WEAll Briefing Papers
Short Summaries of Big Issues

Wellbeing Economics for the COVID-19 recovery
Ten principles to build back better

Milena Büchs¹, Marta Baltruszewicz¹, Katharina Bohnenberger³, Jonathan Busch¹, James Dyke⁵, Patrick Elf⁴, Andrew Fanning², Martin Fritz⁶, Alice Garvey¹, Lukas Hardt¹, Elena Hofferberth¹, Diana Ivanova¹, Amanda Janoo², Dan O’Neill¹, Monica Guillen-Royo⁷, Marlyne Sahakian⁸, Julia Steinberger¹, Katherine Trebeck², Christine Corlet Walker⁴

¹ University of Leeds, 2 Wellbeing Economy Alliance, 3 University Duisburg-Essen, 4 University of Surrey, 5 Exeter University, 6 University of Jena, 7 University of Oslo, 8 University of Lausanne, 9 Doughnut Economics Action Lab

8 May 2020
Disclaimer: WEAll is a collaboration, not a representative body. With over 80 affiliated organisations around the world, its membership includes an unprecedented breadth of approaches, views and expertise. These WEAll Briefing papers benefit from the knowledge of our diverse members and associates, but do not necessarily
represent their organisational positions or individual stances. WEAll is proud to support and amplify the ideas in this paper, but in doing so it does not present them on behalf of our entire membership.
Executive summary

The COVID-19 pandemic is having devastating effects on vulnerable communities around the world but we are also seeing glimpses of hope, where societies are working to “build back better” by ensuring basic needs and protecting our natural environment. In this briefing paper, we outline a set of ten principles for “building back better” toward a wellbeing economy. We showcase examples of inspiring actions around the world that are moving us towards a wellbeing economy, along with examples of actions that are moving us away from this vision.

1. Introduction

The COVID-19 pandemic is exposing the many cracks in current economic systems. Already before the outbreak, the world has been facing multiple crises – the climate emergency, rising inequality, and increasing public disengagement from democratic processes. Responses to the pandemic risk greatly exacerbating these crises if we do not challenge root causes.

Based on a COVID-19 policy-tracking project with a team of over 30 international experts, this briefing provides a guide on suitable policies to build back better in response to COVID-19 by prioritising human health, wellbeing, and ecological stability in the long term. We highlight some of the steps that governments and businesses around the world have taken to “build back better” in response to COVID-19 and point to some of the “back to worse” traps that others have fallen into.

Societies can choose two possible pathways in response to this crisis - “back to worse” or “build back better”: “Back to worse” would defend neoliberal economic systems and ideologies by prioritising economic growth, reducing market regulations as quickly as possible and imposing strict austerity measures to curtail public debt. This would greatly risk exacerbating poverty and inequality, decrease life expectancies, and accelerate our climate emergency. This is not what the people want. In the UK, for example, only 9% of respondents in the UK want things to return to how they were before the Pandemic (YouGov poll). “Back to normal” is not a desired option.

There is an alternative. “Building back better” would take the crisis as an opportunity to transform economies and societies in radically positive directions. The creation of wellbeing economies would ensure that our post-COVID-19 world is much safer, more stable and healthy. In order to create a wellbeing economy we must move into the “doughnut” of a “safe and just space for humanity” by staying within planetary boundaries while guaranteeing needs satisfaction for all (Raworth 2017, Trebeck and Williams 2019). Right now, our economies aggravate the climate and ecological crises, and they perpetuate vastly unequal distributions of power and wealth.

“Building back better” will require great creativity and coordination. Concerted effort will be needed to break these path dependencies and develop new institutions that value wellbeing and ecological sustainability simultaneously and for all. New ideas are a crucial ingredient for such an endeavor. We suggest the following 10 principles for responding to COVID-19 but recognize that we are in a unique moment of change with and invite you to engage in this discussion as we work to build back better together.
2. Principles

We have developed the following ten principles for a COVID-19 recovery, based on the doughnut economics framework which combines theories of planetary boundaries and universal human needs (Doyal & Gough, 1991; Max-Neef, with Elizalde, & Hopenhayn, 1991; Raworth, 2017; Rockström et al., 2009; Trebeck & Williams, 2019). The ten principles are organised into an overarching principle, and environmental, social and governance dimensions.

