Beyond tipping points: risks, equity and the ethics of intervention

Laura M. Pereira 1, 2, Steven R. Smith 3, 4 , Lauren Gifford 5 , Peter Newell 6 , Ben Smith 7 , Sebastian Villasante 8 , Therezah Achieng 3 , Azucena Castro 2, 9 , Sara M. Constantino 10 , Tom Powell, 3, Ashish Ghadiali 3 , Coleen Vogel 1 , Caroline Zimm 11

1 Global Change Institute, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa
2 Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm University, Stockholm, Sweden
3 GSI, University of Exeter, UK
4 CUSP, University of Surrey, UK
5 University of Arizona, USA
6 University of Sussex, UK
7 Department of English, University of Exeter, UK
8 EqualSea Lab-CRETUS, University of Santiago de Compostela, Spain
9 Stanford University, Stanford, USA
10 Northeastern University, USA
11 International Institute of Applied Systems Analysis, Vienna, Austria

Correspondence to: Laura M Pereira (laura.pereira@wits.ac.za)

Abstract

Earth system tipping points pose existential threats to current and future generations, both human and non-human, with those least responsible for causing them being at greatest risk. Positive social tipping points (which we shorten to positive tipping points, or PTPs), are often deliberate interventions into human systems with the potential to rapidly address some of these challenges. However, the desire to intervene should neither increase risks nor perpetuate unjust or inequitable outcomes through the creation of sacrifice zones. In this paper, we argue that considerations of what needs to change, who is being asked to change and where the change or its impacts will be felt and by whom, are fundamental questions that require a level of reflexivity and systemic understanding in decision-making. All actors have a role to play in ensuring that justice, equity and ethics are carefully considered before any intervention. Enabling positive tipping points for radical transformations could benefit from more diverse perspectives to open up solutions, with a particular emphasis on the inclusion of marginalised voices. We conclude that taking a cautious approach to positive tipping interventions and stepping back to explore all options, not just those appearing to offer a quick fix, could lead to more equitable and sustainable outcomes.

500 character blurb

Earth system tipping points pose existential threats requiring urgent action. However, this imperative should neither increase risks nor perpetuate injustices. We argue that considerations of what needs to change, who is asked to change and where the impacts will be felt and by whom, are fundamental questions that need to be addressed in decision-making. Everyone has a role to play in ensuring that justice and equity are incorporated into actions towards a more sustainable future.

1. Introduction

The world is facing a series of era-defining, existential threats including climate change, biodiversity loss, increased inequality and poverty. In response to these critical challenges, there have been calls for transformative change (IPBES, 2019). Some of these interventions are proposed as potentially normative 'positive' social tipping points, which we shorten to positive tipping points (PTPs). PTPs are defined as changes to a system which become self-perpetuating beyond a threshold, and which lead to substantial, often abrupt impacts that are predominantly beneficial to humans and the natural systems we rely on (McKay et al., 2022; Milkoreit et al., 2018). As we argue, 'positive' is a value judgement: not all the changes associated with PTPs are universally welcome; difficult decisions and trade-offs need to be made as we weigh up anticipated harms versus benefits. Nevertheless, we argue that we have a collective duty to bring about "intentional transformation towards global sustainability" (Lenton et al., 2022: 2), and this is clearly a normative enterprise. The moral 'force' in our usage of the 'positive' descriptor is based on the science of Earth system boundaries and the ethics of Earth system justice (Gupta et al., 2023a; Rockström et al., 2023).

However, undertaking or operationalizing such transformations and attempting to orient complex systems onto more sustainable and socially just trajectories, is messy and complicated (Pereira et al., 2020). As history shows, there are dark sides of transformations with unintended consequences, distributional impacts, and the potential for vested interests to co-opt or reap the benefits of such processes (Blythe et al., 2018). It is necessary to be cautious when approaching the idea of using PTPs and to be very clear what transformations are intended, whom they benefit, and whom they may harm.

Any moment of societal change will inevitably generate winners and losers (O'Brien and Leichenko, 2003), and this should also be taken into account in the identification and operationalisation of PTPs where change potentially needs to be both rapid and radical. Indeed, in this context, the language of positive tipping needs to be exercised with caution since the very definition of a PTP, as a point towards an 'idealised' future, is likely to be experienced by many as a polarising event and can have differential welfare impacts on different subsets of the population (Ehret et al., 2022). For example, while some welcome a tipping point in the new renewable energy economy (IEA, 2022; Systemiq, 2023; IRENA, 2022), others working in the fossil fuel and related industries may fear the loss of their livelihoods and communities. Pollution, habitat destruction and poor working conditions in the expansion of cobalt and lithium mining for battery production, driven by rapidly increasing production of electric vehicles, may create problems as well as opportunities for a different set of communities.

An approach to governance that centres principles of equity and justice (Okereke and Dooley, 2010), will recognise that tipping points, whether conceived primarily as positive or negative, will leave segments of the population behind without the engagement of complementary redistribution mechanisms that can help mitigate against the worst impacts of change (Rammelt et al., 2023). This paper is not proposing how to govern tipping points broadly, but rather focuses on the very specific governance issue of equity and justice. When identifying or

triggering a tipping point through an intervention, it is necessary to ask: What kind of trade-offs are necessary and what sacrifice zones are being created? Who ends up occupying these sacrifice zones? What forms of vulnerability are exposed by change? Who is left behind? And how can a comprehensive understanding of justice be included in a rigorous way when examining PTPs. Here, we understand sacrifice zones as extractive zones created by the advancement of coordinated forms of capitalism that see those territories and the communities inhabiting them as commodifiable (Gómez-Barris, 2017).

1.1. Climate Justice in Light of Tipping Points

Recent UNFCCC climate summits have seen increasing calls from climate justice campaigners and representatives of the Global South for a recognition of uneven historical and ongoing responsibility for climate change, currently articulated in calls for 'loss and damage' and elsewhere for reparations (Huq et al., 2013; Constantino et al., 2023). These calls are supported by the work of climate historians, decolonial critics and authors who assert that we cannot hope to advance climate action if we do not address systems of capitalism and colonialism that have created the current crisis and still shape intergovernmental responses to it (Bhambra and Newell, 2022; Ghosh, 2022; Yusoff, 2018; Sultana, 2022). The future-focus of much scientific, political and popular discourse around climate change can create a disconnect with the past, occluding the fact that climate change and its associated crises 'are deeply rooted in history' (Ghosh 2022, 158). In this context, there is a danger that the language of tipping points – small perturbations that trigger large, irreversible responses (Lenton, 2011) – could reinforce a discourse that abstracts climate change from past inequities. The notion of tipping points that are rooted in a biophysical framing, which assumes some 'threshold' and 'set of shocks' that tips a system over, ignores the grinding every-day realities of life that many of the poor and most vulnerable endure as an interconnected set of social, economic and environmental crises (Nixon, 2013). These vulnerabilities will only be compounded with the increased risks, given climate change and other changing biophysical pressures (O'Brien and Leichenko, 2000).

Moreover, a focus on preventing tipping points can distract attention from the deep structural imbalances of capital and asymmetric power that drive precarity and lead to increased vulnerability to the impacts of tipping events in poorer nations (Roberts and Parks, 2006). The urgency that accompanies the notion of tipping points can overshadow the slow process of rebuilding trust and relationships that have been broken through past harms, referred to by Kyle Whyte as "relational tipping points" (Whyte, 2020). For many Indigenous peoples and local communities who have faced the existential crisis of colonialism and who are now at the forefront of the climate crisis (Gilio-Whitaker, 2019), relational tipping points may have already been breached (Whyte, 2021, 2020). The process of rebuilding consent, trust, accountability, and reciprocity—qualities of relationships necessary to avoid further injustices—require time and commitment (Whyte, 2020). Attempts to avoid tipping points through geoengineering, for example, could merely pass on costs and irreversible effects onto future generations (Biermann et al., 2022), while contemporary drives to reach technological tipping points, such as the push towards electric vehicles, can produce new vulnerabilities for communities with homes rich in

243 rare earth minerals (Calvão et al., 2021). Hence without due care, attempts to address tipping
244 points can perpetuate spatial and temporal injustices (Sovacool et al., 2022).
245
246 In this paper we discuss considerations of ethics, equity and justice in relation to the complex
247 interconnection of biophysical and social, 'positive' and 'negative' tipping points. The
248 destabilizing of critical Earth systems is already contributing to adverse effects on human well-
249 being and global ecosystems on which it depends, and will continue to worsen (Rockström et
250 al., 2009). Crossing biophysical and social tipping points will exacerbate current injustices and
251 inequities as access to water, food, energy and infrastructure will be uneven, strained, and
252 increasingly politicised (Rammelt et al., 2023), leading to greater potential harms on future
253 generations by triggering potentially irreversible processes. It is thus necessary to approach
254 PTPs with due precaution and humility in our understanding of how complex social-ecological
255 processes unfold- as such we refer to the need for an ethics of intervention that centres
256 considerations of equity and justice as central tenets.
257

1.2. Discourse matters

259
260 Within the framework of tipping points, it is crucial to remember that all human and more than
261 human 'actors' are, in Donna Haraway's words, 'situated… in complicated histories' (Haraway,
262 2016), which inform complex and plural visions for the future. The IPCC AR6 report urges
263 immediate action and deep emissions reductions in this decade whilst also calling for climate
264 resilient development that prioritises risk reduction, equity and justice (IPCC, 2023). In seeking
265 to build a majority of people in favour of stronger, faster action, it is vital that values-inclusive
266 forms of discourse are identified to 'create a sense of collective responsibility and action'
267 (Wiedmann et al., 2020) and which avoid alienating the actors needed to form this coalition.
268 Even processes to decolonise understandings of time, including seeing it as linear, must be
269 fostered so that we do not exacerbate problems as we act with urgency to find near-term
270 solutions to the climate emergency like large-scale renewable energy infrastructures that can
271 sometimes infringe on human and nature's rights (Whyte, 2021).
272
273 At the same time, the extreme difficulty and tradeoffs inherent in achieving a safe and just
274 operating space for life on Earth need to be understood (Gupta et al., 2023a). A discourse that
275 reconciles the need to meet the internationally agreed +1.5°C rise in average global
276 atmospheric temperature, alongside the need to address over-consumption and inequalities
277 within and between nations, can no longer rely on the dominant narratives of efficiency gains
278 and gradual decoupling (Hickel and Kallis, 2019; Wiedmann et al., 2020; Steinberger et al.,
279 2020; Constantino and Weber, 2021; Lamb et al., 2020). A growing understanding of tipping
280 points in the Anthropocene 'cancels the peaceful and reassuring project of sustainable
281 development' (Bonneuil and Fressoz, 2016: 29). We have entered what Bruno Latour calls 'the
282 new climatic regime' (Latour, 2018) in which the geophysical framework that we have always
283 taken for granted, the ground on which our history, politics and economics have played out, has
284 become destabilized. An ethical community of nations that respects the Earth's biophysical
285 limits and minimum social foundations for human flourishing must recognise that the only viable
286 solutions are ones that prioritise strong sustainability and sufficiency for all (Haberl, 2015;

Deleted: .

Deleted: entrench

Deleted: .

Deleted: (Rockstrom et al., 2009). Crossing physical

Deleted: (Rammelt et al., 2023),

Formatted: Normal, No bullets or numbering

Deleted: ..

Deleted: (Haraway, 2016),

Deleted: (Wiedmann et al., 2020), pg 7

Deleted: (Whyte, 2021).

Deleted: earth

Deleted: .

Deleted: societies

Deleted: (Hickel and Kallis, 2019; Wiedmann et al., 2020; Steinberger et al., 2020; Constantino and Weber, 2021; Lamb et al., 2020).…

Deleted: (Bonneuil and Fressoz, 2016) 29.

Deleted: (Latour, 2018)

Deleted: (Newell, 2021; Haberl et al., 2020; Trebeck and Williams, 2019)…

Deleted: 4

306 Trebeck and Williams, 2019) informed, for example, by the principles of 'doughnut economics'
307 (Raworth, 2017) and notions of safe and just boundaries (Gupta et al., 2023a). This places
308 differential responsibilities on different groups of people as we seek to navigate towards more
309 just, equitable and sustainable futures.
310
311 **1.3. What do we mean by equity and justice?**
312
313 When considering climate justice, it is useful to be precise about which area or domain is
314 investigated – climate impacts, mitigation efforts, adaptation or decent living standards. There
315 are dilemmas and trade-offs across attempts to address recognition, procedural, distributional,
316 reparative, and inter- and intragenerational aspects of justice simultaneously; clarity on the
317 scope, both in terms of space and time, is important. Additionally, many different terms and
318 concepts used interchangeably across disciplines, cultures and individuals, create a risk for
319 misunderstandings and also misinterpretation of research findings (Newell et al., 2021). As we
320 go about shaping just transitions, it is important to find a common ground (Stevis and Felli,
321 2020; Zimm et al., in press).
322
323 Gupta et al. (2023) propose an integrated "Earth system justice" framework to approach these
324 questions and understand how to reduce risks from crossing tipping points while ensuring well-
325 being for all and an equitable distribution of nature's benefits, risks and related responsibilities.
326 Earth system justice is conceptualised through multiple approaches and understandings of
327 justice including, but not limited to, intragenerational, intergenerational justice and interspecies
328 justice. Intragenerational justice refers to the relationships between humans right now and
329 includes justice between states and among people across scales. Intergenerational justice
330 examines relationships across generations, such as the legacy of greenhouse gas emissions or
331 ecosystem destruction by current and past generations on youth and future people, and
332 assumes that natural resources and environmental quality should be shared across generations
333 (Tremmel, 2009). In this context, interspecies justice refers to considering the rights of nature
334 and other species to coexist on the planet. It draws on a rights of nature discourse (Harden-
335 Davies et al., 2020) that also counters the idea of human exceptionalism as a lens for thinking
336 through development impacts (Srinivasan and Kasturirangan, 2016). Drawing on these
337 frameworks can help us to assess the uneven impacts of nearing earth system tipping points,
338 but also the differential responsibility for efforts to avoid tipping points and the distributional and
339 procedural aspects of positive tipping dynamics.
340
341 Within the domains mentioned above, one can discriminate between different forms (or
342 dimensions) of justice, i.e., distributive (or equity across different populations), procedural (how
343 decision or research processes are designed, who is involved), or reparative (e.g. recognition of
344 wrongs, restoration where possible, and compensation for negative impacts and past injustices)
345 (Byskov and Hyams, 2022). Such justice approaches also include recognition and epistemic
346 justice, which consider the value of multiple knowledge systems, especially local, Indigenous,
347 and unrecognised, misrecognized or marginalised groups (de Sousa Santos, 2008). Finally,
348 'intersectional' justice that includes multiple and overlapping social identities and categories
349 underpinning inequality, underrepresentation, marginalisation, and the capacity to respond (i.e.

