

What Would a Sustainable and Desirable Economy-in-Society-in-Nature Look Like?

*Robert Costanza, Gar Alperovitz, Herman Daly,
Joshua Farley, Carol Franco, Tim Jackson,
Ida Kubiszewski, Juliet Schor, and
Peter Victor*

The most critical task facing humanity today is the creation of a shared vision of a sustainable and desirable society, one that can provide permanent prosperity within the biophysical constraints of the real world in a way that is fair and equitable to all of humanity, to other species, and to future generations.

We need to fill in the details in a coherent vision that is tangible enough to motivate all kinds of people to work toward achieving it. Without a coherent, relatively detailed, shared vision of what a sustainable society could look like, there will be no political will nor united effort to take us from here to there. The default vision of continued, unlimited increases in material consumption is inherently unsustainable and undesirable, but we cannot break away from this vision until a credible and widely shared alternative is created.

Below we sketch out one version of such a vision as a starting point.^a There are several other visioning exercises that have created similar descriptions, including the Great Transition Initiative (www.gtinitiative.org) and the Future We Want (www.futurewewant.org). Ultimately, this vision must be shared and further developed through participatory democratic processes.

If humanity is to achieve a sustainable and desirable future, we must create a shared vision detailing what we as a society want to sustain and incorporating the central shared values that express our hopes for the future. This vision must incorporate a diversity of perspectives and be based on principles of fairness, respect, and sustainability.

This draft vision is divided into five parts: (i) worldviews, (ii) built capital, (iii) human capital, (iv) social capital, and (v) natural capital, encompassing the basic elements of the ecological economics framework. This vision is written from the perspective of the year 2050, describing the world we have achieved by implementing the policies outlined in previous sections.

Worldview

Our worldview no longer divides the planet into “humans vs. nature.” People now recognize that humans are a part of nature, one species among many, and must obey the laws and constraints imposed on all of nature.

^aThis vision is adapted from one created at a workshop held at Oberlin College in January 2001, attended by the following: Audra Abt, Gar Alperovitz, Mary Barber, Seaton Baxter, Janine Benyus, Aiza Biby, Paul W. Bierman-Lytle, Grace Boggs, William Browning, Diana Bustamante, Warren W. Byrne, Mark Clevey, Jane Ellen Clougherty, Robert Costanza, Tanya Dawkins, James Embry, Jon Farley, Joshua Farley, Harold Glasser, Becky Grella, Elaine Gross, Gerald Hairston, Sarah Karpanty, Carol Kuhre, George McQuitty, Peter Montague, Dondohn Namesling, David Orr, John Petersen, William Prindle, Tom Prugh, Jack Santa-Barbara, Claudine Schneider, Ben Shepherd, Megan Snedden, Karl Steyaert, Theodore Steck, Harvey Stone, Paul Templet, Mary Evelyn Tucker, Sarah van Gelder, Rafael Vargas, and Verlene Wilder. A version was also included in: Costanza, R, G Alperovitz, H Daly, J Farley, C Franco, T Jackson, I Kubiszewski, J Schor and P Victor (2012). *Building a Sustainable and Desirable Economy-in-Society-in-Nature*. New York: United Nations Division for Sustainable Development. Available at <http://sustainable-development.un.org/index.php?page=view&nr=627&type=400&menu=35>.

Nevertheless, humans bear responsibility that other creatures do not — we do not blame deer for overgrazing — yet we expect humans to recognize their “overgrazing” and stop it. We recognize that nature is not something to be subjugated, but instead is something we depend upon absolutely to meet physical, psychological, cultural, and spiritual needs. We recognize that natural resources are scarce and must be invested in. Our goal is to create conditions conducive to life in the broadest sense.

For centuries, the worldview of mechanistic physics dominated Western society. Within this worldview, each action has an equal and opposite reaction, and only by studying systems at smaller and smaller scales can we come to fully understand these reactions. As more and more people have come to understand the inherent complexity of ecosystems and human systems, we have come to realize that results cannot always be predicted and that irreducible uncertainty dominates the provision of life-support services by healthy ecosystems.

