

Mansoori, Issa

Preprint

A Primer on the Epistemology of New Commons

Suggested Citation: Mansoori, Issa (2025) : A Primer on the Epistemology of New Commons, ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics, Kiel, Hamburg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/312282>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

A Primer on the Epistemology of New Commons

Issa Mansoori¹

Abstract

By framing development as an emergent property of collective consciousness, this paper provides a fresh epistemological lens to address local and global common challenges, such as inequality, social, cultural, and ecological degradation, and resource management through commoning.

The paper argues for the 'new commons', reimagining the concept of development by integrating insights from the philosophy and neuroscience of consciousness. Moving beyond economic conventional and institutionalist paradigms, it explores how development, like consciousness, functions as an interconnected and emergent system that transcends the sum of its parts.

Countering neoliberal ideologies and prioritizing collective intention instead of pluralistic action, 'new commons' can be defined from a different perspective. Also, distinct from Ostrom's common resource management model, the new commons framework emphasizes the societal construction of shared spaces and values through collective consciousness.

Keywords: New commons, Development, Epistemology, Economic goods.

Introduction

As Ziai (2019) suggests, a meta-theory of development is required to provide a comprehensive framework for explaining the new economic logic, new commons, and local culture. This article tries to explain the 'new commons' through the lens of 'development as consciousness.'

This paper navigates beyond conventional paradigms of development and post-development critiques, proposing a different epistemological approach that incorporates insights from the philosophy and neuroscience of consciousness.

By aligning development with consciousness—individual and collective—the development discourse transcends reductionist narratives, embracing the nuances of collective consciousness, intentionality, and social construct.

Through this lens, the new commons concept emerges as a transformative paradigm, challenging neoliberal assumptions of individualism and privatization of commons and resources. Instead, it foregrounds collective action and co-creating shared resources and knowledge systems. This

¹ Issa Mansoori, PhD in Economic Development,
Visiting Lecturer at University of Tehran.
Email: isamansouri@gmail.com

paper unpacks these ideas, situating the "new commons" within broader theoretical debates, and elucidates the critical role of collective consciousness in fostering a more inclusive model.

I. Development as Consciousness

Unlike conventional development and post-development approaches, a more inclusive approach to development can be advanced by integrating insights from the philosophy and neuroscience of consciousness (Mansoori, 2024). Both consciousness and development encompass the interconnectedness and interdependence of all things within a system. Both are not reducible to the sum of their constituent parts - such as signals, neurons, and synapses, as well as education, environment, and economy. They are more than just the aggregation of their individual constituents. They possess emergent properties—qualities that arise from the interactions and relationships between the parts, not from the parts themselves. Both consciousness and development exemplify this emergent property with its subjective unity and integrated experience. Furthermore, they constantly shift and evolve, responding to internal and external stimuli. They are dynamic entities continually adapting and responding to changes within and around them (McGillivray, 2016; Ziai, 2016; Mukhopadhyay, 2009).

Upgrading the landscape from individual to group consciousness leads to a discussion of joint consciousness, which describes the capacity of minds to be jointly directed at objects, states of affairs, goals, or values. It transcends individual mental states, encompassing shared beliefs, desires, and intentions that emerge within social contexts. (Searle, 2004; Rotila, 2015; Ule, 2015; Mukhopadhyay, 2018; Dennison, 2022).

However, two types of joint consciousness need to be distinguished. The first, *Shared or pluralistic consciousness*, concerns external stimuli, such as the shared awareness of a book ("We are aware of this book"), which reflects multiple individuals' acknowledgment of an external reality. Shared consciousness enables individuals to experience the actions and emotions of others (Shteynberg et al., 2020).

Shared consciousness would create pluralistic intention, acknowledging the inherent multiplicity of desires within a group. A common activity or location may get individuals together, but their underlying goals can be diverse and even contradictory. Connected action and shared action are included in this term. Online communities in which the members follow their own goals while focusing on a shared topic can be categorized in this perspective (Jankovic & Ludwig, 2017; Bratman, 2014; Chant, 2007).

