

Ten principles for transforming economics in a time of global crises

In the format provided by the
authors and unedited

Results with sources

Table S1. Overview of new economics approaches and principles emphasized in the sources analyzed. An asterisk (*) denotes ‘hybrid’ approaches that bridge conventional and new economics. Principles: 1: Social-ecological embeddedness and holistic wellbeing; 2: Interdisciplinarity and complexity thinking; 3: Limits to growth; 4: Limited substitutability of natural capital; 5: Regenerative design; 6: Holistic perspectives of people and values; 7: Equity, equality, and justice; 8: Relationality and social enfranchisement; 9: Participation, deliberation, and cooperation; 10: Post-capitalism and decolonization.

		Principles										Main sources
		Holistic		Ecological			Social		Political economy			
Type of approach	Approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Schools of economics	Behavioral economics*		✓				✓					1–5
	Complexity economics*		✓									6–10
	Ecological economics	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		11–15
	Feminist economics	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓		16–20
	Institutional economics		✓					✓		✓		21–25
	Post-Keynesian economics		✓	✓	✓	✓						26–30
Economic perspectives	Agrowth			✓	✓		✓					31–33
	Bioeconomy*			✓		✓						34–38
	Caring economics	✓						✓	✓			39–42
	Circular economy*				✓	✓						43–47
	Cosmolocalism		✓			✓			✓	✓	✓	48–52
	Degrowth	✓		✓	✓	✓		✓	✓		✓	53–57
	Deliberative economics				✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		58–62
	Doughnut economics	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				63–66
	Ecological feminist economics	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓	67–71
	Economic democracy			✓			✓	✓	✓		✓	72–76
	Fair markets	✓					✓				✓	77–80,41
	Flourishing economics	✓		✓	✓		✓					81–85
	Foundational economy	✓			✓			✓	✓			51,86–89
	Living economy	✓		✓				✓	✓			90–93

		Principles										Main sources
		Holistic		Ecological			Social		Political economy			
Type of approach	Approach	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
	New municipalism	✓							✓	✓		51,94–97
	New progressivism	✓					✓	✓	✓			98,99
	Post-capitalism	✓					✓		✓	✓	✓	100–102
	Post-development						✓	✓	✓		✓	103–107
	Post-growth			✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			108–110,101,51
	Responsible/natural capitalism*	✓					✓		✓		✓	80,111–114
	Sharing economy*			✓		✓	✓		✓			115–118
	Solidarity economy							✓	✓	✓		119–123
	Steady-state economics	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓				56,124–127
	Wellbeing economy	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓		✓			128–132
	World system theory		✓						✓			9,133–135
Broad societal perspectives	Buen vivir	✓			✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	136–140
	Christian humanistic/relational perspectives	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	141–144
	Comanche philosophy†	✓			✓				✓	✓		145
	Enlivenment	✓		✓		✓	✓		✓			146–149
	Kaitiakitanga	✓		✓			✓			✓	✓	150–153
	Sumak kawsay	✓			✓		✓		✓		✓	140,154,155
	Ubuntu	✓					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	156–159

† Only a single appropriate source was identified for Comanche philosophy.

Holistic principles

Two ‘holistic’ principles point out that economies are part of societies, which in turn are embedded in wider nature. Principle 1 calls on economists to ‘*Recognize that economies are embedded within societies and ecosystems, and that the basic purpose of economics is to support human and planetary wellbeing.*’ Many approaches focus directly on integrating long-term environmental, social, and economic value, arguing that economics is fundamentally normative^{82,160} and all economic relations are social-ecological relations^{9,68,145,150,156}. Wellbeing is conceived as embedded in these relationships, with human and planetary wellbeing interdependent^{63,81,145,151}. An explicit goal is to align economic welfare with planetary wellbeing, recognizing critical constraints like social capital (e.g., caring and trust essential to healthy communities), Earth’s life-supporting systems, cultural principles that regulate relations between people and nature, intergenerational equity, and social-ecological resilience^{65,133,134,142,145,151,153,156,161}.

The second holistic principle, ‘*Acknowledge complexity and the need for interdisciplinarity in addressing economic problems*,’ points out the need for economists and policymakers to integrate diverse scientific, humanities, and local and indigenous knowledge. Economies are complex, adaptive systems^{9,118,133,134}. Conventional neoclassical models reduce real-world complexity to an abstract set of production and consumption measures¹⁶², which narrows possibilities and can drive problematic policy outcomes, e.g., in addressing highly complex problems such as climate change¹²⁷. Many approaches thus advocate complexity-based, non-linear, integrated social-ecological perspectives, acknowledging interdependencies and dynamics within and between natural and social systems^{81,133,134,163}, to underpin more holistic economic, social and environmental policies^{6,164}.

Ecological principles

Building on the holistic principles of embeddedness and complexity, many approaches are grounded in ecological understanding. Regardless of innovation, economic activity (products and services) always draws on natural resources^{43,62}. Principle 3 encourages economists and policymakers to ‘*Acknowledge that economies have fundamental biophysical and biochemical limits to growth*’. It recognizes that economies are inherently constrained by earth systems^{46,65,165}. Bio- and circular economic approaches reframes the relationships between economies and earth systems as metabolic processes: the conversion of matter and energy, and generation and recycling of material flows⁴⁶. Because metabolic processes are never completely efficient, growth has fundamental limits¹⁶⁵. While circular economy perspectives mostly focus on decoupling growth and environmental impacts, steady-state, degrowth, post-growth, and many ecological economists consider that decoupling alone is insufficient to address the climate and nature emergencies^{38,54,56,108,110,128}. They argue that ecological constraints require: worldviews, models and policy frameworks at local, national, and global scales that explicitly recognize, assess, and integrate planetary boundaries and societal metabolism^{64–66,81,83,146,161,166}; limiting affluence, particularly in the global north^{81,167}; holistic, wellbeing-based indicators to measure progress rather than GDP^{168–171}; and reducing inequality^{65,130,167,172,173}.

Principle 4 asks economists and policymakers to ‘*Recognize that human-derived capital depends on nature*’. Conventional economic thinking is primarily concerned with outputs⁸, maintaining that when one form of capital input is diminished, another can replace it^{26,44}. This perspective is strongly challenged. For example, post-Keynesian economists reject direct substitutability of resources in aggregate production functions¹⁷⁴, while circular and ecological economists emphasize inherent connections between natural resource consumption and production through societal metabolic processes^{46,165}. This principle thus strongly advocates nature and resource conservation, including preservation of biodiversity and the climate system^{15,46,47}, and diverse social innovations for environmental stewardship like multi-scale networking between businesses, neighborhoods, and cities to manage resources^{44,47}.

