

# **CSS @ 50 Years**

(1969-2019)

Lecture Series : VII

## **BIRTH OF AN ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM**

**Sunil Ray**



**CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES, SURAT**

**2021**



**CSS @ 50 YearS (1969-2019)**

Lecture Series: VII

**BIRTH OF AN ALTERNATIVE  
DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM**

**Sunil Ray**

Former Director,  
A. N. Sinha Institute of Social Sciences,  
Patna

Email: [sunilay41@gmail.com](mailto:sunilay41@gmail.com)

Mobile- +91-9414443673

**CENTRE FOR SOCIAL STUDIES**  
VEER NARMAD SOUTH GUJARAT UNIVERSITY CAMPUS  
UDHNA-MAGDALLA ROAD, SURAT - 395 007

E-mail: [info@css.ac.in](mailto:info@css.ac.in) • Visit: <http://www.css.ac.in>

Phone: (0261) 2977172/74, 2255298

**2021**

**Published by Centre for Social Studies, Veer Narmad South Gujarat  
University Campus, Surat - 395 007**

**Price Rs.100/-**

## PREFACE

On the momentous as well as emotional occasion of completing 50 years of its voyage (1969-2019) Centre for Social Studies, Surat (CSS) has planned series of activities. We have started with Lecture Series; *CSS@50 Years*. This is the printed version of the VIIth lecture delivered by Prof.Sunil Ray in the series. Earlier six lectures were delivered by renowned scholars such as Prof.E. V. Ramakrishnan; Prof.Vibhutiben Patel; Prof.D. Rajasekhar; Prof.Paramjit Singh, Prof.Sudarshan Iyengar and Prof.Surinder Singh Jodhka. All except one are published.

Founded in 1969 as Centre for Regional Development Studies by founding director late Prof. I P Desai, CSS is an autonomous research institute recognised by Ministry of Education of central Govt., and receiving financial support from ICSSR, New Delhi and Govt. of Gujarat. Though the faculty strength has remained small over a period of time, they have been representing variety of disciplines of social sciences as CSS has adopted interdisciplinary research approach. In terms of the key areas in research, the CSS has been mainly focussing on; issues and problems of marginal communities such as tribals, dalits, working sections, women, minority groups and others, sects and religion, migration, rural transformation, social conflicts, movements, riots and violence, urban society, literature and social consciousness, human resource development (education and health), coastal studies, environmental issues, social impact assessment of projects, land and credit markets, governance, social justice and civil society. Theoretical contributions of CSS have been well-recognised in the field of social stratification, agrarian relations, social movements, sociology of education, issues related with dalits, tribes and development studies. The purpose of Centre's research since inception is not only to contribute to theoretical knowledge but also to assist in policy formulations and implementation on issues pertaining to social development. Institute has accomplished more than 300 research projects till date.

Apart from its primary engagement in research, CSS has also been active in holding seminars on various subjects, organising interactive workshops for mainly teachers and researchers as well as publication of books based on research and other academic pursuits of faculty and other scholars. So far CSS has published 196 books, both in Gujarati and English, 19 selected bibliographies and 37 Occasional/Working

papers on important themes. The institute has been publishing quarterly journal in Gujarati ARTHAT since 1981 providing social sciences literature on various subjects to Gujarati readership and also a medium to publish articles for scholars and teachers. Till date CSS has organised 107 national and international seminars and dialogues. The institute regularly holds lectures under its 'Colloquia' initiative in which scholars and others present their research papers and ideas. Till date CSS has organized more than 400 lectures. We have founded I P Desai memorial lecture series to commemorate our founding director under which so far 28 lectures have been organised, which are also published. In all CSS has organised 51 interactive workshops including, on 'Application of Computer-SPSS in Social Science Research' - which were held continuously for 25 years as well as workshops on 'Research Methodology' and 'Capacity Building', interacting with more than 1000 scholars and teachers from all over the country. We also have interacted with another more than 200 scholars pursuing their Ph.D. and M.Phil. under our 'Guidance and Consultancy Programme'.

For the *CSS@50 Years Lecture Series* the larger theme of "Social Change and Social Movement" is chosen in accordance with CSS central focus in terms of academic pursuit. In the VIIth lecture of the series, which was held online due to corona pandemic, on 26 November, 2020; Prof. Sunil Ray delivered lecture on "**Birth of An Alternative Development Paradigm**".

Prof. Ray started with a theoretical premise that the crisis of capital system is deepening due to its own logic. With passage of time the expansionary move of capital to produce itself at a higher levels has turned out to be self-defeating. The incessant commodification of nature has intensified planetary ecological crisis and the social cost of it is immensely high. The essay mainly examines alternative development paradigm unfolds with a new epistemological base as a result of resistance movements. It attempts to construct theoretical edifice of the alternative development framework. The author draws attention towards several anti-systemic resistance movements directed against globalization, environmental degradation, racial and gender discrimination, against exploitation system. He elaborates one cosmivision that counter-poses commodification and neo-liberalism. This vision respects diversity. It combats the principle of homogenization of economy.

Epistemologically it vouches for autonomy by rejecting representative democracy with participating democracy. These autonomy movements tends to dismantle state power. The author differentiates it with earlier anti-systemic movements which aimed at capturing state-power, and in which they succeeded. But they could not transform inequalitarian social relations and introduced democracy. These transformative narratives' core element is breaking off from dualism between society and nature. This paradigmatic shift of development has turned Latin America into an epicenter for deconstructing the dominant notion of development. The transformative initiatives taken up throughout the globe against the dominant regime rooted in capitalism, patriarchy, racism, statism and anthropocentrism, finding expression through social movements, ideological reconstruction, new idea of development, unmasking the false epistemological base that has pushed humanity to its catastrophic end. The emergence of self-help organization shows how innovative organizing principles, antithetical to the dominant regime, have germinated in the intestine of the dominant system to annihilate the latter.

The new development paradigm rests on cooperation and solidarity between humans and humans and nature. Prof. Ray terms an alternative development paradigm as cohesive development that includes economic, social, ecological and spiritual dimensions. The author argued that individual – centric liberal philosophy was accorded social legitimacy in order to promote the interest of the emerging capitalist class after the collapse of feudalism under the veil of democracy and progress. On the other hand, sociologists suggests a synthesis of individualistic and holistic elements while seeking socio-economic explanation. Human nature comprises both self-servicing and solidaristic tendencies. Improved technology centric change would not be sufficient in light of environmental degeneration. Prof. Ray suggests solidaristic mode of production that encapsulates along with principle of sufficiency, the constituents of new logic of capital, culture as a productive force, reciprocal altruism, and qualitative metamorphosis. He suggested about going beyond Marxism thoughts and praxis that explain transition in the confinement of materialism. The quality of life goes beyond satisfying the basic needs of life and fixes the well-being of the individual in the total relational context between humans on the one hand and humans and the nature on the other. The author in the end argues that the incongruous evolutionary process can be corrected by cohesive development as the alternative development paradigm in the 21st century.

We take this opportunity to express our profound gratitude to ICSSR, New Delhi and the Government of Gujarat for supporting CSS during this long span. We are also grateful to members of our Board of Governors for guiding and steering us, as well as our former and present colleagues, including our administrative staff, who have collectively contributed significantly and immensely to take CSS up to this point of achievement. And how can we forget a vast circle of our friends and well-wishers; scholars from different institutes not only from India but also from abroad, from neighbouring university campus and colleges of different parts; also from other institutes and universities across the country; those organizations with whom we have done collaborative research endeavours; our activist friends who have shared their grass-root experiences to make our research earthy and concerned members of civil society who have been meeting us and attending CSS events regularly and encouraging us. We express deep gratitude towards them all.

And finally, CSS is immensely grateful to Prof. Sunil Ray, for accepting our invitation and delivering a highly theoretical lecture quite lucidly. This lecture was held during pandemic period and hence, took place on online mode. CSS also expresses gratitude toward those who attended this online lecture. I also express gratefulness to my colleagues at CSS-faculty as well as administrative, for extending support in organising the event and in publishing this lecture. I am especially thankful to Dr. Gagan Bihari Sahu for his active role in organising Prof. Ray's lecture.

February 2021

Kiran Desai



# BIRTH OF AN ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT PARADIGM

Sunil Ray\*

## I

### INTRODUCTION

The 21<sup>st</sup> century has made its beginning with a shift of geographies of reasons for reorganizing the principles of economic and social life of humanity across the globe. It is a new site in the making, unparalleled in the history of the contemporary world, in the wake of the social movements against globalization that have been shaking several parts of the world for the last two decades or so. While an epistemic disobedience (Mignolo, 2011: 44) is built into these movements, most of which are antisystemic,<sup>1</sup> they take us to a different beginning with a different cosmic vision “it is delinking from the modern, political episteme articulated as

---

\* Special lecture delivered on the occasion of Centre for Social Studies completing 50 years of its journey. It is also an improved version of the introductory chapter titled "Cohesive development as an alternative paradigm" by Sunil Ray (2021) in Sunil Ray, Neetu choudhary and Rajeev Kumar (eds.), *Theorizing Cohesive Development An Alternative Paradigm*, Abingdon, Routledge. This essay is based on my research which was conducted during a fellowship at the M.S Merian-R. Tagore International Centre of Advanced Studies "Metamorphosis of the Political: Comparative perspectives of the long Twentieth century" (ICAS: MP), an Indo-German Research Cooperation funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research. I express my gratefulness to it for having awarded me fellowship. I thank profusely Prof. Martin Fuchs, University of Erfurt, Germany, and director of ICAS MP for having extended full co-operation and help during the period of my fellowship programme. Prof. Antjie Linkenbach of University of Erfurt, Germany has been a great source of inspiration for me. I had several rounds of discussion with her that incredibly helped me to organize my thoughts. Her comments on the draft of my paper are invaluable. I thank her profusely.

right, left or center, it is an opening towards another thing.... searching for itself in the difference" (Mignolo, 2011: 50). It is no less than Polanyi's double movement that resonates in reality to trigger the process of self-protection of the communities against the onslaught of the single globalized model of development rooted in the capital system (Polanyi, 1944: 76). The unbridled capital system that separates humans from nature based on its instrumental rationality and self-regulating market doctrine is now faltered with its inherent fallacious logic of expansion. Its falling tendency which is inevitable and not so imminent, "Was it earlier as it is now today?", is reinforced by its sharp internal contradictions. The pathological symptoms of the capital system that designs devastating acts against humanity and nature are indicative of an entropic disorderly stalemated post-capitalist interregnum society (Streeck, 2017: 35).

The crisis of the capital system is deepening as it is being entrapped by its own logic and not able to find any escape route except the one being shown by Keynes in the wake of the Great Depression in the 1930s. However, its repetitious application to get the economy out of the 'Great Recession' has proved futile in the present context of the global economy. It is preposterous for having failed to recognize the distinct contextual difference between the two periods both in terms of quantitative and qualitative changes that global economy witnessed for the last several decades. Of course, the logic of capital has not changed. But the expansionary move of capital to produce itself at a higher level has turned out to be self-defeating over the years. None other than vast shrinkage of the real economy testifies it.

It has pushed the capital system to a crisis leaving no scope for it to be resilient, especially in the present context, when both centralization and concentration of capital have crossed all limits at the cost of dispossession and deprivation of the largest majority of the people in the globe.