The second, collective consciousness, is represented by representations stemming from internal stimuli, such as collective emotions or beliefs ("We are aware that we like this book. Building upon shared consciousness, group self-awareness arises when a collection of individuals transcends individual perspectives and recognizes itself as a unified entity, constituting the fabric of social constructs (Shteynberg et al., 2023).

The outcome of collective consciousness is the collective intention, which highlights the coordinated purpose that binds a group together. It signifies a unified objective that transcends individual differences and motivates coordinated action. Sports teams and scientific research collaboration function based on a collective intention (Searle, 1999; Tuomela, 1995; Gilbert, 1989; Bratman, 1992).

Looking at the emergence of collective consciousness as a metaphor for the development process, development can be defined as enhancing shared and pluralistic consciousness to a meta-level of collective consciousness, intentionality, and action to build and rebuild social constructs and institutions. These constructs and institutions might aim at economic and noneconomic goals.

II. New Commons

The new common is a local and global, social and ecological, material and immaterial space where communities can reclaim autonomy, where nature can regenerate, and where knowledge can be made and shared equitably. The new commons can be seen as systems where resources are managed collectively, which is different from the liberalism beliefs (Esteva, 2014; Shiva, 2010; Ziai, 2019).

Based on liberalism beliefs, 'individual self-interested choice' is the driving force behind all human activities. As Smith put it, "It is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity but to their self-love" (1776, p. 7). From this viewpoint, collective actions are, in fact, the sum of individual self-interested vectors. According to Hayek (1978), humans have no universal and comprehensive secondary action for managing the surrounding world. Social abstractions are self-organizing orders subject to selective evolution. From this perspective, the existing world order is an aggregation of individual orders instead of a single integrated entity (Colgan, 2019). A result of this type of order is disregarding collective attributes and preferences at the community, national, and global levels.

On the other hand, there is a long history of discussion about 'commons.' Samuelson (1954) divided the world into two categories: private consumption and public consumption goods. Musgrave (1959) contended that excludability is also important in classifying goods as public or private. It refers to the possibility of preventing people from enjoying a good after it has been produced.

Olson (1965) discussed that the study of public goods was not necessarily the concept of exclusion itself but rather how to explain collective action problems. In large groups, individuals have less incentive to contribute to public goods because they can benefit even if they do not participate (free-riding). This is especially true when the benefits are spread out, and the costs are concentrated on those who contribute. Further, Ostrom (2002) challenged the idea that public goods were doomed to fail and offered a more nuanced perspective on how communities can cooperate for sustainable management. Her research showed that communities could develop

their own rules to ensure sustainable use of these resources. She proposed a new framework for the effective management of Common Pool Resources (CPRs), characterized by high exclusion costs and subtractability of use, contingent upon the structure of property rights regimes. Ostrom et al. (1999) identified four primary regimes: Open Access, Group Property, Individual Property, and Government Property.

Recognizing the complexity, Ostrom (2010) introduced the concept of a rules framework to analyze the intricate socio-ecological interactions within CPR systems. This framework emphasizes the significance of institutional arrangements, including formal rules, informal norms, and decision-making processes, in shaping resource use outcomes.

Jointness of Use or Construction		
	Alternative Use	Joint Use
	Private good	Tool good
Feasible Exclusion	Bread, shoes, automobile haircut, books, etc.	Theatre, nightclub, tel. service, tool rad, cable TV, electric power
Infeasible Exclusion	Common pool resources Water pumped from a groundwater basin, fish taken from an ocean, crude oil extracted from an oil field	Public good Peace and Security, national defense, mosquito abatement, fire protection, weather forecast, “public” TV

Figure 1. Four types of goods

Source: Adapted from Ostrom, 2005.

Developing Ostrom’s approach, Bollier and Helfrich (2012, 2015, 2019) introduced their triad of commoning, which integrates the three spheres of social life, peer governance, and provisioning, to show how commoning is simultaneously a cultural, social, and economic practice. Bauwens and colleagues (2017) also draw attention to the immaterial commons, but their example goes to digital and peer-product commons. However, they innovatively argue that although capitalism prioritizes market forces as an economic institution, leading to commodifying all virtual goods and services, the elimination of markets is not the solution. Markets can exist within a commons-oriented society as coordinating mechanisms, but their function must shift from extractive to generative.