Principle 5, ‘*Design economic systems to be circular and regenerative*,’ reflects the design implications of ecological limits and embeddedness. Circular economy approaches focus on generating value by reducing material and energy use per unit of output and maximizing resource regeneration^{175,176}. Sharing economy thinking takes this further by looking to manufacturers, retailers, and co-operatives to act as service providers by supplying the use rather than consumption of products^{45,115,117}. Doughnut economics adds social boundaries to the circular economy, shifting the emphasis to social-ecological regeneration^{64,64,66}. Flourishing economics emphasizes long-term socioecological benefits generated through collaborations between business and public policy within bioregions^{83,177}. Perspectives such as wellbeing and living economies highlight the importance of designing community-based living infrastructures that generate security, stability, and productivity, and decentralise decision-making^{90,128,129}. Many approaches recognise the importance of resilient circular and local economies and supply chains, especially in terms of basic needs like food and energy, to minimise waste, ‘humanise’ productive activities, and improve resource security^{8,48,51,94}.

Social principles

Through its social principles, many approaches explicitly consider the relational and societal implications of economic practices. Principle 6, *'Embed pluralistic models of values and behavior, based on wellbeing, dignity, sufficiency, and holistic freedom, in all economic thinking, decisions, and actions,'* spells out these social needs and implications. Institutions like monetary systems, markets, valuation methods, and economic education have 'meta-values'¹⁷⁸ embedded in their design that determine what values are privileged in decisions^{24,178,179}. This principle thus recognizes the need to embed more relational and sustainability-aligned values in institutional models, e.g., through inclusive community approaches to manage common pool resources and deliberative democratic approaches to social-economic valuation^{23,61,180}. This principle also invites retirement of the conventional view of *homo economicus* as a self-interested maximizing agent^{7,23,64,181}. Instead, it recognizes the sociobiological reality that humans are diversely motivated, and that values and behavior are grounded in social relationships. It resonates with concepts like humanistic management¹²¹ and *homo integralis*¹⁸², expressing people's wholeness and environmental embeddedness^{18,67,181,183}. Holistic freedom here balances 'negative' freedom from constraints, such as free enterprise¹⁶², with 'positive' freedoms to be and do what is intrinsically valuable, such as being educated and participating in community life^{184,185}. This understanding encourages interventions focused on needs and capabilities, emphasizing dignity and sufficiency over unconstrained preference satisfaction^{138,186}.

Economics has traditionally focused on growth and efficiency as central goals^{127,165,187}. This is reflected in many economic and political institutions¹⁰⁹. Principle 7, *'Consider equity, equality, and justice as central questions of economic inquiry,'* explicitly challenges this emphasis and its association with 'trickle down' theory in economic policy, with global wealth inequality persistently increasing in recent decades^{170,188}, despite decreases in between-country income inequality¹³⁵. Approaches such as wellbeing economics and economic democracy point out that not just poverty, but also inequality undermine wellbeing, including for the better off^{130,131,173}. Equality, equity, and justice are strongly emphasized by feminist and indigenous economists, advocating rights for social and cultural groups suppressed by conventional economic systems^{18,70,145,157}. Caring and feminist economics approaches challenge the gendered nature of economic relations, exposing assumptions concerning women's paid and unpaid labour in relation to social reproduction^{18–20,39,69,189,190}. Sen's capabilities framework and its extensions also constitutes an important conceptual lens, redefining progress and development to better integrate social justice^{16,184,185,191}. Concepts of environmental justice link environmental impacts and social-economic equality^{192,193}. With growth constrained by earth systems (Principle 3), fair distribution is an urgent environmental matter^{167,172}. Ecological economists thus propose a new hierarchy of concerns, where sustainable scale, equitable distribution, and social-ecological resilience precede efficiency^{11,12,14,15,166}.

Political economy principles

The fourth set of principles expresses ways to reshape the political economy to support inclusion and participation. Principle 8, *'Embrace pluralistic social and relational approaches that support social enfranchisement, social needs, and the common good,'* encourages more central integration of relational worldviews and values like care, community, love, and reciprocity into economic thinking and policy^{39,68,142,145,190,194}. Proponents generally see important roles for the state and civil society in securing economic and socio-relational priorities^{23,86,90,94,114} and universal access to basic services^{65,166}. Approaches such as foundational⁸⁶, caring⁴⁰, and diverse indigenous economics^{145,152,153,158} advocate repurposing businesses and financial systems to ensure long-run social and ecological value, overcoming narrow emphases on short term surplus generation and adapting more relational models of corporate leadership and new structures of accountability towards stakeholders¹¹¹. This also requires more holistic and integrated evaluation and reporting, including metrics that recognise the profound value of unpaid care work, and environmental benefits and damages^{39,40,70,132,194}.

Conventionally, economics has emphasized modelling and analytical, data-driven methods. Several approaches expand their scope to recognise complex systems and incorporate coupled ecological economic models^{7,58,187,195,196}. Principle 9, *'Embed participation, deliberation, and cooperation as core to economic thinking and policy,'* advocates integrating analytical approaches with more inclusive social processes in research and policy. It is not possible to fully separate analytical from normative research when considering complex systems. Any choice of technical parameters is ultimately value-based^{6,163} and

conflicts between values cannot be fully resolved through optimization but must be democratically deliberated^{62,94,197} through methodologies like participatory action research, participatory systems modelling, and deliberative valuation^{58,62,190,197,198}. In relation to policy, deliberative economic approaches envisage an active role for citizens participating and cooperating to improve their quality of life^{62,72}, and advocate for the rights of workers and others affected by economic policies to have genuine opportunities to participate in decisions⁷³. New municipalism and cosmocalism focus on institutionalising participative platforms and practices involving collaborations among citizens, municipalities, and other levels of governance, and through effective cooperative institutions serving local economic development needs^{48,49,94–97}. While cooperative perspectives have received some scepticism in conventional economics²⁵, institutional and feminist economists have pointed them out as common practice, benefiting sustainability, productivity, and equality^{20,22,199}.

