

Ecological Economics as a Response to Inequality and Environmental Crisis

By: Rudy C Tarumingkeng



*Rudy C Tarumingkeng: Ecological Economics as a Response to
Inequality and Environmental Crisis*

Oleh:

[Prof Ir Rudy C Tarumingkeng, PhD](#)

Professor of Management NUP: 9903252922

Professor Emeritus, IPB-University

Anggota MPR-RI, 1982-1987

Rektor, Universitas Cenderawasih, Papua (1978-1988, dan

Rektor, Kampus AGRO Manokwari sekarang Universitas Papua Manokwari

Coordinator, CIDA/DIKTI SFU Burnaby BC Canada 1988-1991

Rektor, Universitas Kristen Krida Wacana, Jakarta (1991-2000)

Ketua, Dewan Guru Besar, IPB-University, Bogor (2005-2006)

AI - Data Analyst, dan Ketua, Senat Akademik, IBM-ASMI, Jakarta 2024-

© RudyCT Academic Series

rudymt75@gmail.com

6 May 2026

ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS AS A RESPONSE TO INEQUALITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL CRISIS

Abstract

Ecological economics emerged as a critical response to the limitations of conventional economic thinking, especially its tendency to treat the environment as an external factor and inequality as a secondary social outcome rather than a structural problem. In the twenty-first century, two crises increasingly define the future of development: widening inequality and accelerating ecological degradation. These crises are not separate. They are deeply connected through patterns of extraction, consumption, production, ownership, and political power. The environmental crisis is visible in climate change, biodiversity loss, land degradation, pollution, water scarcity, and the transgression of planetary boundaries. At the same time, inequality appears in unequal access to resources, unequal exposure to environmental harm, unequal responsibility for emissions, and unequal ability to adapt to climate risks. Ecological economics offers an alternative framework by placing the economy inside the biosphere, not above it. It argues that economic activity must operate within ecological limits while distributing resources, opportunities, and responsibilities more justly. This paper discusses ecological economics as a normative, analytical, and policy-oriented response to inequality and environmental crisis. It examines the conceptual foundations of ecological economics, its critique of growth-centered development, its relationship with environmental justice, its relevance to poverty and global inequality, and its policy implications for a just and sustainable transition. The paper argues that ecological economics is not merely an environmental theory, but a broader paradigm of civilization: one that calls for sufficiency, redistribution, democratic

governance of commons, circular production, low-carbon development, and intergenerational justice. It concludes that ecological economics can help societies move from extractive growth toward regenerative prosperity, from unequal accumulation toward shared wellbeing, and from ecological overshoot toward responsible stewardship of the Earth.

Keywords: *ecological economics, inequality, environmental crisis, sustainability, planetary boundaries, environmental justice, steady-state economy, green economy, circular economy, just transition.*

Ecological Economics as a Response to Inequality and Environmental Crisis

1. Introduction

The modern world is marked by a paradox. On the one hand, economic development has generated extraordinary achievements. Industrialization, technological innovation, global trade, medical advances, and digital transformation have improved human life in many ways. Many countries have increased income, expanded education, built infrastructure, and reduced extreme deprivation. On the other hand, the same development model has produced serious ecological and social costs. Climate change is intensifying, biodiversity is declining, pollution is spreading, and natural systems are under increasing pressure. At the same time, wealth and power remain highly concentrated, while many communities continue to experience poverty, vulnerability, and exclusion.

The problem is not simply that the world economy has grown. The deeper issue is the type of growth pursued: growth based on large-scale extraction, fossil energy, material expansion, unequal consumption, and the

assumption that nature can absorb unlimited waste. Conventional economics often treats environmental damage as an “externality,” meaning that ecological costs are placed outside the market price of goods and services. Yet these costs are very real. They appear as floods, droughts, heat waves, crop failures, disease burdens, polluted rivers, lost forests, collapsing fisheries, and displaced communities.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change states that climate change has already produced widespread impacts and risks for human societies and ecosystems. ([IPCC](#)) Scientific work on planetary boundaries also shows that humanity has moved beyond several safe operating limits of the Earth system; a 2023 update concluded that six of the nine planetary boundaries had been transgressed. ([Science](#)) These findings are not abstract warnings. They indicate that the global economy is pressing against biophysical limits that cannot be ignored.

