


## The emergence and evolution of Earth System Science

Will Steffen , Katherine Richardson, Johan Rockström, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber, Opha Pauline Dube, Sébastien Dutreuil, Timothy M. Lenton and Jane Lubchenco

**Abstract** | Earth System Science (ESS) is a rapidly emerging transdisciplinary endeavour aimed at understanding the structure and functioning of the Earth as a complex, adaptive system. Here, we discuss the emergence and evolution of ESS, outlining the importance of these developments in advancing our understanding of global change. Inspired by early work on biosphere–geosphere interactions and by novel perspectives such as the Gaia hypothesis, ESS emerged in the 1980s following demands for a new ‘science of the Earth’. The International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme soon followed, leading to an unprecedented level of international commitment and disciplinary integration. ESS has produced new concepts and frameworks central to the global-change discourse, including the Anthropocene, tipping elements and planetary boundaries. Moving forward, the grand challenge for ESS is to achieve a deep integration of biophysical processes and human dynamics to build a truly unified understanding of the Earth System.

For tens of thousands of years, indigenous cultures around the world have recognized cycles and systems in the environment, and that humans are an integral part of these. However, it was only in the early 20th century that contemporary systems thinking was applied to the Earth, initiating the emergence of Earth System Science (ESS). Building on the recognition that life exerts a strong influence on the Earth’s chemical and physical environment, ESS originated in a Cold War context with the rise of environmental and complex system sciences<sup>1–3</sup>.

The ESS framework has since become a powerful tool for understanding how Earth operates as a single, complex, adaptive system, driven by the diverse interactions between energy, matter and organisms. In particular, it connects traditional disciplines — which typically examine components in isolation — to build a unified understanding of the Earth. With human activities increasingly destabilizing the system over the last two centuries, this perspective is necessary for studying global changes and their planetary-level impacts and risks, including phenomena

such as climate change, biodiversity loss and nutrient loading. Indeed, one of the most pressing challenges of ESS is to determine whether past warm periods in Earth history are a possible outcome of current human pressures and, if so, how they can best be avoided.

In this Perspective, we explore the emergence and evolution of ESS, outlining its history, tools and approaches, new concepts and future directions. We focus largely on the surface Earth System, that is, the interacting physical, chemical and biological processes between the atmosphere, cryosphere, land, ocean and lithosphere. Although other definitions of ESS include the whole planetary interior<sup>4,5</sup>, the processes of which become increasingly important as the timescale of consideration increases<sup>6</sup>, we focus on the surface, where the majority of materials are cycled within the Earth System.

### The emergence of ESS

We begin with a brief history of ESS, outlining important historical phases, including: precursors and beginnings up through the 1970s, the founding of a new

science in the 1980s, global expansion in the 1990s and present-day ESS. A timeline of key events, publications and organizations that characterize the evolution of ESS is shown in FIG. 1.

**Beginnings (pre-1970s).** Past conceptualizations of the Earth formed important precursors to the contemporary understanding of the Earth System. Examples include J. Hutton’s 1788 ‘theory of the Earth’, Humboldtian science in the 19th century and V. Vernadsky’s 1926 ‘The Biosphere’<sup>7</sup>. Understanding the historical roots of ESS, however, requires a focus on the second half of the 20th century when, in a Cold War context, important shifts occurred in the Earth and environmental sciences<sup>8</sup>. Thanks to military patronage taking precedence over traditional sources of funding for Earth sciences, geophysics experienced unprecedented growth<sup>9</sup>. Moreover, surveying and monitoring the global environment became a strategic imperative, providing information that would later be useful for contemporary ESS<sup>10,11</sup>.

In the middle of the 20th century, international science started to develop, epitomized by the International Geophysical Year (IGY) 1957–1958 (REF.<sup>12</sup>). This unprecedented research campaign coordinated the efforts of 67 countries to obtain a more integrated understanding of the geosphere, particularly glaciology, oceanography and meteorology. One of the key impacts of the IGY was a lasting transformation in the practices used to understand how the Earth works. The interpretative and qualitative geological and climatological research based on field observations — as classically studied by geographers — was replaced by field instrumentation, continuous and quantitative monitoring of multiple variables and numerical models<sup>13</sup>. This transformation led to the two contemporary paradigms that structure the Earth sciences: modern climatology and plate tectonics<sup>14,15</sup>.

Ecology and environmental sciences also developed rapidly<sup>16</sup>. Ecosystem ecology emerged with the work of G. E. Hutchinson and the brothers H. Odum and E. Odum, supported by the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE).




Fig. 1 | **Timeline illustrating the development of Earth System Science from the mid-20th century.** The figure shows the key organizations, events and concepts that have helped to define and develop Earth System Science.

Large projects such as the International Biological Program (IBP) were a major step towards a global ecological study. These efforts provided the basis for understanding the role of the biosphere in the functioning of the Earth System as a whole<sup>17–21</sup>.

The 1960s and 1970s were marked by a broadening cultural awareness of environmental issues in both the scientific community and the general public. Driving this increased awareness were

the publication of R. Carson's *Silent Spring*<sup>22</sup>, the 'Only One Earth' discourse at the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, the first alerts on ozone depletion and climatic change<sup>23,24</sup> and the Club of Rome's publication of the *Limits to Growth* report<sup>25</sup>, the latter warning of the finitude of economic growth due to resource depletion and pollution<sup>26</sup>. Visual images of the Earth, in particular 'The Blue Marble' image taken by the crew of the Apollo 17

spacecraft on 7 December 1972, sharpened the research focus on the planet as a whole and highlighted its vulnerability to the general public<sup>27–29</sup>.

Amidst these developments, J. Lovelock introduced the term Gaia in 1972 as an entity comprised of the total ensemble of living beings and the environment with which they interact, and hypothesized that living beings regulate the global environment by generating homeostatic




Fig. 2 | **The NASA Bretherton diagram of the Earth System.** The classical, simplified depiction of the Earth System and its interactions. The focus is on the interactions between the geosphere and the biosphere, with human forcings represented as an outside force affecting the geosphere–biosphere system. Reproduced with permission of National Academies Press from NASA (1986) Earth System Science Overview. A program for global change. Prepared by the Earth System Sciences Committee, NASA Advisory Council. 48pp. (REF.<sup>4</sup>), permission conveyed through Copyright Clearance Center, Inc.

feedbacks<sup>30</sup>. Although this hypothesis generated scientific debate and criticism<sup>31,32</sup>, it also generated a new way of thinking about the Earth: the major influence of the biota on the global environment and the importance of the interconnectedness and feedbacks that link major components of the Earth System<sup>33–35</sup>.

The scientific developments up to 1980 — from Vernadsky's pioneering research, through large-scale field campaigns and the emerging environmental awareness of the 1970s, to Lovelock's Gaia — led to a new understanding of the Earth, challenging a purely geophysical conception of the planet and transforming our view of the environment and nature<sup>16,36</sup>. The stage was now set for the introduction of a new science — a more formal and well-organized ESS.

**Founding a new science (1980s).** Triggered by the growing recognition of global changes such as human-driven ozone depletion and climatic change, a series of workshop and conference reports in the 1980s called for a new 'science of the Earth'<sup>37,38</sup>. The calls were based on the acknowledgement that if a new science was to be founded, it would need to be based on the newly emerging recognition of Earth as an integrated entity: the Earth System.