375 gender, race, age, class, health) must be considered in the context of earth system justice
376 (Gupta et al., 2023b). These different forms of justice are not mutually exclusive: procedural
377 justice may be used to arrive at restoration or compensatory payments, which can be assessed
378 through the lens of distributive justice.
379
380 Changes related to Earth and social system tipping can be analysed with reference to all these
381 justice considerations to design forward looking actions that avoid negative impacts. Especially
382 in cross-disciplinary discussions and exchanges between different actors, having shared
383 understanding of the nuance and need for contextual framing of challenges will enable and
384 speed up implementation. It is key to highlight that what is perceived as fair is subjective and
385 highly context specific and may change over time (Caney, 2012). In the context of addressing
386 negative biophysical tipping points by attempting to enable positive tipping, an Earth system
387 justice approach is critical to ensure past injustices are not perpetuated in the name of staying
388 within planetary boundaries.
389

390 **2. Blind Spots of intervention**
391
392 Treaty negotiators have sometimes ignored or dismissed normative dimensions of climate policy
393 and the possibility of unintended social consequences (Okereke and Dooley, 2010; Klinsky et
394 al., 2017). However, all actors in the process – from scientists to world leaders – must avoid
395 today's solutions becoming tomorrow's harms. This is especially true when considering
396 interventions designed to trigger exponential rates of positive social change, or quick 'fixes' such
397 as geo-engineering (Sovacool, 2021). An equally exponential increase in unintended negative
398 consequences is also possible. It is thus imperative that all actors take responsibility to
399 acknowledge potential risks and centre questions of justice, when referencing PTPs as solutions
400 to the ongoing climate and other social-ecological crises.
401
402 **2.1. Risks and Unintended consequences of interventions for climate impact mitigation**
403 **and adaptation.**
404
405 Interventions for climate impact mitigation and adaptation can have unintended consequences,
406 broadly addressed as maladaptation. "Aside from wasting time and money, maladaptation is a
407 process through which people become even more vulnerable to climate change," Schipper
408 suggests (Schipper, 2020: 409). A good example of risks associated with the quest for PTPs for
409 climate impact mitigation is the transformation to a renewable energy economy that is driving
410 the growing demand for batteries, solar panels, and other digital devices, all of which require
411 mining of lithium, cobalt and other rare earth minerals (Dutta et al., 2016). While this creates
412 economic benefits for mining communities, it can also produce negative ecological, economic
413 and social impacts in the near, medium and long-term (Hernandez and Newell, 2022; Manzetti
414 and Mariasiu, 2015). A recent study finds that if today's demand for Electric Vehicles is
415 projected to 2050, the lithium requirements for the US market alone would triple the amount of
416 lithium currently produced for the global market (Rionfrancos et al., 2023). However, the authors
417 also find that lithium demand could be reduced by 92% in 2050 relative to the most lithium-
418 intensive scenarios by decreasing car dependency (e.g. through increasing public transit or

447 biking), limiting the size of EV batteries, and creating a robust recycling system (Rionfrancos et
448 al., 2023). Within this context, the industrial mining sector has been accused of supporting state
449 violence and corruption, polluting ecosystems (Banza Lubaba Nkulu et al., 2018), and
450 exacerbating poverty, while the informal mining sector is known for ignoring occupational safety
451 and health standards and human rights concerns (Sovacool, 2019).
452
453 Other prominent examples of unintended consequences have been documented for: a) large-
454 scale renewable and bioenergy projects, resulting in significant local opposition (Cavicchi, 2018;
455 Torres Contreras, 2022); b) the displacement of Indigenous peoples, local communities (Zurba
456 and Bullock, 2020) and coastal fishers (Beckensteiner et al., 2023); c) deforestation (Kraxner et
457 al., 2013); d) biodiversity losses (Pedroli et al., 2013); e) competition for land and water
458 resources (Haberl, 2015; Tarhule, 2017); f) food insecurity (Hasegawa et al., 2018); and g) for
459 decarbonisation of the built environment, particularly the housing stock, resulting in health
460 impacts from poor indoor air quality, and fuel poverty (Davies and Oreszczyn, 2012).
461
462 An example of climate policy leading to unintended outcomes with social justice implications is
463 'carbon leakage' (Carbon leakage, 2023; Grubb et al., 2022). Although often difficult to measure
464 and distinguish from the more general offshoring of emissions due to globalisation of trade and
465 deindustrialisation in richer countries, carbon leakage in response to climate policy measures is
466 an example of a negative spill-over effect. Unilateral climate policies such as carbon pricing and
467 emissions trading schemes (ETSs), designed to encourage domestic carbon-intensive sectors
468 to invest in carbon-neutral production, may raise costs and contribute to the decision to relocate
469 to a region enjoying equal access to the same markets, but which has fewer, less stringent
470 policies/regulations (Prellezo et al., 2023). Further intervention in the form of carbon border
471 adjustment mechanisms (CBAMs), carbon content labelling/mandates and other measures may
472 then be introduced to adjust for these climate policy asymmetries.
473
474 Relatedly, significant policy research is being devoted to the concept of a 'just transition' (Wang
475 and Lo, 2021; Newell and Mulvaney, 2013), which originated from labour market impacts of
476 decarbonization strategies in coal-intensive regions the Global North (Abraham, 2017). Unless
477 sufficient government investment, regional regeneration, support and retraining are provided to
478 those workers and communities most at risk in the transition away from fossil fuels, severe
479 economic, social and cultural hardships may predictably (though unintentionally) follow.
480 Furthermore, trust in government will fall even lower, and counter-narratives on grounds of
481 fairness/justice voiced by actors for climate policy delay will be strengthened (Patterson et al.,
482 2018; Lamb et al., 2020) potentially further undermining efforts to strengthen governance and
483 make it more inclusive. Participatory and deliberative governance approaches that include
484 potential losers and other stakeholder groups in designing and implementing policy for
485 sustainability transitions, can help to lower the barriers to transition by building political will and
486 legitimacy, and negotiating effective compromises for more just outcomes (Fesenfeld et al.,
487 2022). More generally, fiscal policy needs to be designed to subsidise lower-income households
488 for the higher costs that may accompany climate policies such as carbon pricing, emissions
489 trading, new mandates/standards for energy-efficient buildings, smart energy systems, and the
490 electrification of transport. Failure to do so could set off a cascade of unintended consequences

519 and increase poverty, inequality, hunger and other health impacts, popular protest and political
520 instability (Newell et al., 2021; Davies and Oreszczyn, 2012).

521 In the Global South, the transition to net-zero carbon emissions faces multiple challenges, such
522 as addressing energy security, poverty, multidimensional vulnerabilities, and ensuring decent
523 living standards for all. These countries are confronted with a toxic mix of shrinking carbon
524 budget, growing inequalities, heightened climate-related risks, and limited capabilities for
525 mitigation and adaptation due to increasing debt burdens (Steele and Patel, 2020), but the
526 debate on historic responsibilities, development rights, and net-zero efforts is gaining renewed
527 attention (Mishra, 2021). From the perspective of the Global South, achieving just transitions
528 requires addressing the double inequality of the climate crisis where developing countries bear
529 a disproportionate share of the risks associated with emissions, while industrialised nations are
530 primarily responsible for historical emissions (Gardiner, 2004). Therefore, developing countries
531 are demanding fair procedures for distributing the costs and benefits of mitigation and
532 adaptation. Such financing commitments from rich countries remained absent in the decisions
533 taken at COP28 in Dubai in 2023 (Jessop et al., 2023).

534 Unpopular climate policies can sometimes trigger a widespread 'backlash' that can be defined
535 as:

537   'An abrupt and forceful negative reaction by a significant number of actors seeking to
538   reverse a policy, often through extraordinary means that transgress established
539   procedures and norms' (Patterson, 2023, 68).

541 Examples of climate policy backlash include the ill-fated Australian carbon pricing scheme
542 (Crowley, 2017), and the fuel tax increase that gave rise to the Gilets Jaunes or Yellow Jackets
543 protest movement in France in 2018-2019 (Kinniburgh, 2019). Other well-researched forms of
544 unintended impacts of policy measures include rebound effects and moral licensing
545 (Chakravarty et al., 2013). Rebound effects generally refer to behavioural responses in which
546 people consume more of something that costs less due to an environmental improvement, such
547 as energy efficiency, which can perversely lead to an overall net increase in pollution and
548 resource use. For example, people may choose to drive further or buy larger cars as cars
549 become more fuel efficient (Sorrell et al., 2009). Although rebound effects have so far shown
550 negligible impact, these kinds of dynamics highlight the complexities and uncertainties
551 surrounding human-nature systems, and the potential for unintended consequences in our
552 efforts to induce 'positive' tipping points (Constantino et al., 2022).

554 In the field of climate communications, there are unintended consequences associated with a
555 failure to build broad coalitions based on values-inclusive narratives and norms (Evans, 2017;
556 Klein, 2015; Constantino and Weber, 2021; Rowson and Corner, 2014; Sloterdijk, 2012;
557 Meadowcroft, 2011). Research shows that politically progressive actors tend to believe in the
558 inseparability of climate, (re)distributional and social justice issues as a moral imperative.
559 Procedural justice is also key as small producers and/or vulnerable people are often excluded
560 from political mechanisms which determine climate actions (Villasante et al., 2022). 'Climate
561 justice' can then include colonial, gender and racial injustices and future generations (Jafry,

2018; Perkins, 2018), particularly in its more transformative form which seeks to address the drivers of climate injustice (Newell et al., 2021). In centering justice and combining multiple, intersecting social movements under the climate justice umbrella, many campaigners and scholars believe that the strength of their combined movements can be amplified (Mikulewicz et al., 2023). However, there are also concerns that strong social justice framings can have the unintended effect of increasing political polarisation rather than building broader coalitions (Patterson et al., 2018; Smith, 2022). Political progressives tend to frame climate change risk in terms of 'individualising' values of equality, care and fairness, while political conservatives prefer to use 'binding' values based on loyalty, authority, and purity (Adger et al., 2017; Haidt, 2013; Graham et al., 2009). Conservatives are not necessarily against stronger climate governance, but reject progressive framings that challenge their values and identities (Feinberg and Willer, 2013; Feygina et al., 2010; Kidwell et al., 2013). Research has also shown that some actors recognise the need for greater urgency in climate policy, but are reluctant to champion it due to a lack of support and to avoid being labelled as 'extremists' (Willis, 2020). As a result, some climate policymakers and other actors prefer to focus on the more technocratic, less politically risky aspects of transition governance (Patterson et al., 2018).

If decarbonisation is left to market-based mechanisms that prioritise only profitability, the speed and up-scaling of technological change may threaten the human rights and well-being of some people while allowing other, more powerful, incumbent actors and structures to prevail (Newell et al., 2022). Unique opportunities to redesign entire systems and subsystems along more efficient, ethical, sustainable, and equitable lines may be lost where speed is allowed to trump inclusivity and depth of process (Leach and Scoones, 2006). For example, U.S. solar photovoltaic deployment is forecast to grow non-linearly in the near-term, generating around 12% of all US power by 2027 (SEIA/Wood MacKenzie, 2023). While this is a positive development in terms of the speed of overall decarbonisation, the perpetuation of an energy system dominated by profit-maximising utility companies would be viewed as a missed opportunity for advocates of energy democracy and place-based, cooperative and community-owned energy (Stone et al., 2022; Hoffman and High-Pippert, 2005). Likewise, 'plug and play' approaches that seek to electrify cars, but not boost the accessibility of public transport can serve to reinforce private automobility (Rionfrancos et al., 2023).

Additionally, there is a risk that a growing concern regarding Earth System tipping dynamics could propel research into speculative interventions such as widespread carbon dioxide removal or social geoengineering or solar radiation modification—a set of hypothetical solutions aimed at reducing incoming sunlight and thus lowering global mean temperatures (National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 2021). The most common solar geoengineering proposal involves injecting aerosols into the stratosphere to limit the influx of solar energy, but there are also more regional or local proposals involving different technologies. Proponents often argue for these hypothetical solutions on the grounds that we have made little progress on reducing carbon emissions and that solar geoengineering could be used to buy time or as a failsafe (Keith, 2013; Keith et al., 2017). However, solar geoengineering and other more speculative solutions often come with substantial uncertainty and risks, which are likely to vary across regions, and insufficient governance mechanisms to equitably and effectively manage such

risks (Schneider et al., 2020; Stephens et al., 2021; Kravitz and MacMartin, 2020; McLaren, 2018). This has led groups of scholars to call for an "international non-use agreement" and for limits on related research as well (Biermann et al., 2022).

