



HAL
open science

Conceptual roots of degrowth

Fabrice Flipo

► **To cite this version:**

Fabrice Flipo. Conceptual roots of degrowth. First International Conference on Economic De-growth for Ecological Sustainability and Social Equity, Apr 2008, Paris, France. pp.24 - 28. hal-02510344

HAL Id: hal-02510344

<https://hal.science/hal-02510344>

Submitted on 17 Mar 2020

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Conceptual roots of degrowth

FLIPO Fabrice

Author: Fabrice Flipo, philosopher, associate professor at TELECOM & Management SudParis, 9 rue Charles Fourier, 91011 Evry.

E-Mail: fabrice.flipo@it-sudparis.eu

1. Introduction

Degrowth: the term challenges, raises questions, is found in improbable places and catches many people unaware. Here we trace a small descriptive panorama of it, prior to entering into the detail of these issues, which are on the conference agenda.

2. Increasing audience

Degrowth is gaining an audience on the left. This term, used by J. Grinevald to translate the title of the work of Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen¹, whose original title, "The Entropy Law and the Economic Process"², was known only to groups of experts when the newspaper "Decroissance", first published in March 2004, re-launched this concept to the public. The newspaper prints 45,000 copies, of which 25,000 are sold. It has doubled its frequency of publication, becoming a monthly. Several web sites are devoted to degrowth: Decroissance.info is a site self-managed by local groups; Decroissance.net is the official site of the Institute of Economic and Social Studies for Sustainable Degrowth, with the same approach as the newspaper "La Decroissance"; Ladecroissance.org is the web site of the journal "La Decroissance. Several "marches for degrowth" have happened in various places (from Lyon to Magny-Cours in June 2005, in Loire-Atlantique, in Nord-Pas-de-Calais and in Charente-Maritime). Others are planned.

Degrowth even has its own party: the Party for Degrowth (le Parti pour la Décroissance - PPLD), founded on April 8 2007 in Dijon. It calls for a "degrowth based on equity, sustainability and values that are humanist, democratic, republican, non-violent, defending human rights and fighting all forms of discrimination and totalitarianism". Many small newspapers support this idea of degrowth: "l'âge de faire", "Silence", etc. Degrowth circulates undercover to a large degree, it generates debates which support a symbolic reappropriation of our surroundings. The engineer Nicolas Ridoux has synthesized an overview of the elements of degrowth in a small, well done book³.

Degrowth is not limited to the small or medium circulation press. The 25th of March 2006 edition of *Le Monde* 2, a supplement of the daily newspaper, devoted its cover and

principal article to degrowth⁴. This topic has been the object of several articles in *Le Monde* and elsewhere. One can find files on the subject in places as improbable as *TGV Magazine*. The wave is deep and give the impression that it will last.

It has started to touch the large political parties. Yves Cochet has pushed this idea within the Greens, but he didn't win the nomination for the presidential race. The "Utopia" motion, led by Frank Pupumat, is the first to have called the religion of growth into question within the PS. It obtained 1,05% of the votes at the Mans Congress November 2005. The network of objectors to growth, who are not exclusively partisans of degrowth, has been very active around the unitary candidacy of the geft. Nicolas Hulot, advised by, among others, Jean-Paul Besset, was introduced by "Politis" as the crusader of degrowth⁵ - and was denounced by "La Decroissance" as an "écotartuffe". Corinne Lepage has refuted this idea, which she considers too negative, and Domenica Voynet prefers "decrease of the ecological footprint", which is very different.