At the same time, inequality remains a central development challenge. The World Bank’s *Poverty, Prosperity, and Planet Report 2024* projects that, on the current trajectory, 622 million people may still live in extreme poverty in 2030, while about 3.4 billion people may live on less than \$6.85 per day. ([World Bank](#)) Inequality also appears in ecological responsibility. Research by Lucas Chancel estimates that the richest 10 percent of the global population were responsible for nearly 48 percent of global emissions in 2019, while the top 1 percent alone accounted for about 17 percent. ([WID - World Inequality Database](#)) This means that environmental crisis cannot be understood only as a technological failure. It is also a justice crisis.

Ecological economics offers an important framework for understanding and responding to this combined crisis. Unlike conventional economics, ecological economics begins with the recognition that the economy is embedded within society and the biosphere. It depends on energy, matter, ecosystems, water, soil, forests, oceans, and climate stability. The economy cannot expand indefinitely on a finite planet. Therefore, the task of

economics is not merely to maximize production, but to organize human wellbeing within ecological limits.

This paper argues that ecological economics is highly relevant as a response to inequality and environmental crisis because it asks three fundamental questions. First, what are the ecological limits within which economic activity must operate? Second, how should resources, opportunities, risks, and responsibilities be distributed fairly? Third, what forms of economic life can promote human wellbeing without destroying the natural systems that sustain life?

2. The Meaning and Scope of Ecological Economics

Ecological economics is a transdisciplinary field that integrates economics, ecology, ethics, political economy, systems thinking, and public policy. Its central premise is simple but profound: the economy is not an independent machine floating above nature; it is a subsystem of the Earth's ecological system. All production requires energy and material inputs. All consumption produces waste. All human wellbeing depends on functioning ecosystems.

This perspective differs from mainstream economic models that often represent the economy as a circular flow between households and firms, with nature appearing only as a source of raw materials or a sink for waste. Ecological economics expands this picture. It sees the economy as an open system that draws low-entropy energy and matter from nature and returns high-entropy waste to the environment. Thus, economic activity is always constrained by thermodynamics, ecological regeneration, and the absorptive capacity of the biosphere.

Herman Daly, one of the most influential ecological economists, argued that the world needs to move beyond the obsession with unlimited growth toward a steady-state economy. A steady-state economy does not mean stagnation or poverty. It means maintaining the scale of the economy

within ecological carrying capacity while improving distribution, efficiency, quality of life, and social wellbeing. In this view, the central economic question is not "How can we produce more forever?" but "How can we live well within limits?"

Ecological economics is also normative. It does not pretend that economic choices are value-free. Decisions about forests, energy, mining, agriculture, transport, and urban development always involve ethical judgments. Who benefits? Who pays the cost? Whose land is used? Whose water is polluted? Which generation receives the benefit, and which generation inherits the damage? These questions show that ecological economics is deeply connected with justice.

The field therefore challenges the narrow measurement of progress. Gross Domestic Product may increase when forests are cut, minerals are extracted, roads are built, and goods are consumed. However, GDP does not adequately subtract the loss of biodiversity, community displacement, soil erosion, water contamination, or long-term climate risk. Ecological economics calls for broader indicators that measure genuine wellbeing, ecological integrity, resilience, equity, and intergenerational responsibility.

3. The Environmental Crisis as a Crisis of Economic Scale

One of the most important contributions of ecological economics is the idea of scale. Scale refers to the physical size of the economy relative to the ecosystems that support it. A small economy may extract resources and release waste without overwhelming natural systems. But when the economy becomes too large in relation to the biosphere, ecological degradation becomes unavoidable.

The contemporary global economy has reached a scale that creates systemic ecological stress. Fossil fuel combustion increases greenhouse gas concentration. Industrial agriculture contributes to soil degradation, water pollution, and biodiversity loss. Urban expansion transforms landscapes.