Finally, Principle 10, ‘*Take post-capitalist, decolonized economic perspectives*,’ underpins diverse models and applications that disrupt conventional relationships between capital and labor, with particular regard for the views of marginalized and previously colonized peoples. Concepts of production conventionally build on labour-capital dichotomies and the concentration of power and capital^{100,115}, reflected in the post-colonial export of Western mass consumption lifestyles to the Global South. Decolonization and postcapitalism are thus linked in their analyses of ‘unmaking’ colonial and capitalist institutional configurations²⁰⁰. Rather than providing a single ideological post-capitalist blueprint, diverse approaches, applications, and perspectives on markets and monetary and financial systems are advocated^{26,31,77,100,117}. At the microeconomic scale, sharing economy and post-capitalist approaches envisage economic practices based on new technologies and a reduced need for labour^{100,115,116}, including new currencies that embed social and ecological values, communal ownership, new forms of cooperatives, and online networking spaces to promote non-profit forms of work and address labour mobility, empower disadvantaged individuals and support capabilities^{41,100,117}. Cosmocalism envisages collaborations between globally connected citizens and grassroots movements to transform consumption-production regimes through digital innovation, strengthening both local, social-ecologically embedded economies, and global citizenship and multilateralism^{48–50,52}. At the macroscale, degrowth, post-growth, ecological, steady-state and post-Keynesian economics provide new analytical tools in areas like monetary and physical input-output and system dynamics modelling^{26,38,55,108,126,196}, while post-development theory affirms cultural diversity^{103,145,150}, aligns new economics with indigenous philosophies^{145,150}, promotes democracy^{103,136,140}, and provides social spaces for conflict resolution and social protocols associated with reciprocity and respect for nature^{145,150}.

In summary, these ten principles explicitly shift attention in economic thinking and policy towards holism, heterodoxy, plurality, interdisciplinarity, equity, wellbeing, participation, and aligning economic activities with natural systems. They recognize the context-specificity of institutions, values, and culture, and the need for relational and complexity-based thinking to achieve inclusive and just transformation towards sustainability.

Approaches and Principles

In the sources assessed, the most emphasized principles included relationality and social enfranchisement (n=25 approaches), holistic perspectives of people and values (n=24), and holistic wellbeing and social-ecological embeddedness (n=23) (Table 1). Transformative approaches expressed three to ten principles each, and hybrid approaches two to four (Table 1). Christian relational perspectives (n=10), ecological and ecological feminist economics, and degrowth (each n=8) were characterized by most principles. Along with *sumak kawsay*, *buen vivir*, and foundational and wellbeing economy, those approaches were also associated with at least one principle in each of the holistic, ecological, social, and political economy groupings.

We identified four groups of approaches in terms of the principles they emphasized (Table 1). A group of mainly economic perspectives (economic democracy, deliberative economics, new municipalism, new progressivism, post-development, world system theory) emphasize social and political principles, focusing on questions of democracy, participation, cooperation, deliberation, and decolonization^{72,73,94,98}.

A second, larger cluster also mostly consists of economic perspectives (flourishing economics, wellbeing economy, doughnut economics, degrowth, agrowth, ecological economics, circular economy, steady state economics, cosmocalism and post-growth). These approaches have a strong focus on

ecological limits and the scale of the economy and often also frame social and political economy questions within the contexts of earth systems^{11,14,32,33,38,49,63,165,201}. *Buen vivir*, enlivenment, and Christian humanistic and relational perspectives overlap with this cluster whilst also linking to the next^{136–139,141,142,146,148}.

A third cluster consists of a wide range of economic and broader societal perspectives (institutional, caring, and feminist economics, responsible capitalism, solidarity, foundational and sharing economy, *buen vivir*, *sumak kawsay*, *ubuntu*, *kaitiakitanga*, enlivenment, Christian humanistic and relational perspectives) that emphasize social and political economic issues such as power, justice, and equity, and often link these with relationality, quality of life and human dignity^{16,18,20,23,86,87,117,120,136–142,146,148,157,202–204}.

The final, smallest cluster consists of schools of economics and economic perspectives (fair markets, and behavioral, complexity, post-Keynesianism and post-capitalist economics) that critically develop mainstream economic knowledge and themes, elaborating on issues like growth and development, business values, fairness in markets and economies, wealth and distribution, and behavior^{1,2,6,7,26,77,100,195,205}.

References

1. Thaler, R. H. Behavioral Economics: Past, Present, and Future. *American Economic Review* **106**, 1577–1600 (2016).
2. Sent, E.-M. Behavioral Economics: How Psychology Made Its (Limited) Way Back Into Economics. *History of Political Economy* **36**, 735–760 (2004).
3. Kahneman, D. *Thinking, Fast and Slow*. (Allen Lane, London, 2011).
4. DellaValle, N. People’s decisions matter: understanding and addressing energy poverty with behavioral economics. *Energy and Buildings* **204**, 109515 (2019).
5. Thaler, R. H. & Sunstein, C. R. *Nudge: Improving Decisions about Health, Wealth, and Happiness*. (Penguin, 2009).
6. Arthur, W. B. Complexity Economics: A Different Framework for Economic Thought. *CFA Digest* **43**, dig.v43.n4.70 (2013).
7. Arthur, W. B. Complexity and the Economy. *Science* **284**, 107–109 (1999).
8. Max-Neef, M. The World on a Collision Course and the Need for a New Economy. *Ambio* **39**, 200–210 (2010).
9. Chase-Dunn, C. & Hall, T. D. Ecological Degradation and the Evolution of World-Systems. *Journal of World-Systems Research* 403–431 (1997) doi:10.5195/jwsr.1997.100.
10. Colander, D., Holt, R. & Rosser Jr., B. The changing face of mainstream economics. *Review of Political Economy* **16**, 485–499 (2004).

