CONCEPT OF ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Yelahanka Lokesh
Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni

ALEXIS PRESS
JERSEY CITY, USA

CONCEPT OF
ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

CONCEPT OF ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Yelahanka Lokesh

Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni

ALEXIS PRESS

ALEXIS PRESS

Published by: Alexis Press, LLC, Jersey City, USA
www.alexispress.us

First Published 2022

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication Data

Includes bibliographical references and index.

Concept of Ecological Economics by *Yelahanka Lokesh, Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni*

ISBN 978-1-64532-934-3

CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1

AN OVERVIEW OF ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Mr. Yelahanka Lokesh
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: lokesh.yr@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Understanding the intricate relationships between human economies and the natural environment is the goal of the multidisciplinary discipline of ecological economics. The major tenets, ideas, and approaches that constitute ecological economics are thoroughly examined in this review. The main ideas of ecological economics are defined at the outset of the essay, with a focus on the necessity for sustainable resource usage and the understanding of the Earth's finite carrying capacity. It examines the idea of "ecosystem services," emphasising the pivotal function of ecosystems in the provision of necessary products and services that sustain human well-being. Following an overview, the main ideas and theoretical frameworks of ecological economics are explored. It examines the idea of externalities and emphasises how crucial it is to take into consideration the environmental costs and benefits of economic activity. It is explained how human activities affect ecosystems and natural resources via the notion of ecological footprint. By looking at different economic valuation techniques, the overview also investigates how ecological and economic systems might work together. It talks about the difficulties of putting monetary values on things like biodiversity and ecosystem resilience that are not sold on the open market.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Ecology, Environmental, Market.

INTRODUCTION

The term "eco" is derived from the Greek word "oikos," which is used in both ecology and economics. Oikos translates as home. Economics is the study of housekeeping in human society, whereas ecology is the study of housekeeping in the natural world. Economics is the study of how people earn a livelihood and satiate their wants and desires, whereas ecology is the study of how animals and plants relate to their organic and inorganic surroundings[1], [2].The study of the interactions between human housekeeping and natural housekeeping is known as ecological economics. In other words, it is concerned with how ecological and economic systems interact. According to these definitions, the study of economics is in some ways a subset of the study of ecology since humans are a type of animal. However, because of their ability to connect socially with one another, humans are a unique kind of animal, and their current eco- nomic activity is clearly distinct from that of other animals. Ecology and economics are sciences whose subject subjects intersect rather than one being a subset of the other, and ecological economics is where they do. It treats the world's economies as a unified system, with the planet earth's whole natural environment serving as the "Environment." The environment is where the economy is situated, and it trades matter and energy with it. Humans take resources from the environment that are important for their survival, such as oil, iron ore, lumber, etc.

Humans also release the many waste products that inevitably result from earning a livelihood, such as sulphur dioxide and carbon dioxide from burning oil. Earth's environment, which is the rest of the cosmos, has an environment of its own. Our environment and its environment exchange energy but not matter. Environmental transfers of materials and energy have long been a part of human economic activity. Without interaction with nature, people would not be able to meet their requirements. The degree of contact did not significantly alter the functioning of the environment, save locally, during the most of human history due to the fact that there were relatively few people. But during the last three centuries, the size of the exchanges has grown significantly. The amounts of human economic activity's extractions from and insertions into the environment now have an impact on how it functions on a global scale. The capacity of the environment to support human economic activity is impacted by changes in how it functions. Because of their interdependence, the environment and economy are both affected by what occurs in the former. Another way we may phrase this is to suggest that the economy and the environment work together as a single system[3], [4].

The contribution of carbon dioxide to climate change is one illustration of this. Carbon dioxide is released into the atmosphere as a consequence of the extraction and burning of fossil fuels in the economy. One of numerous "greenhouse gases" is carbon dioxide. The number of these gases in the atmosphere influences the energy exchanges between the environment and its environment; larger concentrations of these gases result in a warmer environment, or planet earth. Carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere have grown during the last 200 years as a consequence of increased usage of fossil fuels. According to the agreement of experts, this has already warmed the earth and will do so again. The precise amount of warming that may be anticipated, say by 2100, is unknown. However, experts agree that it will be sufficient to have significant effects on human economic activity and the fulfilment of wants and ambitions. Beyond 2100, the effects might be disastrous[5], [6].

A Summary of the Environment's History in Economics

Examining the historical roles played by the natural environment in economics is one method to teach ecological economics. With the publication of The Wealth of Nations by Adam Smith (1723–1790), the study of economics as a separate subject was established in 1776. This in-depth investigation into the nature and reasons of economic advancement is now mostly known for Smith's "invisible hand" theory[7], [8]. This is the notion that, under the appropriate conditions, allowing people the freedom to pursue their own selfish goals would benefit society the most. Smith belonged to the school of thought that is now referred to as "the classical economists," whose theories dominated economic thought up to the latter quarter of the nineteenth century. The gloomy science label applied to classical economics was well-known. This was because it adopted the perspective, mainly attributed to Thomas Malthus (1766–1834), that the chances for raising living standards over the long term were dim. This viewpoint was founded on the presumption that agricultural land will always be available and that the human population would continue to expand. The environment, according to traditional economists, placed constraints on the growth of economic activity, making it more likely that, in the long term, worker salaries would be pushed down to subsistence levels. This did not go well as a forecast. In reality, it has been incorrect so far.

Since the beginning of the nineteenth century, population growth and growing living standards have been the major characteristics of experience for the economies of western Europe and its offshoots. Malthus' error is often attributed to his disregard for technological advancement. When technology was really moving extremely quickly in the years after the industrial revolution, he and the other classical economists made the mistake of assuming it was static. It is important to keep in mind, though, that during this time, the economies of

western Europe were not running on a fixed supply of agricultural land; instead, more and more food was being imported from 'new' land in the Americas and Australasia, where those economies were exporting people.

One of the things that contributed to the downfall of classical economics was this prediction failure. Around 1870, classical economics started to give way to what is now known as "neoclassical economics" in mainstream economics. By 1950, students of economics were only exposed to the theories of the classical economists as a part of the discipline's history. Neoclassical economics, which emerged about 1950, primarily neglected the connections between human housekeeping and nature's housekeeping. While the natural environment, namely the availability of land, had been a key concern of classical economists, these links were now being taken more seriously. Economists created models of economic development in the 1950s and 1960s that omitted the natural environment entirely. According to these views, the level of life may continue to rise indefinitely with sound economic management. Economic policy's primary goal has increasingly been the pursuit of economic growth. One significant factor in this was the perception that economic expansion offered the possibility of eradicating poverty in a relatively easy manner. In no way is neoclassical economics "dismal."

Neoclassical economics started to take an interest in the environment again in the early 1970s, and now it encompasses the two significant specialisations, or sub-disciplines, of environmental economics and natural resource economics (sometimes simply resource economics). Environmental economics is primarily concerned with issues related to environmental contamination and the economy's interactions with the environment. Natural resource economics focuses on issues related to the utilisation of 'natural resources' and the economy's extraction of resources from the environment. Higher-level elective courses in one or both of these specialisations are now offered in a number of university economics degrees. The majority of economics programmes' required courses give little attention to how the economy and environment interact. Even if you are not extremely knowledgeable on environmental and resource economics, you may still be considered an economist. Neoclassical economists acknowledge the importance of the environment, but they do not believe that an education in economics should include a thorough grasp of the linkages between the economy and the environment.

DISCUSSION

Ecological economists agree that having this knowledge is a crucial component of economics education. The foundation of ecological economics is the premise that an accurate study of "how humans make their living" must also examine how the human animal interacts with its "organic and inorganic environment." The study of the relationship between the economy and the environment is fundamental to ecological economics, in contrast to neoclassical economics, which views it as an optional bonus. The fact that economic activity occurs inside the environment is the first step.

A relatively young, interdisciplinary area of research is ecological economics. Many scientists began to realise in the latter three decades of the 20th century that human economic activity was having negative effects on the environment and that these effects would be financially detrimental to coming generations. The International Society for Ecological Economics was founded in 1989 as a result of the belief shared by a number of academics from various fields that studying economy-environment interdependence and its implications necessitates a transdisciplinary approach that incorporates aspects of both the traditional fields of economics and ecology[9], [10].

The prefixes are employed by various persons in relation to academic fields and research in somewhat different ways. However, the following sums up what the majority of people mean when they say "multidisciplinary research": Multidisciplinary research attempts to bring information from several fields of study together. The interdisciplinary approach enhances understanding of the issue, and the new insights contribute to the advancement of the contributing fields. Interdisciplinary research also implies that all disciplinary representatives are involved in problem definition, familiarisation with concepts and methods from other disciplines, incorporation of findings from other disciplines, and presentation of findings. Issue-focused and multidisciplinary, transdisciplinary research ideally engages both stakeholders and researchers from related areas.

When we state that ecological economics is cross-disciplinary, we don't only mean that it is interested in economic and ecological phenomena and that it draws from the fields of ecology and economics. It is and does, but there is more going on. The 'trans' in reference to ecological economics refers to occurrences and issues that transcend or cross academic boundaries. Not only must an economist and an ecological study such events and issues separately using their own methods and viewpoints. It calls for a shared viewpoint that "transcends" that which is typical of the two disciplines. Working on the connection of the economy and environment requires changing the standard economics paradigm to account for the material foundation of economic activity and the reality that humans are, despite all else, an animal species. The conventional ecological viewpoint must acknowledge the contribution made by humans as a species to the health of all ecosystems. With these viewpoint changes comes the realisation of the value of analytical tools and techniques that were previously thought to belong to a different field.

Another two points. First off, the appropriate study of economy and environment interaction encompasses numerous disciplines that are of great relevance, in addition to ecological economics as we have defined it. We do believe that ecological economics is a good place to start, however. Second, there are numerous economic and ecological occurrences and issues that fall within the purview of established academic disciplines. If all you want to learn about is how the stock market operates, you don't really need to learn much about ecology. Similarly, if all you are interested in is the food chains in a far-off lake, you don't really need to think about ecology. However, you do need to transcend borders if you want to comprehend the global economy as a system for gratifying human wants and desires or the functioning of the global ecology in terms of the distribution and abundance of species.

Along with analysing how people actually earn a livelihood, economists have provided guidance on how people should live throughout the history of economics. The prescriptive nature of economics is one of the things that draws many people to it. Adam Smith initially advocated for a greater dependence on markets and less government involvement in economic concerns than was really the situation at the time he wrote. Since his time, economists' opinions on a wide range of public policy concerns have always been a significant contribution to political discourse. On any particular policy topic, infamously, economists have never spoken with a unified voice. Both among neoclassical economists and between neoclassical and ecological economists, there exist disagreements. We must examine the causes of policy disparities in order to provide the foundation for an introduction to the link between ecological and neoclassical economics.That is what section 1.5 is for. In order to properly utilise the phrases "economist(s)," "neoclassical economist(s)," and "ecological economist(s)" there and throughout the remainder of this work, we must first define them. There are several topics on which the majority of ecologists and neoclassical economists agree. In discussions of this sort, we shall use the terms "economists" or "economics" without

any more qualification. We shall use the terms "neoclassical economists/economics" or "ecological economists/economics" as appropriate when referring to areas where there are notable distinctions.

The "positive" and the "normative" are distinguished when thinking about study modalities. A normative research incorporates prescriptive components, while a positive study is entirely descriptive. A report on successful research would only include assertions about what is or might be -- facts and explanations. Such encouraging words would probably be included in a report on normative research, along with normative suggestions for how things should be. A statement that is true has the structure "event A always follows action B." "Event A is bad, so action B should be avoided," would be a similar normative statement. The proposal in this case needs two things: a factual connection from A to B, and an assessment of the result A as undesirable. Every proposal and piece of policy guidance has both constructive and normative components.

In theory, it is feasible to prove positive claims to be true or false in a manner that satisfies all persons involved. Let's say Jack and Jill are the parties with an interest. Jill disagrees with Jack's assertion that A always comes after B. It is possible to come to an agreement. For instance, Jack and Jill may keep track of several repetitions of action B and the occurrence—or nonoccurrenceof event A that followed. Jack would have to concede that the adage "event A always follows action B" is untrue if ever A did not take place. With normative claims, things are different since they cannot be objectively judged as true or incorrect. No experiment can settle a disagreement between Jack and Jill on whether or not A is a poor result.

One definition of science is the process of categorising affirmative propositions into true and untrue. Some might argue that a discipline is not a science if it requires making suggestions. However, a lot of people who work in what are often thought of as scientific disciplines do provide recommendations. No contradiction is necessary in this case. A lot of advise is really conditional counsel. As a result, a scientist working in that field may advise, "If you want A to happen, make B happen." if it were well-known in some field that A did invariably follow B. If you want to experience less pain, take this drug, for instance, is the kind of thing that medical professionals, for example, spend a lot of time researching. This kind of remark by a scientist does not cause any issues when, as in this instance, the aim that is the foundation for the suggestion -- pain reduction -- would be commonly recognised as self-evidently beneficial. Frequently, the conditionality is implicit because it is so clear and unarguable.

It is possible to think of economists' proposals as conditional counsel of the kind, "repeal the minimum wage law if you want a healthy economy." However, there is a "if" in both the economist's and the doctor's statements. ..then, there are significant changes in the structure.

among them. While 'economic health' is an abstraction defined with relation to many people, pain is a direct experience via the senses of an individual. It is worthwhile to investigate just what a "healthy economy" may be, and any definition must include normative components.

various economists arrive at suggestions for various reasons; some disputes have normative roots, while others have positive foundations. Not all optimistic economic claims can be categorically categorised as true or untrue. There is disagreement among economists as to how the economy really operates; some believe that raising the minimum wage causes unemployment, while others disagree. However, even if all economists agreed on the true/false classification of all hypothetically positive statements about the operation of the economy, different recommendations could still result from different understandings of what "economic health" is. For example, economist Jack might think it requires an unemployment

rate below 3%, while economist Jill might think it requires any level of unemployment below 10%.

When economists agree on suggestions, it is because they also agree on normative standards for judging performance and positive explanations of how things operate. We refer to the normative criteria that people employ when selecting between alternative choices as "preferences" or "tastes" at the level of researching individuals making these decisions. Given that Jack had the option of purchasing either oranges or lemons, we can argue that his choice of fruit is influenced by his preferences between the two. We examine the normative criteria involved in the analysis of policy decisions in terms of their foundation in some ethical perspective. The study of the moral principles that should guide behaviour is known as ethics or moral philosophy. How can we determine if a course of action is ethically right or wrong? is one of its central issues. There are two major philosophical traditions.

Moral correctness, in accordance with deontological views, is an issue of performing duties. Moral correctness is to be evaluated in terms of the results of an action, according to consequentialist views. Consider the following question to show the difference: Is it ever okay to lie? On deontological criteria, the answer is "no," whereas on consequential criteria, it is "yes." In the former situation, it is maintained that telling the truth is a universal obligation. In the latter scenario, there can be situations in which telling a falsehood has a better result than stating the truth.

A specific kind of consequentialism is utilitarianism. According to utilitarianism, the balance between pleasure and misery that a behaviour causes determines whether or not it is morally right to do so. The ethically right thing to do is to enhance the overall amount of pleasure or decrease the total amount of misery; the morally wrong thing to do is to do the opposite. 'Utility' refers to a person's position in relation to the relative importance of pleasure and pain: pleasure enhances an individual's utility, while pain decreases it. According to utilitarianism, morally righteous activities are those that improve wel- fare. The word "welfare" is used to refer to the entirety of value among persons. The moral tenet on which economics is based is utilitarianism.

For utilitarianism, there are three primary issues to consider. Whose usefulness is important first? How is usefulness measured, secondly? Third, how is welfare calculated by summing the utility of all individuals? The responses to these three questions indicate that there are several types of utilitarianism. We shall examine the contrasts and similarities between ecological economics and neoclassical economics.

Since sustainability and sustainable development are two of the most important concepts in ecological economics, they will play a significant role in this work. Sustainability means preserving the combined economy-environment system's ability to continue meeting people's needs and wants for a very long time into the future. The combined economy-environment system is in a sustainable mode of operation if it is running as needed for sustainability; otherwise, it is not. Concerns concerning the size and content of economic activity—in terms of the types of extractions from and insertions into the environment—are necessary to distinguish between economically viable and unsustainable configurations. The opinion that the current state of the global economy was unsustainable was a major driving force behind the founding of the International Society for Ecological Economics in 1989. They were worried about aspects of contemporary economic activity that they saw as risks to sustainability and that may impair the ability of the combined economy-environment system to continue satiating human wants and desires. An example of a danger to sustainability is climate change.