Mass consumption increases waste. Global supply chains move materials across continents, often hiding ecological damage from final consumers.

The planetary boundaries framework is useful here because it identifies key Earth-system processes that maintain planetary stability. When these boundaries are exceeded, societies face higher risks of irreversible or nonlinear environmental change. The finding that six of nine boundaries have been transgressed suggests that ecological overshoot is no longer a theoretical possibility; it is an existing condition. ([Science](#))

Climate change is perhaps the most visible expression of this overshoot. It is caused largely by the accumulation of greenhouse gases from fossil energy, land-use change, industrial processes, and consumption patterns. Yet climate change interacts with other crises: biodiversity decline weakens ecosystem resilience; deforestation reduces carbon sinks; water stress affects agriculture; and ocean warming threatens fisheries and coastal livelihoods.

Ecological economics interprets these crises as evidence that the economy has exceeded sustainable scale. Technology and efficiency are important, but they are not sufficient if total material and energy throughput continues to rise. A more efficient engine may still increase total emissions if society uses more engines, travels more, and consumes more. This is known as the rebound effect. Therefore, ecological economics emphasizes not only efficiency but also sufficiency, restraint, and redesign of economic goals.

4. Inequality and Environmental Crisis: Two Sides of the Same System

Inequality and environmental crisis are often discussed separately. Social policy deals with poverty, wages, welfare, education, and health.

Environmental policy deals with climate, forests, energy, water, pollution, and biodiversity. Ecological economics insists that this separation is misleading. Inequality and environmental degradation are produced by the

same economic structures: unequal ownership, unequal consumption, unequal political influence, and unequal exposure to harm.

First, inequality appears in contribution to environmental damage. High-income groups generally consume more energy, travel more, own larger homes, purchase more goods, and hold more carbon-intensive investments. The data on global carbon inequality show that the richest groups contribute disproportionately to emissions. ([WID - World Inequality Database](#)) This means that climate responsibility cannot be distributed equally across all people. A poor rural household with minimal electricity use does not have the same ecological footprint as a wealthy household with frequent air travel, luxury consumption, and high-emission assets.

Second, inequality appears in exposure to environmental harm. Poor communities often live in flood-prone areas, polluted urban zones, degraded rural landscapes, or climate-vulnerable regions. They may depend directly on natural resources for farming, fishing, forestry, or informal livelihoods. When ecosystems are damaged, their income and survival are immediately affected. Wealthier groups can often relocate, insure assets, install cooling systems, or access better healthcare. Poorer groups have fewer adaptive options.

Third, inequality appears in decision-making power. Communities most affected by mining, deforestation, pollution, or infrastructure development are often least represented in policy decisions. Their land, water, and forests may be treated as economic inputs for national growth, while their cultural and ecological relationships with place are ignored. Ecological economics therefore overlaps with environmental justice, which demands fair participation, fair distribution of benefits and burdens, and recognition of local rights.

Fourth, inequality appears between generations. Current generations may enjoy the benefits of fossil-fuel development, resource extraction, and high consumption, while future generations inherit climate instability, depleted

ecosystems, and adaptation costs. This is why ecological economics includes intergenerational justice as a core principle.

In this sense, environmental crisis is not only about pollution or climate. It is about how society organizes power, wealth, and responsibility. A just ecological economy must therefore reduce both ecological overshoot and social inequality.

5. Critique of Growth-Centered Development

Conventional development thinking often assumes that economic growth is the primary solution to poverty and inequality. Growth creates jobs, expands tax revenue, attracts investment, and increases consumption. This assumption contains some truth. Growth has helped many countries reduce poverty. However, ecological economics argues that growth alone is not sufficient and may become destructive if it ignores ecological limits and distribution.

Growth-centered development faces three major criticisms.

First, growth does not automatically reduce inequality. If the gains from growth are captured by elites, large corporations, asset owners, or politically connected groups, then GDP may rise while social inequality deepens. The World Inequality Report has highlighted extreme concentration of global income and wealth, including the large share of global wealth held by the top 10 percent. ([The World Bank Docs](#)) Without redistribution, labor protection, public services, and democratic accountability, growth can reproduce inequality.

