

Optionale Leitfragen für die Degrowth Debatte

1. Was ist laut Hickel (2020) das eigentliche Ziel der Degrowth-Bewegung und wie begründet er ihren Namen? Was ist eure Einschätzung/Erfahrung?
2. Was ist laut Hickel (2020) der Unterschied zwischen *Degrowth* und einer *Rezession*? Wie beurteilt ihr diese Unterscheidung?
3. Inwiefern problematisiert Degrowth globale Verteilungskonflikte und asymmetrische Effekte auf Nord/Süd-Länder? Wie beurteilt ihr seine Einschätzung?
4. In den bisher bekannten Modellen, welchen Effekt hätte "Degrowth"? Inwiefern sind die Modelle geeignet um die Folgen von Degrowth a la Hickel (2020) zu untersuchen?

Kernreferenz: Hickel, J. (2020). What does degrowth mean? A few points of clarification. *Globalizations*, 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14747731.2020.1812222>

Zu Frage 1: Was ist Degrowth?

“ Some people worry that degrowth introduces confusion because it is not, in fact, the opposite of growth. When people say ‘growth’ they normally mean growth in GDP, so one might reasonably assume that degrowth is likewise focused on reducing GDP.

Proponents of degrowth are therefore condemned to perpetually clarify that degrowth is not about reducing GDP, but rather about reducing material and energy throughput.

Hickel (2020, p. 2)

Zu Frage 1: Was ist Degrowth?

“

Some people worry that degrowth introduces confusion because it is not, in fact, the opposite of growth. When people say ‘growth’ they normally mean growth in GDP, so one might reasonably assume that degrowth is likewise focused on reducing GDP.

Proponents of degrowth are therefore condemned to perpetually clarify that degrowth is not about reducing GDP, but rather about reducing material and energy throughput.

Hickel (2020, p. 2)

Zu Frage 1: Degrowth und GDP-Reduktion

“ If we accept the empirical evidence that green growth is unlikely to be achieved, then we have to accept that reducing throughput will impact on GDP itself, and we must focus on how to restructure the economy so that this can be managed in a safe and just way.

Hickel (2020, p. 2-3)

Zu Frage 2: Degrowth vs. Rezession

- In fact, degrowth is in every way the opposite of a recession.
 1. Degrowth is a planned, coherent policy to reduce ecological impact, reduce inequality, and improve well-being. Recessions are not planned, and do not target any of these outcomes.
 2. Degrowth has a discriminating approach to reducing economic activity. [...] Recessions, by contrast, do not discriminate so wisely. Indeed, they quite often destroy socially important sectors while empowering socially less necessary sector
 3. Degrowth introduces policies to prevent unemployment, and indeed even to improve employment.
 4. Degrowth seeks to reduce inequality and share national and global income more fairly, such as with progressive taxation and living wage policies. Recessions, by contrast, tend to make inequality worse

Zu Frage 2: Degrowth vs. Rezession

- In fact, degrowth is in every way the opposite of a recession.
 5. Degrowth seeks to expand universal public goods and services, such as health, education, transportation and housing, in order to decommodify the foundational goods that people need in order to lead flourishing lives. Recessions, by contrast, generally entail austerity measures that cut spending on public services.
 6. Degrowth is part of a plan to achieve a rapid transition to renewable energy, restore soils and biodiversity, and reverse ecological breakdown

“Recessions happen when growth-dependent economies stop growing: it is a disaster that ruins people’s lives and exacerbates injustices. Degrowth calls for a different kind of economy altogether.

Hickel (2020, p. 4)

Zu Frage 3: Nord-Süd-Problematik

“ Some people worry that proponents of degrowth want to see degrowth universally applied, in all countries.

This would be problematic, because clearly many poor countries in fact need to increase resource and energy use in order to meet human needs. In reality, proponents of degrowth are clear that it is specifically high-income countries that need to degrow, not the rest of the world.

Hickel (2020, p. 4-5)

Zu Frage 3: Nord-Süd-Problematik

“ Obviously, the best way to reduce poverty isn't more exploitation, but more economic justice: the South should receive fair prices for the labour and resources they render to the global economy. [...] In other words, justice for the South (fair wages for labour and fair prices for resources) would entail degrowth in the North. We should embrace this outcome.

Hickel (2020, p. 5)

Zu Frage 3: Nord-Süd-Problematik

“ Either way, decolonization in the South along these lines would likely cause degrowth in the North. [...]

Right now, high-income nations maintain high levels of income and consumption through an ongoing process of net appropriation [...] from the South, through unequal exchange. [...] This is a continuation of the basic tenets of the colonial relationship [...].

Ending this exploitative relationship would mean either ending the pattern of net appropriation or ending unequal exchange, both of which would likely result in a reduction in the rate of surplus accumulation by economic elites, and a reduction in the growth driven by this accumulation in the North, but to the benefit of communities and ecologies in the global South.

Hickel (2020, p. 6)

Zu Frage 3: Nord-Süd-Problematik

“ The vast majority of ecological breakdown is being driven by excess consumption in the global North, and yet has consequences that disproportionately damage the South. [...]

In other words, resource consumption in the North has an ecological impact that registers largely in the South (Dorninger et al., 2020). [...]

Still, some worry that degrowth in the North might have a negative impact on economies in the South.

Hickel (2020, p. 5)

Zu Frage 4: Effekte von Degrowth in bisherigen Modellen

- Auf welche Variablen würden Maßnahmen zugunsten von Degrowth wirken?
 - Insbesondere Rate der Kapitalakkumulation g_K , oder auch X
 - In endogenen Wachstumsmodellen Reduktion über Reduktion von X oder N
 - In exogenen Modellen: Reduktion der Sparneigung, Technologie, Produktivität
- Kernproblem 1: direkter Effekt auf "Throughput" nicht in den Modellen erfasst
 - Probleme mit dem **Construal** der Modelle → intended scope ist ein anderer
- Kernproblem 2: Institutionen nicht auf die Art abgebildet als dass eine "Transformation" des Wirtschaftssystems" untersucht werden könnte
 - Auch hier: Problem mit dem **Construal** der Modelle
- Liegt es an repräsentativen Kapazitäten der Modelle oder den Forscher:innen?
 - Welche Kernmechanismen/Interdependenzen fehlen in den uns bekannten Modellen Ihrer Ansicht nach? Wie könnte man diese repräsentieren?