

if the most basic human functions are to procreate, grow food, and hunt... what are the sustainable human numbers needed for Ecologic balance, and methods should we use to determine raw variables in regards (define as Economies of Scale x Force Multiplication + La Grange Points) =

The query posits a minimalist view of human society focused on three core functions: procreation (reproduction to sustain the population), growing food (basic agriculture for caloric needs), and hunting (supplementary wild resource extraction). This framework implies a low-technology, pre-industrial agrarian-hunter society with minimal environmental footprint beyond direct extraction—no industrial pollution, global trade, or high-consumption lifestyles. Ecological balance here means a steady-state population where resource use (land, water, biodiversity) does not exceed regeneration rates, avoiding overshoot, soil depletion, or species collapse.

Sustainable Human Population Estimate

Based on historical, anthropological, and ecological data, Earth's carrying capacity for such a society is roughly **100–500 million people**. This range supports long-term balance without advanced tech:

- **Lower end (100 million):** Aligns with global hunter-gatherer densities (0.01–0.1 people/km² across habitable land), extrapolated from prehistoric models. Pure hunting/gathering limits populations due to low yields (e.g., ~10–17 million globally pre-agriculture ~12,000 years ago), but adding basic farming boosts it modestly while keeping impacts low.
- **Upper end (500 million):** Matches pre-industrial agrarian societies (~300–500 million by 1 CE), where ~80% of people farmed/hunted on ~10–20% of land, leaving ecosystems intact. This assumes rotational farming, fallowing, and hunting quotas to prevent erosion or overhunting.

Current global population (~8.1 billion as of 2025) exceeds this by 16–80x, driven by fossil fuels and monocrops, leading to 1.7 Earths' worth of footprint (ecological overshoot). Scaling back to basic functions would require degrowth, but it could restore balance by reducing waste and emissions 70–90%.

Scenario	Estimated Population	Key Assumptions	Ecological Impact
----------	----------------------	-----------------	-------------------

Pure Hunter-Gatherer	10–100 million	1–10 ha/person; no tillage; nomadic	Minimal; mimics natural predation
Basic Agrarian + Hunting	100–500 million	0.5–2 ha/person; mixed crops/livestock; seasonal hunts	Low-moderate; soil regeneration via rotation; biodiversity preserved
Modern Industrial (for comparison)	8–10 billion (unsustainable)	0.2 ha/person via tech; global supply chains	High; 80% overshoot; habitat loss

These figures draw from anthropological baselines (e.g., ~10 million at agriculture's dawn) and models like the Ecological Footprint, adjusted for low-tech yields (~1–2 tons/hectare vs. modern 5+).

### Methods to Determine Raw Variables

"Raw variables" refer to foundational inputs like land availability, caloric output per laborer, reproduction rates, and extraction limits. The provided definition—**(Economies of Scale × Force Multiplication) + Lagrange Points**—offers a conceptual framework for modeling them. I'll interpret and operationalize it as follows, drawing from systems ecology and the queried terms (inspired by resonance-based sustainability models like those in the ERES ARI framework):

- **Economies of Scale (E):** Efficiency gains from population size/grouping (e.g., shared labor in villages reduces per-person energy needs by 20–50%). Variable:  $E = (\text{Group Size} / \text{Individual Output}) \times \text{Resource Sharing Factor}$  (0–1 scale; e.g., 0.3 for small bands, 0.7 for agrarian communes).
- **Force Multiplication (F):** Amplifiers of human effort (e.g., basic tools like plows or cooperative hunts boost yields 2–5x). Variable:  $F = (\text{Tool/Org Multiplier}) \times \text{Labor Input}$  (e.g., 3x for sickles in farming; 2x for group hunting strategies).
- **Lagrange Points (L):** Metaphorical "stable equilibria" (from orbital mechanics, adapted to socio-ecology as balance nodes, e.g., L2 = Economy-Ecology equilibrium). Variable:  $L = \text{Sum of Threshold Balances}$  (e.g., +1 for population where birth/death rates stabilize; -1 for overshoot tipping points). Identifies "sweet spots" like 200 million where procreation matches losses without depletion.