Second, growth can increase ecological pressure. Industrial expansion, infrastructure development, energy demand, transport, and consumer goods all require material and energy flows. If these flows are carbon-intensive and resource-intensive, growth increases environmental damage.

This is especially problematic when countries pursue development by replicating high-consumption models of wealthy economies.

Third, growth may become socially inefficient after a certain point. In poor societies, additional income can significantly improve wellbeing by increasing food security, healthcare, education, housing, and mobility. But in affluent societies, additional consumption may generate less wellbeing while producing large ecological costs. Ecological economics therefore distinguishes between growth that meets real human needs and growth that merely expands status consumption, waste, and accumulation.

This critique does not imply that poor countries should be denied development. On the contrary, ecological economics emphasizes that poverty reduction is morally necessary. But it also argues that global development must be differentiated. Low-income communities need greater access to resources, energy, infrastructure, and public services. High-consuming groups need to reduce excessive ecological footprints. Justice requires both redistribution upward from wasteful consumption to genuine needs and transformation of production systems toward sustainability.

6. Ecological Economics and Poverty Reduction

Ecological economics is sometimes misunderstood as anti-development. This is incorrect. Its goal is not to preserve nature by keeping people poor. Rather, it seeks to eradicate poverty in ways that do not destroy the ecological systems on which poor communities depend.

Poverty is often ecological as well as economic. Rural poverty may be linked to degraded soil, water scarcity, deforestation, declining fisheries, or climate-vulnerable agriculture. Urban poverty may be linked to polluted air, unsafe housing, inadequate sanitation, and exposure to heat or flooding. Therefore, poverty reduction requires ecological restoration, not only income support.

The World Bank's framing of ending poverty and boosting shared prosperity on a livable planet reflects the growing recognition that poverty reduction and environmental protection must be pursued together. The 2024 report emphasizes that reducing poverty and increasing shared prosperity must not come at unacceptable environmental cost. ([Open Knowledge Repository](#)) This is consistent with ecological economics: development must improve human wellbeing while preserving the biophysical foundations of life.

In practical terms, ecological poverty reduction may include regenerative agriculture, community forestry, sustainable fisheries, renewable energy access, clean cooking, public transport, climate-resilient housing, ecosystem restoration, and green jobs. These policies reduce vulnerability while improving livelihoods.

For example, restoring mangroves can protect coastal communities from storm surges, support fisheries, store carbon, and create ecotourism opportunities. Supporting agroecology can improve soil fertility, reduce dependence on expensive chemical inputs, increase food diversity, and strengthen farmer resilience. Expanding decentralized renewable energy can improve rural education, healthcare, and enterprise development while reducing fossil fuel dependence.

Thus, ecological economics reframes poverty reduction. The goal is not merely to increase income but to build secure livelihoods within healthy ecosystems.

7. The Green Economy and Its Limits

The green economy is often presented as a practical pathway toward sustainability. UNEP defines a green economy as low carbon, resource efficient, and socially inclusive; it links growth in employment and income to investments that reduce emissions and pollution, improve energy and resource efficiency, and prevent biodiversity and ecosystem-service loss.

([UNEP - UN Environment Programme](#)) This definition is compatible with many ecological economics principles, especially the integration of environmental and social goals.

Green economy policies may include renewable energy, energy efficiency, sustainable transport, green buildings, circular manufacturing, ecosystem restoration, sustainable agriculture, and green finance. These policies can create employment and reduce environmental damage. They are especially important for countries seeking to modernize infrastructure and industry.

However, ecological economics also warns that the green economy can become superficial if it merely changes the color of growth without changing its scale, distribution, and purpose. A green economy that continues to depend on endless consumption, extractive mining, unequal ownership, and global waste displacement may not solve the deeper crisis.

For example, electric vehicles reduce tailpipe emissions, but they still require minerals, energy, roads, and urban space. Renewable energy is essential, but solar panels, wind turbines, and batteries require material extraction and supply chains. Green finance can mobilize capital, but it can also produce greenwashing if projects are labeled sustainable without real ecological benefit.