The concept of "maintaining" a capacity indicates that it is adequate. In reality, many academics contended that rather than maintaining the combined economy-environment system's ability to satisfy human needs, it should be strengthened in the second half of the 20th century. Mass poverty is a significant aspect of the present state of humanity. Economic expansion, which broadens the scope of economic activity, is usually seen as the answer to poverty. This is a serious issue. On the one hand, many believe that the level of global economic activity at the moment poses a danger to sustainability, reducing the capability to meet future human wants and aspirations. On the other hand, many contend that in order to reduce poverty, economic activity must be expanded. It seems that addressing poverty today will lead to future economic issues due to the environmental effects of expanding present economic activity.

Our Common Future was one of the most significant and influential books of the latter half of the 20th century. The World Commission on Environment and Development, or WCED, released this study in 1987, two years before the International Society for Ecological Economics was established. The report is sometimes referred to as the "Brundtland Report" since Ms. Brundtland served as the committee's head. Both the degree of poverty and the different sustainability challenges were outlined in Our Common Future. It made the case that the circle could be squared and that future economic issues could not be brought on by the economic development needed to address poverty. The Brundtland Report claimed that what was required was a new sort of economic development that had far less of an effect on the environment and that, rather than endangering sustainability, expanded the potential of the combined economy-environment system to satisfy human needs. It promoted sustainable development as a means of achieving what was necessary. It is: a kind of economic development that would satisfy the wants and requirements of the present without jeopardising the ability of the economy-environment system to satisfy them in the future.

The Relationship Between Ecological and National Asocial Economics

In this part, we'll examine the general link between ecological theory and neoclassical economics in terms of both theories' positive and normative aspects. Whose utility counts is the first question we raised in relation to utilitarianism. The solution according to economic, ecological, and neoclassical theories is all the people who are impacted by the activity. The joy and misery of any impacted animal may theoretically be taken into consideration under utilitarianism. Some utilitarian school moral philosophers contend that in determining the appropriate balance between pleasure and misery, consideration should be given to all affected creatures who are capable of experiencing both. If this claim were to be true, welfare would be based not just on the utilities of humans but also on the utilities of all'sentient' creatures. The higher animals have mostly been recommended as alternatives to taking into account alongside humans. The utility of animals are not considered in normative economics. It is anthropocentric because non-human consequences of an activity are only considered inasmuch as they cause human suffering or pleasure. If no humans experience (mental) anguish as a result of animal suffering brought on by an activity, then that suffering is not included in the evaluation of the action's pleasure/pain balance. If any person experiences pain, that anguish—not the suffering of animals—affects the balance between pleasure and pain. Additionally, while assessing the activity that caused the damage and the suffering, it should be taken into consideration whether any person experiences pain as a result of the harm done to a non-sentimental entity, such as a structure.

There is absolutely no distinction between ecological economics and neoclassical economics in regards to the solution to the first issue. Both are utilitarian and anthropocentric. Regarding the second query, how should human pleasure and suffering be quantified? – there

are several variations. Neoclassical economics holds that each individual human being who is impacted must decide for herself whether her utility has improved or reduced. The only variable used to determine how an individual's utility has changed is that person's own preferences. Individual preferences are accepted as givens and are not morally judged. 'Consumer sovereignty' is another name for this idea. Individual preferences are not disregarded in ecological economics, but they are neither treated as sovereign nor as the exclusive source of normative standards.

Neoclassical economics holds that there can be no moral justification for attempting to alter an individual's preferences if it can be assumed that they have access to all relevant information. There can be no justification for arguing that while a desire for driving a vehicle should be discouraged, a taste for cycling should be promoted. In ecological economics, there may be a moral justification for contrasting, assessing, and attempting to alter preferences. Environmental economists would support the claim that cycling should be promoted as a healthier alternative to driving on the basis that it increases both societal and individual well-being. They see sustainability as a need for social wellbeing. Sustainability standards are a source of normative criteria in ecological economics.

CONCLUSION

In order to achieve sustainable objectives, the article also looks at how institutions and governance function. It talks about how crucial it is to develop frameworks for policy that internalize environmental costs and support resource management that is sustainable. It is investigated how markets, laws, and neighborhood-based efforts might help achieve ecological sustainability. The summary concludes by highlighting some of the recent developments and discussions in the area of ecological economics. The idea of "degrowth" is discussed as an alternative to conventional growth-focused economic models, and the possibilities of other economic frameworks like steady-state economics and the circular economy are also examined. Overall, this review offers a thorough introduction to the topic of ecological economics, with special emphasis on the significance of fusing economic concepts with ecological realities to advance fair and sustainable human growth. In order to preserve the long-term wellbeing of both people and the earth, it emphasizes the need of fundamental reforms in our economic structures.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. L. Ruder and S. R. Sanniti, “Transcending the learned ignorance of predatory ontologies: A research Agenda for an ecofeminist-informed ecological economics,” *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/SU11051479.

[2] E. Pirgmaier and J. K. Steinberger, “Roots, riots, and radical change-A road less travelled for ecological economics,” *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072001.

[3] M. Lehtonen, “Ecological Economics and Opening up of Megaproject Appraisal: Lessons From Megaproject Scholarship and Topics for a Research Programme,” *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.01.018.

[4] M. Ballandonne, “The historical roots (1880–1950) of recent contributions (2000–2017) to ecological economics: insights from reference publication year spectroscopy,” *J. Econ. Methodol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1350178X.2018.1554227.

[5] A. Bruel, J. Kronenberg, N. Troussier, and B. Guillaume, “Linking Industrial Ecology and Ecological Economics: A Theoretical and Empirical Foundation for the Circular Economy,” *J. Ind. Ecol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/jiec.12745.

[6] V. Mauerhofer, "Legal Institutions and Ecological Economics: Their Common Contribution for Achieving a Sustainable Development," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.09.023.

[7] S. Bliss, "The case for studying non-market food systems," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11113224.

[8] M. B. Wironen, R. V. Bartlett, and J. D. Erickson, "Deliberation and the promise of a deeply democratic sustainability transition," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11041023.

[9] D. Hoyos, W. Sigüenza, I. Capellán-Pérez, Á. Campos, and D. Álvarez-Antelo, "A collaborative game-based learning to enhance ecological economics teaching," 2019. doi: 10.4995/head19.2019.9468.

[10] H. Daly, "Some overlaps between the first and second thirty years of ecological economics," *Ecological Economics*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106372.

CHAPTER 2

SUSTAINABILITY, MARKETS AND GLOBAL CHANGE IN ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Dr. Dasinis Nathan Annette Christinal
Assistant Professor,Masters in Business Administration (E-Commerce),
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: annette.c@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:
In the study of ecological economics, it is essential to consider how sustainability, markets, and global change are intertwined. The link between sustainability, markets, and climate change is discussed in general terms in this abstract, with special emphasis on the intricate interactions and ecological economics-based ramifications of these relationships. The capability to satisfy the demands of the current generation without jeopardising the ability of future generations to satisfy their own needs is the definition of sustainability given in the first paragraph of the paper. It highlights the significance of fusing economic, social, and environmental factors to produce sustainable results. After conceding that markets have the capacity to influence both good and negative sustainability outcomes, the abstract goes on to discuss the role that markets play in determining how resources are allocated and how economic activities are shaped. Following that, the abstract explores the idea of global change and its effects on sustainability. It talks on the several aspects of global change, such as climate change, biodiversity loss, and resource depletion. It draws attention to the interdependence of world systems and the need of intergovernmental collaboration in resolving global environmental issues. In the overview, the contribution of markets to sustainability is examined. The idea of market-based tools is covered, including payments for ecosystem services and carbon trading, as ways to internalise environmental costs and encourage sustainable behaviour. Additionally, it examines the drawbacks and difficulties of market-based solutions, including their potential for inequities and market failures.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Environmental, Progress, Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

The way ecological economics is now used often represents a paradigm change from the original ideas behind neoclassical environmental economics. However, it is impossible to overlook how deeply ingrained contemporary ecological economics is in fundamental classical developmental difficulties. The discourse on development has its roots in ideas of economic growth defined as the expansion of the social basket of goods and services, and it has eventually progressed to the point where academics and governments are more interested in more holistic ideas of development than just talking about reductionist growth. Sustainable development has eventually become a very important idea of the day and offers a more comprehensive definition of development, linking ecosystem services and quality of life with economic growth.

This is true even though growth-fetishism still pervades large portions of policy thinking in the developing world. A revolution is the only word to describe such a paradigm change in less than a century. This change has, as would be expected, been accompanied by cognitive dissonance, acrimonious arguments, and academic hostility[1], [2].

Classical Political Economy's Golden Age

Political economy emerged from Adam Smith and David Ricardo's ideas, and as a result, the field of economics was restricted to studying the "nature and causes" of economic progress. It has always been regarded as a maverick field, lurking in the shadows but not really thought of as real economics, rather as an amalgam of sociology, anthropology, history, and politics, and all-too-often is based on ideological constructs of political thoughts and normative principles from ethics. The situation is neither straightforward nor comfortable for modern economists of the post-Keynesian era[3], [4].There is little question that the concept of development existed even in the classical economic thinking processes, although under a different name. However, it has often been said that economic development as a field of economic research originated only in the 1950s.

Over the last 50 years, the acknowledgment of development economics as a separate profession has served as a marker for changes in how people conceptualise development. Since there have been so many experiments, it is evident that there are no foolproof strategies for success. If there were, there would have been a lot more successes than there are now. In truth, economic theory has developed to take into consideration both successes and failures.

However, very few of the best economists blatantly disregarded it. Adam Smith and other members of the Classical School were clearly interested in "economic development." However, their idea of economic development was far different from what development theorists now characterise as development. This distinction is emphasised in Ricardo's Principles of Taxation, Smith's Wealth of Nations, and Schumpeter's famous Theory of Economic Development, among other works. The German Historical School, along with its English and American equivalents, might very well be considered a branch of "development economics," even though it was primarily focused on the then-current theory of economic growth. However, up until the 1930s, industrialised countries were the major focus of economic study. The quantitative research of Colin Clark in 1940 helped economists to understand that the majority of humanity did not live in the most developed capitalist economic systems. However, the first focus was still on Europe, namely the industrialization of its eastern periphery and post-war rebuilding of Europe, as shown by the groundbreaking paper by Paul Rosenstein-Rodan and Kurt Mandelbaum's book in 1947. Only after the war did economists start to express genuine concern about Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

Decolonization served as a key catalyst in this direction. Modern development theory—by which we mean the analysis of not only growth but also of institutions that could induce, sustain, and accelerate growth—began in earnest to change its focus and rearrange its referential in the face of a plethora of new nations whose standards of living and institutions were so dissimilar from the European way of life.

After the Second World War, academia started to consider strategies for coping with the extreme poverty and misery that two-thirds of the human race were experiencing[5], [6].The post-war establishment of the United Nations and its ancillary organisations, including the World Bank, the IMF, the ILO, and several regional commissions, gave rise to a change in emphasis and perspectives. A non-academic stream of development theory emerged as a result of these entities funding several research.

Stage Theory of Growth and Capital Formation in the Post-War Era

Post-war development was largely examined in terms of capital generation and expansion. Even before then, poor countries saw development as essentially an industrialised process. As a consequence, the idea of a Third World emerged, made up mostly of what were to be

considered "underdeveloped" nations in Latin America, Asia, and Africa. It was thought that since they were still developing, they would eventually be able to go through the several phases of underdevelopment and climb the ladder. This was dependent on how capital was being created, industrialisation was happening, and GDP growth was happening.

The "stage" hypothesis of development, popularised by Gerschenkron and Rostow, was the result of this train of thinking. The stage theory presupposes a certain linearity in the growth patterns of economies and contends that "underdevelopment in some of the economies will be converted to development over time." A handful of the developing nations in Asia, Africa, and Latin America trailed behind them in terms of development time. Interestingly, it is a reductionist assumption to think of growth, capital accumulation, and technical advancement as linear functions of time since it ignores social and political factors that could have an impact on diverse and varied growth trajectories.

However, Nurkse and Lewis as well as Gerschenkron and Rostow recognised the importance of capital accumulation as a factor that speeds up progress. Early Keynesians like Kaldor and Robinson made an effort to draw attention to income distribution as a factor in growth and savings. Even contemporary Marxists like Maurice Dobb concentrated on conserving formation. Even traditional Marxists have not disagreed on this matter. Lewis and even Keynesians have suggested that government involvement may influence savings. Government engagement was thus seen as an essential instrument for economic growth, whether via planning, socioeconomic engineering, or effective demand management.

DISCUSSION

Marxist thought after the war: A number of emigrant economists in Britain created ideas for the post-war development of impoverished areas after being affected by their own observations of late industrialization in Central and Eastern Europe. Development economics as a formal sub-discipline was founded on the contributions of Michael Kalecki, Kurt Mandelbaum, Joseph Steindl of Oxford University, and Paul Rosenstein-Rodan of the Royal Institute of International Affairs. These economists from Central Europe were more acquainted with Marx than Keynes, and their approaches to developmental planning were greatly influenced by the success of the Soviet five-year plans. It is commonly known that Kalecki's model of an economy with underutilisedlabour and capital resources was comparable to Keynes', but it was presented under Marxist analytical categories rather than the more popular Anglo-Saxon ones. In truth, Kalecki should be greatly praised for his contribution to economic growth planning[7], [8].

Newly established economies, such as India, adopted the planning procedures used in the USSR, and their first growth models were based on this experience. The private sector was either controlled by landed and commercial oligarchies with vested interests in maintaining the status quo or was just too weak and disorganised, it was widely agreed, that the State must take a prominent role in economic development. The extent to which the State was involved in the economy varied among nations, but the State was always responsible for funding the basic public infrastructure and building it up, along with some kind of long-term economic planning. Countries were able to favour indigenous agriculture and industry in the first three post-war decades via flexible access to finance and foreign cash, subsidies, and a range of protective commercial laws. Although it was often broken in practise, the notion of sovereignty regarding natural resources and more broadly the sovereign right of countries to design fiscal, monetary, commercial, and all other parts of government policy, were not contested. In the context of numerous developing countries, Homer-Dixon, Ghosh and Bandyopadhyay, among many others, have highlighted incidents of such abuses and

disputes[9], [10]. With the writings of Lewis and Nurkse, a new orthodoxy centred on the idea of balanced growth began to take shape at this time. However, it didn't take long for an opposition to the ideas of imbalanced development to appear with the writings of Hirschman and Streeten. They believed that balanced growth was impossible since the idea presupposed that a contemporary sector would be forced on an outdated and conventional one. In the process, the balanced growth theory shifted its attention away from the processes of change, which was really where the development theory's main concentration should have been.

Traditional Growth Theory

Neoclassical development theorists have highlighted the crucial part that trade plays as a replacement for weak domestic aggregate demand. They contend that in order to increase commerce between nations' economy, governments should serve as facilitators. The government must eliminate obstacles to global commodity trade in order to put the economy on a path of autonomous, continuous development. The remainder may then be handled using the Hecksher-Ohlin theorem together with comparative advantage. In addition to the list of government actions needed to encourage appropriate movements of production factors across sectors, promote the adoption of appropriate technology, and boost capital accumulation, later revisions to this position also call for the elimination of price distortions in domestic factor and commodity markets. According to this perspective, local and international liberalisation measures are sufficient to produce structural change and sustained economic development.

Numerous economies have shown a great deal of confidence in this framework and heavily depended on export-oriented development. The economies of Southeast Asia and modern China have mostly shown this trait. Even emerging nations like Brazil and India have adopted this way of thinking to some degree. It's interesting to note that export facilitation led to fixed exchange rate regimes and unrestricted capital movement abroad in many Southeast Asian nations. Although there has been amazing economic development, there have often been issues with capital flight brought on by the reduction of interest rates when currencies were depreciated to encourage exports. Therefore, warnings to proceed cautiously on this front have always been sent in emerging economies like India where complete capital account convertibility has been considered and argued for a long time.

Economic Development Follows Economic Growth

For millennia, capital production remained a crucial part of development, and its significance is still felt today. However, its meaning has evolved through time. The importance of human capital production as a crucial complement to the development of physical capital was first acknowledged by T.W. Schultz. As a result, the importance of education and training as prerequisites for development was highlighted, and the issue of "brain drain" from the Third World to the First World was identified. Lewis and Singer agreed with Schultz's position. Their thesis focused on the evolution of society as a whole, which might be influenced by factors like fertility, education, and health. Thus, it started to be understood that improving human capital was a crucial condition for economic progress. According to this theory, industrialisation could never be self-sustaining if it sacrificed social advancement.