The incessant commodification of nature is another source of the crisis turning the production conditions feeble so as to respond to the expansionary move of the capital system. It is but the fall-out of its growing contradiction between the mainstream development paradigm and the production conditions that nature creates. Apart from the metabolic rift that commodification has caused, deep planetary ecological crisis has ravaged the safe operating space for humanity to disappear. Its adverse impact on the capital system to reproduce even at a lower limit is discernable. Let alone the rising cost of commodity production leading dysfunctionality of the system to accumulate. As a consequence, the social cost in terms of human misery that surfaces in the form of inequality, deprivation, loss of employment and income, loss of control over assets and resources and more importantly loss of social cohesion, is surging disproportionately at a high rate. It is aggravated further due to nature's misery that manifests in the form of its ceaseless degradation.

The social cost in terms of the level of inequality which is now all time high and the unprecedented rise of joblessness has surpassed the level of social tolerance. The only way to extricate humanity from such entanglement is to look for its substitution by alternative organizing principles of economy and society.

Methodological individualism, private property and representative democracy that lend credibility to the theoretical legitimacy of the mainstream development paradigm rooted in the same capital system are increasingly proven to be enemies of the civilization. Having unmasked these theoretical moorings, resistance movements (anti-systemic movements) have embraced an epistemological battle against the old one such that humanity can escape from the catastrophic end through creation of another world.

In this paper, I am making a modest attempt to examine how the alternative development paradigm unfolds with a new epistemological base as a result of the resistance movements and other radical transformative initiatives against globalization and the socio-economic system and institutions that create and reproduce unequal distribution of power, perpetuates discrimination and domination by humans over other humans and nature. Insightful lessons from the experiences of these movements are drawn, and, based on them, the paper attempts to construct theoretical edifice of the alternative development framework that shows how the rise of another world from within the metabolism of the capital system is a historical inevitability.

The paper is divided into six parts. Part II learns lessons from the social movements, anti-systemic in nature, witnessed by some Latin American countries and several radical transformative initiatives taken around the globe to construct alternative development framework. The fundamental premises of the alternative development framework what I call "Cohesive Development" as opposed to that of the mainstream is spelt out in part III. While part IV of the paper briefly explains criticality of the principles of sufficiency and reciprocal altruism, part V shows how solidaristic transformative mode of production is forming and gradually emerging based on the forces of cohesive development beyond Marxian analytics in the post-development (post-capitalist) stage of social evolution. The paper ends in part VI with the presentation of a few remarks in lieu of conclusion.

## II

### **LESSONS FROM SOCIAL MOVEMENTS**

"Interregnum" Gramsci's disquiet almost a century ago that "...Old is dying and the new cannot be born" (Gramsci, 1971: 276) does not hold good anymore. The contemporary

counter narratives of social disobedience against the dominant development paradigm testify it. It is true that the old is dying. But it is also true that the new is born now, maturing and expanding the horizon of its mass acceptability. Its passage for expansion is gradually widened up by the radical alternatives as demonstrated by the resistance movements most of which are anti-systemic. The movements have devitalized the reasons for the old to stay and to decide the fate of humanity. A new society is germinating from these movements as an outcome of the inexorable forces of history.

Several such movements have taken place in the recent past, both at the national and international levels. While most of them were directed against globalization, environmental degradation, racial and gender discrimination, etc., they were all against the exploitative system. They were anti-systemic. Of course, several resistance movements were organized in several parts of the world that went against global capitalism, while some others did not.<sup>2</sup> The anti-globalization movement being organized by ATTAC that initiated the first world social forum in the Porto Alegre in 2001 suggests how the solidarity of the losers, the deprived around the world from North to South can create another world (with the slogan 'Another world is possible'). The global justice movement is another such movement that counter-poses an alternative conception of welfare and development to the ones advanced by the International Monetary Fund (IMF), World Trade Organization (WTO), etc. (Barker and Lavallette, 2015). Similarly, immense variety of radical alternatives to the mainstream development regime emerged during the last two decades around the globe. Kothari et al. shows that they range from sector-specific such as sustainable and holistic agriculture, community-led water/energy/food sovereignty to more holistic or rounded transformation attempted by Zapatistas in Chipas in Mexico (Kothari et al., 2019, p. 339).

The Zapatista movement in Mexico and the new political processes that were set in motion in Ecuador and Bolivia having been inspired by the philosophy of 'Buen Vivir' against neo-liberal market reforms may be cited as historic. These are not only resistance movements against globalization and the exploitative systemic order, but also have different cosmic vision that provides alternative development epistemology (Gudyuas, 2011; Burbach, Fox and Fuentes, 2013). They are unique in several ways, and hence, it is rewarding for one to draw lessons from its cosmivision that echoes other anti-systemic movements.

Zapatista movement by Chipas in Mexico in early 1990 showed how a new world could be born. This was another anti-systemic movement after 1840 when the Neo-Zapatistas (EZLN) rose in Chipas and proclaimed the autonomy of the indigenous people and went much beyond the reformist movements. This was followed by the new political processes in Ecuador and Bolivia under the influence of the philosophy of 'Buen Vivir' (good life) (Gudyuas, 2011: 442). Several other countries in Latin America joined these countries subsequently to bring about social upheaval to challenge the capital system and its neo-liberal order. Hegemonic impact of the mainstream development paradigm on developmentalism was thus crushed by the pragmatic understanding of the Zapatistas with holistic 'cosmovision' that transcended modernist meta-narratives of both capitalism and socialism (Burbach et al, 2013:18). The foundational features of the cosmivision as quoted below from the declaration of the Zapatista Army of National Liberation (EZLN) in the International Encounter for Humanity and Against Neo-liberalism show how they differ from others. Particularly, it displays a remarkable epistemological shift from the world of artificial perfection of the dominant development paradigm.

"The universal need for a more just and inclusive world, in opposition to the commodified and exclusionary world of neo-

liberalism, is the great event of our country; it opens the possibility of joining together local, national, sectoral and class struggles, in one single struggle for the formation of a planetary community, the self-realization of civil society and the construction of a world where many worlds fit" (EZLN, 1996:151; as quoted in Stahler-Sholk, 2000).

Not only it debunks commodification, as the features imply, as an enemy of civilizational progress, but also, and more importantly, it completely rejects the homogenization principle of the mainstream economics based on which market-oriented model of globalization is built.<sup>3</sup> While its cosmivision is devoid of being delusionary on any count, diversity that exists in the planetary community, according to it, needs to be recognized for construction of a world which is more just and inclusive. Diversity exists in any form in which people may define their relation with the state. The construction of hypothesis for development and change without taking cognizance of the real-life situation in which diversity rests is an anarchic theoretical position that mainstream paradigm has been maintaining for the last two centuries or so. 'The construction of a world where many worlds fit' is a powerful theoretical abstraction which is founded on existentialism. It combats the principle of homogenization that presumes a flat world economy under globalization (Friedman, 2005).

The epistemological shift is also discernable in their vision of autonomy what they call 'horizontal autonomy' or communal self-rule. They rejected representative democracy of the liberal paradigm which was consolidated during the 18<sup>th</sup> century in Europe along with the concept of private property, individual rights and the market economy as the organizing principles of economy and social life (Stahler-Sholk, 2010, Solano, 2019). They replaced it by participatory democracy, the essence of which is local autonomy with communal self-

rule. For, according to them, representative democracy is 'democratic despotism' in reality (Esteve, 2019). Hence, participatory democracy is construction of democracy from the root in which common people can assume the power to act upon which they think necessary to do so for their own development. The striking aspect of this autonomy movement is not to seize the state power but to dismantle it and rebuild it where the practice of commanding by obeying thrives (Solano, 2019).

This is contrary to what the first anti-systemic movement that took place during 1848 aimed at. It aimed at capturing the state power and it did so. But it did not want to dismantle it. The state power captured by the elite forces in that state was made instrumental to promote the interest of capital than that of labour, the people. It was essentially a bourgeoisie revolution that overthrew feudalism. Although it began in France in 1848, it turned out as an upheaval of the people of Europe to remove old monarchical structure and create independent nation states (Fotopoulos, 2010, 29). It must be seen as triumph of capitalism as a means of organizing the economy and society. It gave birth to the logic of capital for its proliferation through surplus generation. Then, ownership of capital and its accumulation became the law of social change. Although the movement began with the objective of achieving true democracy, no solution to human misery and social problems was in sight. The spontaneous uprising failed to bring about social transformation.<sup>4</sup> The organizing principles of the economy and society remained capital accumulation and maximization of private interest (Wallerstein, 2014).

After the historical event of 1848, global society witnessed several social and national movements. Many of them were anti-systemic in nature in that some were of strong varieties such as the Russian revolution and the 1968 uprising in Europe or what Wallerstein calls 'world revolution of 1968', while some others were less strong varieties such as the



women's movement, and ethno/racial/religious movement (Wallerstein, 2014). Many of them stood for capturing the state power and fundamental transformation of social relations through removal of inegalitarian system and introduction of democracy. While they succeeded in achieving the first one, they were far away from achieving the second one. Hence, these movements can hardly be characterized as anti-systemic. Although they struggled against the established power structure in an attempt to replace it by more democratic and egalitarian system, they were collusive with the same system in practice (Wallerstein, 2014, p. 164).

The philosophy of 'Buen Vivir' or *Sumak Qawsay* (living well) focusing on good life reinforced the political process of Ecuador that was already under the influence of Zapatistas. Ecuadorians also challenged the neoliberal market reforms. However, its cosmovision is primarily made up of the ethical principles of Andean culture of harmony and balance. It is 'living well' not 'living better' that invites competition not co-operation, disintegration not integration and deprivation not equity. In contrast to the hegemonic anthropocentrism of western capitalist modernity (Jime'nez, 2011), human beings are seen here as equivalent to other parts of cosmic universal whole. One is related to the other part and each one exists based on reciprocal relations. The profound impact of the ethical principle of Buen Vivir is discernable when it is seen as a remedy to the civilizational crisis under the hegemonic development paradigm that disintegrates humans on the one hand and humans and nature on the other. While the horizontal coexistence with the nature dissolves society – nature dualism (Gudyas, 2011: 445), it upholds radical notion that eco-systems have the legal right "to exist, flourish and regenerate their natural capacities" (Kawano, 2018: 8). The rights of Mother Earth (nature), in view of this, have been enshrined in the new constitution of Ecuador in 2008 and Bolivia in 2009 (Kawano, 2018: 9). It not only mirrors perceptual validity and the reasoning in

favor of solidarism between humans and nature, but also exemplifies cultural conditioning for survival and development of all living species.

The transformative narratives explicitly or implicitly recognize different principles to organize the economy and society that are antithetical to the dominant development paradigm. Central to all is the breaking off from dualism, as mentioned above, between society and nature. The legal right being accorded to nature exemplifies its uncontested solidarity that must be rebuilt with the people of multicultural origin within the relational context of reciprocity. Legalizing such an intrinsic bond, done nowhere else so far, is a unique attempt to stop its destruction that threatens co-evolution of humans and nature. It contributes to the formation of alternative development paradigm by being based on nature-centric development epistemology. Equally important is its radical understanding about wellbeing that never considers economic growth as the means of development (Villalba, 2013, Walsh, 2010). It then naturally restricts unlimited production and irresponsible waste. It is an epistemic change from where 'principle of sufficiency' emerges as its basic tenet that contributes to the formation of the alternative development paradigm. It works as a building block to counter global ecological crisis by rejecting commodification of nature. The transcendental influence of this paradigmatic shift of development on several other countries including Bolivia and Brazil has apparently turned Latin America into an epicenter for deconstructing the dominant notion of development.

