Shorten the length of the work year to give everyone more leisure time.

Advantages:
- Inequalities
- Unemployment
- Ecological footprint
- Leisure time

Today:
- We work 40 hours per week and make €30,000 per year.

90% of the working-age population works full time for €30,000/year.*

10% of the working-age population is unemployed.

With increasing robotization, the amount of needed work will decrease. Thus, unemployment will increase.

This is the whole work needed from the society. Each flower represents a share of the work.

...why not let everyone pick 2 flowers?

Everyone could work 34 hours/week, make €27,000 per year and enjoy more leisure time.

* This is a theoretical example based on current averages in rich countries (see Haxen & Randers, 2016, p. 10).
Raise the retirement age

Advantages:
- inequalities
- poverty
- GDP
- risk of increased ecological footprint

As life expectancy increased while the birth rate decreased, the percentage of old people in rich countries increased in the last decades. This means that more and more old people need to be supported by the State through taxes on the working population.

Therefore:
Older people have to work longer than before to reduce the pressure on the State & working population.

Why cannot an increase of birth rate solve the problem?

Having more kids NOW... means more workers in 30 years only... and even more old people to support in 70 years!

One solution could be a constantly growing birth rate... leading to an ever growing world population!

* data for the USA

net ecologically manageable!
Redefine paid work to cover those who care for others at home

Advantages:
- Inequalities (ex: gender inequality)
- Unemployment
- Income distribution & economic power
- GDP/capita

The majority of the population benefits from home-careers at several points in their lives.

Care takes place in an institution or at home.

In any case, it should be well paid!

More and more carers are needed for an ageing population.

This would give carers social recognition and motivation.

An easy implementation could happen through State's payments and carer's organizations.
Increase unemployment benefits

Advantages:
- Inequalities
- Income distribution
- Incentive to tax the rich
- Well-being

⚠️ Risk of increased consumption & ecological footprint

Why can high unemployment & benefits boost the economy?

- High benefits make it (morally) easier to fire workers & turn down unproductive businesses.
- Free workers can go to the most productive activities.
- Higher productivity
- Higher growth rate

Now, I can more easily turn down:
- Unsuitable jobs
- Badly paid jobs
- 'Uncool' jobs

With more money for each unemployed....

Companies have to be more attractive: pay better, give safe conditions, make compromises, etc.

This would benefit the most vulnerable & less qualified especially.
PROPOSAL 5

Increase Taxation on corporations and the Rich

Advantages: ↓ inequalities  ↑ GDP  ↓ unemployment

If we pay more taxes, we will not be able to give you jobs anymore.

This is BRAINWASHING!

Still, governments tend to believe this too. This leads to low taxes on corporations and the Rich and uncontrolled tax avoidance.

More taxes on the Rich → More means for States → improvement of infrastructure & public goods → Consumption shift from consumer goods to other goods → production decreases while GDP & jobs are maintained → redistribution to the Poor → which boosts the demand → ... and the production → jobs are created → revenues for corporations & the Rich increase → GDP rises.
Expand the use of green stimulus packages by printing money or raising taxes.

Advantages:
- ecological footprint
- GDP
- unemployment

Increase general well-being

Public goods & services:
- climate change mitigation and adaptation
- resource efficiency
- biodiversity protection
- help for the dispossessed
- higher taxes
- printing money

...but are not profitable for private companies (in the short term)

Therefore, we need public financing by states and action plans.

* boost job creation
* more income
* more demand
* more production
* GDP increase
Tax fossil energy and return the proceeds in equal amounts to all citizens.

Advantages: inequalities, carbon footprint.

AN ECO-FRIENDLY "TAX & DISTRIBUTE" POLICY...

The idea is to tax energy consumption...

...and distribute the money to all citizens.

Since the Rich usually use much more energy than the Poor,

...The Rich will pay more than they will receive, while the Poor will make benefits.

How does this foster sustainability?

If the tax is applied at producer's level, it will be redistributed among users through higher fuel & energy prices.

The price of energy intensive food & goods will also increase.

Higher prices create incentives for efficient consumption and energy savings.

⇒ increasing the attractiveness of local food & goods!
Shift taxes from employment to emissions and resource use

**Advantage:** ecological footprint

**IS INFINITE ECONOMIC GROWTH POSSIBLE?**

- Economic growth uses resources...
- Earth is a spaceship: all its resources are inside...
- ... and these resources are **FINITE**.
  