At NASA, the new scientific endeavour was named 'Earth System science'. The NASA Earth System Science Committee was established in 1983 (REF.<sup>39</sup>) and aimed at supporting the Earth Observing System (EOS) satellites and associated research

that helped drive the evolving definition of ESS via observations, modelling and process studies. The NASA-led research initiatives also developed new visual representations of the Earth System, most famously the NASA Bretherton Committee diagram<sup>4</sup> (FIG. 2). The Bretherton diagram (as it is often referred to) was the first systems–dynamics representation of the Earth System to couple the physical climate system and biogeochemical cycles through a complicated array of forcings and feedbacks. Humans constituted a single box of their own connected to the rest of the Earth System through three forcings (carbon dioxide, pollutant emissions and land-use change) and their corresponding impacts<sup>40</sup>. The Bretherton diagram epitomized the rapidly growing field of ESS through its visualization of the interacting physical, chemical and biological processes that connect components of the Earth System and through the recognition that human activities were a significant driving force for change in the system.

Reports, workshops and conferences all agreed that ESS, given the very nature of its object, should be interdisciplinary and international: interdisciplinary given that interactions between processes do not respect disciplinary barriers and international because global phenomena are studied. Whilst interactions within individual components of the Earth had already been studied, the emphasis of ESS was in understanding the multi-component interactions between physical, chemical

and biological processes. This created a significant challenge in bringing different disciplines together to study the Earth System as a whole.

The challenge of international commitment and disciplinary integration was addressed in 1986 by the International Council for Science (ICSU) with the formation of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP)<sup>5,41–43</sup>, which joined the World Climate Research Programme (WCRP), formed in 1980 to study the physical-climate component of the Earth System. The IGBP was originally structured around a number of core projects on biogeochemical aspects of the Earth System: ocean carbon cycle, terrestrial ecosystems, atmospheric chemistry, the hydrological cycle and others. Two projects of particular importance were Past Global Changes (PAGES) and Global Analysis, Integration, and Modelling (GAIM), given their locus of strong disciplinary integration. In addition, the IGBP developed a dedicated project on data and information systems (DIS), especially remotely sensed data, to support the research.

This convergence of disciplines accelerated the evolution of ESS, evident as a transition from isolated process studies to interactions between these processes, and increasingly global-level observations, analyses and modelling<sup>44</sup>. ESS thus facilitated the transformation from interdisciplinary research (where multiple disciplines work together to tackle common problems) to transdisciplinary research (where disciplinary boundaries fade as researchers work together to address a common problem). ESS consequently has a diverse epistemological framework, adopting fundamental building blocks and methodologies from diverse disciplines to tackle highly complex questions.

The scientific effervescence of the 1980s was linked with the political ambition to do something about global change. Motivated by the Brundtland report (1987), *Our Common Future*<sup>45</sup>, and the growing interest in sustainable development, many actors thought that the IGBP should be designed to provide scientific knowledge that was more immediately policy relevant, generating some initial disagreement<sup>46</sup>. However, a more policy-relevant international research effort would have to wait until the 1990s. Nevertheless, by the end of the 1980s, ESS had emerged as a powerful new scientific endeavour, triggered by the growing recognition of global change and built on the rapid development of interdisciplinary research methods.

**Going global (1990s–2000s).** The formal launch of the IGBP in 1990 and the widespread use of the Bretherton diagram (FIG. 2) powered the ongoing development of ESS. Yet, despite the rapidly increasing use of resources and the emerging impacts of climate change, the underlying human drivers of global change, as well as population and community ecology, were not a strong focus. Thus, motivated by a suite of studies that illustrated the importance and relevance of ecological research to climate change, biodiversity and sustainability more broadly<sup>47,48</sup>, the international research programme DIVERSITAS was created in 1991 to study the loss of, and change in, global biodiversity, complementing the IGBP's research on the functional aspects of terrestrial and marine ecosystems. The quantification of human impacts on the planet from climate change, fixed nitrogen, biodiversity loss and fishery collapses brought the reality of a human-dominated planet into focus<sup>49</sup>.

In 1996, the International Human Dimensions Programme (IHDP) on Global Environmental Change was founded, providing a global platform for social science research that explored the human drivers of change to the Earth System and the consequences to human and societal well-being. This global system of international research programmes, including the WCRP, IGBP, DIVERSITAS and IHDP, provided 'workspaces' for international scientists of different disciplines to come together, which was critical for the development of ESS. In the early 2000s, this more complete suite of global-change programmes, along with the emerging concept of sustainability<sup>50</sup>, would give birth to sustainability science<sup>51</sup>.

In the late 1990s, H. J. Schellnhuber introduced and developed two concepts that were fundamental for ESS<sup>52,53</sup>: the dynamic, co-evolutionary relationship between nature and human civilization at the planetary scale and the possibility of catastrophe domains in the co-evolutionary space of the Earth System. The first provided the conceptual framework for fully integrating human dynamics into an Earth-System framework. The second introduced the risk that global change may not unfold as a linear change in Earth-System functioning but, rather, that human pressures could trigger rapid, irreversible shifts of the system into states that would be catastrophic for human well-being. Indeed, the discovery of the stratospheric ozone hole showed that humanity, by luck rather than design, has

already narrowly escaped the creation of a catastrophe domain<sup>54</sup>.

Over a critical 5-year period from 1999 through 2003, the IGBP accelerated its transition from a collection of individual projects to a more integrated ESS programme, with the 1999 IGBP Congress being the key to achieving the required integration. The Congress launched both the IGBP synthesis project and a major international conference in 2001. The synthesis project resulted in the publication of *Global Change and the Earth System*<sup>55</sup>, an integrator of a vast amount of global-change research. It also provided the scientific basis for the Amsterdam Declaration and emphasized research that would underpin the new concept of the Anthropocene.

The 2001 conference, 'Challenges of a Changing Earth' — co-sponsored by the four international global-change programmes (the IGBP, WCRP, IHDP and DIVERSITAS) — was truly international, attracting 1,400 participants from 105 countries. The conference introduced the Amsterdam Declaration (BOX 1), triggering the formation of the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP) to connect fundamental ESS with issues of central importance for human well-being: food, water, health, carbon and energy<sup>56</sup>.

At the same time, the integration of ESS and global sustainability communities was

also strengthened. This integration led the IGBP to define the term 'Earth System' as the suite of interlinked physical, chemical, biological and human processes that cycle (transport and transform) materials and energy in complex, dynamic ways within the system<sup>55</sup>. This definition emphasized two points: first, that forcings and feedbacks within the system, including biological processes, are as important to it functioning as external drivers and, second, that human activities are an integral part of system functioning<sup>57</sup>. The 1990–2015 period was critical for ESS as it moved from a challenging vision to a powerful new science capable of effectively integrating a wide array of disciplines towards understanding our home planet in all its complexity.

