



Although our numbers are concentrated in cities, our needs reach beyond the city. And far beyond our awareness of their effects. Agricultural land now covers almost 40% of the world's land area.

The problematic 'Green Revolution' can be improved in the digital age, with targeted irrigation, and higher diversity of micro-managed crops. The habitat we do displace must at least be used non-destructively.



And it seems, despite this massive footprint, our food supply will still have to increase 50-70% by the year 2050 to adequately feed a world population of 9-billion.

Of course *supply* is not the whole story when 30% of food produced now is being *wasted!*



If the 28% of total land area now taken up by forest-cleared pasture were to be used more efficiently to grow vegetables, this alone would increase food supply by 100%!



(Urban gardening alone won't be enough to feed cities in the near future, but its contribution can be significant.)

By 2050, 70% of the world's population is projected to be living in urban areas. But right now almost 50% is still rural, and many of these people depend on subsistence farming with primitive methods that produce poor yields, and contribute to desertification. In some cases, just by providing these people with some basic technologies and health services, yields might be increased by as much as 300%!



If our future is seen only in terms of developing the best land and 'natural resources', territoriality and isolationism easily become excuses for letting 'other' people starve, or worse. But if the future is seen as a continuing effort to *free up* Natural habitat, only then



These numbers are necessarily approximate. But my 'back of the envelope' calculations show no reason we should be overwhelmed by the Extremophile Choice. The real problem has always been **lack of clear direction** for an animal that doesn't know what its 'gadgets' are for. When we finally see where we're going, we should be happy with every little step we take.

do we become highly motivated to find ways of sharing left-over food, and the means of food production. Money, which is too often treated as a commitment to 'progress for the sake of progress', is really just an imperfect measure of our share in a larger human effort. **This effort itself, with a clear view of our place in an intelligent universe, is the gold standard of Extremophile economics.**