Differently, Shiva (2010) and Esteva (2014) offered some new challenges from a noneconomic point of view. They argue that previous works highlight the potential for self-governance of resources, which could be undermined by corporate interests or privatization. They also argue that 'commons' and 'resources' differ fundamentally. When one treats commons as resources, he/she loses sight of their deeper – subjective – significance. The enclosure movement was a

turning point, where customary rights to shared resources were replaced by private ownership. Nature is not something to be owned or exploited for profit but rather a shared life support system. The Idea of Shiva and Esteva is close to Linebaugh's (2008) perspective in which 'commons' is more than just a noun referring to a resource. It represents a social activity and the relationship between people and nature. Linebaugh suggests using 'commons' as a verb to capture this dynamic aspect better. From this perspective, commoning is an activity rooted in ethics, community, and cultural renewal. The commons are alternatives to both capitalism and centralized governance, not merely a framework for resource management.

Furthermore, Ziai (2017) and Schöneberg and colleagues (2022) offer a compelling vision of how collective action and shared resources can challenge existing power dynamics and foster transformative change. Their work provides a roadmap for reimagining social organization and reclaiming spaces of collective agency.

In line with Ziai, Schöneberg, and Bauwens's arguments, the 'new commons' debate should be able to propose its approach beyond the confines of state-centric or market-driven approaches. This approach would connect grassroots movements, local communities, and global advocacy networks through collective intention and action to address global challenges such as climate change, inequality, and social justice, as well as local ones.

Yet, as Bollinger and Helfrich (2019) categorize, most studies have focused on patterns rather than principles of commoning and new commons. Therefore, although patterns acknowledge the complexity and specificity of real-world situations, there is a lack of discussion on the epistemological principles leading to a meta-theory of development.

Discussion

From the viewpoint of development as consciousness, there are essential differences between the approach of 'new commons' and the previous ones, including Ostrom's idea. The differences cannot be reduced to their (non)economic perspectives but foreground collective emergence and the co-creation of shared soft and hard resources. Some differences are discussed in the following, and new thoughts are shared.

In Ostrom's approach, the singularity of every self-interested individual is presupposed, which requires balancing interventions. Also, in most previous studies, including Ostrom's (1990, 1999), physical common resources are represented as commons. Conversely, Shiva and Esteva's beliefs indicate that commons are created and developed societally, which usually are intersubjective (Shiva, 2010).

In essence, while both scenarios involve shared resources and collaborative action, the focus of intention differs. Former studies like Ostrom's encompass shared intention emphasizing the external goal, while new common includes collective intention accentuating the community itself and its broader values and aspirations.

In the case of Ostrom's common resource management (2008), fishermen within a community develop a shared understanding of the ecological dynamics of the fishery, recognizing the impact of overfishing on the long-term health of the fish stocks. Through dialogue and consensus-building, they establish shared rules for fishing practices, such as catch limits, seasonal closures, and instrument restrictions. Community members actively monitor fishing activities and enforce agreed-upon rules, ensuring everyone follows the shared understanding of the benefit of all other lake stakeholder individuals. The rules take care of individuals' self-interests.

In Shiva (2010) and Esteva's (2014) new commons, for instance, seed banks preserve and exchange locally adapted seeds, fostering biodiversity and protecting farmers' rights (Vernooy et al., 2015). Communities that maintain seed banks share a deep respect for biodiversity, a commitment to ecological sustainability, and a belief in the importance of local food systems. Seed banks embody collective memory and traditional knowledge passed down through generations. This knowledge includes seed selection, cultivation practices, and ecological rationality. The act of preserving and sharing seeds strengthens community identity and fosters a sense of collective responsibility for the long-term well-being of the ecosystem and future generations.

In addition, all previous researchers, including Ostrom, elaborated on the commons from the consumption viewpoint. However, in the 'development,' the matter is not only consumption but primarily how to build up, empower, and maintain the soft commons.