**Formula for Raw Variables (V):**  $V = (E \times F) + L$

This yields a scalar (e.g., 2.5–5.0) to weight inputs in carrying capacity equations. Higher V means more sustainable scale-up.

### Step-by-Step Methods to Determine Variables

Use iterative, data-driven approaches blending historical analysis, field measurements, and modeling. No single tool suffices—combine empirical data with simulations.

**1. Gather Empirical Baselines (Historical/Ethnographic Data):**

- Review pre-industrial records (e.g., Roman Empire ~50–100 million on basic ag/hunting) or modern analogs (e.g., Amish or indigenous groups: ~0.5–1 ha/person sustainable yield).
- Method: Query archives for yields (e.g., medieval Europe: 500–800 kg/hectare wheat). Adjust for local biomes (tropics: higher hunting; arid: lower ag).
- Output: Calibrate E (e.g., village-scale farming = 1.5x solo) and F (e.g., ox-plow = 4x hand-tilling).

**2. Field/Proxy Measurements (Ecological Surveys):**

- Map habitable land (~100 million km<sup>2</sup> excluding deserts/ice) and test low-tech yields (e.g., plot trials: maize at 1 ton/hectare with hand tools).
- Track procreation (fertility rate ~4–6 births/woman) vs. mortality (20–40% infant loss from hunting risks/famine).
- Method: Use GIS for land suitability; sample biodiversity loss from hunting (e.g., sustainable deer harvest = 20% of herd/year).
- Output: Quantify L (e.g., equilibrium at 300 million where ag covers 10% land without deforestation).

**3. Mathematical Modeling (Simulation):**

- Apply logistic growth:  $dP/dt = rP(1 - P/K)$ , where K (carrying capacity) = Total Resources / Per-Capita Need, modulated by V.
  - $r$  = intrinsic growth (0.01–0.02/year from procreation).
  - Per-Capita Need = 2,000 kcal/day (~0.5 ha ag + 0.2 ha hunt).
  - Integrate V:  $K_{\text{adjusted}} = K_{\text{base}} \times V$  (e.g., base K=200 million;  $V=2.5 \rightarrow$  500 million).
- To solve: Start with initial P=10 million (ag dawn). Iterate annually until steady-state ( $dP/dt=0$  at K).
  - Example derivation: At equilibrium,  $P = K$ . For  $V = (0.6 \times 3) + 1 = 2.8$ ,  $K = 200M \times 2.8 = 560M$  (upper bound).
- Tools: Python/SymPy for sensitivity analysis (vary E/F/L  $\pm 20\%$  to test robustness).

**4. Validation (Scenario Testing):**

- Run "what-if" sims: E.g., if F drops (no tools), L shifts to lower equilibrium (~50 million).
- Cross-check with footprint metrics: Sustainable if <1 Earth equivalent (current: 1.7).
- Iterate with stakeholders (e.g., indigenous knowledge for hunting sustainability).

This framework ensures variables are "raw" (unadjusted for modern biases) and tunable for locales. For precise sims, variables like  $E=0.5\text{--}0.8$ ,  $F=2\text{--}4$ ,  $L=1\text{--}2$  yield  $V\sim 2\text{--}4$ , supporting the 100–500M range. Balance requires cultural norms (e.g., taboos on over-hunting) alongside these metrics.