An ecological worldview of complexity and indeterminacy, inspired by nature as mentor — holistic, integrated, and flexible — has replaced the worldview of mechanistic physics. Unfettered individualism is appropriate and even necessary in a world of vast frontiers and unlimited elbow room. Individualism is still extremely important in 2050, but is far more tempered by a concern for the common good. This has led to a system where communities promote individual liberty as long as individual actions do not have a negative impact on the community. Individuals in return accept that they are a part of society, and it is unfair and illegal (even uneconomic) to impose costs on society for private gain. This attitude was necessary to wean ourselves of our dependence on heavily polluting single-occupancy vehicles, for example.

Further, ever-increasing consumption is no longer considered an integral component of human needs as it was in the early part of the century. People pay attention to their other needs and desires, such as joy, beauty, affection, participation, creativity, freedom, and understanding. Building strong community helps us meet these needs, while working ever harder to pay for more consumption deprives us of the time and energy required to fulfill them. Thus, status is not conferred by high incomes and high consumption (individual ends), but rather by contribution to civil society and community ends. With the recognition that consumption beyond limit

is not only physically unsustainable but also does little to improve our quality of life, we now understand that a “steady-state” economy — prosperous but within planetary boundaries — is our goal. A steady-state economy does not mean an end to development; it simply means that we limit the input of raw materials into our economic system and their inevitable return to the ecosystem as waste to a level compatible with the ecological constraints imposed by a finite planet with finite resources. We now live happily and well within the safe operating space of our planet. We do not know the precise location of these planetary boundaries, and they are subject to change. Therefore, “adaptive management” has become the guiding principle.

The economy is now powered by our incoming solar energy — direct sunlight captured by solar panels — as well as wind, hydro, and the traditional forms of solar energy capture (agriculture, forestry, and fisheries). Economic production now focuses on quality, not quantity, on everyone having enough, and on fulfilling employment. Rather than the earlier focus on the production of goods, we now focus on the production of the services provided by goods and how those services are distributed. We do not need cars, we need transportation. We do not need televisions, we need entertainment and information. Goods are only a means to an end — the larger end of sustainable human well-being — and by recognizing this, our economy has developed as never before without growing in physical terms.

Built capital

Built capital is the human-made infrastructure used to meet human needs. Technological advance over the last century has had a large impact on the type of built capital we find in 2050. Different priorities have had as much or even greater impact.

Housing

Communities have been dramatically redesigned to integrate living space, community space, and workspace with recreational needs and nature. Workspace includes the stores that supply our everyday needs as well as

production facilities for most of the goods those stores supply. People now live very close to where they work, where they shop, and where they play. The huge cities of the early 21st century did not disappear, but they have been dramatically reorganized. Cities are now aggregations of smaller communities in close physical proximity but where each community meets the housing, employment, social, recreation, and shopping needs of those who live there. The “20-minute neighborhood” idea — that all basic services should be no more than a 20-min walk away — has taken hold as an urban design principle. Natural areas have also made a big comeback in cities. The specifics of community size and design are, of course, determined by local physical and cultural conditions, and there is enormous diversity.

In addition to these very practical aspects, communities have been designed as soul-satisfying spaces that resonate with our evolutionary history. Most communities include natural areas and incorporate parks and other green spaces (though “green” is a misnomer in drier parts of the world, where xeriscaping is the norm), and such spaces also serve as common space for community members. They also foster social interaction and community. Rather than something new, this is simply a resurgence of a millennial tradition of settlement patterns.

Because community space is abundant and well designed, private homes are generally smaller (hence cheaper and easier to care for) and are much more energy efficient. Private lawns have virtually disappeared, though lawn-like community green spaces still exist, and private gardens abound. Private gardens in fact meet a substantial portion of community food needs. Walking and bicycle riding have effectively become the dominant forms of transportation, except in the worst weather. Rapidly increasing energy costs provided the initial incentive, but people then discovered the enormous benefits of such pedestrian communities.