**Contemporary ESS (beyond 2015).** By 2015, ESS was well established and the time was right for a major institutional restructure built on a higher level of integration. Indeed, the IGBP, IHDP and DIVERSITAS were merged in 2015 into the new programme, Future Earth, aiming to accelerate the transformation to global sustainability through research and innovation. It builds on the research of the earlier global-change programmes but works more closely with the governance and private sectors from the outset to co-design and co-produce new knowledge towards a more sustainable

#### Box 1 | The Amsterdam Declaration

The Amsterdam Declaration<sup>55</sup>, signed by the Chairs of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP), International Human Dimensions Programme (IHDP), World Climate Research Programme (WCRP) and DIVERSITAS at the 2001 'Challenges of a Changing Earth' conference, described the key findings of a decade of Earth System Science (ESS). The focus was on recognizing the Earth as a single system with its own inherent dynamics and properties at the planetary level, all of which are threatened by human-driven global change. The declaration concluded that:

- The Earth System behaves as a single, self-regulating system comprised of physical, chemical, biological and human components, with complex interactions and feedbacks between the component parts.
- Global change is real and it is happening now. Human-driven changes to Earth's land surface, oceans, coasts and atmosphere, and to biological diversity, are equal to some of the great forces of nature in their extent and impact.
- Global change cannot be understood in terms of a simple cause–effect paradigm. Human-driven changes cause multiple, complex effects that cascade through the Earth System.
- Earth-System dynamics are characterized by critical thresholds and abrupt changes. Human activities could inadvertently trigger such changes and potentially switch the Earth System to alternative modes of operation that may prove irreversible and less hospitable to humans and other forms of life.
- The nature of changes now occurring simultaneously in the Earth System, as well as their magnitudes and rates of change, are unprecedented. The Earth System is currently operating in a no-analogue state.

On the basis of these insights, the declaration called for a new system of global science, which not only intensified the interdisciplinary approach that had been developed by the four programmes during the previous decade but also transcended the divide between environment and development. The document ended with a call to the ESS research community to work "... with other sectors of society and across all nations and cultures to meet the challenge of a changing Earth."

future. Meanwhile, the WCRP continued, along with some IGBP core projects, such as the International Global Atmospheric Chemistry (IGAC) project, PAGES and the ESSP Global Carbon Project.

A broad range of research centres now directed their work towards ESS and global sustainability research; for example, the Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research (PIK), the US National Center for Atmospheric Research (NCAR), the Stockholm Resilience Centre (SRC) and the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA). Although universities maintained their traditional discipline-based faculties, as the emphasis on interdisciplinarity and global-level studies grew, interdisciplinary ESS programmes also emerged in many universities around the world. The revolution in digital communication links these, and many other research bodies, in an expanding global ESS effort.

## ESS tools and approaches

Supporting the evolutionary development of ESS are three interrelated foci that drive science forwards: observations of a changing Earth System, computer simulations of system dynamics into the future and high-level assessments and syntheses that initiate the development of new concepts.

**Observations and experiments.** The transdisciplinary research needed to understand the Earth System requires past and contemporary changes in the system to be considered at a wide range of spatial (for example, top down and bottom up) and temporal (for example, forward-looking and backward-looking) scales. Perhaps the most iconic ‘top-down’ observation is the ongoing measurement of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration at the Mauna Loa Observatory, Hawaii, which was started in 1958 by C. D. Keeling<sup>58</sup>. The Keeling Curve — as it is commonly known — underpins our understanding of how humans are influencing the climate, depicting continuously increasing CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations<sup>59</sup>.

The development of space-based observations at ever-higher spatial and temporal resolutions has also revolutionized our ability to repeatedly and consistently observe the Earth System in near real time. Remote-sensing systems now monitor a wide range of processes and indicators, including climatic variables, land-cover change, atmospheric composition, the surface ocean and urban development<sup>60–62</sup>. These ‘top-down’

approaches — along with the ability to rapidly process, analyse and visualize large amounts of data — build a compelling, globally coherent picture of the rate and magnitude of changes in the structure and functioning of the Earth System at the planetary level<sup>28</sup>.

Bottom-up observations of Earth-System processes are challenged by the heterogeneity of the planet but have provided valuable insights. A classic example is the Global Ocean Observing System (GOOS), built around a growing fleet of autonomous platforms, such as the Argo floats, that continuously collect and transmit ocean data. On land, global networks of long-term sites, such as FLUXNET, measure the fluxes of energy and gases between the land surface and the atmosphere and rooting depths in the soils of major ecosystems<sup>63</sup>. Such process-level studies complement remote-sensing observations by providing critical insights into the underlying dynamics that generate the patterns of a changing Earth System observed from space.

Large-scale observational campaigns bring together interdisciplinary teams of researchers to provide a crucial scaling link between local observations and experiments and the planetary level. For example, the NASA Advanced Global Atmospheric Gases Experiment (AGAGE) and the NOAA ESRL Global Monitoring Division have tracked how human activities have changed the composition of the atmosphere for over 40 years by measuring not only the increase of greenhouse gases such as CO<sub>2</sub> but also the stabilization of some ozone-depleting gases. The Asian brown-cloud study over the Indian subcontinent measured the concentration of atmospheric aerosol particles, their seasonal variation, their atmospheric lifetimes and their transport by atmospheric circulation, important for estimating the risk that the South Asian monsoon could be destabilized by local and regional pollutants<sup>64</sup>. The Large-scale Biosphere–Atmosphere Experiment in Amazonia (LBA) used both ground-based and remote-sensing approaches to study the atmosphere–biosphere–hydrosphere dynamics of the Amazon rainforest, yielding insights into where a tipping point might lie for the conversion of the forest into a savanna. In the ocean, the GEOSEC programme (1972–1978) studied the distribution of man-made geochemical tracers (from the atmospheric testing of nuclear weapons) in the world’s oceans, enabling estimation of the timing and pattern of global cycling of carbon in the oceans<sup>65</sup>.

Looking back at the past Earth System is important to understand its present dynamics. The Vostok ice core data<sup>66</sup> marked a major advance by showing the regularity and synchronicity in the temperature–CO<sub>2</sub> relationship through the late Quaternary. Studies of past interglacial periods<sup>67</sup> and the long-term dynamics of the climate system<sup>68</sup>, for example, have provided a rich background against which contemporary changes in the Earth System, in both magnitudes and rates, can be analysed. Palaeo studies of the more recent past (tens, hundreds and a few thousand years) are particularly useful in providing insights into future risks. As human forcings drive even more profound changes to the Earth System, time intervals further back in time come into focus as potential analogues, such as the Paleocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum (PETM) about 56 million years ago, when a rapid release of greenhouse gases triggered a global temperature rise of 5–6 °C (REF.<sup>69</sup>).

Looking ahead, large-scale experiments can explore how parts of the Earth System may respond to future levels of human forcing or interventions. For example, numerous studies have examined the efficacy of iron fertilization to stimulate oceanic drawdown of CO<sub>2</sub> from the atmosphere as a potential mitigation strategy<sup>70</sup>. On land, free-air carbon dioxide enrichment (FACE) experiments, in which ecosystems are fumigated over many years with high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>, explore ecosystem responses to future atmospheric conditions<sup>71</sup> and ecosystem-warming experiments explore responses to the future climate<sup>72</sup>. These, and other similar studies, complement modelling approaches and palaeo studies, enhancing our understanding of how the Earth System could evolve in the coming decades and centuries, and the risks for humanity that changes in the system could bring.

**Modelling the Earth System.** Mathematical models are key components of ESS research. They started with conceptual or toy models which elucidate important processes, features or feedbacks in the Earth System, often drawing on the principles of complexity science<sup>73–75</sup>. In the 1960s, for example, simple energy-balance models described how the ice–albedo feedback could potentially drive the Earth into an alternative ‘snowball’ stable state<sup>76,77</sup>. The Daisyworld model in the 1980s further showed how feedback processes between life and its environment could lead to global-scale temperature regulation<sup>78</sup>.

