Converging Crises in the Anthropocene: A Critical Synthesis of Planetary Boundaries, Manufactured Risks, and Systemic Fragility

Narrative Review

Anonymous[1*]

1. beyondthelimitsoftaste.com

*Corresponding author email: anonymous@beyondthelimitsoftaste.com

Abstract

Human civilization in the mid-2020s confronts a convergence of interconnected crises spanning ecological, technological, geopolitical, and public health domains. This narrative review synthesizes current evidence across multiple risk categories, examining their hypothesized interactions and cumulative implications for societal stability. Drawing on the planetary boundaries framework for biophysical thresholds, risk society theory for understanding manufactured uncertainties, and science and technology studies for analyzing sociotechnical co-production, the analysis identifies three distinct but interacting crisis domains: (1) ecological overshoot, where six of nine planetary boundaries have been transgressed; (2) sociotechnical systemic risks, including antimicrobial resistance, biosecurity vulnerabilities, and information ecosystem degradation; and (3) institutional-political fragilities, notably democratic erosion and governance failures. While these crises share common drivers-growth imperatives, externalized costs, and fragmented governance-they differ ontologically and require differentiated analytical treatment. The review acknowledges significant countervailing capacities (technological innovation, institutional adaptation, social movements) and substantial regional variation obscured by global aggregates. Rather than claiming deterministic collapse trajectories, this synthesis argues that current configurations elevate risks of cascading failures, though outcomes remain contingent on political choices, governance innovations, and distributional justice. The analysis explicitly values intergenerational equity, democratic deliberation, and ecological integrity while recognizing these commitments as contestable normative positions requiring ongoing justification.

Keywords: Planetary boundaries, risk society, Anthropocene, systemic risk, climate change, democratic erosion, co-production, environmental justice, polycrisis

Introduction

The Anthropocene Condition

The concept of the Anthropocene-a proposed geological epoch defined by human domination of Earth systems-has evolved from academic abstraction to empirical reality[1]. The planetary boundaries framework, first articulated by Rockström et al.[2] and subsequently updated[3,4], provides quantitative thresholds for nine Earth system processes essential for maintaining Holocene-like conditions. The most recent assessment confirms transgression of six boundaries: climate change, biosphere integrity, land-system change, freshwater use, biogeochemical flows, and novel entities[4].

However, the planetary boundaries framework, while foundational for understanding biophysical limits, captures only one dimension of contemporary systemic challenges. This review extends the analysis to encompass technological acceleration, geopolitical destabilization, public health emergencies, and socioeconomic fragilities. Crucially, this extension requires theoretical justification: biophysical boundaries involve quantifiable thresholds and measurable feedback mechanisms, whereas social and political phenomena operate through different causal logics involving reflexivity, contestation, and normative choice.

Theoretical Framework: From Overshoot to Manufactured Risk

The systems ecology concept of "overshoot"-exponential growth exceeding carrying capacity with delayed corrective feedback[5,6]-provides a useful heuristic for understanding biophysical transgressions. However, its application to social systems requires careful qualification. Unlike ecological carrying capacity, social "limits" are not fixed natural constraints but contested, negotiable, and historically contingent constructs. Democratic institutions do not have "carrying capacity" in the same sense as fisheries; information ecosystems do not exhibit threshold dynamics analogous to ice sheet collapse.

Therefore, this review employs a differentiated analytical framework distinguishing three crisis domains. These categories function as *ideal types* in Weber's sense-analytical constructs that sharpen distinctions for theoretical clarity while acknowledging that empirical phenomena may span multiple categories. The framework is heuristic rather than ontologically rigid: fossil fuel infrastructure, for instance, simultaneously drives ecological overshoot (emissions), constitutes sociotechnical risk (energy system dependencies), and reflects institutional-political choices (regulatory capture, lobbying). The value of differentiation lies not in strict classification but in preventing category errors that conflate distinct causal logics and governance challenges.