Therefore, ecological economics supports green transformation but insists on deeper questions. Who owns green infrastructure? Who benefits from green jobs? Are local communities protected from new forms of extraction? Does the green transition reduce total ecological pressure or merely shift it elsewhere? Are high-consuming groups reducing consumption, or are they simply replacing one luxury product with another?

The green economy must therefore be embedded in justice, sufficiency, circularity, and democratic governance.

8. Circular Economy and the Reduction of Throughput

A circular economy seeks to replace the linear model of “take–make–dispose” with systems that keep materials in use for as long as possible. Products are designed for durability, repair, reuse, remanufacturing, recycling, and biological regeneration. Circularity is important because ecological economics focuses on material and energy throughput: the flow of resources from nature into the economy and waste back into the environment.

A circular economy can reduce pressure on forests, minerals, water, landfills, and oceans. It can also create local employment in repair, recycling, remanufacturing, waste management, and product redesign. In developing economies, circular practices can support small enterprises and informal workers if properly regulated and socially protected.

However, circular economy must not be romanticized. Complete circularity is impossible because energy is degraded and materials are lost over time. Recycling also requires energy and may produce pollution. Therefore, circularity must be combined with reduction of excessive consumption. The first priority should be refusing unnecessary material use, then reducing, reusing, repairing, and only afterward recycling.

Ecological economics adds a justice perspective to circularity. Waste is often exported or dumped in poorer communities. Informal waste workers may perform essential recycling labor under unsafe conditions. A just circular economy must improve labor standards, recognize informal workers, reduce toxic exposure, and ensure that circular value is shared fairly.

The most transformative circular economy is not merely a technical recycling system. It is a cultural and economic shift from disposable consumption toward stewardship, care, repair, and sufficiency.

9. Commons, Community, and Democratic Governance

Ecological economics draws strongly from the study of commons. Commons are resources shared by communities, such as forests, fisheries, grazing lands, irrigation systems, groundwater, and even knowledge systems. Conventional economics sometimes assumes that commons inevitably suffer from overuse. Elinor Ostrom challenged this assumption by showing that communities can govern common resources sustainably when institutions are well designed.

Commons governance is important because many ecological resources cannot be managed effectively by either pure markets or centralized states alone. Forests, rivers, fisheries, and watersheds require local knowledge, monitoring, trust, rules, conflict resolution, and collective responsibility. Ecological economics therefore emphasizes polycentric governance: multiple centers of decision-making operating at local, regional, national, and global levels.

Democratic governance matters because ecological decisions affect people's livelihoods, culture, health, and future. Communities should not be passive recipients of development projects. They should participate in defining what development means, what resources should be protected, and what trade-offs are acceptable.

For indigenous peoples and local communities, ecological economics must also include recognition justice. Many communities maintain deep cultural relationships with land, forests, rivers, and ancestors. Treating land only as a commodity can erase these relationships. A more just ecological economy recognizes diverse ways of valuing nature: economic, cultural, spiritual, ecological, and intergenerational.

Commons governance is also relevant for global climate. The atmosphere is a planetary commons. If some groups use disproportionate carbon space, less space remains for others. Climate justice therefore requires fair

allocation of the remaining carbon budget, technology transfer, climate finance, and differentiated responsibility.

10. Just Transition: From Fossil Economy to Ecological Economy

A transition to ecological economics requires structural change. Fossil energy systems must decline. Carbon-intensive industries must transform. Land-use systems must protect ecosystems. Cities must reduce car dependence. Agriculture must become more regenerative. Finance must move away from destructive investments.

But transition creates social risks. Workers in coal, oil, gas, heavy industry, and related sectors may lose jobs. Regions dependent on extractive industries may lose revenue. Poor households may face higher energy prices if reforms are badly designed. Therefore, ecological economics supports a just transition.

A just transition means that the shift to a low-carbon and ecological economy must be socially fair. It should include worker retraining, income protection, regional diversification, public investment, social dialogue, community participation, and affordable access to clean energy. It should not punish the poor for a crisis largely produced by high-consuming groups and fossil-based development.