More complex models of the Earth System — general circulation models (GCMs) — have since developed. GCMs are based on the fundamental physics and chemistry of the climate system, including the exchange of energy and materials between the Earth's surface (land, ocean, ice and, increasingly, the biosphere) and the atmosphere<sup>79,80</sup>. They are forced by scenarios of human greenhouse gas and aerosol emissions, providing possible trajectories of the future climate and their impacts that can be assessed by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and used to inform policy and governance. However, there is considerable uncertainty in long-term GCM projections, influenced by parameterizations and omitted or inadequate constraints on feedback processes and interactions between the geosphere and biosphere<sup>81,82</sup>. In addition, GCMs lack human dynamics as an integral, interactive part of the model, instead treating them as an outside force that perturbs the biogeophysical Earth System.

Human dynamics are the domain of integrated assessment models (IAMs), which typically couple economic models of varying complexity to climate models of reduced complexity<sup>83–86</sup>. IAMs have a number of uses, for example, simulating costs of specific climate-stabilization policies, exploring climate risks and uncertainties based on a range of potential policies, identifying optimal policies for a specific climate target and providing more general insights into feedbacks within the coupled system<sup>87</sup>. In addition, IAMs provide critical information on future greenhouse gas and aerosol emission scenarios, which are used to force the GCM simulations. However, the economic components of IAMs are rarely interactively coupled with GCMs to build a completely integrated Earth System model. An early exception to this generalization is the MIT Integrated Global System Model (IGSM), which coupled a computable general equilibrium (CGE) economics model to a detailed GCM<sup>88,89</sup>.

Arguably the most powerful tools for exploring the complex dynamics of the Earth System, particularly at long timescales, are Earth System Models of Intermediate Complexity (EMICs)<sup>90</sup>. EMICs include the same main processes as GCMs but have a lower spatial resolution and greater number of parameterized processes, allowing them to run longer timescale simulations that include nonlinear forcings and feedbacks between components of the Earth System. EMICs, for example, can be run at timescales

of up to hundreds of thousands of years, allowing the models to be tested against palaeo observations and to explore possible climates of the far future<sup>91,92</sup>. Taken together, GCMs, IAMs and EMICs create powerful ways to explore Earth-System dynamics at numerous space scales and timescales.

The diversity of modelling tools available to the ESS community plays a central role in the research effort. Although best known for their capability to simulate potential future trajectories of the Earth System, models are probably most valuable as knowledge-integration tools: they bring our rapidly growing understanding of individual processes into an internally consistent framework, they generate new ideas and hypotheses, and, most importantly, the model–observation interface is the ultimate test of our understanding of how the Earth System works.

**Assessments and syntheses.** In addition to observations and modelling, assessments and syntheses have themselves become essential tools within ESS research. Syntheses build new knowledge at a fundamental level, yielding new insights, concepts and understanding that are central to the scientific process. In contrast, the global-assessment architecture acts as a broker between the scientific and policy communities, facilitating new directions in research following feedback from the policy sector. Perhaps the best-known example of the latter is the IPCC, where science has clearly influenced policy development, but the policy sector has also prompted new research approaches. For example, the IPCC Special Report on the 1.5 °C target, mandated by the policy sector as part of the Paris Climate Agreement, assessed the significant difference in risks and impacts between the 1.5 °C and 2 °C Paris targets<sup>93</sup>. The IPCC provided the first targeted assessment of climate-change impacts on the ocean and cryosphere<sup>94</sup> and triggered the first quantification of ocean-based mitigation options<sup>95</sup>.

A further synthesis project was the 2001–2005 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA), a major effort to document the state of the biosphere, with an emphasis on human-driven pressures and potential future scenarios for the biosphere<sup>96</sup>. That pioneering, interdisciplinary scientific synthesis led directly to the creation of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), which provides broad science-policy interfaces on environment, conservation and sustainability across

scales, and has recently published a major assessment following on from the MEA. Syntheses were also an important part of the IGBP and other global-change research efforts<sup>55,97–105</sup>. For example, the Global Carbon Project (GCP) provides an annual carbon budget that integrates our growing knowledge base on the carbon cycle and how it is influenced by human activities<sup>59</sup>.

### New concepts arising from ESS

ESS, facilitated by its various tools and approaches, has introduced new concepts and theories that have altered our understanding of the Earth System, particularly the disproportionate role of humanity as a driver of change<sup>49,106,107</sup>. The most influential concept is that of the Anthropocene, introduced by P. J. Crutzen to describe the new geological epoch in which humans are the primary determinants of biospheric and climatic change (BOX 2). The Anthropocene has become an exceptionally powerful unifying concept that places climate change, biodiversity loss, pollution and other environmental issues, as well as social issues such as high consumption, growing inequalities and urbanization, within the same framework<sup>108,109</sup>. Importantly, the Anthropocene is building the foundation for a deeper integration of the natural sciences, social sciences and humanities, and contributing to the development of sustainability science through research on the origins of the Anthropocene and its potential future trajectories<sup>110,111</sup>.

Tipping elements are a further concept stemming from ESS. They describe important features of the Earth System that are not characterized by linear relationships but can instead show strongly nonlinear, sometimes irreversible, threshold-abrupt change behaviour<sup>74,112–114</sup>. Tipping elements include important biomes such as the Amazon rainforest and boreal forests, major circulation systems such as the Atlantic meridional overturning circulation and large ice masses such as the Greenland ice sheet<sup>74</sup>. In the latter example, a reinforcing feedback occurs: as the ice sheet melts, its surface lowers into a warmer climate, increasing the melting rate and, beyond a critical point of self-reinforcement, the feedback loop leads to an irreversible loss of the ice sheet<sup>74</sup>. More recent research has focused on the causal coupling between tipping elements — via changes in temperature, precipitation patterns and oceanic and atmospheric circulation — and their potential to form cascades<sup>114–116</sup>. Tipping cascades could

## Box 2 | The Anthropocene

The term 'Anthropocene' was originally introduced by E. F. Stoermer in the early 1980s but in the context of freshwater limnology research. It was not until 2000, when the phrase was independently re-introduced by P. J. Crutzen<sup>132,133</sup>, that it spread rapidly throughout the natural and social science communities and the humanities. The Anthropocene as proposed in 2000 had two meanings. In a geological context, Crutzen proposed the Anthropocene as a new epoch to follow the Holocene in the geological time scale<sup>133</sup>. In an Earth-System context, the Anthropocene was proposed as a very rapid trajectory away from the 11,700-year, relatively stable conditions of the Holocene<sup>55</sup>. The two definitions, although not identical, have much in common<sup>134</sup>.


The primary evidence for the Anthropocene were the Great Acceleration graphs, which arose from the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP) synthesis project and highlight trends in socio-economic and Earth-System metrics<sup>55,109,135</sup>. They demonstrated that the rapid exit of the Earth System from the Holocene was directly related to the explosive growth of the human enterprise from the mid-20th century onwards. Although new to the Earth System Science community, the

Great Acceleration had already been extensively explored by the historian J. R. McNeill<sup>136</sup>.


In response to Crutzen's (2002) proposal that the Anthropocene be formally included in the geological time scale<sup>133</sup>, the Anthropocene Working Group was established in 2009 by the Subcommission on Quaternary Stratigraphy (SQS). In 2019, following a decade of research, publications, discussion and robust debate, the working group formally recommended that the Anthropocene be treated as a formal chronostratigraphic unit defined by a Global Boundary Stratotype Section and Point (GSSP), and the primary guide for the base starting date of the Anthropocene should be a stratigraphic signal around the mid-20th century<sup>137,138</sup>.