1. **Ecological overshoot** (hard biophysical limits): Climate, biodiversity, chemical pollution, resource depletion-domains where quantifiable thresholds and feedback mechanisms operate relatively independently of human perception.

2. **Sociotechnical systemic risks** (complex thresholds): Antimicrobial resistance, biosecurity, energy systems, AI-domains where technical and social factors co-produce risks through infrastructures, institutions, and incentive structures.

3. **Institutional-political fragilities** (contested normative breakdowns): Democratic erosion, information integrity, governance failures-domains where "crisis" is defined relative to normative commitments (e.g., democratic values) rather than objective thresholds.

The title concept of "systemic fragility" denotes a structural condition distinct from both risk (probability-weighted potential for harm) and crisis (acute rupture demanding decision). Fragility refers to the susceptibility of interconnected systems to cascading failure under stress-the brittleness that emerges when tight coupling, reduced redundancy, and eroded buffers leave systems vulnerable to shocks that would previously have been absorbed. Systemic fragility is thus a meta-property of the configuration itself, not reducible to any single crisis domain.

This differentiation draws on three complementary theoretical traditions that together illuminate the full complexity of converging crises. Ulrich Beck's[7] concept of "risk society" explains *why* contemporary risks emerge: they are increasingly "manufactured uncertainties"-products of modernization itself rather than external hazards. Beck's framework reveals that technological and institutional crises differ fundamentally from natural disasters because they emerge from human decisions, are distributed unequally across populations, and cannot be addressed through technical expertise alone but require political deliberation about acceptable risk levels.

Sheila Jasanoff's[8] concept of "co-production" from science and technology studies (STS) illuminates *how* these risks take shape: scientific knowledge and social order are mutually constituted, meaning that crises like antimicrobial resistance or information ecosystem degradation cannot be understood as purely technical problems awaiting scientific solutions. They are simultaneously technical and political, shaped by regulatory regimes, economic incentives, and cultural values. Notably, even the "hard" biophysical thresholds of the planetary boundaries framework involve co-production: while the metrics are biophysical, the *boundary-setting* itself reflects social decisions about acceptable risk levels and intergenerational obligations.

Finally, Thomas Hughes's[9] concept of "technological momentum" explains *why transformation is difficult*: large technical systems acquire political and economic constituencies that resist change, creating path dependencies that constrain future options regardless of available alternatives. Together, these frameworks reveal converging crises as manufactured (Beck), co-produced (Jasanoff), and locked-in (Hughes)-a configuration that cannot be addressed through technical fixes alone but requires political transformation of the systems that generate and perpetuate risk.

Scope and Normative Commitments

This review explicitly operates from normative commitments that should be transparent rather than concealed within ostensibly neutral analysis:

- **Intergenerational equity:** Future generations have morally relevant interests that constrain present resource use.
- **Democratic deliberation:** Collective decisions about risk acceptance should emerge through inclusive democratic processes rather than technocratic imposition.

- **Ecological integrity:** Non-human species and ecosystems possess value beyond instrumental utility to humans.
- **Distributive justice:** Crisis burdens and transition costs should be allocated according to principles of fairness, acknowledging historical responsibilities and differential vulnerabilities.

These commitments are contestable-alternative value frameworks exist-but they provide the evaluative standpoint from which “crisis” is identified and response pathways assessed.

Ecological Overshoot: Biophysical Boundaries Transgressed

Climate System Destabilization

The year 2024 marked a critical threshold: for the first time, global annual mean surface temperature exceeded 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels[10]. Arctic amplification has intensified beyond earlier estimates, with the region warming nearly four times faster than the global mean since 1979[11].

Climate tipping points-thresholds beyond which self-reinforcing feedbacks drive potentially irreversible change-represent the clearest case of hard biophysical limits. Armstrong McKay et al.[12] identify 16 major tipping elements, with potential cascade dynamics whereby triggering one increases probability of triggering others[13]. Unlike social phenomena, these dynamics operate through physical mechanisms largely independent of human perception or political choice-though their *causes* remain firmly rooted in political economy.

