Operation Hormuz: A Grand Strategy Hypothesis

What if the Middle East crisis is not a failure of diplomacy, but its culmination?

20 March 2026 40 min read

I thought I would start with a long first post…

> *"The statesman's task is to hear God's footstep marching through history, and to try and catch on to His coattails as He passes by."*
> — Otto von Bismarck
>
> *"America has no permanent friends or enemies, only interests."*
> — Henry Kissinger

Preface: A Thought Experiment

This paper is a speculative strategic analysis, not a statement of fact. It asks a single, uncomfortable question: **what if the current Middle East crisis is not an accident, a miscalculation, or a failure of diplomacy — but a deliberately engineered strategic outcome?**

The events unfolding since 28 February 2026 have the surface appearance of chaos. Looked at differently, they have the internal coherence of a chess endgame played several moves in advance. This paper maps that alternative reading, traces the historical precedents that make it plausible, examines the economic geometry that makes it attractive, and identifies the tells that would confirm or refute it.

It should be read as strategic fiction grounded in documented fact — a "what if" that demands serious engagement precisely because it cannot be easily dismissed.

Part One: The Precedent — Kissinger and the 1973 Oil Shock

To understand 2026, start in 1973.

On 6 October 1973, Egypt and Syria launched a coordinated surprise attack on Israeli positions along the Suez Canal and the Golan Heights. What followed was not merely a regional war. It became the hinge point of postwar global economic architecture — and the United States, despite appearing to be on the back foot, emerged from it with its strategic position dramatically strengthened.

The oil embargo launched by OAPEC in October 1973 sent the price of crude from approximately **$3 per barrel to nearly $12** within months — a near 300% increase that shocked Western economies into recession, generated long fuel queues, introduced rationing, and fundamentally altered the relationship between energy, money, and geopolitics. (Wikipedia: 1973 Oil Crisis)

The conventional narrative treats this as a crisis the United States suffered. The more interesting reading is that Henry Kissinger — Nixon's Secretary of State and arguably the most strategically sophisticated American statesman of the twentieth century — saw the crisis as an opportunity to be shaped rather than merely survived.

What emerged from 1973 was not a defeat. It was the **petrodollar system**.

In a series of meetings through 1974, the Nixon and Ford administrations negotiated a foundational agreement with Saudi Arabia: the Saudis would price all oil exports in US dollars, invest their surplus oil revenues in US Treasury securities, and receive American military protection in return. By 1975, every OPEC nation had joined the arrangement. (LegalClarity: The Kissinger Petrodollar System)

The consequences were transformative. Every nation on earth that wished to purchase oil — which meant every industrial nation on earth — was now required to hold US dollars. Global demand for the dollar became structurally self-sustaining. As one analysis describes it: *"The term petrodollar recycling was coined by Henry Kissinger. The petrodollar recycling system elevated the US dollar to the world's reserve currency and brought massive advantages to the US."* (Great Power Relations: Birth of the Petrodollar)

Meanwhile, the oil shock had other geopolitical side effects that served American interests:

- Japan, devastated by its near-total import dependency, permanently reoriented its economy away from oil-intensive heavy industry toward electronics and fuel-efficient manufacturing — and deepened its security dependence on the United States for energy protection.
- The Arab oil states, suddenly flush with petrodollars they could not productively invest domestically, funnelled their surpluses through American and European banks, enriching Wall Street while creating a structural Arab dependency on Western financial infrastructure.
- The Soviet Union benefited short-term from high oil prices — but this masked an underlying fragility. When prices collapsed in the 1980s, that revenue stream vanished, contributing materially to the Soviet collapse of

1989.

The lesson Kissinger drew — and that his intellectual heirs absorbed — is that **a well-managed energy crisis can be more strategically productive than its absence.** Disruption, channelled correctly, creates dependency relationships that persist for generations.

This is the historical template against which the events of 2026 must be read.

Part Two: The Current Crisis — Facts on the Ground

On 28 February 2026, the United States and Israel launched coordinated strikes on Iran under Operation Epic Fury, targeting military facilities, nuclear sites, and leadership. Supreme Leader Ali Khamenei was killed in the initial strikes.

On 2 March, a senior IRGC official declared the Strait of Hormuz closed to US, Israeli, and Western-aligned shipping. The closure was immediately material: the Strait carries approximately **20% of the world's daily oil supply and significant volumes of liquefied natural gas**. Brent crude, priced at approximately $65 per barrel before the war began, surpassed $100 on 8 March — a move the benchmark had not made in four years — and reached $126 per barrel at its peak. (Wikipedia: 2026 Strait of Hormuz Crisis)

The closure has been described as **the largest disruption to the energy supply since the 1970s energy crisis** — a description that should not pass unremarked.

War risk insurance was removed from Strait transits by 5 March, making the economic cost prohibitive for commercial shipping. The United States Navy began escorting vessels through the Strait, effectively nationalising the insurance function through military deployment — at a cost the Pentagon has requested over $200 billion from Congress to fund.

Iran has used cluster munitions against Israel — confirmed by AP footage showing missiles releasing submunitions over Israeli territory — presenting intercept challenges that Israeli air defences were not fully optimised to handle. In response, Israel escalated to striking Iranian oil and gas infrastructure: first the fuel depots in Tehran, then, in a significant threshold crossing, the South Pars gas field — the world's largest natural gas reserve. Iran retaliated by threatening five named Gulf Arab energy facilities in Saudi Arabia, the UAE, and Qatar.

The energy infrastructure of the Middle East — the material basis of the global oil economy — is now a declared target on both sides.

Part Three: The Strategic Geometry

3.1 Who Does This Hurt?

The closure of Hormuz and the destruction of ME oil infrastructure hurts everyone. But it does not hurt everyone equally. Strategic analysis requires asking who it hurts *least* — and who it might, perversely, benefit.

China receives approximately 45% of its oil through the Strait of Hormuz. (Al Jazeera, March 2026) This is not a marginal dependency — it is existential. Chinese manufacturing cost advantages, which underpin its export-led economic model and its capacity to fund military expansion, are built on a foundation of cheap imported energy. A sustained Hormuz disruption degrades that foundation in ways that no trade tariff or technology restriction could replicate.