At the global level, the main reason global policies regarding the control of global warming have not succeeded, from this viewpoint, is that global role players have not yet reached a collective intention toward the concept and subject. It is terrific that the behavior at the global level is mainly close to 'pluralistic intention' (in which everybody looks for his/her own advantages through an I-you relationship) rather than 'collective intention.' Besides, most activities, even the 'degrowth' movement, focus on consumption. The most recent instance, the 29th Conference of the Parties (COP29) in Baku, was marked by a significant conflict between developed and developing countries on the issue of climate finance (Oberghassel, 2024). Nations, mainly developed ones, primarily pursued their own national interests regarding the consumption of natural resources. This included concerns about economic competitiveness, protecting existing industries (like fossil fuel-consuming ones), and minimizing financial burdens. President Trump's new withdrawal from the Paris Agreement is another example of this approach (White House, 2025).

To illustrate, intersecting the types of goods and joint intentions, commons are categorized in Figure 2. The new commons can be considered in quadrant A, which results from building the common through collective intention. The 'common resource' consumption is in quadrant D, which encompasses the management of consumption by a pluralistic action of separated individuals who follow their interests. The recent movements persuading the 'degrowth' may be put in quadrant B as, although they carry out the collective intention, they focus on the decline in the consumption of resources. Also, movements that form through social media, such as Wall Street 99%, are categorized in quadrant C.

	Emergence	Consumption
Collective intention	A <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New commons (Objective or subjective/Global or local) 	B <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Degrowth movement
Shared intention	C <ul style="list-style-type: none"> New-built shared goods (Connected actions) 	D <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Common resource management (Ostrom's model)

Figure 2. Types of Commons

Source: Figure Created by Author

Focusing on economic goods as carriers of value, as Klamer (2020) argues, goods are not simply commodities with monetary worth but embody cultural, social, and personal significance. A community initiative carries intangible values such as creativity, connection, and identity, transcending their material existence. This inspires a vision of economics that aligns with looking at social commons as goods.

Based on the above argument, two new types of goods can be distinguished from Ostrom's categories: a) pluralistic/shared goods and b) collective goods.

Jointness of Use or Construction			
	Alternative Use	Joint Use	Joint construction
	Private good	Tool good	Pluralistic good
Feasible Exclusion	Bread, shoes, automobile haircut, books, etc.	Theatre, nightclub, tel. service, tool rad, cable TV, electric power	Stag hunt
Infeasible Exclusion	Common pool resources Water pumped from a groundwater basin, fish taken from an ocean, crude oil extracted from an oil field	Public good Peace and Security, national defense, mosquito abatement, fire protection, weather forecast, "public" TV	Collective good Seed bank, Fight for the homeland, prisoner's dilemma

Figure 3. Typology of Goods and the Position of Pluralistic and Collective Goods

Source: Figure Created by Author, Adapted from Ostrom, 2005.

These typologies enhance Ostrom's framework by introducing a richer understanding of the motivations and intentionality underlying resource governance. While traditional theories often presuppose pluralistic intentions, where individuals act out of self-interest and align their goals through shared rules, by centering collective intentionality—a unified purpose that prioritizes the group's collective values and aspirations over individual interest—commons are redefined.

This shift in focus aligns with societal and ecological inclusive development, providing a more holistic understanding of how communities can build and govern commons in which new kinds of goods are included. In this context, commoning as the collective intention is a prerequisite for successful joint construction and use in the development process.

Conclusion

The epistemology of development, illuminated through the lenses of consciousness and the new commons, reveals a paradigm shift in our understanding of social and ecological systems. This approach transcends conventional- and post-development frameworks by integrating consciousness's emergent and collective dynamics into development theory, offering a holistic model grounded in collective intentionality and societal co-creation.

The concept of the new commons, emphasizing collective values and governance, highlights the inadequacy of models rooted in individualism and pluralistic intentions. Instead, it calls for a unified, meta-level collective consciousness to address social and socio-economic new commons and global challenges such as inequality and ecological degradation. This shift from consumption-oriented approaches to one that prioritizes the construction and empowerment of shared, soft commons proposes a development-as-consciousness approach, which integrates shared and collective consciousness into a new governance of commons, fostering emergent and adaptive systems.