Lessons that one learns from several other transformative initiatives that are taken up throughout the globe, as mentioned earlier, against the dominant regime rooted in capitalism, patriarchy, racism, statism and anthropocentrism during the last two decades or so, are equally robust. These initiatives found their expressions either through social movements like the ones discussed

here or ideological reconstruction or new experiment with new idea of development. Each attempt in whichever direction is taken up is geared to finally replace the dominant regime by the new one. They unmask the false epistemological base that has pushed humanity to its catastrophic end. The lessons that one learns from these experiences break new grounds for designing new organizing principles for the society and economy.

The emergence of self-organizations, for example, as niche institutions in several parts of the world demonstrate it sufficiently well. The new practices and behavior of these organizations illustrate how significant have been the new grounds they break for creating 'fitness landscape' in the competitive environment for survival and development of the people (Kauffman, 1995). The reinvention of workers' co-operatives, as an independent creation of the workers not as protégés either of the government or of the large capital (Marcuse, 2015: 34) or producers' or community-based organizations in India (Kumbamu, 2009) or Kurdistan (Akbulut and Aslan, 2019) or Bangladesh (Mazhar, 2019) and in many other countries apart from Brazil, Argentina and other Latin American countries, are some examples that one can cite to show how new organizing principles that are antithetical to the dominant regime, have grown in the intestine of the capital system to the detriment of interest of the latter.

This suggests, as I have argued elsewhere, coordinates of transformation must change from the parts to the whole (Ray et al., 2020). It is now between the parts on the one hand and between parts and whole on the other, unlike the dominant paradigm that explains the dynamics of the system based on the properties of the parts (Capra, 1996). It also suggests a radically different social metabolic order that corresponds to reproductive order of the society, which is sustainable and based on the principle of substantive equality and freedom (Meszoras, 2017: 8). The process of

substantive freedom finds its real expression only when development paradigm rests on cooperation and solidarity between humans and humans and nature (Honneth, 2015, Ray, 2012). The coordinates of transformation must arise from cooperation, not competition. The dialectics of progress of human society is then governed by the law of reciprocal altruism, not methodological individualism. Cohesive development arises as an alternative development paradigm based on these new co-ordinates of transformation.

### III

#### **COHESIVE DEVELOPMENT**

The primary condition for cohesive development is social cohesion among the individuals with a sense of community and commitment to the common objective based on collective understanding and shared consciousness. It is this common objective that binds individuals together despite differences that might exist between them. However, this can happen only if the common objective never falls in line with the existing power structure which is undemocratic and exploitative, yielding powerlessness and deprivation of the majority. In other words, no social cohesion can ensure cohesive development as an alternative development paradigm if it fails to recognize the debilitating impact of the existing power structure on it. It is not that powerlessness is confined to the economic aspect of human life alone, and hence, the talk about monolithic class division. It is equally important to recognize how in other aspects of life including social, cultural, political, environmental, etc., subordinate groups are excluded from various forms of power. The unifying element of all subordinate groups who develop a shared consciousness is exclusion from various forms of power (Fotopoulos, 2010: 62). The task of the subordinate groups, therefore, is to overcome the cultural hegemony of the dominant groups, preserve cultural diversity and ensure all social groups have a voice through democratic means

such as participation, dialogue, etc. as ruling by obeying comes into play.

Hence, cohesive development, in the present context, is conceived as an alternative development paradigm that replaces the logic of capital as it works in the capital system with the new one that seeks to establish radically different social metabolic order based on the principle of solidarity between humans on the one hand and humans and nature on the other. The reciprocal altruism, contrary to the methodological individualism of the mainstream development paradigm, directs here to shape the development paradigm. While having its glue to hold the people, the deprived together based on reciprocal altruism, it seeks to achieve common objective, a common world view based on their collective understanding with substantive freedom or actual freedom whose key resides in the 'apolitical' network of social relations from market to family (Zizek, 2017: 29).

This holds good equally at all levels including local, national and international. Besides, it institutionalizes fulfilment of all necessities of life while equal space of all aspects of life is created for all to harness their full potential and live with dignity. A new development paradigm is thus conceived suggesting deep structural change from the grassroots to bring about equity and justice while maintaining relational totality. Besides, it never allows natural resources, the very base of the productive forces of the economy to be exhausted beyond the limit where co-evolution of both humans and nature stops. It is only within this framework that one may have reasons to argue why sustainable development is realizable. Further, no economic development is sustainable if it is understood based only on the notion of unlimited quantitative growth. It is more than purely an economic process in that it is associated with qualitative growth that includes social, ecological and spiritual dimensions (Capra and Henderson, 2009: 41).

Hence, the fundamental tenets of the epistemological base of cohesive development as emerging from radical movements and transformative initiatives are: (1) holistic cosmovision with diversity, (2) solidarity between humans and humans and nature, (3) equity and justice for harmony, (3) principle of sufficiency, (4) new logic of capital, (5) participatory democracy and communal self-management, (6) reciprocal altruism, (7) expansion of commons and (8) qualitative metamorphosis. It is needless to mention that each one of these tenets is interdependent as a relational totality and reinforces each other for constructing alternative paradigm. The emerging transformative mode of production which is solidaristic as discussed in section V grows out of the close interaction between these tenets. While the instrumental role of all these tenets is explained in this section, the following section (IV) is devoted to examine criticality of the principle of sufficiency and reciprocal altruism against the backdrop of their glaring differences with the competing theoretical strands. It is worthwhile to underline their theoretical prowess in a comparative framework to explain why it is inevitable for the post-capitalist era to witness emergence of the solidaristic transformative mode of production.

## **IV**

### **CRITICALITY OF THE PRINCIPLE OF SUFFICIENCY AND RECIPROCAL ALTRUISM**

#### **Principle of Sufficiency**

The principle of sufficiency never separates means from the end. It is born out of the epistemological shift towards solidarity between humans and nature and breaks a new ground for the formation of the transformative mode of production. It produces alternative development narratives without being fetish to economic growth (Alier-Martinez,

et.al, 2010: 1745). For, it envisages a perfect correlation between the means and the end in that means are designed to eradicate misery of both humans and nature. It is contrary to the dominant development regime in which means are designed to generate more economic growth for profit. The development narratives of this regime naturally become fetish to growth that has finally resulted in sharp economic disparity propelled by the market forces throughout the globe. The largest majority, as a result, is left with no choice but to proceed towards the point of no return. While one may have reasons to argue why it finally works against the capital system, the latter cannot escape from its eventual collapse unless development ceases to be fetish to growth. This provides sufficient ground to testify theoretical validity of the principle of sufficiency.

For, growth is not sustainable ad infinitum in a resource constrained planet. Besides, what is distressing is that, as Hansen, a leading climate scientist points out, the global economy has grown to a scale that it has crossed the planetary boundaries that mark the safe operating space of the planet and is tearing apart the biogeological cycle of the planet resulting in planetary rift (Foster, 2011: 24). In other words, material and energy consumption has exceeded the allowable ecological footprints (Alier-Martinez, et al., 2010: 1743).<sup>5</sup> Its consequences are disastrous leading to planetary ecological emergency. It is threatening the human race to be imperiled.

True, scholars from several quarters around the world have opposed uninterrupted extraction of natural resources for human consumption. But one wonders how their opposition takes one to its logical end without contesting the fundamentals of the capital system responsible for creating such a catastrophe. One may quote two strands of thought in this regard that originate from (1) Degrowth movement and (2) Steady-state economy. Seemingly, both of them have some areas of convergence with the principle of

sufficiency. But then, the latter greatly differs fundamentally from both for being evolutionary in its operational approach and revolutionary as it seeks reversal of the logic of capital of the capital system.

Degrowth movement advocates contraction of the economy by means of downscaling of both production and consumption. Of course, the celebrated publication of the Club of Rome titled 'Limits to Growth' (1972) did explicitly recognize economic growth as the factor responsible for environmental problem much earlier (Club of Rome report, 1972). It does not necessarily imply that economic growth per se is problematic. However, it may be so only when it is seen as the source of development without decoupling it from the material needs. Therefore, the question is how to decouple it without the decline in well-being of the people. The advocates of the degrowth movement suggest that the route to maximize well-being of the people is to enhance qualitative growth based on consumption of non-material goods but not by enhancing quantitative growth beyond a point in terms of material production and its consumption.

It is here that some have suggested green technology that can decouple growth from the material need (Burton and Somerville, 2019). Assuming that green technology works at a higher level of efficiency with cost effectiveness in the use of energy resources, how could it reduce increased pressure on the finite stock of resources and on the overall environment to the detriment of the functioning of the capital system? For, it is quite likely that resource consumption would increase in response to higher energy efficient technology. It exemplifies what is known as 'Jevon's Paradox' as a result of which environmental crisis could deepen further.<sup>6</sup> But it does not reduce the significance of green technology for decoupling. The latter can reposition itself outside the capital system based on the principle of sufficiency for the same purpose and escape from 'Jevon's paradox'. Besides, resource use efficiency being even less



than 100 per cent (as per the second law of thermodynamics), it will never lead the economy to collapse in such a situation.

Daly, having traced the perspective of his analysis to the 'stationary state' of the classical political economy, also suggests contraction (or reduction) of the economy. However, according to him, it has to be maintained perpetually at a steady state.<sup>7</sup> It means that the steady state economy (SSE) will continue to replace investment but never encourages new net investment (Foster, 2011: 25). While SSE may have some points of convergence with the principle of sufficiency, the latter fundamentally differs from the former which offers no less than a reformist framework of the capital system. The major offensive against Daly's prescription of SSE came from Georgescu-Roegen who argued that ecological salvation does not lie in the stationary state that still sees positive growth although at a lower rate. According to him, the most desirable state is not stationary, but a declining one (Wikipedia on Degrowth).

The reformist proposal of SSE for capital system is rejected both by the mainstream and Keynesian schools. For, economic growth is an inherent necessity for capitalism of any configuration (Smith, 2010: 255). Instead of contraction on the pretext of depletion of natural resources, Solow, as one of the proponents of the mainstream Economics, argues that higher growth is attainable with less use of resources within the same capital system through substitution by improved technology that works with higher level of efficiency (Solow, 1974). However, it does not resolve resource-efficiency issue either. For, as the law of thermodynamics states that any technological system has a maximum efficiency of energy flow and has limited capacity to convert one type of energy to another. Hence, substitution by improved technology is of no help to overcome the problem of energy-efficiency issue (Kolasi, 2019: 36).

Hence, nothing can be more suggestive than decoupling of economic growth from the material needs to avert the planetary crisis. It insinuates qualitative expansion of human activities alongside limited quantitative expansion to enhance peoples' well-being. The material needs for quantitative expansion can be met within the ecological limit. While there may be no qualms on the limit to the material needs, the scenario as painted by the protagonist of degrowth and the SSE may not be much engaging notwithstanding the robustness of their logic. The theoretical edifice of their constructions is bound to get entangled and conflict with the extant logic of capital. It implies that, unless the logic of capital is substituted by a new one, no reform of the capital system whatever be its extent, can respond positively to the asking for resolving the planetary crisis. It is the new logic of capital that suggests restructuring of the organizing principles of economy and society based on the principle of sufficiency that can decouple growth from material needs.