The magazine "Entropia" was launched in the presence of some fifty people in November 2006 at the French National Assembly, to help give theoretical substance to the idea of degrowth. The editorial board is composed of Jean-Paul Besset⁶, J. - C. Besson-Girard⁷, François Brune⁸, Alain Gras⁹, Serge Latouche¹⁰ and Agnès Sinai¹¹. The magazine is presented as a "magazine of theoretical and political study of degrowth" - "Entropia falls within a long tradition of examining ideas and action, a place favouring expression of a growing collective thought, working itself out in the passage of time. A reflection on the crest of the fundamental questions of our time, for the expansion of awareness an unprecedented human condition, for the enrichment of theoretical, poetic and political imaginary of after-development"¹². The title of the journal, "Entropia", does not refer to entropy in a physical sense, this concept raised to a fad in economics by Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen, but to the Greek "entropè", action to be turned over, to look beyond oneself in order to contemplate the path travelled, and to take time to wonder whether it wouldn't be better to change.

For Entropia, "all thoughts which refuse self-criticism are no longer thoughts, but beliefs. They leave the earthly grounds of clarity for the mirages of hope. For more than

⁴ Peut-on continuer comme ça ? Pollution-inégalités-énergie, la théorie de la décroissance revient, 25 mars 2006.

⁵ Edition du 9 novembre 2006

⁶ Ancien rédacteur en chef du Monde, coordinateur du « Pacte écologique » de Nicolas Hulot, auteur de « Comment ne plus être progressiste... sans devenir réactionnaire » chez Fayard

⁷ Paysan, artiste, auteur de « Decrescendo Cantabile » chez Parangon

⁸ Auteur de « Les médias pensent comme moi », « De l'idéologie aujourd'hui » etc.

⁹ Professeur d'anthropologie à Paris 1-Sorbonne, auteur de « La fragilité de la puissance » chez Fayard

¹⁰ Economiste, auteur du « Pari de la décroissance » (Fayard, 2006), « Survivre au développement » et bien d'autres ouvrages

¹¹ Journaliste, co-auteure de « Sauver la Terre » avec Yves Cochet

¹² Entropia n°1, novembre 2006.

¹ Demain la décroissance: Entropie-écologie-économie, foreword and translation of I. Rens and J. Grinevald, Lausanne, Pierre-Marcel Favre, 1979, 2nd ED. magazine and [supplement], La Decroissance, Paris, Sang de la terre, 2006.

² Harvard University Press, 1971.

³ N. Ridoux, La Décroissance pour tous, éditions Parangon, 2006.

fifty years, “growth” and “development” have stuck by this irrational and dogmatic rule. In the Seventies, however, some heterodox researchers unfrightened by perspicacity (Illich, Georgescu-Roegen, Ellul, Partant, Castoriadis...) drew up themselves against this dictatorship of economics and provided the foundations for a framework for degrowth. Disturbing thought that it is. Since a only few years ago, and especially since conference: “Demolish development to remake the world” (UNESCO 2002), publications like “Silence” and “The Ecologist”, the newsletter “La Ligne d’horizon, les amis de François Partant”, gave him a growing space in their columns. The bi-monthly “La Décroissance” has contributed, for three years, to accentuate its iconoclast and provocative character. Because this concept of degrowth indeed upsets the signs and the lines: the theoretical and symbolic signs of recognition like the lines of traditional political cleavages. This situation can generate theoretical and political skids and drifts which require the greatest vigilance in thought and practice.”¹³

And in fact skids happened. Texts from degrowth theorists have been found on sites in Greece, whose links with the extreme-right are notorious. That threw some confusion into the ranks of degrowth proponents, a little less so with respect to the theorists. Greece is indeed usually the salvager of ideas without the awareness of authors, the journal MAUSS having already had this experience in the past.

Beyond false polemics, there is lots of work to do. Degrowth building sites are as numerous as the ways of using this term or referring to it. A “shell-word”, for those like Paul Ariès¹⁴, used to break down unfavourable conceptual frameworks, which cannot imagine any future beyond that of growth, degrowth can also be elevated to the rank of a concept, in particular in the field of economics. Degrowth also designates way of being, which one sometimes finds under the term “voluntary simplicity”.