Biodiversity and Chemical Pollution

The IPBES Global Assessment estimates approximately one million species face extinction risk[14]. The planetary boundary for novel entities-synthetic chemicals with no evolutionary precedent-has been exceeded, with over 350,000 chemicals registered for commercial use[15]. PFAS detected in 77% of human blood samples exemplify the ubiquity of anthropogenic contamination[16].

Resource Throughput

Global material extraction exceeds 100 billion tonnes annually, substantially outpacing regenerative capacity[17]. Critical materials for energy transition face supply-demand gaps, with China’s dominance in rare earth processing (70% mining, 90% refining) creating geopolitical vulnerabilities[18,19].

Sociotechnical Systemic Risks: Co-Produced Vulnerabilities

Antimicrobial Resistance

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) exemplifies Beck’s “manufactured risk”-a threat produced by the very medical advances that extended human lifespans. Drug-resistant infections caused an estimated 1.27 million deaths in 2019, with projections of 10 million annual deaths by 2050[20,21].

Crucially, AMR is not merely a biological phenomenon but a sociotechnical one: it emerges from the intersection of microbial evolution, agricultural practices (approximately 70% of antibiotics used in livestock), pharmaceutical economics (only two new antibiotic classes since 2000), healthcare delivery systems, and regulatory regimes. Addressing AMR requires not only scientific innovation but transformation of incentive structures that currently make antibiotic development economically unattractive.

Biosecurity and Pandemic Risk

The proliferation of high-containment laboratories-approximately 70 BSL-4 facilities across 30+ countries-combined with synthetic biology advances, illustrates what Jasanoff terms the "co-production" of risk and governance[22]. Laboratory biosecurity is simultaneously a technical problem (containment protocols) and a governance problem (international oversight, dual-use research regulation). Historical incidents demonstrate that technical systems depend on organizational cultures, regulatory frameworks, and geopolitical contexts that shape their actual safety performance.

Energy Systems and Technological Lock-in

Despite renewable growth, fossil fuels account for approximately 80% of primary energy consumption[18]. This persistence reflects what historians of technology call "technological momentum"[9]-the tendency of large technical systems to acquire political and economic constituencies that resist transformation. Infrastructure is not merely technical but sociotechnical: power plants, transportation networks, and industrial facilities embody past political choices and constrain future options. As Langdon Winner[23] argued in his influential essay "Do Artifacts Have Politics?", technological systems are not neutral instruments but encode and stabilize particular distributions of power, visibility, and responsibility. The design of energy infrastructure-centralized versus distributed, fossil versus renewable-shapes not only carbon emissions but also which communities bear pollution burdens, which workers gain or lose employment, and which governance arrangements remain viable.

The AI-energy nexus illustrates emerging tensions: data center electricity consumption may double by 2026[18], potentially offsetting efficiency gains elsewhere. This trajectory is not technologically determined but reflects political choices about AI development priorities, energy pricing, and regulatory oversight-choices that remain open to democratic contestation.

Institutional-Political Fragilities: Contested Breakdowns

Democratic Erosion

Global democracy has experienced two decades of net decline. The V-Dem Institute classifies 91 countries as autocracies versus 88 democracies, with 45 nations autocratizing versus 19 democratizing[24]. Full democracies represent approximately 6.6% of world population[25].

However, framing democratic erosion as "crisis" requires acknowledging the normative commitment to democratic governance that grounds this evaluation. From alternative value frameworks-authoritarian stability, technocratic efficiency, religious authority-the same phenomena might be assessed differently. This review proceeds from democratic commitments while recognizing their contestability.

The relationship between democratic erosion and environmental degradation, while plausible, is empirically complex. Authoritarian regimes have sometimes implemented aggressive environmental policies (China's renewable deployment); democracies have sometimes deregulated environmental protection (US under certain administrations). The feedback loop "Democratic Erosion → Regulatory Weakening → Environmental Degradation" should be understood as a tendency with significant exceptions rather than a deterministic mechanism.