2.2. Winners and Losers: Sacrifice Zones

To include equity and justice in the discourse of tipping points, it is necessary to consider how resource extraction at the planetary level is not only pushing local tipping points through resource dispossession, but is also exacerbating the drivers leading to transgressing planetary boundaries (Richardson et al., 2023). Resource extraction, be it for fossil fuels or green energy sources, creates sacrifice zones mainly in the Global South to sustain unlimited economic growth in the Global North while it contributes to transgressing the planetary boundaries further (Sultana, 2023b). The tendency of PTPs to benefit some while (intentionally or unintentionally) excluding others, exacerbates sacrifice zones. Winners and losers from transitions are relational in a highly unequal global economy stratified by power, race, class and gender (Newell, 2021). Well-intentioned interventions therefore have the potential to put severe pressure on lands held by Indigenous and marginalised communities and reshape their ecologies into "green sacrifice zones" by reproducing a form of climate colonialism in the name of just transitions (Zografos and Robbins, 2020). Climate colonialism involves ''the deepening or expanding of domination of less powerful countries and peoples through initiatives that intensify foreign exploitation of poorer nations' resources or undermine the sovereignty of native and Indigenous communities in the course of responding to the climate crisis'' (Zografos & Robbins, 2020: 543). They go on to define Green sacrifice zones as "spaces or ecologies, places and populations that will be severely affected by the sourcing, transportation, installation, and operation of solutions for powering low-carbon transitions, as well as end-of-life treatment of related material waste" (Zografos & Robbins, 2020: 543). Current examples include 'green grabs' for critical minerals, biofuels and water or the acquisition of land for forestry carbon offset projects (Fairhead et al., 2012; Scoones et al., 2015).

Some queer decolonial critique puts it, sacrifice zones are not random, but carefully chosen: "the colonial paradigm, worldview, and technologies […] mark out regions of "high biodiversity" in order to reduce life to capitalist resource conversion" (Gómez-Barris, 2017). The violence that capitalism inflicts on places designated as sacrifice zones can be immediate, but it can also be slow and imperceptible. Decolonial ecocritical thinker Rob Nixon, describes the "slow violence" that unfolds in marginalised communities, over a long period of time and which are almost imperceptible (Nixon, 2013). This extractive view from corporations and governments meets the resistance of "submerged perspectives", that is, the ways in which the local humans and nonhumans that inhabit those territories perceive life as entangled, where the destruction of one parcel affects the rest of the entities and breaks the spiritual heritage in a region (Gómez-Barris, 2017). This slow violence has delayed effects and requires justice to take new forms to secure effective legal measures for prevention, restitution, and redress (Nixon, 2013: 8,9). To include justice and equity in climate mitigation actions, Latin American countries, for example, have developed the first agreement *Acuerdo de Escazú* in 2018 (CEPAL, 2018). This regional agreement proposes three concrete objectives to include climate justice in environmental policies and transition actions: (1) access to environmental information, (ii) public participation in

722 environmental decision-making processes, and (iii) access to justice in environmental matters.
723 These three points involving communities in discussions of climate justice stand out as crucial
724 for a theory on positive tipping points that aims to include equity and justice frameworks.

725 A theory of tipping points should not only recognise the way in which the military-industrial
726 complex through powerful non-state actors, and even well-intentioned government policies
727 disguise and disregard the toxicity and contamination that poor and disadvantaged communities
728 of the world suffer (Bullard, 2005), but also where the "disposable" populations are rising in
729 resistance to demand a climate justice attuned to local social-ecological realities (Gilio-Whitaker,
730 2019). Discussions of tipping points similarly need to be aware of the technologies of
731 governance (race-making, even the processes for identifying 'indebted countries' or Least
732 Developed Countries - LDCs) that enable access to and appropriation of stocks for capitalist
733 resource conversion. For the concept of sustainability and just sustainable futures to help
734 improve the situation of those local realities, environmental justice scholar Julie Sze argues that
735 a "situated sustainability" is necessary (Sze, 2018). Situated sustainability should "set the
736 parameters for why and how vulnerability (environmental or other) is disproportionately
737 distributed, one of the key questions in environmental justice research" (Sze, 2018, 13). In other
738 words, if the questions we ask aim at transformative change or positive tipping points, these
739 cannot neglect how racial capitalism contributes to inequalities and environmental degradation
740 (Sze, 2018; Newell, 2005).

741 **2.3. Reinforcing current power dynamics and structures**
742
743 While averting negative biophysical tipping points in the Earth system is a global challenge that
744 will require a coordinated global effort, the research and policymaking surrounding positive
745 tipping must also grapple with historical and contemporary inequalities in the production of
746 environmental harms, and the differentiated and uneven capacity and responsibility to respond
747 or to withstand such impacts. These concerns are echoed in the principle enshrined in the
748 UNFCCC of 'common but differentiated responsibilities and respective capabilities' and
749 highlights the greater responsibility to act to reduce emissions and the likelihood of crossing
750 critical thresholds by richer countries and polluter elites, whether through their own direct efforts
751 or through the support of efforts in countries with fewer economic resources (O'Brien and
752 Leichenko, 2000). Refocusing mitigation attention on high-emitting groups, countries and
753 sectors highlights the need for interventions and policy measures that attempt to shift the
754 current consumption patterns of the wealthy and the actions of large private corporations
755 (Newell, 2021; Kenner, 2019; Wiedmann et al., 2020; Rammelt et al., 2023) and the
756 infrastructures of high-impact sectors such as food (reducing meat and dairy consumption) and
757 energy production (switching to non-fossil fuel based energy), transport (reducing car use and
758 air travel) and housing that, combined, comprise about 75% of total carbon footprints (Newell et
759 al., 2021). Furthermore, this view also highlights the need for substantial financial transfers from
760 the Global North to the Global South to help build climate resilience, to compensate for
761 irreparable losses due to climate change, and to offset the costs of mitigation efforts (Jackson et
762 al., 2023). Without such measures, efforts to address Earth System tipping points risk
763 reinforcing unequal power dynamics and current inequities.
764

2.4 Positive financial tipping points: actors and mechanisms

Large financial actors have been shown to possess significant corporate control globally (Fichtner et al., 2017). Through their influence over economic activities that modify ecosystems associated with tipping elements, financial actors can also affect climate stability and biodiversity. A financial sector tipping point that reconfigures flows of finance towards climate mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage compensation, biodiversity conservation, addressing vulnerability etc. requires reimagining and reconfiguring governance of public and private finance (Rammelt et al., 2023), including changing the mandates of multilateral development banks, reforming central banks and regulating private company law and disclosure policies.

For example, higher costs of accessing finance in the Global South mean that many countries are unable to invest sufficiently in providing access to basic services like electricity (Ameli et al., 2021), which underpin provision of healthcare and clean water, food security, and access to information and economic opportunity. The most vulnerable in these countries stand to gain significantly from the low-carbon transition, with cost reductions in renewable energy generation making solar PV the most viable way to provide electricity to the majority of those currently without access (nearly 600million people in Sub-Saharan Africa alone) (IEA, 2023). Low investment due to the difficulty of accessing finance creates a higher risk-perception of investment in these countries further increasing the cost of capital and leading to an 'investment trap' that can be further exacerbated by climate impacts (Ameli et al., 2021). Interventions that lower the cost of capital, like credit guarantees and supporting growth of domestic capital markets, can help to break out of this cycle and open up flows of finance to address critical vulnerabilities and support adaptation.

Furthermore, the public sector should ringfence funding to support the need to respond to unintended consequences. With this improved and new direction of finance mechanisms, businesses should then be able to both meet standards and operate in vulnerable areas that need finance to become more resilient. This includes moving money to key areas where it is needed (adaptation, biodiversity, social common goods) rather than just for profit (Crona et al., 2021).

A framework for guiding sustainable and equitable investments, and a taxonomy of these investments are not universally defined. It is necessary to provide a classification system of activities that comply with the principles of such investments, thereby guiding capital investment decisions and development policy towards an improved sustainability (Sumaila et al., 2021). One example is the United Nations Principles for Responsible Investment[1] committing to responsible investment, which has been signed by 1400 signatories from all over the world since 2015, and with 59 trillion USD of assets under their management. In practice, this means that publicly listed companies globally need to abide by international principles, even if the countries they operate in might be insensitive to such standards (Galaz et al., 2015). Another example is the United Nations Environmental Programme (UNEP) Sustainable Blue Economy

---

[1] www.unpri.org/about-pri/the-six-principles

Finance Principles whereby UNEP works with financial institutions to incorporate environmental, social, and governance issues into business principles and financial market practices (UNEP, 2020).

The recent vision for a global, multi-directional and interconnected public investment to design a new architecture of the finance system based on the application of a global and progressive tax system on wealth and on more democratic ways of deciding how best to spend public investments is one of the serious proposals for reform of the global financial structure (Global Public Investment Network, 2023). In addition, Zucman (2016) suggests that there are several ways that would help limit tax evasion and avoidance in the global economy. For example, the creation of a global financial registry that tracks wealth regardless of where it is located, reforming the corporate tax system so that the global profits of multinational companies are distributed where the resources are extracted, and more strictly regulating banks that help evade taxes with lax regulations.

Although the secrecy practices afforded by tax havens hinder a precise quantification, Fortune 500 companies are estimated to have US$2.3 trillion in offshore accounts and capital positions. Tax havens cost governments between US$ 500-600 billion/year in lost taxation, including an estimated loss to non-OECD economies of US$200 billion. Individual wealth sheltered in tax havens is an estimated US$ 8-36 trillion, costing public accounts further (Shaxson, 2019). For comparison, financing needed to preserve global biodiversity is estimated at US$ 722-967 billion per year until 2030 (Deutz et al., 2020). In addition, the average global statutory corporate tax rate has gone from 40% in 1980 to 24% in 2020, with an actual tax rate much lower in many jurisdictions (Dempsey et al., 2022). This reduction in the tax rate for large companies has already been shown to lead to increased inequality in different countries around the world, with a higher risk in developing countries that are highly dependent on natural resource-based exports (Banerjee and Duflo, 2020). At the national level, positioning sustainability as a tax principle, integrating this dimension into corporate social responsibility on financial markets and reducing the acceptability of tax avoidance can be powerful levers for generating the funds needed for sustainability agendas (Bird and Davis-Nozemack, 2018). Moreover, reducing tax avoidance, tackling illicit financial transfers, and reducing the debts of developing countries can produce in many cases more governmental income than what has been identified in the biodiversity finance gap (Dempsey et al., 2022).

The above distortions are not simply a market failure, they signal a broader institutional failure. Governments almost everywhere exacerbate the problem by paying people more to exploit Nature than to protect it, and to prioritise unsustainable economic activities (Dasgupta, 2021). Therefore, another way to unlock the funding needed to reverse nature loss by 2030 as well as the cost of reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2050 is to remove harmful subsidies that harm biodiversity, such as in agriculture, fisheries and fossil fuel production (Dasgupta, 2021; Sumaila et al., 2021). According to Koplow and Steenblik (2022), the world is spending at least $1.8 trillion a year, equivalent to 2% of global GDP on subsidies that are driving ecosystem destruction and species extinction. In other words, public money is funding our own extinction (Dasgupta, 2021). To address this problem, Costello et al. (Costello et al., 2016) recently

showed that global governments could repurpose some or all of the roughly US$22 billion they annually allocate as harmful fisheries subsidies to directly support fishers' incomes without incentivizing overfishing. This funding could support business development capacities for fishers, be given to fishers as lump sum cash transfers, or be used to develop and institute management reforms all of which would support low-income fishers, particularly in the countries of the Global South.

Achieving a sustainable future leaves no choice but to avoid a transgression of planetary boundaries and tipping points in key Earth system processes (Lenton et al., 2019). Financial actors are key players in the global economy and affect biodiversity around the world. Several recent policy and private initiatives have been launched with the ambition to redirect financial flows towards activities that protect natural capital, influence ecosystems and generate equitable outcomes to people in a positive way (Galaz et al., 2015).

3. **Illustrative case study on risks and justice implications in Marine Protected Areas**

The ocean economy is expected to grow faster than the global economy in the coming decades, reaching $3 trillion by 2030 (OECD, 2016), with well-established (e.g. fisheries, aquaculture) and novel ocean sectors (e.g. seabed mining, ocean wave energy) multiplying their activity and footprint in recent years (Jouffray et al., 2020). Yet, opportunities, access and benefits from oceans remain highly unequal. For instance, seafood production is highly concentrated in a few Global North large corporations (Österblom et al., 2015), while in most places of the Global South, the local nutritional needs are jeopardised by the activity of distant fishing fleets, seafood trade, and the use of catches for fish oil/fish meal for animal feed (Hicks et al., 2019). The unprecedented race for food, spaces and materials, but also the effects of other drivers such as climate change and pollution, are exacerbating social inequities and threatening marine ecosystems functioning and productivity. The race to occupy the oceans and exploit more resources and at greater depths, combined with the impacts of climate change, are leading to an increasing risk of reaching dangerous ocean tipping points (Jouffray et al., 2020; McKay et al., 2022). Thus, there is a pressing call for transformative actions that halt and reverse marine biodiversity loss rates (IPBES, 2019), particularly in some Global South biodiversity hotspots.

