**GAIA does it differently**

GAIA – Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society offers first-hand information on state-of-the-art environmental and sustainability sciences and on current solutions to environmental problems. Well-known editors, reviewers, and authors work to ensure a unique inter- and transdisciplinary dialogue – in a comprehensible style.

GAIA …
... is a community-based journal.
... is published by oekom, an independent publisher committed to high environmental standards (see below and www.oekom.de).
... follows the Green Road to Open Access with these features as required by cOAlition S for Plan S (www.coaision-s.org):
  - articles can be archived with no embargo period,
  - authors retain copyright,
  - articles are published under the Creative Commons Attribution licence CC BY 4.0.

**oekom, naturally**

This journal puts a true slice of sustainability into your hands. In buying it, you are supporting production methods based on strict environmental standards.

In producing our journals, we …
... use 100 % recycled paper and mineral-oil free inks,
... do not wrap them in plastic packaging,
... offset all harmful emissions, and
... print them in Germany, thus guaranteeing short transport distances.

Further information is available at www.natuerlich-oekom.de and #natuerlichoekom
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**THE TRANSDISCIPLINARY JOURNAL**
If Greta read GAIA ...

I love GAIA, this unique journal, powered by committed people. The world needs it to fill one of the most significant knowledge gaps of humanity: actionable understanding of what it takes to thrive within the means of our planet. The COVID-19 crisis reminds us that the means of our planet are not only climate, water, or food. Given our species’ dominance and global connectivity, the symptoms of ecological overshoot also include new diseases. I eagerly browse through every GAIA issue, admire its pleasing layout … and get this sinking feeling that GAIA may not respond adequately to the challenges humanity is facing.

Humanity demands now at least 56 percent more from our planet than its ecosystems can renew. This is like using 1.56 planet Earths. But to safeguard 85 percent of the world’s biodiversity, humanity needs to use less than half Earth, according to E.O. Wilson. Hence humanity exceeds threefold the metabolic rate compatible with a lasting existence, including stabilizing our climate and maintaining biodiversity. This gap represents the average. Some portions of humanity still need more material possibilities to thrive. Pointing out the speed and scale of needed change is neither pessimistic, apocalyptic, nor negative. It is a best effort to describe the reality within which we operate. As we devise strategies for a thriving future, we better acknowledge our context. Research that ignores this context leads society astray, is damaging, if not dangerous.

Therefore, the question begs: what if Greta read GAIA? Greta Thunberg and her millions of colleagues have enabled a conversation that was overly tacit. They ask us to acknowledge the changing conditions of our planet, the way scientists have documented and measured. They want us to recognize the conclusion of many of those scientists: the high likelihood that humanity is trespassing beyond the safe operating zone of the Holocene. They beg us, because their lives literally depend on it, to concede that humanity is facing a huge, and well documented, gap between how much pressure our species is putting on the planet, compared to what the planet can renewably provide. They then invite us to take these conclusions seriously, do the math in terms of how much human pressure needs to be reduced, and act accordingly.

The corona crisis has shown that the teenagers can’t keep this conversation open for long on their own. They need support. Therefore, as scientists and citizens, we need to ask ourselves: what should researchers, including those publishing in GAIA, offer if they want to help turn her “door-opening” into a lasting shift towards the transition humanity needs? In my view, every entry should be judged through the following lens: 1. Does the article acknowledge, at minimum, the scale and speed of the needed ecological transformation? Or if not, does it make a credible case that the scale and speed of the transformation can be minor to what I outlined above? 2. Is the insight the article delivers advancing societies’ ability to pursue the transformation at the required speed and scale? Finally, if Greta and her generation read GAIA, what articles would you submit?

Mathis Wackernagel, GAIA Scientific Advisory Board
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