

# **2018 Nobel Prize in Economics - Relevance for India**

### What is the issue?

\n\n

The ideas of this year's Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences are relevant for India in terms of handling its growth.

\n\n

#### What were the prizes awarded for?

\n\n

\n

• The Nobel Prize for this year has been awarded to two economists in two different fields.

\n

- William Nordhaus has worked on  $\underline{climate\ change\ and\ economic\ growth.}_{\n}$
- It is more on the 'negative spillover' of emissions and damage to the environment as a result of growth.
- Paul Romer had worked on innovation and growth and is on the 'positive spillovers' of knowledge and technology.  $\gamma_n$
- Notably, both works were related to economic growth.  $\space{\space{1.5}n}$

\n\n

#### What are the key ideas of Nordhaus?

\n\n

∖n

- **Observation** As the world strives to bring about high growth, it tends to damage the environment.
  - \n
- This, in turn, comes back to haunt people and retard future growth.
- E.g. land gets less fertile due to excessive use of fertilisers and overgrazing  $\n$

- Carbon emissions affect health, damage the ozone layer, cause erratic rainfall, affect ocean life, etc.  $\n$
- **Measures** Nordhaus hence spoke of 'DICE' ('Dynamic Integrated model for Climate and Economy') as the way forward.
- The obvious solution is a carbon tax, which is now quite popular in the world.  $\slash n$
- It discourages emissions or makes entities use better technologies that lower such emissions.

\n

- Concerns The problem here is that countries, at times, make such compromises for short-term gains.
  \n
- Also, the externalities caused by damaging the environment are often assumed to be everyone's problem and not just that of the nation.  $\n$
- Given this, carbon tax is a softer option that may not really bring an end to the polluting process.

\n

• It only increases the cost of damaging the environment, which will be passed to the consumer.

n

• Way forward - Outright bans are the only way out.

\n

• There should ideally be ban on the use of certain material or technology that damages nature.

\n

- Importantly, this should be agreed upon by all the countries.  $\slashn$
- It is important here for government intervention as the market system is less likely to ensure such a solution.

\n\n

# What are the key ideas of Romer?

\n\n

\n

• Argument - Romer talks of a positive stimulus to growth, which is based on knowledge or technology.

\n

• This is logical because across countries technology has been the differentiating factor in the strategies pursued for higher growth.

\n

• Evidently, going by this, the African countries remain slow-movers in terms of growth.

\n

- The East Asian economies were able to gallop on the back of innovation.  $\ensuremath{\sc vn}$
- In fact, a lot of progress in India can be attributed to innovation.  $\slash n$
- E.g. the Green Revolution in agriculture, the IT revolution, etc  $\n$
- An interesting observation by Romer is that when technology brings about growth, it is non-exclusive.  $\$
- This is because the benefits do percolate to other companies and countries.  $\ensuremath{\sc n}$
- **Measures** There is thus the need for Research & Development subsidy to be given by governments.
- So here, one can leave it to the market to drive such innovation as it is intrinsic to the business models that focus on growth.  $\n$

\n\n

# What are the apprehensions?

\n\n

∖n

- The works of the two winners raises a key question regarding the <u>link</u> <u>between technology and climate change</u>. \n
- For innovation to succeed, it is hard to ensure that such technology is consistent with sustainable growth.  $\n$
- E.g. the technology of mobile phones has brought in a broader debate of radiation emissions
  - \n
- Here the tenets of Nordhaus and Romer would collide.  $\space{1mm}\space{1m$
- Another concern is that if <u>technology</u> which becomes <u>labour-displacing</u> can really lead to meaningful higher growth.  $\n$
- Addressing this is crucial especially in labour-surplus economies. n

- Also, the practical feasibility of innovations in several countries in Africa and South Asia where there is power shortage is uncertain.  $\n$ 

\n\n

### What could be done?

\n\n

∖n

- For India, the ideas of both these economists are very relevant.  $\ensuremath{\sc n}$
- Innovation must be tailor-made to suit local requirements so that it does not disturb the ecosystem.  $\gamman$
- When talking of inclusive growth and creation of jobs, the focus has to be on using innovation in a balanced manner.  $\n$
- The climate change issue is more challenging; there needs to be internal rules to ensure that environment is protected.  $\n$
- Laws need to be in place to ensure that there is a proper balance of technology with carbon emissions.  $\gamman{\carbon}{n}$

\n\n

\n\n

### **Source: Financial Express**

∖n