The recently agreed Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework seeks to protect 30% of the ocean by 2030 to halt biodiversity loss (30x30 target 3 (CBD, 2022). Through the global CBD negotiations, conserving 30% of the ocean (and land) is seen as an important threshold for halting biodiversity loss and maintaining ecosystem function as previous levels of protection were insufficient (Dinerstein et al., 2019; Baillie and Zhang, 2018). With Target 3 set 'to ensure and enable that by 2030 at least 30% of terrestrial and inland water areas, and of marine and coastal areas, are effectively conserved and managed (CBD, 2022),' it could function as a potential positive tipping point if appropriately implemented. However, the 30x30 target risks perpetuating historical injustices, colonial legacies and power imbalances by imposing Western conservation models on communities in the Global South (Obura et al., 2023). In effect, it is essential to explore the intricate social aspects of the initiative (Sandbrook et al., 2023), offering

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Normal, Outline numbered + Level: 1 + Numbering Style: 1, 2, 3, … + Start at: 1 + Alignment: Left + Aligned at: 0,63 cm + Indent at: 1,27 cm

Deleted: (Jouffray et al., 2020).

Deleted: (Österblom et al., 2015),

Deleted: (Hicks et al., 2019).

Deleted: (Jouffray et al., 2020; McKay et al., 2022).

Deleted: (IPBES, 2019),

Deleted: (CBD, 2022).

Deleted: (Dinerstein et al., 2019; Baillie and Zhang, 2018).

Deleted: (CBD, 2022),

Deleted: (Obura et al., 2023, 2021).

Deleted: (Sandbrook et al., 2023),

Deleted: 14

926 a more nuanced and equitable discourse on positive tipping points in ocean governance and
927 conservation and the role of Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) in achieving them.
928
929 Although the positive ecological impacts of MPAs are relatively well understood (i.e. large, old,
930 well-enforced and 'no-take' MPAs would provide greater ecological benefits within the area
931 effectively protected (Sala and Giakoumi, 2018), less attention is paid to the negative socio-
932 economic impacts that MPA establishment can have on dependent and marginalised
933 communities (Bennett and Dearden, 2014; Rasheed, 2020). Past research has shown that the
934 MPAs can exacerbate equity issues currently present in the Global South, by further
935 marginalising already vulnerable coastal communities (Sowman and Sunde, 2018; Hill et al.,
936 2016). MPAs establishment and management may exclude local and Indigenous participation,
937 which in turn can also lead to reduced conservation and management gains (Hill et al., 2016). A
938 heightened focus on increasing MPAs may entail undesirable consequences for social well-
939 being of vulnerable communities in a variety of ways, including forced removals and
940 displacement of Indigenous peoples from traditional lands and waters, loss or restricted access
941 rights, as well as negative impacts on food security, health, livelihoods, identity and culture
942 (Bennett and Dearden, 2014; Hill et al., 2016). As an example, (Sowman and Sunde, 2018)
943 explored the social dimensions of five MPAs in South Africa, finding that they led to the
944 weakening of local governance rights and processes, loss of tenure rights and access to
945 resources, loss of livelihoods, negative impacts on culture and way of life, and increased conflict
946 in already marginalised coastal communities. Similarly, Oracion et al (2005) documented how in
947 some MPAs in the Philippines, the tourism sector marginalised small-scale fisheries in terms of
948 access and control, jeopardising the economic and socio-cultural viability of fishing-dependent
949 communities.
950
951 A strong global focus on increasing MPAs as a 'tipping point' towards conserving marine
952 biodiversity, may fail to carefully and comprehensively address historical impacts and ongoing
953 equity issues experienced by coastal communities in the Global South. In addition, measuring
954 conservation success based solely on a coverage metric can incentivize the establishment of
955 large centrally-governed MPAs (often situated in former colonies) (O'Leary et al., 2018), at the
956 expense of relatively small, but locally managed MPAs (Smallhorn-West et al., 2020). A looming
957 time horizon for 30x30 may also discourage participatory and collaborative processes that may
958 take longer to achieve but are more efficient in the long term (O'Leary et al., 2018). Concerning
959 global planning of MPAs expansion, maps are not apolitical. Global conservation planning
960 exercises informed by biophysical variables and cumulative human impacts placed a significant
961 fraction of priority areas within the Global South (e.g. Coral Triangle, Southwest Indian Ocean,
962 Caribbean Sea) (Zhao et al., 2020; Selig et al., 2014; Jenkins and Van Houtan, 2016),
963 occupying the entire Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZs) of some Global South countries (e.g.
964 Indonesia) and thereby perpetuating a form of green sacrifice zone. While providing important
965 foundations, this literature hardly discusses the ethical and governance considerations of such
966 "conservation planning exercises" and local socio-economics needs are either conceptualised
967 as an extra map layer that competes with wildlife or something to consider in future analyses.
968

985 The 30x30 initiative and the revitalization and empowerment of local communities may be
986 reconciled by: (1) balancing both biodiversity and well-being outcomes of local communities
987 when enhancing existing MPAs and designing new ones; (2) seriously considering the wide
988 range of "other effective area-based conservation measures", including those where small-scale
989 actors are empowered; (3) involving coastal communities from the very beginning of decision-
990 making processes to enhance procedural justice, increasing the likelihood of equitable
991 outcomes; (4) acknowledging customary, traditional and local practices of Indigenous peoples
992 when protecting coastal areas; and (5) considering ongoing sustainable Indigenous
993 management systems within the 30x30 target (e.g. (Atlas et al., 2021). Importantly, the
994 expansion of MPAs, across both large and small areas, should not be seen as a single strategy
995 to balance marine biodiversity and socio-economic needs; it must be part of a broader and more
996 diverse management and governance portfolio to govern our oceans in a sustainable and
997 equitable manner (O'Leary et al., 2018).
998

999 **4. Implications for practice.**

1000
1001 Above we have laid out a series of risks and potential injustices associated with the need to act
1002 to address the existential threat that is climate change and related sustainability concerns like
1003 biodiversity loss. We argue that interventions, especially concerning narratives of positive
1004 tipping points, cannot be divorced from current injustices and inequities in the global earth
1005 system. Below, we set out some specific key messages for different actor groups to internalise
1006 as we all seek to act to shift the planet onto a more environmentally sustainable and equitable
1007 trajectory.
1008

1009 **4.1. Researchers**

1010
1011 **4.1.1. Employ participatory and plural/inclusive approaches.**
1012 Biophysical and social system tipping points are interconnected, and do not exist in isolation
1013 (Sultana, 2023a). Avoiding an increase of harms requires a broad set of expertise, approaches,
1014 and acknowledgment that we may need multiple and plural approaches not only within
1015 academic disciplines, but also of diverse knowledge systems beyond academia and that these
1016 need to be taken seriously (Tàbara et al., 2022). Interactions with other knowledge systems are
1017 only slowly developing, but participatory approaches that involve stakeholders in science, can
1018 still be very superficial and not go beyond consultation into more embedded modes of
1019 knowledge co-production (Osinski, 2021; Chambers et al., 2021). By being more mindful about
1020 inclusiveness, we can bring about more procedural justice in research through participatory co-
1021 design, action research and humility on the part of researchers (Huybrechts et al., 2017).

1022
1023 **4.1.2. Diversify the research space.**
1024 Diversity is a key principle of resilience and should also be a core framing when thinking through
1025 equity, so that diverse groups, perspectives, knowledge systems and research methods are not
1026 side-lined in the quest for addressing global tipping points. Greater diversity in research is
1027 therefore needed - in terms of cultural, religious, ethnic, gender or background of the
1028 researcher, but also in the disciplines that are engaged. For example, considering social

sciences in the intentions, design, implementation and evaluation of interventions are also more likely to avoid harms and associated costs, with potential to achieve both positive social and ecological impacts on people (Latulippe and Klenk, 2020). Including diverse groups, perspectives, and knowledge systems in the quest for addressing global tipping points will enhance resilience and success for social tipping and will broaden the type and scope of research undertaken (Stirling, 2010). To harness relevant social tipping opportunities we need to learn about diverse living realities and interact with actors outside science (Bentley et al., 2014).

4.1.3. Have more heterogeneity in research contributions.

Science has an agenda-setting function that could benefit from accounting for the heterogeneity of the expertise that is needed to solve complex problems like tipping points. Place-specific information and experience is often lacking as a lot of traditional research is concentrated in high-income countries. A more inclusive global research project to reflect on the justice and risk aspects of the Earth system and understanding the full breadth of impacts of positive and negative tipping points needs to be undertaken. Diversity and inclusivity of research teams within and beyond academia are needed to help find solutions to tipping points that do not exacerbate existing inequities and inequalities (de Souza, 2021; Latulippe and Klenk, 2020).

4.2. Business and finance

4.2.1. Transformed financial systems

Recognise that finance and business as part of social and ecological systems and not somehow apart from them; that active steering and regulation are required to divest, de-finance and divert financial resources to where positive tipping points can be found. This means reconfiguring currently highly uneven access to credit, education and capital in order to bring about more transformative change and creating mechanisms that redirect finance away from activities pushing us past planetary boundaries and towards sectors and regions where they are most required (Newell, 2021).

Transformation of financial systems must extend to providing mechanisms to transform sufficient financial assets back into biodiversity and climate assets held in secure commons instruments that can ensure equitable access to all, in particular in developing countries (IPBES, 2022). This requires a greatly strengthened architecture of global financial governance that prioritises sustainability and social justice (UNEP, 2015). Reaching a financial sector tipping point implies changing the mandates of multilateral development banks, reforming central banks and regulating the need to change company law and disclosure policies. Furthermore, the public sector should ring-fence funding to provide a cushion against unintended consequences.

4.2.2. Introduce investment restrictions for non-compliant companies.

Cutting off investment for companies that are seen to be complicit in transgressing planetary boundaries, such as some oil majors and powerful cattle lobby groups in the Brazilian Amazon (Piotrowski, 2019), has the potential to reshape the business environment towards more ethical

practices. Another area where investments could leverage positive tipping points, for instance, would be an investment shift from car dependency as this could potentially ease pressure in the mining sector, reinforcing reduced social and environmental harms and a densification of metropolitan areas, which would experience myriad benefits from improved air quality to pedestrian safety (Rionfrancos et al., 2023). Likewise redirecting the $11 million per minute currently being spent on fossil fuel subsidies towards improved access to renewable energy for poorer communities would represent a major gain (McCulloch, 2023).

4.2.3. Develop more supportive and inclusive investments

Financial actors, such as international development banks, institutional and private investors, credit rating agencies and international commercial banks, are increasingly interested in the financial risks of climate change and associated changes in ecosystems (Galaz et al., 2018). It is crucial that capital investments steer the sector toward improved sustainability, as opposed to unsustainable working conditions and overexploitation of resources (Hickel et al., 2021) by integrating sustainability and equity into traditional finance mechanisms (Jouffray et al., 2019), through ESG approaches or measures like the Social Cost of Carbon. For example, Prellezo et al (2023) highlight the need to build climate resilience, social sustainability, and equity in global fisheries to achieve targets to limit global warming established by the Paris Agreement. By internalising the social cost of carbon, the authors found that if CO2 trading prices reach the 2050 social cost of carbon, around 75% of the landings worldwide would be more valuable as carbon than as foodstuff in the market.

Redirecting public and private money to new innovative tools and instruments can enable new entrants into the new financial architecture while reducing the degradation of biodiversity. For example, the IIX Sustainability Bonds[2] are debt securities that can be listed on a social stock exchange, and they explicitly address the inclusion of women in economic activities. There are also initiatives to supplement gaps in the national currency systems such as Community Inclusion Currencies[3] that empower communities to create their own financial systems based on local goods and services (Ruddick, 2023).

At the national level, the Netherlands provides, for instance, special green investment funds that are exempt from income tax, thus allowing investors in green projects (e.g. green shipping), to contract loans at reduced interest rates (usually ~2% below commercial rates). Another example is the Raven Indigenous Impact Fund[4], a new innovative financial product committed to Indigenous-led equity investments in mission-driven and innovative indigenous enterprises to help build a renewed and sustainable Indigenous economy in Canada and the US. The Climate Bonds Initiative[5] has also a number of sector criteria (e.g. for marine energy and water utilities); while other relevant initiatives include the Blue Natural Capital Positive Impacts Framework[6] and

---

[2] https://iixglobal.com/iix-sustainability-bonds/
[3] https://grassrootseconomics.org/
[4] https://ravencapitalpartners.ca/investments/impact-funds
[5] www.climatebonds.net
[6] https://bluenaturalcapital.org

the technical guideline for blue bonds. Mainstreaming these examples as best practice is critical for leveraging the financial system to enable PTPs.

4.3. Decision and Policy-makers

4.3.1. Design fiscal policies that are reflective and cognisant of extant configurations.

Fiscal policy needs to be designed to subsidise lower-income households for the higher costs that may accompany climate policies such as carbon pricing, emissions trading, new mandates/standards for energy-efficient buildings, smart energy systems, and the electrification of transport. Failure to do so could set off a cascade of unintended consequences and increase poverty, inequality, hunger and other health impacts, popular protest and political instability. Hypothecation, for example redirecting funds from fossil fuel subsidies to affordable public transport or from windfall taxes on oil companies for home insulation schemes, can build support among poorer groups for measures that might otherwise be opposed. Policy and governance actors attracted to tipping interventions need not only to design targeted, sector- and actor-specific approaches, but also to combine disciplines and sectors for a coordinated, complex systems thinking approach and capabilities. Including potential losers in the design process can also reduce opposition and ensure more equitable outcomes. They should also maintain the highest commitment to research and policymaking standards that expose hidden assumptions, biases and potential for backfires, rebounds and other unwelcome results (Sterman, 2002).

