generation of 1960s, 11–12
- geologic history, 25–26
- Germany, 66.
- Ghosh, Amitav, 150nn25 and 26
- Global Crisis: War, Climate Change & Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century* (Parker), 20–21
- Global Warming of 1.5°C*, 7, 95. *See also* “Special Report on 1.5”
- Great Britain, 32, 70, 134
- Great Depression, 21
- The Great Derangement: Climate Change and the Unthinkable* (Ghosh), 150nn25 and 26
- greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions, 5, 6, 32–33, 48, 69–70, 92, 94, 161n19, 166n11. *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; Industrial Revolution and industrialization; methane; net zero emissions; temperature rise
- Greenland ice sheet, 24, 25, 79, 81, 91, 147nn44 and 47, 148n50, 159n62, 161n13
- Guardian* investigation (newspaper), 125–126
- Gulf Stream. *See* AMOC (Atlantic Meridional Overturning Circulation)
- guns, 16
- Halliburton, 122–123
- Hansson, Sven Ove, 104
- Hartzell-Nichols, Lauren, 22
- Hausfather, Zeke, 146n42
- Havel, Václav, 41
- health, 32, 64–65, 69, 119, 123, 154n20.  
*See also* deaths and misery; wrongful imposition arguments
- Helm, Dieter, 126
- Hermansson, Héléne, 104
- historical context and historic opportunity, 3–13, 36–37, 76, 83, 90–94, 145n26, 163n41. *See also* date-of-last-opportunity; deceptions, lies, and secrecy; Industrial Revolution and industrialization; political leaders and policies
- Hobbes, Thomas, 20
- hope, 84–86
- “Hothouse Earth,” 24
- human extinction, 17–18, 21, 23, 85, 146n36
- “Human Rights, Responsibilities, and Climate Change” (Caney), 149nn9 and 13, 152n43
- Hungary, 20
- hydrogen, 125
- ice-sheet melting. *See* Antarctic ice sheets; Greenland ice sheet; sea-level rise
- identity, 27, 28, 50, 144n24
- inaction: additional risks and, 14–15; consequences of versus costs, 80; fossil fuel interests and, 9; future danger and, 103–111, 155; future remediation and, 162n25; science and, 6; unlimited dangers and, 21–22. *See also* date-of-last-opportunity
- India: air pollution and, 59; alternative energy and, 158n49; BECCS feedstocks and, 102; carbon budget and, 69–70; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 40, 69–70, 74–75; energy poverty and,

- 58, 62, 72, 74; Energy Revolution and, 68–75; fossil fuel interests and, 122; industrialization and, 32–33; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 58–59, 62, 74; planetary electricity grid and, 68, 71, 72, 173n76; renewable energy and, 158n49; state-owned fossil fuel companies and, 122; thermal power and, 158n49; US foreign policy and, 72–73, 74, 172n76. *See also* energy poverty; international inequalities and responsibilities
- “India’s Electricity Sector Transformation Has Made Progress in 2019/20” (Buckley and Warrington), 158n49
- individual agency, responsibility, and rights: carbon cycle and, 28; externalization and, 150n24; fairness and, 55, 150n18; fossil fuel interests and, 121, 170n45; of future generations, 119; group effects and, 79; identities and, 144n24; India’s poor and, 58–59; institutions and practices versus, 60–61, 83; national responsibility and, 30–31, 42, 43, 45, 60–61, 148n7; negative duties and, 118; political power and, 131; Rawls and, 149n9; wrongful harms and, 46–47. *See also* consumption; luxury carbon taxes; pure fairness argument; social movements; wrongful imposition arguments
- individual inequalities, 139–141
- Industrial Revolution and industrialization: causal responsibility and, 81; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and, 3–4; CO<sub>2</sub> levels and, 6; coal and, 32–33; delayed costs and, 33–34; effects of, 32; greenhouse gas emissions and, 5, 33; individual choices and, 30; international inequality and, 139; irreversible change and, 116; present and, 27; pure fairness argument and, 36–37; sovereign externalization and, 43–44; strikes and, 134. *See also* agriculture and agribusiness; CO<sub>2</sub> emissions; fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual inequality. *See* individual inequalities; international inequalities and responsibilities; sovereign externalization