Information Ecosystem Degradation

Deepfake incidents increased 257% in 2024; false news spreads approximately six times faster than truthful content[26,27]. Trust in news media has declined to approximately 40% globally[28].

Yet characterizing this as "ecosystem collapse" risks overstating the case. Information systems have always involved contested claims, propaganda, and manipulation; what has changed is the technological infrastructure enabling rapid, low-cost production and distribution of misleading content. Whether this constitutes qualitative transformation or quantitative intensification of longstanding dynamics remains debated. The term "collapse" should be understood as rhetorical emphasis rather than precise description.

Nuclear Risk

The world maintains approximately 12,240 nuclear warheads, with the Doomsday Clock at 89 seconds to midnight[29,30]. Nuclear risk exemplifies what Beck calls "civilizational self-threat"-existential danger produced by human technological achievement. Modeling suggests major exchange could cause 5 billion deaths from nuclear winter effects.

Hypothesized Systemic Interactions

The crises documented above may interact through feedback mechanisms, though the strength and directionality of these interactions vary substantially and remain empirically contested. The following pathways are proposed as hypotheses warranting further investigation rather than established dynamics:

Climate → Water → Food → Migration → Political Stress: Rising temperatures reduce water availability and agricultural yields in vulnerable regions, potentially driving displacement that strains receiving areas. This pathway has empirical support in specific contexts (Syrian drought-migration-conflict nexus) but generalizations require caution given substantial regional variation and multicausal complexity[31].

Resource Competition → Geopolitical Tension: Demand for critical materials may intensify competition among major powers. However, resource competition can also drive cooperation (joint development agreements) or technological substitution (alternative materials). The pathway to conflict is contingent rather than determined.

Market Failures → Health System Vulnerabilities: Pharmaceutical profit maximization has contributed to antibiotic development collapse and vaccine access inequities. This represents a relatively well-documented causal mechanism operating through identifiable incentive structures.

Technological Acceleration → Energy Demand: AI expansion increases electricity consumption, potentially conflicting with decarbonization. However, AI also enables efficiency improvements; net effects remain uncertain and depend on governance choices.

These interactions create what some scholars term "polycrisis"-a condition where multiple crises interact such that the whole exceeds the sum of parts[32]. The relationship between the polycrisis concept and this review's three-fold framework warrants clarification. The tri-partite categories (ecological, sociotechnical, institutional-political) represent analytically distinct *types* of crisis with different causal logics; "polycrisis" names the *condition* that emerges when crises across these categories interact in ways that amplify systemic fragility. Polycrisis is thus not a fourth category but a meta-level descriptor of the configuration-the emergent property of mutual reinforcement among distinct crisis domains. However, the polycrisis concept should be deployed carefully: not all co-occurring crises are systemically coupled, and conflating correlation with causation risks analytical confusion.

Differential Vulnerabilities and Justice Dimensions

Global aggregates obscure profound inequalities in crisis exposure and responsibility. The wealthiest 10% of the global population produces approximately 50% of consumption-based emissions; the poorest 50% produces approximately 10%[33]. Climate impacts fall disproportionately on Global South populations who contributed least to cumulative emissions.

Water scarcity affects 4 billion people, concentrated in regions with least adaptive capacity[34]. Food insecurity (735 million undernourished) clusters in conflict-affected areas and sub-Saharan Africa[35]. AMR mortality concentrates in low- and middle-income countries with weakest health systems.

These patterns reflect what political economists term "environmental load displacement"-the tendency of wealthy nations to externalize ecological costs onto poorer regions and future generations. Any adequate response to converging crises must address distributional justice, not merely aggregate risk reduction.

The apparent universalism of "civilization in overshoot" obscures that different populations occupy radically different positions within this configuration: some as primary drivers, others as primary victims, and many as both in complex ways. Indigenous communities, for example, often possess traditional ecological knowledge offering alternatives to industrial modernity while bearing disproportionate impacts of extractive industries and climate change. Environmental justice scholarship[36,37] and decolonial critiques of the Anthropocene[38,39] argue that these inequalities are not incidental but constitutive: the very systems producing ecological overshoot were built through colonial extraction and racialized labor regimes. Adequately addressing converging crises therefore requires not merely technical solutions but reckoning with these historical and ongoing injustices-what Nixon[40] terms the "slow violence" disproportionately borne by marginalized communities.