Japan receives the overwhelming majority of its energy imports via Hormuz. Its manufacturing sector, its trade surplus, and its economic autonomy are all conditional on those flows remaining uninterrupted. A Japan dependent on US naval escort for its energy supply is a Japan deeply embedded in American strategic alignment — which is precisely the relationship the United States has sought since 1973.

Russia is structurally insulated: its energy production is inland and domestic. High oil prices boost Russian export revenues. But Russia cannot serve as a replacement supplier for the global market without demanding massive political concessions — specifically, territorial recognition in Ukraine and potentially beyond. Any Western government that turns to Russia is paying in sovereignty rather than cash. This means the Russia valve stays closed.

Europe suffers significantly but lacks the military capacity to independently resolve the situation. European suffering drives European security dependence on the United States and accelerates the energy transition investments that were always the long-term strategic necessity.

The United States is the most insulated large economy. It is now effectively energy independent through domestic shale production and potential Western Hemisphere supplies. Its Navy is the only force capable of escorting shipping through the Strait. Its dollar is the currency in which oil is priced globally. Its Gulf Coast refineries are specifically configured for the alternative supply source that is already being prepared.

3.2 The Shale Windfall

US shale production has a breakeven range. According to Dallas Fed Energy Survey data, the average new well breakeven in the Permian Basin — the heart of US shale — sits at approximately **$62 per barrel**. (Statista / Dallas Fed, 2024) Some highly efficient operators like Diamondback Energy have driven their breakeven as low as **$37 per barrel** through drilling technology improvements.

With Brent at $108 and climbing, every barrel of US shale production is generating extraordinary margin. At $100+ oil, the US shale industry is not merely profitable — it is generating the kind of returns that fund rapid

capacity expansion. The tight oil sector historically achieves a payback time of just **two years** at an average $70 oil price (Rystad Energy) — at $108 that timeline compresses dramatically.

The United States is, right now, running the largest involuntary wealth transfer from energy-importing economies to energy-exporting ones since 1973. And this time, the United States is itself the primary beneficiary of that transfer.

3.3 The Venezuelan Pre-Position

This is where the hypothesis becomes most specific — and most verifiable.

Venezuela holds the **world's largest proven oil reserves**. Its Orinoco Belt produces heavy sour crude of a type that requires specialised refinery infrastructure to process — specifically, the deep conversion coking capacity that US Gulf Coast refineries were deliberately built to handle.

The physical and historical record here is unambiguous. As Reuters reported in early 2026: *"Refineries along the US Gulf Coast from Corpus Christi, Texas to Pascagoula, Mississippi are configured to run the heavy sour, corrosive crude oil produced by Venezuela."* Beginning in the 1990s, these refineries were specifically reconfigured with increased coking capacity to process Venezuelan heavy crude. As one refinery consultant stated plainly: *"Some units were designed to run Venezuelan crude. They will always run best on this crude compared to other feedstock."* (Energy Intelligence, January 2026)

Venezuela was once supplying **1.4 million barrels per day** to the United States — at its peak in 1997, it was America's single largest foreign oil supplier. (US EIA) That relationship was broken by Chávez's nationalisation programme and subsequent sanctions. The infrastructure on the American side — the refineries, the port facilities, the supply chain logistics — never went away. It was repurposed for Canadian heavy crude but remains fully capable of reverting.

Now trace the sequence of Trump administration decisions:

- **January 2026**: Trump meets oil executives and pitches Venezuelan oil investment. The meeting is publicly unsuccessful — ExxonMobil CEO Darren Woods calls Venezuela "uninvestable," citing billions lost to previous nationalisations.
- **January 2026**: Venezuelan sanctions quietly begin to ease. Crude exports to the US resume. Chevron, the only company with an approved Venezuelan production licence, begins moving volumes.
- **February 2026**: Operation Epic Fury launches.
- **March 2026**: Hormuz closes. Oil hits $108+.
- **March 2026**: Treasury Department eases Venezuelan sanctions further, explicitly citing the need to boost world oil supply. (PBS NewsHour)

Each step has a plausible innocent explanation. The sequence, at pace, with the Gulf Coast refinery infrastructure already pre-positioned, is harder to explain as coincidence.

S&P Global CERA estimated that PADD 3 refiners — the Gulf Coast corridor — could absorb an additional **300,000 to 400,000 barrels per day** of heavy Venezuelan crude simply by raising coking utilisation to 2024 levels, without capital expenditure. (S&P Global, January 2026) With sustained investment, Venezuela's production could ultimately return toward its historical peak of **3.5 million barrels per day** — though Rystad Energy estimates this would require up to $183 billion over fifteen years and is a decade-plus project. (OilPrice.com)

Venezuela is, therefore, the designed Western Hemisphere bridge fuel — already underway, geographically insulated from Hormuz risk, and specifically compatible with the processing infrastructure the United States built for precisely this crude type.

Part Four: The Israeli Dimension

Israel's strategic problem is not primarily military. It is financial.

For decades, the existential threats to Israel — Hamas, Hezbollah, Iranian proxy networks throughout the region — have been sustained by petrodollar patronage. Iranian oil revenues fund Hezbollah's military infrastructure in Lebanon. Qatari money flows toward Hamas political operations. Saudi charitable networks, however indirectly, have funded Salafist movements. The Islamic world's capacity to threaten Israel is, at its root, a function of oil wealth.

A Middle East in which oil infrastructure is destroyed and revenue streams are severed is not merely a weaker threat environment. It is a structurally different threat environment — one in which the patronage model that sustains proxy warfare becomes operationally impossible.

No money, no rockets. No oil revenues, no decade-long tunnel construction projects. No petrodollars recycling through Beirut banks, no Hezbollah precision missile programme.