- infrastructure, 35, 57, 124
- Institute for Energy Economics and Financial Analysis (Cleveland), 68–69, 167n20
- institutions and practices, 36, 60–61, 83, 118, 120, 123, 135
- insurers, 123
- “integral fabric,” 13, 145n26
- integrated assessment models (IAMs), 144n21
- intentions, 5–6, 40, 56. *See also* causal responsibility; knowledge; moral reasons and responsibilities
- intergenerational justice, 13, 15–16, 103–104, 107–108, 158n53. *See also* future generations; pivotal (present) generation; Rawls, John; responsibility, generational
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), 7, 94–95
- internalization of negative externalities, 44
- internal versus external emission reductions, 94
- International Energy Agency (IEA), 126–127
- international inequalities and responsibilities: adequate sacrifices and, 82–88; affordability of noncarbon energy and, 66–75; benefits and costs and, 151n35; causal responsibility and, 71–72, 80–81; contemporary strangers and prices and, 66–75; coronavirus and, 126–127; date-of-last-opportunity and, 77–82; Dodd-Frank reform law and, 133; domestic justice distinguished from, 152n40; dual obligations for mitigation and, 94; Energy Revolution and, 61–66, 73, 124; fairness and, 49–52, 55; future strangers and tipping points and, 75–76; India and, 58–59, 72–73; individual agency versus institutions and practices,

182 INDEX

- international inequalities and responsibilities (*continued*)  
60–61, 139–141; intergenerational justice and, 80–81; local versus global agency and, 60, 69, 79, 150n25; non-carbon energy and, 124; past and present, 59–60; present and future generations and, 75; risk structure and, 105–106; solar radiation management and, 162n40. *See also* equality, human; sacrifices, present; sovereign externalization; space gaps
- international justice. *See* international inequalities and responsibilities
- international law, 151n34
- international negotiations, 33, 51–52. *See also* COP24 (Conference of the Parties to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in 2018); Paris Agreement (2015)
- IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), 94–95, 98–99, 101, 144n21, 146n42
- Iran, 122
- irreversible changes, 25–26, 59, 78, 84–88, 111–116. *See also* Antarctic ice sheets; date-of-last-opportunity; Greenland ice sheet; tipping points
- Jamieson, Dale, 151n35
- Japan, 128
- jobs, 38, 52, 71, 126, 166n19, 170n42. *See also* coal miners
- justice, domestic versus international, 152n40. *See also* intergenerational justice; international inequalities and responsibilities
- King, Martin Luther, Jr., 10
- Klein, Naomi, 134, 154n23
- knowledge, 5–6, 106–107. *See also* science
- Koch Industries, 122, 123, 130, 167n25
- land use, 5, 37, 65, 96, 99, 100, 101. *See also* agriculture and agribusiness
- Lazarus, Michael, 126, 170n42
- Lenzi, Dominic, 90
- Leonard, Christopher, 167n25
- Little Ice Age, 20–21
- Louisiana marshes, 147n48
- Lovejoy, Tom, 78
- Lugar, Richard, 131
- luxury carbon taxes, 140–141
- Maddow, Rachel, 167n24
- Making Climate Policy Work* (Cullenward and Victor), 155n31
- Malm, Andreas, 23–24
- Mann, Michael E., 169n33
- market mechanisms: causal responsibility and, 73; flooding markets, 125–126; fossil fuel interests and, 122–123, 125–126; negative duties and, 118–124; political leaders and policies and, 155n31; regulation versus, 64, 74; stability and, 133. *See also* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; prices
- McKinnon, Catriona, 145n26, 146n40
- means and ends, 109
- methane, 6, 79, 122, 166n19
- migrants and refugees, 16, 20, 24, 83