### **Reciprocal Altruism**

The radical alternatives of all sources, irrespective of place and context, unequivocally rejects self-interest maximizing principle of methodological individualism as the only axiomatic truth of human behavior. It is instead reciprocal altruism, they reveal, as the trait that influences individual behavior. The epistemic influence of methodological individualism on designing the mainstream economics and therefore mainstream development paradigm that shapes development regime is phenomenal. It has been teaching the world for last the two centuries or so, that "self-goal choice" is the only trait that guides the economic action of the individuals. Arrow explains it aptly:

"Each individual is conceived of as acting in the way determined partly by his psychology and his physical surroundings and partly by the actions of others.... Therefore, given the reaction of each individual to his total (social

and other) environment... and given the nonsocial environmental factors, which we may term exogeneous, we can determine the behavior of any individual in society".

(Arrow, 1951).

A religious sermon, as it were, is continuously given to the world community to display its instrumental rationality as the norm of reasoning for the individuals to achieve her economic ends. Hence, development of the economy, accordingly, is derivative of the aggregate individual-centric growth. This is what was discovered by the Enlightenment of the 17<sup>th</sup> century England. Individualism which is later termed as methodological individualism was conceived as a method of examining any socio-economic phenomenon based on the action and motivation of the individual and individual alone. However, social movements and all other radical alternatives exposed its illusory effect on development, dump it as false construction and reveals how it has been misleading the human progress and refusing to accept the evolution of human society.

Historically, growth of 'individualism' was central to the emergence of the philosophy of liberalism in the middle of the 17<sup>th</sup> century in England. It marked its beginning with the collapse of the feudal system in that Enlightenment stressed that the progress of the society was achievable only through individual initiatives. It ruled out outside interference. In other words, individuals must be given maximum freedom to operate to maximize his/her self-interest with the establishment of the market economy. They are rational because they are selfish and seek to maximize their self-interest only. The truth is that such an individual-centric liberal philosophy accorded social legitimacy in order to promote the interest of the emerging capitalist class after the collapse of feudalism under the veil of democracy and progress (Peet and Hartwick, 2010: 26-30).

Hence, liberalism on which freedom, progress and democracy are pillared was basically the British Enlightenment philosophy which was born to serve the interest of the early capitalist. Its early class commitments under the rubric of 'scientific neutrality' was eternalized and got entry as the founding principles of economics being laid by Adam Smith (Peet and Hartwick, 2010: 42). The mainstream development paradigm is but the descendent of the same in which individualism continues to be the central source through which economic progress is sought. The only difference is that it is called methodological individualism.

The centrality of the perspective of Schumpeter who is known to have invented the term 'methodological individualism' in 1909 (Schumpeter, 1909) or Menger, who is considered to be its proponent, is a lineage of the philosophy of liberalism (Menger, 1883). For Schumpeter, Economics as a science is a pure theory of production and exchange as the individuals' desire is based on their own interest. Hence, outside interference is outside the scope of the pure theory. Similarly, for Menger, it is a spontaneous order of the society as an outcome of the interaction of the atomistic rational self-interested behavior on the part of the individual (Basu, 2008: 587). In both cases, one-sided assumption about the individual and their self-interest maximization goal being the sole criteria for being rational are maintained. Of course, no interference of outside forces is entertained. Although varieties of protagonists of the mainstream economics have surfaced over the years, the same continues to remain central to the development epistemology of the dominant regime.

What can be more delusory in the study of human behavior than by reducing the human beings to be inhabited only by the virtues of selfishness? It is an intellectual mishap which the sociologists also ignored as a factor to count in the landscape of social progress. However, they have chosen to debate with the mainstream economics on the issue of

outside influence on the behavior of the individual. Their basic question is whether the socio-economic explanation must move from agency to the structure or from the structure to the agency. While the mainstream economists advocate for imposition of strict separation of structure from agency axiomatically, sociologists do not accept it. What it means for the mainstream economists is that any socio-economic explanation at any point of time must move from agency to structure (Arnsperger and Varoufakis, 2018: 1). Although there are several areas of conflict among the sociologists while conceptualizing methodological individuals,<sup>8</sup> they suggest that socio-economic explanation must be sought from both since social structure is a set of interactive relations between individuals. In other words, sociologists suggest a synthesis of individualistic and holistic elements while seeking socio-economic explanation (Udehen, 2002: 502).

In any case, methodological individualism of any version focuses only on the one-sided assumption of human behavior and has never critiqued the rationality assumption that motivates the individual to act. However, the resistance movements reveal why this is a false construction and how following such development epistemology has led to the horrific debasement of human beings and nature never witnessed since the industrial revolution. These movements have also discovered that altruistic trait of human beings can be equally strong to influence her/his rational behavior that evolves in an associational framework. It is the individual's "reciprocal altruism" that is much closer to reciprocity and redistribution which Polanyi observes as the norms of living in a pre-capitalist society that can give birth to a new development epistemology that fights the degeneration of both human beings and nature (Polanyi, 1944: 47-55). Trivers who originally developed the theory of reciprocal altruism in evolutionary biology extended the theories of the evolution of biological altruism to humans. Trivers observes:

“There is no direct evidence regarding the degree of reciprocal altruism practiced during human evolution nor its genetic basis today, but given the universal and nearly daily practice of reciprocal altruism among humans today, it is reasonable to assume that it has been an important factor in recent human evolution and that the underlying emotional dispositions affecting altruistic behavior have important genetic components”.

(Trivers, 1971: 46).

On the question of whether ideas about the evolution of animal behavior can be extrapolated to humans, all biologists accept that *homo sapiens* is an evolved species and thus general evolutionary principles apply to humans as well (Stanford Encyclopedia, 2013: 15). It is not necessary in the case of human species that individuals are to be relatives or members of the same species. Even if they do not interact with each other more than once, one cannot dismiss the influence of culture, conscious belief and desire of humans. This is far greater than that of the other animals (Stanford Encyclopedia, 2013: 15). Hence, behaviors that benefit both self and others can evolve much more easily than even altruistic behavior.<sup>9</sup>

Genetically, altruism originates as a form of fellow feeling from the very womb of the instinct of self-preservation (self-interest). Fellow feeling and ethics are outcomes of “symbiosis” and “co-operation”, which are biologically true as self-preservation.<sup>10</sup> This natural truth, an axiomatic truth, was completely ignored by the liberal philosophy of the English Enlightenment and so was Adam Smith who founded the principles of economics based on self-preservation as the only motivating force for exchange and gains. This stems from the particular one-sided assumption about individuals based on the recognition of only one instinct. This is *homo economicus*, which is self-serving individual (self-interest) as

mentioned earlier that has been ruling the dominant development regime for the last two centuries.

However, several biological studies show that human nature comprises both self-servicing and solidaristic tendencies (Roughgarden 2009, Rilling et al. 2002) Humans are *homo solidaricus* not *homo economicus*. This means that they are both self-serving and solidaristic, hence, altruistic which is genetically antithetical to self-interest and never claims to be ethically neutral. No one has any reason to diminish its conceptual prowess by misusing it as a 'cover' to be ethically neutral as it is done in the mainstream development paradigm. Its ethical predilections are clear – to be seen as being favorable toward the deprived, and at the same time, against the logic of capital. The infallible truth of human survival, the anti-systemic movements reveal, is the preferences that do not inhabit in a well-defined space within the wall separating one "self" from the "other". They cannot be explained either by rational choice theory (Ray, 2012: 43). The reciprocal altruism as the founding principle of this new paradigm brings integration between humans on the one hand and humans and nature on the other based on the principle of solidarity while recognizing the importance of co-evolution of human and nature. As one of the epistemological tenets, it opens the possibility for the new development footprint to reign in the humanity through transformative mode of production which is solidaristic.

## V

### **SOLIDARISTIC TRANSFORMATIVE MODE OF PRODUCTION**

The solidaristic transformative mode of production grows out of close interaction between the fundamental tenets of the new epistemological base of development that have emerged from the radical alternatives to the dominant regime. These fundamental tenets as observed earlier grow outside the

capital system and create alternative development paradigm with an alternative cosmovision. It is neither capitalistic mode of production which is primarily driven by profit and capital accumulation nor socialistic mode of production as envisaged by the traditional Marxists. While unfolding from within the metabolism of the capital system, it never overshadows Marxian materialist conception of history that stems from the principle of production and exchange. But certainly, I argue, it goes beyond it. It is not the social ability to transform nature into production of commodities alone. It is equally or more important to underline the ability of the nature to withstand the social pressure on it for its transformation into commodities. Its fallout is discernable with growing commodification at the present stage of the development of capitalism. This phenomenon seems to have been downplayed by the traditional Marxist account of historical change and development until of course its retrogressive impact on human existence is accounted for in recent years in view of growing metabolic rift between humans and nature as nature is used beyond the point of its resilience for commodity production (O'Connor, 1988: 38 and Foster, 2013: 4).

Within the Marxian analytics of epochal change of mode of production, social relations come in conflict with the forces of production. For, social relations that organize and direct the forces of production in the transformation of nature face the adverse consequences of metabolic rift or environmental disaster. However, it happens not necessarily due to incompatibility of the old social structure (social relations) with the technology that has improved. The argument is that once technology as one of the productive forces improves, obsolete social arrangements of the old social structure (social relations) fail to rearrange themselves to appropriately respond to the increasing requirement of higher level of internal efficiencies. It is then left with no choice but to prevent further social progress. It leads to develop contradiction to the point that social revolution takes



place to allow for the emergence of new forms of social relations that are compatible with the improved level of technology [(Wikipedia, mode of production) 7, 92-93]. It gives birth to a new mode of production.

The transition, however, to the post-capitalist mode of production through technological development to higher level as explained above finds limited justification in view of the depleting production condition caused by environmental degeneration. In other words, technology-centric explanation of the forces of production is theoretically handicapped to explain transition of the mode of production from capitalistic to post-capitalistic (post-development) unless other productive forces are considered. The significant one is environment and its resources that have limited production possibilities through their conversion. To clarify this point further, let us assume that there is no technological improvement. Does it imply that production possibilities will not be exhausted? Or can one rule out retrogressive effect of conversion of nature to commodity production beyond a limit? The answer is negative.

For, profit making is the primary goal of capitalism that determines its expansionary moves. Hence, with the same level of technology and at the same level of efficiency, hunt for profit continues through conversion of nature into commodity production. Natural resources as productive forces come under severe pressure even in such situations, leading to conflict with the social relations of production. Hence, contradiction between the forces and relations of production develops here not due to technological incompatibility with old social order as has been the traditional Marxist account of historical change, but through nature once the limit of its exploitation exceeds. Social struggle may be an outcome of the contradiction in this case also. However, it is beyond being endemic to class societies.

## **How Principle of Sufficiency Works?**

It is here that the principle of sufficiency that never separates means (technology) from the end (meeting basic needs of the people), as explained earlier as one of the basic tenets of the new epistemological base of development, comes out as a means to resolve such contradiction. It fairly indicates compatibility between all productive forces, including technology, human skill, knowledge, organizational forms, and cooperation under the influence of new logic of capital with nature's response for its conversion into commodity production. The compatibility issue is complex since cooperation, to be specific, mode of cooperation is culture centric that sets in a new metabolic order and goes beyond 'technological determinism' or cooperation for technical necessity as a tendency within Marxism (O'Connor, 1988: 38).

