The New Energy Architecture

Energy, systems, and the architecture of the next century

By Rear Admiral (Ret.) Oded Gour Lavie

I. THE WEAPON THE WORLD ALREADY KNOWS

In 2026, during Operation Epic Fury, the Strait of Hormuz—one of the most critical arteries of the global economy—was effectively closed. For a period measured not in years but in days, a significant share of global energy flows and critical materials was disrupted. The effects were immediate: markets reacted sharply, supply chains tightened, and governments were forced to confront, in real time, the fragility of systems long assumed to be resilient.

Nothing about this vulnerability was new. It had been mapped, studied, and debated for decades. What changed was not the structure, but the clarity. A single chokepoint demonstrated, once again, how deeply modern economies remain dependent on energy flows they do not fully control.

This pattern has appeared before. In 2022, Germany—Europe's industrial anchor—discovered how quickly strategic autonomy can erode when energy dependencies are exposed. The disruption of Russian gas supplies triggered consequences far beyond energy markets, extending into industrial output, fiscal stability, and political cohesion.

The lesson was not unprecedented then, and it is not unprecedented now. The 1973 oil embargo had already shown that energy can exert strategic pressure comparable to military force—not through destruction, but through disruption.

And yet, energy is still largely treated as an environmental challenge, an economic variable, or a supply chain problem.

That framing is incomplete. Energy is the operating condition of modern civilization. When it fails, the effects are not sectoral. They are systemic.

That framing misses what energy actually is. Before it is a commodity, before it is a policy challenge, before it is a line item in a national budget — energy is the lifeline of modern life. It is the condition under which hospitals function, food is grown and distributed, children are educated, economies operate, and societies hold together. Remove it and you do not inconvenience a civilization. You unmake it. The lights going out is not a metaphor. It is the most precise description of what strategic defeat looks like in the modern world.

II. A SYSTEMS PROBLEM WEARING A FUEL MASK

The substitution model governs most national energy strategies today: identify the problematic fuel, find a cleaner or more secure alternative, execute the swap. This model has an internal coherence and has produced real results. But it misdiagnoses the problem at the level that matters most strategically.

The problem is not any individual fuel. The problem is the nature of the system those fuels have built over one hundred and fifty years, a system defined not by what it burns but by what it has organized. Cities were built near coal deposits and refineries. Trade routes were drawn by the geography of oil fields and the necessity of tanker lanes. Military doctrines were written around these chokepoints and proven insufficient to secure them. The Strait of Hormuz has been threatened and partially closed. The Suez Canal has been blocked and contested. Nord Stream was destroyed while the nations that depended on it debated attribution. The pipelines crossing Eastern Europe were weaponized at will. The system was not built to be secured. For those who designed it, it was simply progress — pipelines, trade routes, and refinery networks expanding the reach of modern civilization. The vulnerabilities became visible long ago. What never followed was a doctrine — a word nations reserve for war, for deterrence, for the organization of survival. Energy was never granted that seriousness. This essay is the argument for why it must be,and what that doctrine looks like.

When you substitute a renewable energy source into a grid designed for fossil fuels, you have not changed this system. You have changed one input. The grid still has chokepoints. The supply chains for solar panels run through China, which controls over eighty percent of all solar manufacturing stages — from polysilicon and wafers to cells and modules, according to the International Energy Agency. The vulnerability has not been eliminated. It has been relocated.

China alone invested $818 billion in energy transition in 2024 — more than the United States, the European Union, and the United Kingdom combined that year - more than any other nation on earth. This is not primarily a climate strategy. It is a systems strategy. Beijing has understood with strategic clarity that the nation controlling the architecture of the new energy system — its supply chains, its critical materials, its manufacturing base, its technical standards — will hold in the coming century the same structural leverage that oil-producing states held over the last one. China is not transitioning away from energy dependency. It is engineering a world in which others are dependent on it.

A genuine system transition is categorically different from a fuel substitution. It replaces not one input with another but the organizing logic of the entire structure — the geography of dependency, the architecture of vulnerability, the map of who holds leverage over whom. History records only a handful of such transitions: the shift from wood to coal that made the Industrial Revolution possible; the emergence of oil that drew the map of the twentieth century's great power competition. Each one did not merely change what nations burned. It changed which nations were powerful, which alliances held, and which civilizational architectures survived.

The world is at the threshold of the third such transition. The nations that understand this, and organize their strategy around it, will shape the century. Those that continue managing the transition as a fuel substitution problem will find that the terms of the new order have been set elsewhere, in their absence.

III. THE PRECONDITION FOR EVERYTHING

Strategic thinking often distinguishes between domains of competition—land, sea, air, space, cyber—and the capabilities that enable them. Energy does not fit neatly into either category. It is more Fundamental.

Every modern capability—whether military, economic, or technological—is bounded by energy availability. Advanced manufacturing requires reliable, high-density power. Digital infrastructure depends on continuously operating data centers. Naval operations, satellite constellations, logistics chains, precision munitions, and communications networks are all, at their core, energy-dependent systems.