- Mildenberger, Matto, 131
- Mitchell, Timothy, 117, 134
- mitigation: CDR and, 96, 97–98, 103, 104; distributed sacrifices and, 105; dual obligations for, 93–94; economic costs and, 94, 109–110; future burdens and, 14; India's costs and, 72; political power and, 131; unlimited risks and, 162n41; zero emissions and, 14, 93, 105, 106, 107. *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> removal (CDR); negative emission technologies (NETs) and other mitigations; temperature rise
- monsoons, 72
- Mooney, Chris, 147n48
- moral hazard, 96
- moral reasons and responsibilities: causal responsibility versus, 37–42; historic opportunity and, 10–13; overachievement and, 87–88. *See also* deceptions, lies, and secrecy; duties, unconditional; fairness; historical context and

- historic opportunity; international inequalities and responsibilities; responsibility, generational; self-interested reasons; wrongful imposition arguments
- Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), 94, 134
- national responsibility. *See* individual agency, responsibility, and rights; international inequalities and responsibilities; pure fairness argument; sovereign externalization; United States *and other sovereign states*
- nations at a disadvantage: affordability of noncarbon energy and, 38, 66–75; burdens and, 16; carbon budget and, 38; delayed costs and, 33–42; hope and, 85–86. *See also* international inequalities and responsibilities; Nigeria *and other nations*
- nations with an advantage: causal responsibility and, 33; costs and benefits and, 33–42; dual obligations for mitigation and, 94; ranking and, 56; state-owned companies and, 122, 124, 126; wrongful imposition arguments and, 43–54. *See also* fossil fuel regime/carbon regime/energy-business-as-usual; individual agency and responsibility; international inequalities and responsibilities; sovereign externalization; United States *and other nations*
- natural law, 152n38
- natural processes, 29
- natural species, 24
- Nazis, 10–11.
- NDCs (Nationally Determined Contributions), 94, 105
- necessity, avoidable, 47
- negative duties, 118
- negative emission technologies (NETs), 92–93, 94–95
- negative emissions, 92, 95. *See also* CO<sub>2</sub> removal (CDR)
- negative externalities, 44. *See also* externalization
- net negative CO<sub>2</sub>, 162n24
- net zero emissions, 107; bank financing and, 129; breathing and, 99; climate change and, 14; CO<sub>2</sub> budget and, 160n75; consumption and, 119–120; fossil fuel interests and, 117–118, 125, 127–128; government policies and, 134, 135; individual consumption and, 119–120; political power and, 131; possibility of, 162n40; temperature rise and, 92, 96; unlimited climate change and, 19. *See also* action, immediate; mitigation
- Nigeria, 65, 154n23
- “no offense” objection, 35–36, 37–38
- noncarbon energy. *See* alternative/noncarbon/renewable energy; solar energy; wind energy
- nonhuman factors, 19, 22, 23–24
- nonviolence, 172n73
- Northern Hemisphere and, 99
- Norway, 122
- Obama administration, 134
- Obiangs (Equatorial Guinea), 131
- ocean floor, 159n61
- oceans, 24, 65, 79, 99, 162n40. *See also* sea-level rise
- Ohio State University, 159n62
- oil. *See* fossil fuels; fracking; pipelines; subsidies, fossil fuel
- oil leaks, 65
- 1.5°C rise, 7, 77–78, 92, 93, 94–95, 126. *See also* temperature rise
- One Sun One World One Grid (India), 68, 71, 72, 173n76
- Open Secrets Newsletter* (Center for Responsive Politics), 167n27
- Orbán, Victor, 20
- ordinary costs, 46–54, 150n24, 151n27. *See also* costs
- overshoots, 93–95, 96, 97, 112, 113, 114–115
- Oxfam, 139–140
- Oxford University, 134–135
- Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E), 7–8
- Paris Agreement (2015), 30, 53, 104, 105, 125, 126, 127, 128, 134, 153n10
- Parker, Geoffrey, 20–21

184 INDEX