41 web pages

## Search Results

### [Ecological Footprint and Sustainable Population](#)

[A sustainable population corresponds to the total human population that the planet can support without diminishing the health of the biosphere.](#)



[overpopulation-project.com](#)

[Reconciling a positive ecological balance with human development](#)

[We introduce a new criterion based on two constraints, accounting for both ecological and human sustainability.](#)



[sciencedirect.com](#)

[Population, Ecological Footprint and the Sustainable Development ...](#)

[We call the \(ecological\) gap between demand and sustainable supply the Impact Inequality.](#)



[pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](#)

[Ecological Footprint](#)

[The Ecological Footprint measures how fast we consume resources and generate waste compared to how fast nature can absorb our waste and generate resources.](#)



[footprintnetwork.org](#)

[Equal Claims: Earth Can't Fairly or Sustainably Support 8 Billion](#)

[The Earth could only support 1.5 billion people at an average American citizens lifestyle, which uses 8 times more resources that the average Ethiopian.](#)



[populationmedia.org](#)

[The Big Picture - Population Balance](#)

[We are in ecological overshoot, which means we are consuming resources and producing waste 80 percent faster than the Earth can provide or absorb sustainably.](#)



[populationbalance.org](#)

[Humans and the Environment: Population in Ecological Perspective](#)

[Explore how human population growth impacts ecosystems, resource use, and sustainability: a critical look at population dynamics through an ...](#)



[scienceabbey.com](#)

[Ecological Footprint and Sustainable Population - MAHB](#)

[A sustainable population corresponds to the total human population that the planet can support without diminishing the health of the biosphere.](#)



[mahb.stanford.edu](#)

[How Does Overpopulation Affect Sustainability? - Earth.Org](#)

[With more people comes more waste and pollution, which can lead to water contamination, air pollution, and other environmental issues. This has ...](#)



[earth.org](#)

[How many people could inhabit Earth if we were still hunter - Reddit](#)

[According to an article I found, 100 million people could be supported globally if they were all hunter gatherers. \[https://science.howstuffworks ...\]\(https://science.howstuffworks...\)](#)



[reddit.com](#)

[\[PDF\] WHAT'S THE EARTH'S CARRYING CAPACITY? - K20 Learn](#)

[The maximum population of a species an environment can sustain is called the carrying capacity of the environment. Carrying capacity estimates can vary.](#)

 [learn.k20center.ou.edu](https://learn.k20center.ou.edu)

[Global hunter-gatherer population densities constrained by ...](#)

[The modelled global total hunter-gatherer population is 17 million, which is at the high end of the estimates of prehistoric \(pre-agriculture\) population ...](#)

 [pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

[Agriculture and Human Population Growth | CK-12 Foundation](#)

[Many anthropologists say that the carrying capacity of humans on the planet without agriculture is about 10 million \(Figure below\). This population was reached ...](#)

 [flexbooks.ck12.org](https://flexbooks.ck12.org)

[5.2: Carrying Capacity - Biology LibreTexts](#)

[Carrying capacity, "K," refers to the number of individuals of a population that can be sustained indefinitely by a given area.](#)

 [bio.libretexts.org](https://bio.libretexts.org)

[Human Populations | Earth Science - Lumen Learning](#)

[Many anthropologists say that the carrying capacity of humans on the planet without agriculture is about 10 million \(Figure below\). This population was reached ...](#)

 [courses.lumenlearning.com](https://courses.lumenlearning.com)

[How to Feed 8 Billion People in a World Designed for 10 Million](#)

[Humans have lived more than 90 percent of our existence as hunter-gatherers. Prior to the advent of agriculture some 10,000 to 15,000 years ago, ...](#)

 [crozetgazette.com](https://crozetgazette.com)

[Here's How Earth's Carrying Capacity Has Increased Over Time](#)

[Earth's carrying capacity, the number of humans our planet can support, has been long debated and there is no clear answer.](#)

 [populationeducation.org](https://populationeducation.org)

[What is the carrying capacity of Earth for human beings if everyone ...](#)

[Therefore, the most widely accepted estimate for human carrying capacity of Earth is around 8 billion people \(at current consumption rates\). To ...](#)

 [quora.com](https://www.quora.com)

[How can "We The People" evolve gracefully? - ResearchGate](#)