Israel has consistently resisted pressures to limit its strikes on Iranian infrastructure. The Trump administration initially objected to strikes on oil depots in Tehran. But the strike on South Pars — the world's largest gas field — was coordinated with and approved by the White House. An Israeli official described it as *"a signal of what could come next"* if Iran continued disrupting Hormuz shipping. (Axios, March 2026)

The strategic logic from Israel's perspective, plainly stated, is this: the fastest route to a generation of security is not killing every enemy, but **bankrupting the entire patronage system simultaneously**. A Hezbollah without Iranian money is a militia without precision weapons and without the construction budget to rebuild. A Hamas

without Qatari backing is a political movement without a military wing. An Iran without oil revenue is a large country with a revolutionary ideology and no means to export it.

Israel buys itself thirty years of relative security not through military victory but through economic collapse of the adversary ecosystem. This is not incidental to the current campaign. It may be its primary strategic purpose.

Part Five: The China Encirclement

The geometry of the current crisis, viewed from Washington, produces a remarkable map of Chinese strategic exposure.

Energy: 45% of Chinese oil transits Hormuz. The closure or disruption of that route forces China to seek alternative supplies at premium prices, paying for energy in dollars (reinforcing dollar hegemony), through routes it cannot militarily protect, from suppliers it cannot politically control.

Belt and Road: Chinese infrastructure investments throughout the Middle East — ports, pipelines, industrial zones — are now stranded in an active war zone. The geopolitical returns on those investments have evaporated.

Iranian client: Iran, China's primary ME strategic partner and a significant oil supplier, is half-destroyed. China is actively lobbying Iran to allow Chinese vessels through the Strait — a position of supplicant, not patron. (Al Jazeera, March 2026)

Venezuelan client: Venezuela, previously a Chinese debt-client whose oil was flowing primarily to Chinese refineries, is being systematically reintegrated into the US economic orbit. Chinese refiners who received discounted Venezuelan Orinoco crude now face losing that supply as Gulf Coast refineries — built specifically for this crude grade — outbid them.

Japan: Japanese energy import dependency, already acute, is now existential. A Japan that relies on US naval escorts for its industrial energy supply is a Japan that cannot afford strategic ambiguity in the US-China competition. The latitude for Japanese hedging between the two great powers narrows dramatically.

In a single crisis, China has lost strategic leverage across energy supply, regional infrastructure investment, its primary ME client, its Venezuela oil deal flow, and its most important Asian competitor's freedom of manoeuvre. None of these losses require a Chinese military response that China is currently capable of executing. They simply accumulate as structural disadvantages.

Part Six: The Energy Transition Forcing Function

The green energy transition has been structurally dependent on one implicit assumption: that cheap imported fossil fuels would remain available as the bridge fuel while renewables and nuclear scaled. Policy timelines, investment models, and political narratives were all built on that foundation.

That assumption died in the Strait of Hormuz.

The forced transition now underway is not the gentle, managed glide path that energy policy planners modelled. It is a demand-destruction-driven scramble in which governments that delayed transition investment now face the consequences simultaneously and without runway.

For the United States, this creates a paradox that is strategically attractive rather than merely painful: the crisis that forces the transition also enriches the domestic energy industry that funds the transition. Shale profits at $100+ oil finance the capital expenditure for the next generation of US energy infrastructure — both continued fossil fuel production and the clean energy build-out. The United States is uniquely positioned to run both simultaneously.

For the UK specifically: North Sea production peaked in 1999 and 2025 output represents approximately **20% of year 2000 levels**, with further decline projected. Without serious government intervention, the sector faces the prospect of the UK depending on imports for **almost 80% of its oil and gas needs within the decade**. (Parliament POST, 2026) The UK produced a record-low total energy output in 2024, with more than 40% of its requirement met by imports.

The UK's first small modular reactors, to be built by Rolls-Royce at Wylfa in Anglesey under the Great British Energy–Nuclear programme, are targeted for **mid-2030s grid connection** — with a final investment decision not expected until 2029 and site activity only beginning in 2026. (GOV.UK, June 2025) The Rolls-Royce 470 MWe pressurised water reactor design — itself using technology proven in Royal Navy submarines — targets a 500-day construction time per unit, with an overall four-year build including site preparation. Three units at Wylfa would deliver approximately 1.4 GW — enough to power around three million homes. That is not nothing. But it is not enough, and it arrives a decade from now.

The hydrogen economy that abundant SMR baseload eventually enables — for transport, heating, and industrial processes — is structurally a 2040s story. The sequencing runs: SMR fleet operational by mid-2030s → surplus baseload economics enable electrolytic hydrogen at scale → hydrogen infrastructure buildout for transport and heating through the late 2030s and 2040s. The whole chain runs roughly fifteen to twenty years from today.

Between now and then lies what might charitably be called the **decade of managed hardship**. Supply chains that assumed cheap, globally available transport fuel will reprice. Electricity costs will rise 20-50% as gas-fired generation becomes expensive and the grid struggles to absorb the pace of change. Inflation driven by energy input costs will work through every sector of the economy — food, manufacturing, logistics, construction — with a lag of roughly three to six months as contracts roll over and suppliers reprice.

The political response to this in democracies is historically predictable. Populations that were abstractly committed to green transition principles when the costs were marginal discover those commitments have limits when heating becomes unaffordable and petrol prices force lifestyle changes. The parties that promise the lights will stay on — by whatever means — gain power. The parties that offer ideological purity in the dark lose it. Germany's 2022 coal restart, undertaken quietly and without serious public backlash, is the template. A UK government that in 2025 would not consider coal as even a transitional option may find by 2028 that the political arithmetic has changed entirely.

This is not a counsel of despair. Populations who have actually lived through genuine energy austerity — those who remember the three-day week, the power cuts, the ration books — understand that hardship is survivable and that people adapt with remarkable pragmatism when there is no alternative. The gap between the supply chain crisis arriving in months and the energy transition delivering in decades is filled by managed hardship, demand destruction, and the rediscovery of resilience practices that the postwar consumer economy had allowed to atrophy. In the United Kingdom, that rediscovery will feel less foreign to those who have lived through it before. It is the generation that has never experienced it — and was never expected to — that will need the most preparation.