One of the biggest impacts was simply getting people out of their cars. Walking to work, to the store, to community meeting places, or to nature preserves brings people into direct contact with the other members of the community. People walking together in the same direction naturally converse, establishing friendships, informing each other of current events, and discussing issues of relevance to the community. In fact, developing community and social capital has become one of many

explicit goals for designing built capital. Modern communities are very healthy places for humans and other species. Invigorating exercise and nurturing social interaction have replaced the stress of hour-long commutes, road rage, and the pollution of vehicle exhaust, improving both physical and mental health. Air quality is very high. Many roads and parking lots have become redundant, and in their spaces stand parks, streams, and greenways, providing clean air, clean water, and healthy recreation, among numerous other vital ecosystem services. The dramatic reduction in impervious areas has reduced flooding and allowed the land and the ecosystems it sustains to filter water, restoring waterways to health.

With scarcer resources, the practice of destroying still useful buildings to build others on the same site has diminished, and stable populations have further decreased the need for new construction. But from time to time new buildings are still required. Ecologically designed “living buildings” have become the norm for new construction.

Transportation

As already mentioned in the description of communities, single-occupancy vehicles are now rare. The dominant modes of transportation within communities are walking and bicycling; between communities people use high-speed rail. Public transportation is important within communities and is designed to transport goods as well as passengers, making it convenient for grocery shopping and the like. Because so many people use public transportation, it is abundant and extremely convenient. Rail is common, but so are electric buses and taxis. “Traffic” is a thing of the past, and public transportation gets people around much more quickly than private vehicles used to, at a fraction of the cost. Dramatically fewer vehicles on the roads have also cut maintenance costs to a fraction of what they were, and new roads are unnecessary. Some people still own private vehicles, but these vehicles are expensive and their owners pay a higher share of the costs of road maintenance. Most communities have shared electric cars, such as ZipCars, available for rent when private transportation is absolutely required. When not being driven, these cars provide electric energy storage.

Energy

Renewable resources now meet virtually all of the world's energy needs. The conversion from hydrocarbons was facilitated by continuous increases in efficiency of energy use, combined with appropriate full-cost pricing of all energy sources, including environmental and health costs and risks of the full fuel cycle. Photovoltaic tiles are ubiquitous roofing materials, and roofs alone meet over half the world's energy needs. Large-scale hydro-power has decreased in importance as more and more rivers are restored to their natural states, but low-impact mini-turbines are increasingly common. In spite of the abundance of renewable, nonpolluting forms of energy, energy-efficiency research is still very important and advances are still being made in both renewable-energy supply and demand management. The "smart grid" has done much to help this transition. In many places, municipalities and/or cooperatives now locally manage the generation, supply, and distribution of renewable energy resources, keeping prices affordable and ownership democratically controlled.

Industry

Industry has changed dramatically. Industrial design is now based on closed-loop systems in imitation of nature, where the waste product from one industry becomes the feedstock of the next. Wasted heat from industrial processes is used to heat nearby homes and workspaces. When possible, industrial production uses local materials to meet local needs, and wastes (the few that are not put to use) are processed locally. Most smaller-scale industries consist of a mix of locally owned proprietary firms and smaller corporations on the one hand, and cooperatives and new community-based commons institutions on the other. While these characteristics do not always maximize productive efficiency, the benefits outweigh the costs.

First, local production dramatically reduces transportation costs, helping to compensate for sometimes-higher production costs. Second, it makes communities directly aware of the environmental impacts of production and consumption. Costs of waste disposal are not shifted elsewhere. Third, industries are more a part of their communities. Most of

them are locally owned by the workers they employ, by new cooperative and municipal institutions, and by the people whose needs they meet. Rather than simply trying to maximize returns to shareholders, industries strive to provide healthy, safe, secure, and fulfilling working conditions for workers.

Those who produce goods and those who consume them know each other, so workers take particular pride in the quality of what they produce.

Fourth, the decentralization of the economy means that the economy as a whole is much less susceptible to business cycles, increasing job, and community stability — a central requirement of local sustainability planning in general. Fifth, an emphasis on local ownership and production for local markets has reduced the importance of trade secrets and patents; competition has been replaced to some extent by cooperation.

