

Die Rolle kritischer Sozialwissenschaft in und für IPBES

Dr. Alice Vadrot

Centre for Science and Policy, Cambridge University

Bonn, 8.2.1017

HINTERGRUND



Anne Larigau

Major biodiversity panel desperately seeks social scientists

Affiliations | C

Nature 532, 3

Published onlin

Intergovernmental body that tracks world ecosystems is criticized for its own lack of diversity.

PDF



Olive Heffernan

“[t]he social sciences are similarly implicated and are called upon as “social engineers” who only work to help achieve preconceived policy goals” (Hajer 1996, 255).

→ “reconstituting the basis and meaning of environmental politics” (Hajer 1996, 266).

Die Rolle kritischer Sozialwissenschaft in und für IPBES

1. Sozial- und Geisteswissenschaften in IPBES
2. Sozial- und Geisteswissenschaften über IPBES
3. Wozu Kritik?
4. Ausblick: Special Issue

1. SOZIAL- UND GEISTES- WISSENSCHAFTEN IN IPBES

“Multidisciplinarity”

*“an approach that crosses many disciplinary boundaries, knowledge systems and approaches to create a holistic approach, focusing on complex problems that require expertise across two or more disciplines. Multidisciplinarity arises when scientists (**including natural and social scientists**), policy and technical experts, natural resource managers, other relevant knowledge holders and users, interact in an open discussion and dialogue giving consideration to each”*

(UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, p.17)

„We are very, very weak...“

*“[...] One of the weakness of IPBES at the moment is we’ve got plenty of very good natural scientists being nominated by governments for all the various assessments, **but we are very, very weak on economists and a range of social scientists and the humanities.** [...] in IPBES we really do need to increase the number of social scientists, the number that come from the humanities and the number of economists, ranging all the way – because there are macro-economic issues, there’s obviously environmental economics, but also behavioural economics and ecological economics – 4 very different fields of economics, we need all of them basically”*

(Interview, IPBES Bureau, 04.12.2015).

Schwierigkeiten SSH in IPBES zu integrieren

(1) Normativ

(2) Epistemisch

(3) Konzeptuell

(4) Institutionell

(5) Praktisch

“Another difficulty, as Watson sees it, is that there’s more **funding** for natural scientists to do environmental research than there is for social scientists — making for a larger pool of experts to choose from” (Heffernan, Nature, 2016)

“But others say that a major problem is **how IPBES picks its experts**. Processes for nominating IPBES authors are largely handled through UN member states’ environment ministers, who typically have contacts within the natural-science community, says Watson. From those nominated, researchers within IPBES are supposed to select men and women from different geographical regions and with diverse expertise — but given the slim pickings they have to choose from, this doesn’t always happen.” (Heffernan, Nature, 2016)

Selektivität

*“the expertise of social scientists is **highly concentrated in the fields of economy and management** [...]. This lack of first-hand experience and practical knowledge could lead to unrealistic or clichéd views of the market and could weaken IPBES’ ability to deal with real-world industrial stakeholders. Ethnography, sociology, philosophy of sciences, and other disciplines that are crucial for a reflexive and self-critical boundary organization are not represented within IPBES.”*

(Morin et al. 2016).

“A strong collective effort is necessary to reach scholars outside the natural sciences, because they might not consider themselves to be biodiversity researchers”

(Larigauderie et al. 2016)

2. SOZIAL- UND GEISTES- WISSENSCHAFTEN ÜBER IPBES

State of the Art

- **Normative Beiträge zum Design von IPBES** (e.g. Watson 2005, van den Hove 2007, Koetz et al. 2008; van den Hove and Chabason 2009, 2011, Görg, 2010, Briggs and Knight 2011, Duraiappah & Rogers 2011, Hulme et al. 2011, Turnhout et al. 2012, Vohland 2011, Vadrot 2011)
- **Die Entstehungsgeschichte von IPBES** (e.g. Granjou 2013, Vadrot, 2013, Vadrot 2014, Hrabranski & Pesche 2016)
- **IPBES & Internationale Biodiversitätspolitik** (Brand & Vadrot 2013, Hrabranski & Pesche 2016, Morin et al. 2016)
- **Repräsentanz und Zusammensetzung** (Montana & Borie 2015, Kovács and Pataki 2016)
- **Stakeholder-Engagement** (Esguerra et al. 2016, Montana 2016, Oubenal et al. 2016)
- **Conceptual Framework** (Borie & Hulme 2015, Maier & Feest)

3. WOZU KRITIK?

- Fashion for attaching ‘critical’ to any kind of study” (Sayer 2009, 796).
- “apparent exhaustion of the critical” (Braun 2015, 120).
- “neoliberalism fatigue” (Holmes & Cavanagh 2016).

“[A] certain form of critical spirit has sent us down the wrong path, encouraging us to fight the wrong enemies and, worst of all, to be considered as friends by the wrong sort of allies because of a little mistake in the definition of its main target. The question was never to get *away* from facts but *closer* to them, not fighting empiricism but on the contrary, renewing empiricism.” (Latour, 2004, 231).

3. AUSBLICK: SPECIAL ISSUE