Just transition also requires international justice. Developing countries need finance, technology, and policy space to build sustainable infrastructure. Wealthy countries have historically contributed more to cumulative emissions and generally possess greater financial capacity. Therefore, global climate cooperation must include grants, concessional finance, adaptation support, loss-and-damage mechanisms, and fair trade rules.

Ecological economics warns against a transition that is green in technology but unjust in distribution. For example, mining for transition minerals should not reproduce land dispossession, water pollution, or labor

exploitation. Renewable energy should not become another field of monopoly profit while communities remain energy poor. The transition must transform both energy systems and social relations.

11. Policy Framework for Ecological Economics

Ecological economics can be translated into policy through several major directions.

First, governments should adopt ecological limits as planning constraints. Land-use planning, energy strategy, water management, urban development, and industrial policy should be guided by carrying capacity, climate targets, biodiversity protection, and pollution thresholds.

Second, economic indicators should move beyond GDP. Countries and regions need dashboards that include wellbeing, inequality, emissions, biodiversity, ecosystem health, health outcomes, education, unpaid care work, and resilience. What societies measure strongly influences what they manage.

Third, fiscal policy should support ecological justice. Carbon pricing, pollution taxes, subsidy reform, and resource royalties can reduce harmful activities, but they must be designed progressively. Revenue should be returned to households, invested in public services, or used for green infrastructure and climate adaptation.

Fourth, public investment should prioritize ecological infrastructure. Forests, wetlands, mangroves, watersheds, public transport, renewable energy, sanitation, and climate-resilient housing are not merely environmental projects. They are foundations of long-term economic security.

Fifth, wealth and income redistribution are necessary. Because high-income groups contribute disproportionately to ecological pressure, progressive taxation and regulation of luxury emissions can be part of climate policy.

Redistribution also enables poorer households to meet basic needs without expanding destructive extraction.

Sixth, finance must be redirected. Banks, pension funds, development banks, and investors should phase down support for destructive activities and increase support for low-carbon, circular, regenerative, and socially inclusive development.

Seventh, education must cultivate ecological citizenship. Students of economics, management, engineering, public policy, and social science should learn that markets operate inside ecosystems and societies. The future economy requires leaders who understand systems, ethics, limits, and justice.

12. Narrative Case: A Mining Region at the Crossroads

Consider a region whose economy depends heavily on coal mining. For years, mining has provided jobs, local revenue, infrastructure, and business opportunities. Restaurants, transport services, housing markets, and local government budgets depend on the industry. Conventional economic analysis may view coal as the backbone of regional growth.

Yet the region also experiences ecological and social costs. Rivers become polluted. Agricultural land is disturbed. Former mining pits create safety risks. Workers face uncertain health conditions. When global energy markets shift and climate policy tightens, the region becomes economically vulnerable. Its apparent prosperity is built on a declining and ecologically damaging foundation.

An ecological economics approach would not simply close the mines without concern for workers. Nor would it defend coal indefinitely in the name of employment. Instead, it would plan a just transition. Public policy would map ecological damage, require restoration, protect workers, diversify the economy, develop renewable energy, invest in education,

support small enterprises, and involve local communities in decision-making.

Former mining land might be restored for agroforestry, solar farms, water management, or community enterprises, depending on ecological suitability. Workers could receive training in construction, renewable energy maintenance, ecological restoration, logistics, or manufacturing. Local revenue could be redirected toward long-term resilience rather than short-term extraction.

This case illustrates the central message of ecological economics: the goal is not to choose between people and nature, but to redesign the economy so that human livelihoods are secured by ecological recovery rather than ecological destruction.

13. Ethical Foundations: Sufficiency, Responsibility, and Intergenerational Justice

Ecological economics is grounded in ethical principles. The first is sufficiency. A society must ensure that everyone has enough to live with dignity: food, water, shelter, healthcare, education, energy, security, and participation. But sufficiency also challenges excess. When some groups consume far beyond need, they occupy ecological space that others require for survival and development.