Development, in the words of Singer, "is growth plus change, and change includes not only economic change but also social and cultural change." He emphasised that the issue of poverty had not been addressed by growth and suggested "poverty-biased policies" to have an impact on the lives of the most vulnerable. All arguments up to this point, including those in support of development, were growth-focused. When Seers released a crucial article in which development was characterised as a social phenomena rather than only being defined in the reductionist manner of per capita income increase, the growth preoccupation of development

theory experienced a significant shock. According to Seers, development included progress towards the social objectives of equality, employment, and poverty reduction.

Myrdal concurred with Seers' opinions. Seers gave a more succinct explanation of development with distinction in his presidential address at the 11th Conference of the Society for International Development in New Delhi, saying, "[i]t is very slipshod for us to confuse development with economic development, and economic development with economic growth." When Seers argued that economic growth should be rethought, Haq was inspired. He said, "[w]e were taught to take care of our GNP as this [would] take care of poverty. Instead, let's do something about poverty, which will benefit the GNP.

As a result, structural concerns including dualism, population growth, inequality, urbanisation, agricultural transformation, education, health, and unemployment started to be examined independently rather than solely as a byproduct of an underlying growth theory. In the end, there was a dispute over whether growth was even desirable, which was sparked by a very inflammatory article by Schumacher in which he argued against the benefits of industrialization and praised handcraft economies.

The Human progress Index was adopted by academics and multinational organisations in the 1990s as a rather ad hoc gauge of progress, which increased the prominence of social perspectives of development. The HDI rates each nation's quality of living, life expectancy, literacy, and education. This gives a general indication of how economic policies affect people's quality of life. Amartya Sen and Mahbub ul Haq created the index in 1990 with assistance from Gustav Ranis of Yale University and Meghnad Desai of the London School of Economics. Since its creation, the United Nations progress Programme has used it as a benchmark for classifying a country's level of progress in its yearly Human Development Reports. Despite being a "vulgar measure," as Sen referred to it due to its limitations, it still highlights more aspects of development than the per capita income measure it replaced and gives researchers access to the wide range of in-depth metrics found in the Human Development Reports. Even other international organisations, like the World Bank, have begun to concentrate on social factors like poverty. As a consequence, social factors started to be taken into account and were eventually included in development economics, whether in academic study or policymaking.

However, the argument between growth and development persisted, took on a new angle in the late 1980s, and gained in prominence in the 1990s as environmentalists seriously questioned the viability of economic expansion in light of the escalating environmental catastrophe. It was believed that environmental contamination was an externality of hasty growth initiatives. The issues that lingered were: Growth? What price?

Sustainable Growth

The "limits to growth" idea was proposed by the Club of Rome, a group of scholars, around three and a half decades ago. It foresaw catastrophe for humanity unless the use of natural resources that were limiting economic and technological advancement was stopped. These negative calls were severe in their outlook. However, it wasn't until 1980 that the International Union for the Conservation of Nature issued the World Conservation Strategy and coined the phrase "sustainable development" that the relationship between the environment and development became widely acknowledged.

Following the release of the Brundtland Commission's 1987 report—previously known as the World Commission on Environment and Development—the idea became widely accepted. The Brundtland Commission, which was established by the UN General Assembly, came up

with the concept of sustainable development that is often cited: Development that satisfies current demands without jeopardising the capacity of future generations to do the same. Despite being hailed as the first official effort to define sustainable development, this notion has encountered significant opposition and cognitive dissonance.

However, there is a misunderstanding that sustainable development is only concerned with ecology and the environment. Nothing could be more destructive than to think about this idea in such a narrow context. Sustainable development strategies generally include three areas: economic, environment, and social, as opposed to concentrating just on environmental concerns. In support of this, economic growth, social development, and environmental protection are referred to as the interrelated and mutually reinforcing pillars of sustainable development in a number of UN publications, most recently in the 2005 World Summit Outcome Document.

The sustainable development triangle in Figure 2.1 illustrates one of the commonly recognised interpretations put out by Munasinghe during the 1992 Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit, among several other definitions that followed. All of the published publications on sustainable development recognise the connections between the three areas and suggest that environmental changes affect institutions, culture, and growth in both the short and long terms. Changes in societal norms and behaviours have an impact on both the management of the environment and economic growth. Critically, social and ecological characteristics are impacted by economic development and welfare and income distribution.

Eventually, sustainable development brought to the realisation that natural life-support systems, which are essential for human growth, may sometimes be limited, declining, but replenishable. It is crucial to explore for alternate sources in the case of non-replenissability in order to limit the exploitation of such resources. It also acknowledged that a given stock, composition, and productivity of society's capital—natural, man-made, and human—can only make a maximum contribution to sustainingly satisfy fundamental human requirements over time. Still, the argument persists. Despite several efforts to define "sustainable development" in terms of principles, standards, metrics, objectives, practises, etc., a precise, unchanging definition is still difficult. Because "development" and "sustainability" cannot coexist, some people have come to believe that sustainable development is an oxymoron. In fact, sustainable development, according to Kates et al., "draws much of its resonance, power, and creativity from its very ambiguity".

Because of its adaptability, it may be used to match a variety of situations and settings across both place and time.

This enables it to remain an open, dynamic, and changing notion. Additionally, since it is subject to interpretation, participants may redefine and reinterpret its meaning to suit their particular circumstances at many levels, from local to global, within and between activity sectors, and in institutions of government, business, and civil society. Sustainable development has developed a core set of guiding principles and values based on the Brundtland Commission's standard definition to meet the needs of human, economic, and social development now and in the future while remaining within the constraints of the planet's life-support systems. This is true even though the term "sustainable development" has been given a creative ambiguity and is open to interpretation.Since the reconciliation of what appears to be the incompatibility of economic growth, social development, and environmental sustainability is challenged, opportunities for a healthier and sustainable future are presented. As a result, there is no reason to doubt that sustainable development is one of the most potent and holistic thought processes that has enriched the development discourse.

CONCLUSION

It emphasized how ecological economics may be used as a framework for examining and resolving issues related to sustainability in market-based systems. It talks about incorporating ecological concepts into economic analysis, such as ecosystem services and carrying capacity. Additionally, it highlights how important multidisciplinary study and cooperation are to comprehending the intricate relationships between sustainability, markets, and global development. The summary concludes by highlighting current trends and potential directions in the study of ecological economics with reference to markets, sustainability, and climate change. It talks about how radical reforms like the circular economy and environmentally friendly consumer habits might help market systems become more sustainable. In order to establish the right circumstances for sustainable development, it also emphasises the significance of institutional and policy changes. In summary, this emphasises how ecological economics must take into account the complex interactions between markets, sustainability, and global change. The problems faced by global transformation are highlighted, underscoring the necessity for integrated measures that take into account economic, social, and environmental factors.

REFERENCES:

[1] K. J. Komatsu *et al.*, "Global change effects on plant communities are magnified by time and the number of global change factors imposed," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*, 2019, doi: 10.1073/pnas.1819027116.

[2] P. Peduzzi, "The Disaster Risk, Global Change, and Sustainability Nexus," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11040957.

[3] D. P. Giling *et al.*, "A niche for ecosystem multifunctionality in global change research," *Global Change Biology*. 2019. doi: 10.1111/gcb.14528.

[4] T. Heger *et al.*, "Towards an Integrative, Eco-Evolutionary Understanding of Ecological Novelty: Studying and Communicating Interlinked Effects of Global Change," *BioScience*. 2019. doi: 10.1093/biosci/biz095.

[5] D. Tian *et al.*, "Global changes alter plant multi-element stoichiometric coupling," *New Phytol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/nph.15428.

[6] R. S. Snell *et al.*, "Consequences of intraspecific variation in seed dispersal for plant demography, communities, evolution and global change," *AoB PLANTS*. 2019. doi: 10.1093/aobpla/plz016.

[7] M. Pascal, P. Beaudeau, S. Medina, and N. C. Hamilton, "Global Change: a Public Health Researcher's Ethical Responsibility," *Current environmental health reports*. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s40572-019-00238-4.

[8] A. V. Pastor *et al.*, "Projecting future impacts of global change including fires on soil erosion to anticipate better land management in the forests of NW Portugal," *Water (Switzerland)*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/w11122617.

[9] S. Tlili and C. Mouneyrac, "The wedge clam Donax trunculus as sentinel organism for Mediterranean coastal monitoring in a global change context," *Regional Environmental Change*. 2019. doi: 10.1007/s10113-018-1449-9.

[10] I. Dirks, J. Köhler, S. Rachmilevitch, and I. C. Meier, "The phosphorus economy of mediterranean oak saplings under global change," *Front. Plant Sci.*, 2019, doi: 10.3389/fpls.2019.00405.

CHAPTER 3

ECONOMIC GROWTH AND SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mounicav@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In academic and policy circles, the connection between economic growth and sustainable development has generated a lot of attention and discussion. The essential ideas, difficulties, and possible intersections between economic growth and sustainable development are highlighted in this abstract, which offers an overview of the complicated dynamics between these two goals. The introduction of the study defines economic growth and sustainable development, highlighting their distinctions while tying them together. A rise in the production and consumption of goods and services is referred to as economic growth, and it is often quantified by metrics like the GDP. The goal of sustainable development, on the other hand, is to protect the environment and its resources while ensuring the welfare of current and future generations. The overview examines the several facets of sustainable development, such as its social, environmental, and economic facets. It talks about how achieving sustainable development objectives necessitates taking into account social fairness, environmental preservation, and resource efficiency in addition to economic growth. The abstract then looks at possible tensions and compromises between sustainable development and economic growth. It admits that traditional strategies for economic expansion have often resulted in resource depletion, environmental damage, and social inequality. It also acknowledges that economic expansion may open doors for the eradication of poverty, the progress of technology, and higher living standards.

KEYWORDS:

Economic, Environmental, Ecosystem, Natural, Technology.

INTRODUCTION

The report also identifies possible policy measures and synergies that might balance the goals of sustainable development and economic growth. It examines the idea of "green growth," which tries to break the link between economic expansion and environmental deterioration by implementing resource-saving technology and sustainable patterns of consumption and production. The significance of include social and environmental factors in economic decision-making processes is also covered[1], [2]. The review also looks at how institutions, governance, and international collaboration may support both economic growth and sustainable development. In order to promote efforts for sustainable development, it highlights the need for robust legislative frameworks, effective regulatory systems, and creative finance techniques. Sustainable development has been seen as both a tactic of competing environmental and ecological campaigners and a concept originating from communist thinking processes. Both of these are typical misunderstandings of the idea. The idea is considerably more objective than it is when it is seen as favouring a specific tradition. As diverse and complicated as human civilizations and natural ecosystems are over the globe, so too are the actual problems with sustainable development. Unfortunately, this idea has been utilised as a potent weapon to argue against economic expansion by both socialistic thinking processes and ecological antagonism, and this has even discouraged many market-

oriented thinkers from embracing this idea. It is important to keep in mind that sustainable development refers to maintaining the process of growth and development through generations rather than being in opposition to either economic growth or development[3], [4].

Contrarily, the correlation between economic development and measures of the quality of the air and water suggests that growth is not necessarily a factor in the deterioration of the environment. There seems to be a U-shaped link between income and environmental quality, and the relationship is strongly dependent on income levels. The Environmental Kuznets' Curve best captures this claim in support of balancing ecological sustainability and economic development.1 The EKC shows a correlation between numerous environmental degradation indices and per-capita income. Early economic expansion is accompanied by an increase in environmental deterioration and pollution, but after per capita income crosses a certain threshold, the tendency reverses, and at high income levels, economic growth is accompanied with an improvement in the environment [5], [6].

With Grossman and Krueger's groundbreaking investigation into the possible effects of NAFTA and Shafik and Bandyopadhyay's background investigation for the 1992 World Development Report, the EKC idea first surfaced in the early 1990s. However, a key component of the WCED's case for sustainable development is the notion that economic growth is required to preserve or enhance environmental quality. Nevertheless, despite the fact that study publications on the subject have poor econometrics, the EKC is an empirical phenomenon.

The EKC makes it simple to see that levels of hazardous metals and suspended particles in air and water rise quickly when earnings reach middle-class levels before falling again. Because newer, cleaner technologies become more prevalent as economies expand, there is a correlation between wealth and pollution. On the political aspect of the relationship between the economy and the environment, the EKC also makes a strong position. Citizens in higher income economies express their desires for a cleaner environment more effectively than those in lower income countries due to greater education and knowledge. Therefore, the "utility bundle" of the consumer's concern for the "environment" as a "good" serves as the main motivator in the overall scheme of things[7], [8].

On the other hand, Munasinghe's compelling arguments and the recently released Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and TEEB on how ecosystem services affect economic behaviour show that ecological services and economic development cannot be separated or disintegrated, and that there is a causal relationship that runs both ways.

Pollution reduction has often been seen as conflicting with the goals of development in developing nations. If they were to result in the stabilisation of emissions, an implausibly high degree of technological advancement in energy consumption would be required. In addition, most developing nations are still far below their pollution maxima, in keeping with the EKC phenomena, meaning that before it starts to drop, global environmental harm is expected to worsen significantly. Does it suggest that growth must be forgone in order to achieve this? Instead, putting growth before other priorities would make the situation worse by speeding population expansion, delaying the adoption of cleaner technology, and impeding the establishment of democratic institutions. Population expansion is negatively correlated with income growth, and pollution is often correlated with both. Higher levels of average income and productivity are only beneficial for the environment when they go hand in hand with measures that relieve the burden on the population by lowering personal risk and the need for big families. It is particularly crucial to make improvements in social security, pension plans, pension security, and the employment of women.

DISCUSSION

A crucial initial step in the creation of suitable policies is the assessment of environmental costs and benefits. The depreciation of environmental resources is not taken into account in current estimations of the net national product, which has an impact on investments and technological decisions by imputing a negative depreciation rate. Profits and national production would be lower if environmental depreciation were fully taken into consideration. For instance, in Costa Rica, it is estimated that the depreciation of forests accounts for about a third of gross capital accumulation and over 10% of GDP. These biases have serious repercussions worldwide, but they are especially harmful in developing nations where minor changes in income or growth rates might mean the difference between starvation and survival.

Future generations' choices are expected to be preserved with just minor adjustments to measurement, production, and lifestyle practises. In the near run, investments in environmental preservation are likely cause barely detectable losses in income growth; nevertheless, over the long term, they should promote more fast and internationally equal development. The foundation for improved environmental management is provided by policies that encourage economic expansion and result in fair pricing of natural resources. It will also be very beneficial to design a price system for natural resources that accurately represents their worth. The deterioration of natural resources by current generations may weaken the foundation for future economic development since natural resources, such as water, are not priced at their economic cost[9], [10].

Trade liberalisation is completely consistent with sustainable development and provides a particularly potent boost to GDP. Indeed, the significant reliance on subsidised polluting fuels in China and Eastern Europe is evidence that trade distortions are a major cause of environmental degradation. Governments are responsible for changing trade policies if they have a negative impact on the environment. To guarantee that the advantages of economic progress may be more promptly and effectively reflected in an improved environment, improved minimum standards and worldwide collaboration for environmental management are essential. Growth is not only sustainable, but it is also a prerequisite for better environmental management.

Position of Markets

The debate thus far makes it evident that a sustainable development route should also take into account institutions that will be favourable to increased engagement of people at all levels. This is important from the perspective of policymaking. The importance of the market mechanism is one of the key points that have been impliedly made in this discussion. Markets have always been one of the societal adaptation methods to shortage. There are more others. Homer-Dixon describes "ingenuity" as society's capacity to produce enough ideas in order to comprehend the factors that influence social adaptation to shortage. Sadly, the role of the market in sustainable development has not gotten much attention and, in many instances, has even come under fire from communist organisations. It is only relevant to discuss a few market phenomena that have evolved and might be beneficial to sustainable development at this time.

Ecosystem Services Trading: A Market for Nature

It has often been claimed that ecosystem services could be considered a kind of natural capital, in which case investing might prove to be more efficient in delivering essential services than doing so with constructed capital. Think of flood control as an example.