11. Faber, M. How to be an ecological economist. *Ecol. Econ.* **66**, 1–7 (2008).
12. ISEE. Constitution. *The International Society for Ecological Economics*
<https://www.isecoeco.org/about/constitution/> (2012).
13. Spash, C. L. Social Ecological Economics: Understanding the Past to See the Future. *The American Journal of Economics and Sociology* **70**, 340–375 (2011).
14. Gowdy, J. The approach of ecological economics. *Cambridge J. Reg. Econ.* **29**, 207–222 (2005).
15. Costanza, R. *et al.* *An Introduction to Ecological Economics, Second Edition*. (CRC Press, 2014).
16. Nussbaum, M. Capabilities as Fundamental Entitlements: Sen and Social Justice. *Fem. Econ.* **9**, 33–59 (2003).
17. Eisler, R. & Loye, D. The ‘failure’ of liberalism: A reassessment of ideology from a new feminine–masculine perspective. *Political Psychology* **4**, 375–391 (1983).
18. Agarwal, B. *Gender Challenges*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, New York, 2015).
19. Piaget, K., Coffey, C., Molano, S. & Moreno Ruiz, M. J. *Feminist Futures: Caring for People, Caring for Justice and Rights*. (Oxfam, Oxford, 2020). doi:10.21201/2020.6348.
20. Agarwal, B. *Gender and Green Governance: The Political Economy of Women’s Presence Within and Beyond Community Forestry*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2010).
doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199569687.001.0001.
21. Hodgson, G. M. What Is the Essence of Institutional Economics? *Journal of Economic Issues* **34**, 317–329 (2000).
22. Ostrom, E. *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1990). doi:10.1017/CBO9780511807763.
23. Ostrom, E. Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *Am. Econ. Rev.* **100**, 641–672 (2010).
24. Vatn, A. An institutional analysis of methods for environmental appraisal. *Ecol. Econ.* **68**, 2207–2215 (2009).
25. Olson, M. *Logic of Collective Action: Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. (Harvard Univ Pr, Cambridge, MA, 1974).

26. Fontana, G. & Sawyer, M. Towards post-Keynesian ecological macroeconomics. *Ecol. Econ.* **121**, 186–195 (2016).
27. Barker, T., Anger, A., Chewpreecha, U. & Pollitt, H. A new economics approach to modelling policies to achieve global 2020 targets for climate stabilisation. *Int. Rev. Appl. Econ.* **26**, 205–221 (2012).
28. Aboobaker, A., Köhler, K., Prante, F. & Tarne, R. Post-Keynesian Economics.
<https://www.exploring-economics.org/en/orientation/post-keynesian-economics/> (2016).
29. Eichner, A. S. Post-Keynesian Theory: An Introduction. *Challenge* **21**, (1978).
30. Stockhammer, E. & Ramskogler, P. Post-Keynesian economics – how to move forward. *European Journal of Economics and Economic Policies* **6**, 227–246 (2009).
31. Bergh, J. van den. Agrowth Instead of Anti-and Pro-Growth: Less Polarization, More Support for Sustainability/Climate Policies. *J. Popul. Soc.* **3**, 53–73 (2018).
32. Bergh, J. C. J. M. van den. Environment versus growth — A criticism of “degrowth” and a plea for “a-growth”. *Ecological Economics* **70**, 881–890 (2011).
33. Bergh, J. van den. A third option for climate policy within potential limits to growth. *Nature Clim Change* **7**, 107–112 (2017).
34. D’Amato, D. *et al.* Green, circular, bio economy: A comparative analysis of sustainability avenues. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **168**, 716–734 (2017).
35. Melece, L. Challenges and Opportunities of Circular Economy and Green Economy. *Engineering for Rural Development* **8** (2016).
36. Oliveira Neto, G. C. de, Pinto, L. F. R., Amorim, M. P. C., Giannetti, B. F. & Almeida, C. M. V. B. de. A framework of actions for strong sustainability. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **196**, 1629–1643 (2018).
37. Ferreira Gregorio, V., Pié, L. & Terceño, A. A Systematic Literature Review of Bio, Green and Circular Economy Trends in Publications in the Field of Economics and Business Management. *Sustainability* **10**, 4232 (2018).
38. D’Alessandro, S., Cieplinski, A., Distefano, T. & Dittmer, K. Feasible alternatives to green growth. *Nat. Sustain.* **3**, 329–335 (2020).

39. Eisler, R. Economics as If Caring Matters. *Challenge* **55**, 58–86 (2012).
40. Eisler, R. The Real Wealth of Nations: From Global Warming to Global Partnership. *Interdiscip. J. Partnersh. Stud.* **4**, (2017).
41. Waddock, S. Reframing and Transforming Economics around Life. *Sustainability* **12**, 7553–16 (2020).
42. Henderson, H. *Paradigms in Progress: Life beyond Economics*. (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
43. Didenko, N. I., Klochkov, Y. S. & Skripnuk, D. F. Ecological Criteria for Comparing Linear and Circular Economies. *Resources* **7**, 48 (2018).
44. Merli, R., Preziosi, M. & Acampora, A. How do scholars approach the circular economy? A systematic literature review. *J. Clean. Prod.* **178**, 703–722 (2018).
45. Ellen Macarthur Foundation. *Towards a Circular Economy: Business Rationale for an Accelerated Transition*. <https://ellenmacarthurfoundation.org/towards-a-circular-economy-business-rationale-for-an-accelerated-transition> (2015).
46. Giampietro, M. On the Circular Bioeconomy and Decoupling: Implications for Sustainable Growth. *Ecol. Econ.* **162**, 143–156 (2019).
47. Stahel, W. R. The circular economy. *Nature* **531**, 435–438 (2016).
48. Schismenos, A., Niaros, V. & Lemos, L. Cosmolocalism: Understanding the Transitional Dynamics Towards Post-Capitalism. *tripleC: Communication, Capitalism & Critique. Open Access Journal for a Global Sustainable Information Society* 670–684 (2020) doi:10.31269/triplec.v18i2.1188.
49. Kossoff, G. Cosmopolitan Localism: The Planetary Networking of Everyday Life in Place. *Cuad. Cent. Estud. Diseñ. Comun.* **73**, 51–66 (2019).
50. Papadimitropoulos, V. The digital commons, cosmolocalism, and open cooperativism: The cases of P2P Lab and Tzoumakers. *Organization* 13505084231156268 (2023) doi:10.1177/13505084231156268.
51. Smith, T. S. Mapping complexity in deglobalisation: A typology of economic localisms from ‘hyper-localism’ to ‘strategic autonomy’. *Local Economy* **38**, 242–263 (2023).
52. Norberg-Hodge, E. Localization: The Economics of Happiness Tikkun. *Tikkun* <https://www.tikkun.org/localization-the-economics-of-happiness/> (2012).