The exchanges between Herve Kempf¹⁵, Nathalie Kosciusko-Morizet¹⁶ and Sylvia Pérez-Vitoria¹⁷ in the broadcast “Du grain à moudre” on France Culture last February 1 showed the extent of the debate opened by degrowth well. Herve Kempf put the deluxe question into the public place. Basing himself on the economist Thorstein Veblen, he put forward the hypothesis that behavior is driven by ostentation [ostentatious consumption] rather than by needs, and also that the spread of the Western model in the world is the key to the global ecological crisis. We Westerners should thus practise sobriety as soon as possible, starting with richest. The Deputy of the Essonne, while recognizing this urgency, minimized the responsibility of the rich. Supported by the journalist Brice Couturier, who lost his duty to be neutral, she sought to

show that growth benefitted the poorest, because the phase of growth of pollution gives way to a phase of stabilization then of reduction of impacts, while economic growth benefits a growing number of people. Las ! Well documented, Herve Kempf supported all criticisms, the innocence of the rich person was not proven, nor the tendency of economies to dematerialize themselves nor the capacity of growth to reduce the numbers of the poor. Like Sylvia Pérez-Vitoria reminded them, growth is especially the growth of inequalities and the exploitation of the majority by an increasingly rich minority. The journalist Brice Couturier was irritated, while Mrs. Kosciusko-Morizet relied very largely on scientific and technological progress, even while she stated her wishes for a cleaner growth, “made in moderation”.

The debate testifies to the embarrassment of the elite before the ecological question. The old concepts, through which the global crisis has arrived, seem impotent. Degrowth spills the beans, like the MIT report and that of the Club of Rome before it¹⁸. Whereas growth is called upon everywhere as the solution to all problems, in the North as in the South, a veritable universal “open sesame”, it asserts a scandalous conclusion, and not exactly well founded, namely that on the one hand growth does not have a future since it does not solve the ecological problem, and on the other hand since it doesn't have the universality that one supposes.

Growth is the result of a whole range of policies and initiatives. Few countries in the world know if a whole range of policies and initiatives such that growth is accompanied by a reduction of inequalities. It is rather the opposite. And on a historical scale it is even more obvious. The countries which have experienced strong growth rates for a long time are those which had the highest ecological impact, aside from a few nuances. The “dematerialization of GDP” is only apperent, because the most polluting countries have largely devolved the most destructive links in the chain of production which serves to maintain their standard of living. China and Brazil do not hesitate to remind us that most of the environmental impacts of their countries are the direct result of gargantuan demand from Western countries. And even if ecological problems didn't exist, the mental pollution generated by productivism, whose supreme symbol is growth, should raise questions. Degrowth thus points to the de-economisation of spirits, which comes back to a fresh look at the program of MAUSS¹⁹.

These questions are not entirely new. They are for the most part them of the environment movement. We have to note however, that the ecologists did not succeed in their seduction. They nevertheless tried: ecology of right, left, neither right nor left, NGO ecology, business ecology.

¹³ Entropia n°1, novembre 2006.

¹⁴

http://www.decroissance.org/index.php?chemin=textes/Un_mot-obus.htm

¹⁵ Journaliste au Monde, auteur de « Comment les riches détruisent la planète » paru chez Seuil en 2006.

¹⁶ Députée UMP de l'Essonne.

¹⁷ Economiste et sociologue, membre de « La ligne d'Horizon », auteure du « Retour des paysans » chez Actes Sud.

¹⁸ Là aussi la traduction est instructive : le rapport original s'intitulait « The limits to growth », que Fayard avait traduit par « Halte à la croissance ». Le rapport 2003 du Club de Rome endosse toujours les conclusions du rapport de 1972, voir D. Meadows, J. Randers & D. Meadows, Limits to growth – The 30-years update, Chelsea Green Publishing Company, 2004.