4.4. Media/communications

4.4.1. Be aware of the politics of language and power dynamics in the science landscape.

Communicators must be alert to the ideologies, values and systems of power that affect which messages are communicated and how they are encoded. For example, how a tipping point is identified (Juhola et al., 2022) and what specific language is used to define and communicate it (Milkoreit et al., 2018). This is particularly relevant in relation to the language of 'positive' and 'negative' tipping points, which can imply a universality of effect that is insensitive to the diverse experiences (and responsibilities) of different communities illustrated above.

4.4.2. Recognize their position in framing key messages in the scientific landscape.

In an equity and justice context, media and communicators must be alert to the competing ideologies and value systems that affect how a message is 'decoded' or interpreted by different communities (Holmes, 2020). It is well established in Communications studies that the meaning of a message is not necessarily determined by the messenger or the message, but 'a complex interplay of how this meaning is framed though ideological values and beliefs' (Hall, 1980). Thus, it is important to view communication not as a neutral process of information transmission, but as a complex, non-linear system that is entangled with competing knowledges and powers. Studies have shown that increased knowledge does not automatically lead to enlightened action (Norgaard, 2011) and, indeed, that more factual information may serve to further entrench dismissive perceptions of climate change (Bain et al., 2012). There is, therefore, a need to go beyond linear 'information deficit' models of communication, moving

instead towards 'non-linear' models of communication that prioritise open, reflective dialogue between different stakeholders. For example, case studies of communication strategies involving Indigenous people and local communities on the front line of climate change have found that 'messages rooted in empirical research and using simple language is insufficient and that researchers should investigate different stakeholders' understandings of what good climate change communication is and thereby determine the needs of different audiences from their unique cultural standpoints before developing materials (Gotangco and Leon, 2017; Barau and Tanko, 2018). With this in mind, it is important that communication strategies are co-produced with the communities they are seeking to engage (Moser, 2016).

4.4.3. Embrace creative co-production practices.

Initiatives arising from the Arizona State University Imagination and and Climate Futures Initiative and the University of Exeter-led 'Climate Stories' and 'We Still Have a Chance' projects, have shown that the arts and humanities offer models for empowering communities to create their own narratives and contextualise climate change in relation to their own systems of value, which is an important step towards the design and implementation of just and equitable transitions (Woodley et al., 2022; Roberts et al., 2023; Milkoreit et al., 2016). The effectiveness of literature, film and art in promoting ethical responses to climate change is increasingly being recognised in empirical studies (James, 2015; von Mossner, 2017; Houser, 2014) and, as David Holmes states, 'the arts have an ability to communicate the vulnerability and sensitivity of climate issues that other channels may lack' (Holmes, 2020). Therefore, in the context of tipping points, engaging a wide range of stakeholders in creative co-production would offer an open-ended, non-instrumental approach to communication that could be key to achieving ethical solutions in this complex field.

5. Conclusion

Biophysical tipping points pose existential threats to current and future generations, both human and non-human, with those currently underserved being the most vulnerable. It is therefore imperative to act. However, this cannot be done in a way that perpetuates past and current unjust or inequitable outcomes. Considerations of what needs to change, who is being asked to change and where the change or its impacts will be felt and by whom, require a level of reflexivity and systemic understanding. All actors have a role to play in ensuring that justice, equity and ethics are incorporated to all actions, with a particular emphasis on the inclusion of marginalised voices: those most affected by disruptive environmental change and the least responsible for causing it. Finally, enabling social tipping points towards radical transformations could benefit from more diverse perspectives to open up the solution space, leveraging a shift in worldviews and paradigms rather than just reconfiguring materials and feedbacks (Meadows, 1999). Trying to fix a system using the same tools that created it is not the best way to go about solving our planetary crises. Taking a cautious step back to explore all options, not just those that seem to offer a quick fix or 'low-hanging' fruit, could offer a more substantial route into thinking through tipping points that could create a more equitable as well as sustainable future.

1291 Author contribution

1292 LP conceptualised the paper and prepared the initial draft together with SRS, LG, PN, BS and

1293 SV. TA, AC, SC, AG, CV, TP and CZ edited and reviewed the draft.

1294

1295 Competing interests

1296 The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

1297

1298 Acknowledgements

1299 LP is funded by the Future Ecosystems for Africa Programme in partnership with Oppenheimer

1300 Generations Research and Conservation and by the Swedish Research Council FORMAS

1301 Project No 2020-00670. SV gratefully acknowledges the financial support from EQUALSEA

1302 (Transformative adaptation towards ocean equity) project, under the European Horizon 2020

1303 Program, ERC Consolidator (Grant Agreement # 101002784) funded by the European

1304 Research Council. JMDR gratefully acknowledges the financial support of Xunta de Galicia (ref.

1305 ED431B 2022/03). TP is funded by the Bezos Earth Fund and the Oppenheimer Programme in

1306 African Landscape Systems in partnership with Oppenheimer Generations Research and

1307 Conservation.

1308

References:

1310 Abraham, J.: Just Transitions for the Miners: Labor Environmentalism in the Ruhr and

1311 Appalachian Coalfields, New Political Science, 39, 218–240,

1312 https://doi.org/10.1080/07393148.2017.1301313, 2017.

1313 Adger, W. N., Butler, C., and Walker-Springett, K.: Moral reasoning in adaptation to climate

1314 change, Environmental Politics, 26, 371–390, https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2017.1287624,

1315 2017.

1316 Ameli, N., Dessens, O., Winning, M., Cronin, J., Chenet, H., Drummond, P., Calzadilla, A.,

1317 Anandarajah, G., and Grubb, M.: Higher cost of finance exacerbates a climate investment trap

1318 in developing economies, Nat Commun, 12, 4046, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-24305-3,

1319 2021.

1320 Atlas, W. I., Ban, N. C., Moore, J. W., Tuohy, A. M., Greening, S., Reid, A. J., Morven, N.,

1321 White, E., Housty, W. G., Housty, J. A., Service, C. N., Greba, L., Harrison, S., Sharpe, C.,

1322 Butts, K. I. R., Shepert, W. M., Sweeney-Bergen, E., Macintyre, D., Sloat, M. R., and Connors,

1323 K.: Indigenous Systems of Management for Culturally and Ecologically Resilient Pacific Salmon

1324 (Oncorhynchus spp.) Fisheries, BioScience, 71, 186–204,

1325 https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biaa144, 2021.

1326 Baillie, J. and Zhang, Y.-P.: Space for nature, Science, 361, 1051–1051,

1327 https://doi.org/10.1126/science.aau1397, 2018.

1328 Bain, P. G., Hornsey, M. J., Bongiorno, R., and Jeffries, C.: Promoting pro-environmental action

1329 in climate change deniers, Nature Clim Change, 2, 600–603,

1330 https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1532, 2012.

1331 Banerjee, A. V. and Duflo, E.: Good Economics for Hard Times: Better Answers to Our Biggest

1332 Problems, 1st edition., Penguin, London, 2020.

1333 Banza Lubaba Nkulu, C., Casas, L., Haufroid, V., De Putter, T., Saenen, N. D., Kayembe-

1334 Kitenge, T., Musa Obadia, P., Kyanika Wa Mukoma, D., Lunda Ilunga, J.-M., Nawrot, T. S.,

1335 Luboya Numbi, O., Smolders, E., and Nemery, B.: Sustainability of artisanal mining of cobalt in

1336 DR Congo, Nat Sustain, 1, 495–504, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0139-4, 2018.

1337 Barau, A. and Tanko, A. I.: In Search of New Narratives for Informed Decisions on Climate

1338 Change Crisis in the African Drylands, in: Handbook of Climate Change Communication: Vol. 3:

Case Studies in Climate Change Communication, edited by: Leal Filho, W., Manolas, E., Azul, A. M., Azeiteiro, U. M., and McGhie, H., Springer International Publishing, Cham, 1–20, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-70479-1_1, 2018.

Beckensteiner, J., Boschetti, F., and Thébaud, O.: Adaptive fisheries responses may lead to climate maladaptation in the absence of access regulations, npj Ocean Sustain, 2, 1–5, https://doi.org/10.1038/s44183-023-00010-0, 2023.

Bennett, N. J. and Dearden, P.: Why local people do not support conservation: Community perceptions of marine protected area livelihood impacts, governance and management in Thailand, Marine Policy, 44, 107–116, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2013.08.017, 2014.

Bentley, R. A., Maddison, E. J., Ranner, P. H., Bissell, J., Caiado, C. C. S., Bhatanacharoen, P., Clark, T., Botha, M., Akinbami, F., Hollow, M., Michie, R., Huntley, B., Curtis, S. E., and Garnett, P.: Social tipping points and Earth systems dynamics, Frontiers in Environmental Science, 2, 2014.

Bhambra, G. K. and Newell, P.: More than a metaphor: 'climate colonialism' in perspective, Global Social Challenges Journal, 1–9, https://doi.org/10.1332/EIEM6688, 2022.

Biermann, F., Oomen, J., Gupta, A., Ali, S. H., Conca, K., Hajer, M. A., Kashwan, P., Kotzé, L. J., Leach, M., Messner, D., Okereke, C., Persson, Å., Potočnik, J., Schlosberg, D., Scobie, M., and VanDeveer, S. D.: Solar geoengineering: The case for an international non-use agreement, WIREs Climate Change, 13, e754, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.754, 2022.

Bird, R. and Davis-Nozemack, K.: Tax Avoidance as a Sustainability Problem, Journal of Business Ethics, 151, 1009–1025, 2018.

Blythe, J., Silver, J., Evans, L., Armitage, D., Bennett, N. J., Moore, M., Morrison, T. H., and Brown, K.: The Dark Side of Transformation: Latent Risks in Contemporary Sustainability Discourse, Antipode, 50, 1206–1223, https://doi.org/10.1111/anti.12405, 2018.

Bonneuil, C. and Fressoz, J.-B.: The Shock of the Anthropocene: The Earth, History and Us, Verso Books, 315 pp., 2016.

Bullard, R. D.: The quest for environmental justice: human rights and the politics of pollution, First edition., Sierra Club Books, San Francisco, 393 pp., 2005.

Byskov, M. F. and Hyams, K.: Epistemic Injustice in Climate Adaptation, Ethical Theory and Moral Practice, 25, 613–634, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10677-022-10301-z, 2022.

Calvão, F., Mcdonald, C. E. A., and Bolay, M.: Cobalt mining and the corporate outsourcing of responsibility in the Democratic Republic of Congo, Extractive Industries and Society, 8, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2021.02.004, 2021.

Caney, S.: Just Emissions, Philosophy & Public Affairs, 40, 255–300, https://doi.org/10.1111/papa.12005, 2012.

CBD: COP15: Final text of Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, 2022.

CEPAL: Acuerdo Regional sobre el Acceso a la Información, la Participación Pública y el Acceso a la Justicia en Asuntos Ambientales en América Latina y el Caribe | CEPAL, CEPAL, Santiago, Chile, 2018.

Chakravarty, D., Dasgupta, S., and Roy, J.: Rebound effect: how much to worry?, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 2, 216–228, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2013.03.001, 2013.

Chambers, J. M., Wyborn, C., Ryan, M. E., Reid, R. S., Riechers, M., Serban, A., Bennett, N. J., Cvitanovic, C., Fernández-Giménez, M. E., Galvin, K. A., Goldstein, B. E., Klenk, N. L., Tengö, M., Brennan, R., Cockburn, J. J., Hill, R., Munera, C., Nel, J. L., Österblom, H., Bednarek, A. T., Bennett, E. M., Brandeis, A., Charli-Joseph, L., Chatterton, P., Curran, K., Dumrongrojwatthana, P., Durán, A. P., Fada, S. J., Gerber, J.-D., Green, J. M. H., Guerrero, A. M., Haller, T., Horcea-Milcu, A.-I., Leimona, B., Montana, J., Rondeau, R., Spierenburg, M., Steyaert, P., Zaehringer, J. G., Gruby, R., Hutton, J., and Pickering, T.: Six modes of co-production for sustainability, Nat Sustain, 1–14, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-021-00755-x, 2021.

Constantino, S. M. and Weber, E. U.: Decision-making under the deep uncertainty of climate

Deleted: 22

change: The psychological and political agency of narratives, Curr Opin Psychol, 42, 151–159, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.11.001, 2021.

Constantino, S. M., Sparkman, G., Kraft-Todd, G. T., Bicchieri, C., Centola, D., Shell-Duncan, B., Vogt, S., and Weber, E. U.: Scaling Up Change: A Critical Review and Practical Guide to Harnessing Social Norms for Climate Action, Psychol Sci Public Interest, 23, 50–97, https://doi.org/10.1177/15291006221105279, 2022.

Constantino, S. M., Skaredina, O., and Ivanova, M.: Catalytic leadership in climate change negotiations: a reply to 'Why do climate change negotiations stall? Scientific evidence and solutions for some structural problems' by Ulrich Frey and Jazmin Burgess, Global Discourse, 1–8, https://doi.org/10.1332/204378921X16842177275040, 2023.

Costello, C., Ovando, D., Clavelle, T., Strauss, C. K., Hilborn, R., Melnychuk, M. C., Branch, T. A., Gaines, S. D., Szuwalski, C. S., Cabral, R. B., Rader, D. N., and Leland, A.: Global fishery prospects under contrasting management regimes, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 113, 5125–5129, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1520420113, 2016.

Crona, B., Folke, C., and Galaz, V.: The Anthropocene reality of financial risk, One Earth, 4, 618–628, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2021.04.016, 2021.

Crowley, K.: Up and down with climate politics 2013–2016: the repeal of carbon pricing in Australia, WIREs Climate Change, 8, e458, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.458, 2017.

Dasgupta, P.: The economics of biodiversity: the Dasgupta review: full report, HM Treasury, London, 2021.