Countervailing Capacities and Alternative Trajectories

Technological Innovation

Renewable energy costs have declined dramatically; solar PV is now the cheapest electricity source in most markets. Electric vehicle adoption accelerates. Agricultural innovation continues improving yields. Carbon capture technologies advance, though scalability remains uncertain.

Institutional Adaptation

International climate agreements (Paris), biodiversity frameworks (Kunming-Montreal), and pandemic preparedness mechanisms demonstrate institutional learning capacity, however inadequate to crisis scale. Some jurisdictions implement ambitious policies: EU Green Deal, US Inflation Reduction Act.

Social Movements

Climate activism, environmental justice movements, and democratic resistance demonstrate societal capacity for mobilization and normative contestation. These movements challenge not only specific policies but underlying growth imperatives and distributional arrangements.

Regional Variation

Global aggregates obscure significant variation. Some regions (Nordic countries, Costa Rica) demonstrate that high human development is achievable with lower ecological footprints. Some cities lead in sustainable urban planning. Some sectors decarbonize rapidly.

These countervailing factors do not guarantee favorable outcomes but demonstrate that crisis trajectories are not deterministically fixed. The future remains open to political contestation and collective choice.

Discussion: The Governance Paradox

A central tension pervades this analysis: addressing converging crises appears to require coordinated global action, yet the institutional capacity for such coordination is itself eroding. Democratic decline, international fragmentation, and epistemic polarization undermine precisely the governance mechanisms needed for transformative response.

This paradox admits no easy resolution. Historical precedents for large-scale transformation (New Deal, postwar reconstruction, decolonization) involved specific configurations of crisis, leadership, and institutional capacity that cannot be assumed replicable. Calls for “fundamental transformation” must grapple with questions of agency, legitimacy, and process:

- **Who decides?** Transformations imposed technocratically risk authoritarian overreach; those requiring democratic consensus may prove too slow.
- **Whose transformation?** Costs and benefits will be distributed unequally; justice requires attention to who bears burdens.

- **By what authority?** International coordination lacks enforcement mechanisms; national sovereignty constrains global governance.

These questions do not invalidate the diagnosis of converging crises but complicate prescriptive responses. The review offers no blueprint for transformation, recognizing that such blueprints must emerge from democratic deliberation rather than expert proclamation.

Yet the governance paradox is not merely an impasse; it is also a research agenda and a space for institutional experimentation. Several emerging approaches attempt to navigate between technocratic imposition and democratic paralysis. Elinor Ostrom's[41] work on polycentric governance demonstrates that complex problems can be addressed through nested, overlapping institutions operating at multiple scales-local, national, and international-rather than requiring singular global authority. Citizens' assemblies and deliberative mini-publics[42] offer mechanisms for informed democratic deliberation on complex technical issues, as demonstrated by Ireland's Constitutional Convention on climate and France's Citizens' Convention for Climate. Adaptive governance frameworks[43] emphasize iterative learning, flexibility, and the capacity to respond to surprise rather than assuming predictability and control.

These approaches do not resolve the governance paradox but indicate directions for its navigation. They share a recognition that transformative response requires institutional innovation-new forms of decision-making that are simultaneously more inclusive than technocracy and more effective than gridlocked democratic processes.