Any way, it is basically a conflict between the development of the productive forces and its fettering nature of the current production relations with the growing aspiration for its rational use to meet the basic needs of the people, the deprived (Wright, 2019: 6). The principle of sufficiency unfetters the productive forces that struggle against the economic relations or irrational mode of production. The rational allocation of resources for transformation of nature into commodities and their mode of exchange are then determined by other factors than profitability. This gives rise to the emergence of the solidaristic transformative mode of production that determines what Engels writes "what is to be produced, how it is to be produced and finally how it is exchanged" (Engels, 1880: 1).

The solidaristic transformative mode of production that has been developing in the interstices of capitalist society has enormous potential to grow and reject the dysfunctional dominant mode of production (Wright, 2019: 5). While the dysfunctionality is visibly large against the backdrop of limits to conversion of nature into commodity production, it is

reinforced further by the growing contradiction between the logic of capital and interest of majority of the people (Linden, 2017: 184). It has yielded economic stagnation to an unbelievable proportion and severe crisis that the capital system has ever faced after the Great Depression. The solidaristic transformative mode of production could resolve the crisis only if the principle of sufficiency is complemented by four other constituents.

These constituents are: (1) new logic of capital, (2) culture as a productive force, (3) reciprocal altruism, and (4) qualitative metamorphosis. While the first one indicates a new role being assigned to capital within the framework of cohesive development, the second one defies the control of production relations over the forces of production. The third one seeks to shift to alternative mode of transaction of goods and services based on the principles of solidarity. And, the fourth one stresses the importance of qualitative aspects of human life and shows how it can harmonize material with the spiritual domain of human survival. It is within the framework of comprehensive co-operation that stems from solidarity these constituent elements of the transformative mode of production set civilizational progress in motion without being detrimental to the coevolution of both human and nature.

### **New Logic of Capital**

While the post-capitalist new logic of capital originates outside the capital system, its operational moorings are determined by several factors that reinforce together to bring about cohesive development. The principle of sufficiency is one of those that give new logic to capital which is decommodification, a shift from commodification which is the logic of capital of the capital system. The new logic also advocates a shift from alienation to integration that facilitates social metabolic exchange between labour and nature and between labour (or deprived sections of all

social groups) that underscores achievement of real solidarity (Ray, 2012: 45).

The new logic of capital will not valorize capital, but recognize the 'self-valorization' of the workers. One can see then, as Negri argues, the theoretical possibility of proletarian independence within capital (Negri, 1984). Self-valorization subordinates the power of capital of the capital system to give precedence to use value over the creation of exchange value. It defies capitalist mechanisms of accumulation and development (Negri, 2005).

However, one may ask how "capital" is in-its-being for itself could allow such integration to take place? (Mészorás, 2008: 43). It is a theoretical puzzle that may be resolved by assigning it a different role in the changed relational context as the framework of cohesive development suggests. For example, once it is seen as being separate from the capitalist mode of production that controls labour, it fosters cohesion between the deprived, including humans and nature, and contributes to the emergence of the transformative mode of production.

### **Culture as a Productive Force**

It is inconceivable why the concept of culture which is downplayed by the traditional Marxist account of historical change and development (O'Connor, 1988: 38) should not be weaved into the discussion on the growth of post-capitalist mode of production that reifies 'cooperation'. Essentially, it is a culture of cooperation or comprehensive cooperation, which is the cornerstone of the post-capitalist mode of production for the new organizing principles of society and economy. It gives rise to new organizational form in that commons expand. The new logic of capital originates from this ontological basis of real-world experience. The dialectics of progress of human society is then governed by the law of reciprocal altruism, not methodological Individualism. Under the vision of economic

democracy and with the emergence of culture of shared identity, production relations lose its control over the productive forces in the transformative mode of production.

Production relations are three sided in capitalist formation. First, it is between exploited and exploiting classes, second it is within the exploiting classes; and the third, it is within the exploited classes. The first pertains to extraction of surplus labour, the second to distribution and utilization of surplus product within the exploiters; and the third, to the mode of cooperation within the exploited classes in production (O'Connor, 1988: 40) 7,105). The mode of cooperation is never derived here from technical necessity in production but springs from the culture of shared identity (Johnson, 2013: 1) that promotes different production relations or social relations with a definite mode of cooperation. It is here that one must recognize that this definite mode of cooperation is itself a productive force (Korsch, 1938: 146) 7, 90).

It is different from cooperation arising out of technological determinism of Marx as mentioned earlier or Smithian division of labour that give us the concept of 'social' productive forces (Korsch, 1938: 146). Here, also, it is social productive force but the difference is that it is created by cooperation based on the culture of shared identity. While the former category of social productive force represents technologically determined mode of cooperation that aims at maximizing profit, the latter aims at setting up a process of collective production and culture based on value practices, which are participatory and democratic and whose horizons are the welfare of the commoners and of environmental sustainability. Actually, it is the difference between the logic of capital of two different modes of production, respectively. The emerging solidaristic transformative mode of production captures the essentiality of the social organization with definite mode of cooperation and culture of shared identity

and counts it as a productive force in addition to science and technology.

In other words, new productive forces based on shared identity aim to expand the commons that benefit all at nobody's cost. This is of course different from state - controlled commons that are far away from being democratic and provides no scope for accumulation of social capital that plays a crucial role as assigned by the solidaristic transformative mode of production. One can cite workers-run cooperatives that have emerged in several parts of the world with the new logic of capital as commons that formulate new relations and extends the principles of conviviality. It is regenerative solidarity economics based on sharing that makes them possible not only to produce commodities, but also "reverse social disintegration, environmental devastation as well as working on a new model of expropriation and appropriation" (Barkin, 2019: 137).

It is a 'new kind of interdependence and group mindedness' Tomasello argues that went well beyond the joint intentionality of small-scale co-operation to a kind of collective intentionality at the level of the entire society (Johnson, 2013: 2). It indicates new organizational forms of production as the constituent of the productive force of the post-capitalist mode of production. It is promoted by way of, for example, reinventing workers' cooperatives as indicated earlier, producers' group or community-based organization engaged in production of goods and services and their exchange. The mode of ownership if at all granted, is determined by the cohesive forces of the workers, and remains as independent creation of the workers. In any case, what is non-negotiable is that the enterprise/ organization remains fully under the control of the workers in the transformative mode of production. The new form of organization as productive force promotes the culture of integration, not alienation. It is, in other words, emergence

of self-organization with new cultural practices that requires creation of niche structure as a part of the structural transformation. There may, however, be serious challenges of restructuration of the organizational forms in the early stage of evolution of the transformative mode of production. For example, tendency to move towards the growth of more material production than what the principle sufficiency allows, may pervade these organizations. Such kind of deviation may be tackled by new institutions and social organizations that develop based on new productive forces and production relations and their complementarity. The state as an institution being the outgrowth of the latter can provide regulatory mechanism or some policy of restraint to be followed by such organizational forms (Blauwhof, 2012: 260).

While these new productive forces seek to enhance the economic standing of their individual members, they are not profit-oriented as regular for-profit firms. Whatever they earn is used for the advancement of the common interests of the members rather than for distribution as profit. It hardly matters if these types of organizational form is branded as third sector organizations (TSO) that can grow in response to 'market failure', especially in the low income countries with high transaction cost economy (Valentinov, 2008: 482). For, it may be one of the ways that can be conceived as new trajectory of change through restructuration of the organizational forms. Maximizing utility through attaining self-sufficiency of all members of the group is the goal, although they may partially depend on market exchange (Valentinov, 2008:479). Be that as it may. It all depends upon whether these types of organizational forms are able to meet the basic consumption needs of the people.

### **Reciprocal Altruism**

Exchange relations are primarily governed by reciprocal altruism in the solidaristic transformative mode of production. The new logic of capital that originates from the

principle of solidarity never allows the sphere of exchange to be the source of accumulation of profit at the cost of misery of both humans and nature. It serves the interest of the majority, the deprived, contrary to what it does for capitalists. It promotes exchange only to facilitate the interest of both the parties engaged in it in a manner that no loss is inflicted on the other. And exchange benefits, both self and others. In other words, exchange is simultaneously both self-serving and solidaristic. Here, self-interest is never allowed to be maximized at the cost of equity (Ray, 2012: 45). It is not necessarily true that making profit at the cost of others is the only source of motivation and individual needs to excel accordingly.

The new forms of organizations that grow based on economics of solidarity may open up the space for innovating other means than profit and design incentive structures to motivate the individual or the community to excel. It promotes a culture of mutual insurance for any transaction to materialize. If non-price component of any transaction ranges from 5% to 95% in market economy that functions at the dictate of the logic of capital (Ekins, 1986: 275), it is not impossible for one to comprehend how large could be the space for mutual insurance if the logic of capital changes based on the principles of solidarity. Reciprocal altruism then determines the mode of exchange in that the transformative mode of production gives rise to a system of production, consumption and transaction that, in turn, allows mutual growth of X and Y at no cost to Z (nature) or anyone else (Ray, 2012: 45). Since capital owes a different logic here and has allegiance to reciprocal altruism, it may not be detrimental to the operation of the system of transaction, production and consumption as desired by the solidaristic transformative mode of production. For, these tenets are complimentary to each other in this mode of production. This is unlikely in the capitalist mode of production where relations of production are determined by capital or what capital desires by virtue of having its control over the



production relations. However, since no such control is exercised by capital and complementary relations exist between the forces and relations of production, emergent transformative mode of production ensures mutual growth with new rationale of investment, production and consumption. It opens up the possibility for thwarting civilizational crisis and stopping coevolution of human and nature. The deprived could then discover a route for their emancipation.

### **Qualitative Metamorphosis**

The emerging transformative mode of production sees no reason why the role of qualitative growth in explaining evolution of the society and economy is downplayed. It is growth of non-materialist aspect of human life that originates from human instinct and influences human activity. While analyzing Marx's key link to human potential and productivity, it is called human product or social product (Lebowitz, 2017: 43). Human product, which according to Marx, is 'rich human beings', expressed in terms of enlargement of human capacity. If enlargement of human capacity represents richness of human beings, there are other forms also through which the latter can manifest. It can do so in the form of altruism (Trivers, 1971), empathy (Jahanbegloo, 2017: xxxi), compassion and consciousness of oneness with nature and other humans, both in the practices of Buddhism and Buen Vivir (Prayukvong, 2005: 1174, Chuji et al., 2019: 113) and communitarianism of Marx (Chakrabarti et al., 2016). All these forms reflect deeper tenets of the human species that foregrounds the interconnectedness and interdependence of all other species. Discounting the impact of these forms that originate in the spiritual domain of the human beings on evolution of the society and economy is tantamount to underestimating the evolutionary processes. Hence, transition to the post-capitalist mode of production accounts for these non-material aspects of social life as well.