¹⁹ A. Caillé, Critique de la raison utilitaire – Manifeste du Mauss, Paris, La Découverte, 2003, Ed. orig., 2003. Le Mauss (Mouvement Anti-Utilitariste en Sciences Sociales) a été fondé en 1981.

Nothing happened, the stakes are worse and the remainder of society always finds reasons to dismiss the ecological stakes as from an imaginary environmentalist whom they see as detached from reality - and all that in spite of the innumerable more and more official reports. Catherine Larrère speaks about “sociocentrism”²⁰ in connection with this astonishing incapacity of our societies to other things in the environmental crisis that their problems of relations. Ecology would be first of all the problem of the ecologists. Téliorama, astonished by the intellectual vacuum existing in the field of the ecology²¹, testified as much to this tangible reality, as well as its own ignorance on the matter, although the theoreticians indeed exist. Our societies seem to always have to find a reason not to take the ecological stakes seriously. “The ecologists” were too ecological, then too “social” when they started to take into account the social stakes, in short never “as it should be”. Because ecology continues to disturb, and in the face of ideas which disturb, the ostrich policy ensures that obscurity remains the tested recipe.

The very broad range of opponents to degrowth on the left gives an idea of the political and theoretical importance of the problems that this term raises on a conceptual and political level. The idea of degrowth is unbearable to all those and all those which see in the mediation of the market the social link par excellence, one that is based on the contract or on planning. For many, it is modernity which is in question. It is perhaps that indeed. But it would be necessary to go further ahead and to show that modernity thus understood still has something to bring to the world, or more exactly to the planet. Modernity is too often put forward as a standard without further arguments, all that are opposed to it are reactionary or obscurantist. Ecology poses from the beginning the question of knowing how to “no longer be progressive without becoming more reactionary” as the pretty formula in the title of the work of Jean-Paul Besset says²². Degrowth irritates the majority of economists - and calls into question their domination. Economists have already, for a long time, been on bad terms with the ecologists. The interest in these exchanges is that degrowth resists all attacks very well. The objections raised are familiar to ecologists: degrowth would be relativistic (J.-M. Harribey²³), it would be a backward step, a return to obscurity, an idealization of nature and “traditional” societies²⁴ and of course blackmail over jobs.

The existing answers are robust, and for this reason the debate goes on. Does degrowth confuse “development” and “growth”, as Rene Passet²⁵, as well as many others suggest?

²⁰ C. & R. Larrère, *Du bon usage de la nature*, Paris, Aubier, 1997.

²¹ W. Zarachowicz, *Ecolos cherchent intellos*, Téliorama n° 2970 - 16 Décembre 2006.

²² J.-P. Besset, *Comment ne plus être progressiste, sans devenir réactionnaire*, Paris, Fayard, 2005.

²³ J.-M. Harribey, *Une conception de la richesse non-marchande pour sortir du faux dilemme croissance / décroissance*, E. Berr & J.-M. Harribey (dir.), *Le développement en question(s)*, Presses Universitaires de Bordeaux, 2006, pp. 265-288.

²⁴ G. Duval, *Décroissance ou développement durable ?*, *Alternatives économiques*, Hors-Série « Le développement durable », 1er trimestre 2005, pp. 53-55.

²⁵ R. Passet, *Querelles byzantines autour de la croissance -*

And if it was the economists who confused “common good” and “development”, they never had a reduced vision, narrowly economic, of common good? Although Passet insists on the qualitative, it doesn't exist, and as a result, neither does an economic theory of the qualitative. As a result, how does he contribute to the debate? That remains fuzzy. To put the management of the common good in the hands of computers and economic materialists, will ensure sure that one will remain on the level of management, and that one will never rise above the level of projects. There is generally a teleology under current with the analyses of developpementists, moreover Passet once again takes the example of the child who grows up to explain the difference between growth and development. Are underdeveloped countries children? Such paternalist attitudes we thought had been relegated in the dustbins of the history. How can we not see that this analogy is a structural design of development, an underlying anthromorphism which should be denounced with the same vigour that certain analysts use to put down the idea of nature in the discussions of ecologists? Among those who unceasingly denounce natural law and those who resort to the development, the more naturalist of the two is perhaps not that which one would believe. The partisans of degrowth thus can retort to Rene Passet that it is he who has mistaken the adversary, by giving credence to the dominant naturalist thesis. Indeed, to again take the term “development” can be compared to support for the practices which accompany this term. Starting from such naturalism, how can one think of an opening to the world? How to reawaken our imagination? These questions, which are at the base of criticisms resulting from degrowth, are not taken seriously, the objections thus fall a little flat.