Floodwaters may be dealt with using either natural or constructed capital, such as landscape management or engineering works. Once one takes into consideration the positive externalities of enhanced water quality, animal habitat, and recreational facilities, landscape management may prove to be a superior public and private investment method for delivering flood control in some cases, if not many. Many approaches have been put out to stop environmental deterioration and stop the decline in ecosystem services. While some have succeeded, others have failed. The potential of market-based methods to reduce the deterioration of ecosystem services was emphasised by an examination of response plans carried out by the Millennium Ecosystem examination.

There there existed a belief that nature is abundantly supplied with resources. Everything that is produced in excess ultimately loses its value and its market. However, throughout time, due to human interference in how the ecosystem functions, there has been resource deterioration and depletion. A conventional reaction to the loss in their supply has been to look to governments for continuous provision of ecosystem services via legislation, cost sharing, and other similar measures. Thus far, public services and products have been provided. In fact, the condition of the ecology warrants more worry than that of public services and amenities. The Hardin-initiated tale known as "The Tragedy of the Commons" illustrates how unrestrained demand for an open-access natural resource may lead to overexploitation and the resource's demise. This occurs because none of the resource's users are ready to take on the burden of repair and upkeep since they believe that doing so will cost them much more than the advantages it will provide. The Millennium environmental Assessment predicts that if present trends continue, environmental services that are now free of charge could soon become more expensive or disappear altogether. The additional expenses that main consumers would incur will trickle down to secondary and tertiary sectors, changing how all firms operate.

The necessity for developing markets and market values becomes crucial since it is difficult and costly for the government to supervise and regulate ecosystem services. The health of people and the effectiveness of businesses are both impacted by ecosystem services. The financial incentives that ecosystem players get, however, seldom reflect this. Typically, neither people who produce ecosystem services are compensated for the advantages they give to others nor those who limit ecosystem services suffer all the costs they impose on others. Allowing members to act in their own private interests may lead to less ecosystem services than is ideal for the community as a whole in the absence of nonexistent markets. Because markets are effective at generating rewards, they may be used to incentivize resource managers to manage natural resources effectively.

Any marketed commodity's value chain will reveal that products taken from ecosystems have been exchanged in markets for a very long time. Ecosystem services have been used for just as long, but they have mainly remained unpriced and outside of markets. The issue with open access is that some materials' property rights are either vaguely defined or nonexistent. Therefore, if their usage is not restricted, anybody may access them and utilise them until they run out. However, a growing shortage might make them marketable, just as in any market.

Markets for ecosystem services have been established, and many have suggested that payments for these services might aid in both the process of conservation and reducing rural poverty. In order to determine the worth of the advantages the environment provides to human civilization, economists have also been crucial in developing instruments like environmental valuation. This has often assisted in developing guidelines for compensating for environmental harms that result in financial losses for underdeveloped areas.

As a result, the markets for other environmental services expanded, raising the possibility that they might quickly take the lead in funding sustainable development over the next 10 to 15 years, accounting for tens of billions of dollars yearly. Two key factors, including intentional national environmental policy advances towards market-based instruments and increased demand for environmental products and services from public authorities, corporate organisations, and consumers, have caused all of these trends towards markets. On the one hand, there are new governmental rules and the development of market-based tools; on the other, it is now highly profitable and popular for private companies to take initiatives for biodiversity conservation. Over time, there has also been a rise in consumer demand for items that are fair trade, organic, or otherwise derived from sustainable ecosystems. Its beneficial effects on human health and general welfare are also consistently being established.

The Markets' Failure

Recently, however, the failure of environmental markets has drawn attention to a new way of looking at markets. The failure is more apparent in the context of the collapse of the carbon trading markets, particularly the Certified Emission Reduction markets after the end-of-2008 financial market catastrophe and the ensuing worldwide slump.

The decline in CER futures prices from USD 23 in 2008 to USD 0.4 in 2016. We now have a new understanding of markets as a result of the recent market crisis. To further understand this, let's examine the fundamentals of the markets. In essence, the price of CER is expected to represent the value loss caused by a tonne of carbon emissions under the efficient market hypothesis. From a different perspective, the price will also take into account the shadow value created by the forest's tonne of carbon sequestration. This is a crucial regulation function provided by the forest. The current state of affairs is such that CER prices have fallen to pitiful levels as a result of a collapse in industry and associated sector demand for carbon credits, mostly as a result of the global downturn. Does it mean that the value of carbon sequestration provided by forests as part of their ecosystem services decreases during economic downturns as opposed to boom times? There is no disputing that markets are inefficient, but this is a well-known contradiction of economic theory that sees all values via their relationship to the market. This particular illustration demonstrates how the markets have been unable to recognise the actual worth of the underlying ecosystem services. The derivatives markets, which have effectively evolved into a market of speculation, also have potential flaws.

Sustainability and Emerging Markets

Markets are significant despite their inherent flaws. To be used properly, they must be controlled. The value of the ecosystem's services to the economy as a whole, the impact of economic activity on the ecosystem, and eventually its potential effects on quality of life are all understood by the common man thanks to market institutions, which is something that cannot be disputed. This determines the supply-side phenomenon in an economy, which ultimately affects labour markets as well as human health and welfare. The exchange of ecosystem services has the potential to emerge as a new sector of economic development. With a multiplier impact on incomes and employment, areas and projects where such commerce is feasible are likely to provide large secondary advantages, including ecotourism. Therefore, there is a lot of room for collaboration among diverse efforts. In addition to fulfilling its obligations under the various environmental conventions to fight desertification, biodiversity loss, and global climate change, an economy has the potential to involve various rural communities in formal market transactions, thereby reducing the scope and severity of poverty.

Global Change and Ecological Economics

Planetary-scale alterations to the earth system are referred to as global change. The land, seas, atmosphere, poles, life, planet's natural cycles, and deep Earth processes make up the system. These individual components interact with one another. Global change also entails significant social changes since human civilization is now a part of the earth system. We discussed the necessity for global change to be a conference focus at the Indian Society for Ecological Economics. What role does climate change have in ecological economics? In an effort to address the crucial intersection of environment, economy, and society, ecological economics has arisen during the last three decades as a trans-disciplinary field of academic study with a clearly defined scope. Ecological economics acknowledged the spatio-temporal co-evolutionary interaction between the natural environment and the human economy as a result. On the other hand, environmental economics is expressly acknowledged as a manifestation of the neoclassical framework in the mainstream economic analysis. Environmental economics views nature as a source of resources that contribute to the basis of economic activity, in contrast to ecological economics which sees the economy as integrated in and sustained by natural systems. Ecological economists looked at the interactions between several different socio-ecological and institutional aspects that regulated an economic system in order to present scientific justifications for the preservation of the natural environment.

Sagoff makes the claim that "Ecological economics aimed to be revolutionary, but it is now ignored by the sciences it had hoped to transform" in a recent essay that appeared in the Breakthrough Journal. This assertion is false, as a significant portion of Sagoff's arguments are based on the claim that ecological economics has essentially tried to put a price on the ecosystem services and functions. Ecology and economics have changed, but not because of the rise of ecological economics. This stance would have been accurate if we had acknowledged ecological economics as a branch of the conventional school of economics that focuses on the relationship between values and market prices. In essence, neoclassicism represented a methodological advance within the conventional school of economics, which was preoccupied with the operation of different types of markets, with diverse stakeholder powers. Neoclassicism, however, seldom considered assessing institutions, and even when it did, decision-making was based on the conventional cost-benefit analyses with the current value of monetized net benefits.

However, Sagoff was correct to note the paucity of progress in this area as well as the inherent reductionism that pervaded the governmental and academic worlds as a result of the adherence to these measures. The development of ecological economics in the other direction, independent of cost-benefit analyses of ecosystem services and functions, is what Sagoff utterly overlooks in his thesis. Here, Ostrom expanded the field of ecological economics. She demonstrated how the operation of institutions might be assessed without truly turning to neoclassical techniques of valuation by using the institutional analysis and development framework. Additionally, Ostrom departed from the early writings of many ecological economists' conception of ecosystems as only giving services to human civilization. She has considered society to be a crucial element of the socio-ecological system. The field of ecological economics lacked this methodology. Unfortunately, Sagoff's critique has in fact missed this new aspect of the study of ecological economics.

By focusing on "global change" as the topic of its seventh biannual conference, INSEE has fundamentally sought to comprehend the wider relationship between human civilization and the changes occurring in the global system. Population, climate, economy, resource use, energy development, transport, communication, land use and cover, urbanisation, globalisation, atmospheric circulation, ocean circulation, carbon, nitrogen, water, and other

cycles, sea ice loss, sea-level rise, food webs, biological diversity, pollution, health, overfishing, and more are all included in this. It is important to recognise the circular causation in this situation between the different factors. While beginning the causal reasoning process is vital in the setting of ecological economics in South Asia, it's also critical to acknowledge the external stimuli influencing the dynamics of the many forces. A more complete knowledge of the social-ecological systems may result from this.

Finally, a few words

By all means, sustainable development is a broad concept that takes into account aspects of human health, employment, education, industrialization, and demand-side variables in addition to the understanding of how nature affects the economy. Such a paradigmatic change from a reductionist idea to a holistic conception of development in less than a century is nothing less than a revolution.

As disciplines are transcended, the quality-of-life indicators—rather than just growth—have grown in importance for governments and academia. The carrying capacity of nature is constrained by the biophysical limitations of land, soil, and water, so it is imperative to create institutions like markets to manage the finite resources effectively, ensure equity in their distribution, allow ample time for resource replenishment, and come up with alternatives to ensure sustainability. This would need the creation of suitable macro and sectoral policies, a trans-disciplinary knowledge foundation, and public action. More importantly, the whole public policy debate must be evaluated within the broader framework of inclusive development, which includes the demands of future generations. Ecological economics is unquestionably a key facilitator of this process.

CONCLUSION

The summary concludes by identifying new trends and upcoming difficulties in the quest of sustainable development and economic success. It addresses how achieving sustainable development objectives might be affected by climate change, technology advancements, and shifting global dynamics. Overall, this abstract emphasises the nuanced connection between sustainable development and economic success. It emphasises how crucial it is to take an integrated, holistic strategy that strikes a balance between economic, social, and environmental factors in order to ensure the long-term wellbeing of both the present and future generations. It urges fundamental adjustments to economic structures and regulatory frameworks in order to advance sustainable development and meet the urgent issues of the twenty-first century.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Waheed, S. Sarwar, and C. Wei, “The survey of economic growth, energy consumption and carbon emission,” *Energy Reports*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.egyr.2019.07.006.

[2] L. Marquez-Ramos and E. Mourelle, “Education and economic growth: an empirical analysis of nonlinearities,” *Appl. Econ. Anal.*, 2019, doi: 10.1108/AEA-06-2019-0005.

[3] F. Manzoor, L. Wei, M. Asif, M. Z. Ul Haq, and H. Ur Rehman, “The contribution of sustainable tourism to economic growth and employment in Pakistan,” *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/ijerph16193785.

[4] G. T. Dalyop, “Political instability and economic growth in Africa,” *Int. J. Econ. Policy Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1007/s42495-018-0008-1.

[5] C. A. N. Malarvizhi, Y. Zeynali, A. Al Mamun, and G. Bin Ahmad, "Financial Development and Economic Growth in ASEAN-5 Countries," *Glob. Bus. Rev.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0972150918802684.

[6] A. Alfada, "The destructive effect of corruption on economic growth in Indonesia: A threshold model," *Heliyon*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.heliyon.2019.e02649.

[7] M. Zakaria, W. Jun, and H. Ahmed, "Effect of terrorism on economic growth in Pakistan: an empirical analysis," *Econ. Res. Istraz.* , 2019, doi: 10.1080/1331677X.2019.1638290.

[8] W. Liang and M. Yang, "Urbanization, economic growth and environmental pollution: Evidence from China," *Sustain. Comput. Informatics Syst.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.suscom.2018.11.007.

[9] M. Busu and C. L. Trica, "Sustainability of circular economy indicators and their impact on economic growth of the European Union," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11195481.

[10] B. Gashi, G. Asllani, and L. Boqolli, "The effect of tax structure in economic growth," *Int. J. Econ. Bus. Adm.*, 2019, doi: 10.35808/ijeba/209.

CHAPTER 4

HISTORICAL DEVELOPMENT OF ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS

Mr. Yelahanka Lokesh
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:lokesh.yr@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

The history of ecological economics shows how a multidisciplinary discipline that was created in response to the flaws in traditional economic ideas and methods evolved. This summary gives a general overview of the significant turning points and factors that have affected the historical development of ecological economics, emphasising how it has developed into a unique and comprehensive method for comprehending how the economy and the environment interact. The first part of the essay looks at the early writings of economists who understood the value of natural resources and its constraints as the foundations of ecological economics. It looks at the contributions of traditional economists like Thomas Malthus and Karl Marx, who voiced worries about how population expansion and resource scarcity might affect economic systems. The introduction of ecological economics as a discipline for inquiry and study follows. It looks at how networks and organisations like the International Society for Ecological Economics (ISEE) were created to promote multidisciplinary cooperation and information sharing. It also recognises the growth of academic disciplines and specialised publications devoted to ecological economics.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Natural, Policy, Transdisciplinary.

INTRODUCTION

The historical history of ecological economics is thoroughly examined in this review article, which charts its progression from its early beginnings to its current position as a multidisciplinary topic. This study presents a thorough review of the historical development of ecological economics by examining the significant turning points, significant thinkers, and essential conceptual frameworks. The overview emphasizes the field's development, from early worries about resource shortages to the incorporation of ecological ideas into economic analysis, underscoring its relevance in tackling sustainability difficulties. Additionally, it pinpoints new patterns and directions, illuminating how ecological economics may influence fundamental adjustments in financial structures and environmental policy[1], [2].

The overview looks more closely at the key ideas and issues that have arisen in ecological economics. It talks about the idea of sustainable development, which became popular in the 1980s and stressed the need of incorporating social and environmental factors into economic decision-making. The ecological footprint, steady-state economics, and other ideas that have proven crucial to comprehending how the economy and the environment interact are also covered. The shifting issues and disagreements in ecological economics[3], [4]. It explores the conflicts that exist between economic expansion and environmental sustainability as well as the shortcomings of traditional economic measures like the gross domestic product (GDP) in measuring sustainability and well-being. It also looks at how institutions, systems of government, and policy frameworks help spread the ideas of ecological economics.

This extensive review essay provides a full examination of the historical development of ecological economics. It is a useful resource for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners interested in understanding the growth of this dynamic area by synthesising a broad variety of literature and views from key personalities. The study focuses light on ecological economics' ability to direct egalitarian and sustainable future routes in addition to capturing the historical background of ecological economics.

In the latter half of the 20th century, ecological economics emerged as a result of worries about preserving the environment and ensuring economic viability. It was mostly a reaction to neoclassical economics' actual or perceived dearth of scientific and biological foundations. A moral philosophy was also supposed to be infused into economics, in opposition to the amoral implications of neoclassical models that portrayed man as an intelligent, utility-maximizing machine. A transdisciplinary field, ecological economics incorporates and synthesises ideas and information from a variety of natural and social disciplines. The fundamentals of ecology and the laws of thermodynamics are particularly significant. Only the first two principles of thermodynamics provide a complete understanding of the limits to economic development. The first rule states that the amount of inputs needed for economic production has a limit, while the second law states that the efficiency with which those inputs may be converted into products and services has a limit. Similar ecological ideas, such as trophic levels, niche width, and competitive exclusion, are necessary for a complete understanding of the interaction between the human economy and the variety of nonhuman species, or the "economy of nature."

The key concepts in ecological economics are size, distribution, and allocation because of its foundations in the natural sciences and moral philosophy. Scale describes how large the human economy is in comparison to its enclosing, supporting ecology. In order to reduce poverty, the distribution of wealth must be addressed, maybe via public policy, since size is constrained—that is, there is a limit to economic expansion. Ecological economics, which emphasises size and distribution, differs from neoclassical economics, which assumes limitless economic expansion and, as a result, argues that a "rising tide lifts all boats." The effective distribution of resources among producers is the main focus of neoclassical economics. It is believed that efficient allocation of labour and capital, in particular, would assist to maximise output and accelerate rates of economic development. Although effective allocation is acknowledged as a key goal in ecological economics, the significance of land and other natural resources as a component of production is emphasised. It is discovered that labour and manufactured capital are only partly substitutable for natural resources. Individual natural resources are also examined in ecological economics to see whether they possess the qualities required for effective market allocation. When it comes to many natural resources and ecosystem services (including pollination, climate control, and water purification), it is often discovered that they lack these qualities. As a result, they are either abused or disregarded until they are preserved by forces outside of the market.