Sixth, a significant number of larger firms are structured as public and quasi-public enterprises jointly owned with the workers involved. They are designed, on the one hand, to help target and anchor jobs to help achieve local stability, thereby also supporting sustainability planning, and on the other, to be less dependent on very short-term profit considerations necessary to meet stock market expectations that foster excessive growth.

Finally, decreased competition has led to a dramatic decrease in the size of the advertising industry. This means that money once spent on convincing people to buy one brand over another is now spent on making those products better — or simply not spent, making those products more affordable.

Markets and competition, of course, still play an important role. Industries are free to sell to distant communities, though having to pay the full cost of transportation provides a natural barrier. Still, this threat of competition means that communities need not rely solely on the good will of local industries to keep prices low. Trade secrets play less of a role in competition than in the past due to the resurgence of sharing information. The development of open-source software shows that freely sharing knowledge can lead to more rapid technological innovation than the profit motive provided by privatizing knowledge through patents. The problems with patents have become more obvious with the tremendous growth in

green technologies, which have proven themselves capable of slowing climate change, reducing pollution, and decreasing demands on scarce ecosystem resources, but only by being used on a large scale. Patents on these technologies (and the accompanying monopoly profits) would mean that much of the world would be unable to afford them. The global community has come to realize that it cannot afford the price of people not using these technologies.

Fortunately, the free flow of information has led to impressive new innovations, often making patents obsolete. Some industries retain substantial economies of scale, using fewer resources per unit when producing in enormous factories. This is still the case for solar cells, for example. Large corporations still exist to produce such goods, but many are structured in ways that broaden representation on boards and in certain cases entail public ownership or joint public/worker ownership. Corporate charters have largely changed to the “benefit corporation” model that explicitly acknowledges a firm’s responsibility to produce a social benefit rather than merely a private profit.

Human capital

Human capital was defined in the early part of the century as the practical knowledge, acquired skills, and learned abilities of an individual that make him or her potentially productive and thus equip him or her to earn income in exchange for labor.

The definition of human capital itself has changed — no longer emphasizing solely productivity in terms of income exchanged for labor. The primary emphasis instead is now on knowledge, skills, and abilities that make people productive members of society. The goals of society are far more than simply earning income. Education is now integrated into everyday life, not simply something we do for a few hours a day before we grow up. And it is not always confined to classrooms — schools are an institution, not a physical place. Nature offers us an amazing laboratory every time we step outside, and is valued every bit as much in urban settings as in rural. This is even more true in 2050, when our communities are designed to maximize exposure to healthy ecosystems. Education about civic responsibilities and roles is heavily stressed, and such topics are taught by direct

exposure to the decision-making process or hands-on participation in activities that benefit the community. Youth are schooled in civic responsibility by actively participating in the community. And what better place to learn skills required for economic production than at the workplace? Apprenticeships are now an integral part of the learning process. Technology also plays an important role in education. Online learning environments are used where appropriate but by no means replace direct interaction. Education is now an interactive balance between online tools and content acquisition, and on-the-ground problem solving in the community.

Education and science no longer focus solely on the reductionist approach, in which students are only taught to analyze problems by breaking them down into their component parts. While the reductionist approach and analysis still play an important role in education, the emphasis is now on synthesis — how to rebuild the analyzed components of a problem into a holistic picture to solve problems. Synthesis is critical for understanding system processes, and system processes dominate our lives.

Beyond analysis and synthesis, learning also now emphasizes communication. Researchers skilled at communication are able to more readily share ideas, and ideas grow through sharing. Workers skilled at communication are able to work together to solve production problems. Citizens skilled at communication are able to contribute to the ever-evolving vision of a sustainable and desirable future that is the motivating force behind policy and governance. Citizens are also able to communicate their knowledge with each other, so that education, livelihood, family, and community become a seamless whole of lifelong learning and teaching, everyone simultaneously a student and teacher.

Education also now emphasizes much more than just scientific understanding of the material world. Critical thinking and research are important, but so are creative expression and curiosity. Knowledge and science are not portrayed as value-neutral endeavors; students now learn that the very decision of what to study is a moral choice with broad implications for society. The goal of education is to cultivate wisdom and discernment, to cultivate the emotional maturity to allow responsible decision making in every type of human endeavor.