53. Research and Degrowth (R&D). Definition. *Research and Degrowth (R&D)*
<https://degrowth.org/definition/>.
54. Kallis, G. In defence of degrowth. *Ecological Economics* **70**, 873–880 (2011).
55. Victor, P. A. Growth, degrowth and climate change: A scenario analysis. *Ecological Economics* **84**, 206–212 (2012).
56. Charonis, G.-K. Degrowth, Steady State and Circular Economies: Alternative Discourses to Economic Growth. *Society Register* **5**, 75–94 (2021).
57. Jackson, T. *Prosperity without Growth*. (Routledge, 2016).
58. Lecture, K. E. & Norgaard, R. B. Deliberative economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **63**, 375–382 (2007).
59. Aaken, A. van & List, C. *Deliberation and Decision: Economics, Constitutional Theory and Deliberative Democracy*. (Routledge, 2017).
60. O'Neill, J. *Markets, Deliberation and Environment*. (2013). doi:10.4324/9780203607169.
61. Orchard-Webb, J., Kenter, J. O., Bryce, R. & Church, A. Deliberative Democratic Monetary Valuation to implement the Ecosystem Approach. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **21**, 308–318 (2016).
62. Zografos, C. & Howarth, R. B. Deliberative Ecological Economics for Sustainability Governance. *Sustainability* **2**, 3399–3417 (2010).
63. Raworth, K. A Doughnut for the Anthropocene: humanity's compass in the 21st century. *Lancet Planet. Health* **1**, e48–e49 (2017).
64. Raworth, K. *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. (Chelsea Green Publishing, White River Junction, VT, 2017).
65. O'Neill, D. W., Fanning, A. L., Lamb, W. F. & Steinberger, J. K. A good life for all within planetary boundaries. *Nat. Sustain.* **1**, 88–95 (2018).
66. Doughnut Economics Action Lab. Amsterdam City Doughnut.
<https://doughnuteconomics.org/stories/1> (2020).
67. Perkins, E. *et al.* Introduction: Exploring Feminist Ecological Economics / Gender, Development, and Sustainability from a Latin American Perspective / African Peasants and Global Gendered Class Struggle for the Commons / Ecofeminist Political Economy: Integrating Feminist Economics and Ecological Economics / Habits of Thought, Agency, and Transformation: An Institutional

- Approach to Feminist Ecological Economics / the Network Vorsorgendes Wirtschaften / Engendering Organic Farming. *Feminist Economics* **11**, 107–150 (2005).
68. Mellor, M. Ecofeminist political economy. *International Journal of Green Economics* **1**, 139–150 (2006).
 69. Mair, S. Neoliberal economics, planetary health, and the COVID-19 pandemic: a Marxist ecofeminist analysis. *Lancet Planet. Health* **4**, e588–e596 (2020).
 70. McMahon, M. From the ground up: ecofeminism and ecological economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **20**, 163–173 (1997).
 71. Nelson, J. Between a Rock and a Soft Place: Ecological and Feminist Economics in Policy Debates. *Ecological economics* 1–8 (2009).
 72. Johanisova, N. & Wolf, S. Economic democracy: A path for the future? *Futures* **44**, 562–570 (2012).
 73. Malleson, T. Economic Democracy: The Left’s Big Idea for the Twenty-First Century? *New Political Sci.* **35**, 84–108 (2013).
 74. Schweickart, D. Property-Owning Democracy or Economic Democracy? in *Property-Owning Democracy* 201–222 (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2012). doi:10.1002/9781444355192.ch10.
 75. Cumbers, A., McMaster, R., Cabaço, S. & White, M. J. Reconfiguring Economic Democracy: Generating New Forms of Collective Agency, Individual Economic Freedom and Public Participation. *Work, Employment and Society* **34**, 678–695 (2020).
 76. Ukpere, W. I. Demise of a single orthodoxy and the possibility of a cooperative economy. *International Journal of Social Economics* **37**, 239–253 (2010).
 77. Frankfurter, G. M. The Theory of Fair Markets (TFM) toward a new finance paradigm. *Int. Rev. Financial Anal.* **2**, 130–144 (2006).
 78. Frankfurter, G. M. *Theory And Reality In Financial Economics: Essays Toward A New Political Finance*. (World Scientific, 2007).
 79. Borch, C. & Wosnitzer, R. *The Routledge Handbook of Critical Finance Studies*. (Routledge, 2020).
 80. Hawken, P. *The Ecology of Commerce: A Declaration of Sustainability. Revised Edition*. (Harper Business, New York, 1993).
 81. Kosoy, N. *et al.* Pillars for a flourishing Earth: planetary boundaries, economic growth delusion and green economy. *Curr. Opin. Environ. Sustain.* **4**, 74–79 (2012).

82. Upward, A. & Jones, P. An Ontology for Strongly Sustainable Business Models: Defining an Enterprise Framework Compatible With Natural and Social Science. *Organ. Environ.* **29**, 97–123 (2016).
83. Schaefer, K., Corner, P. D. & Kearins, K. Social, Environmental and Sustainable Entrepreneurship Research: What Is Needed for Sustainability-as-Flourishing? *Organ. Environ.* **28**, 394–413 (2015).
84. Hoveskog, M., Halila, F., Mattsson, M., Upward, A. & Karlsson, N. Education for Sustainable Development: Business Modelling for Flourishing. *J. Clean. Prod.* **172**, 4383–4396 (2018).
85. Engström, G. *et al.* What Policies Address Both the Coronavirus Crisis and the Climate Crisis? *Environ Resour Econ (Dordr)* **76**, 789–810 (2020).
86. Bentham, J. *et al.* *Manifesto for the Foundational Economy*. 23 <https://www.ppru.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/12/FoundationalEconomy.pdf> (2013).
87. Foundational Economy. The Foundational Economy book. *The Foundational Economy* <https://foundationaleconomy.com/foundational-economy-book/> (2018).
88. Foundational economy. What is the foundational economy? *The Foundational Economy* <https://foundationaleconomy.com/introduction/> (2017).
89. Foundational Economy Collective. ¿Qué viene después de la pandemia? Un programa de diez puntos para la renovación fundamental. *El Trimestre Económico* **87**, 899–917 (2020).
90. Korten, D. *The New Economy: A Living Earth System Model*. <https://davidkorten.org/new-economy-system-model/> (2016).
91. Korten, David. Ten Essential Principles for Healthy Markets. <https://davidkorten.org/healthy-markets/> (2010).
92. Korten, David. 8 Point Policy Agenda. *David Korten* <https://davidkorten.org/eight-point-policy-agenda/> (2010).
93. Korten, D. Economic Redesign for the 21st Century. *Tikkun* **23**, 11 (2008).
94. Thompson, M. What's so new about New Municipalism? *Prog. Hum. Geogr.* **45**, 317–342 (2021).
95. Arpini, E., Panez, A., Cumbers, A. & Pearson, B. New municipalism in South America? Developing theory from experiences in Argentina and Chile. *Urban Studies* **60**, 2290–2306 (2023).