[... force multiplication effect that amplifies individual ... If the company has a minimum level of production due to economies of scale ...](#)

 [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)

[\(PDF\) ERES ARI E-Manual V.1 - ResearchGate](#)

[- Amplifies compliance with core rules, integrated with Graceful Contribution Formula. 3. \\*\\*LaGrange Points ... economies of scale, force.](#)

 [researchgate.net](https://www.researchgate.net)

[\[PDF\] Space for Operations - IRSEM](#)

[The libration points, more often known as Lagrange points, are zones within which the ... by the other and thereby achieve consistent economies of scale. The ...](#)



[New Study Rewrites the Story of Humanity's Leap to Farming](#)

[A new study published shifts the narrative on the origins of farming by emphasizing the active role of human interaction, rather than environmental change.](#)



[How ecological feedbacks between human population and land ...](#)

[We model human population over the next century, emphasizing feedbacks between natural and agricultural resource availability and human demography.](#)



[Feeding Billions, Failing Nature - Population Matters](#)

[Sustainable farming practices that enhance soil health and protect biodiversity are essential to ensure long-term food security without ...](#)



[8 Billion Will Die! | Do the Math](#)

[One of the most common reactions is that abandoning agriculture is tantamount to committing many billions of people to death, since the planet ...](#)



[To what extent and how did hunter-gatherer cultures practice ...](#)

[Can anyone point to specific instances of hunter-gatherer cultures consciously engaging in sustainable hunting/fishing?](#)



[Returning to "Normal"? Evolutionary Roots of the Human Prospect](#)

[... hunting and gathering to abnormal agriculture and launched an acceleration of population growth. We might trace that transformation's ...](#)



[Can agriculture become sustainable and still feed a growing human ...](#)

[The vast majority of our agriculture is already sustainable. Soil erosion is a problem in only a few places, and others forms of soil degradation are more and ...](#)



[Impact of Sustainable Agriculture and Farming Practices](#)

[Sustainable agricultural operations and farming practices yield positive impacts on the environment, animals, and people. Here's how.](#)



[Hunter-gatherer land management in the human break from ...](#)

[The land management practices of some hunter-gatherer societies have been portrayed as sustainable, even beneficial. Research suggests such practices may ...](#)



[Hunter-gatherer populations inform modern ecology - PNAS](#)

[Their estimates of hunter-gatherer populations provide a useful baseline for understanding how the human species has alleviated environmental constraints.](#)



[12.1: History of Human Population Growth - Biology LibreTexts](#)

[During the time of the Agricultural Revolution, 10,000 B.C., there were only 5-10 million people on Earth - which is basically the population ...](#)

 [bio.libretexts.org](https://bio.libretexts.org)

[World population - Wikipedia](#)

[It took around 300,000 years of human prehistory and history for the human population to reach a billion and only 218 more years to reach 8 billion. High, ...](#)

 [en.wikipedia.org](https://en.wikipedia.org)

[Population trends and the transition to agriculture: Global processes ...](#)

[The early move toward agriculture was associated with changes in age-independent mortality. It dampened the potential for unrestrained population growth.](#)

 [pnas.org](https://pnas.org)

[The Development of Agriculture - National Geographic Education](#)

[The development of agricultural about 12,000 years ago changed the way humans lived. They switched from nomadic hunter-gatherer lifestyles ...](#)

 [education.nationalgeographic.org](https://education.nationalgeographic.org)

[Agriculture, population growth, and statistical analysis of the ...](#)

[The human population has grown significantly since the onset of the Holocene about 12,000 y ago. Despite decades of research, the factors ...](#)

 [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

[Toward an age of low tech for a more resilient and sustainable society](#)

[I believe 'high' technology will not solve global problems and propose a different 'low tech' approach to building a more resilient, equitable and sustainable ...](#)

 [resilience.org](https://resilience.org)

[Is living low tech the answer? - Shado Magazine](#)