This is not a semantic distinction. It has operational consequences. A weapon without propellant is not a weapon. A data center without power is not a capability. A factory without reliable electricity is not an industrial base. A nation can possess sophisticated institutions, advanced technology, and considerable military power and still find those strengths sharply constrained if its energy foundation is insecure, intermittent, or vulnerable to external disruption.

The central claim of the Energy Doctrine is therefore straightforward: energy is not one domain among the others, energy is not one variable among many in the strategic calculus. It is the condition that makes the calculus possible at all. Strategy that does not begin by accounting for the security, reliability, and availability of energy risks being built on assumption rather than foundation. History has repeatedly and brutally punished that assumption.

IV. THE DISCIPLINE OF TWO SCALES

Few platforms embody the logic of the Energy Doctrine more clearly than vessels that carry their energy with them. Submarines, for example, draw no pipeline from the surface. They require no port in order to preserve their most immediate operating logic. Every system aboard—propulsion, weapons, life support, navigation,

communications—runs from a self-contained energy source. In that sense, the submarine offers a useful analogy for what energy sovereignty looks like at the scale of a vessel. Operating such a platform demands a discipline that holds two scales of reality in mind at once.

The first is the electron: the finite, technical, immediate currency that determines what the vessel can do, for how long, and under what constraints. The second is the mission: the strategic purpose that gives meaning to every technical choice. A commander who ignores the first may lose the vessel's freedom of action at the worst possible moment. A commander who becomes consumed by systems management and loses sight of the mission has also failed, even if every gauge reads correctly.

This ability to hold the electron and the mission in the same thought is often missing from public energy debate. The discussion is typically fragmented: this fuel, that technology, this price curve, that supply chain. But energy is not a collection of isolated pieces. It is an architecture, and architectures do not change when one component is swapped for another. They change when the principles of organization change.

As a result, policy debates often oscillate between engineering optimism and geopolitical anxiety without fully integrating the two. Technical feasibility is discussed without asking whether it solves the deeper strategic exposure. Strategic anxiety is expressed without enough fluency in how actual energy architectures work, without the fluency to distinguish between genuine sovereignty and a renegotiation of dependency terms. A more durable framework must hold both simultaneously.

V. BEYOND SOVEREIGNTY

A nation approaches energy sovereignty when it can no longer be readily coerced through its energy dependencies—when no adversary, supplier, transit route, or concentrated supply chain can easily impose strategic paralysis by interrupting access to energy. Without such sovereignty, autonomy remains exposed. But sovereignty is the floor, not the ceiling. A nation that has reduced its vulnerability still faces a deeper

choice: to adapt to a new energy architecture designed by others or to participate in shaping it.

History suggests that actors who help design foundational systems tend to preserve structural advantages over time. The relevant analogy is not only access to critical technology, but influence over its standards, supply chains, infrastructure models, and institutional logic. The Netherlands did not merely acquire the lithography machines that made modern semiconductor manufacturing possible. Through ASML, it built them — and in doing so, became a nation of seventeen million people without whose participation the world's most advanced chip fabrication cannot proceed. That is what engagement with architecture produces.

The same is increasingly true in energy. The architecture of the next era is still being written. Those who bring the same seriousness to that process that they bring to defense, trade, and diplomacy may do more than escape inherited dependencies. They may help define the terms of the order that follows.

VI. THE COMPETITION ALREADY UNDERWAY

The competition to shape future energy architecture is not a theoretical prospect. It is underway now, and its early stages are already influencing its strategic position.

China has invested at exceptional scale across manufacturing, supply chains, grid technologies, batteries, and the industrial base surrounding the transition.

The United States, through successive administrations and through both the Inflation Reduction Act and subsequent industrial policy, has committed to reshoring energy technology manufacturing, securing critical mineral supply chains, and building domestic capacity across the full spectrum of next-generation energy systems. Washington's 2025 National Security Strategy identifies energy as among the three domains where American leadership is most consequential and most contested, alongside advanced computing and biotechnology.

The Gulf Cooperation Council states are executing a parallel strategy from a different position. Saudi Arabia's Public Investment Fund has committed over $400 billion in investments since 2016 as part of Vision 2030. The UAE's sovereign wealth is being deployed systematically into advanced computing, clean energy infrastructure, and grid modernization. These are not philanthropy programs. They are positioning operations by states that understand that the value of their existing energy assets is finite, and that the architecture of what replaces those assets is the strategic prize worth competing for.

These moves differ in emphasis, but they reflect a common recognition: the structure of the future energy architecture will shape economic influence, strategic flexibility, and geopolitical leverage for decades. What remains less developed is a coherent doctrine able to organize this recognition around a clear theory of power.

VII. THE DOCTRINE

The Doctrine is an organizational principle that rests on four convictions.

The first is that energy is the precondition, not a domain. Every arena of modern power — space, sea, cyber, advanced manufacturing, economic competition — is bounded by energy availability. Strategy that does not begin with energy security is built on assumption.

The second is that this transition is a systems revolution, not a fuel substitution. The strategic question is not which fuel replaces which. It is who designs, controls, and owns the architecture of the system that replaces the current one. Fuel substitution within the existing system reproduces the existing vulnerabilities under different names.