1. New goals: ecologically safe and environmentally just
Prioritise long-term human wellbeing and ecological stability in all decision-making; degrow and divest from economic sectors that do not contribute to ecological and wellbeing goals; invest in those that do; facilitate a just transition for all that creates jobs in and reskills for environmentally friendly and wellbeing focused sectors.

2. Protecting environmental standards
Protect all existing climate policy and emission reduction targets, environmental regulations and other environmental policies in all COVID-19 responses.

3. Green infrastructure and provisioning
Develop new green infrastructure and provisioning, and sustainable social practices as part of the COVID-19 recovery. For instance, transform urban space towards active travel and away from car use; scale up public transport, green energy, environmentally sustainable food production, low carbon housing; attach environmental conditionality to bailouts of high carbon industries.

4. Universal basic services
Guarantee needs satisfaction for everyone, including through health care coverage for the whole population free of charge at point of access; universal free provision or vouchers for basic levels of water, electricity, gas, housing, food, mobility, education.

5. Guaranteed livelihoods
Ensure everyone has the means for decent living, for instance through income and/or job guarantees, redistribution of employment through working-time reduction.

6. Fair distribution
Create more equal societies nationally and globally through a fair distribution of resources and opportunities. E.g. more progressive and environmentally orientated income and wealth taxation; public/common ownership of key resources and infrastructure.

7. Better democracy
Ensure effective, transparent and inclusive democratic processes at all levels; end regulatory capture from corporate interests and corruption.

8. Wellbeing economics organisations
Prioritise in all businesses and organisations social and ecological goals; implement circular economy principles to minimise resource use and waste; ensure economic and organisational democracy.

9. Cooperation
Ensure cooperation and solidarity at all levels, including in international politics and the global economy; across industrial sectors and government ministries; across scales (global, national, regional, local).

10. Public control of money
Introduce public and democratic control of money creation. Spend newly created money on investments that promote social and environmental goals and avoid post-recovery austerity.
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3. Policy Examples

Here we present examples (but not a comprehensive list) to illustrate some of the steps that are already being taken to “build back better” in response to COVID-19. These steps are occurring within the current institutional context and are confined by it, something we have to bear in mind when evaluating them. Most of the “build back better” policies we mention below do not go far enough in order to achieve a true wellbeing economy. It is important to highlight them as steps into the right direction. They can be contrasted with “back to worse” examples which do not advance wellbeing economics.

1. Priorities: ecologically safe and environmentally just

The city of Amsterdam has sped up the adoption of a doughnut economics framework in response to COVID-19 to guide decision making.

New Zealand, Iceland and Scotland are already implementing wellbeing economics principles, through the formation of the Wellbeing Economy Government group, and wellbeing budgets and decision-making frameworks. These countries have also achieved better outcomes in dealing with the COVID-19 crisis.

2. Protecting environmental standards

The European Commissioner for Climate Action and environment ministers of 17 EU countries commit to upholding the European Green Deal during the COVID-19 recovery (against pressure from 40 MEPs to put the Green Deal on ice).

The US National Highway Traffic Safety Administration relaxes vehicle fuel efficiency standards and the US Environmental Protection Agency suspends the enforcement of environmental laws.

3. Green infrastructure and provisioning

South Korea’s new “COVID-19” government pledges to implement a European style Green Deal.

Several cities facilitate green and active travel for socially distanced mobility, e.g. pop up bike lanes in Germany, Brussels, New Zealand & restricted car travel in California, reduced barriers for road closures in the UK, Milan has announced a scheme to seek continued reduction of car use after the Covid-19 crisis.

In New Zealand, the government coalition Green Party has proposed a $1 billion green recovery plan.

Several governments, including in the US, UK, Australia, Sweden and Denmark have bailed out airlines, without environmental conditions in response to COVID-19.

4. Universal basic services

Many governments have significantly stepped up spending on healthcare and improved sick leave regulations (see this OECD tracker for a comprehensive overview). In many countries, more radical reforms will be required to extend health care coverage to the whole population and potentially nationalise private health sectors.
New Asia-Africa knowledge sharing partnerships have been emerging in recent years to advance the adoption of universal health care systems.