Davies, M. and Oreszczyn, T.: The unintended consequences of decarbonising the built environment: A UK case study, Energy and Buildings, 46, 80–85, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enbuild.2011.10.043, 2012.

Dempsey, J., Irvine-Broque, A., Bigger, P., Christiansen, J., Muchhala, B., Nelson, S., Rojas-Marchini, F., Shapiro-Garza, E., Schuldt, A., and DiSilvestro, A.: Biodiversity targets will not be met without debt and tax justice, Nat Ecol Evol, 6, 237–239, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01619-5, 2022.

Deutz, A., Heal, G., Niu, R., Swanson, E., Townshend, T., Li, Z., Delmar, A., Meghji, A., Sethi, S., and Puente, J.: Financing Nature: Closing the Globail Biodiversity Financing Gap, Paulson Institute, Washington D.C, https://doi.org/10.13140/RG.2.2.26226.32968, 2020.

Dinerstein, E., Vynne, C., Sala, E., Joshi, A. R., Fernando, S., Lovejoy, T. E., Mayorga, J., Olson, D., Asner, G. P., Baillie, J. E. M., Burgess, N. D., Burkart, K., Noss, R. F., Zhang, Y. P., Baccini, A., Birch, T., Hahn, N., Joppa, L. N., and Wikramanayake, E.: A Global Deal For Nature: Guiding principles, milestones, and targets, Science Advances, 5, eaaw2869, https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aaw2869, 2019.

Dutta, T., Kim, K.-H., Uchimiya, M., Kwon, E. E., Jeon, B.-H., Deep, A., and Yun, S.-T.: Global demand for rare earth resources and strategies for green mining, Environmental Research, 150, 182–190, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.05.052, 2016.

Ehret, S., Constantino, S. M., Weber, E. U., Efferson, C., and Vogt, S.: Group identities can undermine social tipping after intervention, Nat Hum Behav, 6, 1669–1679, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-022-01440-5, 2022.

Carbon leakage: https://climate.ec.europa.eu/eu-action/eu-emissions-trading-system-eu-ets/free-allocation/carbon-leakage_en, last access: 28 June 2023.

Evans, A.: The myth gap: what happens when evidence and arguments aren't enough?, Penguin Random House, UK, 119 pp., 2017.

Fairhead, J., Leach, M., and Scoones, I.: Green Grabbing: a new appropriation of nature?, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 39, 237–261, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2012.671770, 2012.

Feinberg, M. and Willer, R.: The Moral Roots of Environmental Attitudes, Psychol Sci, 24, 56–62, https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612449177, 2013.

Fesenfeld, L. P., Schmid, N., Finger, R., Mathys, A., and Schmidt, T. S.: The politics of enabling tipping points for sustainable development, One Earth, 5, 1100–1108,

Deleted: 23

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.09.004, 2022.

Feygina, I., Jost, J. T., and Goldsmith, R. E.: System Justification, the Denial of Global Warming, and the Possibility of "System-Sanctioned Change," Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 36, 326–338, https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167209351435, 2010.

Fichtner, J., Heemskerk, E. M., and Garcia-Bernardo, J.: Hidden power of the Big Three? Passive index funds, re-concentration of corporate ownership, and new financial risk, Business and Politics, 19, 298–326, https://doi.org/10.1017/bap.2017.6, 2017.

Galaz, V., Gars, J., Moberg, F., Nykvist, B., and Repinski, C.: Why Ecologists Should Care about Financial Markets, Trends in Ecology & Evolution, 30, 571–580, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2015.06.015, 2015.

Galaz, V., Crona, B., Dauriach, A., Jouffray, J.-B., Österblom, H., and Fichtner, J.: Tax havens and global environmental degradation, Nat Ecol Evol, 2, 1352–1357, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-018-0497-3, 2018.

Gardiner, S. M.: Ethics and Global Climate Change, Ethics, 114, 555–600, https://doi.org/10.1086/382247, 2004.

Ghosh, A.: The Nutmeg's Curse: Parables for a Planet in Crisis, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, IL, 336 pp., 2022.

Gilio-Whitaker, D.: As Long as Grass Grows: The Indigenous Fight for Environmental Justice, from Colonization to Standing Rock, Beacon Press, 226 pp., 2019.

Global Public Investment Network: Time for Global Public Investment: Leaders and experts rethinking sustainable development finance, Global Public Investment Network, Online, 2023.

Gómez-Barris, M.: The Extractive Zone: Social Ecologies and Decolonial Perspectives, Duke University Press, Durham, NC, https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822372561, 2017.

Gotangco, C. K. and Leon, I. P. de: Balancing Paradigms in Climate Change Communication Research to Support Climate Services, Environmental Science Faculty Publications, 2017.

Graham, J., Haidt, J., and Nosek, B. A.: Liberals and conservatives rely on different sets of moral foundations., Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96, 1029–1046, https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015141, 2009.

Grubb, M., Jordan, N. D., Hertwich, E., Neuhoff, K., Das, K., Bandyopadhyay, K. R., van Asselt, H., Sato, M., Wang, R., Pizer, W. A., and Oh, H.: Carbon Leakage, Consumption, and Trade, Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 47, 753–795, https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-120820-053625, 2022.

Gupta, J., Liverman, D., Prodani, K., Aldunce, P., Bai, X., Broadgate, W., Ciobanu, D., Gifford, L., Gordon, C., Hurlbert, M., Inoue, C. Y. A., Jacobson, L., Kanie, N., Lade, S. J., Lenton, T. M., Obura, D., Okereke, C., Otto, I. M., Pereira, L., Rockström, J., Scholtens, J., Rocha, J., Stewart-Koster, B., David Tàbara, J., Rammelt, C., and Verburg, P. H.: Earth system justice needed to identify and live within Earth system boundaries, Nat Sustain, 1–9, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-023-01064-1, 2023a.

Gupta, J., Liverman, D., Prodani, K., Aldunce, P., Bai, X., Broadgate, W., Ciobanu, D., Gifford, L., Gordon, C., Hurlbert, M., Inoue, C. Y. A., Jacobson, L., Kanie, N., Lade, S. J., Lenton, T. M., Obura, D., Okereke, C., Otto, I. M., Pereira, L., Rockström, J., Scholtens, J., Rocha, J., Stewart-Koster, B., David Tàbara, J., Rammelt, C., and Verburg, P. H.: Earth system justice needed to identify and live within Earth system boundaries, Nature Sustainability, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-023-01064-1, 2023b.

Haberl, H.: Competition for land: A sociometabolic perspective, Ecological Economics, 119, 424–431, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2014.10.002, 2015.

Haidt, J.: The Righteous Mind: Why Good People Are Divided by Politics and Religion, Reprint edition., Vintage, New York, 528 pp., 2013.

Hall, S.: Encoding/decoding ∗, in: Culture, Media, Language, Routledge, 1980.

Haraway, D.: Staying with the Trouble: Making kin in the Chthulucene, Duke University Press, Baltimore, USA, 2016.

Deleted: 24

Harden-Davies, H., Humphries, F., Maloney, M., Wright, G., Gjerde, K., and Vierros, M.: Rights of Nature: Perspectives for Global Ocean Stewardship, Marine Policy, 122, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104059, 2020.

Hasegawa, T., Fujimori, S., Havlík, P., Valin, H., Bodirsky, B. L., Doelman, J. C., Fellmann, T., Kyle, P., Koopman, J. F. L., Lotze-Campen, H., Mason-D'Croz, D., Ochi, Y., Pérez Domínguez, I., Stehfest, E., Sulser, T. B., Tabeau, A., Takahashi, K., Takakura, J., van Meijl, H., van Zeist, W.-J., Wiebe, K., and Witzke, P.: Risk of increased food insecurity under stringent global climate change mitigation policy, Nature Clim Change, 8, 699–703, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41558-018-0230-x, 2018.

Hernandez, D. S. and Newell, P.: Oro blanco: assembling extractivism in the lithium triangle, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 49, 945–968, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2022.2080061, 2022.

Hickel, J. and Kallis, G.: Is Green Growth Possible?, New Political Economy, 25, 469–486, https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2019.1598964, 2019.

Hickel, J., Sullivan, D., and Zoomkawala, H.: Plunder in the Post-Colonial Era: Quantifying Drain from the Global South Through Unequal Exchange, 1960–2018, New Political Economy, 26, 1030–1047, https://doi.org/10.1080/13563467.2021.1899153, 2021.

Hicks, C. C., Cohen, P. J., Graham, N. A. J., Nash, K. L., Allison, E. H., D'Lima, C., Mills, D. J., Roscher, M., Thilsted, S. H., Thorne-Lyman, A. L., and MacNeil, M. A.: Harnessing global fisheries to tackle micronutrient deficiencies, Nature, 574, 95–98, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1592-6, 2019.

Hill, L. S., Johnson, J. A., and Adamowski, J.: Meeting Aichi Target 11: Equity considerations in Marine Protected Areas design, Ocean & Coastal Management, 134, 112–119, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2016.09.017, 2016.

Hoffman, S. M. and High-Pippert, A.: Community Energy: A Social Architecture for an Alternative Energy Future, Bulletin of Science, Technology & Society, 25, 387–401, https://doi.org/10.1177/0270467605278880, 2005.

Holmes, D. C.: Introduction to the Research handbook on communicating climate change, in: Research Handbook on Communicating Climate Change, Edward Elgar Publishing, 1–20, 2020.

Houser, H.: Ecosickness in Contemporary U.S. Fiction: Environment and Affect, in: Ecosickness in Contemporary U.S. Fiction, Columbia University Press, https://doi.org/10.7312/hous16514, 2014.

Huq, S., Roberts, E., and Fenton, A.: Loss and damage, Nature Clim Change, 3, 947–949, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate2026, 2013.

Huybrechts, L., Benesch, H., and Geib, J.: Institutioning: Participatory Design, Co-Design and the public realm, CoDesign, 13, 148–159, https://doi.org/10.1080/15710882.2017.1355006, 2017.

IEA: Renewables 2022 – Analysis, IEA, Paris, 2022.

IEA: Africa Energy Outlook 2022 – Analysis, IEA, Paris, France, 2023.

IPBES: The Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Bonn, Germany, 2019.

IPBES: Methodological assessment of the diverse values and valuation of nature of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, IPBES secretariat, Bonn, Germany, https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6522522, 2022.

IRENA: Renewable Power Generation Costs in 2021, International Renewable Energy Agency, Abu Dhabi, 2022.

Jackson, G., N'Guetta, A., Rosa, S. P. D., Scown, M., Dorkenoo, K., Chaffin, B., and Boyd, E.: An emerging governmentality of climate change loss and damage, Progress in Environmental Geography, https://doi.org/10.1177/27539687221148748, 2023.

Jafry, T. (Ed.): Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice, Routledge, London, 566 pp., https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315537689, 2018.

James, E.: The Storyworld Accord: Econarratology and Postcolonial Narratives, edited by: Matz, J. E. and Herman, D., University of Nebraska Press, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctt1d9898m, 2015.

Jenkins, C. N. and Van Houtan, K. S.: Global and regional priorities for marine biodiversity protection, Biological Conservation, 204, 333–339, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2016.10.005, 2016.

Jessop, S., Stanway, D., and Abnett, K.: COP28 calls for adapting to warmer world without resolving how to pay, Reuters, 13th December, 2023.

Jouffray, J.-B., Crona, B., Wassénius, E., Bebbington, J., and Scholtens, B.: Leverage points in the financial sector for seafood sustainability, Science Advances, 5, eaax3324, https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.aax3324, 2019.

Jouffray, J.-B., Blasiak, R., Norström, A. V., Österblom, H., and Nyström, M.: The Blue Acceleration: The Trajectory of Human Expansion into the Ocean, One Earth, 2, 43–54, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2019.12.016, 2020.

Juhola, S., Filatova, T., Hochrainer-Stigler, S., Mechler, R., Scheffran, J., and Schweizer, P.-J.: Social tipping points and adaptation limits in the context of systemic risk: Concepts, models and governance, Front. Clim., 4, 1009234, https://doi.org/10.3389/fclim.2022.1009234, 2022.

Keith, D.: A Case for Climate Engineering, MIT Press, 2013.

Keith, D. W., Wagner, G., and Zabel, C. L.: Solar geoengineering reduces atmospheric carbon burden, Nature Clim Change, 7, 617–619, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate3376, 2017.

Kenner, D.: Carbon Inequality: The Role of the Richest in Climate Change, Routledge, London, 146 pp., https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351171328, 2019.

Kidwell, B., Farmer, A., and Hardesty, D. M.: Getting Liberals and Conservatives to Go Green: Political Ideology and Congruent Appeals, Journal of Consumer Research, 40, 350–367, https://doi.org/10.1086/670610, 2013.

Kinniburgh, C.: Climate Politics after the Yellow Vests, Dissent Magazine, Spring, 2019.

Klein, N.: This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate, Reprint edition., Simon & Schuster, 576 pp., 2015.

Klinsky, S., Roberts, T., Huq, S., Okereke, C., Newell, P., Dauvergne, P., O'Brien, K., Schroeder, H., Tschakert, P., Clapp, J., Keck, M., Biermann, F., Liverman, D., Gupta, J., Rahman, A., Messner, D., Pellow, D., and Bauer, S.: Why equity is fundamental in climate change policy research, Global Environmental Change, 44, 170–173, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2016.08.002, 2017.

Koplow, D. and Steenblik, R.: Protecting Nature by Reforming Enviornmentall Harmful Subsidies: The Role of Business, Earth track, Cambridge, Mass., 2022.