96. Sareen, S. & Waagsaether, K. L. New municipalism and the governance of urban transitions to sustainability. *Urban Studies* **60**, 2271–2289 (2023).
97. Centre for Local Economic Strategies. *New Municipalism in London*. https://cles.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/04/New-Municipalism-in-London_April-2019.pdf (2019).
98. Wong, F. *The Emerging Worldview: How New Progressivism Is Moving Beyond Neoliberalism*. <https://rooseveltinstitute.org/publications/the-emerging-worldview-how-new-progressivism-is-moving-beyond-neoliberalism/> (2020).
99. Konczal, M., Milani, K. & Evans, A. The empirical failures of neoliberalism. *Issue Brief*. New York: Roosevelt Institute (2020).
100. Mason, P. *PostCapitalism: A Guide to Our Future*. (Allen Lane, London, 2015).
101. Blühdorn, I. Post-capitalism, post-growth, post-consumerism? Eco-political hopes beyond sustainability. *Global Discourse* **7**, 42–61 (2017).
102. Pitts, F. H. Beyond the Fragment: postoperaismo, postcapitalism and Marx’s ‘Notes on machines’, 45 years on. *Economy and Society* **46**, 324–345 (2017).
103. Latouche, S. *In the Wake of the Affluent Society: An Exploration of Post-Development*. (Zed Books, Atlantic Highlands, NJ, 1993).
104. Escobar, A. *Encountering Development*. (Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2011).
105. Rapley, J. Development Studies and the Post-development Critique. *Progr Dev Stud* **4**, 350–354 (2004).
106. Escobar, A. Degrowth, postdevelopment, and transitions: a preliminary conversation. *Sustain Sci* **10**, 451–462 (2015).
107. *Pluriverse: A Post-Development Dictionary*. (Tulika Books and Authorsupfront, New Delhi, 2019).
108. Jackson, T. The Post-growth Challenge: Secular Stagnation, Inequality and the Limits to Growth. *Ecol. Econ.* **156**, 236–246 (2019).
109. Jackson, T. *Post Growth: Life after Capitalism*. (John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2021).
110. Pansera, M. & Fressoli, M. Innovation without growth: Frameworks for understanding technological change in a post-growth era. *Organization* **28**, 380–404 (2021).
111. Donaldson, T. & Walsh, J. Toward a Theory of Business. *J. Organ. Behav.* **35**, 181–207 (2015).

112. Jensen, M. C. Value Maximization, Stakeholder Theory, and the Corporate Objective Function. *Journal of Applied Corporate Finance* **22**, 32–42 (2010).
113. Hawken, P., Lovins, A. B. & Lovins, L. H. *Natural Capitalism: The Next Industrial Revolution*. (Routledge, 2013).
114. Waddock, S. Achieving sustainability requires systemic business transformation. *Glob. Sustain.* **3**, e12 (2020).
115. Rifkin, J. *The Zero Marginal Cost Society: The Internet of Things, the Collaborative Commons, and the Eclipse of Capitalism*. (St. Martin's Publishing Group, 2014).
116. Mi, Z. & Coffman, D. The sharing economy promotes sustainable societies. *Nature Communications* **10**, 1214 (2019).
117. Martin, C. J. The sharing economy: A pathway to sustainability or a nightmarish form of neoliberal capitalism? *Ecol. Econ.* **121**, 149–159 (2016).
118. White, A. L., Stoughton, M. & Feng, L. *Servicizing: The Quiet Transition to Extended Product Responsibility*. 97 <https://www.tellus.org/pub/Servicizing%20-%20The%20Quiet%20Transition%20to%20Extended%20Product%20Responsibility.pdf> (1999).
119. Bergeron, S. *et al. Social and Solidarity Economy: Beyond the Fringe*. (Bloomsbury Publishing, London, 2015).
120. Kawano, E & Matthaei, J. System Change: A Basic Primer to the Solidarity Economy. *Non Profit News | Nonprofit Quarterly* <https://nonprofitquarterly.org/system-change-a-basic-primer-to-the-solidarity-economy/> (2020).
121. Pirson, M. *Humanistic Management: Protecting Dignity and Promoting Well-Being*. (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2017). doi:10.1017/9781316675946.
122. Annoni, D., de Souza Silva, K. & Martini dos Santos, G. Solidarity Economy and social inclusion: The Immigrant Fair in Florianópolis, Brazil. *Dev. Policy Rev.* **40**, e12564 (2022).
123. UNTFSSE. *What Role for the Social and Solidarity Economy in the Post COVID-19 Crisis Recovery?* <https://knowledgehub.unsse.org/knowledge-hub/what-role-for-the-social-and-solidarity-economy-in-the-post-covid-19-crisis-recovery/> (2020).
124. Daly, H. E. *Steady-State Economics*. (Island Press, Washington, D.C, 1977).

125. CASSE. Read and Sign the Position Statement. *Center for the Advancement of the Steady State Economy*
<https://steadystate.org/act/sign-the-position/read-the-position-statement/> (2022).
126. Lawn, P. Facilitating the transition to a steady-state economy: Some macroeconomic fundamentals.
Ecological Economics **69**, 931–936 (2010).
127. Daly, H. A further critique of growth economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **88**, 20–24 (2013).
128. Fioramonti, L. *et al.* Wellbeing economy: An effective paradigm to mainstream post-growth policies?
Ecological Economics **192**, 107261 (2022).
129. Hough-Stewart, L., Trebeck, K. & Sommer, C. *What Is a Wellbeing Economy? Different Ways to
Understand the Vision of an Economy That Serves People and Planet.* 11
<https://wellbeingeconomy.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/12/A-WE-Is-WEAll-Ideas-Little-Summaries-of-Big-Issues-4-Dec-2019.pdf> (2019).
130. Pickett, K. & Wilkinson, R. *The Spirit Level: Why Equality Is Better for Everyone.* (Allen Lane, London, 2009).
131. Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. E. *A Convenient Truth: A Better Society for Us and the Planet. Fabian Ideas
638.* https://uk.fes.de/fileadmin/user_upload/publications/files/A-Convenient-Truth.pdf (2014).
132. Durand, M. The OECD Better Life Initiative: How's Life? and the Measurement of Well-Being.
Rev. Income Wealth **61**, 4–17 (2015).
133. Chase-Dunn, C., Kawano, Y. & Nikitin, D. A World-Systems Perspective. *Global social change:
Historical and comparative perspectives* 79 (2006).
134. Kuran, T. Explaining the economic trajectories of civilizations: The systemic approach. *Journal of
Economic Behavior & Organization* **71**, 593–605 (2009).
135. Hung, H. Recent Trends in Global Economic Inequality. *Annu. Rev. Sociol.* **47**, 349–367 (2021).
136. Gudynas, E. Buen Vivir: Today's tomorrow. *Development* **54**, 441–447 (2011).
137. Kothari, A., Demaria, F. & Acosta, A. Buen Vivir, Degrowth, and Ecological Swaraj: Alternatives to
Sustainable Development and Green Economy. *Development* **57**, 57–3 (2015).
138. Beling, A. E. *et al.* Discursive Synergies for a 'Great Transformation' Towards Sustainability:
Pragmatic Contributions to a Necessary Dialogue Between Human Development, Degrowth, and
Buen Vivir. *Ecol. Econ.* **144**, 304–313 (2018).