In the social sciences and humanities, the Anthropocene is viewed as a novel, holistic framing that captures complex human dynamics and their interactions with natural systems<sup>139</sup>. It has generated considerable discussion around the importance of the unequal responsibilities of different countries and people for the Anthropocene<sup>106,140</sup> and highlights not only humanity's geological-scale impacts but its challenge to achieve global sustainability<sup>141</sup>.

## a Socio-economic trends



## b Earth-System trends



Reproduced from REF.<sup>109</sup>, Steffen, W. et al. The trajectory of the Anthropocene: the Great Acceleration. *Anthrop. Rev.* 2, 81–98 (2015), Sage Journals.

provide the dynamical process that drives the transition of the Earth System from one state to another, effectively becoming a planetary-level threshold<sup>117</sup>. Research on tipping elements and cascades highlights the ultimate risks of not only climate change but also of biosphere degradation and the destabilization of the Earth System as a whole<sup>118</sup>.

A final example is the planetary boundaries framework, which links biophysical understanding of the Earth (states, fluxes, nonlinearities, tipping elements)<sup>118</sup> to the policy and governance communities at the global level<sup>119</sup>. Built around nine processes that collectively describe the state of the Earth System

(including climate change, biodiversity loss, ocean acidification and land-use change), the planetary boundaries framework guides the levels of human perturbations that can be absorbed by the Earth System whilst maintaining a stable, Holocene-like state — a 'safe operating space' for humanity — the only state that we know for certain can support agriculture, settlements and cities, and complex human societies. Although the present framework is static in that boundaries are considered in isolation, the next conceptual advance aims to simulate interactions between individual boundaries, integrating the dynamics of the Earth System as a whole into the planetary boundaries framework.

## Future directions

ESS emerged in the early to mid-20th century from conceptualizations of the Earth that emphasized its systemic nature, such as Vernadsky's observation that life has a strong influence on the chemical and physical properties of Earth and the Gaia hypothesis of Lovelock and Margulis that Earth functions as a single organism, with self-regulating processes and feedbacks that maintain homeostasis. ESS then developed rapidly, from the 'new science of the Earth' movement in the 1980s to the global research efforts of international programmes such as the IGBP. Observational campaigns, Earth-System models and periodic syntheses powered

the science forward. In the 21st century, the concept of the Anthropocene, which arose in ESS, challenges not only the scientific community but humanity itself. ESS now faces two critical research challenges. First, how stable and resilient is the Earth System? Can tipping cascades generate a planetary tipping point? Are there accessible states of the system that would threaten human well-being? Secondly, how can we better understand the dynamics of human societies? What can ESS contribute to understanding — and perhaps to steering — the integrated geosphere–biosphere–anthroposphere trajectory of the Anthropocene?

The first of these challenges is being addressed by a rapidly increasing effort within the biogeophysical research community on nonlinearities in the Earth System<sup>94,120</sup>, tipping-point interactions and cascades<sup>115,121,122</sup>, and potential planetary thresholds and state shifts<sup>117</sup>. The second challenge, however, requires a much greater effort, as our understanding of the Earth System is still largely constrained to its biogeophysical components.


The big challenge is to fully integrate human dynamics, as embodied in the social sciences and humanities, with biophysical dynamics to build a truly unified ESS effort. FIGURE 3 highlights this challenge, with its inclusion of the anthroposphere as a fully integrated, interactive component of the Earth System, along with the geosphere and biosphere. Forcings and feedbacks between the spheres, including psycho-social feedbacks involving the anthroposphere<sup>123</sup>, describe the functioning of the Earth System as a whole.

The human dimensions of ESS must, therefore, go well beyond economic models (IAMs) and incorporate the deeper human characteristics that capture our core values and how we view our relationship to the rest of the Earth System. Whether these fundamental human characteristics be included in large-scale computational models is difficult to assess, but EMICs may offer the first framework in which this computational ‘grand integration’ could be attempted.

Other approaches are also useful in exploring the future of the Earth System. The concept of complex, adaptive systems<sup>73</sup>

can build understanding of and simulation tools for the co-evolution of the biosphere and human cultures as social-ecological systems<sup>124</sup>. These approaches can also provide vital guidance for formulating policy and management in the Anthropocene<sup>125</sup>. Although long-ignored by the physical perspectives that have dominated ESS, understanding these human dynamics is essential for the effective guidance systems required for steering the future trajectory of the system<sup>115,126,127</sup>.

Technology will also be important for ESS in the future. The emergence of high-speed computing, digitization, big data, artificial intelligence and machine learning — the tools of the technosphere<sup>128</sup> — has generated a step change in our ability to sense, process and interpret masses of data in near real time. This new capability underpins our growing understanding of the key Earth-System processes, their interactions and nonlinear behaviours, particularly the influence of the anthroposphere on the entire system. As these tools develop further, they will allow us to not only learn more about the planet but



**Fig. 3 | An updated conceptual model of the Earth System.** A detailed systems diagram of the Earth System, inspired by the original Bretherton diagram (FIG. 2), but with humans (the anthroposphere) as a fully integrative, interacting sphere. The internal dynamics of the anthroposphere are depicted as a production/consumption core driven by energy systems and modulated by human societies, as influenced by their cultures, values, institutions and knowledge. Interactions between the Anthropocene and the rest of the Earth System are two way, with human greenhouse gas emissions, resource extraction and pollutants driving impacts that reverberate through the geosphere–biosphere system. Feedbacks to the anthroposphere are also important, including direct impacts of climate change and biosphere degradation, and also psycho-social feedbacks from the rest of the Earth System and within the anthroposphere. GHG, greenhouse gas.

also to learn much more about ourselves, our social and governance systems, and our core values and aspirations.

More than technology, however, is required to understand human dynamics. The ESS of the 2020s can draw upon a rapidly expanding portfolio of innovative research and policy ideas to improve our understanding of the anthroposphere. For example, projections of the trajectory of the Earth System — ranging from the biophysical dimensions (for example, climate) to the social sciences and humanities — provide a very wide range of perspectives on the future<sup>83,108,129</sup>. In the policy arena, the earlier Millennium Development Goals, which were strongly human-centric, have now been replaced by the Sustainable Development Goals, which retain a strong human focus on development, equity and other human issues, but embed them in a broader, Earth-System context. One of the most innovative of all new approaches is the Common Home of Humanity, which proposes formal, legal recognition of a stable and accommodating state of the Earth System itself (i.e. a Holocene-like state, as defined by the planetary boundaries) as the intangible, natural heritage of all humanity<sup>130</sup>.

To meet these challenges, ESS must achieve an even deeper integration of the wealth of research tools, approaches and insights that the wide range of research communities offer. Underpinning this broad, global ESS effort is one fundamental, unavoidable truth. Humans are now the dominant force driving the trajectory of the Earth System: we are no longer “a small world on a big planet” but have become “a big world on a small planet” (REF<sup>131</sup>).

Will Steffen<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Katherine Richardson<sup>3</sup>, Johan Rockström<sup>2,4</sup>, Hans Joachim Schellnhuber<sup>4</sup>, Opha Pauline Dube<sup>5</sup>, Sébastien Dutreuil<sup>6</sup>, Timothy M. Lenton<sup>7</sup> and Jane Lubchenco<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Australian National University, Canberra, Australian Capital Territory, Australia.

<sup>2</sup>Stockholm Resilience Centre, Stockholm, Sweden.

<sup>3</sup>Globe Institute, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.

<sup>4</sup>Potsdam Institute for Climate Impact Research, Potsdam, Germany.