Ecological economics has a variety of unique policy consequences as a result of its topics and discoveries. If the objectives of sustainable size, equitable distribution, and efficient allocation are to be achieved, some new policies are necessary, and many current policies must be changed. The wide range of fiscal, monetary, and trade policies that are intended to promote economic development may progressively be revised to make them more supportive of a steady state economy with stabilised output and consumption of goods and services overall. This is necessary for sustainable scale. It may be essential to implement additional regulations, such as extraction and pollution limitations, in order to guarantee sustainable development and get closer to the ideal size. As development is constrained, countries must

make difficult decisions about how to address poverty. One conventional approach to achieve this is via progressive taxation. Ecological economics also offers the distribution of rewards from natural resources, minimum wages, and caps on wealth and income.

Numerous policy suggestions derived from "environmental economics," or neoclassical economics as applied to environmental challenges, are also backed by ecological economics for the effective allocation of resources. When it is possible, these measures are aimed at addressing natural resource market flaws. The primary way that ecological economics contributes to the application of these corrective policies is by providing a richer knowledge of the ecosystems' parts, structures, and functions that must be assessed in order to determine the appropriate course of action. This knowledge is often acquired via the interaction of economists and ecologists or by the cross-training of specialists in ecology and economics, and it is frequently used to the estimation of the monetary values of natural capital and ecosystem services. With these projections, markets might be created or altered to distribute the resources. In contrast, the neoclassical faith in the market tends to discourage the polity from adopting conservation regulations. In ecological economics, however, the need for non-market mechanisms for allocating or conserving some natural resources and ecosystem services is readily recognised. Regulations are viewed as effective policy tools in many such cases.

One of the most significant endeavours of the twenty-first century will be ecological economics as countries and the global populace approach, breach, and adapt to supply shocks like Peak Oil and environmental disasters like climate change. For a variety of reasons, including the neoclassical economists' extensive influence in academia, business, and government, ecological economics will have difficulties in staying away from natural capital assessment exercises at the price of its distinctive focus on sustainable scale. The fact that the steady state economy as a macroeconomic policy objective also has to be balanced with justifiable requests for economic de-growth shows that ecological economics has not arrived too soon[5], [6].

DISCUSSION

Ecological Economics' Historical Development

Environmental issues that the general public saw and that scientist recorded in works like Barry Commoner's The Closing Circle (1971), Donnella Meadows et al.'s The Limits to Growth (1972), among others, prompted the development of ecological economics. The "neoclassical" economics approach to environmental deterioration, as epitomised by Howard Barnett and Chandler Morse (Scarcity and Growth, 1963), which held that pricing in a healthy market would avoid debilitating resource shortages, disappointed many observers. Julian Simon and other neoclassical economists and business experts always advocated for economic expansion as the answer to almost all social issues, including environmental issues and pollution in particular. They believed that technology advancement might resolve tensions between environmental preservation and economic expansion.

Herman Daly was one of the first highly qualified economists to reject the neoclassical school on the basis of environmental concerns. His 1977 book Steady-State Economics offered an alternative vision for a viable, just, and environmentally conscious economy. When he produced Steady-State Economics, Daly was a professor of economics at Louisiana State University. He also worked as a senior economist at the World Bank from 1988 to 1994. His professional leadership abilities and writing prowess drew in a large number of other economists as well as ecologists who cared about the environment. Steady-State Economics provided ecologists with a welcome acquaintance with both the natural sciences and

economic fundamentals. Daly was highly knowledgeable with the laws of thermodynamics and its implications for economic development. He was Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen's student and wrote The Entropy Law and the Economic Process in 1971. With comparable emphasis and outlooks were Kenneth Boulding, Robert Ayres, and E. F. Schumacher, among other well-known and successful individuals[7], [8].

The 1980s saw the gathering of important people in the development of ecological economics, most notably in Stockholm in 1982 (organised by AnnMari Jansson) and Barcelona in 1987 (organised by Joan Martinez-Alier). These gatherings assisted the participants in identifying areas of overlap, complimentary abilities, and significant obstacles to the development of an economics theory and practise that is more environmentally sound. Many of the guests would go on to make significant contributions to the literature on ecological economics and organisations that are connected to it. Robert Costanza, one of them, made the initiative to form the International Society for Ecological Economics in 1988. H. T. Odum (1924–2002), a systems ecologist, was a student of Costanza, who added further ecological and economic applications to his knowledge of thermodynamics. One of the most prolific writers in the ecological economics field as a whole, Costanza served as the journal's editor from its founding in 1989 until 2002.

Since the first ISEE conference in 1990, conferences have been conducted every two years. Nine regional societies connected with ISEE in 2007 represented countries such Australia-New Zealand, Argentina-Uruguay, Brazil, Canada, Europe, India, Russia, and the United States. The Iberian and Latin American Network of Ecological Economics and the Chinese Ecological Economics Society were both independent organisations. The work of Francois Quesnay and the physiocrats of late 18th-century France is one of the most significant historical origins of ecological economics. Quesnay was employed as a physician in the king's court before rising to the position of general adviser. With his training in medicine, he acquired a keen interest in agriculture and came to see the French economy as a system of exchange for products and services, as it was depicted in the Tableau Economique (1759). The Tableau's assertion that agriculture is the only source of economic output and that all other economic activities derive from it is its most significant claim[9], [10].

Prior to writing The Wealth of Nations in 1776, Adam Smith met Quesnay and studied the Tableau. He explained how agricultural surplus was required for the division of labour even if he disagreed with Quesnay's classification of agriculture as the only source of output. Even during the Industrial Revolution, there was no disagreement among classical economists regarding the importance of agricultural surplus, but as their studies of "political economy" split into neoclassical economics and political science at the start of the 20th century, microeconomics supplanted the more comprehensive, integrated view of the economy.

The interrelationships between economic sectors, much less the natural sciences or agricultural practises, would be unfamiliar to future economists. In the meanwhile, Marxists and Henry George's supporters filled a large portion of the political economics void by advocating for a unique and significant tax on land rentals in their 1879 book Progress and Poverty.

Land lords joined up with hand-picked experts to minimise the importance of land in economic output in order to concentrate tax policy on wages after Henry George followed up on Progress and Poverty with political activities and won wide support from populist supporters. The anti-George response expressed itself in the growth of neoclassical economics at a time when many economics departments in the United States were still in their infancy. Agricultural economics had been relegated to its own lanes by the time

macroeconomics emerged from the Keynesian revolution in the second quarter of the 20th century. Land was often disregarded as a component of production by the larger economics community in favour of labour and capital. The Great Depression caused an emphasis on labour and employment whereas the economics of war was particularly focused on capital mobilisation. In addition, people in wealthy nations were rapidly urbanising, living more away from the countryside. The increasing inclination of 20th century neoclassical economists to underestimate the size and effects of natural resource scarcity and environmental degradation may be explained in part by these changes in the social and political setting. On the other hand, the cornerstone of the theoretical underpinning of ecological economics is the essential necessity of agricultural surplus for a fully developed economy, and rising surplus for a developing economy.

John Stuart Mill was a classical economist who had a particularly strong connection to ecological economics. He summarized the status of economics at the time in Principles of Political Economy (1848). Additionally, he may have been the first economist to advance the idea of the "stationary state" with optimism as opposed to warning against it like Thomas Malthus and David Ricardo had done. These two economists had pointed grimly to the conflict between population growth and agricultural capacity, leading some to label economics as the "dismal science." According to Mill, an educated populace may eventually gain control over itself, reach a high level of living, and then focus on issues of social justice. For all practical reasons, the steady state economy of ecological economics is equivalent with the stable state, which is a non-growing, non-declining economy.

It's unclear exactly how Marxist ideas contributed to the development of ecological economics. Ecological economists' forerunners saw that the focus on development in capitalism (and other) economies posed a serious danger to society and the environment, making "green" Marxists ideal partners. Marx, on the other hand, seems to have a strong belief in technology's ability to overcome development constraints; instead, his criticism of capitalism originated largely from his views on the unequal distribution of power and money. One of the aftereffects of the Cold War, which was judged by how much economic productivity was produced, was an armaments race between the United States and the Soviet Union. One of the things that accelerated environmental degradation and the study of ecological economics was these powers' obsession with economic expansion.

Ecological Economics' method and philosophy

Any endeavor's general strategy and philosophy are interconnected; thus they are discussed here in the same section. Ecological economics differs from neoclassical economics and the majority of "heterodox" economic traditions including the Austrian School, Keynesian economics, and Marxism in terms of methodology and philosophy. Transdisciplinary and normative are succinct ways to sum up ecological economics' methodology and philosophy, respectively.

Transdisciplinary

In order to separate it from a large list of "interdisciplinary" subjects that emerged in academia during the latter decades of the 20th century, ecological economics is often referred to as a "transdisciplinary" endeavor. In certain academic circles, there has been a trend towards the integration and synthesis of disciplinary research due to worries about the impractical or unwise policy consequences of reductionist science. However, the transdisciplinary method was promoted as cooperative problem-solving with dynamic integration of philosophical ideas and empirical discoveries after multiple attempts at interdisciplinary research were criticised for just coupling of reductionist fields.

It was especially important to avoid disciplinary reduction when it came to the ecological aspects of economic systems because many national economies had expanded beyond what was sustainable and because issues with the ozone layer, biodiversity loss, and climate change were becoming increasingly obvious on a global scale. Most economists and ecologists have little knowledge of the economic factors contributing to environmental issues, as well as the severity and financial effects of ecological degradation. Many economists and ecologists were unaware of how politics and society affected their research and sometimes made policy suggestions. It was in this setting that Daly, Costanza, Richard Norgaard, and others promoted the idea of transdisciplinarity, which may be seen as an ecological economics issue or focus in and of itself. A transdisciplinary approach, however, presupposes that there is something to apply it to, and ecological economics does so in relation to three main topics that may be summed up as size, distribution, and allocation.

Goals, Methods, and a Normative Position

Economic theory is generated, evaluated, and used in a way that is heavily influenced by views on human nature and civil rights. Although there is disagreement in ecological economics on the ethical makeup of man or his spiritual roots, there is universal agreement that economics is inherently normative both in terms of study and application. This sets ecological economics apart from neoclassical economics, which models man as "Homo economicus," an automaton that is self-interested and seeks to maximise utility via the consumption of commodities and services. According to ecological economics, man has a variety of motivations that stem not just from economic need but also from deeply ingrained evolutionary, cultural, and spiritual causes. Although it is possible to simulate human consuming behaviour in an academic setting, this seldom results in reliable or practical policy consequences.

With a better understanding of human nature, a range of goals and strategies may help put the academic environment in perspective. Sciences that narrow the field of study to the smallest physical and biological details provide insights into the strategies for achieving a variety of human aims and objectives. The purpose of life and its related goals, however, are outside the scope of science and often expressed in or understood via religion. Transdisciplinary studies, interdisciplinary research, and social sciences all contribute to bridging the gap between reductionist science and meaningful lives, or from means to goals. In contrast, social sciences like economics examine intermediate means (like economic institutions) and goals (like economic wellbeing), while physics studies ultimate means and religion studies ultimate objectives.

Compared to neoclassical economics, ecological economics clearly and purposefully covers a wider range of aims and methods. Due to the fact that ecological economics was born out of environmental concerns, its practitioners have combined their ecological knowledge with a deeper examination of all natural disciplines that have a special bearing on economic issues, such as the principles of thermodynamics. In other words, by definition, ecological economics is concerned with the ultimate means and how they influence the prospects for the economy of humans. The normative perspective of ecological economics, on the other hand, necessitates taking into account ultimate purposes, such as religious callings and demands. This is an amusing component of ecological economics given that ecologists are sometimes painted as atheistic academics who only see Homo sapiens from an evolutionary perspective. However, as discussed in the section below on the distribution of wealth, there are rational and religious justifications for connecting ultimate means and ultimate purposes in economic concerns.

CONCLUSION

The abstract concludes by highlighting the prospects and future directions for ecological economics. It talks about how ecological economics research may include fresh approaches like complex systems theory and behavioural economics. It also emphasises how crucial it is to use multidisciplinary strategies and international collaboration to solve pressing environmental issues like climate change and biodiversity loss. This summary gives a broad overview of the historical history of ecological economics, following its growth from early economic ideas to a unique and multidisciplinary subject. It emphasises the importance of ecological economics in solving the difficult sustainability problems and encouraging the incorporation of ecological concepts into economic decision-making.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. L. Ruder and S. R. Sanniti, "Transcending the learned ignorance of predatory ontologies: A research Agenda for an ecofeminist-informed ecological economics," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/SU11051479.

[2] E. Pirgmaier and J. K. Steinberger, "Roots, riots, and radical change-A road less travelled for ecological economics," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072001.

[3] M. Lehtonen, "Ecological Economics and Opening up of Megaproject Appraisal: Lessons From Megaproject Scholarship and Topics for a Research Programme," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.01.018.

[4] M. Ballandonne, "The historical roots (1880–1950) of recent contributions (2000–2017) to ecological economics: insights from reference publication year spectroscopy," *J. Econ. Methodol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1350178X.2018.1554227.

[5] A. Bruel, J. Kronenberg, N. Troussier, and B. Guillaume, "Linking Industrial Ecology and Ecological Economics: A Theoretical and Empirical Foundation for the Circular Economy," *J. Ind. Ecol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/jiec.12745.

[6] V. Mauerhofer, "Legal Institutions and Ecological Economics: Their Common Contribution for Achieving a Sustainable Development," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2018.09.023.

[7] J. Ament, "Toward an ecological monetary theory," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11030923.

[8] J. J. Goddard, G. Kallis, and R. B. Norgaard, "Keeping multiple antennae up: Coevolutionary foundations for methodological pluralism," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106420.

[9] D. Hoyos, W. Sigüenza, I. Capellán-Pérez, Á. Campos, and D. Álvarez-Antelo, "A collaborative game-based learning to enhance ecological economics teaching," 2019. doi: 10.4995/head19.2019.9468.

[10] H. Daly, "Some overlaps between the first and second thirty years of ecological economics," *Ecological Economics*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106372.

CHAPTER 5

ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS THEMES AND FOCUSES

Dr. Dasinis Nathan Annette Christinal
Assistant Professor,Masters in Business Administration (E-Commerce),
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:annette.c@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:
An interdisciplinary topic called ecological economics studies the intricate relationships between the economy and the environment. The main issues and areas of ecological economics are summarised in this abstract, together with the essential ideas and concepts that guide its study and investigation. The primary topic of the essay is sustainability, which forms the basis of ecological economics. It examines the idea of sustainable development, focusing on the need of striking a balance between economic expansion, societal well-being, and environmental preservation. The abstract also looks at how ecological concepts like carrying capacity, resilience, and feedback loops might be included into economic analyses. The abstract then explores the topic of resource management and allocation. It talks about how it's critical to comprehend the constraints and limited nature of natural resources, as well as how to create plans for resource usage that is sustainable. It also examines how economic tools, such price structures and market-based strategies, might support effective resource allocation and conservation. The abstract also touches on the subject of market failures and externalities. It draws attention to the fact that many social and environmental costs are not effectively represented in market pricing, which results in inefficient resource allocation and detrimental effects on ecosystems and human well-being. The idea of environmental externalities is examined, as well as the need to internalise these costs through legislative and regulatory measures.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Natural, Policy, Transdisciplinary.

INTRODUCTION

Economics is described in traditional economics courses as "the allocation of scarce resources among competing end uses." Efficiency, or the effective use of resources, is often the main topic of neoclassical economics. Neoclassical economics recognise that resources are scarce at any given moment and that effective resource allocation is necessary as a result, but they seldom recognise that resources are scarce in the long term. The typical assumption made by neoclassical economics is that innovation and brand-new technology continually push back the output and consumption ceilings that are momentarily imposed by scarcity[1], [2]. On the other side, ecological economics emphasises the need to distribute limited resources. Both short-term and long-term restrictions are acknowledged, which gives rise to the "scale" problem. This recognition of the long-term limitations to development fuels intense concern about the distribution of wealth as well (as will be shown later). The backdrop for evaluating allocative efficiency is provided by the scale problem and wealth distribution.

The Scale Problem

As was said in the historical context, neoclassical economics has ignored or minimised the significance of land as a component of production. The economy is often represented in

economics and business textbooks as a circular flow of money between businesses and people. In the fundamental circular flow model, households provide the companies with the labour, and enterprises have the capital necessary to produce products and services when paired with labour. In the form of wages, money is transferred from businesses to households and ultimately used to purchase the products and services that businesses generate[3], [4].