139. Salazar, J. F. Buen Vivir: South America's rethinking of the future we want. *The Conversation*
<http://theconversation.com/buen-vivir-south-americas-rethinking-of-the-future-we-want-44507>
 (2015).
140. Cuestas-Caza, J. Sumak Kawsay is not Buen Vivir. *Alternantas* **5**, 49–63 (2018).
141. Pope Francis. Encyclical Letter *Laudato Si'* on Care for Our Common Home. (2015).
142. Schluter, M. Beyond Capitalism: Towards a Relational economy. *Cambridge Papers* **19**, 1–4 (2010).
143. Karakunnel, G. Economics, Well-Being and Theology. *Finance & Bien Commun* **22**, 80–88 (2005).
144. Maspero, G. Christian Humanism: Fatherhood, Economics, and Relational Ontology. in *After Liberalism? A Christian Confrontation on Politics and Economics* (eds. Schlag, M. & Maspero, G.) 127–147 (Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021). doi:10.1007/978-3-030-75702-1_7.
145. Harris, L. D. & Wasilewski, J. Indigeneity, an alternative worldview: four R's (relationship, responsibility, reciprocity, redistribution) vs. two P's (power and profit). Sharing the journey towards conscious evolution. *Syst. Res. Behav. Sci.* **21**, 489–503 (2004).
146. Weber, Andreas. *Enlivenment: Towards a Fundamental Shift in the Concepts of Nature, Culture and Politics*.
<https://www.boell.de/en/2013/02/01/enlivenment-towards-fundamental-shift-concepts-nature-culture-and-politics> (2013).
147. Vasile, M. The Enlivenment of institutions: emotional work and the emergence of contemporary land commons in the Carpathian Mountains. *Journal of Environmental Planning and Management* **62**, 124–150 (2019).
148. Weber, A. & Kurt, H. Towards Cultures of Aliveness: Politics and Poetics in a Postdualistic Age—an Anthropocene Manifesto. *Solutions* **5**, 58–65 (2015).
149. M. Küpers, W. From the Anthropocene to an 'Ecocene' —Eco-Phenomenological Perspectives on Embodied, Anthrocentric Transformations towards Enlivening Practices of Organising Sustainably. *Sustainability* **12**, 3633 (2020).
150. Kawharu, M. Kaitiakitanga: A Maori anthropological perspective of the Maori socio-environmental ethic of resource management. *J. Polyn. Soc.* **109**, 349–370 (2000).

151. Centre for Science in Society, Te Herenga Waka/Victoria University of Wellington, McAllister, T., Hikuroa, D. & Macinnis-Ng, C. Connecting Science to Indigenous Knowledge: kaitiakitanga, conservation, and resource management. *NZJE* (2023) doi:10.20417/nzjecol.47.3521.
152. Spiller, C., Pio, E., Erakovic, L. & Henare, M. Wise Up: Creating Organizational Wisdom Through an Ethic of Kaitiakitanga. *J Bus Ethics* **104**, 223–235 (2011).
153. Independent Maori Statutory Board. *The Kaitiakitanga Report for Tamaki Makaurau 2019*.
<https://www.imsb.maori.nz/assets/pdf/IMSB-Kaitiakitanga-Report-20200226.pdf?k=c6cba5af1c>
(2019).
154. Waldmüller, J. M. Buen Vivir, Sumak Kawsay, ‘Good Living’: An Introduction and Overview. *Alternantas* **1**, 13 (2014).
155. Thomson, B. Pachakuti: Indigenous perspectives, buen vivir, sumaq kawsay and degrowth. *Development* **54**, 448–454 (2011).
156. Migheli, M. Ubuntu and social capital: a strong relationship and a possible instrument of socio-economic development. *Cambridge Journal of Economics* **41**, 1213–1235 (2017).
157. Mwiripikeni, P. Ubuntu and the modern society. *South African Journal of Philosophy = Suid-Afrikaanse Tydskrif vir Wysbegeerte* **37**, 322–334 (2018).
158. West, A. Ubuntu and Business Ethics: Problems, Perspectives and Prospects. *J Bus Ethics* **121**, 47–61 (2014).
159. Chibvongodze, D. T. Ubuntu is Not Only about the Human! An Analysis of the Role of African Philosophy and Ethics in Environment Management. *Journal of Human Ecology* **53**, 157–166 (2016).
160. Pressman, S. The Two Dogmas of Neoclassical Economics. *Sci. Soc.* **68**, 483–493 (2004).
161. Crépin, A.-S. & Folke, C. The Economy, The Biosphere and Planetary Boundaries: Towards Biosphere Economics. *IRERE* **8**, 57–100 (2015).
162. Lawson, T. What is this ‘school’ called neoclassical economics? *Cambridge J. Econ.* **37**, 947–983 (2013).
163. Ainscough, J., Wilson, M. & Kenter, J. O. Ecosystem services as a post-normal field of science. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **31**, 93–101 (2018).