It is here that one has to go beyond Marxian thought and praxis that have chosen to side with 'materialism' alone to explain transition to take place. One might assess the decisive impact of the non-material forces on the qualitative metamorphosis of the mode of production in the light of the lessons that one learns from the anti-systemic movements around the world. While in Marxian scheme of things, "spirit" is completely separated from "matter" as against their over determination, having had its tilt towards materialism, the essentiality of their mutual constitutivity in instituting social transformation is relegated to the background (Chakrabarti et al., 2016).<sup>11</sup>

Buen Vivir, ontology of the indigenous people, however, brings mutual constitutivity back (Villaalba, 2013: 1434) to the center of the emergent mode of production and shows how it can explain alternative organizing principles of economy and society. The qualitative growth which may not differ from 'social humanity' of Marx (Chakrabarti, et.al, 2016) stems, I argue, from mutual constitutivity, that conceives material progress of the society towards being more humanistic focusing on the individual and enhancement of quality of life (Walsh, 2010: 16). The 'this-worldly' spirituality of Dalai Lama echoes the same and explains how Marxian materialism and praxis of equal distribution and social transformation are not totally stripped off compassion, empathy and love (Chakrabarti et al, 2016) 6, 223). It demands reworking on the notion of economic progress based on the ineluctable fact of its alliance with all other spheres of life including social, political and environmental. Hence, it suggests going beyond technology-centric explanation of social transition and accepting the importance of emotions and their relational nature that creates room for variety of sensitivities to co-exist.

The quality of life, as Buen Vivir asserts must be defined within these spiritual parameters that go beyond satisfying the basic needs of life and fixes the well-being of the

individual in the total relational context between humans on the one hand and humans and the nature on the other. Capra argues that a new science of qualities is slowly emerging in that creativity and the constant emergence of novelty are the driving forces for human evolution which is no longer seen as competitive struggle but as product of cooperation (Capra and Henderson, 2009: 39). Hence, it is mutual constitutivity, new productive force of the emergent transformative mode of production that draws on both qualitative growth that resides in the spiritual domain of human action and quantitative growth that embodies material production being guided by the principle of sufficiency.

The decline in well-being due to decline of employment opportunities within the value creation of limited material production, as apprehended, is countered here by way of properly calibrating utilization of materials and job creation (Weiss and Cattaneo, 2017: 227). For instance, 'good' growth can be promoted against 'bad' growth. In other words, such production processes and services are encouraged to grow that "fully internalize costs, involve renewable energies, zero emission, continued recycling of natural resources and restoration of the Earth's ecosystem" (Capra and Henderson, 2009: 42). The society and economy could benefit from it in two ways. On the one hand, they are small-scale projects but energy efficient, non-polluting and community oriented; on the other, they have potential to create local jobs through investment in green technologies that decouples growth from the material need. The best way to achieve it is to follow the principle of utilizing human capabilities to meet human needs (Burton and Somerville, 2019: 103).

The alignment of this new praxis reifies improvement in the quality of life that promotes happiness in which wealth acquisition has no role to play (Esterlin et al, 2010). Its implication for reorganizing economy and society is

immense. Since the emerging mode of production is not driven by capital accumulation and profitability, its values and institutions and productive forces can be reorganized to scale up the quality of life and bring happiness to all, especially the deprived ones from all wakes of life based on the principles of cohesive development.

## **VI**

### **IN LIEU OF CONCLUSION**

The questions that the human race is encountering today are: why is it that the largest majority of the people in the planet earth have been disenfranchised? What evolutionary transformative process society and economy must choose that leads them towards enfranchisement? While no evolutionary process is independent of the course through which it chooses to evolve, the paper argues against it that architected the organizing principles of the economy and society in the 16<sup>th</sup> century in Europe with the rise of capitalist world economy. The calamitous impact of its organizing principles manifesting in the form of vast disenfranchisement of the humanity, the paper argues, can be fought back only through changing the course of evolution. This is a powerful assertion, and is not notional that lacks empirical support. The paper counts the dialectical process of change that suggests infusion of a new course of evolution based on social movements and radical transformative initiatives taken around the globe for the last few decades or so.

The characteristic features of the new course of evolution as described in this paper can be explicated by the phenomenon called "Quantum entanglement" discovered by the physicists. According to this theory, in an entangled system, two or more objects have to be described with reference to each other. They behave as an inseparable whole even though they are spatially separated.

Theoretically, if one separates the two entangled objects (particles), one would find that their velocity of spin would be identical but in opposite directions. In other words, they are non-separable halves of the same entangled entity. They are quantum twins (Sanghi, 2020). Reciprocal altruism, according to which, humans are self-serving as well as solidaristic, may be understood as a manifestation of such entanglement. This is what represents human behavior as an axiomatic truth, which is fundamentally against methodological individualism. The significant aspect is that it is no way different from what the evolutionary biology understands about human behavior.

Similarly, one has reasons to admit how quantitative growth is entangled with the qualitative growth and how they together could be the source of development. Further, one does not see hostility between spirit and matter provided that their relations are viewed within the same quantum perspective. The mutual constitutivity between them demonstrates their entanglement, an intersection where mind, matter and love in the form of compassion, empathy and consciousness collude. It is this point of intersection that conceives solidaristic transformative mode of production in the post-capitalist era.<sup>12</sup>

Now, no choice is left with humanity but to accept it to replace the old one and reconstruct the development paradigm with alternative organizing principles of society and economy. It is this that the paper finds its engagement to respond to meet this incontestable need. The inexorable forces of history stand to witness how the incongruous evolutionary process is corrected by cohesive development as the alternative development paradigm in the 21<sup>st</sup> century.

## Notes

1. Anti-systemic movement is a struggle against established power structure in an effort to bring into existence a more democratic and more egalitarian system than the existing one. "It explicitly or implicitly challenges legitimacy of a socio-economic system both in the sense of its institutions which create and reproduce the unequal distribution of power and also in the sense of its values which legitimizes domination of a human being over other human beings or society over nature" (Fotopoulos, 2010: 4). Resistance movement can be interchangeably used as anti-systemic movement provided that it is the integral part of the latter. However, if it is not so, it is a reformist movement that fails to challenge the socio-economic system that reproduces unequal power relations (Fotopoulos, 2010, 59).
2. For instance, at the national level, a precise and analytically insightful documentation by Nilsen gives an account of several movements. These include National Alliance of Peoples' Movement (NAPM) in India as a struggle against global capitalism and for seeking a just and sustainable alternative model of development, movements by the marginalized communities for empowerment from within, Narmada Bacho Andolan, etc. (Nilson, 2007, 271-92). In addition, there were agrarian movements, movements against special economic zones (SEZ) (Ray, 2012). Several resistance movements organized at the international level can be said to have gone against global capitalism while some others not. For example, protest movements in France, Italy, Argentina, Brazil, Paraguay, El Salvador, Mexico, Guatemala, and Colombia were essentially resistance movements against loss of employment, cuts in social security, etc. However, movements including peasant movements in Mexico, the Brazilian landless workers

movement, the FARC movement in Colombia, social movements in Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia and Ecuador are all against global capitalism (Petras and Veltmeyer, 2005). The new social movements that are manifestations of the new social conflict over autonomy, quality of life, human rights, political participation, environmental degradation, etc., are needless to mention, finally shaped by the global capital system (Ci'sar', 2015). The massive resistance movements organized by the peasants and Adivasis (tribal) in India in the recent past give testimony to how solidarity between people from varying social, religious and economic backgrounds can develop collective understanding to achieve common objectives (Dhawale, 2018). Kothari et al. have documented several such social movements and radical transformative initiatives taken around the globe (Kothari et al., 2019).

3. It all began with the basic assumption of the mainstream economics. It assumes that individuals are atoms, following the footsteps of Newtonian physics; human behavior is, therefore, governed equally by the law of gravitation that governs the cosmos. It means that each one has the same gravitational pull. They are assumed to be unconnected from each other, who interact by exchanging goods and services in the market. This is, however, antithetical to existentialism that allows variability between individuals who are in any case not atoms, but vary from place to place and change their opinion and behavior. To assume that no variability exists between individuals, Jevon's 'single average individual' as the unit of which population is made up, is postulated as a proven analytical mode in mainstream economics (Orrell, 2010: 15).
4. The problem was, as pointed out by Fotopoulos, that there was no counter organization both at the political and cultural levels and the movement was organized on

a bureaucratic basis. This gave enough leverage to the state that could foil the movement with the help of the powerful elites that controlled the state (Fotopoulos, 2010, p. 29).

5. It is downsizing of economic throughput as measured by the material and energy flow. It is estimated that the collective material footprint of humankind is 1.7 times the available biocapacity. The available bio capacity is determined by the global ecological footprint. The global ecological footprint is measured in terms of the area of the biologically productive land; water required to produce goods consumed and to assimilate the wastage generated (Burton and Somerville, 2019: 100).
6. In 1865, Stanley Jevons observed that efficiency of coal uses increased due to improvement in the technology, but it in turn, led to the increase in consumption of coal in a wide range of industries.
7. According to Daly "Steady state economy is an economy with constant stocks of people and artifacts maintained at some desired, sufficient level by low rates of maintenance 'Throughput' by the lowest feasible flows of matter and energy" (Daly, 1991). Daly also talks about constant stock of physical wealth that J.S. Mill discussed in his book on the 'Principles of Political Economy' while defining what he means by 'stationary state'. Mill argues that if the economic expansion is to stabilize or reach a steady state, economic goal of the society could then shift to the qualitative aspect of existence rather than mere quantitative expansion.
8. For instance, it is methodological structuralism or methodological institutionalism to Hodgson (Hodgson, 2007: 9); for Watkins (Watkins, 1952) it is methodological holism at one end, while it is individualism at another end. Having recognized the



tension between methodological individualism and methodological holism, Prechter offers his concept of social mood in his socio-economic theory to bring about integration between them (Prechter and Robert, 2003). According to Popper, it is a synthesis of contextualist and organicist worldviews (Popper, 1942). For, it is the socio-economic context that creates social mood, which may be encouraging or discouraging for all to behave accordingly. The perception arising out of social mood context may have some reason to integrate methodological individualism with methodological holism. For social mood depending upon the socio-economic context coordinates all individual, instinct, habit and creativity together on the one hand, while it is social institutions on the other. It is a kind of integration between the individual and institution outside of the individual that may provide some scope for treating self-centeredness as not the only determinant of individual rationality.

9. In evolutionary biology, an organism is said to behave altruistically when its behaviour benefits other organisms, at a cost to itself. Altruism is advantageous at the group or association level, especially from the point of view of survival of all members of the group. A group containing lots of altruists may have a survival advantage over a group composed mainly of selfish organisms. Groups composed mainly/only of selfish organisms go extinct. However, the behavioural pattern relevant to the present purpose is the one that benefits both the self and others. It can evolve much more easily than altruistic behaviours in that it goes beyond kinship. This is precisely the advantage of reciprocal altruism in that individuals may not be members of the same species. See *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*, 2008, "Biological Altruism", <http://plato>.

10. Self-preservation or self-interest is generated through biological processes of living beings, including genes, cells, nerves, and the brain. The same biological processes also work to produce symbiosis and co-operation that are antithetical to self-preservation (Engels, *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State*, 1972 and L.H. Morgan, *Ancient Society*, 1980; cited in Basu, 2000).
11. Here, we do not see any reason to enter the debate whether human consciousness and, therefore, material progress is the gift of the Hegelian "World spirit" or the same is the product of matter as materialism of Marx and Engels stresses. We are not even debating the "modern reason" as many idealists stress as the source of material progress. It may be human reason, in the form of simply logical thinking or transcendental reason, in the form of some kind of spiritual director or some combination of the two (Peet and Hartwick, 2010: 144).
12. Alexander Wendt argues that this truth is discovered in the field of quantum mechanics that shows how the assumptions of the classical physics (Newtonian) breaks down at the sub-atomic level. According to classical physics, human beings are atomistic and therefore they are separate. The mainstream development paradigm draws inspiration from it. But the sub-atomic systems can be entangled, which means that they cannot be defined as separate from each other. This is the quantum perspective that suggests we are holistic and we are entangled. Cooperation is much easier to achieve in this situation. However, if we start with the premise, Wendt argues further, that social life is atomistic, then every organism is out for itself, we are all selfish, and it is all about survival of the fittest. Co-operation is very difficult to achieve in such a situation, for we all are separate and trying to survive in our own way (Wendt, 2014-15).