[Low-tech living doesn't mean abandoning all technology "We cannot completely get rid of high-tech today, but we need to put limits on it," ...](#)

 [shado-mag.com](https://shado-mag.com)

[Minimum Population For a High Tech Society?](#)

[The answer is different for different tech levels. It is different not only in terms of low tech level needs one person to make stone knives and ...](#)

 [worldbuilding.stackexchange.com](https://worldbuilding.stackexchange.com)

[Green New Deal: How About A "Low Tech New Deal"?](#)

[Redistribution of populations into communities of no more than 10,000 people spread across the landscape according to geographically bounded " ...](#)

 [lowtechinstitute.org](https://lowtechinstitute.org)

[The Age of Low Tech: Towards a Technologically Sustainable ...](#)

[A best-seller in France, this English language edition introduces readers to an alternative perspective on our technological future.](#)

 [academic.oup.com](https://academic.oup.com)

what if the standard of living is the function defining comfort, is there a number where the Earth's resources can be sustained indefinitely, or are we bound to need another "HOST" as a Species?

If we define "standard of living" (SOL) as the level of material comfort, resource consumption, and waste generation per person—encompassing factors like energy use, diet, housing, transportation, and goods—then Earth's sustainable human population is indeed finite but flexible. It hinges on per-capita ecological footprint (EF), which measures the biologically productive land and water area required to support a person's lifestyle against the planet's regenerative capacity (biocapacity). Currently, global biocapacity is about 1.6-1.63 global hectares (gha) per person if divided equally among ~8.1 billion people, but humanity's average EF is ~2.75-2.77 gha per person, leading to an overshoot of ~1.7 Earths' worth of resources annually. This means we're depleting stocks (e.g., soils, forests, fisheries) and accumulating wastes (e.g., CO<sub>2</sub>) faster than renewal, which is unsustainable long-term.

Indefinite sustainability—maintaining resources without degradation over centuries or millennia—requires keeping total EF ≤ global biocapacity. This isn't a fixed number; it scales inversely with SOL: higher comfort demands more resources per person, supporting fewer people overall. Technology can expand effective biocapacity (e.g., via renewables, efficiency, or synthetic alternatives), but it has limits due to physics, biodiversity loss, and unintended effects like climate change. Historical and modeled estimates vary, but here's a breakdown based on lifestyle tiers, drawing from ecological models:

## Sustainable Population Estimates by Standard of Living

These are approximate ranges for steady-state scenarios, assuming optimized resource use, no net depletion, and adaptation to climate shifts. They're derived from EF calculations and carrying capacity studies, not absolutes.

- **High SOL (e.g., US or Australian levels: ~7-14 gha/person, with high meat consumption, car dependency, and energy use):** Sustainable population: ~1-2 billion. At this level, equivalent to current affluent nations, Earth could support about 1.5 billion indefinitely without overshoot. This assumes advanced tech like widespread renewables but still high waste. Exceeding this risks irreversible damage, as seen in current trends where high-income countries use 3-8x the global average resources.
- **Medium SOL (e.g., European or global average aspirational: ~3-5 gha/person, with efficient urban living, balanced diets, and public transit):** Sustainable population: ~3-4 billion. This allows for comfortable lives with healthcare, education, and moderate consumption. Some models suggest 4 billion as a threshold for "reasonable" SOL without biosphere collapse, balancing human development indices (HDI) with EF.



- **Low/Subsistence SOL (e.g., many developing nations: <2-3 gha/person, focused on basic needs like simple agriculture, minimal energy, and local resources):**  
Sustainable population: ~7-10 billion. At bare-minimum comfort (e.g., subsistence farming/hunting as in the prior query), closer to 7 billion at pure renewal rates, but tech like improved agriculture could push to 10 billion short-term. However, this implies widespread poverty and vulnerability to shocks.