  Once they are used up... well, they are used up! And we are as well?

**THEREFORE:**

- Either economic growth has to stop
- Or economic growth stops overusing resources.

**GREEN GROWTH = increase in GDP + reduced emissions**

In order to achieve green growth...

...any damaging activity must be taxed:

- Polluting a river
- Emitting GHG
- Overusing resources
- Causing health problems
- ... etc.

This is the "polluter pays" principle. It makes their externalities:

...and give incentive to stop damaging activities

It will raise awareness...

let's not try to put a price on everything, though...
**PROPOSAL 9**

**Increase death taxes**

**Advantages:** Inequality

- Only a few are lucky and inherit money without much effort.
- While most never have that luck.
- This leads to the rich getting richer while the poor are stuck at the same level.

Sometimes, money goes to charity. In this way, some rich people decide on which activities to support...

If we would progressively tax inheritance up to 100%, the State, which represents the whole society...

...could decide which activities are worth financing.

...or could redistribute the money to give everyone a similar starting point.
Encourage unionization

Advantage: \textbf{inequalities}

to put pressure on politicians to think on the long-term

to find the right balance

Why are unions so important?

They foster:
- income & wealth distribution
- stronger social & labor rights
- social & intergenerational mobility

Over the last 30 years,
- wages decreased
- unemployment increased
- inequalities widened
- unionization decreased
Restrict trade

Advantages:
- ecological footprint
- unemployment
- inequalities

Extreme free market ideology

Philosophy of the cheapest GDP

TODAY...

WHO BENEFITS REALLY FROM FREE TRADE?

In the past, free trade helped current developed countries build up their economy through specialization. This gave many people access to necessary goods.

Today, UNEMPLOYMENT has become the major issue in rich countries. NOT access to goods.

Protectionism:
- to protect jobs in rich countries
- to lower emissions (ex. from transportation)
- to shift more easily to ecologically sound products
- prices would rise & consumption would decrease

but haven't we produced everything we need already, anyway
Encourage smaller families

**Advantage**

- ecological footprint

**Population Growth** is seen as one of the major factors contributing to Climate Change & Resource Depletion.

*Therefore* In order to lower humanity's ecological footprint...

- we could decrease the ecological footprint per person...
- or lower the size of the Earth population

*Quite difficult, although we aim for that, too*

GDP generated by an average rich world citizen in 2 years. $50,000

*In rich countries, a bonus could be given to every woman who had only 1 or no kid at all on her 50th birthday.*
Introduce a guaranteed livable income for those who need it most

Advantages: 
inequalities → well-being
poverty

At the current level of wealth in rich countries, it seems unfeasible to implement an unconditional & universal basic income without lowering well-being dramatically.

Still, it is possible to support up to 30% of the population (of a rich country) with up to one third of the average GDP/person (~ $15,000/year)
**Different ways to change societies**

1. **Radical Revolution**
   - Today's world
   -but is it really feasible to start a global sustainable revolution?
   - Club of Rome says 'no.'

2. **The Slow Pathway**
   - Today's world
   - Small steps will take society further on the right path
   - 13 proposals
   - 13 steps towards a better world
8 criteria for politically feasible solutions:

- It does not cost more, in the short term, than doing nothing.
- It does not lead to higher unemployment and greater inequality in the short term.
- It helps to turn the political system and leadership in the right direction.
- It does not cause the existing system to collapse.
- It builds a wider awareness about the extent of change needed.
- It is welcomed by the democratic majority, if not the 99%.
- It offers immediate benefits for most people.
- It moves humanity towards a better and more sustainable future, with lower ecological footprint per person.
How much do you really know about GDP?

1. What does "GDP" stand for?
2. Who came up with it?
3. When was "GDP" invented?

What does GDP show?
- The level of activity in an economy

Check this box to see surprising activities that boost GDP

What does GDP not show?
- What kind of activities are valued (war products)
- Well-being level in society
- Inequalities
- Poverty
- Health
- Resource depletion
- Happiness
- Education level
- Life expectancy
- Etc.

Does GDP growth lead to well-being?
Since the 80's, GDP kept on increasing...

[But] real wages decreased
Working hours increased
Inequalities increased
Working conditions worsened
Taxes on the rich decreased
Taxes on the middle class increased
Unemployment increased

⇒ Happy now?!