The second principle is responsibility. Those who benefit most from high-emission and resource-intensive systems should bear greater responsibility for transformation. This includes wealthy consumers, corporations, investors, and historically high-emitting countries. Responsibility is not only individual; it is institutional and structural.

The third principle is intergenerational justice. Future generations cannot vote in present elections, buy shares in current corporations, or negotiate today's contracts. Yet they will live with the consequences of today's

decisions. Ecological economics insists that development must respect their right to a livable planet.

The fourth principle is humility. Modern economics often assumes that human intelligence and technology can substitute for nature. Ecological economics recognizes that many ecosystem functions cannot be fully replaced: pollination, climate regulation, soil formation, water cycles, biodiversity, and ocean systems are complex and irreplaceable.

The fifth principle is care. An ecological economy is not merely efficient; it is caring. It cares for people, ecosystems, communities, and future life. This moral language is important because technical solutions without ethical transformation may reproduce the same destructive logic under a greener label.

14. Challenges and Criticisms of Ecological Economics

Ecological economics faces several challenges. The first is political feasibility. Powerful interests benefit from the existing growth model: fossil fuel firms, extractive industries, speculative finance, and high-consumption elites. Transforming the system requires political courage and social mobilization.

The second challenge is measurement. Ecological economists criticize GDP, but alternative indicators can be complex. Measuring ecosystem services, wellbeing, inequality, resilience, and cultural values requires interdisciplinary methods. Some values cannot be reduced to money.

The third challenge is development equity. Poor countries may fear that ecological limits will be used to restrict their development while wealthy countries continue to enjoy high living standards. This concern is legitimate. Ecological economics must therefore support differentiated responsibilities, redistribution, technology transfer, and fair development space.

The fourth challenge is transition management. Moving from fossil-based, linear, growth-centered systems to ecological systems requires coordination across energy, finance, labor, industry, agriculture, education, and social protection. Poorly designed transitions can trigger backlash.

The fifth challenge is cultural. Many societies associate success with consumption, accumulation, speed, and expansion. Ecological economics calls for a different idea of prosperity: enoughness, quality, resilience, community, health, time, and ecological harmony. Such cultural change is slow but necessary.

Despite these challenges, ecological economics remains one of the most comprehensive responses to the combined crisis of inequality and environmental degradation. It does not offer a simple formula, but it provides a more realistic map of the problem.

15. Conclusion

Ecological economics is a powerful response to inequality and environmental crisis because it addresses the root assumptions of modern development. It rejects the idea that the economy can grow without limit on a finite planet. It challenges the belief that market prices automatically reflect ecological and social costs. It questions the assumption that growth alone can solve poverty and inequality. Most importantly, it reconnects economics with ethics, ecology, and justice.

The environmental crisis shows that the global economy has exceeded safe ecological limits. Climate change, biodiversity loss, land degradation, pollution, and resource depletion are signs of ecological overshoot. At the same time, inequality reveals that the benefits and burdens of the current economy are distributed unjustly. The wealthy consume more, emit more, and hold more power, while the poor and vulnerable often suffer the worst consequences.

Ecological economics offers a different vision. It calls for economies that operate within planetary boundaries, distribute resources fairly, protect vulnerable communities, restore ecosystems, reduce excessive consumption, and promote meaningful wellbeing. It supports green transformation, but only when it is socially just and ecologically real. It supports development, but development understood as human flourishing within the living systems of the Earth.

The future of development will depend on whether societies can move from extractive growth to regenerative prosperity. This requires not only new technologies but also new institutions, new indicators, new forms of ownership, new ethical commitments, and new educational frameworks. Ecological economics reminds us that the economy is ultimately a way of managing our common home. If that home is damaged, no amount of financial wealth can secure human wellbeing. But if economies are redesigned around justice, sufficiency, and ecological integrity, prosperity can become both more humane and more durable.

Glossary

Biodiversity: The variety of life at genetic, species, and ecosystem levels.

Carrying capacity: The ability of an ecosystem or environment to support life and human activity without degradation.

Circular economy: An economic model that keeps materials in use through repair, reuse, remanufacturing, recycling, and regenerative design.