SOL Level	Per-Capita EF (gha)	Sustainable Population	Key Constraints	Example Countries' Current EF
High	7-14	1-2 billion	High energy/waste; biodiversity loss	US (7.8), Australia (5.4-14 equiv. in emissions)
Medium	3-5	3-4 billion	Moderate tech reliance; climate adaptation	Germany (7.1 equiv.), Japan (8)
Low	<2-3	7-10 billion	Basic needs only; famine risks	India (~1), Ethiopia (low, ~1)

These figures account for variables like population distribution, tech multipliers (e.g., boosting yields 2-5x), and economies of scale (e.g., urban efficiency reducing per-person needs by 20-50%). But they're not static—rising sea levels or soil loss could shrink biocapacity 10-20% by 2100.

### Are We Bound to Need Another "Host"?

Not necessarily, if we prioritize sustainability over endless growth. Earth can sustain us indefinitely at medium-to-low SOL with systemic changes: shifting to circular economies, renewables (e.g., solar/wind covering 100% energy), plant-based diets (reducing EF by 20-30%), and population stabilization via education/family planning. Models show that with these, 4-6 billion at comfortable levels is feasible long-term, avoiding collapse. Human ingenuity has historically expanded capacity (e.g., agriculture revolution raised it from ~10 million to billions), and future innovations like vertical farming or fusion could add 20-50% more without depletion.

However, if "comfort" escalates unchecked—demanding ever-higher SOL for a growing population (projected 9-10 billion by 2050)—we'll hit hard limits. Overshoot is already causing biodiversity crashes (60% species loss since 1970) and climate tipping points, potentially halving biocapacity. In that case, yes, humanity might need an off-planet "host" for resources or habitation:

- **Short-term (decades):** Asteroid mining for metals/rare earths, or lunar/orbital habitats for overflow population/tech.

- **Long-term (centuries):** Colonizing Mars or exoplanets, but this is speculative—current tech makes it energy-intensive and risky, supporting perhaps millions, not billions. It's not a quick fix; we'd still need Earth as primary host.

Ultimately, the "number" exists but is chosen by us through policy and behavior. Without degrowth in high-consumption areas and equity in distribution, we're on track for ecological debt, forcing either population decline (via natural checks like famine/disease) or expansion beyond Earth. Prioritizing well-being over quantity could keep us thriving here indefinitely.

29 web pages

### Search Results

[Population, Ecological Footprint and the Sustainable Development ...](#)

[The Anthropocene can be read as being the era when the demand humanity makes on the biosphere's goods and services—humanity's 'ecological footprint'—vastly ...](#)

 [pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov)

[Ecological Footprint and Sustainable Population](#)

[A sustainable population corresponds to the total human population that the planet can support without diminishing the health of the biosphere.](#)

 [overpopulation-project.com](https://overpopulation-project.com)

[Ecological Footprint and Sustainable Population - MAHB](#)

[A sustainable population corresponds to the total human population that the planet can support without diminishing the health of the biosphere.](#)

 [mahb.stanford.edu](https://mahb.stanford.edu)

[Ecological Footprint](#)

[The Ecological Footprint measures how fast we consume resources and generate waste compared to how fast nature can absorb our waste and generate resources.](#)

 [footprintnetwork.org](https://footprintnetwork.org)

[Sustainable Development - Global Footprint Network](#)

[One simple way to assess sustainable development is by using the Ecological Footprint and the Human Development Index \(HDI\).](#)

 [footprintnetwork.org](https://footprintnetwork.org)

[Equal Claims: Earth Can't Fairly or Sustainably Support 8 Billion](#)

[The Earth could only support 1.5 billion people at an average American citizens lifestyle, which uses 8 times more resources than the average Ethiopian.](#)

 [populationmedia.org](https://populationmedia.org)

[Willing to Live Sustainably? | Ecological Footprint | Earth Overshoot](#)

[8.3 billion people are consuming far more resources than the earth can naturally renew and emitting far more wastes than it can absorb.](#)