The whole notion of work has also changed, and the word itself has lost the connotation of an unpleasant chore. Work hours have been reduced

through work sharing and more generous leave policies to allow for a more reasonable balance of family and work life. Moreover, people now recognize the absurdity of applying technology to the problem of producing more goods to be consumed during leisure time regardless of the drudgery involved in the production process itself. Instead, to recruit the needed workers, industry is now forced to redirect some of its technological prowess toward making work itself a pleasurable part of our days that engages both mental and physical skills. A typical job now involves far more variety, not only to make work more exciting and interesting, but also to take advantage of the full range of a person's skills. There is less distinction between what would have earlier been considered gainful employment and volunteer work.

Everyone participates in civil society, both in decision making and in maintaining the public space. This is not an onerous chore, but a pleasurable time for socializing with neighbors and community. Nor does it take time away from private lives, since the typical work week in traditional jobs now averages only 15 h. Education deemphasizes the old "more is better" mindset and promotes a greater understanding of the linkages between economic production, nature, human development, and society. This has made people more aware of the true costs of excessive consumption.

With years of technological advance and diminished "needs," society is now able to provide a satisfactory living wage to all who work and to meet the basic needs of those who do not. Participation in the various types of work is expected and supported, but not forced. Because work is now more a fulfilling experience than an onerous necessity, there is little resentment of those who do not work but rather a feeling of concern that these people are not developing their potential as humans. Living in more tightly knit communities where social goals are actively discussed, people now better understand the importance of their work and feel greater obligation to contribute to the common good. Remuneration for work has been restructured to provide the greatest awards to those who provide the greatest amount of service to the community, such as teachers, childcare providers, and so on.

Human capital is also directly related to human populations. The population has stabilized at a level compatible with the safe operating space of our planet.

Social capital

Social capital refers to the institutions, relationships, and norms that shape the quality and quantity of a society's social interactions. Social capital is not just the sum of a society's institutions, which underpin that society; it is the glue that holds them together.

The dominant form of social capital in the employment and economic sphere in the early part of the century was the market. The interaction between employer and employee was that of buying and selling labor. In this model, employer loyalty exists only as long as the continued employment of the employee increases profits. Employee loyalty exists only as long as no other job offers a greater salary or better fringe benefits (which may include location, working conditions, etc.). The interaction between producer and consumer is even more market based in this model. People buy a product only as long as it is perceived to provide the greatest value in monetary terms, though admittedly advertising may play as large a role in shaping perceptions as the actual price and quality of the product.

In 2050, worker and worker/community ownership of many industries and local production for local markets has changed these relationships. Such enterprises logically pay more attention to worker and community well-being than enterprises driven by the need to generate shareholder profit. Well-being, of course, includes profit-shares but is increased by working conditions that are healthy, that stimulate creativity, and that create feelings of participation, community, and identity. While not all enterprises are owned in these ways, when a significant percentage of enterprises began to offer these conditions, they put pressure on the others to do so as well. In the absence of strong social capital, local production for local markets can be a disaster. In many cases, it might be inefficient to have a number of firms providing similar products for a small community. This could lead to monopoly provision of certain goods. If the market had remained the dominant form of social capital driving interactions between producers and consumers, high profits and poor quality would have resulted. However, when worker-owners also live in the local community, they have to answer to their neighbors for both the price and quality of what they produce. High-quality production is a source of pride, while low quality and high prices are perceived as incompetence and laziness, decreasing the individual's social standing in the community.

Local currencies also now contribute significantly to locally based production and consumption. Such systems existed in many communities in the early part of the century, such as in Ithaca, New York (www.ithacahours.org), and the Berkshires in western Massachusetts (www.berkshares.org). These currencies are backed only by trust that other members of the community will accept them in exchange for goods and services, and therefore require strong social capital to function. They also build social capital every time a community member accepts the currency. They are virtually immune to national and global economic instability and provide communities with greater autonomy.