Ultimately, this perspective encourages communities and global actors to move beyond fragmented pluralism toward a cohesive framework of collective options, enabling the emergence of transformative solutions that honor humanity's and nature's interconnectedness.

References:

Bollier, D., Helfrich, S. (2019). *Free, Fair and Alive*. The Insurgent Power of the Commons. New Society Publishers.

Bollier, D., Helfrich, S. (2015). *Patterns of Commoning*. The Commons Strategy Group.

Bollier, D., & Helfrich, S., et al. (2012). *The Wealth of the Commons: A World Beyond Market and State*. Levellers Press.

Bratman, M. E. (2014). *Shared Agency: A Planning Theory of Acting Together*. Oxford University Press.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199897933.001.0001>

- Bauwens, M. et al. (2017). *Commons Transition and P2P: A Primer*. The Transnational Institute. https://p2pfoundation.net/wp-content/uploads/2017/09/commons_transition_and_p2p_primer_v9.pdf
- Chant, S. R., Ernst, Z. (2008). *Epistemic Conditions for Collective Action*. *Mind*. 117(467), 549–573. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mind/fzn033>
- Colgan, J. D. (2019). Three Visions of International Order. *The Washington Quarterly*. 42(2), 85-98. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0163660X.2019.1621657>
- Dennison, P. (2022). *Sensory Consciousness, Jhana Consciousness, and the Role of the Upper Brain Stem*. <https://doi.org/10.31219/osf.io/uv82b>
- Esteva, E. (2014). Commoning in the new society. *Community Development Journal*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/cdj/bsu016>
- Gold, N., Sugden, R. (2007). *Collective Intentions and Team Agency*. *Journal of Philosophy* 103(3), 109–137. Halpern.
- Hayek, F. A. (1978). *The Constitution of Liberty*. University of Chicago Press.
- Jankovic, M., Ludwig, K. (2016). *Collective Intentionality*. In M. Lee & A. Rosenberg (Eds.), *The Routledge Companion to the Philosophy of Social Science*. 214–227. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315410098.ch19>
- Klamer, A. (2020). *The Economy in Context: A Value-Based Approach*. *Journal of Contextual Economics* – 140 (3-4), 287–300. <https://doi.org/10.3790/schm.140.3-4.287>
- Linebaugh, P. (2008). *The Magna Carta Manifesto: The Struggle to Reclaim Liberties & Commons for All*. University of California Press. <https://provisionaluniversity.files.wordpress.com/2012/12/peter-linebaugh-the-magna-carta-manifestoliberties-and-commons-for-all-2008.pdf>
- Mansoori, I. (2024). *Development as Consciousness: An Introduction to a New Epistemology. Toward a Logic for Economic Practices*. ZBW - Leibniz Information Centre for Economics, Kiel, Hamburg. <https://hdl.handle.net/10419/312155>
- Obergassel, W. et al. (2024). *Not Gift from God; A first assessment of COP29 in Baku*. Wuppertal Institute. https://wupperinst.org/fa/redaktion/downloads/publications/COP29-Report_en.pdf
- Olson, M. (1965). *Public Goods and the Theory of Groups*. Harvard University Press.
- Ostrom, E. (2010). *Analyzing collective action*. *Agricultural Economics*. 41, 155–166. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1574-0862.2010.00497.x>
- Ostrom, E. (2010). Beyond Markets and States: Polycentric Governance of Complex Economic Systems. *American Economic Review*. 100, 1–33. <http://www.aeaweb.org/articles.php?doi=10.1257/aer.100.3.1>

Ostrom, E. (2008). *The Challenge of Common Pool Resources*. Environment. 50 (4), 8–21. https://conservation-strategy.org/sites/default/files/field-files/Ostrom_Challenge_of_Common_Pool_Resources_Environment_JulyAug_2008_1.pdf

Ostrom, Elinor. 2005. *Understanding Institutional Diversity*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Ostrom, E. (2002). *Property-Rights Regimes and Common Goods: A Complex Link*. In Adrienne Héritier (Ed.), *Common Goods. Reinventing European and International Governance*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers. 29– 57.