<sup>5</sup>University of Botswana, Gaborone, Botswana.

<sup>6</sup>Centre Gilles Gaston Granger, Aix-Marseille Université, CNRS, Aix-en-Provence, France.

<sup>7</sup>Global Systems Institute, University of Exeter, Exeter, UK.

<sup>8</sup>Oregon State University, Corvallis, OR, USA.

\*e-mail: will.steffen@anu.edu.au

<https://doi.org/10.1038/s43017-019-0005-6>

Published online 13 January 2020

- Vernadsky, V. I. *La Géochimie* (Librairie Félix Acan, 1924).
- Vernadsky, V. I. *The Biosphere* (complete annotated edition: Foreword by Margulis, L. et al., Introduction by Grinevald, J., translated by Langmuir, D. B., revised and annotated by McMenamin, M. A. S.) (Springer, 1998).
- Lovelock, J. *Gaia: A New Look at Life on Earth* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1979).
- National Research Council. *Earth System Science. Overview: A Program for Global Change* (National Academies Press, 1986).
- Dutreuil, S. *Gaia: Hypothèse, Programme de Recherche pour le Système Terre, ou Philosophie de la Nature?* Thesis, Univ. Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne (2016).
- Lenton, T. M. *Earth System Science. A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2016).
- Grinevald, J. *La Biosphère de l'Anthropocène: Climat et Pétrole, la Double Menace. Repères Transdisciplinaires (1824–2007)* (Georg Editeur, 2007).
- Oreskes, N. & Krige, J. *Science and Technology in the Global Cold War* (MIT Press, 2014).
- Doel, R. E. Constituting the postwar earth sciences: the military's influence on the environmental sciences in the USA after 1945. *Soc. Stud. Sci.* **33**, 635–666 (2003).
- Turchetti, S. & Roberts, P. *The Surveillance Imperative: Geosciences During the Cold War and Beyond* (Palgrave Macmillan, 2014).
- Hamblin, J. D. *Arming Mother Nature: The Birth of Catastrophic Environmentalism* (Oxford Univ. Press, 2013).
- Beynon, W. J. G. (ed.) *Annals of the International Geophysical Year* (Pergamon Press, 1970).
- Oreskes, N. & Doel, R. E. In *The Cambridge History of Science. Volume 5, The Modern Physical and Mathematical Sciences* (ed. Nye, M. J.) 538–557 (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2008).
- Edwards, P. N. *A Vast Machine: Computer Models, Climate Data, and the Politics of Global Warming* (MIT Press, 2010).
- Oreskes, N. *The Rejection of Continental Drift: Theory and Method in American Earth Science* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).
- Warde, P., Robin, L. & Sörlin, S. *The Environment. A History of the Idea* (Johns Hopkins Univ. Press, 2018).
- Aronova, E., Baker, K. S. & Oreskes, N. Big science and big data in biology: from the International Geophysical Year through the International Biological Program to the Long Term Ecological Research (LTER) network, 1957–present. *Hist. Stud. Nat. Sci.* **40**, 183–224 (2010).
- Grinevald, J. in *Gaia in Action: Science of the Living Earth* (ed. Bunyard, P.) 34–53 (Floris Books, 1996).
- Grinevald, J. in *The Biosphere* (ed. Vernadsky V. I.) 20–32 (Springer, 1998).
- Kwa, C. Representations of nature mediating between ecology and science policy: the case of the International Biological Programme. *Soc. Stud. Sci.* **17**, 413–442 (1987).
- Kwa, C. Modeling the grasslands. *Hist. Stud. Phys. Biol. Sci.* **24**, 125–155 (1993).
- Carson, R. *Silent Spring* (Houghton Mifflin, 1962).
- Farman, J. C., Gardiner, B. G. & Shanklin, J. D. Large losses of total ozone in Antarctica reveal seasonal interaction. *Nature* **315**, 207–210 (1985).
- Besel, R. D. Accommodating climate change science: James Hansen and the rhetorical/political emergence of global warming. *Sci. Cont.* **26**, 137–152 (2013).
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J. & Behrens III, W. W. *Limits to Growth* (Universe Books, 1972).
- Vieille Blanchard, E. *Les Limites à la Croissance dans un Monde Global: Modélisations, Perspectives, Réfutations*. Thesis, Ecole Hautes Etudes Sci. Soc. (2011).
- Poole, R. *Earthrise: How Man First Saw the Earth* (Yale Univ. Press, 2008).
- Grevsmühl, S. V. Images, imagination and the global environment: towards an interdisciplinary research agenda on global environmental images. *Geo* **3**, e00020 (2016).
- Höhlér, S. *Spaceship Earth in the Environmental Age, 1960–1990* (Routledge, 2015).
- Lovelock, J. & Margulis, L. Atmospheric homeostasis by and for the biosphere: the Gaia hypothesis. *Tellus* **26**, 2–10 (1974).
- Doolittle, F. W. Is nature really motherly? *Coevol. Q.* **29**, 58–63 (1982).
- Kirchner, J. The Gaia hypothesis: can it be tested? *Rev. Geophys.* **27**, 223–235 (1989).
- Lovelock, J. & Whitfield, M. Life span of the biosphere. *Nature* **296**, 561–563 (1982).
- Charlson, R. J., Lovelock, J. E., Andreae, M. O. & Warren, S. G. Oceanic phytoplankton, atmospheric sulphur, cloud albedo and climate. *Nature* **326**, 655–661 (1987).
- Dutreuil, S. in *Dreamers, Visionaries and Revolutionaries in the Life Sciences* (eds Dietrich, M. R. & Harman, O.) (Univ. Chicago Press, 2017).
- Latour, B. *Facing Gaia. Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime* (Polity Press, 2017).
- Waldrop, M. M. (1986) Washington embraces global earth sciences. *Science* **233**, 1040–1042 (1986).
- Edelson, E. Laying the foundation. *MOSAIC* **19**, 4–11 (1988).
- Conway, E. M. *Atmospheric Science at NASA: a History* (John Hopkins Univ. Press, 2008).
- Bretherton, F. P. Earth system science and remote sensing. *Proc. IEEE* **73**, 1118–1127 (1985).
- Kwa, C. Local ecologies and global science: discourses and strategies of the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme. *Soc. Stud. Sci.* **35**, 923–950 (2005).
- Kwa, C. The programming of interdisciplinary research through informal science-policy interactions. *Sci. Public Policy* **33**, 457–467 (2006).
- Uhrqvist, O. *Seeing and Knowing the Earth as a System: An Effective History of Global Environmental Change Research as Scientific and Political Practice*. Thesis, Linköping Univ. (2014).
- Richardson, K. & Steffen, W. in *Handbook of Science and Technology Convergence* (Springer, 2014).
- Brundtland Commission. *Our Common Future: Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development* (Oxford Univ. Press, 1987).
- Roederer, J. G. ICSU gives green light to IGBP. *Eos Trans. Am. Geophys. Union* **67**, 777–781 (1986).
- Lubchenco, J. et al. The sustainable biosphere initiative: an ecological research agenda. *Ecology* **72**, 371–412 (1991).
- Huntley, B. J. et al. A sustainable biosphere: the global imperative. The International Sustainable Biosphere Initiative. *Ecol. Int.* **20**, 1–14 (1991).
- Vitousek, P. M., Mooney, H. A., Lubchenco, J. & Melillo, J. M. Human domination of Earth's ecosystems. *Science* **277**, 494–499 (1997).
- Clark, W. C. & Munn, R. E. *Sustainable Development of the Biosphere* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1986).
- Kates, R. W. et al. Sustainability science. *Science* **292**, 641–642 (2001).
- Schellnhuber, H. J. in *Earth System Analysis. Integrating Science for Sustainability* (eds Schellnhuber, H. J. & Wentzel, V.) 3–195 (Springer, 1998).
- Schellnhuber, H. J. 'Earth system' analysis and the second Copernican revolution. *Nature* **402**, C19–C23 (1999).
- Crutzen, P. J. M. in *Nobel Lectures, Chemistry 1991–1995* (ed. Malmström, B. G.) 189–244 (World Scientific Publishing, 1997).
- Steffen, W. et al. *Global Change and the Earth System: A Planet Under Pressure* (Springer, 2004).
- Leemans, R. et al. Developing a common strategy for integrative global environmental change research and outreach: the Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP). *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sust.* **1**, 4–13 (2009).
- Seitzinger, S. et al. International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme and Earth system science: three decades of co-evolution. *Anthropocene* **12**, 3–16 (2015).
- Harris, D. C. Charles David Keeling and the story of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> measurements. *Anal. Chem.* **82**, 7865–7870 (2010).
- Le Quéré, C. et al. Global carbon budget 2018. *Earth Syst. Sci. Data* **10**, 2141–2194 (2018).
- Conway, E. M. Drowning in data: Satellite oceanography and information overload in the Earth sciences. *Hist. Stud. Phys. Biol. Sci.* **37**, 127–151 (2006).
- Toth, C. & Józkow, G. Remote sensing platforms and sensors: a survey. *ISPRS J. Photogr. Remote Sens.* **115**, 22–36 (2016).
- Silsbe, G. M., Behrenfeld, M. J., Halsey, K. H., Milligan, A. J. & Westberry, T. K. The CAFE model: A net production model for global ocean phytoplankton. *Glob. Biogeochem. Cycles* **30**, 1756–1777 (2016).
- Yang, Y., Donohue, R. J. & McVicar, T. R. Global estimation of effective plant rooting depth: Implications for hydrological modeling. *Water Resour. Res.* **52**, 8260–8276 (2016).

