Living Within Our Means: Why the Ecological Footprint Still Matters

By Dr. Dhiraj Pradhananga

What Is the Ecological Footprint?

Have you ever wondered how much of nature your lifestyle uses up? From the food you eat to the electricity that powers your home, every choice adds up to what scientists call our Ecological Footprint.

The Ecological Footprint is a way to measure how much land and sea we need to support our lives – to grow our food, absorb our waste, and provide the materials we use every day. It helps us see if we are living within the planet's means – or using more than nature can regenerate.

This idea isn't new. It was introduced in the 1990s by Mathis Wackernagel and William Rees, but it remains more relevant than ever. Today, we live in a time of rising temperatures, shrinking forests, and growing cities. Keeping track of our ecological impact has become essential for creating a future that works for both people and the planet.

Why It Matters More in 2024

As of 2024, humanity is using up more natural resources than Earth can replace in a year. This year's Earth Overshoot Day fell on July 24. From that day onward, we started living on borrowed resources.

Think of it like spending all your salary by July and living on loans for the rest of the year.

Right now:
- The Earth provides about 1.6 global hectares of resources per person.
- But each person uses about 2.3 hectares on average.
- That leaves a gap of 0.7 global hectares per person – an ecological debt we pass on to future generations.

This ecological overspending is not the same everywhere. Wealthier countries tend to have bigger footprints – mainly because of higher consumption and more fossil fuel use. On the other hand, many communities in places like rural Nepal still live with a small footprint, often out of necessity rather than choice.

Lessons from the Water Mills of Nepal

Back in 2003, I studied the ecological footprint of water mills (ghattas) in Nepal's hills. These traditional mills, powered by rivers, have supported rural life for generations. They grind grain using flowing water—no fossil fuels, no pollution.

At first glance, they seem like the perfect green technology.

But there's more to the story.

As demand for more power grew, Improved Water Mills (IWMs) were introduced with metal runners and electricity generation features. These were a big leap forward for rural energy access. However, my research showed that without careful planning, such improvements could increase energy demand and lead to higher environmental footprints—especially if they replaced simplicity with consumption.

This was one of the earliest applications of Ecological Footprint Analysis (EFA) to micro-energy systems in Nepal, and it showed a clear lesson: Even green technologies must be monitored for their full environmental cost.

Making the Ecological Footprint More Human

In the Green View article I wrote earlier this year, I emphasized how local knowledge and practical examples can make complex concepts like the Ecological Footprint easier to understand.

When I spoke with villagers near Bardia, one elder said:
"Hamro jeevan ta prakritiko gati sanga chaldai cha." ("Our life moves with the rhythm of nature.")

This wisdom captures what the Ecological Footprint tries to measure: how close – or far – we are from nature's balance.

In fact, many traditional systems already promote low-footprint living:
- Organic farming without synthetic inputs.
- Shared transportation and walking.
- Low-waste households, reusing and recycling long before it became fashionable.

These practices aren't just good habits – they're the foundation of ecological living.

Where Do We Go from Here?

The Ecological Footprint is now used worldwide by scientists, planners, businesses, and even schools to:
- Track national resource use
- Design low-impact cities
- Model future consumption scenarios
- Set sustainable development goals

In Nepal, we should continue to use tools like the National Footprint and Biocapacity Accounts and adapt them to our own contexts, just like we did with water mills.

We also need to:
- Educate the next generation about living within our means.
- Support communities that already follow low-footprint lifestyles.
- Bridge science and tradition, so sustainability becomes something we live, not just talk about.

Final Thoughts

The Ecological Footprint reminds us of a simple truth:
We are part of nature, not apart from it.

If we continue to take more than nature can give, the planet will push back – through climate change, resource scarcity, and biodiversity loss.

But if we listen to both science and our elders, balance is possible.

Let's walk lighter on the Earth. Not just because we have to—but because we can.

References

- Chambers, N., & Lewis, K. (2024). Ecological Footprint Analysis: Toward a Sustainability Indicator for Business. London: Certified Accountants Educational Trust.
- Global Footprint Network. (2024). Earth Overshoot Day 2024. https://www.footprintnetwork.org
- Pradhananga, D. (2003). Ecological Footprint Analysis of Water Mills in Nepal. University of Melbourne.
- Wackernagel, M., & Rees, W. (1996). Our Ecological Footprint: Reducing Human Impact on the Earth. New Society Publishers.
- WWF. (2022). Living Planet Report 2022. https://www.worldwildlife.org