 [earthovershoot.org](https://earthovershoot.org)

[Impact of urbanization and human development on ecological ...](#)

[This study investigates the influence of urbanization and human development controlling for GDP and industrialization on ecological footprints](#)

 [sciencedirect.com](https://www.sciencedirect.com)

[The Human Footprint - World Wildlife Fund](#)

[Every human produces an individual ecological footprint that is determined largely by the wealth and level of development in the country they live in.](#)

 [worldwildlife.org](https://www.worldwildlife.org)

[\[PDF\] Ecological Footprint and Sustainable Population | MAHB](#)

[To assess this population, several calculation methods can be used, or even combined. In this contribution, we will confine ourselves to a ...](#)

 [mahb.stanford.edu](https://mahb.stanford.edu)

[Has the Earth reached its carrying capacity? | HowStuffWorks](#)

[In 1798, an English clergyman named Thomas Malthus made a dire prediction: He said the Earth could not indefinitely support an ever-increasing human population. The planet, he said, would check population growth through famine if humans didn't check themselves. The theory publicized by Malthus is known as the carrying capacity of Earth. Carrying capacity itself is a well-known and widely accepted concept in ecology. It's a very basic idea -- sustainability requires balance.](#)

 [science.howstuffworks.com](https://science.howstuffworks.com)

[Carrying Capacity - World Population](#)

[Human population, now nearing 8 billion, cannot continue to grow indefinitely. There are limits to the life-sustaining resources earth can provide us. In other words, there is a carrying capacity for human life on our planet. Carrying capacity is the maximum number of a species an environment can support indefinitely.](#)

 [worldpopulationhistory.org](https://worldpopulationhistory.org)

[Carrying capacity - Wikipedia](#)

[This suggests to technological optimists that new technological discoveries \(or the deployment of existing ones\) could continue to increase Earth's human carrying capacity, as it has in the past. Yet technology has unexpected side effects, as we have seen with stratospheric ozone depletion, excessive nitrogen deposition in the world's rivers and bays, and global climate change. This suggests that 8 billion people may be sustainable for a few generations, but not over the long term, and the term 'carrying capacity' implies a population that is sustainable indefinitely.](#)

 [en.wikipedia.org](https://en.wikipedia.org)

[r/Futurology on Reddit: What is your estimate of Earth's human carrying capacity?](#)

[While I don't have an answer for this I have been thinking about it since a religious family member indicated that he did not think humans could impact the planet from an environmental perspective, if that were true the earth would need to have an infinite carrying capacity and after a tiny bit of thought I realised that whatever it is, it is not infinite and if it is not infinite then sustainability must be factored in to everything if the planet is to survive for the longest possible timeframe.](#)

 [reddit.com](https://www.reddit.com)

[Can Earth support 4 billion people sustainably and well? - N-IUSSP](#)

[On October 18, 2023, the International Union for the Scientific Study of Population \(2023\) broadcast a Yes-or-No debate on the statement: "The population of humans that can be supported sustainably on the planet at a reasonable standard of living is below 4 billion." Here is an abridged version of Joel E. Cohen's introduction to and background for the debate. Professor Stan Becker, who proposed the debate \(UN 2023\), asked me to provide background for it, probably because some time ago](#)

[\(Cohen 1995, p. 368\) I reviewed 66 published estimates of the human carrying capacity of Earth, as defined in various ways by the publications.](#)

 [niussp.org](https://niussp.org)

[What is the Carrying Capacity of Earth? A conversation with Joel Cohen](#)

[But so does resource inequality, future technologies, conflict resolution, economic systems, social demographics, physical environment preferences, risk assessments, population variability, sustainability time horizons and values, tastes, and fashions. "It's a dubious value in many of its applications. The existence of a carrying capacity in wildlife management is not supported. Animals change their environment and that changes their capacity," Cohen said. "Humans change their worlds and that changes their capacities."](#)

 [populationconnection.org](https://populationconnection.org)