Other parts of the economy are included in more in-depth models of the circular flow, either as "leakages" from the flow (such as savings) and "injections" into the flow (such as investment) or as additional entities that fit inside the circle. A Keynesian interpretation of the circular flow, for instance, incorporates the government, which levies taxes on businesses and families, provides salaries to certain people, and purchases products and services from businesses. The majority of circular flow models, however, do not explain how natural resources are extracted and utilised in production, much less how the environment affects how the economy works.

The cyclical trade between businesses and families is recognised in ecological economics, but graphical representations of the economy place more emphasis on the setting in which this transaction takes place. It is shown that the economy, together with all of its businesses, citizens, and government sectors, live inside a containing, supporting environment. The ecosystem is shown to provide the natural resources (such as water, timber, and minerals) and energy (primarily the solar energy required for photosynthesis and thus agriculture) needed for the production of consumer goods and services as well as the manufacturing of capital and infrastructure. Furthermore, it is shown that the ecosystem may take in pollutants and waste products from the process of economic production. With this visual representation of the economy in mind, the student moves on with an understanding of the significance of the environment as a sink for pollutants and the supremacy of land as a source of economic inputs. The learner is also assisted by this graphic in understanding and appreciating the concept of "scale," which in ecological economics refers to the size of the economy in relation to its enclosing and supporting environment.

Considering the largest size that can be supported are educated on carrying capacity, which is the maximum number of creatures that an environment can sustain, through ecological literature. The carrying capacity of every species is established by a combination of wellbeing and decimating influences. The wellbeing aspects for wildlife species are the four elements that make up a species' habitat: food, water, cover, and space. Predators, illnesses, and bad weather are all devastating contributors. The ecosystem's carrying capacity for typical animal species is represented in terms of the maximum number of people that it can sustain.

The importance of carrying capacity to Homo sapiens is emphasized in ecological economics. Humans, however, are distinct from other animal species in terms of how much of an individual's environment is used or consumed. In actuality, human per capita consumption ranges by many orders of magnitude. Therefore, GDP, which is a measure of human population and per capita consumption, is a superior statistic (than the number of persons) for measuring human carrying capacity. To put it another way, GDP is a respectably accurate measure of the size of the human economy, or the overall amount of production and consumption of goods and services. As a result, it is also a good place to start when figuring out how big the economy is in comparison to how big the ecosystem is.

The incorrect assumption that GDP is not a physical indicator with ecological consequences since it is stated in value units is not appropriate. A value-based compilation of tangible commodities and services is known as GDP. A physical amount of X is equal to one dollar, and the gross domestic product (GDP) is an index of all physical quantities. Further study and

attention are needed on the topic of how precisely and accurately GDP measures physical activity and throughput[5], [6].

DISCUSSION

All facets of the economy/ecosystem link are included in the scale problem, including pollution, population growth, climatic stability, etc. One topic that has garnered a lot of attention is biodiversity preservation. The concepts of ecology that are most pertinent to the interaction between humans and biodiversity, such as niche width and competitive exclusion, have been described by conservation biologists as a contribution to ecological economics. For instance, they have shown how the human economy advances at the competitive exclusion of nonhuman species overall because of the enormous width of the human niche, which grows as a result of new technology. Professional scientific groups like The Wildlife Society and the American Society of Mammalogists have taken stances on the "fundamental conflict" between economic development and biodiversity protection as a result of these and similar ideas. The adjective "fundamental" in this case denotes that the disagreement is grounded on physical and ecological principles, rather than just observation[7], [8].

To characterise, measure, and assess the economic worth of "ecological services" offered by nonhuman animals and other elements of the natural environment, ecologists and economists have joined forces. Because they unintentionally pollinate domestic and wild plants that people appreciate for their food and fibre throughout the course of their life cycles, many species, for instance, are advantageous to the human economy. Economic growth is recognised as a threat to biodiversity as well as the continued operation of the human economy when the fundamental conflict between economic growth and biodiversity conservation is acknowledged along with the value of ecological services provided by nonhuman species.

Therefore, it is impossible to predict the maximum sustainable size without understanding: 1) the natural resource stocks and ecological services offered by nature, generally known as "natural capital;" 2) how natural capital stocks and services are transformed or depleted during economic expansion; 3) the extent to which natural capital can be replaced by human technology; and 4) the likelihood that human technology will advance in a way and at a rate that will enable the discovery and production of substitutes for natural capital. Since each of these four subjects is very complicated, ecological economists advocate utilising the "precautionary principle" in environmental and economic management rather than assuming that people would be able to create an accurate and full synthesis. To better educate people and decision-makers, however, useful methods for scale evaluation have been created. The "ecological footprint" idea, developed by William Rees and Mathis Wackernagel, serves as an illustration of how much space is needed to maintain human economies. Environmental footprinting and related studies have focused on natural capital inventories and the needs of economic activities for natural capital[9], [10].

Numerous national economies and the global economy are already running over their maximum sustainable size, according to the literature on ecological footprints. For instance, according to some estimates, Earth equivalents would be required to maintain all individuals on Earth if they consumed at the same rate per capita as Americans. According to some estimations, the per capita consumption at the start of the twenty-first century would need to be sustainable globally for 4 Earth equivalents. These studies claim that the only reason humans have been able to consume at levels above what is long-term sustainable is because they have been "liquidating" natural resources like fossil fuels (especially petroleum) at a rate that is faster than it can be replenished or replaced.

Ecologists have long understood that species may persist in populations that are larger than their long-term carrying capacity. However, in many of these situations, there is a long-term decline in carrying capacity, as when an ungulate species destroys its food supply and degrades the soils, causing erosion and the emergence of an environment that is not as favourable to the ungulate species.

Numerous "technological optimists" and other neoclassical economists have argued that humans are exempt from the concept of carrying capacity because, in contrast to other animals, humans are able to control their environment and create ever-more effective modes and methods of production. This idea has given rise to a protracted debate concerning "limits to growth." The first two principles of thermodynamics are used in ecological economics, which has some origins in Georgescu-Roegen's work, to disprove the idea of endless development. It is established by the first law and its derivatives that neither matter nor energy can be generated or destroyed. The second or "entropy law" implies that it is impossible for an economic manufacturing process to reach (much less surpass) 100% efficiency. The principles of thermodynamics suggest that economic expansion has an absolute limit. A related finding is that economic development and environmental protection may not always be reconciled by technical advancement and that apparent, intermediate reconciliation is often overstated or nonexistent when all environmental implications are taken into consideration.

Limits to expansion are becoming increasingly obvious, prevalent, and politically acceptable notwithstanding the difficulties in identifying maximum size and maximum sustainable scale. As a consequence, optimal size has been the analytical focus of many ecological economics. The "equimarginal principle of maximisation," a fundamental idea in microeconomics, urges the business to cease producing once the expenses of production grow to equal the income earned from each additional (or marginal) unit produced. This principle serves as the starting point for determining optimal size. Applying this reasoning to the economy as a whole, ecological economists understand that, when the interests of society as a whole are taken into account, the costs (in a wide sense) of increasing an economy ultimately outweigh the advantages. When the marginal disutility of growth equals the marginal utility of growth, an economy should stop expanding in order to maximise societal welfare. Beyond that threshold, economic development is no longer net beneficial to society, and some ecological economists refer to it as "uneconomic growth." (There is some disagreement among ecological economists about the merits of using the term "uneconomic growth," especially in the context of policy, because "economic growth" is used by conventional economists and the general public to describe rising production and consumption of goods and services, regardless of the net benefits to society.)

Most experts in ecological economics agree that GDP is a fair estimate of an economy's size, but they all agree that it is not a good predictor of social welfare (thus the idea of uneconomic growth). As a result, different measures have been created to provide hints regarding the ideal scale. For instance, Herman Daly and John B. Cobb created the Index of Sustainable Economic Welfare (ISEW) in the 1980s, which takes into consideration both the natural capital that has been depleted throughout the economic process as well as the monetary worth of the final products and services (such the GDP). In the 1990s, Redefining Progress created the Genuine Progress Indicator (GPI) as a result of their work. Beyond solely economic criteria, the GPI also takes into account social aspects of human wellbeing. When the GPI (or ISEW) is plotted against GDP for many countries with the necessary data, the GPI has been stable or dropping since the 1970s, even though GDP has continued to expand, implying growth beyond the optimal level. Similar evaluations may also utilise a variety of different

development-stage-specific measures, such as the more recent Gross National Happiness or the venerable Human Development Index. The King of Bhutan first used the phrase "Gross National Happiness" in 1972, and since the middle of the 1990s, the idea has been the subject of much theoretical and empirical research.

Wealth Distribution

Consideration of how distribution is perceived in neoclassical economics, which holds that economic development is limitless and that "a rising tide lifts all boats," is a great starting point for understanding how ecological economics views wealth distribution as a problem. In other words, neoclassical economists believe that poverty can be eradicated by expanding the economy even more so that financial prosperity may trickle down via job possibilities or generosity. This is because the scale problem does not exist in neoclassical economics. Neoclassical economics often opposes state-sponsored welfare programmes because they interfere with the free operation and, hence, the effectiveness of market economies.

On the other hand, ecological economics places more emphasis on the limitations to economic development, which naturally raises concerns about how wealth is distributed. The tide can only go up so far, and only a certain number of boats can be hauled, to use a metaphor from the "rising tide" phenomenon. The normative position of ecological economics becomes crucial in light of this knowledge, which is based on an understanding of ultimate means (matter and energy). Although ecological economists accept and to some degree analyse evolution and natural selection, they do not hold that the market should be allowed to determine the chances of the poor. In contrast to neoclassical economists, they acknowledge a wider range of market failures and the reality that certain production variables are not suitable for efficient market allocation. Distribution issues may arise as a result of ineffective allocation or get worse. However, they also support policies and programmes to redistribute wealth whenever required for the sake of distributive justice and the greater good. Ecological economists and neoclassical economics share a number of additional market failures and corrections that might be addressed by public policy.

Because there are no scientific or quantitative procedures to determine an equitable distribution of wealth, this results in challenging policy choices. Ethics are by definition necessary for even recognising the idea of justice. In the end, religion offers legitimacy or at the very least direction in developing an ethical framework. Religious teachings with relation to economic justice are examined in some detail by ecological economics. All major faiths preach fiscal restraint and charity while cautioning against the spiritual dangers of greed, wealth, and luxury. The public and decision-makers benefit from even brief reminders of these lessons while making economic decisions.Many ideas and approaches employed in the field of international development are also used to ecological economics when it comes to strategies for analysing the distribution of wealth. The Gini coefficient, for instance, is used to assess how evenly money is distributed throughout the population, with consequences for public policy and global diplomacy. On the other hand, unlike neoclassical economics, economic justice does not consider Pareto optimality to be significant (explained more in the section on resource allocation).

One of the main topics in ecological economics relating to the distribution of wealth is international commerce. Free commerce between countries is often seen as a positive characteristic for the global economy in neoclassical economics. Free trade is seen as a tool for the effective distribution of resources and for promoting global economic expansion. This frame of view is based on David Ricardo's (1772–1823) comparative advantage theory. If a country's opportunity costs—as opposed to its absolute costsare lower than those of other

countries, it has a comparative advantage in the production of that good. The consequence for economic development is that if countries specialise in producing commodities for which they have a comparative advantage, a greater level of global production may happen.

Since one of the fundamental assumptions of the concept is that the factors of production do not transcend international borders, the principle of comparative advantage is neither denied nor totally rejected in ecological economics. The idea applies less than it did during the classical age of the 19th century since capital had become very mobile and there had been several large-scale international migrations of labour. However, more crucially, any event promoting more growth is not necessarily judged good in ecological economics, regardless of whether it promotes allocative efficiency. This is because economic expansion threatens to exceed the ecological capacity of the planet. Finally, it is believed that extensive and quick international commerce disrupts the social fabric of countries and encourages the accumulation of wealth in countries with a variety of comparative advantages. A laissez faire approach to free trade suggests that it will result in an increasingly lopsided macroeconomic distribution of income due to favourable terms of trade for countries with an industrial and institutional head start.

Resource Allocation

In economics, "allocation" largely refers to the use of "resources" in a broad sense, which refers to the components of production. Macroeconomic analyses and descriptions of factor allocation may include the ratios of land, labour, and capital used to produce a country's goods and services, but in neoclassical economics, the distribution of the factors of production among firms and subsequently commodities is the main focus. In fact, a typical definition of economics is "the study of the allocation of resources among competing end uses," and many academics agree that macroeconomics belongs to a different discipline, such as Keynesian economics, and that neoclassical economics is identical with microeconomics. In any case, effective resource allocation is the main metric of success in neoclassical economics (and among many Keynesians as well).

It is necessary to elaborate on the concept of "competing end uses". "Competing end uses" refers to a firm's productive endeavours when there is a production-based emphasis. For instance, one company may utilise oak logs to make flooring, while another would use them to make furniture. The final products of the economic manufacturing process are furniture and flooring. "Competing end uses" emphasises the options of customers with a focus on consumption. As an example, one customer could choose oak flooring while another prefers oak furniture. It would not be effective if businesses employed the majority of the oak logs to make flooring while the majority of customers wanted the supply to take the shape of furniture. Neoclassical economics' central insight and emphasis is that prices dynamically lead to the best distribution of resources, including oak logs, for a particular distribution of consumer wealth and income. This is true for all resources.

Although efficient allocation is crucial in ecological economics as well, ecological economics has a distinct allocation philosophy and different consequences for allocative policy as a result of its ecological base and ethical framework. First, it is emphasised that land is the most important component in production. Contrary to what is often believed in neoclassical economics, manufactured capital is instead acknowledged as emanating from the land and requiring labour energy. Once produced, capital often enters the manufacturing process as a complimentary, not a substitute, input. Second, efficiency is evaluated more in terms of materials or energy than it is in terms of money. For instance, a company may adopt a certain capital-to-labor ratio while not using resources like materials or energy effectively. Third, the

macroeconomic component of efficiency is highlighted as a result of the focus on scale. Even a fiscally efficient combination of government expenditure or a financial mix of inputs for the company could not be energy- or material-efficient for the economy as a whole.

It is not efficient to utilise a certain resource to create an item or a service if another, more abundant resource may be used in its place, or "ceteris paribus" in economics parlance. Resources that are more numerous are more likely to be used in production since their costs should be lower, which helps to provide information about their scarcity. Neoclassical economists believe that markets ensure that no resource will become so scarce as to cripple a business or economy that is alert and competitive because new institutions and technologies are created when prices signal enterprises and governments.

In ecological economics, the belief that pricing would resolve serious resource shortages is less basic. Ecological economists also emphasise that many natural resources and ecological services cannot be replaced by money or synthetic items, regardless of how high prices may grow. All economists agree that numerous market "imperfections" lead to erroneous pricing. Prices also reflect current circumstances, with little thought given to the needs of future generations. For instance, the cost of global warming, which resulted partly as a result of cheap oil (and other fossil fuel) prices, was not adequately reflected in oil prices throughout the 20th century. Neither did they represent the energy problems that would emerge in the 21st century.

Additionally, certain commodities and services (referred to as "goods" collectively in this section) lack the qualities necessary for effective market allocation. These traits include excludability and rivalry. Rivalry is an innate quality. A good is rival if it can only be consumed by one person at a time. Food, for instance, is a competing good. Although excludeability is a natural quality as well, it can only be seen in the context of a legal institution, unlike rivalry. If others could be prohibited from using a good, it is excludeable. Property rights must be excluded in order to be allocated, and certain products are more excluded than others. For instance, non-migratory fisheries may be excluded more easily than migratory ones. No matter how easily excludable a product is, its exclusion must be maintained.

Competitive products are often to some extent excludable. However, many excludable products, particularly services, are not competitors. One or many individuals could enjoy singing at a concert venue, for instance. Based on the availability of singers (and concert halls) and the demand for singing, the performer, hall owner, and/or producer negotiate the degree of exclusion and the cost of tickets. Prices must be competitive and excludable in order to serve as indications of scarcity. Prices are excellent indications of scarcity for products like food, clothes, and shelter that are competitive and excludable. For items that are excludable but non-rival, such as information and entertainment services, prices, on the other hand, are not very reliable indications of scarcity. Prices for items that are not even excludable cannot be sought or accepted. As a consequence, in a free market where prices are determined by supply and demand, resources might be allocated effectively among rivals, less effectively among non-rival but excludable resources, or not at all. In other words, non-excludable resources need to be maintained or given outside of the market.