Kravitz, B. and MacMartin, D. G.: Uncertainty and the basis for confidence in solar geoengineering research, Nat Rev Earth Environ, 1, 64–75, https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-019-0004-7, 2020.

Kraxner, F., Nordström, E.-M., Havlík, P., Gusti, M., Mosnier, A., Frank, S., Valin, H., Fritz, S., Fuss, S., Kindermann, G., McCallum, I., Khabarov, N., Böttcher, H., See, L., Aoki, K., Schmid, E., Máthé, L., and Obersteiner, M.: Global bioenergy scenarios – Future forest development, land-use implications, and trade-offs, Biomass and Bioenergy, 57, 86–96, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.02.003, 2013.

Lamb, W. F., Mattioli, G., Levi, S., Roberts, J. T., Capstick, S., Creutzig, F., Minx, J. C., Müller-Hansen, F., Culhane, T., and Steinberger, J. K.: Discourses of climate delay, Global Sustainability, 3, e17, https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2020.13, 2020.

Latour, B.: Down to Earth: Politics in the New Climatic Regime, 1st edition., Polity, Cambridge, UK ; Medford, MA, 140 pp., 2018.

Latulippe, N. and Klenk, N.: Making room and moving over: knowledge co-production, Indigenous knowledge sovereignty and the politics of global environmental change decision-

making, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 42, 7–14, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2019.10.010, 2020.

Leach, M. and Scoones, I.: The slow race: Making science and technology work for the poor, Demos, London, U.K., 2006.

Lenton, T. M.: Early warning of climate tipping points, Nature Clim Change, 1, 201–209, https://doi.org/10.1038/nclimate1143, 2011.

Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., Rahmstorf, S., Richardson, K., Steffen, W., and Schellnhuber, H. J.: Climate tipping points - too risky to bet against, Nature, 575, 592–595, https://doi.org/10.1038/d41586-019-03595-0, 2019.

Lenton, T. M., Benson, S., Smith, T., Ewer, T., Lanel, V., Petykowski, E., Powell, T. W. R., Abrams, J. F., Blomsma, F., and Sharpe, S.: Operationalising positive tipping points towards global sustainability, Global Sustainability, 5, e1, https://doi.org/10.1017/sus.2021.30, 2022.

Manzetti, S. and Mariasiu, F.: Electric vehicle battery technologies: From present state to future systems, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, 51, 1004–1012, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2015.07.010, 2015.

McCulloch, N.: Ending Fossil Fuel Subsidies: The politics of saving the planet, Practical Action Publishing, S.l., 166 pp., 2023.

McKay, D. I. A., Staal, A., Abrams, J. F., and et al.: Exceeding 1.5 C global warming could trigger multiple climate tipping points, Science, 377, https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1126/science.abn7950, 2022.

McLaren, D. P.: Whose climate and whose ethics? Conceptions of justice in solar geoengineering modelling, Energy Research & Social Science, 44, 209–221, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2018.05.021, 2018.

Meadowcroft, J.: Engaging with the politics of sustainability transitions, Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions, 1, 70–75, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2011.02.003, 2011.

Meadows, D. H.: Leverage Points: Places to Intervene in a System, The Sustainability Institute, Hartland, VT, USA, 1999.

Mikulewicz, M., Caretta, M. A., Sultana, F., and J. W. Crawford, N.: Intersectionality & Climate Justice: A call for synergy in climate change scholarship, Environmental Politics, 0, 1–12, https://doi.org/10.1080/09644016.2023.2172869, 2023.

Milkoreit, M., Martinez, M., and Eschrich, J.: Everything Change: An Anthology of Climate Fiction, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona, 2016.

Milkoreit, M., Hodbod, J., Baggio, J., Benessaiah, K., Calderón-Contreras, R., Donges, J. F., Mathias, J.-D., Rocha, J. C., Schoon, M., and Werners, S. E.: Defining tipping points for social-ecological systems scholarship—an interdisciplinary literature review, Environ. Res. Lett., 13, 033005, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/aaaa75, 2018.

Mishra, S.: India demands US and other largest historic carbon emitters start taking responsibility for their actions, The Independent, 7th April, 2021.

Moser, S. C.: Editorial overview: Transformations and co-design: Co-designing research projects on social transformations to sustainability, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 20, v–viii, https://doi.org/10.1016/J.COSUST.2016.10.001, 2016.

von Mossner, A. W.: Affective Ecologies: Empathy, Emotion, and Environmental Narrative, Ohio State University Press, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctv11hpszq, 2017.

National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine: Reflecting Sunlight: Recommendations for Solar Geoengineering Research and Research Governance, National Academies Press, Washington, D.C., https://doi.org/10.17226/25762, 2021.

Newell, P.: Race, Class and the Global Politics of Environmental Inequality, Global Environmental Politics, 5, 70–94, https://doi.org/10.1162/1526380054794835, 2005.

Newell, P.: Power Shift: The Global Political Economy of Energy Transitions, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108966184, 2021.

Newell, P. and Mulvaney, D.: The political economy of the 'just transition,' The Geographical

Deleted: 27

Journal, 179, 132–140, https://doi.org/10.1111/geoj.12008, 2013.

Newell, P., Srivastava, S., Naess, L. O., Torres Contreras, G. A., and Price, R.: Toward transformative climate justice: An emerging research agenda, WIREs Climate Change, 12, e733, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.733, 2021.

Newell, P. J., Geels, F. W., and Sovacool, B. K.: Navigating tensions between rapid and just low-carbon transitions, Environ. Res. Lett., 17, 041006, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ac622a, 2022.

Nixon, R.: Slow Violence and the Environmentalism of the Poor:, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 368 pp., 2013.

Norgaard, K. M.: Living in Denial: Climate Change, Emotions, and Everyday Life, The MIT Press, https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262015448.001.0001, 2011.

O'Brien, K. L. and Leichenko, R. M.: Double exposure: assessing the impacts of climate change within the context of economic globalization, Global Environmental Change, 10, 221–232, 2000.

O'Brien, K. L. and Leichenko, R. M.: Winners and Losers in the Context of Global Change, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 93, 89–103, https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8306.93107, 2003.

Obura, D. O., DeClerck, F., Verburg, P. H., Gupta, J., Abrams, J. F., Bai, X., Bunn, S., Ebi, K. L., Gifford, L., Gordon, C., Jacobson, L., Lenton, T. M., Liverman, D., Mohamed, A., Prodani, K., Rocha, J. C., Rockström, J., Sakschewski, B., Stewart-Koster, B., van Vuuren, D., Winkelmann, R., and Zimm, C.: Achieving a nature- and people-positive future, One Earth, 6, 105–117, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2022.11.013, 2023.

Okereke, C. and Dooley, K.: Principles of justice in proposals and policy approaches to avoided deforestation: Towards a post-Kyoto climate agreement, Global Environmental Change, 20, 82–95, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2009.08.004, 2010.

O'Leary, B. C., Ban, N. C., Fernandez, M., Friedlander, A. M., García-Borboroglu, P., Golbuu, Y., Guidetti, P., Harris, J. M., Hawkins, J. P., Langlois, T., McCauley, D. J., Pikitch, E. K., Richmond, R. H., and Roberts, C. M.: Addressing Criticisms of Large-Scale Marine Protected Areas, BioScience, 68, 359–370, https://doi.org/10.1093/biosci/biy021, 2018.

Oracion, E. G., Miller, M. L., and Christie, P.: Marine protected areas for whom? Fisheries, tourism, and solidarity in a Philippine community, Ocean & Coastal Management, 48, 393–410, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2005.04.013, 2005.

Osinski, A.: From Consultation to Coproduction: A Comparison of Participation in Poverty Research, JPRM, 2, https://doi.org/10.35844/001c.18875, 2021.

Österblom, H., Jouffray, J.-B., Folke, C., Crona, B., Troell, M., Merrie, A., and Rockström, J.: Transnational Corporations as 'Keystone Actors' in Marine Ecosystems, PLOS ONE, 10, e0127533, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0127533, 2015.

Patterson, J. J.: Backlash to Climate Policy, Global Environmental Politics, 23, 68–90, https://doi.org/10.1162/glep_a_00684, 2023.

Patterson, J. J., Thaler, T., Hoffmann, M., Hughes, S., Oels, A., Chu, E., Mert, A., Huitema, D., Burch, S., and Jordan, A.: Political feasibility of 1.5°C societal transformations: the role of social justice, Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 31, 1–9, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2017.11.002, 2018.

Pedroli, B., Elbersen, B., Frederiksen, P., Grandin, U., Heikkilä, R., Krogh, P. H., Izakovičová, Z., Johansen, A., Meiresonne, L., and Spijker, J.: Is energy cropping in Europe compatible with biodiversity? – Opportunities and threats to biodiversity from land-based production of biomass for bioenergy purposes, Biomass and Bioenergy, 55, 73–86, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2012.09.054, 2013.

Pereira, L., Frantzeskaki, N., Hebinck, A., Charli-Joseph, L., Drimie, S., Dyer, M., Eakin, H., Galafassi, D., Karpouzoglou, T., Marshall, F., Moore, M.-L., Olsson, P., Siqueiros-García, J. M., Van Zwanenberg, P., and Vervoort, J. M.: Transformative spaces in the making: key lessons from nine cases in the Global South, Sustain Sci, 15, 161–178, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-

019-00749-x, 2020.

Perkins, P. E.: Climate justice, gender and intersectionality, in: Routledge Handbook of Climate Justice, Routledge, 2018.

Piotrowski, M.: Nearing the tipping point: Drivers of deforestation in the Amazon Region, Inter-American Dialogue, Washington D.C., USA, 2019.

Prellezo, R., Da-Rocha, J. M., Palomares, M. L. D., Sumaila, U. R., and Villasante, S.: Building climate resilience, social sustainability and equity in global fisheries, npj Ocean Sustain, 2, 1–7, https://doi.org/10.1038/s44183-023-00017-7, 2023.

Rammelt, C. F., Gupta, J., Liverman, D., Scholtens, J., Ciobanu, D., Abrams, J. F., Bai, X., Gifford, L., Gordon, C., Hurlbert, M., Inoue, C. Y. A., Jacobson, L., Lade, S. J., Lenton, T. M., McKay, D. I. A., Nakicenovic, N., Okereke, C., Otto, I. M., Pereira, L. M., Prodani, K., Rockström, J., Stewart-Koster, B., Verburg, P. H., and Zimm, C.: Impacts of meeting minimum access on critical earth systems amidst the Great Inequality, Nature Sustainability, 6, 212–221, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-022-00995-5, 2023.

Rasheed, A. R.: Marine protected areas and human well-being – A systematic review and recommendations, Ecosystem Services, 41, 101048, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2019.101048, 2020.

Raworth, K.: A Doughnut for the Anthropocene: humanity's compass in the 21st century, The Lancet Planetary Health, 1, e48–e49, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(17)30028-1, 2017.

Richardson, K., Steffen, W., Lucht, W., Bendtsen, J., Cornell, S. E., Donges, J. F., Drüke, M., Fetzer, I., Bala, G., von Bloh, W., Feulner, G., Fiedler, S., Gerten, D., Gleeson, T., Hofmann, M., Huiskamp, W., Kummu, M., Mohan, C., Nogués-Bravo, D., Petri, S., Porkka, M., Rahmstorf, S., Schaphoff, S., Thonicke, K., Tobian, A., Virkki, V., Wang-Erlandsson, L., Weber, L., and Rockström, J.: Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries, Science Advances, 9, eadh2458, https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.adh2458, 2023.

Rionfrancos, T., Kendall, K. K., Haugen, M., McDonald, K., Hassan, B., and Slattery, M.: Achieving Zero Emissions with More Mobility Less Mining, University of California, Davis, Davis, California, USA, 2023.

Roberts, H. G. A., Barciela, R., Flint, S., Fussell, I., Maestri, E., Nyblon, C. M., Marple, A., Sabet, F., and Stott, P.: New narratives for a healthy planet: creative writing and art projects reveal We Still Have a Chance, The Lancet Planetary Health, 7, e646–e647, https://doi.org/10.1016/S2542-5196(23)00144-4, 2023.

Roberts, J. T. and Parks, B.: A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass., 404 pp., 2006.

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., De Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., Van Der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., Falkenmark, M., Karlberg, L., Corell, R. W., Fabry, V. J., Hansen, J., Walker, B., Liverman, D., Richardson, K., Crutzen, P., and Foley, J. A.: A safe operating space for humanity, Nature, 461, 472–475, https://doi.org/10.1038/461472a, 2009.

Rockström, J., Gupta, J., Qin, D., Lade, S. J., Abrams, J. F., Andersen, L. S., Armstrong McKay, D. I., Bai, X., Bala, G., Bunn, S. E., Ciobanu, D., DeClerck, F., Ebi, K., Gifford, L., Gordon, C., Hasan, S., Kanie, N., Lenton, T. M., Loriani, S., Liverman, D. M., Mohamed, A., Nakicenovic, N., Obura, D., Ospina, D., Prodani, K., Rammelt, C., Sakschewski, B., Scholtens, J., Stewart-Koster, B., Tharammal, T., van Vuuren, D., Verburg, P. H., Winkelmann, R., Zimm, C., Bennett, E. M., Bringezu, S., Broadgate, W., Green, P. A., Huang, L., Jacobson, L., Ndehedehe, C., Pedde, S., Rocha, J., Scheffer, M., Schulte-Uebbing, L., de Vries, W., Xiao, C., Xu, C., Xu, X., Zafra-Calvo, N., and Zhang, X.: Safe and just Earth system boundaries, Nature, 1–10, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-023-06083-8, 2023.

Rowson, J. and Corner, A.: How framing can move climate change from scientific to social fact, The Guardian, 23rd May, 2014.