The third is that Energy sovereignty as strategic freedom. The third is that energy dependency is a form of strategic subjugation, and energy sovereignty its only cure. A nation whose energy can be weaponized against it — by an adversary, by market disruption, or by supply chain failure — is a nation whose sovereignty is conditional. The

nation that removes that dependency entirely has removed the most fundamental constraint on strategic action. It has not merely secured its energy. It has purchased genuine freedom of maneuver.

The fourth is that the stakeholders that architect the new energy system will define the terms of the century. As with every previous civilizational energy transition, the states that participate in designing the new order — its standards, its infrastructure, its supply chains, its governance — will carry forward structural advantages that compound for generations. Those who arrive as consumers of a system designed by others will negotiate their sovereignty within terms they did not set. Every nation, regardless of size, has the potential to participate in building that architecture according to its own values, capabilities, and grand strategy. The new lines of strategic consequence are being drawn now. Nations that treat this as an energy ministry problem rather than a national strategy problem will find those lines drawn without them.

VIII. THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE NEW SYSTEM

The new energy architecture is not defined by what it burns. It is defined by what it no longer depends on. The following five criteria are a compass with which to navigate the path to the optimal and internal energy architecture, removing the old system's vulnerabilities.

The first is sovereignty of source. The fuel cannot be located beneath another nation's ground, transported through another nation's territory, or refined in another nation's factories. A system that merely relocates the point of dependency has not solved the problem. It has renamed it.

The second is compact and defensible. A system spread across thousands of square kilometers of wind farms and solar arrays is not just an engineering challenge; it is a strategic liability. Every additional kilometer of infrastructure is another point of failure, another target, another dependency on weather and

season that no doctrine can overcome. The new architecture requires energy that is compact enough to defend, consistent enough to rely on, and self-contained enough to deploy wherever it is needed.

The third is unit-level resilience. Most nations remain dependent on centralized grid infrastructure whose failure cascades across everything connected to it. The new architecture requires energy that functions at the unit level — vessel, base, city, nation — not as a backup, but as a genuine capability independent of the larger system.

The fourth is that energy itself is free of geographic chokepoints. Nations will always depend on trade routes for goods and materials, that exposure cannot be eliminated. But energy is different. It is the one dependency that touches everything else, the one lever whose disruption cascades across an entire civilization. A new architecture worthy of the name ensures that no strait, no pipeline, and no transit corridor can be weaponized against a nation's energy supply.

The fifth is that the architects of energy systems are no longer exclusively states. The capital budgets of Amazon, Google, and Microsoft now exceed those of most sovereign nations. These companies are not waiting for national energy policy — they are writing their own, signing direct nuclear offtake agreements, funding geothermal development, and building grid infrastructure at a scale that shapes the systems nations will inherit. A new energy architecture must account for this reality: that private actors are now independent energy developers with the reach, the capital, and the technical capacity to define the system from outside the state. The question is not whether they will shape the new order. They already are. The question is whether nations engage that reality deliberately, or discover too late that the architecture was built without them.

The Doctrine does not prescribe a single solution. No existing technology fully satisfies all strategic requirements across all contexts, and it is unlikely that one will in the near term.

Instead, the Doctrine proposes a set of architectural questions against which technologies and strategies can be evaluated: To what extent does a given approach reduce or merely redistribute dependency? How concentrated or exposed is its physical and supply-chain footprint? Can it operate at multiple scales, including independently when required? How resilient is it to disruption—technical, geopolitical, or environmental? And does it contribute to a structure that is more adaptable over time?

Different technologies meet these criteria in different ways. The strategic task is therefore not to select a single winner, but to design an architecture in which strengths can be combined and weaknesses mitigated. That means treating energy terms and choices not as isolated bets, but as components within a larger framework of resilience.

IX. WHO WILL WRITE THE TERMS?

The architecture of the next energy era is not yet fixed. It is being formed through investment decisions, supply chain development, infrastructure deployment, and technological integration taking place now. Over time, these structures will become more difficult to alter. Dependencies will solidify, standards will converge, and paths will narrow. The question is therefore not whether change is occurring, but how deliberately it is being shaped.

This essay is addressed to states, firms, investors, strategists, engineers, and commanders who understand that energy is no longer only a matter of supply. It is a matter of architecture. Those who approach it that way—rather than solely as a technological, environmental, or market problem—will have greater influence over the order that emerges.

The issue is not whether the world will build a new energy architecture. It already is. The issue is who will shape it, according to what principles, and with what understanding of resilience, sovereignty, and power. Those terms should not be written by default. They should be written deliberately, by actors with the clarity to recognize what energy has always been: not simply an input to modern life, but one of the deepest structures that determines its possibilities.

Rear Admiral (Ret.) Oded Gour Lavie is CEO and Co-founder of nT-Tao Ltd., developing next-generation compact fusion energy. He previously served as Commander of the Israeli Navy's Sea Division, overseeing Naval Operations, Training, and Doctrine, and commanded the submarine fleet prior to that. A Technion and Harvard graduate and MIT Sloan Visiting Fellow, he has spent his career at the intersection of strategic command, energy systems, and national security.