Part Seven: The British Response — A North Sea Transition Doctrine

7.1 The Paradox Britain Has Built for Itself

The Hormuz crisis has exposed a contradiction at the heart of British energy policy that can no longer be managed quietly. The United Kingdom sits atop an estimated 7.5 billion barrels of oil equivalent in extractable North Sea reserves. It possesses the world's most advanced small modular reactor programme, a fusion research lead of at least a decade over any comparable Western nation, and the institutional and engineering capability to execute a credible thirty-year transition to sovereign clean energy. It has done everything except make the strategically coherent decision that connects these assets into a single purposeful plan.

Instead, it has contrived through a combination of punitive taxation and regulatory hostility to discourage extraction of the asset it owns, while simultaneously lacking the capital to fund the transition that would make that asset irrelevant. This is not a policy position. It is an accident of political cycles masquerading as one.

The crisis changes the arithmetic. It also provides the political cover to change the policy.

7.2 The Fiscal Self-Destruction of the Current Regime

The Energy Profits Levy — introduced by the Conservatives in 2022 and extended by Labour through 2030 — applies a combined marginal rate of 78% on North Sea operators. The intent was to capture windfall profits during elevated prices. The outcome has been their destruction.

Government receipts collapsed from £9.8 billion in 2022-23 to £4.5 billion in 2024-25 — a 54% decline in two years — with projections heading below £3 billion in 2026. This is the Laffer curve operating in its most mechanical form: a rate so punitive that it has shrunk the tax base faster than it extracts from what remains.

The collateral damage is severe. North Sea investment fell below $3.5 billion in 2026 — its lowest real-terms level since the 1970s. 2025 was the first year since 1960 without a single exploration well drilled in British offshore waters. Not one. Companies including Apache Corporation have announced complete basin exit by 2030. Ineos, Serica, and others have characterised the UK as the most fiscally unstable petroleum jurisdiction on earth — not relative to Norway or the Gulf, but globally.

Meanwhile, on the Norwegian side of the same geological basin, $26.9 billion in upstream investment is flowing in 2026 alone. Norway's 2020 tax incentive package produced record investment over three consecutive years. Same rock. Different policy. Entirely different outcome.

The current UK approach achieves the worst possible configuration: declining revenue, accelerating production collapse, no new reserves being developed, and an increasingly stranded asset base whose decommissioning liability will eventually return to the taxpayer anyway — without the production revenue to offset it.

7.3 The Resource Economics of Deliberate Extraction

The argument for maximum-rate extraction during this window is not an argument for fossil fuel dependency. It is an argument from resource economics: the asset is finite, its market value is at or near its historical peak, and the window for extraction at high margin closes in only one direction. To leave it in the ground is not environmentalism. It is waste of the most strategically consequential kind.

Three premises underpin the case.

The asset is time-limited by both geology and market. After 2026, the North Sea basin enters a natural decline trajectory so steep that no realistic licensing programme can reverse it. Fields not developed in the next five to seven years will not be developed at commercial scale. The question is not whether to extract — it is whether to extract deliberately and fund something meaningful with the proceeds, or to allow the asset to strand passively while importing at elevated cost from markets the Hormuz crisis has rendered structurally unreliable.

Oil's role in the global energy system is narrowing to chemistry, not combustion. Within twenty to twenty-five years, petroleum's primary value will not be as a fuel. It will be as the feedstock for plastics, pharmaceuticals, synthetic fibres, lubricants, and advanced materials that cannot currently be sourced elsewhere at scale. A barrel that is worth £100 today as a combustion fuel is worth a multiple of that in 2045 as a chemical

precursor in a world that has largely electrified its transport and heating. Extracting it now at peak combustion value, rather than leaving it to be extracted later at chemical premium, requires a view about which window of value is larger. The case for now is strong.

The transition requires capital that only the asset can generate at the required scale and speed. The SMR programme, the STEP fusion plant, the hydrogen infrastructure build-out, and the grid hardening required to absorb electrification of transport and heating collectively require tens of billions in sustained public investment over a decade. The current fiscal position — debt at 98% of GDP, bond markets sensitised after the 2022 Truss episode, interest rates elevated — means this capital cannot be borrowed cheaply. It must be earned. The North Sea, at current margins, is the only domestic source capable of generating it at the required rate.

7.4 The North Sea Transition Doctrine

The policy architecture that follows from this analysis has four components, each interlocking and each time-constrained.

Component One: Rate reduction and basin reopening. Cut the Energy Profits Levy from 78% effective marginal rate to approximately 40%, immediately reinstate investment allowances, and reopen the licensing programme. The mechanism here is not generosity to operators — it is recognition that a lower rate applied to a larger, growing production base generates more total revenue than a higher rate applied to a collapsing one. Norway demonstrated this conclusively. The immediate effect of a credible rate reduction and licensing reopening would be a substantial reversal of the operator capital flight that has characterised the last three years. Shut-in wells — of which there are approximately 200 with meaningful production potential — can be restored to production within months. New field development requires longer lead times, but the investment decision clock starts the moment fiscal certainty is restored.

Component Two: The North Sea Transition Endowment. The incremental revenue generated by higher production at elevated oil prices — the windfall above a defined baseline — is ringfenced by statute into a sovereign capital fund with a single permitted use: funding the SMR fleet, the STEP fusion programme, green hydrogen infrastructure, and grid reinforcement. This is not a discretionary allocation subject to Spending Review negotiation. It is a statutory earmark, protected from Treasury reallocation, with a legislative sunset clause tied to SMR grid connection milestones. The political framing is crucial: this is not a pro-fossil-fuel policy. It is a strategic mobilisation of a time-limited asset to fund permanent energy sovereignty. The same political logic that justified North Sea revenue funding the Welfare State in the 1980s — without a transition fund — applies here with considerably more justification.

Component Three: A decommissioning bond requirement. Any operator receiving the benefit of the reduced rate and reopened licensing must post a decommissioning bond as a condition of licence, sized to cover their proportionate share of eventual field abandonment and infrastructure removal costs. The current regime has allowed private equity entrants to extract production value while progressively offloading decommissioning liability toward the state. The new regime makes liability follow the licence. This is not punitive — it is the basic commercial discipline that should always have applied.