Ruddick, W.: Sarafu Network Community Asset Vouchers, 2022-2023, 2023.

Sala, E. and Giakoumi, S.: No-take marine reserves are the most effective protected areas in the ocean, ICES Journal of Marine Science, 75, 1166–1168, https://doi.org/10.1093/icesjms/fsx059, 2018.

Sandbrook, C., Albury-Smith, S., Allan, J. R., Bhola, N., Bingham, H. C., Brockington, D., Byaruhanga, A. B., Fajardo, J., Fitzsimons, J., Franks, P., Fleischman, F., Frechette, A., Kakuyo, K., Kaptoyo, E., Kuemmerle, T., Kalunda, P. N., Nuvunga, M., O'Donnell, B., Onyai, F., Pfeifer, M., Pritchard, R., Ramos, A., Rao, M., Ryan, C. M., Shyamsundar, P., Tauli, J., Tumusiime, D. M., Vilaça, M., Watmough, G. R., Worsdell, T., and Zaehringer, J. G.: Social considerations are crucial to success in implementing the 30×30 global conservation target, Nat Ecol Evol, 7, 784–785, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-023-02048-2, 2023.

Schipper, E. L. F.: Maladaptation: When Adaptation to Climate Change Goes Very Wrong, One Earth, 3, 409–414, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.09.014, 2020.

Schneider, T., Kaul, C. M., and Pressel, K. G.: Solar geoengineering may not prevent strong warming from direct effects of CO2 on stratocumulus cloud cover, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 117, 30179–30185, https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2003730117, 2020.

Scoones, I., Leach, M., and Newell, P.: The Politics of Green Transformations, Routledge, 2015.

SEIA/Wood MacKenzie: US Solar Market Insight, Wood MacKenzie, Boston, Massachusetts, 2023.

Selig, E. R., Turner, W. R., Troëng, S., Wallace, B. P., Halpern, B. S., Kaschner, K., Lascelles, B. G., Carpenter, K. E., and Mittermeier, R. A.: Global Priorities for Marine Biodiversity Conservation, PLOS ONE, 9, e82898, https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0082898, 2014.

Shaxson, N.: The True Cost of Global Tax Havens, International Monetary Fund, Paris, France, 2019.

Sloterdijk, P.: You Must Change Your Life, Wiley, London, U.K., 2012.

Smallhorn-West, P. F., Weeks, R., Gurney, G., and Pressey, R. L.: Ecological and socioeconomic impacts of marine protected areas in the South Pacific: assessing the evidence base, Biodivers Conserv, 29, 349–380, https://doi.org/10.1007/s10531-019-01918-1, 2020.

Smith, S. R.: Towards an understanding of advocacy coalitions for rapid transition to net zero carbon in the United Kingdom, University of Surrey, https://doi.org/10.15126/thesis.900563, 2022.

Sorrell, S., Dimitropoulos, J., and Sommerville, M.: Empirical estimates of the direct rebound effect: A review, Energy Policy, 37, 1356–1371, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2008.11.026, 2009.

de Sousa Santos, B. (Ed.): Another Knowledge Is Possible, Verso, London, U.K., 2008.

de Souza, G. F. F.: Politcal Ecology of the Global South: The Amazon Fund, Journal on Innovation and Sustainability RISUS, 12, 4–15, https://doi.org/10.23925/2179-3565.2020v12i1p04-15, 2021.

Sovacool, B. K.: The precarious political economy of cobalt: Balancing prosperity, poverty, and brutality in artisanal and industrial mining in the Democratic Republic of the Congo, The Extractive Industries and Society, 6, 915–939, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.exis.2019.05.018, 2019.

Sovacool, B. K.: Reckless or righteous? Reviewing the sociotechnical benefits and risks of climate change geoengineering, Energy Strategy Reviews, 35, 100656, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esr.2021.100656, 2021.

Sovacool, B. K., Newell, P., Carley, S., and Fanzo, J.: Equity, technological innovation and sustainable behaviour in a low-carbon future, Nat Hum Behav, 6, 326–337, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41562-021-01257-8, 2022.

Sowman, M. and Sunde, J.: Social impacts of marine protected areas in South Africa on coastal fishing communities, Ocean & Coastal Management, 157, 168–179, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ocecoaman.2018.02.013, 2018.

Srinivasan, K. and Kasturirangan, R.: Political ecology, development, and human

Deleted: 30

exceptionalism, Geoforum, 75, 125–128, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2016.07.011, 2016.

Steele, P. and Patel, S.: Tackling the triple crisis. Using debt swaps to address debt, climate and nature loss post-COVID-19, International Institute for Environment and Development, London, 2020.

Steinberger, J. K., Lamb, W. F., and Sakai, M.: Your money or your life? The carbon-development paradox, Environ. Res. Lett., 15, 044016, https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/ab7461, 2020.

Stephens, J. C., Kashwan, P., McLaren, D., and Surprise, K.: The risks of solar geoengineering research, Science, 372, 1161–1161, https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abj3679, 2021.

Sterman, J. D.: All models are wrong: reflections on becoming a systems scientist, System Dynamics Review, 18, 501–531, https://doi.org/10.1002/sdr.261, 2002.

Stevis, D. and Felli, R.: Planetary just transition? How inclusive and how just?, Earth System Governance, 6, 100065, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2020.100065, 2020.

Stirling, A.: Keep it complex, Nature, 468, 1029–1031, https://doi.org/10.1038/4681029a, 2010.

Stone, L., Montes de Oca, G., and Christie, I.: A Commoners' Climate Movement, in: Addressing the Climate Crisis: Local action in theory and practice, edited by: Howarth, C., Lane, M., and Slevin, A., Springer International Publishing, Cham, 27–37, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-79739-3_3, 2022.

Sultana, F.: The unbearable heaviness of climate coloniality, Political Geography, 99, 102638, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2022.102638, 2022.

Sultana, F.: Political ecology III: Praxis - doing, undoing, and being in radical political ecology research, Progress in Human Geography, 03091325231157360, https://doi.org/10.1177/03091325231157360, 2023a.

Sultana, F.: Whose growth in whose planetary boundaries? Decolonising planetary justice in the Anthropocene, Geo: Geography and Environment, 10, e00128, https://doi.org/10.1002/geo2.128, 2023b.

Sumaila, U. R., Walsh, M., Hoareau, K., Cox, A., Teh, L., Abdallah, P., Akpalu, W., Anna, Z., Benzaken, D., Crona, B., Fitzgerald, T., Heaps, L., Issifu, I., Karousakis, K., Lange, G. M., Leland, A., Miller, D., Sack, K., Shahnaz, D., Thiele, T., Vestergaard, N., Yagi, N., and Zhang, J.: Financing a sustainable ocean economy, Nat Commun, 12, 3259, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-021-23168-y, 2021.

Systemiq: The Breakthrough Effect: How tipping points can accelerate net zero, Systemiq, The University of Exeter, Bezos Earth Fund, 2023.

Sze, J.: Sustainability: Approaches to Environmental Justice and Social Power., NYU Press, 2018.

Tàbara, J. D., Lieu, J., Zaman, R., Ismail, C., and Takama, T.: On the discovery and enactment of positive socio-ecological tipping points: insights from energy systems interventions in Bangladesh and Indonesia, Sustain Sci, 17, 565–571, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-021-01050-6, 2022.

Tarhule, A.: Part 4 - The Future of Water: Prospects and Challenges for Water Management in the 21st Century, in: Competition for Water Resources, edited by: Ziolkowska, J. R. and Peterson, J. M., Elsevier, 442–454, https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-803237-4.00025-2, 2017.

Torres Contreras, G. A.: Twenty-five years under the wind turbines in La Venta, Mexico: social difference, land control and agrarian change, The Journal of Peasant Studies, 49, 865–883, https://doi.org/10.1080/03066150.2021.1873293, 2022.

Trebeck, K. and Williams, J.: The economics of arrival: Ideas for a grown-up economy, 1st ed., Bristol University Press, https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvb1hrn9, 2019.

Tremmel, J. C.: A Theory of Intergenerational Justice, Earthscan, London, U.K., 2009.

UNEP: The financial system we need: Aligning the financial system with sustainable development, UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya, 2015.

UNEP: Sustainable Blue Finance: Mobilising Capital for a Sustainable Ocean, 2020.

Deleted: 31

Villasante, S., Macho, G., Silva, M. R. O., Lopes, P. F. M., Pita, P., Simón, A., Balsa, J. C. M., Olabarria, C., Vázquez, E., and Calvo, N.: Resilience and Social Adaptation to Climate Change Impacts in Small-Scale Fisheries, Frontiers in Marine Science, 9, 2022.

Wang, X. and Lo, K.: Just transition: A conceptual review, Energy Research & Social Science, 82, 102291, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2021.102291, 2021.

Whyte, K.: Too late for indigenous climate justice: Ecological and relational tipping points, Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Climate Change, 11, e603, https://doi.org/10.1002/wcc.603, 2020.

Whyte, K.: Time as Kinship, in: The Cambridge Companion to Environmental Humanities, edited by: Cohen, J. and Foote, S., Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2021.

Wiedmann, T., Lenzen, M., Keyßer, L. T., and Steinberger, J. K.: Scientists' warning on affluence, Nature Communications, 11, 1–10, https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-020-16941-y, 2020.

Willis, R.: Too Hot to Handle? The Democratic Challenge of Climate Change, Bristol University Press, Bristol, U.K., 2020.

Woodley, E., Barr, S., Stott, P., Thomet, P., Flint, S., Lovell, F., O'Malley, E., Plews, D., Rapley, C., Robbins, C., Pearce, R., and Sandover, R.: Climate Stories: enabling and sustaining arts interventions in climate science communication, Geosci. Commun., 5, 339–354, https://doi.org/10.5194/gc-5-339-2022, 2022.

Yusoff, K.: A Billion Black Anthropocenes or None, U of Minnesota Press, 157 pp., 2018.

Zhao, Q., Stephenson, F., Lundquist, C., Kaschner, K., Jayathilake, D., and Costello, M. J.: Where Marine Protected Areas would best represent 30% of ocean biodiversity, Biological Conservation, 244, 108536, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108536, 2020.

Zimm, C., Mintz-Woo, K., Brutschin, E., Hanger-Kopp, S., Hoffman, R., Kikstra, J. S., Kuhn, M., Min, J., Muttarak, R., Pachauri, S., Patange, O., Riahi, K., and Schinko, T.: Climate Justice Beyond Burden Sharing, Nature Climate Change, under review.

Zografos, C. and Robbins, P.: Green Sacrifice Zones, or Why a Green New Deal Cannot Ignore the Cost Shifts of Just Transitions, One Earth, 3, 543–546, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.oneear.2020.10.012, 2020.

Zucman, G.: Sanctions for Offshore Havens, Transparency at Home, New York Times, 7th April, 2016.

Zurba, M. and Bullock, R.: Bioenergy development and the implications for the social wellbeing of Indigenous peoples in Canada, Ambio, 49, 299–309, https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-019-01166-1, 2020.

Page 1: [1] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Authors

Page 1: [2] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Correspondence

Page 1: [3] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Footer

Page 1: [4] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Caption

Page 1: [5] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Equation

Page 1: [6] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Balloon Text

Page 1: [7] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Affiliation

Page 1: [8] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

MS title

Page 1: [9] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Copernicus_Word_template

Page 1: [10] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Name

Page 1: [11] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Kontakt

Page 1: [12] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Header

Page 1: [13] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Bullets

Page 1: [14] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Betreff

Page 1: [15] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Heading 4: Font: (Default) Arial, 12 pt, Not Bold, Font colour: Grey-60%, Left, Space Before: 14 pt, After: 4 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1,15 li, Keep lines together

Page 1: [16] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Heading 3: Font: (Default) Arial, 14 pt, Not Bold, Font colour: Custom Colour (RGB(67,67,67)), Left, Space Before: 16 pt, After: 4 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1,15 li, Keep lines together

Page 1: [17] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Heading 2: Font: (Default) Arial, 16 pt, Not Bold, Left, Space Before: 18 pt, After: 6 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1,15 li, Keep lines together

Page 1: [18] Style Definition   Admin   18/12/2023 12:45:00

Heading 1: Font: (Default) Arial, 20 pt, Not Bold, Font colour: Auto, Left, Space Before: 20 pt, After: 6 pt, Line spacing: Multiple 1,15 li, Keep lines together

Page 1: [19] Style Definition   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Normal: Font: (Default) Arial, 11 pt, Left, Line spacing: Multiple 1,15 li

Page 1: [20] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

▼

Page 1: [21] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Normal

Page 1: [22] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Left: 2,54 cm, Right: 2,54 cm, Top: 2,54 cm, Bottom: 2,54 cm, Width: 21,59 cm, Height: 27,94 cm, Header distance from edge: 1,27 cm, Footer distance from edge: 1,27 cm, From text: 0 cm

Page 1: [23] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Font: Bold, Font colour: Custom Colour (RGB(70,70,70))

Page 1: [24] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [25] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [26] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [27] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [28] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [29] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [30] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [31] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [32] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [33] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [34] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Not Superscript/ Subscript

Page 1: [35] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Font: Not Italic

Page 1: [36] Formatted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Font: Not Bold

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted   **Admin**   **18/12/2023 12:45:00**

Page 1: [37] Deleted	Admin	18/12/2023 12:45:00
Page 1: [37] Deleted	Admin	18/12/2023 12:45:00
Page 1: [37] Deleted	Admin	18/12/2023 12:45:00
Page 1: [37] Deleted	Admin	18/12/2023 12:45:00
Page 21: [38] Deleted	Admin	18/12/2023 12:45:00