Climate justice: The principle that climate responsibility and climate impacts should be addressed fairly, considering inequality, historical emissions, and vulnerability.

Commons: Resources shared and governed by a community, such as forests, fisheries, water systems, or knowledge.

Ecological economics: A field of study that views the economy as a subsystem of the biosphere and emphasizes ecological limits, justice, and wellbeing.

Ecological overshoot: A condition in which human demand exceeds the regenerative and absorptive capacity of ecosystems.

Environmental externality: An environmental cost or benefit not reflected in the market price of a good or service.

Environmental justice: Fair distribution of environmental benefits and burdens, fair participation in decisions, and recognition of affected communities.

Green economy: An economy that is low carbon, resource efficient, and socially inclusive.

Intergenerational justice: Ethical responsibility to ensure that future generations inherit a livable and healthy planet.

Just transition: A fair shift toward a low-carbon and ecological economy that protects workers, communities, and vulnerable groups.

Planetary boundaries: Scientific limits that define a safe operating space for humanity within Earth-system processes.

Regenerative economy: An economy that restores ecosystems, communities, and social wellbeing rather than merely reducing harm.

Steady-state economy: An economy that maintains stable material and energy throughput within ecological limits while improving quality of life and distribution.

Sufficiency: The principle that everyone should have enough for dignity while excessive consumption should be reduced.

Throughput: The flow of energy and materials from nature into the economy and back to the environment as waste.

References

- Chancel, L. (2022). *Global carbon inequality, 1990–2019*. World Inequality Lab. ([WID - World Inequality Database](#))
- Chancel, L., Piketty, T., Saez, E., & Zucman, G. (2022). *World inequality report 2022*. World Inequality Lab. ([The World Bank Docs](#))
- Costanza, R., Cumberland, J., Daly, H., Goodland, R., Norgaard, R., Kubiszewski, I., & Franco, C. (2014). *An introduction to ecological economics* (2nd ed.). CRC Press.
- Daly, H. E. (1996). *Beyond growth: The economics of sustainable development*. Beacon Press.
- Daly, H. E., & Farley, J. (2011). *Ecological economics: Principles and applications* (2nd ed.). Island Press.
- Georgescu-Roegen, N. (1971). *The entropy law and the economic process*. Harvard University Press.
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. (2023). *Climate change 2023: Synthesis report*. IPCC. ([IPCC](#))
- Meadows, D. H., Meadows, D. L., Randers, J., & Behrens, W. W. III. (1972). *The limits to growth*. Universe Books.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut economics: Seven ways to think like a 21st-century economist*. Chelsea Green Publishing.

Richardson, K., Steffen, W., Lucht, W., Bendtsen, J., Cornell, S. E., Donges, J. F., Drüke, M., Fetzer, I., Bala, G., von Bloh, W., Feulner, G., Fiedler, S., Gerten, D., Gleeson, T., Hofmann, M., Huiskamp, W., Kummu, M., Mohan, C., Nogués-Bravo, D., Richardson, K., ... Rockström, J. (2023). Earth beyond six of nine planetary boundaries. *Science Advances*, 9(37), Article eadh2458. ([Science](#))

Rockström, J., Steffen, W., Noone, K., Persson, Å., Chapin, F. S., Lambin, E. F., Lenton, T. M., Scheffer, M., Folke, C., Schellnhuber, H. J., Nykvist, B., De Wit, C. A., Hughes, T., Van der Leeuw, S., Rodhe, H., Sörlin, S., Snyder, P. K., Costanza, R., Svedin, U., ... Foley, J. A. (2009). A safe operating space for humanity. *Nature*, 461, 472–475.

United Nations Environment Programme. (2018). *Green economy*. UNEP. ([UNEP - UN Environment Programme](#))

World Bank. (2024). *Poverty, prosperity, and planet report 2024*. World Bank. ([World Bank](#))

Copilot for this article: ChatGPT (2026). Access date: 6 May 2026. Author's account ([Rudy C Tarumingkeng](#)), <https://chatgpt.com/c/69faa4e1-2d0c-839d-8b3e-185c35c9eaab>