A deeper question remains: how can democratic agency overcome the "technological momentum" that constrains transformation? If large technical systems acquire constituencies that resist change[9], appeals to "political choice" require a mechanism explaining how such choices become materially effective. Andrew Feenberg's[44,45] concept of "democratic rationalization" offers one response: technological systems are not monolithically closed but contain points of intervention where social movements, regulatory agencies, and counter-experts can redirect development trajectories. Feenberg argues that technology's apparent neutrality conceals sedimented power relations that can be contested and transformed through democratic participation in design and governance. Historical examples support this possibility: environmental and consumer movements have successfully reshaped automobile safety standards, pharmaceutical regulation, and energy policy, demonstrating that momentum can be disrupted when crises open "windows of opportunity"[46] and social mobilization generates countervailing political force. The challenge is less the absence of governance models than the political will to implement them against entrenched interests that benefit from the status quo-and the recognition that such will must be actively constructed through coalition-building, institutional entrepreneurship, and sustained contestation.

Limitations

This review necessarily simplifies complex systems and emphasizes risks over resilience factors. Several limitations warrant acknowledgment:

1. **Scope constraints:** Covering multiple crisis domains precludes deep analysis of any single one. Specialists in each area will find treatment superficial.

2. **Aggregation effects:** Global statistics obscure regional variation, potentially overstating crisis severity in some contexts while understating it in others.

3. **Temporal snapshot:** The analysis captures a moment; trajectories may shift with technological breakthroughs, political realignments, or unforeseen events.

4. **Causal uncertainty:** Hypothesized feedback loops vary substantially in empirical support; some represent well-documented mechanisms, others speculative possibilities.

5. **Normative contestability:** The values grounding crisis identification (democracy, ecological integrity, intergenerational equity) are widely but not universally shared.

6. **Counterfactual alternatives:** Historical precedents for systemic transformation (or collapse) may be poor guides to novel configurations; the future remains genuinely uncertain.

Conclusion

The state of the world in 2026 presents a configuration of risks that, while perhaps not "unprecedented" in all respects (past civilizations faced simultaneous pressures), exhibits distinctive features: global scale, technological complexity, and unprecedented speed of change. Climate destabilization, biodiversity collapse, resource constraints, manufactured health risks, democratic erosion, and information ecosystem degradation interact in ways that may-but need not inevitably-produce cascading failures.

This review has argued for analytical differentiation among crisis types (ecological, sociotechnical, institutional-political), explicit acknowledgment of normative commitments, appropriate epistemic modesty about causal mechanisms, and attention to distributional justice. The "overshoot" metaphor retains heuristic value for biophysical domains but requires careful qualification when extended to social systems operating through different causal logics.

The window for transformative intervention may be narrowing, but it has not closed. Outcomes remain contingent on political choices made by identifiable actors within specific institutional contexts. The defining question is not whether human institutions "prove capable" of response-as if capacity were fixed-but whether sufficient political will can be mobilized to transform institutions themselves. This is ultimately a question of power, values, and collective action, not merely technical capacity or systemic dynamics.

The responsibility for navigating these converging crises falls not on abstract "humanity" but on specific populations, institutions, and decision-makers whose choices will shape trajectories for generations. Acknowledging this responsibility-and its profoundly unequal distribution-is the first step toward response commensurate with the challenge.

References

1. Crutzen PJ, Stoermer EF. The Anthropocene. *Global Change Newsletter* **41**, 17–18 (2000).

2. Rockström J, et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* **461**, 472–475 (2009).

3. Steffen W, et al. Planetary boundaries: Guiding human development on a changing planet. *Science* **347**, 1259855 (2015).

4. Richardson K, et al. Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. *Science Advances* **9**, eadh2458 (2023).

5. Meadows DH, et al. *The Limits to Growth*. Universe Books, New York (1972).

6. Meadows DH, et al. *Limits to Growth: The 30-Year Update*. Chelsea Green, White River Junction (2004).

7. Beck U. *Risk Society: Towards a New Modernity*. Sage Publications, London (1992).

8. Jasanoff S. (Ed.). *States of Knowledge: The Co-Production of Science and Social Order*. Routledge, London (2004).

9. Hughes TP. Technological momentum. In: Smith MR, Marx L. (Eds.), *Does Technology Drive History?* MIT Press, Cambridge (1994).

10. Copernicus Climate Change Service. 2024 is the first year to exceed 1.5°C above pre-industrial level. (2025).

11. Rantanen M, et al. The Arctic has warmed nearly four times faster than the globe since 1979. *Communications Earth & Environment* **3**, 168 (2022).

