Finally, a breakthrough alternative to growth economics – the doughnut George Monbiot Opinion The Guardian.pdf Gemt i Dropbox • 24. apr. 2019 12.19

Advertisement





▲ 'Billions of people still live in the hole in the middle': a street boy collects stones in Dhaka, Bangladesh. Photograph: Jan MoellerHansen/BarcroftImages



o what are we going to do about it? This is the only question worth asking. But the answers appear elusive. Faced with a multifaceted crisis - the capture of governments by billionaires and their lobbyists, extreme inequality, the rise of demagogues, above all the collapse of the living world - those to whom we look for leadership appear stunned, voiceless, clueless. Even if they had the courage to act, they have no idea what to do.

The most they tend to offer is more economic growth: the fairy dust supposed to make all the bad stuff disappear. Never mind that it drives ecological destruction; that it has failed to relieve structural unemployment or soaring inequality; that, in some recent years, almost all the increment in incomes has been harvested by the top 1%. As values, principles and moral purpose are lost, the promise of growth is all that's left.

Old economics is based on false 'laws of physics' new economics can save us *Kate Raworth* You can see the effects in a <u>leaked memo</u> from the UK's Foreign Office: "Trade and growth are now priorities for all posts ... work like climate change and illegal wildlife trade will be scaled down." All that counts is the rate at which we turn natural wealth into cash. If this destroys our prosperity and the wonders that surround us, who cares?

Read more

We cannot hope to address our predicament without a new worldview. We cannot use the models that caused our crises to solve them. We need to reframe the problem. This is what the most inspiring book published so far this year has done.

In Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century

Economist, Kate Raworth of Oxford University's Environmental Change Institute reminds us that economic growth was not, at first, intended to signify wellbeing. Simon Kuznets, who standardised the measurement of growth, warned: "The welfare of a nation can scarcely be inferred from a measure of national income." Economic growth, he pointed out, measured only annual flow, rather than stocks of wealth and their distribution.

Eight men own more than 3.6 billion people do: our economics is broken *Mark Goldring*

Read more

Raworth points out that economics in the 20th century "lost the desire to articulate its goals". It aspired to be a science of human behaviour: a science based on a deeply flawed portrait of humanity. The dominant model -"rational economic man", self-interested, isolated, calculating – says more about the nature of economists than it does about other humans. The loss of an explicit

most viewed



Sri Lanka attacker studied in UK, says minister, amid warning more bombers on loose



Avengers: Endgame review – unconquerable brilliance takes Marvel to new heights



Possible 'marsquake' detected for first time on red planet



'Love in the face of bigotry': woman takes smiling stand against Islamophobic protesters



Sri Lanka suicide bomber studied in Australia, minister says

objective allowed the discipline to be captured by a proxy goal: endless growth.

The aim of economic activity, she argues, should be "meeting the needs of all within the means of the planet". Instead of economies that need to grow, whether or not they make us thrive, we need economies that "make us thrive, whether or not they grow". This means changing our picture of what the economy is and how it works.

The central image in mainstream economics is the circular flow diagram. It depicts a closed flow of income cycling between households, businesses, banks, government and trade, operating in a social and ecological vacuum. Energy, materials, the natural world, human society, power, the wealth we hold in common ... all are missing from the model. The unpaid work of carers - principally women - is ignored, though no economy could function without them. Like rational economic man, this representation of economic activity bears little relationship to reality.

So Raworth begins by redrawing the economy. She embeds it in the Earth's systems and in society, showing how it depends on the flow of materials and energy, and reminding us that we are more than just workers, consumers and owners of capital.



▲ The embedded economy 'reminds us that we are more than just workers and consumers'. Source: Kate Raworth and Marcia Mihotich

This recognition of inconvenient realities then leads to her breakthrough: a graphic representation of the world we want to create. Like all the best ideas, her doughnut model seems so simple and obvious that you wonder why you didn't think of it yourself. But achieving this clarity and concision requires years of thought: a great decluttering of the myths and misrepresentations in which we have been schooled.

f) 🎔 👂

The diagram consists of two rings. The inner ring of the doughnut represents a sufficiency of the resources we need to lead a good life: food, clean water, housing, sanitation, energy, education, healthcare, democracy. Anyone living within that ring, in the hole in the middle of the doughnut, is in a state of deprivation. The outer ring of the doughnut consists of the Earth's environmental limits, beyond which we inflict dangerous levels of climate change, ozone depletion, water pollution, loss of species and other assaults on the living world.

The area between the two rings - the doughnut itself - is the "ecologically safe and socially just space" in which humanity should strive to live. The

purpose of economics should be to help us enter that space and stay there.