[How many people can Earth actually support? - Curious](#)

[An average middle-class American consumes 3.3 times the subsistence level of food and almost 250 times the subsistence level of clean water. So if everyone on Earth lived like a middle class American, then the planet might have a carrying capacity of around 2 billion.](#)

 [science.org.au](https://science.org.au)

[The Earth's carrying capacity for human life is not fixed | Aeon Ideas](#)

[Despite its seeming scientific precision, the claim is old, not new – the latest iteration of the longstanding assertion that our population and consumption might soon exceed the Earth's fixed 'carrying capacity'. The concept, tellingly, owes its origin to 19th-century shipping, referring to the payload capacities of steam ships. It jumped from the inanimate to the terrestrial at the end of the 19th century, describing the maximum number of livestock or wild game that grassland and rangeland ecosystems could sustain.](#)

 [aeon.co](https://aeon.co)

[Population, Sustainability, and Earth's Carrying Capacity on JSTOR](#)

 [jstor.org](https://jstor.org)

[How many people can Earth support? | Live Science](#)

[The number of people Earth can support is not a fixed figure. The way humans produce and consume natural resources affects how our environment will be able to sustain future populations. As Gerland said, "When it comes to carrying capacity, it's a matter of mode of production, mode of consumption, who has access to what and how."](#)

 [livescience.com](https://livescience.com)

[Ecological Footprint by Country 2025 - World Population Review](#)

[The U.S. has an ecological footprint of 7.8 gha per capita as of 2024, one of the highest in the world, with a biocapacity per capita of 3.7 hectares. This ...](#)

 [worldpopulationreview.com](https://worldpopulationreview.com)

[Ecological Footprint by Country 2023 - TRANSCEND International](#)

[The world-average ecological footprint was 2.77 global hectares per person \(12 billion total\) in 2017, with an average biocapacity of 1.60 global hectares.](#)

 [transcend.org](https://transcend.org)

[ecological footprint data - Global Footprint Network](#)

[COUNTRIES WITH BIOCAPACITY RESERVE. Percentage that biocapacity exceeds Ecological Footprint. Gabon 663%; Congo ...](#)

 [data.footprintnetwork.org](https://data.footprintnetwork.org)

[List of countries by ecological footprint - Wikipedia](#)

[The world-average ecological footprint in 2016 was 2.75 global hectares per person \(22.6 billion in total\). With a world-average biocapacity of 1.63 global ...](#)

 [en.wikipedia.org](https://en.wikipedia.org)

[Per capita greenhouse gas emissions, 2023 - Our World in Data](#)

[Greenhouse gas emissions are measured in tonnes per person of carbon dioxide-equivalents over a 100-year timescale.](#)

 [ourworldindata.org](https://ourworldindata.org)

[EDA on 2023 Global ecological footprint data - Kaggle](#)

[This suggests that countries with higher GDP per capita tend to have a higher total ecological footprint. link code. Income Groups vs Total Ecological Footprint ...](#)

 [kaggle.com](https://kaggle.com)

[Per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by source, 2023 - Our World in Data](#)

[Per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by source, 2023 ; 5.4 t · Australia 14 t ; 6.6 t · United States 14 t ; China 8.4 t ; 3 t · Japan 8 t ; 2.7 t · Germany 7.1 t ...](#)

 [ourworldindata.org](https://ourworldindata.org)

[Global Ecological Footprint 2023 \[latest report\] - Kaggle](#)

[The Ecological Footprint of Consumption measures the ecological assets that a given population requires to produce the natural resources it consumes.](#)

 [kaggle.com](https://kaggle.com)

[Countries With The Highest Carbon Footprint 2025 - GreenMatch](#)

[For example, the US ranks 13th for per capita emissions at 13.68 metric tons, while China is 28th at 8.20 metric tons despite having the highest ...](#)

 [greenmatch.co.uk](https://greenmatch.co.uk)