Component Four: The ten-year clock. The policy is explicitly framed as a decade-long programme with a defined end state. Licensing rounds are authorised for ten years. The reduced rate is guaranteed for ten years and then subject to review against the SMR deployment schedule. The transition fund has a ten-year accumulation phase and a twenty-year deployment phase. The political commitment is to the clock, not to the commodity — which insulates the government from the accusation of ideological retreat on climate, while making the investment case legible to operators who need multi-year fiscal certainty to commit capital.

7.5 The SMR and Fusion Bridge

The SMR programme is further advanced than public discourse acknowledges.

Rolls-Royce SMR received regulatory justification approval on 13 March 2026 — the first such approval for any SMR design in the UK. The Generic Design Assessment Step 3 detailed assessment is due for completion in August 2026. Site activity at Wylfa has already begun. If licensing completes on schedule, first concrete could be poured in 2027, with first power from a four-year construction timeline by 2031. Three initial units deliver approximately 1.4 GW. Wylfa has been assessed as capable of hosting up to eight units — approximately 3.8 GW from a single site. That is meaningful baseload, and it arrives within the decade.

The fusion programme is the longer bridge. The STEP prototype at West Burton — built on the site of a former coal power station, a fossil-to-fusion transition made physical — targets first operations in 2040, backed by £2.5 billion over five years. The UK is the first country to establish a market framework for commercial fusion electricity, a regulatory infrastructure no other nation has yet built. The AI supercomputer at Culham, operational by June 2026, is the most powerful fusion-dedicated compute system in the world. Private fusion companies — Tokamak Energy and others — are raising capital and generating revenue from fusion-derived technologies today. The sector is not a research aspiration. It is an emerging industry.

The sequencing from here to energy sovereignty runs approximately: North Sea production recovery through 2026-2033, funding the endowment. SMR fleet delivering baseload from 2031 onward, progressively displacing gas-fired generation. Surplus SMR baseload enabling green hydrogen electrolysis at commercial scale through the late 2030s. STEP validating fusion net energy by 2040, enabling the commercial fleet planning that makes the 2040s the decade of genuine transition completion. Hydrogen filling the transport and industrial heat gaps that direct electrification cannot reach.

The decade of managed hardship described elsewhere in this paper is real and unavoidable. But it has a credible end state, a funded pathway, and a technology programme that is already in motion. The missing piece is the political decision to connect the asset that funds the transition to the programme that executes it.

7.6 The Tell for Britain

If this doctrine is adopted — even partially, even under the political cover the Middle East crisis now provides — the tell is straightforward: a Spending Review announcement that reduces the EPL rate, reinstates investment allowances, and establishes a statutory North Sea Transition Endowment with ring-fenced deployment terms.

Secondary tells include an accelerated Wylfa contracting timeline, a STEP construction partner announcement ahead of schedule, and a renewed offshore licensing round framed explicitly as a transition-funding measure rather than an energy security measure.

If those things do not occur, the United Kingdom will enter the decade of managed hardship without a funded transition programme, with a stranded North Sea asset generating neither production nor revenue, and with the SMR and fusion programmes dependent on general Spending Review allocations that compete annually with the NHS, defence, and debt service. That is not a strategy. It is drift — and at the speed events are moving in the Strait of Hormuz, drift is no longer survivable.

The propane was bought in October 2024. The decisions that determine whether the UK catches Bismarck's coattails or watches history pass by need to be made in the next eighteen months.

Part Eight: The Invisible Siege — London's Insurance Market and the Transfer of Risk

Before examining the architecture of the hypothesis itself, there is a dimension of the current crisis that has received insufficient strategic analysis: **the role of the London insurance market, and what the US response to its withdrawal reveals about the deeper power dynamics at play**.

8.1 How Seven Letters Closed the Strait

The Strait of Hormuz was not physically closed by Iranian mines or naval blockade. It was closed by paperwork.

Between 1 and 2 March 2026, transit volumes through the Strait fell by 81% — not because the IRGC had physically obstructed the waterway, but because the International Group of Protection and Indemnity Clubs, whose member clubs collectively insure approximately **90% of the world's ocean-going tonnage**, issued 72-hour cancellation notices for war risk coverage in Iranian waters, the Gulf of Oman, and all adjacent areas. (Windward Maritime AI, March 2026)

As one analyst described it: the closure was achieved not by military force but through *"fear tactics and psychological warfare"* — and the insurance market did the rest. Without a valid P&I certificate, a vessel cannot be chartered. Without a charter, cargo cannot be financed. Without cargo financing, voyages cannot proceed. The kill-switch for global energy commerce was not a weapon. It was a clause in a reinsurance contract.

The Joint War Committee of the Lloyd's Market Association expanded its list of high-risk areas to include Bahrain, Djibouti, Kuwait, Oman, and Qatar. War risk Additional Premiums for Hormuz transits surged from

approximately **0.2% to as much as 1% of a vessel's hull value per transit**. For a Very Large Crude Carrier — a supertanker — that represents a per-voyage insurance cost rising from roughly **$100,000 to over $400,000**. Cargo insurance rose 150-200%. Hull and machinery cover increased 80-120%. (The Middle East Insider, March 2026)

By 16 March, vessel crossing data showed just **two transits** through the Strait in a single day — against a pre-crisis historical average of approximately 138. An estimated **20,000 seafarers** remained stranded on vessels unable to move, with the Lloyd's Market Association estimating the value of ships currently trapped in the Persian Gulf at **at least $25 billion**. (Insurance Journal, March 2026)

8.2 Lloyd's Caught Between Markets and Geopolitics

Lloyd's of London occupies a unique structural position in this crisis. Writing approximately **£65 billion in annual gross premiums** across its syndicate structure — with marine, aviation, and transport representing a core historic competency dating to Edward Lloyd's coffee house in 1688 — it is the world's primary market for exactly the specialist risks that Hormuz has repriced. (Lloyd's Wikipedia; Lloyd's Half Year Results 2025)