64. Ramanathan, V., Crutzen, P. J., Mitra, A. P. & Sikka, D. The Indian Ocean experiment and the Asian brown cloud. *Curr. Sci.* **83**, 947–955 (2002).
65. Broecker, W. S., Takahashi, T., Simpson, H. J. & Peng, T.-H. Fate of fossil fuel carbon dioxide and the global carbon budget. *Science* **206**, 409–418 (1979).
66. Petit, J. R. et al. Climate and atmospheric history of the past 420,000 years from the Vostok ice core, Antarctica. *Nature* **399**, 429–436 (1999).
67. PAGES (Past Interglacial Working Group of Past Global Changes). Interglacials of the last 800,000 years. *Rev. Geophys.* **54**, 162–219 (2016).
68. Summerhayes, C. P. *Earth's Climate Evolution* (Wiley, 2015).
69. McInerney, F. A. & Wing, S. L. The Paleocene-Eocene Thermal Maximum: a perturbation of carbon cycle, climate, and biosphere with implications for the future. *Ann. Rev. Earth Planet. Sci.* **39**, 489–516 (2011).
70. Williamson, P. et al. Ocean fertilization for geoengineering: a review of effectiveness, environmental impacts and emerging governance. *Process Saf. Environ. Prot.* **90**, 475–488 (2012).
71. Norby, R. J. & Zak, D. R. Ecological lessons from Free-Air CO<sub>2</sub> Enrichment (FACE) experiments. *Annu. Rev. Ecol. Syst.* **42**, 181–203 (2011).
72. Aronson, E. & McNulty, S. G. Appropriate experimental ecosystem warming methods by ecosystem, objective, and practicality. *Agric. For. Meteorol.* **149**, 1791–1799 (2009).
73. Levin, S. *Fragile Dominion: Complexity and The Commons* (Helix Books, 1999).
74. Lenton, T. M. et al. Tipping elements in Earth's climate system. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **105**, 1786–1793 (2008).
75. Scheffer, M. *Critical Transitions in Nature and Society* (Princeton Univ. Press, 2009).
76. Budyko, M. I. The effect of solar radiation variations on the climate of the Earth. *Tellus* **21**, 611–619 (1969).
77. Sellers, W. A climate model based on the energy balance of the earth-atmosphere system. *J. Appl. Meteorol.* **8**, 392–400 (1969).
78. Watson, A. & Lovelock, J. Biological homeostasis of the global environment: the parable of Daisyworld. *Tellus B* **35**, 284–289 (1983).
79. Dahan, A. Putting the Earth System in a numerical box? The evolution from climate modeling toward global change. *Stud. Hist. Philos. Sci. B Stud. Hist. Philos. Mod. Phys.* **41**, 282–292 (2010).
80. Flato, G. et al. in *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* (eds Stocker, T. F. et al.) (Cambridge Univ. Press, 2013).
81. Kiehl, J. T. & Shields, C. A. Sensitivity of the Palaeocene–Eocene Thermal Maximum climate to cloud properties. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.* **371**, 20130093 (2013).
82. Kump, L. R. & Pollard, D. Amplification of Cretaceous warmth by biological cloud feedbacks. *Science* **320**, 195 (2008).
83. Heymann, M. & Dahan Dalmedico, A. Epistemology and politics in Earth system modelling: historical perspectives. *J. Adv. Model. Earth Syst.* **11**, 1139–1152 (2019).
84. van Vuuren, D. P. et al. How well do integrated assessment models simulate climate change? *Clim. Change* **104**, 255–285 (2011).
85. Shaman, J., Solomon, S., Colwell, R. R. & Field, C. B. Fostering advances in interdisciplinary climate science. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 3653–3656 (2013).
86. The Royal Society & National Academy of Sciences. Modeling Earth's future: integrated assessments of linked human-natural systems (Royal Society, 2019).
87. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. AR5 Climate Change 2014: mitigation of climate change (IPCC, 2014).
88. Prinn, R. et al. Integrated global system model for climate model assessment: feedbacks and sensitivity studies. *Clim. Change* **41**, 469–546 (1999).
89. Prinn, R. Development and application of earth system models. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **110**, 3673–3680 (2012).
90. Claussen, M. et al. Earth system models of intermediate complexity: closing the gap in the spectrum of climate system models. *Clim. Dyn.* **18**, 579–586 (2002).
91. Ganopolski, A., Winkelmann, R. & Schellnhuber, H. J. Critical insolation–CO<sub>2</sub> relation for diagnosing past and future glacial inception. *Nature* **529**, 200–203 (2016).
92. Clark, P. U. et al. Consequences of twenty-first-century policy for multi-millennial climate and sea-level change. *Nat. Clim. Change* **6**, 360–369 (2016).
93. IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) *Special Report on Global Warming of 1.5 °C*. <http://ipcc.ch/report/sr15/> (2018).
94. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Special report on the ocean and cryosphere in a changing climate (IPCC, 2019).
95. Hoegh-Guldberg, O., Northrop, E. & Lubchenco, J. The ocean is key to achieving climate and societal goals. *Science* **365**, 1372–1374 (2019).
96. Reid, W. V. & Mooney, H. A. The millennium ecosystem assessment: testing the limits of interdisciplinary and multi-scale science. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sust.* **19**, 40–46 (2016).
97. Walker, B., Steffen, W., Canadell, J. & Ingram, J. *The Terrestrial Biosphere and Global Change* (Cambridge Univ. Press, 1999).
98. Crossland, C. J. et al. (eds) *Coastal Fluxes in the Anthropocene* (Springer, 2005).
99. Fasham, M. J. R. *Ocean Biogeochemistry* (Springer, 2003).
100. Kabat, P. et al. (eds) *Vegetation, Water, Humans and the Climate: A New Perspective on an Interactive System* (Springer, 2004).
101. Alverson, K. D., Bradley, R. S. & Pedersen, T. F. *Paleoclimate, Global Change and the Future* (Springer, 2003).
102. Brasseur, G. P., Prinn, R. G. & Pszenny, A. A. P. *Atmospheric Chemistry in a Changing World* (Springer, 2003).
103. Lambin, E. F. & Geist, H. J. *Land-Use and Land-Cover Change* (Springer, 2006).
104. Brondizio, E. S. et al. Re-conceptualizing the Anthropocene: a call for collaboration. *Glob. Environ. Change* **39**, 318–327 (2016).
105. Dube, O. P. & Sivakumar, M. Global environmental change and vulnerability of Least Developed Countries to extreme events: Editorial on the special issue. *Weather Clim. Extremes* **7**, 2–7 (2015).