12. Armstrong McKay DI, et al. Exceeding 1.5°C global warming could trigger multiple climate tipping points. *Science* **377**, eabn7950 (2022).

13. Lenton TM, et al. Climate tipping points-too risky to bet against. *Nature* **575**, 592–595 (2019).

14. IPBES. Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (2019).

15. Persson L, et al. Outside the Safe Operating Space of the Planetary Boundary for Novel Entities. *Environmental Science & Technology* **56**, 1510–1521 (2022).

16. Leslie HA, et al. Discovery and quantification of plastic particle pollution in human blood. *Environment International* **163**, 107199 (2022).

17. UNEP International Resource Panel. Global Resources Outlook 2024. (2024).

18. IEA. World Energy Outlook 2024; Electricity 2024; Critical Minerals Market Review 2024. (2024).

19. USGS. Mineral Commodity Summaries 2025: Rare Earths. (2025).

20. GBD 2021 Antimicrobial Resistance Collaborators. Global burden of bacterial antimicrobial resistance 1990–2021. *The Lancet* **404**, 1199–1226 (2024).

21. O'Neill J. Tackling Drug-Resistant Infections Globally: Final Report. (2016).

22. Koblentz GD, Lentzos F. Global BioLabs Report 2023. (2023).

23. Winner L. Do artifacts have politics? *Daedalus* **109**, 121–136 (1980).

24. V-Dem Institute. Democracy Report 2025. (2025).

25. Economist Intelligence Unit. Democracy Index 2024. (2024).

26. Vosoughi S, Roy D, Aral S. The spread of true and false news online. *Science* **359**, 1146–1151 (2018).

27. Center for Countering Digital Hate. Fake Image Factories. (2024).

28. Reuters Institute. Digital News Report 2025. (2025).

29. Federation of American Scientists. Status of World Nuclear Forces. (2025).

30. Bulletin of the Atomic Scientists. Doomsday Clock Statement 2025. (2025).

31. Selby J, et al. Climate change and the Syrian civil war revisited. *Political Geography* **60**, 232–244 (2017).

32. Lawrence M, et al. The polycrisis: Framing a systemic challenge. *Global Sustainability* **7**, e12 (2024).

33. Chancel L. Global carbon inequality over 1990–2019. *Nature Sustainability* **5**, 931–938 (2022).

34. Mekonnen MM, Hoekstra AY. Four billion people facing severe water scarcity. *Science Advances* **2**, e1500323 (2016).

35. FAO. The State of Food Security and Nutrition in the World 2024. (2024).

36. Bullard RD. *Dumping in Dixie: Race, Class, and Environmental Quality*. Westview Press, Boulder (1990).

37. Pellow DN. *What is Critical Environmental Justice?* Polity Press, Cambridge (2018).

38. Whyte KP. Indigenous science (fiction) for the Anthropocene: Ancestral dystopias and fantasies of climate change crises. *Environment and Planning E: Nature and Space* **1**, 224–242 (2018).

39. Yusoff K. *A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis (2018).

40. Nixon R. *Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge (2011).

41. Ostrom E. Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental change. *Global Environmental Change* **20**, 550–557 (2010).

42. Dryzek JS, et al. The crisis of democracy and the science of deliberation. *Science* **363**, 1144–1146 (2019).

43. Folke C, et al. Adaptive governance of social-ecological systems. *Annual Review of Environment and Resources* **30**, 441–473 (2005).

44. Feenberg A. *Questioning Technology*. Routledge, London (1999).

45. Feenberg A. *Transforming Technology: A Critical Theory Revisited.* Oxford University Press, Oxford (2002).

46. Geels FW. Regime resistance against low-carbon transitions: Introducing politics and power into the multi-level perspective. *Theory, Culture & Society* **31**, 21–40 (2014).

Correspondence: anonymous@beyondthelimitsoftaste.com *Conflicts of Interest: None declared. Funding: None.*