The institution faces a structural dilemma. Marine war risk is, in normal times, a profitable niche — premiums are relatively low, losses infrequent, and the political risk that drives events is historically mean-reverting. But the system was already under stress before Hormuz. Twenty-six months of Houthi attacks on Red Sea shipping had driven war risk premiums for the Bab al-Mandab from 0.05% to 1.0% of hull value — a twentyfold increase — while simultaneously draining the capital reserves supporting the war risk pool as rerouting reduced premium income even as residual claims continued. The Hormuz crisis hit an insurance market already hollowed out by attritional Red Sea losses. (Shanaka Anslempera Substack: The Invisible Siege)

Lloyd's CEO Patrick Tiernan has publicly insisted that coverage remains available — *"on a case-by-case basis reflecting the perception of risk"* — and that marine war risk remains *"a relatively small part of the broader insurance industry."* The Lloyd's Market Association has confirmed that war risk can still be written on individual voyage terms. (Insurance Journal: Lloyd's CEO, March 2026)

UK Chancellor Rachel Reeves has met directly with Lloyd's Chair Charles Roxburgh to discuss maritime insurance for Hormuz passage, with the UK government signalling willingness to play a supporting role. This is politically revealing: the UK government is effectively being drawn into underwriting a military conflict's commercial consequences — exposure that has no defined ceiling.

8.3 The American Seizure of the Insurance Function

This is where the strategic hypothesis gains its sharpest edge.

Faced with a London market unable or unwilling to fully backstop Hormuz shipping at viable commercial rates, the Trump administration did not attempt to negotiate a multinational solution or engage the IMO's existing

frameworks. It moved with striking speed to **nationalise the insurance function through American state capital**.

On 6 March, the US International Development Finance Corporation announced a $20 billion maritime reinsurance facility. On 11 March, Chubb — an American insurer, despite its Swiss corporate structure — was named as lead underwriter. The facility would cover hull and machinery, cargo, and environmental damage on a rolling basis, coordinated directly with US Central Command. (DFC Press Release, March 2026; CNBC, March 2026)

The DFC's primary mandate, prior to this action, was economic development investment in emerging markets. Its use as a war risk reinsurer represents, as one analyst described it, *"a profound departure"* from its institutional purpose — repurposed at speed to fill a gap that the London market, constrained by Solvency II capital requirements and private actuarial logic, could not fill commercially. (CBS News, March 2026)

Moody's Ratings has noted a critical flaw: the facility covers hull and machinery and cargo but **excludes P&I liability cover** — the third-party liability insurance that covers crew death, pollution, and collision damage, and which is arguably the more important class for most operators' legal and commercial purposes. Without P&I coverage, many shipowners remain operationally blocked regardless of hull cover availability. (Insurance Journal, March 2026)

8.4 What This Means for the City of London

The strategic implications for London — and specifically the City — are significant and run in two directions simultaneously.

The immediate loss: Marine war risk premium flows that would in normal times route through Lloyd's syndicates are being captured by an American government facility backed by American capital and an American insurer. This is not merely a short-term revenue loss. It is a demonstration that the US can substitute American sovereign capital for London commercial capital as the backstop for global shipping risk — and do so rapidly, unilaterally, and without negotiation.

The longer structural exposure: A prolonged Hormuz crisis, or escalating attacks on Gulf Arab energy infrastructure, will generate insurance claims of a scale not seen since 9/11. The Lloyd's market's total capital, reserves, and subordinated loan notes stood at approximately **£43.8 billion** at mid-2025. With the LMA estimating $25 billion of vessel value trapped in the Gulf alone — before hull damage claims, cargo losses, or third-party liabilities from environmental incidents — the exposure is not trivially small relative to available capital. (Lloyd's Half Year Results 2025)

The City's broader exposure: Lloyd's is not an island in the City's financial ecosystem. P&I clubs, reinsurance brokers (Aon, Marsh, WTW — all with major London operations), energy traders, commodity finance banks, and shipping financiers are all facing simultaneous repricing events across marine, political risk, energy, and commodity lines. The London market's competitive advantage has always been its concentration of specialist

expertise and its capacity to price genuinely novel risks. A crisis that reprices everything simultaneously, that exhausts war risk capital reserves, and that prompts American sovereign intervention as a substitute for commercial underwriting — this is precisely the scenario that tests whether that concentration of expertise can be monetised or whether it simply accumulates liability.

8.5 The Strategic Reading

Viewed through the hypothesis's lens, the insurance dynamic is not incidental. It is elegantly functional.

London's withdrawal from Hormuz war risk underwriting — driven by actuarial logic, Solvency II capital requirements, and the precedent of two years of Red Sea attrition — **created a vacuum that only American sovereign capital could fill**. The DFC-Chubb facility then made the US the effective insurer of last resort for global energy commerce. Every nation that needs oil through Hormuz now depends not merely on the US Navy for physical protection but on the US government for the financial architecture that makes commercial transit possible at all.

This is the Kissinger petrodollar insight replicated at the insurance layer. In 1973, the dollar became structurally necessary because oil was priced in it. In 2026, American sovereign backing is becoming structurally necessary because the private war risk market cannot function at this threat level without it. The dependency is different in mechanism but identical in strategic effect: access to global energy commerce now runs through Washington.

That Texas congressman's complaint — *"this certainly looks like the United States will be subsidizing and protecting oil shipments to China"* — misses the point entirely. The United States is not subsidising China's oil supply. It is inserting itself as the indispensable intermediary for China's oil supply, at a moment of its own choosing, on terms it controls. That is not a cost. That is leverage.

Part Nine: The Master Plan That Doesn't Need a Master

The most important thing to understand about this hypothesis is that **it does not require a single architect**.

Kissinger's genius in 1973 was not omniscience. He was not in a room somewhere directing an oil embargo. He was reading the strategic landscape, identifying what the crisis made possible, and ensuring the United States positioned itself to capture the benefit rather than merely absorb the cost.

The same dynamic is available to a distributed set of strategically aligned actors in 2026:

- **NSC and State Department officials** who read Kissinger seriously, understand the 1973 template, and have spent careers thinking about Chinese energy dependency and dollar hegemony.