Utility companies have been prevented from cutting customers off if they cannot pay their bills during COVID-19 in several countries, including in the UK, Argentina, Spain. Landlords are being prevented from evicting tenants or increasing rents during the COVID-19 emergency, including in New Zealand and Germany. As mortgage holidays have been offered in several countries (see the OECD tracker) to home owners, rent holidays should also be offered to renters.

In the US, employers with more than 500 employees are exempt from the requirement to provide two weeks of sick-leave that was introduced in response to the Coronavirus crisis.

5. Guaranteed livelihoods

Requests for guaranteed basic incomes received renewed support in a range of countries. Hong Kong gives a one-off HK$10,000 (£985), and Japan ¥100,000 (£930) to every citizen in response to the COVID-19 crisis. Togo has introduced an unconditional cash transfer programme for workers in the informal economy (ca. 85% of the workforce) who are hit by COVID-19, and Malawi an emergency cash-aid programme for poor families. While Spain announced the introduction of a “guaranteed minimum income” this will be a means-tested program to fight extreme poverty, similar to the “emergency basic income” adopted in Brazil.

Many governments expand or introduce job retention schemes, protecting workers’ incomes and jobs (the OECD country tracker has a comprehensive list). Several countries allow furloughed workers or students in receipt of grants (e.g. in Germany) to take up jobs essential for the COVID-19 recovery. However, many vulnerable workers remain ineligible for these schemes.

6. Fair distribution

The G-20 and IMF agree freezing debt payments for low income countries. However, a more comprehensive debt relief would be required to free resources for dealing with this crisis.

Bailout and recovery packages in many countries are greatly benefiting owners of capital (e.g. mortgage holidays) and large corporations.

Bailout and recovery packages in high-income countries focus on redistributing resources within their countries without considering the impacts on low-income countries, such as large capital outflows. Low-income countries are already in a much worse position for dealing with the crisis. Efforts to share the costs of the crisis need to be based on solidarity between countries and not only within countries.

7. Better democracy

In France and the UK, citizen assemblies that had been created to involve the public in climate policy making, have continued their work online following the outbreak of the pandemic.

Many governments have implemented ‘states of emergency’ and restricted parliamentary powers and political freedoms. Dressed up as temporary measures during the COVID-19 crisis, they severely risk undermining democracy and freedoms long term. For instance, Hungary curtails parliamentary powers and allows Orban to govern by decree; Kentucky, South Dakota and West Virginia in the US criminalise fossil fuel protests; Brazil’s president Bolsonaro has distanced himself from Congress and Courts while leading an anti-lockdown demonstration;
In India, democratic freedoms are increasingly being curtailed and government surveillance increased in response to COVID-19.

8. Wellbeing economics organisations

Companies in Denmark which pay out dividends, buy back their own shares or are registered in tax havens will not be eligible for any of the COVID-19 aid programs.

Several banks and corporations in the UK put dividend and bonus payments on hold.

Amazon in the US does not provide sick-leave for employees, except those that test positive for the virus, keeps warehouses open where infections have taken place and is firing workers who are publicly demanding better conditions.

9. Cooperation

Some less seriously affected countries have provided help to others, for instance, Germany has taken over 200 intensive care patients from Italy, France and the Netherlands have sent medical equipment and experts to Italy; Other EU countries have also helped each other with medical equipment and funding, taking intensive care patients, and pooling resources to bring stranded Europeans back home.

The UN Foundation, WHO and the Swiss Philanthropy Foundation have launched a new global solidarity fund to support the response to COVID-19.

Many communities have demonstrated an increase in prosocial and cooperative behaviour, and a range of new mutual aid projects have sprung up in response to COVID-19. For instance, over 1 Million people have volunteered in the UK to help the NHS, charities and other local mutual help groups; communities in South Africa and India have created survival packs for vulnerable people, and in Wuhan, China, people have created a community fleet to transport health workers. Policy makers need to identify schemes that work and provide support to sustain and scale them up.

Despite calls for increased cooperation we have seen numerous counter-examples, e.g. Trump’s decision to withdraw funding from the WHO; resistance to EU coronabonds by countries such as Germany, Austria, Finland and the Netherlands as a joint way of dealing with the crisis; the UK failing to take advantage of EU bulk procurement schemes.

10. Public Control of Money

Some governments adopt new Quantitative Easing measures or direct public money creation, e.g. the Bank of England’s Asset Purchase Facility and UK’s “Ways and Means Facility”.
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