As well as describing a better world, this model allows us to see, in immediate and comprehensible terms, the state in which we now find ourselves. At the moment we transgress both lines. Billions of people still live in the hole in the middle. We have breached the outer boundary in several places.



▲ This model 'allows us to see the state in which we now find ourselves'. Source: Kate Raworth and Christian Guthier/The Lancet Planetary Health



An economics that helps us to live within the doughnut would seek to reduce inequalities in wealth and income. Wealth arising from the gifts of nature would be widely shared. Money, markets, taxation and public investment would be designed to conserve and regenerate resources rather than squander them. State-owned banks would invest in projects that transform our relationship with the living world, such as zero-carbon public transport and community energy schemes. New metrics would measure genuine prosperity, rather than the speed with which we degrade our long-term prospects.

Such proposals are familiar; but without a new framework of thought, piecemeal solutions are unlikely to succeed. By rethinking economics from first principles, Raworth allows us to integrate our specific propositions into a coherent programme, and then to measure the extent to which it is realised.

I see her as the John Maynard Keynes of the 21st century: by reframing the economy, she allows us to change our view of who we are, where we stand, and what we want to be.

Now we need to turn her ideas into policy. Read her book, then demand that those who wield power start working towards its objectives: human prosperity within a thriving living world.

Doughnut Economics by Kate Raworth (Random House Business Books, £20). To order a copy for £17, go to bookshop.theguardian.com or call 0330 333 6846. Free UK p&p over £10, online orders only. Phone orders min. p&p of £1.99.

At this critical time...

... we can't turn away from climate change. For The Guardian, reporting on the environment is a priority. We give climate, nature and pollution stories the prominence they deserve, stories which often go unreported by others in the mainstream media. At this critical time for our species and our planet, we are determined to inform readers about threats, consequences and solutions based on scientific facts, not political prejudice or business interests. But we need your support to grow our coverage, to travel to the remote frontlines of change and to cover vital conferences that affect us all.

More people are reading and supporting our independent, investigative reporting than ever before. And unlike many news organisations, we have chosen an approach that allows us to keep our journalism accessible to all, regardless of where they live or what they can afford.

The Guardian is editorially independent, meaning we set our own agenda. Our journalism is free from commercial bias and not influenced by billionaire owners, politicians or shareholders. No one edits our editor. No one steers our opinion. This is important as it enables us to give a voice to those less heard, challenge the powerful and hold them to account. It's what makes us different to so many others in the media, at a time when factual, honest reporting is critical.

Every contribution we receive from readers like you, big or small, goes directly into funding our journalism. This support enables us to keep working as we do - but we must maintain and build on it for every year to come. Support The Guardian from as little as €1 - and it only takes a minute. Thank you.

Topics **Economic policy / Opinion**

Economic growth (GDP) / Economics / Economic recovery / Inequality / John Maynard Keynes /

Sustainable development goals / comment



Reuse this content

comments (1519) Sign in or create your Guardian account	
to join the discussion.	
Order by Oldest ~ Threads Collapsed ~	1 2 3 4 >
Due to the large number of comments, they are being shown 100 per page.	
CharlesII 12 Apr 2017 11:08	66 个
George Monbiot needs to make up his mind.	
He says that:	
ialmost all the increment in incomes has been harvested	d by the top 1%

Which is only true in developed economies - the only study linked is for the US. The relevant chart **globally** is the 'elephant', which shows substantial growth in incomes for the vast majority of people, driven by globalisation.

So which does Monbiot really care about? If he actually wants to help boys in Bangladesh like the one pictured, the prescription should be more of the same, not putting limits on global growth.

< Compare 1978 Share

Report

FellatioNelson → CharlesII12 Apr 2017 11:20189 ↑

"If he actually wants to help boys in Bangladesh like the one pictured, the prescription should be more of the same"

Yeah he's going to be doing just great when his farm's underwater

< Share

Report



< Share

Report

+ Show 42 more replies



exsanddancer 12 Apr 2017 11:09

187 🔨

The biggest problem is the growth of population, mainly in parts of the world that can

Why no mention?



Sign up to our daily email

Contact us Complaints & corrections SecureDrop Work for us Privacy policy Cookie policy Terms & conditions Help	All topics All writers Digital newspaper archive Facebook Twitter	Advertise with us Search UK jobs Dating Discount Codes	$\begin{array}{l} \textbf{Support The Guardian}\\ \textbf{Available for everyone, funded by readers}\\ \textbf{Contribute} \rightarrow \textbf{Subscribe} \rightarrow \end{array}$	

© 2019 Guardian News & Media Limited or its affiliated companies. All rights reserved.