- **Israeli strategic planners** who have spent decades modelling the patronage network that sustains their adversaries and understand that its financial destruction is more durable than military attrition.
- **US energy sector executives** who lobbied for Venezuelan sanctions relief, understand their refinery configurations intimately, and whose financial modelling at $100+ oil shows extraordinary returns.
- **A president** who makes individually transactional decisions — "we're putting Iran out of business," Venezuelan sanctions relief framed as a migration deal — without necessarily seeing or seeking to see the whole picture.

Each actor is making locally rational decisions. The decisions aggregate into a strategy that none of them individually owns or articulates. This is, historically, how American grand strategy has actually functioned at its most effective. It is distributed strategic consensus among a small number of serious people, executed through political leadership that provides the action without requiring the theory.

The tells to watch for — the observations that would confirm this reading rather than the conventional chaos narrative:

1. **Venezuelan oil investment accelerates dramatically** with US institutional backing (Export-Import Bank, DFC development finance) over the next six months.
2. **The IRGC is never fully destroyed** despite the US having the intelligence and strike capability to finish them — the mining capability is preserved at a level of nuisance rather than existential threat.
3. **Gulf Coast refinery throughput of Venezuelan crude climbs steadily** even as Hormuz remains partially disrupted.
4. **Japan deepens security commitments** to the United States in explicit exchange for energy escort guarantees.
5. **China's economic data begins showing energy-cost stress** in manufacturing sector margins within twelve months.

If these five things occur, the hypothesis moves from "interesting speculation" to "strong circumstantial case."

Part Ten: The Uncomfortable Complications

Intellectual honesty requires equal treatment of the hypothesis's vulnerabilities.

The blowback problem: A half-alive IRGC retains terrorism capability. Iranian-directed assassination plots on European and American soil have been documented throughout the 2020s and do not require oil revenue to

execute — only motivated personnel and modest logistics. Broken states are historically more likely to export terrorism than wealthy ones with something to lose.

The China response problem: Beijing is not passive. China has sufficient leverage over Iran to potentially carve out a parallel supply arrangement outside the Hormuz disruption — Iranian oil flowing to China via non-standard routes, settled in yuan, outside the dollar system. If China succeeds in doing this, a primary strategic objective of the hypothesis is partially defeated.

The European instability risk: The United States appears to be underweighting the damage to its Western European allies. Economic pain at this scale — energy at 50%+ above pre-war prices, supply chain disruption arriving within months — risks political instability in Germany, France, and the UK. The historical record on what European economic crises produce politically is not reassuring. A NATO alliance fraying under economic stress is not in American strategic interests.

The transition timeline problem: The theory requires the West to complete a nuclear and hydrogen transition in roughly fifteen to twenty years. This is optimistic even under emergency conditions and emergency political will. There is a painful middle decade in which the Western alliance is also genuinely suffering the consequences of the disruption.

The nuclear escalation risk: The theory requires the conflict to remain contained below the nuclear threshold. Iran has been pursuing nuclear capability for decades. A destroyed conventional military, a killed Supreme Leader, and devastated oil infrastructure creates maximally desperate conditions. Desperate actors make maximally dangerous decisions. This is not a manageable variable — it is the scenario that breaks every strategic model.

The Semiconductor Helium Problem:

There is a dependency chain running through the technology transition thesis that has received almost no analytical attention: **helium**.

Ultra-high purity helium is not a peripheral input to advanced semiconductor manufacturing. It is a foundational one. Fabs operating at 3nm and below — the nodes where AI accelerators, HBM memory stacks, and high-performance cache dies are produced — require helium for EUV lithography purging, cryogenic cooling, and the inert atmospheric control that makes extreme ultraviolet processes physically possible. There is no substitute at scale. There is no workaround. Without a continuous supply of ultra-high purity helium, advanced node production does not slow. It stops.

The supply geography is unfortunate. Qatar — currently operating under Iranian threat and Hormuz disruption — is one of the world's primary helium exporters, producing it as a byproduct of LNG processing. The Amur facility in Russia, brought online recently to diversify global supply, is subject to sanctions constraints that have already tightened the market. The United States Federal Helium Reserve, long the backstop of global supply, has been in managed drawdown for years under a Congressional disposal mandate that was never designed with semiconductor warfare in mind.

When helium tightens, fabs do not distribute the pain evenly. They triage. The commercial logic is brutal and immediate: low-margin commodity silicon — smartphone SoCs, EV power management dies, display drivers, automotive microcontrollers — is deprioritised or cut entirely. High-margin advanced node products become the entire revenue thesis. AI accelerators and memory stacks get the helium. Everything else waits.

This creates a second-order problem that cuts directly across the Western energy transition strategy. Electric vehicles are extraordinarily silicon-intensive — a modern EV requires three to five times the semiconductor content of an equivalent ICE vehicle. The transition from combustion to electrification that the crisis is supposed to accelerate depends on a steady supply of precisely the chips that helium triage will deprioritise first. The crisis that is meant to force the transition is simultaneously strangling the supply chain the transition requires.

The TSMC Arizona narrative compounds this. American fab nearshoring was already running behind schedule on yield parity at advanced nodes. The helium supply infrastructure for domestic advanced manufacturing at the required volume and purity has not been built. The assumption of semiconductor resilience embedded in American strategic planning may be exactly that — an assumption, untested against a supply shock that arrives from an unexpected direction through an unglamorous commodity that appears in no think-tank threat matrix.

The strategic implication is not that the transition fails. It is that it takes longer and costs more than the models show — and that the decade of managed hardship described elsewhere in this paper has a semiconductor dimension that planners have not yet priced in.

That brings me onto Elon Musk and Stargate/Terrafab project. Musk’s “new physics” framing is characteristically ambiguous but there are a few credible readings.

The most plausible is probably **dry EUV or high-NA EUV processes** that reduce or eliminate the helium purging requirement by operating in near-perfect vacuum rather than inert gas atmospheres. ASML’s High-NA EUV systems are already moving in this direction — the optical path requirements at next-generation nodes push toward vacuum operation anyway because atmospheric absorption becomes the limiting factor before helium purity does.