- peak demand, 132  
peak oil, 171n59  
pipelines, 67, 121, 123, 129, 147n48, 172n73  
pivotal (present) generation: arbitrary demands and, 8–17; carbon prices and, 64–75; defined, 10, 164n47; fate of the planet and, 2; fossil fuel interests and, 135; future dangers and, 103–111, 114–115; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 75–76; past sacrifices and, 83; reach of, 4–5. *See also* action, immediate; historical context and historic opportunity; identity; responsibility, generational; sacrifices, present  
plastic, 121, 125, 132–133, 166n11, 170n45  
political leaders and policies: Brazil and, 16, 118, 131, 173n76; dysfunction of, 16–17, 21; failure of, 120–121; fossil fuel interests and, 52, 65, 115, 117–118, 123–124, 131, 153n8, 162n40; fossil fuels prices and, 64–67; future dangers and, 17, 115; global solutions and, 17; historical context and, 90–91; market mechanisms and, 155n31; net zero carbon and, 119; partisan politics and, 16; renewable energy and, 120; risk structure and, 104; social movements and, 134–135; structural change and, 130–131; 2°C rise and, 63; unlimited threats and, 20–22; wasted time and, 2. *See also* adaptation; cap-and-dividend; carbon tax; CO<sub>2</sub> removal (CDR); historical context and historic opportunity; luxury carbon taxes; mitigation; nations with an advantage; regulation; social movements; sovereign externalization; subsidies, fossil fuel  
poor countries. *See* international inequalities and responsibilities  
poor individuals, 140  
population growth, 71, 100  
positive feedback, 23–25, 115, 146n42, 155  
postindustrial society, 26–27  
Practical Action, 74  
practices and institutions, 36, 60–61, 83, 118, 120, 123, 135  
PR firms, 123  
prices: of carbon, 64–75, 123; of electricity, 68–75; of food, 20; of fossil fuels, 64–67, 71, 72–73, 74; of renewables, 67, 70–71, 72–73, 129, 132. *See also* negative externalities  
*Private Empire* (Coll), 169n33  
*The Production Gap* (SEI and UNEP), 91–92  
*The Production Gap 2020 Special Report* (Lazarus and Verkuil), 126, 170n42  
profit, 44  
“profiteering delay,” 125  
punishment, 36–37, 38, 39  
pure fairness argument, 36–42, 72. *See also* fairness; “wrong person” objection  
Putin, Vladimir. *See* Russia and Vladimir Putin  
race, 16  
Rainforest Action Network, 128  
rationing, 64  
Rawls, John, 13–14, 105–106, 107, 110, 144nn23 and 24, 145n26, 149n9  
reaction time, 76  
“rebound” phenomena, 161n16  
*Rectifying International Injustice: Principles of Compensation and Restitution between Nations* (Butt), 150n17  
recycling, 121, 133, 170n45  
redistribution of burdens, 10–11  
redistribution of wealth, 51–52, 73–74, 108  
reforestation, 99, 102–103  
“Regime Shifts Occur Disproportionately Faster in Larger Ecosystems” (Cooper, Willcock, and Dearing), 164n56  
regulation, 44, 64–65, 74, 123–124, 134. *See also* cap-and-dividend and other regulations; political leaders and policies  
responsibility, generational: agency and, 60–61; Caney’s schema and, 143n6; “carbon footprint” and, 170n45; CO<sub>2</sub>

- emissions and, 22, 35; fairness and, 54–55, 57; future dangers and, 23; historical context and, 145n26; hope and, 85–86; identity and, 27; India and, 59; national past and, 31–39; obligations and, 13–14; overview, 1–8; past, present, and future and, 3; past and, 28–29; Rawls on, 144n23, 145n26; reversible and irreversible effect and, 113–114. *See also* Anthropocene period; benefits; burdens and harms; causal responsibility; costs; duties, promotional; duties, unconditional; individual agency, responsibility, and rights; international inequalities and responsibilities; moral reasons and responsibility; pivotal (present) generation; pure fairness argument; sacrifices, present
- Reus-Smit, Christian, 151n38
- Revelle, Roger, 18