There too, the criticism was made and well made by MAUSS. The economic discourse is a discourse on the means, which hardly leaves space for the debate on ends. While refusing to leave space for discourse on the ends, economists block the free-exercise of politics. They act as if they already had the answers. Let's take a survey: is the difference between growth and development perfectly clear in the minds of the public? We'll wager it's not. In any case it is clear that the media world does not make a difference and identifies one with the other. Wanting to show the difference between the two raises the “Byzantine quarrel”, even if the experts agree amongst themselves to give the lesson to the good people who understand nothing. To make a difference between economic development and well being, the recourse to a term which differentiates both is clearly necessary.

3. Conceptual roots

Degrowth is not a unified doctrine. Sharp tensions between the newspaper *La Décroissance* and the current editorial board of *Entropia* accompanied the emergence of the theoretical magazine. The creation of the PPLD did not achieve unanimity, that's the least one can say, and tensions appeared from the beginning amongst the directors. Disagreement on the use of the term “degrowth” as a watchword or as the heading for a political programme. The “degrowth of the ecological footprint” adopted by the

Greens does not have the same range at all as degrowth per say, it's quite a different choice which was taken. Others prefer after-development, others want to avoid slogans (Sylvia Perez-Vitoria), still others prefer sustainable degrowth (Vincent Cheynet and Bruno Clémentin).

Beyond the foam of the storm that shakes the mind, we think it's possible to characterize degrowth as situated at the junction of five sources which cross, without being necessarily competitive nor even convergent.

The first is the culturalist source. Coming out of anthropology, led by Serge Latouche, a reconverted Marxist; his principal thesis being that homo economicus is contingent, dependent on "his" representation of the world and of history. If one wants to open new possibilities, one needs to reinvent or rediscover our nature. This thesis is distinguished from the Marxist thesis which today still remains largely dependent on the imaginary economist and productivist. Degrowth represents a means of taking the opposite course to development on the project of "socially [imaginative] meanings", to use the vocabulary of Castoriadis²⁶, and thus to reach an [instituted] society in order to make it evolve, to open a breach, a passage to the [instituting] society. Serge Latouche notes that "the other possible world" is that in which it's necessary "to decolonize in our imagination" these economic and developmentist meanings to be able to reach it²⁷.

The democratic source results from the analyses of Ivan Illich. A major component of the approach of Vincent Cheynet, it is based on the collapse of links which are under the weight of the market. Consequently what counts is to revitalize the links, which pass via relocalization, which is not a return to the good old days of the villages, which one knows were not always so good. This source is attached to the quality of the public discussion, and is differentiated clearly from the Marxist analyses which tend to make the symbolic a simple reflection of the relations of production, even if the demand for a maximum acceptable income shows clearly that preoccupation for social justice is present. The abolition of privileges is a major stake for democratization in our societies which cannot use means which are not in themselves democratic without simultaneously going against the stated principles. Here degrowth is a term used to provoke debate, it is there virtual performative key-word, which revitalizes the passions needed for the existence of a public space. Degrowth is also a logical economic consequence of this revitalization which must result in a strong economic deceleration. Indeed to discuss takes time, also the market relations which extend in space without worrying about the existence of a strong public space to support them and to domesticate them they should be strongly restricted, even prohibited, because of concerns over "stowaway" behavior.