Due to the non-excludability or low levels of excludability of many natural resources, the needs of rivalry and excludability for effective market allocation are especially pertinent in ecological economics. Oceanic fisheries, huge forested areas, expansive rangelands, and inaccessible mineral reserves are a few examples of natural resources that are rival yet difficult to exclude. They may be overused by extractors who get the rewards without bearing

the full costs of misuse, leading to prices that are too low for effective allocation. One of the conceptual pillars of ecological economics was the "tragedy of the commons," as described by Garrett Hardin in his seminal paper of the same name (although the term "commons" was somewhat misleading because traditional commons were frequently protected from overuse by complicated social contracts and customs).

Even less is provided by the allocation of non-excludable, even non-rival resources like the ozone layer. It took legislation and international agreements to override the market forces that favoured the use of chlorofluorocarbons as refrigerants in order to protect the ozone layer, which is essential for human health and survival.

The tragedy of open-access, non-excludable resources has also been recognised by neoclassical economists, who also emphasised that the cost of over-exploitation to society was a "externality" of the market that could be mitigated by a variety of institutional structures. It is accepted in ecological economics that certain market externalities may be partially "internalised" via taxes, user fees, etc.

These initiatives, however, are seen as a somewhat Pyrrhic win for the market in ecological economics since they equate to the regulatory devices that are despised in the free market worldview. However, more importantly, the term "externality" has come to represent for many ecological economists the problematic paradigm of neoclassical economics, i.e., that something occurring outside of the market system is unrelated to the primary goal of economics, namely the efficient allocation of resources by the market.

CONCLUSION

The explores the relationship between ecosystem services and natural wealth. It highlights the realisation that a variety of ecosystem services, including pollination, climate control, and water purification, are crucial for human well-being. It examines the valuing and accounting of ecosystem services, with emphasis on the need to take their importance into account when making economic decisions. It emphasises how crucial it is for ecological economics frameworks to take social justice into account and alleviate inequality. It examines the idea of environmental justice and the need of making sure that environmental benefits and liabilities are fairly distributed across various social groups and geographical areas. It examines how institutions, rules, and governance frameworks may support sustainability and synchronise business endeavours with environmental and social objectives. It also emphasises the need of inclusive decision-making procedures and the participation of a range of stakeholders in developing ecological economics regulations.

The major ideas and areas of ecological economics. In guiding the analysis and research in the subject, it highlights the significance of sustainability, resource allocation, externalities, ecosystem services, equality, and governance. Ecological economics provides insightful perspectives and practical strategies for developing a more fair and sustainable interaction between the economy and the environment by addressing these concerns.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. L. Ruder and S. R. Sanniti, “Transcending the learned ignorance of predatory ontologies: A research Agenda for an ecofeminist-informed ecological economics,” *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/SU11051479.

[2] E. Pirgmaier and J. K. Steinberger, “Roots, riots, and radical change-A road less travelled for ecological economics,” *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072001.

[3] M. Ballandonne, "The historical roots (1880–1950) of recent contributions (2000–2017) to ecological economics: insights from reference publication year spectroscopy," *J. Econ. Methodol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1350178X.2018.1554227.

[4] A. Bruel, J. Kronenberg, N. Troussier, and B. Guillaume, "Linking Industrial Ecology and Ecological Economics: A Theoretical and Empirical Foundation for the Circular Economy," *J. Ind. Ecol.*, 2019, doi: 10.1111/jiec.12745.

[5] M. B. Wironen, R. V. Bartlett, and J. D. Erickson, "Deliberation and the promise of a deeply democratic sustainability transition," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11041023.

[6] J. Ament, "Toward an ecological monetary theory," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11030923.

[7] V. Kolinjivadi, "Avoiding dualisms in ecological economics: Towards a dialectically-informed understanding of co-produced socionatures," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.05.004.

[8] C. L. Spash, "Time for a Paradigm Shift: From Economic Growth and Price-Making to Social Ecological Economics," *SRE Discuss. Pap.*, 2019.

[9] O. Jakobsen and V. M. L. Storsletten, "Beyond the green shift—ecological economics," in *Springer Geography*, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-99392-8_13.

[10] H. Daly, "Some overlaps between the first and second thirty years of ecological economics," *Ecological Economics*. 2019. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106372.

CHAPTER 6

ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS' IMPACTS ON POLICY

Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mounicav@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Ecological economics has grown to be a potent and major discipline with profound effects on the formulation of policies at many scales. This abstract gives a general review of the effects of ecological economics on policy, emphasising how it influences procedures for making decisions in the fields of the environment, economy, and society. The introduction of the study discusses the foundational ideas of ecological economics, highlighting its emphasis on the fusion of ecological and economic systems. The idea of sustainability is examined, as well as the understanding of the limited nature of natural resources and the significance of their preservation for long-term wellbeing. The next section of the abstract looks at how ecological economics has impacted policy-making procedures. It talks about how ecological economic concepts may be incorporated into environmental policy frameworks, such as using ecosystem-based management techniques and taking ecological indicators into account when making decisions. The abstract also examines how ecological economics affects monetary policy. It talks about promoting alternative economic models that put a focus on sustainability of the environment and resource efficiency, including the circular economy and the steady-state economy. Additionally, it emphasises how ecological economic ideas like externalities and market imperfections may be used to guide legislation aimed at internalising environmental costs and advancing sustainable economic growth.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Growth, Natural, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The social aspects of ecological economics and how they affect social policy. It looks at how ecological economics influences policy dialogues to emphasise equality, justice, and community well-being. Additionally, it touches on the significance of community involvement and participatory methods in the formulation of public policy. Identifies a few key areas of policy where ecological economics has made a significant contribution. It talks about how ecological economics influences attempts to conserve biodiversity, manage natural resources, and formulate climate change policy. It also looks at how ecological economics has influenced the creation of sustainable energy systems, urban design, and agricultural practices [1], [2].

Public policy is seen as an intermediate means along the ends-means spectrum given the normative attitude of ecological economics. The policies that have an impact on size, distribution, and allocation are of primary interest given the themes and focuses of ecological economics. In addition to reforming many current policies that are unsustainable, unjust, and inefficient, new policies are required for sustainable scale, equitable distribution, and efficient allocation.There are several ideas, customs, or schools of thought in public policy studies that are employed in public policy to varying degrees. The majority of these customs have some kind of economic foundation or tendency. "Public choice theory," for instance, is basically a

neoclassical economics application that holds that people's decisions in the market are a free and effective way for the public to express its preferences. According to this approach, public policy aims to prevent government involvement whenever possible and maintain the market's efficiency. Instead, the repressive character of political and economic forces is the emphasis of "critical theory," which has Marxist origins. It demands policy changes when the necessity for them is inexorably revealed, and often these changes interfere with market dynamics[3], [4].

Political scientists Anne Schneider and Helen Ingram have more recently developed "policy design theory" in an attempt to combine the finest elements of several public policy traditions. According to policy design theory, a public policy is also assessed according to how closely it upholds and supports democracy. Policy design theory is perhaps the school of public policy that is most supportive of the objectives of ecological economics since it is an integrating, synthesisingendeavour with a penultimate aim of democracy. Six guiding principles for creating policies were provided by Herman Daly and Joshua Farley in their ground-breaking book Ecological Economics: Principles and Applications. There are a few common, all-purpose ones among them, as well as some that illustrate the methodology and outlook of ecological economics. The guidelines are, in full:

1. Economic policy always has several objectives.
2. Policies should aim to achieve the required level of macro-control with the least amount of freedom and unpredictability at the micro-level.
3. Policies dealing with the biophysical environment should allow for some mistake.
4. Policies must acknowledge that we always begin with the predetermined beginning circumstances of history.
5. Policies must be flexible enough to alter as circumstances do.
6. The domain of the policy-making unit and the domain of the causes and consequences of the issue that the policy addresses must be consistent. In the goal of sustainable size, fair distribution, and effective allocation, each of these concepts has a distinct weight or prominence.

Scale that is Sustainable

For innovative policy responses to the issues of unsustainable size and uneconomic development (i.e., growth beyond optimum scale), ecological economics is often referred to. In the literature on ecological economics, there have undoubtedly been some novel policy instruments offered. However, the multitude of already in place policies that promote economic expansion are the first and maybe most significant terrain in the policy arena as it relates to sustainable size. These may be broadly grouped as trade, monetary, and fiscal policy. In ecological economics, emphasis is focused mostly on trade and fiscal policy. There isn't much information in the literature on ecological economics on changing specific monetary policies, including money supply and interest rates. This is probably because the necessary changes for sustainable scale are too clear and the issue is politically very difficult. In order to boost "sluggish" economies, monetary authorities are anticipated to lower interest rates and expand money supply. However, monetary policy to promote economic expansion causes more social damage than benefit if an economy has expanded past its optimum size, and particularly beyond its maximum sustainable scale[5], [6]. Higher interest rates and constrained money supply are justified in this situation. However, ecological economics was not well-known enough in the general public or among decision-makers as of the first decade

of the twenty-first century to spark a meaningful discussion about monetary policy in the direction of a steady state economy. When inflation looms, monetary authorities often choose higher interest rates and limited money supply.

All economists agree that the impact of monetary policy is rather small. For instance, cutting interest rates and pouring money into the economy can only lead to inflation when the economy is running at maximum capacity. Similar to how the economy must become "sluggish" as limits to growth are reached due to the liquidation of natural capital, the economy will almost certainly be forced to contract in the wake of significant and global supply shocks like Peak Oil (i.e., the peak on global per capita oil production). There is no way to alter this biophysical truth by financial manipulation[7], [8].

However, the monetary authority may "pull out all the stops" and, more crucially, fiscal policy will also be created for growth if a polity is seen to have economic growth. Taxes are probably going to be reduced in the hopes that customers would spend more as a result and boost the economy. Budgets will be redistributed in a way that also aims to boost the economy. The subsidising of maize cultivation to enhance the production of ethanol, a desired substitute for petroleum as the principal energy source for economic development, is an early 21st-century example. The six above-mentioned design principles for policies and ecological economics do not align with these typical, conventional, and anticipated reactions of fiscal and monetary policy authorities. The majority of ecological economists think that many national economies and the world economy have grown past their maximum sustainable size and are likely far larger than they should be. Therefore, adjusting the fiscal and monetary levers downward would be the ecologically sound course of action. However, as of now, this kind of policy change is not politically viable, which may help to partially explain why there aren't many similar policy suggestions in the ecological economics literature. This emphasises the importance of choosing the right policy aim, as opposed to specific measures. Because the formal acceptance of a policy aim may be seen as a policy in and of itself, this is partially a semantic problem. For instance, the U.S. Full Employment Act illustrates this. Full employment was the intended outcome when the Full Employment Act was first approved in 1946. To that end, it created a programmatic approach, or a strategy or collection of policy instruments, for attaining full employment. However, the United States has full employment as one of its policies[9], [10].

The Full Employment Act, which is likely the most formalised expression of the overall policy objective of economic expansion in the United States, makes this example particularly pertinent to sustainable scale. Although full employment is the primary objective of the Full Employment Act, it was and is believed that the population of the United States would increase. As a result, ceteris paribus, a full employment policy is identical to an economic growth policy. The assumption is that each generation will have a greater quality of life, particularly in material terms, in the United States and most other countries. Unlike full employment in the US, this is not legislated, but it penetrates all aspects of public policy. For instance, monetary authorities talk just as often about their initiatives to encourage economic development as they do to stop unemployment or inflation. In addition, at least four other government institutions in the United States, including the government Reserve (the monetary authority), have economic development as a component of their mandate. The number one domestic policy objective of the United States and many other countries, as well as possibly of the entire international governing community (e.g., OECD, NAFTA signatories, World Bank, International Monetary Fund, etc.), is economic growth, one might infer from all of the formal and informal government policies and programmes for it.

Full employment is related to population size, another essential political concern for reaching sustainable scale. In one crucial sense, overpopulation is the most significant issue to address, even though an economy may expand beyond its optimum and maximum sustainable size via either population growth or per capita output and consumption. Because humans need a certain level of consumption to survive, continued population expansion will ultimately cause carrying capacity to be exceeded. In contrast, if population is concurrently declining, per capita consumption may rise, at least theoretically, without necessarily increasing the global ecological footprint. Since neither population nor per capita consumption can continue to rise indefinitely and since full employment is still a top concern, stabilising the population is more important than stabilising per capita consumption. A increasing population will result in some unemployment as the economy transitions from one of economic growth to one of stable state. It is very difficult to advance a steady state economy politically under this situation.

In conclusion, achieving sustainable size requires switching from a steady state economy at the optimum scale to the national and global objectives of economic development. This implies that the economic growth strategy must be replaced with the steady state economy policy, and the complex of policies created to support economic development must be changed to support a steady state economy. A crucial but probably inadequate prerequisite for creating a stable state economy is reforming current policies. There will undoubtedly be a need for new policies, including those that aim to stabilise the population as well as per capita output, consumption, throughput, and natural capital reserves. Direct regulation, when the state imposes behavioural and commercial restrictions, is always the most extreme strategy. In most countries, direct regulation is socially unacceptable and politically impractical, even if it has the potential to be quite successful.

Pigouvian taxes and subsidies may be used in addition to direct regulation in order to promote sustainable scale. The emphasis on compensating for market failures that separates Pigouvian policies—named after Arthur C. Pigou, 1877–1959—from other taxes and subsidies. Because of this, they are acceptable to the majority of economists and beneficial for social fairness. Specific Pigouvian devices could significantly increase sustainable scale as well. For instance, the rate of pollution will decrease if polluters are charged for the entire societal cost of the pollution.

The cap-and-trade policy, which also incorporates a number of the aforementioned policy design criteria, is the most unique kind of policy in terms of sustainable size. Most natural capital stocks and many pollutants can be efficiently addressed by a cap-and-trade programme (or policy mechanism). The term "cap" illustrates the connection to scale. A de facto barrier to economic development is created when the usage of a resource that is essential to the economy is limited. The best illustration is greenhouse gas emissions, particularly those resulting from the burning of fossil fuels. The majority of the world's energy comes from fossil fuels, with coal being a key source of electric power and petroleum serving as the main fuel for transportation. In this view, limiting greenhouse gas emissions is equivalent to limiting economic expansion.

Instead of slowing down economic expansion, policymakers want to regulate greenhouse gas emissions in order to safeguard the climate and avert potentially catastrophic levels of global warming. However, some of the richest countries have refrained from taking part in global accords to reduce greenhouse gas emissions due to the predicted economic dampening effects of a severe restriction on greenhouse gas emissions. This encounter highlights the importance of macroeconomic policy objectives in the realm of politics.

Theoretically, one might specify a ceiling on greenhouse gas emissions specifically for scale-limiting objectives beginning from the standpoint of ecological economics. However, this would only be possible if the world community agreed that the objective of global economic expansion was no longer suitable, in line with the principles and conclusions of ecological economics. Then, based on principles 3-5 of policy design (above), the amount at which the limit on greenhouse gas emissions (or other environmentally significant) would be established would be determined. In accordance with principle 3, a cautious approach is required, giving the environment and future generations the benefit of the doubt wherever possible. However, in accordance with principle 4, the cap will be implemented gradually to prevent startling the economy. The gradualism concept or requirement in an era of environmental catastrophe implies the need to adopt the steady state economy as a policy objective swiftly, presuming there is still time for gradual policy reforms.

In accordance with principle 5, plans to control throughput must be flexible enough to allow for cap adjustments when growth constraints and optimal scale become clearer. Due to the global dimension of many throughput concerns, international policy structures and mechanisms are necessary in accordance with principle 6. As an early example of a worldwide agreement to control greenhouse gas emissions, see the Kyoto Protocol.

DISCUSSION

The minimal compromise of micro-level flexibility is required by Principle 2. This premise is better met by cap-and-trade programmes than direct controls since businesses are allowed to trade throughput permits within the cap's bounds. Markets are created, licences are distributed among businesses, and from that point on, some of the allocative benefits of laissez-faire markets are used. However, some benefits are not. For instance, a cap-and-trade system is fundamentally a government-established system with regulations that are enforced by the government, but a laissez-faire market needs no government intrusion and expense. This reflects the reality that natural capital is often excludable and not completely or easily rivalled. However, since the throughput permits are completely competitive and excludable, they often are distributed among the enterprises in an effective manner.

The majority, if not all, public policy traditions will value different features of a cap-and-trade regime since it is an acceptable compromise between laissez-faire and central planning. The cap-and-trade policy is a perfect example of policy design principle 2, since it is created with the least amount of sacrifice to micro-level freedom while achieving the appropriate level of macro-control.