106. Palslös, G. et al. Reconceptualizing the 'Anthropos' in the Anthropocene: Integrating the social sciences and humanities in global environmental change research. *Environ. Sci. Policy* **28**, 3–13 (2013).
107. Biermann, F. et al. Down to Earth: contextualizing the Anthropocene. *Glob. Environ. Change* **39**, 341–350 (2015).
108. Malm, A. & Hornborg, A. The geology of mankind? A critique of the Anthropocene narrative. *Anthrop. Rev.* **1**, 62–69 (2014).
109. Steffen, W., Broadgate, W., Deutsch, L., Gaffney, O. & Ludwig, C. The trajectory of the Anthropocene: the Great Acceleration. *Anthrop. Rev.* **2**, 81–98 (2015).
110. Löwbrand, E., Strippel, J. & Wiman, B. Earth system governmentality: reflections on science in the Anthropocene. *Glob. Environ. Change* **19**, 7–13 (2009).
111. Steffen, W. et al. The Anthropocene: from global change to planetary stewardship. *Ambio* **40**, 739 (2011).
112. Schellnhuber, H. J. & Held, H. in *The Eleventh Linacre Lectures* (eds Briden, J. C. & Downing, T.) (Oxford Univ. Press, 2002).
113. Kriegler, E., Hall, J. W., Held, H., Dawson, R. & Schellnhuber, H. J. Imprecise probability assessment of tipping points in the climate system. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **106**, 5041–5046 (2009).
114. Schellnhuber, H. J., Rahmstorf, S. & Winkelmann, R. Why the right climate target was agreed in Paris. *Nat. Clim. Change* **6**, 649–653 (2016).
115. Cai, Y., Lenton, T. M. & Lontzek, T. S. Risk of multiple interacting tipping points should encourage rapid CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction. *Nat. Clim. Change* **6**, 520–525 (2016).
116. Hansen, J. et al. Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2 °C global warming could be dangerous. *Atmos. Chem. Phys.* **16**, 3761–3812 (2016).
117. Steffen, W. et al. Trajectories of the Earth System in the Anthropocene. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **115**, 8252–8259 (2018).
118. Aykut, S. Les "limites" du changement climatique. *Cités* **63**, 193–236 (2015).
119. Rockström, J. et al. A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature* **461**, 472–475 (2009).
120. Drijfhout, S. et al. Catalogue of abrupt shifts in Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change climate models. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **112**, E5777–E5786 (2015).
121. Rocha, J. C., Peterson, G., Bodin, Ö. & Levin, S. Cascading regime shifts within and across scales. *Science* **362**, 1379–1383 (2018).
122. Lenton, T. M. et al. Climate tipping points — too risky to bet against. *Nature* **575**, 592–595 (2019).
123. Alvaredo, F., Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E. & Zucman, G. *World Inequality Report 2018* (Belknap Press, 2018).
124. Levin, S. et al. Social-ecological systems as complex adaptive systems: modeling and policy implications. *Environ. Dev. Econ.* **18**, 111–132 (2013).
125. Lubchenco, J., Cerny-Chipman, E. B., Reimer, J. N. & Levin, S. A. The right incentives enable ocean sustainability successes and provide hope for the future. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 14507–14514 (2016).
126. Folke, C., Biggs, R., Norström, A. V., Reyers, B. & Rockström, J. Social-ecological resilience and biosphere-based sustainability science. *Ecol. Soc.* **21**, 41 (2016).
127. Carpenter, S. R., Folke, C., Scheffer, M. & Westley, F. R. Dancing on the volcano: social exploration in times of discontent. *Ecol. Soc.* **24**, 23 (2019).
128. Hafl, P. Humans and technology in the Anthropocene: Six rules. *Anthrop. Rev.* **1**, 126–136 (2014).
129. Picketty, T. *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2014).
130. Magalhães, P., Steffen, W., Bosselmann, K., Aragão, A. & Soromenho-Marques, V. *The Safe Operating Space Treaty: A New Approach to Managing our Use of the Earth System* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2016).
131. Rockström, J. & Klum, M. *Big World, Small Planet: Abundance within Planetary Boundaries* (Yale Univ. Press, 2015).
132. Crutzen, P. J. & Stoermer, E. F. The "Anthropocene". *IGBP Newsl.* **41**, 17–18 (2000).
133. Crutzen, P. J. Geology of mankind—the Anthropocene. *Nature* **415**, 23 (2002).
134. Steffen, W. et al. Stratigraphic and Earth System approaches to defining the Anthropocene. *Earths Future* **4**, 324–345 (2016).
135. Steffen, W., Crutzen, P. J. & McNeill, J. R. The Anthropocene: are humans now overwhelming the great forces of Nature? *AMBIO* **36**, 614–621 (2007).
136. McNeill, J. R. *Something New Under the Sun* (W.W. Norton, 2000).
137. Waters, C. N. et al. The Anthropocene is functionally and stratigraphically distinct from the Holocene. *Science* **351**, aad2622 (2016).
138. Zalasiewicz, J. et al. When did the Anthropocene begin? A mid-twentieth century boundary level is stratigraphically optimal. *Quat. Int.* **383**, 196–203 (2015).
139. Malhi, Y. The concept of the Anthropocene. *Annu. Rev. Environ. Resour.* **42**, 77–99 (2017).
140. Bonneuil, C. & Fressoz, J. B. *The Shock of the Anthropocene: The Earth, History and Us* (Verso, 2016).
141. Bai, X. et al. (2016) Plausible and desirable futures in the Anthropocene: a new research agenda. *Glob. Environ. Change* **39**, 351–362 (2016).

#### Acknowledgements

JR was supported for this work by the European Research Council under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme (Earth Resilience in the Anthropocene, grant no. ERC-2016-ADG 743080).

#### Author contributions

All authors contributed to the design and writing of the article. S.D. provided essential inputs on the history of ESS. T.M.L. helped W.S. to structure the article. W.S. drafted Figure 3.

#### Competing interests

The authors declare no competing interests.

#### Peer review information

*Nature Reviews Earth & Environment* thanks Sybil Seitzinger and the other, anonymous, reviewer(s) for their contribution to the peer review of this work.

#### Publisher's note

Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

© Springer Nature Limited 2020