²⁶ C. Castoriadis, *L'institution imaginaire de la société*, Paris, Seuil, 1975.

²⁷ S. Latouche, *Survivre au développement*, Paris, Mille et Une Nuits, 2004. S. Latouche, *Décoloniser l'imaginaire – la pensée créative contre l'économie de l'absurde*, Lyon, Parangon, 2005. Voir aussi F. Partant, *La fin du développement – la naissance d'une alternative ?*, Paris, Actes Sud, 1997 ou G. Rist, *Le développement – Histoire d'une croyance occidentale*, Paris, Presses de Sciences Po, 1996.

The third source is environmental, attached to the ecosystems and to respect for the living. For this tendency, degrowth is the inevitable consequence of any ecological policy taken seriously. To reinforce ecological productivity to the detriment of economic productivity will lead to a reduction of mechanization, which itself will result in a reduction of the GDP. The indicator of ecological footprint shows that the world uses 125% of the Earth's renewal capacities²⁸, the Millenium Report on Ecosystems shows that 60% of ecosystems are degraded or used in a non sustainable manner²⁹. A recent FAO report FAO indicates that if removals continue to intensify at the current rate, then the oceans will be exhausted, all fisheries [confused], by 2048³⁰. Desertification touches 1/3 of world land, domestic biological diversity broke down from 50 to 75%, species disappear at a rythme 100 to 1000 times faster than the preindustrial rythme, etc. All the signs of fast and massive degradation of ecosystems are there. However ecosystems are all that we will have when the fossil and consumable resources disappear. Thus We have largely dug out the ecological debt for the generations to come. The environmental argument doesn't consist of an accounting argument, but of a new relationship with nature, a rapport which would no longer be based on exploitation but on respect and coevolution. Mankind has dominated nature, they must now not submit themselves, but admit that they are not the center of all. Ecology has developed analyses close to the previous current in the form "of ecology of the spirit"³¹, "ecosophia"³², "natural contract"³³ or "of emunicipalism"³⁴. Degrowth is also a decrease of the influence on nature, which is not reputed to belong to us, and consequently should be withdrawn from appropriately.

The fourth source is related to the crisis of direction which runs across industrialized societies. Who says crisis of direction says spiritual opening, the life of the spirit, and it is this step which led Pierre Rabhi³⁵, for example, towards degrowth. The topic which is developed here is the non-sense of a life passed "always running more" (of titles, money, things) whereas harmony with nature, humans and living things in general passes rather by meditation and listening. The interior revolution is a necessary precondition to put an end to the increasingly disordered states which agitate the world. Non-violent and [deliberate] action, along the lines of Ghandi's precepts, is the only way of restoring progress which is no longer that of the blind forces of technology. Voluntary simplicity, after François d'Assise, is not a way of depriving oneself, but a way of

²⁸ WWF, *Rapport planète vivante*, 2006.

²⁹ Millenium Assessment Report, *Living Beyond Our Means : Natural Assets and Human Well-Being*, 2004. <http://www.millenniumassessment.org/> www.maweb.org

³⁰ B. Worm & al., *Impacts of Biodiversity Loss on Ocean Ecosystem Services*, Science, 3 nov 2006, vol. 314, pp. 787-790.

³¹ G. Bateson, *Vers une écologie de l'esprit*, Seuil, 1990, Ed. orig. 1972.

³² F. Guattari, *Les trois écologies*, Paris, Galilée, 1989.

³³ M. Serres, *Le contrat naturel*, éd. François Bourin, Paris, 1990.

³⁴ M. Bookchin, *Pour un municipalisme libertaire*, Lyon, Atelier de Création Libertaire, 2003

³⁵ P. Rabhi, *Du Sahara aux Cévennes*, Paris, Albin Michel, 2002.

becoming lighter in order to let a major direction come into oneself, less superficial than that which drives the ceaseless ballet of ordinary things. There, where poverty finds dignity, misery is chased away³⁶ and people can take steps for a better future.