## References

Akbulut, B. and A. Aslan. 2019. Democratic Economy in Kurdistan. *In* Ashish Kothari et al., ed., *Pluriverse, A post Development Dictionary*, pp.151-154. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Alier-Martinez, J., U, Pascual, F-D, Viven, E, Zaccai. 2010. Sustainable de-growth: Mapping the context, criticisms and future prospects of an emergent paradigm. *Ecological Economics*, 69: 1741-1747.

Alier-Martinez, et al. 2010. *ibid*.

Arnsperger, C. and Varoufakis. 2018. The first axiom of Neo-classical Economics: Methodological Individualism. *Real-world Economics Review* blog, [rwer.wordpress.com](http://rwer.wordpress.com).

Arrow, K.J. 1951. Mathematical models in social sciences. *In* M. Broadbeck, ed., *Readings in the Philosophy of social sciences*. New York: Macmillan: 635-67 (from Udhen, Lars. 2002. The Changing Face of Methodological Individualism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 28: 479-507).

Barkin, David. 2019. Conviviality. *In* Ashish Kothari et al., ed., *Pluriverse, A post Development Dictionary*, pp.136-139. op. cit.

Basu, Kaushik. 2008. Methodological individualism. *In* S.N. Durlauf and L.E. Blume, eds., *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. Palgrave Macmillan (a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited).

Basu, Ratanlal. 2000. Magnificent man in quest of ethics. *In* Ajit Kr. Sinha and Rajkumar Sen, eds., *Economics of Amartya Sen*. New Delhi: Deep and Deep Publications.

Blauwhof, F.B. 2012. Overcoming accumulation: Is a capitalist steady-state economy possible?. *Ecological Economics*, 84: 254-261.

Blauwhof. *ibid.*

Barker, Colin and Michael Lavalette. 2015. Welfare changes and social movements. In Dantella Della Porta and Mario Diani, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*, pp 711-728. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Burton, M and Somerville. 2019. Degrowth: A Defense. *New Left Review* 115, Second Series, January-February: 95-104.

Bruton, M and Somerville. 2019. *ibid.*

Burbach, R, M. Fox, and F. Fuentes. 2013. *Latin America's Turbulent Transitions, The Future of Twenty-First-Century Socialism*. London: Zed Books.

Capra, Fritjof and Hazel. Handerson. 2009. Qualitative growth: A conceptual framework for finding solutions to our current crisis that are economically sound, ecologically sustainable, and socially just, pp.35-47, 10.1057/9781137468208. In Michael Pirson, Ulrich Steinvorth, Carlos Largacha-Martinez and Claus Dierksmeier, eds., *Capitalistic to Humanistic Business*, copyright material from [www.palgraveconnect.com](http://www.palgraveconnect.com).

Capra, Fritjof. 1996. System theory and the new paradigm. In Merchant Charolyn, ed., *Key concepts in critical theory ecology* (ed.), pp. 334-341. Jaipur and New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Chakrabarti, Anjan, Anup. Dhar, and Serap. A. Kayatekin. 2016. 'Editors Introduction' to the Special Issue on Marxism and Spirituality. *Journal of Economics, Culture and Society*, Vol.28, Issue, 3-4, July-October: pp.339-353. Published online: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08935696.2016-1243415>.

Chuji, Mo'nica, Grimaldo. Rengifo, Eduardo. Gudynas. 2019, Buen Vivir. In *Pluriverse, A Post-Development Dictionary*. op.cit.

Ci'sar', ondr'ej. 2015. Social movements in political science. In Donatella Della Porta and Mario Diani, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Social Movements*, pp.50-67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Club of Rome Report. 1972. Limits to growth. *Wikipedia*.

Daly, Hirman. E. 1991. *Steady – State Economics*. Island Press: Washington, DC., (from Foster, John. Bellamy. 2011. Capitalism and degrowth - An impossibility theorem. *Analytical Monthly Review*, January, Vol. 8, No. 10).

Dhawale, Ashok. 2018. Remarkable farmers' struggles in India: Some notes from Maharashtra and Rajasthan. *Agrarian South: Journal of Political Economy*, Vol.7, No.2, August: 257-274.

Easterlin, R.A., L. A. Mcvey, M. Switek, O. Sawangfa, and J.S. Zweig. 2010. The happiness income paradox revisited. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 107, 22463-22468 (from Kallis, Giorgos, Christian. Kerschner, and Joan. Alier-Martinez. 2012. The Economics of Degrowth. *Ecological Economics*, xxx-xxx, p.3 of pp.1-9).

Engels, Frederick. 1880. Socialism, utopian and scientific: Chapter 3. *Historical Materialism*. [Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/cha3.htm](http://Marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1880/soc-utop/cha3.htm).

Esteva, G. 2019. *Autonomy. Pluriverse*, pp. 99-101. op.cit.

Ekin, Paul. 1986. *The Living Economy, A New Economics in the Making*. London and New York: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Foster, John. Bellamy. 2013. Marx and the rift in the universal metabolism in nature. *Analytical Monthly Review*, Vol. 11, No. 9: 1-19.

Foster, John. Bellamy. 2011. Capitalism and degrowth - An impossibility theorem. *Analytical Monthly Review*, January, Vol. 8, No. 10.

Foster, James. Bellamy. 2011. Ibid.

Foster, James. Bellamy. 2011. Ibid.

Foster, James. Bellamy. 2011. Ibid.

Fotopoulos, Takis. 2010. The end of traditional anti-systemic movements and the need for a new type of anti-systemic movement today. Published online July 1. <http://doi.org/10.1080/10855660120092302>, pp. 1-77 (First published in *Democracy and Nature*, Vol. 7, 2001, Issue 3).

Friedman, Thomas. 2005. *The world is flat: A brief history of the globalized world in the 21<sup>st</sup> century*. London: Penguin.

Gudyuas, Eduardo. 2011. Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow. *Development*, 54(4): 441-447.

Gudyas, Edurado. 2011. Ibid.

Hodgson, Geoffery. M. 2007. Meanings of methodological individualism. *Journal of Economic Methodology*, June, Vol. 14, Issue 2.

Honneth, Axel. 2015. *Die Idee Sozialismus*. Frankfurt: Suhrkamp.

Jahanbegloo, Ramin. 2017. *The Decline of Civilization*. New Delhi: Aleph Book Company.

Jime'nez, R. 2011. Recovering and valuing other Ethical Pillars Buen Vivir. Working Paper for the International Workshop on *Biocivilization for the sustainability of life and the planet*. Held at Rio De Janeiro, August 9-12.

Johnson, Eric. Michael. 2013. How cooperatives are driving the new economy. [www.yesmagazine.org](http://www.yesmagazine.org), May 4, Economics economics.com/cooperatives-new-economy-eric-michael-johnson.

Johnson, Eric. Michael. 2013. op.cit.

Kauffman, S. A. 1995. *At home in the Universe: the search for the laws of self-organization and complexity*. Harmondsworth: Penguin, (from Morrison, K. 2005. Structuration theory: Habituas and complexity theory: elective affinities or old wine in new bottles?. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, Vol. 26, No. 3: 311-326.

Kawano, Emily. 2018. Solidarity Economy, Building an Economy for People and Planet, May 1: 1-39. [thenextsystem.org/learn/stories/solidarity-building-economy-people-planet](http://thenextsystem.org/learn/stories/solidarity-building-economy-people-planet).

Kawano, Emily. 2018. *ibid*.

Kolasi, E. 2019. Energy, economic growth and ecological crisis. *Analytical Monthly Review*, June: 31-42.

Kolasi, E. 2019. *ibid*.

Korsch, Karl. 1938. Productive forces and production relations in Karl Marx: Chapter 5: 145-156. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004272200\\_025](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004272200_025).

Korsch, Karl. 1938. *ibid*.

Kothari, A., A. Salleh, A. Escobar, F. Demaria,, A. Acosta, eds. 2019. *Pluriverse, A Post Development Dictionary* .New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Kumbamu, A. 2009. Subaltern strategies and autonomous community building: a critical analysis of the network organization of sustainable agriculture initiatives in Andhra Pradesh. *Oxford University Press and Community Development Journal*, Vol. 44, No. 3 July: 336-350.

Lebowitz, Michael. 2017. Human Potential and Productivity. *Analytical Monthly Review*, Vol. 15, No. 8, November.

Lin den, Van der. 2017. Is capitalism's collapse coming? (Review essay). *Development and Change*, 98 (1): 180-188 (The book under review is, Harvey, David. 2015. *Seventeen contradictions and the end of capitalism*. London: Profile Books).

Marcuse, P. 2015. Co-operatives on the path of socialism?. *Analytical Monthly Review*, Vol. 112, No. 11: 30-37.

Mazhar, Farhad. 2019. Nayakrishi Andolon. *Pluriverse*, op.cit, pp. 247-250.

Me'sz'oras, Istvan. 2017. Capital's historic circle in closing - the challenge for secure exit. *Analytical Monthly Review*, Vol. 15, No. 9.

Me'sza'ros, Istvan. 2008. The communal system and the principles of self-critique. *Monthly Review*, 59 (10).



Menger, C. 1883. *Investigations into the method of the social sciences with special reference to economics* (English Translation). New York: New York University Press.

(1986 edition). (From Basu, Kaushik. 2008. Methodological individualism. In S.N. Durlauf and L.E. Blume, eds., *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Economics*. Palgrave Macmillan, a division of Macmillan Publishers Limited).

Mignolo, Walter D. 2011. Epistemic disobedience and the decolonial option: A manifesto. *Trans modernity: Journal of Peripheral Cultural Production of the Luso-Hispanic World*, 1(2). <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/62j3w283>.

Mingnolo, Walter D. *ibid.*

Miszoras, Istavan. 2017. Capital's historic circle is closing - The challenge for secure exit. *op.cit.*

Negri, A. 1984. *Marx beyond Marx: Lessons on the Grundrisse*. New York: Bergen and Gravy.

Negri, A, 2005. Domination and Sabotage: On the Marxist method of social transformation. In A, Negri, ed., *Books for Burning: Between Civil War and Democracy in 1970's Italy*. London: Verso.

Nilsen, Alf Gunvald. 2007. On new social movements, and The reinvention of India. *Forum for Development Studies*, 2.

O'Connor, James. 1988. *Natural Causes Essays in Ecological Marxism (Chapter 5)*, pp. 1-114. New York, London: Guilford Press.

O'Connor, James. 1988. *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism. ibid.*

O'Connor, James. 1994. The second contradiction of capitalism. *Capitalism, Nature and Socialism*, 5(4): 105-114.

O'Connor, James. 1988. op. cit.

Orrell, David. 2010. *Ten ways economics gets it wrong*. Canada: Wiley, John Wiley and Sons Ltd.

Peet, Richard and Hartwick. 2010. *Theories of Development, Contentions, Arguments, Alternatives* (Second edition, Indian Reprints). Jaipur, New Delhi: Rawat Publications.

Polanyi, Karl. 1944. *The Great Transformation - The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Popper, K.R. 1957, 1961. *The poverty of Historicism*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul (from Uden, Lars, 2002. The changing face of methodological individualism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 28: 479-507.