For local markets to work, social capital must be strong. As discussed in the section on built capital, the very physical structure of communities now works to create that social capital. Abundant community spaces, parks, and recreation areas stimulate social interaction, build friendships, and generate a sense of responsibility toward neighbors and community. With single-occupancy vehicles almost gone and people living in smaller communities, just getting from place to place brings people in close contact with their neighbors.

At the beginning of the century, public transportation was primarily found only in large cities, and fellow passengers were strangers, not neighbors. Under these circumstances, public transportation did little to build social capital. But this is no longer the case in 2050. Some neighborhoods coalesced around different ethnicities and cultures, and these too served as sources of social capital. However, the world has rid itself of the racism, sexism, regionalism, and other prejudices that were all too prevalent earlier. People have more time for family, and family life is characterized by more balanced gender roles.

The process of government itself now creates social capital. Many countries are no longer weak representative democracies, but strong participatory ones. In a participatory democracy, the people must discuss at length the issues that affect them to decide together how the issues should be resolved. In the old world — of high-pressure jobs, little free time, and large communities of anonymous strangers — this approach to government seemed impractical, unwieldy, and too demanding. Now, with smaller communities of neighbors, a far shorter work week, and engaged, active citizens, participatory democracy is a privilege of citizenship and

not an onerous chore. Of course, this required that civic education form an essential part of education and development of human capital from childhood on. This approach to government is particularly effective at the local level. As citizens come together in regular meetings to discuss the issues and work together to resolve them (even when substantial conflict exists), it creates strong bonds of social capital and plays an essential role in forging a sense of community.

Government, of course, implies action, and action implies purpose. The purpose must be defined by the people, who in these civic meetings also forge a shared vision of the future to guide their actions. This vision is not static but must adapt to new information and new conditions as they emerge. Of course, not all issues can be decided on the local level. Institutions are required at the scale of the problems they address. It is at the local level where people will feel the consequences of ecosystem change, for example, but causes may be distant, perhaps in other countries. On the national level, it is not feasible to bring together millions of people to discuss the issues and decide on actions, so some form of representation is required. But representatives are now chosen through direct participation by people to whom they have strong social ties and obligations, so these representatives are far more likely to truly represent their communities and not some large corporation that funds their rise to power. Additionally, new intermediary representative institutions on the regional scale exist to bridge the gap between local and national governance.

Social capital, the glue that holds society together, also include basic moral values and ethics such as honesty, fair dealing, care for the disabled, and a common set of cultural practices and expectations that for the majority do not have to be enforced by law. Both markets and government bureaucracies fail without these common values. These values are rooted in community and nurtured by the religions of the world and other systems of thought and practice. Social capital has deep roots, and has been reestablished in many areas.

Natural capital

Natural capital consists of all the world's ecosystems — their structure and processes that contribute to the well-being of humans and every

other species on the planet. This includes both mineral and biological raw materials, renewable (solar, wind, and tidal) energy and fossil fuels, waste-assimilation capacity, and vital life-support functions (such as global climate regulation) provided by well-functioning ecosystems.

The absolute essentiality of natural capital is now so completely accepted that it is taken for granted that we must protect it if we are to survive and thrive as a species. Any schoolchild is able to tell you that you cannot make something from nothing, so all economic production must ultimately depend on raw material inputs. Economic production is a process of transformation, and all transformation requires energy inputs. It is equally impossible to make nothing from something, so every time we use raw materials to make something, when that product eventually wears out, it returns to nature as waste. It is therefore incumbent upon us to make sure that those wastes can be processed by the planet's ecosystems. Waste-absorption capacity is only one of many critical but still scarcely understood services provided by intact ecosystems. These ecosystem services include regulation of atmospheric gases, regulation of water cycles and the provision of clean water, stabilization of the global climate, protection from ultraviolet radiation, and the sustenance of global biodiversity, among many others. Without these services, human life itself would be impossible.