The last source can be called "bioeconomist". It is an old source, like the others, but some authors are regarded as having put the question on the agenda. If ecology starts with living, the bioeconomy speaks about human organization having to manage constraints such as the limits of ecosystems ("load capacity") and the limited availability of certain resources. With the Club of Rome, it was Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen who could be regarded as a precursor, having written in 1971 that the end of the industrial phase will be all faster as the economic level of development reached is raised³⁷. Each car produced is at the cost of cars to come³⁸, each weapon manufactured is a ploughshare less. Degrowth is inevitable, it is a geological consequence, as Yves Cochet said³⁹. It is a question from now on of managing scarcity, the economy becomes a "normative management under constraint"⁴⁰. Georgescu-Roegen shows, like many other economists before him, that we must urgently turn to renewable resources because they are the only ones able to ensure the future, the others having to run out whatever progress might be achieved by science and technology. But renewable resources are also limited, which is why Hermann Daly, one of the founders of "Ecological Economics", showed a long time ago that the stake of a sustainable economy also concerns the question of size, and not only of composition⁴¹. The ecological economy is basically ambiguous: is it about ecologising the economy or economizing the ecology? In all cases, the living and ecosystems are apprehended by an instrumental mode. The limits which are posed can be technical or ethical-political. Ecology can be used to exploit nature more quickly, as well as for protecting resources

The five approaches lead in a relatively independent way to the conclusion that degrowth is one of the essential elements for a better future. Beyond, there are tensions between these five approaches, which are found in exchanges between partisans of degrowth as well as between partisans and opponents, but the fact that they are found around this term are remarkable and testifies to the centrality of the concept of "growth", which plays a much wider societal role than the simple accounting definition behind which national accountants cut themselves off to maintain their objectivity. A good part of these debates is known in political ecology: is degrowth of the right or the left? left? Can it be reduced to voluntary simplicity ("small gestures")? etc. The connaisseurs will only see there a [bis repetita], degrowth being by all evidence one of the first consequences when one takes ecology or the exit from economicism seriously. However the term has at least

partially succeeded in regenerating a debate which seemed to have sunk.

It is true that topicality has helped. It is indeed at the beginning of the years 2000 that the question of climate change finally seems to be taken seriously. The Stern Report⁴², the reports of the GIEC⁴³, the Millenium Ecosystems report⁴⁴ and many other reports have once again showed that the things are worsening. Even if significant sectors of humanity experience a richness up to this point unknown, inequalities increase and the material base of this richness melt like snow in the sun.

Degrowth has become a symbolic element that is impossible to circumvent. "Les Echos", not a newspaper susceptible to fantasies from the economic point of view, made degrowth one of the three economic paradigms likely to take us out of "ready-made thinking" in this domain⁴⁵. The left, in need of new ideas, should grab onto the subject. One has seen committees of "future Desires" engage in public discussions around degrowth. Will it go to the end?

³⁶ M. Rahnama, *Quand la misère chasse la pauvreté*, Paris, Actes Sud, 2004.

³⁷ N. Georgescu-Roegen, *La décroissance*, Sang de la Terre, 1994, Ed. orig. 1971, p. 66.

³⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 67

³⁹ Y. Cochet, *Pétrole apocalypse*, Paris, Fayard, 2006.

⁴⁰ R. Passet, *L'économique et le vivant*, Paris, Payot, 1979.

⁴¹ H.E. Daly & J. Cobb Jr., *For the Common Good*, Boston, Beacon Press, 1989.

⁴² Stern, *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*, 2006.

⁴³ IPCC, *Summary for policymakers – working group 1*, 2007.

⁴⁴ *Op.cit.*

⁴⁵ *Sortir du prêt-à-penser économique*, décembre 2004.