The second possibility is **chiplet architecture at less aggressive nodes**. If you can achieve the performance of a monolithic 3nm die by tiling multiple 5nm or 7nm chiplets with advanced packaging — which is broadly what AMD and Intel are already doing — you sidestep the helium-intensive leading edge entirely. The “new physics” might not be the fab process. It might be the interconnect. High-bandwidth die-to-die interconnects at sub-micron pitch effectively replicate on-die performance from multi-chip assemblies. That’s achievable without touching TSMC’s leading edge at all.

Musk has never been shy about timelines that telescope but he does occasionally have genuine technical insight before the market prices it.

If Terrafab is real and is targeting helium-independent advanced manufacturing, and if the people around Musk have read the same supply chain fragility that your piece identifies — then it’s not a moonshot vanity project.

It’s a deliberate strategic hedge against exactly the scenario you’ve described. Which would mean someone in that orbit has done the analysis that the government seemingly hasn’t.

Part Eleven: The Mangle and the Petrodollar

In October 2024, a person paying attention bought two years of propane.

That decision, made before the crisis, before the embargo, before the supply chain disruptions, reflects a mode of thinking that the architects of grand strategy and the architects of household resilience share: **prepare for what is structurally inevitable rather than wait for what is politically comfortable**. The mechanisms differ in scale by several orders of magnitude. The underlying logic is identical.

The Kissinger insight of 1973 was that a crisis which appears to harm everyone can be structured so that it harms your adversaries more than you, accelerates transitions you needed anyway, and creates dependency relationships that persist for generations. The petrodollar system that emerged from what appeared to be an American defeat in 1973 underwrote American hegemony for fifty years. The price paid — a global recession, European and Japanese economic pain, decades of Middle Eastern instability — was borne largely by others. The benefit accrued almost entirely to the United States.

Kissinger understood something that democratic politicians rarely articulate publicly: that the management of crises is not merely reactive. The question is never only “how do we stop this?” but also “given that this is happening, how do we position ourselves to benefit from its consequences?” The distinction between engineering a crisis and capitalising on one that was going to happen anyway is morally significant but strategically minor. The outcomes can be identical.

Whether the 2026 Middle East crisis was engineered, allowed, or merely capitalised upon by a small number of strategically serious people — we may never know. History rarely delivers that verdict cleanly. The full record of 1973 — including the extent to which Kissinger actively managed the embargo’s consequences rather than merely surviving them — took decades to emerge in declassified documents. The equivalent record for 2026, if it exists, will not be public in our lifetimes.

What we can observe is that the strategic geometry is *coherent*. The pieces fit. The Venezuelan supply chain was being activated before the Hormuz crisis peaked. The Gulf Coast refineries were specifically built for this crude grade, sat partially idle as shale light oil displaced their intended diet, and are now the pre-positioned bridge infrastructure for a Western Hemisphere supply solution. The shale industry’s breakeven economics mean that $100+ oil generates the profits to fund not just production expansion but the broader energy transition investment. The Chinese energy vulnerability — 45% of Chinese oil through the one chokepoint the US Navy now controls the access to — is structural and not easily remedied. The Israeli strategic interest in destroying

the financial architecture that funds its adversaries is not a side effect of the campaign; it may be its primary purpose.

The tells remain to be watched. Does Venezuelan oil investment accelerate with US government financial backing? Does the IRGC remain precisely at the level of capability required to keep the Strait threatened but not closed? Do Gulf Coast Venezuelan crude throughput numbers climb steadily through the rest of 2026? Does Japan formalise deeper security commitments in exchange for energy escort guarantees? Does Chinese manufacturing margin data begin showing energy cost stress in the second half of the year?

If these things occur, the hypothesis migrates from interesting speculation to strong circumstantial case. If they do not — if the US genuinely presses for rapid Hormuz reopening, if Venezuelan investment stalls, if Japanese strategic hedging continues — then the simpler explanation, familiar chaos and improvised crisis management, may be more accurate.

But the person who bought the propane in October 2024 was not making a prediction about grand strategy. They were making a judgment about structural fragility — that systems which appeared stable had underlying vulnerabilities that would eventually manifest, and that preparation made before a crisis is worth ten times the preparation attempted during one. That judgment has been vindicated completely.

Bismarck advised catching hold of God's coattails as history passes by. Whether they are God's coattails or a well-briefed Under Secretary of State's — the effect is the same. The crisis is here. The transition it forces is necessary and was always necessary. The question for every actor — from the NSC to the household — is whether you are positioned to navigate it or merely to suffer it.

The mangles are a rational response. The propane was a rational response. And somewhere in a secure conference room in Washington or Tel Aviv, someone is looking at a map of the world's oil infrastructure, a chart of Chinese GDP projections, and a Venezuelan production recovery timeline — and thinking that the next fifty years just came into focus.

The game was always long. It still is. Act accordingly.

This paper is a speculative strategic analysis written in March 2026. It should be read as an analytical thought experiment, not as a statement of established fact. All source links are provided for verification. The author makes no claims about the intentions of any government or individual actor.

Sources and Further Reading

- Wikipedia: 2026 Strait of Hormuz Crisis

- Wikipedia: 1973 Oil Crisis
- Wikipedia: Petrodollar Recycling
- US State Dept History: Oil Embargo 1973-74
- LegalClarity: The Kissinger Petrodollar System
- Al Jazeera: Strait of Hormuz Passage by Country
- Axios: Israel Strikes Iran Natural Gas Infrastructure
- PBS NewsHour: Both Sides Ratchet Up Energy Attacks
- CBC News: Iran Hits Qatar Energy Hub
- US EIA: Venezuelan Oil and US Refineries
- Energy Intelligence: US Appetite for Venezuelan Imports
- S&P Global: Gulf Coast Refiners and Venezuelan Crude
- OilPrice.com: Venezuelan Oil and US Refining Capacity
- Dallas Fed: Shale Breakeven Prices
- Rystad Energy: Upstream Breakeven Analysis
- GOV.UK: Rolls-Royce SMR Selected
- Parliament POST: North Sea Oil and Gas
- Al Jazeera Centre for Studies: Strait of Hormuz Global Economic Shock

Even better

You can use the datawrapper my friend **Skingers** over at the Curious Connector created for this post. Here's the link: