



This is a draft of the entry for *Encyclopedia of the Social and Solidarity Economy* (forthcoming 2023) published by Edward Elgar Publishing Limited in partnership with United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE). This work has been funded by the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg.

Moral Economy, Human Economy, and the Social and Solidarity Economy

Jean-Louis Laville

Conservatoire National des Arts et Métiers à Paris (Cnam)

Bibliographic information

Jean-Louis Laville. Forthcoming 2023. Moral Economy, Human Economy, and the Social and Solidarity Economy. Edited by Ilcheong Yi, Peter Utting, Jean-Louis Laville, Barbara Sak, Caroline Hossein, Sifa Chiyoge, Cecilia Navarra, Denison Jayasooria, Fernanda Wanderley, Jacques Defourny, and Rocio Nogales-Muriel. *Encyclopedia of the Social and Solidarity Economy*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited in partnership with United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE).

Or

Jean-Louis Laville. Forthcoming 2023. Moral Economy, Human Economy, and the Social and Solidarity Economy. Edited by Ilcheong Yi et al. *Encyclopedia of the Social and Solidarity Economy*. Cheltenham and Northampton, MA. Edward Elgar Publishing Limited in partnership with United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE).

June 2022

UNTFSSSE Knowledge Hub Draft Paper Series

For more details, please visit the Edward Elgar's Companion Website (<https://www.edelgar.com/textbooks/yi/>) and Main book page (<https://www.edelgar.com/shop/gbp/encyclopedia-of-the-social-and-solidarity-economy-9781803920917.html>)



The responsibility for opinions expressed in this document rests solely with their author(s), and availability on the SSE Knowledge Hub for the SDGs (unsse.org) does not constitute endorsement by the United Nations Inter-Agency Task Force on Social and Solidarity Economy (UNTFSSSE), or its institutional members, partners or observers, of the opinions expressed in it. No publication or distribution of this document is permitted without the prior authorization of the author(s), except for personal use. This document is made available on the SSE Knowledge Hub for the SDGs in the form and language in which it was received.

Abstract

The concept of moral economy was introduced by the historian E.P. Thompson as “a consistent traditional view of social norms and obligations, of the proper economic functions of several parties within the community”. And James C. Scott recaptures the moral economy for “peasant conceptions of social justice, of rights and obligations, of reciprocity”. It has been used in different social and human sciences and, as other authors like Didier Fassin mention, this approach of economics, different from the mainstream, is relevant for the past but also for the present. One of its forms today is a human economy characterized by the fact that it is made and remade by people in their daily lives taking into account the institutional complexity and based on a more holistic conception of the world and society. So the social and solidarity economy(SSE) can be considered as a kind of human economy emphasizing the values and roles of democratic solidarity-based practices as well as long term links between human and non-human beings. Mainstream economics seems inappropriate for the ecological and social challenges of the 21st century. That is why the moral economy acquires a current pertinence which is empirically supported by the existence of SSE, understood as a human economy that offers both protection and emancipation.

Keywords: moral economy; human economy; social economy; democratic solidarity; solidarity economy; political economy; transition

Introduction

In the 17th century, the theorists of political economy developed a so-called “classical” economic science. This recognised self-interest as the precondition for exchange: “it is not from the benevolence of the butcher, the brewer, or the baker that we expect our dinner, but from their regard for their own self-interest” Adam Smith wrote (1998). The multiplication of acts of buying and selling then produces an unintentional social order; each individual is “led by an invisible hand” and “by pursuing his own interest he frequently promotes that of the society more effectually than when he really intends to promote it”. In the 19th century, the “neoclassical” school proposed to go further, founding a “pure political economy” which they understood as a “science quite similar to the physical and mathematical sciences” (Walras 1988, 52-30). Walras did still accept the existence of both applied economics, “a theory of the economic production of social wealth” (*op. cit.*, 61 §34) and social economics, which dealt with “the distribution of social wealth” (*ibid.*, 65 §38), but they only had a secondary role.

1. The concept of moral economy

It is this way of seeing the economy that Edward Palmer Thompson contests. He sets out not to claim “that Smith and his colleagues were immoral or were unconcerned for the public good” (Thompson 1993, 201-2) but to challenge the “abbreviated view of economic man” when it becomes “a crass economic reductionism, obliterating the complexities of motive, behaviour, and function” (Thompson *op. cit.* 187). One example of this over-simplicity is the spasmodic view of popular history, according to which social unrest is merely a consequence of rising food prices. Through an examination of the actions of the English “mob” in the 18th century, Thompson puts forward the concept of moral economy to refute this excessively superficial explanation. He shows that “riots” were forms of direct action, “disciplined and with clear objectives”, involving “definite, and passionately held, notions of the common weal”. They had a “popular consensus” legitimised by “a consistent traditional view of social norms and obligations, of the proper economic functions of several parties within the community” (Thompson *op. cit.* 188).

James C. Scott employs this idea to consider “peasant conceptions of social justice, of rights and obligations, of reciprocity” (Scott 1985, 341). Like Thompson, he does not see these shared rules as inciting passivity, but rather as leading to revolts that occur when collective principles are flouted and the protections provided by inherited redistributive institutions are swept away. So protests do not arise suddenly as a result of events but are rooted in the values and affects that characterize everyday resistance. They are the weapons of the weak (Scott 1976).

The term “moral economy” is also used by Lorraine Daston to refer to values and affects, but this time among scientific researchers, according to an approach that Didier Fassin endorses when he defines “moral economy as the production, distribution, circulation and use of emotions and values, norms and obligations in the social space” (Fassin 2012, 37). This development is valuable in the sense that it does not confine the concept of moral economy to a defence of ways of life that predate the market society. On the other hand, however, it loses the critical edge it has when deployed by Thompson and

Scott. This is why, starting again from these authors, this entry will move beyond chronological divisions, making it possible to preserve the concept's epistemological contribution. It will neither restrict its use to a particular historical period nor equate it to a set of rules in any particular social sphere. A moral economy can emerge at any time; what matters is its ability to effectively challenge the monopoly on understanding the economy that orthodox economics has granted itself.

Thus, solidarity-based associationalism (the forgotten source of the SSE. See also the entries "Origins and histories of SSE" and "Associations") can be understood as a form of moral economy that, in the 19th century, was inspired by customs established in different settings (villages, trades, families, etc.), and transformed them by introducing principles of freedom and equality emanating from the democratic revolutions (see the entry "Associations and associationalism"). So both transmission and invention played a role here. Social bonds anchored in the *longue durée* were preserved and modified to bring about forms of self-organised reciprocity that contrasted with previous hierarchies.

2. Moral economy: from oblivion to renaissance

As Thompson says, political economy was not enough to guarantee civil peace (Thompson 1963). Faced with the risks generated by social inequality, the ruling classes supplemented this with a form of philanthropic solidarity advocated by Bastiat, Malthus and Ricardo. It was necessary to eradicate the moral economy so that it could be replaced by this moralization of the poor. With philanthropy, morality was no longer something produced by the groups concerned but became a condition of access to relief – which was reserved for the deserving poor – imposed by the authorities.

Philanthropy was in turn marginalised by the welfare state, which seemed sufficient for restricting and regulating the operation of the market. The moral economy thus experienced a long eclipse.

At the end of the 20th century, new social movements – whose appearance demonstrated that social conflict could not be reduced to class struggle alone – attacked the impasses of a mode of development premised on the complementarity of market and state. The environmental movement challenged a conception of the economy based on endless expansion without regard for the planet's limits, while the feminist movement revealed the residual paternalism and gender inequalities embedded in the traditional welfare state's modes of intervention. These movements were controversial, but they pointed to transformations in modes of engagement. Compared with previous movements, they were both more concerned with concrete actions on the ground and more prefigurative, i.e. the means they mobilised had to anticipate the objectives pursued. This re-emphasis on alternative experiences, which is expressed in alter-globalization (one of whose slogans is: "resist and build: another world is possible . . . and it is already here") has given rise to the rebirth of a moral economy perspective (see the entry "Globalization, alter-globalization and SSE"). This perspective is advanced through the idea of a human economy, inspired by Thompson's economics "from the bottom up". Its main assumption is that economics that focuses on mathematical calculations rooted in the rational individual's utility maximization has an implicit normative stance that makes it inappropriate for safeguarding human and non-human

beings in the 21st century. As a consequence, it is necessary to return to a more realistic conception of the economy embedded in most people's everyday experiences. So a human economy is a form of moral economy characterized by four features:

- "It is made and remade by people; economics should be of practical use to us all in our daily lives.
- It should address a great variety of particular situations in all their institutional complexity.
- It must be based on a more holistic conception of everyone's needs and interests.
- It has to address humanity as a whole and the world society we are making."

This human economy does not have to be created, it "is already everywhere" (Hart, Laville, and Cattani 2010, 5); the problem is that it is made invisible by mainstream economics. And, as the epistemologies of the South point out, this absence explains why it remains so difficult for the SSE to flourish.

3. The SSE as a form of human economy

It is now possible to summarize the relationship between the moral economy, the human economy and the SSE. It is clear that many forms of moral economy prioritize social protection, and are liable to forget about emancipation. Among the different types of moral economy are nationalist protectionism and conservative values, and elites also have moral norms that legitimize inequalities (Hann 2010, 187-198). Within this wide range of moral economies, the social and solidarity economy will gain strength if it is defined as a form of human economy that emphasizes the values and rules of democratic solidarity-based practices – one that takes account of long-term links between human and non-human beings and aims at more than just short-term utility maximization. The SSE fulfils this definition as it combines protection and emancipation, helping to bring about a transformative solidary and environmental transition. But this project of the SSE uses the language of social struggles for emancipation, and for this reason, it is being contested by a new wave of philanthropic solidarity.

First-generation neoliberalism, formulated by Friedrich Hayek (1983), centred on reaffirming the primacy of competition and limiting democracy. It did so by weakening the mechanisms for collective expression and putting the state at the service of a re-marketisation, by shrinking the domain of public services, through financialisation or through deregulation according to the principles condensed in 1989 in the Washington Consensus. Today, the ode to competition typical of Friedman and Hayek's writings is coupled with a concern to establish a form of social-purpose capitalism. The result, social business, is based on the promise of eradicating poverty and is presented as a miracle recipe. Social business initiatives have only rarely been subject to independent evaluations, and these are hardly conclusive (Humberg 2011). The discourse of social business is nevertheless welcomed by public authorities absorbed in their own budgetary problems and is supported by private interests anxious for new investment opportunities. Some of these are already being offered by "bottom of the pyramid" marketing methods targeted at the poorest populations, and by social impact bonds. The mechanism through which these social impact investments operate is revealing; one of its key features is that it shifts the financial risk within social services from the public

authority to a private intermediary. Financed by institutional investors, this intermediary takes on the entrepreneurial risk and allocates funds to operators. It receives payment from the public authority – and investors make a return on their investment – only if its results are judged successful. Such projects rest on a new philosophy of financialising the social sector since it is private actors who determine where interventions take place. They have spread to many different countries, expanding into the culture, international solidarity and development. A whole set of tools is now available for the private redeployment of solidarity. Social business limits discussion to questions about initiatives' effectiveness and efficiency in fulfilling social objectives, without worrying about the distribution of power.

Having seen the inadequacy of social democracy that placed its faith in public redistribution alone to protect society, it is important to reassert the strength of the principle of solidarity. It is also necessary to rediscover the complementarity of the two forms of democratic solidarity – one based on rights and public redistribution, the other on civil ties and egalitarian reciprocity. This will involve both the SSE and public authorities acknowledging their interdependence while recognizing that, in the present as in the past, these two entities are neither separable nor substitutable.

Current levels of social and environmental damage are such that it is no longer enough to simply check economic activity through taxation and redistribution for social purposes. The welfare state's achievements must be supported by a concern for public participation. Representative democracy can now be reinforced by forms of deliberative democracy that are not only granted, but also won through collective action. What is now needed is a new model that is both opposed to neo-conservatism, but also distinct from welfare-statism or the "third way". This new model must include a project to renew public debate and deliberation – a project that corresponds to what can be called plural democracy. Its future depends on public authorities' capacity to consolidate representative democracy by feeding it with voices from a more open public sphere, extending the social dialogue between social partners to include other components of civil society. This is a paradigm shift in public action.

If modes of production and consumption are to change, then capitalism cannot be seen as the only mode of economic activity; other ways of valuing goods and services must be recognized (see the entry "Community economics and SSE"). We are at the end of a period of growth based on scientific arrogance and the belief in human omnipotence. In the future, economic means must be chosen according to environmental, social and cultural ends.

Transforming our societies in a way that addresses environmental and social crises will largely depend on the rejection of the orthodox definition of the economy, which is based on the principle of self-interest alone. It is crucial both to limit commodification and pluralize economic logic. In short, the neo-classical approach developed at the end of the 19th century is becoming inappropriate for the challenges of the 21st century. Hence the revival of a moral economy perspective. This approach should not be reserved for analyzing the societies of the past. Its current relevance is empirically supported by the existence of the SSE, which can be understood as a form of human economy – one that offers both protection and emancipation.

Bibliography

Daston, Lorraine. 1995. "The Moral Economy of Science". *Osiris* 10: 2-24.
<https://doi.org/10.1086/368740>

Fassin, Didier. 2012. "Vers une théorie des économies morales". In *Economie Morale Contemporaine*, 19-47. Paris: La Découverte.

Hann, Chris. 2010. "Moral Economy". In *The Human Economy: A Citizen's Guide*. London: Polity.

Hart, Keith, Jean-Louis Laville and David Antonio Cattani. 2010. "Building the Human Economy Together" in *The Human Economy. A Citizen's Guide*. London: Polity.

Hayek, Friedrich A. 1983. *Law, Legislation and Liberty, Volume 3: Political Order of a Free People*. London and Henley: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Humberg, Kerstin Maria. 2011. *Poverty Reduction through Social Business?: Lessons learned from Grameen Joint Ventures in Bangladesh*. Munchen: Oekom.

Scott, James C. 1976. *The Moral Economy of the Peasant: Rebellion and Subsistence in Southern Asia*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Scott, James C. 1985. *Weapons of the Weak. Everyday Forms of Peasant Resistance*. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.

Smith, Adam. 1998. *The Wealth of Nations*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Thompson, Edward Palmer. 1963. *The Making of the English Working Class*. London: Victor Gollancz.

Thompson, Edward Palmer. 1993. *Customs in Common*. London: Penguin.

Walras, Léon. 1988. *Elements of Pure Economics*. Paris: Economica.