164. Borrás, S. & Edquist, C. *Holistic Innovation Policy: Theoretical Foundations, Policy Problems, and Instrument Choices*. (Oxford University Press, 2019).
165. Daly, H. E. The economic growth debate: What some economists have learned but many have not. *J. Environ. Econ. Manage.* **14**, 323–336 (1987).
166. Stanley, C. Living to Spend Another Day: Exploring Resilience as a New Fourth Goal of Ecological Economics. *Ecol. Econ.* **178**, 106805 (2020).
167. Wiedmann, T., Lenzen, M., Keyßer, L. T. & Steinberger, J. K. Scientists’ warning on affluence. *Nat. Commun.* **11**, 3107 (2020).
168. Boarini, R. & D’Ercole, M. M. Going beyond GDP: An OECD Perspective. *Fisc. Stud.* **34**, 289–314 (2013).
169. Costanza, R., Hart, M., Posner, S. & Talberth, J. *Beyond GDP: The Need for New Measures of Progress* (*The Pardee Papers No. 4*). 46 <https://www.bu.edu/pardee/files/documents/PP-004-GDP.pdf> (2009).
170. OECD. *Beyond GDP: Measuring What Counts for Economic and Social Performance*. (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, Paris, 2018).
171. Stockhammer, E., Hochreiter, H., Obermayr, B. & Steiner, K. The index of sustainable economic welfare (ISEW) as an alternative to GDP in measuring economic welfare. The results of the Austrian (revised) ISEW calculation 1955–1992. *Ecological Economics* **21**, 19–34 (1997).
172. Ripple, W. J., Wolf, C., Newsome, T. M., Barnard, P. & Moomaw, W. R. World Scientists’ Warning of a Climate Emergency. *BioScience* **70**, 8–12 (2020).
173. Wilkinson, R. & Pickett, K. *The Inner Level: How More Equal Societies Reduce Stress, Restore Sanity and Improve Everyone’s Well-Being*. (Penguin Press, London, 2020).
174. Felipe, J. & McCombie, J. S. L. *The Aggregate Production Function and the Measurement of Technical Change: Not Even Wrong*. (Edward Elgar Publishing, 2013).
175. Geissdoerfer, M., Savaget, P., Bocken, N. M. P. & Hultink, E. J. The Circular Economy – A new sustainability paradigm? *J. Clean. Prod.* **143**, 757–768 (2017).
176. Morsetto, P. Restorative and regenerative: Exploring the concepts in the circular economy. *J. Ind. Ecol.* **24**, 763–773 (2020).

177. Lovins, L. H., Wallis, S., Wijkman, A. & Fullerton, J. *A Finer Future: Creating an Economy in Service to Life*. (New Society Publishers, 2018).
178. Kenter, J. O. Editorial: Shared, plural and cultural values. *Ecosyst. Serv.* **21**, 175–183 (2016).
179. Hodgson, G. M. What Is the Essence of Institutional Economics? *Journal of Economic Issues* **34**, 317–329 (2000).
180. Kenter, J. O. *et al.* What are shared and social values of ecosystems? *Ecological Economics* **111**, 86–99 (2015).
181. Mellor, M. Women, nature and the social construction of ‘economic man’. *Ecological Economics* **20**, 129–140 (1997).
182. Chigangaidze, R. K. COVID-19 and the calls of humanistic social work: Exploring the developmental-clinical social work concerns of the pandemic. *Int. Soc. Work* **64**, 663–675 (2021).
183. Nelson, J. A. Feminism, ecology and the philosophy of economics. *Ecological Economics* **20**, 155–162 (1997).
184. Nussbaum, M. C. & Sen, A. *The Quality of Life*. (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1993).
185. Sen, A. *Development as Freedom*. (Alfred Knopf, New York, 1999).
186. Jungell-Michelsson, J. & Heikkurinen, P. Sufficiency: A systematic literature review. *Ecol. Econ.* **195**, 107380 (2022).
187. Jackson, T. *Prosperity without Growth: Foundations for the Economy of Tomorrow*. (Routledge, Abingdon-on-Thames, 2016).
188. Zucman, G. Global Wealth Inequality. *Annu. Rev. Econ.* **11**, 109–138 (2019).
189. Bauhardt, C. Solutions to the crisis? The Green New Deal, Degrowth, and the Solidarity Economy: Alternatives to the capitalist growth economy from an ecofeminist economics perspective. *Ecological Economics* **102**, 60–68 (2014).
190. Perkins, P. E. Feminist Ecological Economics and Sustainability. *J Bioecon* **9**, 227–244 (2007).
191. Nussbaum, M. C. *Creating Capabilities: The Human Development Approach*. (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA, 2011).
192. Bell, K. Can the capitalist economic system deliver environmental justice? *Environ. Res. Lett.* **10**, 125017 (2015).

193. Martínez-Alier, J. *The Environmentalism of the Poor*. (Edward Elgar, Cheltenham, 2002).
194. Dengler, C. & Lang, M. Commoning Care: Feminist Degrowth Visions for a Socio-Ecological Transformation. *Feminist Economics* **28**, 1–28 (2022).
195. Barker, T. & Scricciu, S. S. Modeling Low Climate Stabilization with E3MG: Towards a ‘New Economics’ Approach to Simulating Energy-Environment-Economy System Dynamics. *Energy J.* **31**, 137–164 (2010).
196. Heikkinen, T. A study of degrowth paths based on the von Neumann equilibrium model. *Journal of Cleaner Production* **251**, 119562 (2020).
197. Kenter, J. O. *et al.* What are shared and social values of ecosystems? *Ecol. Econ.* **111**, 86–99 (2015).
198. Jones, N. A. *et al.* Evaluating participatory modeling: developing a framework for cross-case analysis. *Environ. Manage.* **44**, 1180 (2009).
199. Agarwal, B. Can group farms outperform individual family farms? Empirical insights from India. *World Dev.* **108**, 57–73 (2018).
200. Feola, G. Degrowth and the Unmaking of Capitalism: Beyond ‘Decolonization of the Imaginary’? *ACME: An International Journal for Critical Geographies* **18**, 977–997 (2019).
201. Costanza, R. *et al.* Modelling and measuring sustainable wellbeing in connection with the UN Sustainable Development Goals. *Ecol. Econ.* **130**, 350–355 (2016).
202. Agarwal, B. Imperatives of recognising the complexities: gendered impacts and responses to COVID-19 in India. *Econ. Politica* **39**, 31–53 (2022).
203. Agarwal, B. Livelihoods in COVID times: Gendered perils and new pathways in India. *World Dev.* **139**, 105312 (2021).
204. Freeman, R. E. The New Story of Business: Towards a More Responsible Capitalism. *Business and Society Review* **122**, 449–465 (2017).
205. Barker, T. The economics of avoiding dangerous climate change. An editorial essay on The Stern Review. *Climatic Change* **89**, 173–194 (2008).