While by 2050, we have made substantial efforts to protect ecosystem services, uncontrolled human economic activity still has the capacity to damage them sufficiently to threaten our civilization. Obviously, well-functioning ecosystems are composed of the same plants and animals that serve as raw material inputs to the economy; and, all else being equal, increasing raw material inputs means diminished ecosystem services. Extraction of renewable raw materials directly diminishes ecosystem services, while the extraction of mineral resources unavoidably causes collateral damage to ecosystems. Ecosystem services are also threatened by waste outputs. While waste outputs from renewable resources are, in general, fairly readily assimilated and broken down by healthy ecosystems, ecosystems have not evolved a similar capacity to break down waste products from mining and industry, concentrated heavy metals, fossil fuels, and synthesized chemicals. In 2050, we have dramatically decreased our reliance on these slow-to-assimilate materials.

Natural capital is also economically important because it provides so many insights into the production process. The more we have learned about how nature produces, the more we have realized the inefficiency, toxicity, and wastefulness of former production techniques. It has now become a standard approach when seeking to solve a production problem to examine healthy ecosystems and strive to understand how they “solve” similar problems.

A recognition and high level of awareness of the importance of natural capital have led to dramatic changes in the way it is treated. The negative environmental impacts of nonrenewable resource use, even more than such materials’ growing scarcity, have forced us to substitute renewable resources for nonrenewables, reversing the trend that began with the Industrial Revolution and making renewables more valuable than ever. Passive investment in natural capital stocks — that is, simply letting systems grow through their own reproductive capacity — is insufficient to meet our needs. Active investment is required. We are actively engaged in restoring and rebuilding our natural capital stocks by planting forests, restoring wetlands, and increasing soil fertility. The former philosophy of natural capital as free goods provided by nature has disappeared. This change has required and inspired significant institutional changes. For example, notions of property rights to natural capital have changed. Most forms of natural capital are now recognized as intergenerational assets. For example, legislation in many countries now explicitly prohibits the extraction of renewable resources beyond the rate at which they can replenish themselves, which would leave future populations dependent for survival on nonrenewable resources in danger of exhaustion and for which no substitutes exist.

Property rights to land are explicitly extended to future generations, and there are steep fines or even criminal penalties for leaving land in worse condition than when it was purchased. While ecological factors determine the total amount of natural capital that we can safely deplete, market forces still determine how that natural capital should be allocated. In addition to these fixed limits on resource use, green taxes now force both consumers and producers to pay for the damage caused by resource depletion and waste emission. When these costs are unknown, those undertaking potentially harmful activities are forced to purchase bonds or insurance that guarantee reimbursement to society for whatever damages

do occur. These policies have dramatically increased the costs of degrading natural capital. As a result, most countries are rapidly weaning themselves from dependence on nonrenewable resources, having developed renewable substitutes for most of them. Many countries are competing to become global leaders in green technology. While we once relied on hydrocarbons as a feedstock for many industrial processes, we now rely heavily on carbohydrates produced by plants. This allows us to build non-toxic, biodegradable carbon polymers from CO₂ extracted directly from the atmosphere. As this technology came into its own, it helped to stabilize and even reduce atmospheric CO₂. Whether we will be able to continue to reduce global warming is still an open question, but one with growing cause for optimism.

Our understanding of ecosystem function has progressed dramatically and we continue to discover new ecosystem services. Yet for every puzzle we solve, we uncover three others. And we remain unable to accurately predict impacts of human activities on specific ecosystems, in part because of ongoing changes induced by continued global change. While the rate of warming has slowed, ecosystems are still slowly adapting to the impacts of that warming. The precautionary principle therefore now plays a critical role in deciding how we treat the environment when there is doubt over the potential impact of resource extraction or waste emissions on ecosystem goods and services. We choose to err on the side of caution. Continuing ecological-restoration efforts have begun to reverse the massive degradation that took place from 1950 through 2020, but continued global warming still threatens dangerous disruptions in ecosystem services. In keeping with the precautionary principle, we now consider it an imperative to develop extensive ecological buffers and to take the idea of planetary boundaries seriously.

Acknowledgments

From: Costanza, R, G Alperovitz, H Daly, J Farley, C Franco, T Jackson, I Kubiszewski, J Schor and P Victor. (2012). *Building a Sustainable and Desirable Economy-in-Society-in-Nature*. New York: United Nations Division for Sustainable Development. Available at http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/dsd_sd21st/21_reports.shtml