- reversible and irreversible changes, 25, 103–111, 113–114, 115. *See also* date-of-last-opportunity; tipping points
- Rich, Nathaniel, 160n7
- richest individuals, 139–140
- rights. *See* individual agency, responsibility, and rights
- risk structure, 104–105, 109, 145n26
- Royal Dutch Shell, 132. *See also* Shell Oil
- Russia and Vladimir Putin: accountability and, 56, 57; citizen action and, 131; fossil fuel interests and, 16, 43, 61, 118, 122, 123, 126, 167n24, 168n31
- “ruthless few,” 134
- Rystad Energy, 126
- sacrifices, present: adequacy of, 82–87; choices and, 9–11; fair distributive mechanisms and, 14, 105; historical context and, 8–9, 11–12; past sacrifices and, 83. *See also* burdens and harms; consumption; luxury carbon taxes; individual agency, responsibility, and rights
- safety, 119, 123
- Saro-Wiwa, Ken, 154n23
- Saudi Arabia, 16, 118, 122, 130, 131
- Saudi Aramco, 130
- scaling up, rapid, 98–103
- Scheffler, Samuel, 60, 61, 79, 114
- Schell, Jonathan, 134, 172n73
- Schlumberger, 122–123
- science: action now and, 6–7, 8–9, 21–22; CO<sub>2</sub> levels and, 62–63; fossil fuel interests and, 119, 124–125, 169n33; historical context and historic opportunity and, 9, 18; intentional control and, 5–6; intervention and reaction times and, 76; politicians and policies and, 21, 70; tipping points and, 58
- sea-ice. *See* Antarctic ice sheets; the Arctic; Greenland ice sheet
- sea-level rise: carbon emissions and, 3–4; Denman Glacier and, 164n54; ice-sheet melting and, 24–26; India and, 62, 74; international inequality and, 49, 60, 62; Totten Glacier and, 112. *See also* coastal flooding; ice-sheet melting; West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS)
- second chances: CDR and, 94–104; historical context and, 90–94; reversible and irreversible changes and, 103–111; scaling up and, 98–103. *See also* date-of-last-opportunity
- The Secret History of Koch Industries and Corporate Power in America* (Leonard), 167n25
- Section 1504. *See* Dodd-Frank Wall Street reform law
- sediment cores, 147n48
- self-interested reasons, 7–9, 95, 110, 153n8. *See also* economic factors; sovereign externalization
- separation, illusions of, 2–5
- service companies, 122–123
- Shell Oil, 65, 122, 125, 130, 154n23. *See also* Royal Dutch Shell
- Shue, Henry, 90, 96, 137–138, 149nn14 and 16, 152nn41 and 43, 158nn45 and 47
- Smoke and Fumes: The Legal and Evidentiary Basis for Holding Big Oil*



186 INDEX

- Smoke and Fumes (continued)*  
*Accountable for the Climate Crisis*  
(Center for International Environmental Law), 124–125
- Snyder, Timothy, 21
- social movements, 118, 124, 129, 130–136, 172n73. *See also* action, immediate; individual agency, responsibility, and rights; solidarity; strikes and demonstrations
- sociopolitical situation. *See* political leaders and policies
- soil carbon sequestration, 99, 102–103
- solar energy: China and, 156n36; cost of, 67, 68, 132; increased use of, 92, 157n36, 161n16. *See also* electricity grids
- solar radiation management (SRM), 9, 103, 163n40
- solidarity, 47, 51, 52, 83, 158n53. *See also* dignity and respect; respect and dignity; social movements
- Southern Company, 152n40
- sovereign externalization: fairness and, 54–57; health and environmental costs and, 64–65, 167n28; historical responsibility and, 31–34; international inequalities and responsibilities and, 44–54, 72; ordinary costs and, 47–48; risk structure and, 104; unilateral coercion and, 51–52. *See also* externalization; wrongful imposition arguments
- space gaps, 150n25. *See also* international inequalities and responsibilities
- “Special Report on 1.5” (*Global Warming of 1.5°C*), 7, 94–95, 98–99, 101
- steam engine, 54–55
- Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI), 126, 139–140
- stock market, 132
- Stokes, Leah Cardamore, 117, 120, 125
- storms, 20, 62, 72, 74. *See also* coastal flooding; floods