Prayukvong, Wanna. 2005. A Buddhist economic approach to the development of community enterprises: A case study from Southern Thailand. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 29: 1171-1185 (doi: 10,1093/cje/bei071).

Prechter, Jr. and R. Robert. 2003. Pioneering studies in socio-economics. In GA. Gainesville, ed. USA: New Classic Library (From Parker, Wayne. D. 2006. Methodological Individualism vs. Methodological Holism: Neoclassicism, Institutionalism and Socio-economic Theory: pp.1-15. [waynep@socioeconomic.org](mailto:waynep@socioeconomic.org)

Petras, James and Henry. Velteyer. 2005. *Social movements and state power: Argentina, Brazil, Bolivia, Ecuador*. London: Pluto Press.

Quintin, Hoare and Geoffrey. Nowell-Smith. (eds. and trans.). 1971. *Antonio Gramsci: Selections from the prison notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.

Ray, Sunil. 2012. Economics of solidarity: Economics of the 21<sup>st</sup> century. *Economic and Political Weekly*, June 16, Vol. XLVII, No. 24: 39-48.

Ray, Sunil, N. Chaudhary, and R. Kumar. 2020. *Theorizing Cohesive Development: An Alternative Paradigm*. New York: Routledge.

Rilling, J, D. Gutman, J. Zeh. G. Pagnoni. G. Berns, C. Kitts. 2002. A neural basis for social cooperation. *Neuron*, July 18; 35(2): 395-405 (From Kawano, Emily. 2018. op.cit).

Roughgarden, Joan, 2009. *The genial gene: Deconstructing Darwinian selfishness*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press (From Kawano, Emily. 2018. *Building an Economy for People and Planet*. op.cit., p. 9).

Sanghi, Ashwin. 2020. Quantum theories of ideas where two seemingly opinions can behave as an inseparable whole. *The Times of India*, March 9.

Schumpeter, Joseph. A. 1909. On the concept of social value. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 23(2), February: 213-232 (From Hodgson, Geoffrey. M. 2007. Meanings of Methodological Individualism. *Journal in the Economic Methodology*, Vol. 14, No. 2).

Smith, R. 2010. Beyond growth or beyond capitalism. *Real-World Economic Review*, 53: 28-42 (From Blauwhof, F.B. 2012. Overcoming accumulation: Is a capitalist steady-state economy possible?. *Ecological Economics*, 84: 254-261).

Solano, X.L. 2019. Zapatista Autonomy. In Ashish Kothari, et al., eds., *Pluriverse: Post Development Dictionary*, pp. 335-338. New Delhi: Tulika Books.

Solow, Robert. M. 1974. The economics of resources or the resources of economics. *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 64, No. 2, May 1974: 1-14.

Stahler-Sholk, Richard. 2000. A world in which many worlds fit. *Zapatista Responses to Globalization*, April, [researchgate.net/publication/228713180\\_a\\_world\\_in\\_which\\_many\\_worlds\\_fit-zapatista\\_responses\\_to\\_globalization](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/228713180_a_world_in_which_many_worlds_fit-zapatista_responses_to_globalization).

Stahler-Sholk, Richard. 2010. The Zapatistas social movement: Innovation and sustainability. *Alternatives: Global, Local, Political*, 35(3), July: 269-290.

Stanford Encyclopedia. 2013. Biological Altruism. (It was first published during June 3, 2003. However, it underwent substantial revision in July, 2013) *Standard Encyclopedia of Philosophy Plato*. Stanford. [ed/entries/altruism-biological/](https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/altruism-biological/) pp. 1-20.

Streeck, Wolfgang. 2017. *How will capitalism end?*. New Delhi: Juggernaut Books.

Trivers, Robert. L. 1971. The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *The Quarterly Review of Biology*, Vol. 46, No. (March, 1971): 35-57.

Trivers, 1971. *ibid.*

Udehen, Lars. 2002. The changing face of methodological individualism. *Annual Review of Sociology*, Vol. 28: 479-507.

Valentinov, Vladislav. 2008. Non-market institutions in economic development: The role of the third sector. *Development and Change*, 39(3): 477-485.

Valentinev, Vladislav, 2008. *ibid.*

Villalba, U. 2013. Buen Vivir vs. Development: A paradigm shift in the Andes?. *Third World Quarterly*, Vol. 34, No. 8: 1427-1442.

Villalba, U. 2013. *ibid.*

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2014. Anti-systemic movements, yesterday and today. Keynote address delivered at *the World-System Conference*, April 10, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, copyright@2014, American Sociological Association, Vol. 29, No. 2: pp. 158-172.

Wallerstein, Immanuel. 2014. *ibid.*

Walsh, Catherine. 2010. Development as Buen Vivir: Institutional arrangements and (de) colonial entanglements. *Development*, 53(1): 15-21.

Watkins, J. 1952. The principle of methodological individualism. *British Journal for Philosophy of Science*, 3: 186-89 (from Basu, Kaushik. op.cit, p. 590).

Weiss, Martin and Claudio. Cattaneo. 2017. Degrowth - Taking stock and reviewing an emerging academic paradigm. *Ecological Economics*, 137: 220-230.

Wright, Cheri, 2019. Marxism and the solidarity economy. *Regeneration*, [regeneratingmag.org/ Marxism-and-the-solidarity-economy/](http://regeneratingmag.org/Marxism-and-the-solidarity-economy/) pp. 1-14.

Wikipedia. mode of production [en.wikipedia.org/wiki/mode\\_of\\_production](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/mode_of_production) (Wright, Cheri. 2019. op.cit.)

Wikipedia. Degrowth: [En.Wikipedia.org/wiki/degrowth](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/degrowth).

Wendt, Alexander. 2014-15. An interview regarding his book on *Quantum Mind and Social Science: Unifying Physics and Social Ontology*, Merston Center for International Security Studies, The Ohio State University, [mershoncenter.osu.edu/research-project-directory/quantum-mind-and-social-science-unifying-physical-and-social-ontology](http://mershoncenter.osu.edu/research-project-directory/quantum-mind-and-social-science-unifying-physical-and-social-ontology).

Zizek, Slavoj. 2017. *The courage of hopelessness*. Great Britain, UK: Penguin Random House.

## I. P. Desai Memorial Lecture Series

1. Ramkrishna Mukherjee, *I.P. Desai and Sociology of India* (1986).
2. A.R. Desai, *Rural Development and Human Rights of the Agrarian Poor in Independent India* (1987).
3. Yogendra Singh, *Social Processes and Dimensions of Indian Nationalism* (1988).
4. M.S. Gore, *Social Movements and the Paradigm of Functional Analysis* (1989).
5. Rajni Kothari, *Social Policy, Development and Democracy* (1990).
6. A.M. Shah, *The Judicial and Sociological View of the Other Backward Classes* (1992).
7. Y.B. Damle, *Theory, Rhetoric and Social Reality* (1993).
8. Jan Breman, *Labour Nomads in South Gujarat* (1994).
9. Krishna Ahooja-Patel, *Towards a New Social Order in India* (1996).
10. Suma Chitnis, *The Crisis in Higher Education* (1997).
11. Krishna Kumar, *Education and Society in Post-Independence India - Looking Towards the Future* (1998).
12. D.L. Sheth, *Knowledge, Power and Action: Challenges Facing the Grassroots Movements for Alternative Development* (1999).
13. Victor S. D'Souza, *Indian Family at the Crossroads* (2000).
14. N.R. Sheth, *Reflections on Religion as Social Capital* (2001).
15. D.N. Pathak, *Peace and Security in the 21st Century* (2002).
16. Brij Raj Chauhan, *The Fieldwork Tradition in Sociology* (2004).
17. B.S. Baviskar, *Women's Empowerment through Local Governance in South Asia* (2005).
18. D.N. Dhanagare, *Practising Sociology Through History – The Indian Experience* (2006).
19. Upendra Baxi, *Animal Rights as Companion Human Rights* (2008).
20. Sukhadeo Thorat, *On Social Exclusion Addressing Inter-Social Group, Graded and Multiple-Group Inequalities through Inclusive Policy* (2009).
21. Dipankar Gupta, *Translating Growth into Development: Sociology and the Quest for a Desired Type of Society* (2011).
22. Sudhir Chandra, *Gandhi: Rethinking the Possibility of Non-Violence* (2012).
23. V.S. Vyas, *Reaching the Unreached: To Make Poverty Alleviation Programmes More Effective* (2013).
24. David Hardiman, *Nonviolent Resistance in India 1915-1947* (2014).
25. Lord Bhikhu Parekh, *The Cultural Constraints of Indian Democracy* (2015).
26. Sujata Patel, *The Challenge of Doing Social Sciences Today* (2016).
27. Pradip Kumar Bose, *Population, Statistics and Governmentality* (2018).
28. Gopal Guru, *Do Concepts Have An Address?: A Methodological Inquiry* (2020).

**Centre for Social Studies, Surat (CSS)** is an autonomous social science research institute. With a focus on understanding processes of development, CSS is dedicated to the study of Indian society with a firm belief that this can contribute to the social transformation.

Founded by late Professor I.P. Desai in 1969 as the Centre for Regional Development Studies, CSS receives financial support from the Indian Council of Social Science Research (ICSSR, Government of India) and the Department of Higher and Technical Education, Government of Gujarat. A multi-disciplinary institute, CSS formulates ideas, undertakes empirical studies, theorizes and disseminates knowledge through training and publications in vernacular and English languages.

With an emphasis on empirical research and Gujarat as its core research region, Centre also undertakes studies related to other parts of the country. The key areas of research in CSS include marginalized communities, social justice, civil society, women, labour, land, rural credit, migration, culture and conflict, urban landscapes, public health, education, governance, arts, literature, and environment and resources. Theoretical contributions of CSS have been well-recognised in the fields of social stratification, agrarian relations, social movements, sociology of education, dalits and tribes, and development studies.

**Prof. Sunil Ray** (Ph.D., Economics) has served as the Director of A. N. Sinha Institute of Social Studies, Patna. Prior to that, he was Dean, School of Social Sciences and Head, Centre for Economic Studies and Policy at the Central University of South Bihar. He was Professor of Economics at the Institute of Development Studies, Jaipur, and has taught at National Institute of Rural Development, Hyderabad, Institute for Social and Economic Change, Bangalore, and was a visiting fellow at the Institute of Development Studies, Sussex (UK) and Institute of Oriental Studies (Russia). Besides, he visited several countries on international assignment. He was awarded senior fellowship by Government of Germany at Max Weber Stiftung (ICAS MP), to work on alternative development paradigm. Professor Ray has 35 years of experience in research and teaching in the field of environmental economics, political economy of development, rural development and institutional economics. He was part of the review mission team of the European Commission and has worked on several consulting assignments with the World Bank and other international organizations. His papers have been published in reputed national and international journals, such as EPW, International Journal of Ecological Economics, Asian Survey, Savings and Development, Capitalism, Nature and Socialism, and edited volumes of OUP and Sage Publications. He has authored several books including *Industrial Growth and Protection in India (1988)*; *Natural Resources, Organization and Technology Linkages (1997)*; *Agricultural Services and the Poor* (co-authored) (1999); *Management of Natural Resources: Institutions for Sustainable Livelihood (2008)*; and *Theorizing cohesive development an alternative Paradigm* (co-ed.) (2020).