Ostrom, E. (1999). *Coping with tragedies of the commons*. Annual Review of Political Science, 2(1), 493–535. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.polisci.2.1.493>

Ostrom, E. (1990). *Governing the commons: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.

Ramos, J. (2017). *The Rise of Commons-Based Economic Governance*. Journal of Futures Studies. 22(1): 73–88

Ruiz-Ballesteros, E., Gual M. A. (2012). *The Emergence of New Commons Community and Multi-Level Governance in the Ecuadorian Coast*. Hum Ecol (2012) 40:847–862. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-012-9540-1>

Musgrave, R. A. (1959). *The Theory of Public Finance: A Study in Public Economy*. McGraw Hill.

McGillivray, M. (2016). *What is Development?* In D. Kingsbury et al. (Ed.), *International Development: Issues and Challenges*. (pp. 78–107). Palgrave Marshall, D. D. (2014). *The New World Group of Dependency Scholars: Reflections of a Caribbean*

Mukhopadhyay, A. K. (2009). *Brain, Mind, and Consciousness*. In N. S. Rangaswamy (Ed.), *Life and Organicism*. 159–191. Pub. Center for Studies in Civilization.

Rotila, V. (2015). *Social formatting of mind: the structuring of consciousness on domains*. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282869725_The_Structure_of_Consciousness_The_Concept_of_Domain_of_Consciousness_1

Samuelson, Paul A. (1954). *The Pure Theory of Public Expenditures*. The Review of Economics and Statistics. 36, 387–389.

Schöneberg, J. et al. (2022). *The many faces of Post-Development: Alternatives to Development in Tanzania, Iran, and Haiti*. Sustainability Science. 17, 1223–1234. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11625-022-01164-5>

Searle, J. R. (2004). *Mind: A Brief Introduction*. Oxford University Press. <https://coehuman.uodiyala.edu.iq/uploads/Coehuman%20library%20pdf/English%20library%D9%83%D8%AA%D8%A8%20%D8%A7%D9%84%D8%A7%D9%86%D9%83%D9%84%D9%8A%D8%B2%D9%8A/linguistics/SEARLE,%20John%20-%20Mind%20A%20Brief%20Introduction.pdf>

Shiva, V. (2010). A Guide to Knowledge as Power, in W. Sachs, (Ed.), The Development Dictionary. Zed Books.

Shteynberg, G. et al. (2023). *Theory of collective mind*. Trends in Cognitive Sciences. TICS 2462. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.06.009>

Shteynberg, G. et al. (2020). *Shared worlds and shared minds: a theory of collective learning and a psychology of common knowledge*. Psychol. Rev. 127, 918–931. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2023.06.009>

Smith, A. (1776). *The Wealth of Nations*. Collier & Sons. <https://rauterberg.employee.id.tue.nl/lecturenotes/DDM110%20CAS/Smith-1776%20Wealth%20of%20Nations.pdf>

Ule A. (2015). *Consciousness, Mind, And Spirit: Three Levels Of Human Cognition*. Interdisciplinary Description of Complex Systems 13(4), 488–500. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11229-019-02367-7>

Vernooy, R., Shareshta, P., Sthapit, B. (2015). *Community Seed Banks; Origins, Evolution, and Prospects*. Routledge. <https://cgspace.cgiar.org/server/api/core/bitstreams/9357aa73-02eb-405f-971c-f894a412c18f/content>

White House (2025). *Putting America First in International Environmental Agreements*. The White House. <https://www.whitehouse.gov/presidential-actions/2025/01/putting-america-first-in-international-environmental-agreements/>

Ziai, A. (2019). *Towards a More Critical Theory of 'Development' in the 21st Century*. Development and Change. 50(2), 458–467. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dech.12484>

Ziai, A. (2017). *Post-development 25 years after The Development Dictionary*. *Third World Quarterly*. 38(12), 2547–2558. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2017.1383853>

Ziai, A. (2016). *Development Discourse and Global History. From Colonialism to the Sustainable Development Goals*. Routledge.