- strikes and demonstrations, 121, 134
- strip mining, 65
- subsidies, fossil fuel: competitiveness and, 131; consumption versus production, 126; corruption and, 168n31; IMF and, 155n20, 167n28; microgrids and, 66; noncarbon competitiveness and, 67, 124; renewable energy tax credits versus, 168n28; US leadership and, 134; world total in 2015, 64, 123
- Suess, Hans E., 18
- “supermajor” investor-owned firms, 122
- “tapering,” 134
- temperature rise: carbon budget and, 70; CDR and, 95; cumulative emissions and, 9; methane and, 79; net zero emissions and, 92, 96; “polar enhancement” of, 155. *See also* 1.5°C rise; overshoots; 2°C rise
- temporal externalization, 108, 114
- thermal power, 158n49
- Thirty Years War, 21
- threats, unlimited, 17–23. *See also* tipping points
- Thucydides, 51, 151n38
- Thunberg, Greta, generation of, 90–91
- Thwaites Glacier, 111–112; 147n49, 158n57, 164n50
- time, 3, 26, 76, 115, 150n25
- tipping points: action now and, 86–87; cascades of, 24–25, 115; CDR and, 111; date-of-last-opportunity and, 76; future generations and, 23–26, 75–76; generational and international responsibilities to future and, 75–76; irreversible changes and, 113–114; Louisiana sediment cores and, 147n48; scientists and, 58. *See also* date-of-last-opportunity; reversible and irreversible changes; threats, unlimited
- tobacco companies, 124–128
- Total (company), 132
- Totten Glacier, 112–113; 164n53
- Transocean, 122–123
- transparency, 131, 134. *See also* deceptions, lies, and secrecy
- transportation, 61, 102
- trees, 99–100
- Trump administration, 56, 123, 131, 133, 134
- 2°C rise, 7, 63, 77–78, 92, 94–95, 126, 168n31, 170n42. *See also* temperature rise

- unconditional duties, 17–18  
understanding. *See* knowledge;  
science  
unilateral coercion, 51–52  
United Kingdom, 135  
United Nations Environmental Program  
(UNEP), 126; fossil fuel interests  
and, 131  
United States: approach to climate  
change of, 56; bank loans and, 128;  
cumulative emissions of, 69–70,  
161n9; fairness and, 57; foreign  
policy and, 172–173n76; fossil fuel  
combustion and, 118; fossil fuel  
interests and, 61–62, 123, 127, 134;  
generational responsibility and, 35;  
NDCs and, 105; Paris Agreement  
(2018) and, 30, 134; political power  
and, 131; sovereign externaliza-  
tion and, 51–52, 57; “supermajor”  
investor-owned firms and, 122. *See also* India; international inequali-  
ties and responsibilities; international  
negotiations; political leaders and  
policies; sovereign externalization  
unraveling of civilization, 21, 146n36  
US Capitol insurrectionists, 20  
utilities, 7–8, 52, 121–122, 124–125,  
152n40, 167n26  
Verkuijl, Cleo, 126, 170n42  
Victor, David G., 155n31  
violence, 16, 20, 172n73  
Volk, Tyler, 162n31  
WAIS (West Antarctic Ice Sheet), 59,  
78, 81, 85, 111–112, 147n47, 164n52  
Wallace-Wells, David, 91, 120, 125  
waste, reduction of, 66–67  
water: as alternative energy source,  
110; BECCS and, 101; CDR and, 96;  
coal and, 65; fossil fuel interests  
and, 121; “green” hydrogen and, 125;  
India and, 72; population growth  
and, 100; Totten Glacier and, 112.  
*See also* agriculture and agribusi-  
ness; sea-level rise  
Watt, James, 54  
Weisbach, David, 109  
Wenar, Leif, 134  
West Antarctic Ice Sheet (WAIS), 59,  
78, 81, 85, 111–112, 147n47, 164n52  
wetland draining, 5  
“Where Has All the Oil Gone? BP  
Branding and the Discursive  
Elimination of Climate Change  
Risk” (Doyle), 170n45  
wildfires, 7, 99  
Willcock, Simon, 164n56  
wind energy, 38, 68, 92, 120, 156, 156n36,  
161n16. *See also* electricity grids  
women, 71  
World War II, 64  
Worringham, Charles, 158n49  
wrongful imposition arguments, 36,  
43–47, 55, 72, 73, 114, 150nn24 and  
27, 162n40. *See also* burdens; costs;  
sovereign externalization  
“wrong person” objection, 34–35