Fair Distribution

Fair distribution cannot be successfully pursued in ecological economics unless sustainable scale has already been attained or is on the verge of being attained. Fair distribution attempts will always fail if sustainable size is not a policy aim and economic expansion continues to be a state goal while exceeding the maximum sustainable scale. History demonstrates that once development boundaries are crossed, war results, and the winners take control of the natural resources, including the land itself. A social contract is necessary for peaceful and just cooperation, in which members of society pledge to live sustainably and to fairly distribute resources and other goods. This social compact would be represented in ecological economics through minimum wage, income limits, and the distribution of returns from the elements of production, particularly natural capital.

Ecological economics often support "Georgists" (current adherents of Henry George) more than neoclassical economists do. George and other classical economists presented a strong

argument for the fact that land cannot develop, in contrast to labour or capital stocks. The value of land rises when labour and capital stocks multiply and gain prominence in comparison to land. In other words, the landowner benefits financially from the labour of others. The unearned rents of landowners, according to georgians and many ecological economists, should go into the commonwealth.

Socialism may even call for governmental ownership of all land. As long as businesses are not subsidised to take natural capital from public lands and landowners are taxed on unearned rents, ecological economists often support a balance of public and private lands. Because there are already established institutions for taxing land, collecting unearned rents is promoted as a very realistic strategy for achieving equitable distribution. More than the administrative structures of taxes, ecological economics would change the logic and mathematical models.

The case for limiting wealth and income follows immediately from the scale problem to the distribution problem. If the global economy has reached its maximum sustainable size, increasing one individual's income or wealth will cause it to exceed its long-term carrying capacity unless an equal amount is taken away from someone else. It would be unethical for that person to endanger the environment, their fellow humans, and future generations by engaging in even greater and unsustainable levels of consumption, particularly if they were already extremely affluent.

The rationale for limiting or redistributing income and wealth is the flip side of the same ethical coin. Given that the global economy has grown beyond its maximum sustainable size, restricting income and wealth and using current surplus to reduce poverty is the only morally and environmentally sound strategy for reducing poverty while achieving sustainable growth. According to policy design theory, the precise level at which income or wealth should be capped should be decided democratically, with the support of the majority of citizens who understand the need for caps on throughput and, consequently, caps on income. A gradualist strategy would probably include formal, voluntary capping, followed, if required, by enforced capping. For calculating the proper capping levels, information on the current size of the economy, a variety of ideal scales, and the ecological footprints related to various levels of income and wealth would be required.

The minimum income is at the opposite extreme of the distributional policy range. A minimum income policy is grounded on size and distribution-related logic and ethics. Poor people are therefore very unlikely to prioritise environmental concerns, which is essential for creating a sustainable scale. For instance, peasants who are landless and jobless may turn to stealing wood from public properties. The ethical course of action is to assist the poor without endangering the environment or future generations since it is more likely that they are victims of circumstance than they are lazy individuals. In other words, in a functioning global market, it makes sense and is morally just to provide the poor a basic income that is paid for by the wealthy's excessive indulgences. This strategy combines a steady state economy with more equitable wealth distribution.

Efficiency in Allocation

Ecological economics de-prioritizes efficient allocation, the summum bonum of neoclassical economics, but only in relation to the immediate, first-order demands of sustainable scale and equitable distribution. However, from a normative standpoint of avoiding waste and from a macroeconomic viewpoint that efficiency allows for greater sustainable size, efficient allocation is vital in ecological economics. Additionally, one significant difference between ecological economics and conventional economics is that the second law of thermodynamics

is acknowledged as a restriction on the potential for technological efficiency in ecological economics. Ecological economists often concentrate on the assessment of economic values of non-market or public natural capital and ecosystem services since they recognise that the market is frequently a very effective mechanism for distributing private (rival and excludable) commodities. These estimating activities aid in educating the general public and policy makers about the opportunity costs of private goods production and consumption that are borne by society when natural capital and ecosystem services are depleted. In certain circumstances, Pigouvian taxes and subsidies may be developed using the estimated values (see Section 4.1). Additionally, they support decision-makers during cost-benefit analyses. The decision of New York metropolitan authorities to purchase and conserve some of the Catskill Mountains is an often cited example. The city of New York had the option in 1997 of investing roughly $1.5 billion in the Catskills' natural resources, maintaining the ecosystem service of water filtration, or building a water filtration plant at a cost of $4–8 billion, with annual operating costs of $250–300 million. Basic techniques for calculating the values of natural capital and ecosystem services include:

1. Market Price Method, first. In commercial marketplaces, a variety of ecosystem products or services are purchased and sold. Although there are externalities, market prices provide a place to start when determining the worth of associated natural capital and ecosystem services.

2. Method of Productivity. For intermediate ecosystem products or services that aid in the creation of commercially available end products, economic values may be calculated.

3. The hedonic pricing approach. Ecosystem commodities and services that have a direct impact on the pricing of other marketed goods and services might have their economic worth determined.

4. The Travel Cost Approach. Economic values connected to ecosystems or areas of land utilised for recreation are predicated on the notion that the worth of a recreational site is represented in how much people are prepared to pay to visit the location.

5. Damage Cost Avoidance, Replacement, and Substitute Cost Methods. Damage costs, as well as those associated with replacing ecosystem products and services or offering replacement goods and services, are avoided when an ecosystem is shielded from disruptive economic or other activity.

6. Contingent Valuation Method Economic values for almost everything may be assessed based on many speculative outcomes. People could be questioned about their willingness to pay for the preservation of an ecosystem, specific natural resources, or ecosystem services, for instance.

7. Benefit Transfer Technique by "transferring" (or projecting) current estimations from research that have previously been finished in other fields, one calculates economic values.

All of the aforementioned strategies have been discussed in environmental economics, which is the application of neoclassical economics to environmental problems; none of them are exclusive to ecological economics.

The primary way that ecological economics contributes to the adoption of these methodologies is via a greater understanding of the ecosystems' parts, structures, and functions as they relate to economic accounting and decision-making. Ecological and environmental economics have worked together extensively to estimate the values of natural capital and ecosystem services.

CONCLUSION

The abstract concludes by outlining obstacles and potential future prospects for the use of ecological economics in decision-making procedures. It talks about the need of multidisciplinary cooperation, strengthening capacities, and turning scientific information into workable policy. Additionally, it highlights how crucial political will, institutional backing, and public knowledge are for successful policy implementation. Overall, this abstract highlighthow ecological economics has a considerable effect on how policies are developed across a variety of fields. The contributions of the field to advancing sustainability, including ecological factors into economic decision-making, and addressing social justice and fairness are highlighted. This abstract offers insights into the transformational potential of ecological economics in creating a more just and sustainable future by emphasizing the interaction between ecological economics and policy.

REFERENCES:

[1] S. Markkanen and A. Anger-Kraavi, "Social impacts of climate change mitigation policies and their implications for inequality," *Clim. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/14693062.2019.1596873.

[2] B. Carney Almroth and H. Eggert, "Marine plastic pollution: Sources, impacts, and policy issues," *Rev. Environ. Econ. Policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1093/reep/rez012.

[3] E. Aydin and D. Brounen, "The impact of policy on residential energy consumption," *Energy*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.energy.2018.12.030.

[4] A. Faisal, T. Yigitcanlar, M. Kamruzzaman, and G. Currie, "Understanding autonomous vehicles: A systematic literature review on capability, impact, planning and policy," *J. Transp. Land Use*, 2019, doi: 10.5198/jtlu.2019.1405.

[5] D. Qin, H. Xu, and Y. Chung, "Perceived impacts of the poverty alleviation tourism policy on the poor in China," *J. Hosp. Tour. Manag.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2019.09.004.

[6] A. Caragliu and C. F. Del Bo, "Smart innovative cities: The impact of Smart City policies on urban innovation," *Technol. Forecast. Soc. Change*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.techfore.2018.07.022.

[7] L. Ma, Z. Liu, X. Huang, and T. Li, "The Impact of Local Government Policy on Innovation Ecosystem in Knowledge Resource Scarce Region: Case Study of Changzhou, China," *Sci. Technol. Soc.*, 2019, doi: 10.1177/0971721818806096.

[8] L. Mouysset, C. Rais Assa, J. S. Ay, F. Jiguet, R. Lorrilière, and L. Doyen, "Bioeconomic impacts of agroforestry policies in France," *Land use policy*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2019.02.026.

[9] J. Di Filippo, J. Karpman, and J. R. DeShazo, "The impacts of policies to reduce CO2 emissions within the concrete supply chain," *Cem. Concr. Compos.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.cemconcomp.2018.08.003.

[10] H. C. Rafante, S. C. Selingardi, S. de O. da Silva, and L. V. Silva, "Impacts of the special education policy (2008) in Ceara and Fortaleza," *Educ. e Pesqui.*, 2019, doi: 10.1590/S1678-4634201945218350.

CHAPTER 7

FUTURE DIRECTIONS AND ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS' CHALLENGES

Mr. Yelahanka Lokesh
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: lokesh.yr@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

In order to create a sustainable future, ecological economics must overcome both obstacles and possibilities. In order for ecological economics to continue playing a transformational role in tackling environmental, economic, and social concerns, this abstract gives an outline of the future directions and difficulties the field must face. The first section of the study discusses the current state and potential future paths of ecological economics. In order to improve our comprehension of complex socio-ecological systems, it examines the possibilities for incorporating new techniques and approaches, such as complex systems theory, behavioural economics, and big data analytics.

The value of multidisciplinary cooperation, interacting with many stakeholders, and creating alliances between the academy, government, and civil society are also emphasized. The abstract then looks at the difficulties that ecological economics encounters while attempting to achieve sustainability.

It covers the conflicts between economic development and environmental sustainability and emphasizes the need of questioning traditional growth-based economic models and investigating alternative paradigms, such as degrowth and steady-state economics. It also looks at the difficulties associated with including social factors, dealing with inequality, and advancing social justice within ecological economics frameworks. Additionally, the abstract stresses how critical it is to solve ecological economics' knowledge gaps and uncertainties. On the pricing of ecosystem services, the significance of technology and innovation in sustainable development, and the effects of global commerce and globalization on ecological sustainability, further study is recommended.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Environmental, Natural, Policy.

INTRODUCTION

Although ecological economics is now largely accepted in academics, it is still quite new to policy circles. Its emphases and inclinations have always been vulnerable to problems and have varied from one location to another since it accommodated a variety of ideas and approaches from the start.

For instance, the American school of ecological economics emphasises sustainable scale and, particularly since the 1990s, effective utilisation of natural capital, while the European approach places a considerably stronger emphasis on the distribution of income. But the first decade of the twenty-first century brought about significant alterations in the social, political, ecological, and economic spheres. The direction ecological economics takes for the duration of the twenty-first century will be influenced by these current advances, which both strengthen and pose challenges to it[1], [2].

Reiterating Sustainable Scale as Priority

Reiterating and reinforcing the importance of sustainable scale as the most unique and original component of ecological economics is one of the challenges facing the field. The "Dalyist" school of ecological economics emphasises sustainable size. The Dalyist tradition has been eclipsed in academia and in practise by exercises where the value of natural capital and ecosystem services are estimated in monetary terms, often in great econometric detail, sometimes with little ecological grounding, and almost always with little macroeconomic context. This is true even though sustainable scale is frequently listed as the highest priority in ecological economics textbooks or overviews. This is clear from the body of literature as a whole and even from the venerable journal Ecological Economics.

There are at least three phenomena that have contributed to the focus on natural capital value. First, maintaining size would undoubtedly need changing macroeconomic policies, including introducing new instruments and modifying old ones. This is a difficult task. While there is broad consensus regarding the significance of "getting the prices right" with ecologically informed microeconomics, switching from the macroeconomic goal of growth to the goal of a steady state economy requires a true paradigm shift on the part of conventional economists, policymakers, and society at large. Powerful corporate interest groups, also referred to as "the corporatocracy" to denote the coordinated nature of corporate influence in economic policy making, have an impact on the formulation of fiscal, monetary, and trade policies.

Some commentators allude to a "iron triangle" comprising prominent firms, politicians with the support of corporations, and powerful economists who are employed by corporations or chosen by politicians. The macroeconomic policy arena is surrounded by and permeated by this tri-partite network, making entry and success exceedingly challenging. For instance, the Federal Reserve System ("the Fed"), the country's central bank, creates and implements monetary policy in the United States. The Fed's board members are chosen by the President of the United States and serve 14-year terms. They often have distinguished positions in neoclassical economics' academic strongholds. In other words, it will be difficult and time-consuming to replace the traditional, neoclassical approach to monetary policy, and many ecological economists consider the possibility of change to be unrealistic to pursue at this moment in history.

Second, more neoclassical economists are concentrating on environmental problems and even joining ecological economics associations like the International Society for Ecological Economics as environmental concerns grow. The ratio of neoclassical economists to ecological economists in the "ecological economics" field has been rising since there are many more neoclassical economists than ecological economists. Their formal education and training have equipped them to determine and analyse pricing and to write papers on those topics, but not typically to determine and analyse the ecological constraints on economic development[3], [4].

Third, research funders often show greater interest in the value of natural capital than in sustainable scale. This is partially due to the prior finding that reforming macroeconomic policy is too difficult to engage people, particularly donors who often want to see immediate and obvious outcomes from their donations. There is also the added factor that a significant portion of macroeconomic policy, particularly monetary policy, is managed almost entirely at the national level by a small number of individuals. However, fiscal policy is often microeconomic in character (for example, taxing a particular sort of item), even if it may be macroeconomic (for example, setting rates for income taxes). Fiscal policy is handled by various officials in local, regional, and national agencies. While the main objectives of

traditional monetary policy are to promote growth and deter inflation, those of fiscal policy are far more varied and often include changes to prices. Economic values must first be determined for non-market commodities and services, including ecosystem services, in order to employ pricing mechanisms. Because there are more economists with neoclassical (or microeconomic) training than with ecological (and macroeconomic) training, valuation exercises are more prominent in ecological economics due to the volume and variety of issues requiring them.

Given these justifications, the ecological economics community must decide whether or not to place so much emphasis on natural capital value. If so, how may the issue be fixed? There must be a genuine or perceived issue since concerns about the focus on natural capital value are often voiced within the ecological economics field. The most frequent worry is that ecological economics will only become an extension of neoclassical economics if it merely focuses on natural capital value. A merging of neoclassical and ecological economics may be seen as a weakening compromise given that ecological economics was born out of the realisation that neoclassical economics was insufficient for revealing sustainability concerns and assisting in their solution. This worry has caused some of the early proponents of ecological economics to disassociate themselves from the field and/or found other, mostly unofficial, neoclassical economics alternatives. For instance, some researchers label their work as "biophysical" economics to emphasise the importance of the natural sciences in their study[5], [6].

DISCUSSION

The ecological economics community, on the other hand, has benefited from natural capital value in order to become more instantly relevant to the conventional economics community and to decision-makers who must make tough choices about the distribution of natural resources. There are many opportunities for graduate students to engage in ecological economics due to the relative simplicity of natural capital valuation exercises and the political and financial support for such studies. It is likely that many of these students will go on to study ecological macroeconomics and issues of economic justice. Numerous publications have published valuation studies, which have helped to familiarise a wide range of academics and professions with at least the allocation component of ecological economics[7], [8].

In conclusion, it is obvious that the focus on natural capital value has been at least somewhat problematic for the ecological economics group, without passing judgement on the merits of natural capital valuation to date in relation to sustainable size and distributional inquiries. More information on the macroeconomic setting of valuation studies might help to mitigate the issue. The fundamental ideas of growth constraints and sustainable scale are often discussed in introductions, conclusions, or discussion parts of journal papers since they are frequently quite pertinent to the settings of valuation situations. For instance, since biodiversity has been lost as a result of economic expansion, the economic worth of biodiversity has attracted scholarly attention.

Authors might simply summarise the overall (macroeconomic) constraints that resulted in the scarcity of the species or ecosystems in the first place rather than digging into descriptive specifics of specific species and ecosystems and then offering valuation approaches. Similar to this, writers of such papers may appropriately highlight in their conclusions that although effectively distributing biodiversity benefits from accurate pricing, a steady state economy will eventually be needed to preserve biodiversity.

Through programme creation, curriculum development, faculty credentials, graduate student exams, and community service, the focus on sustainable scale and more attention to equitable

income distribution may also be implemented in academia. These emphases may also be supported by government and non-governmental organisations with conservation interests via the creation of programmes, employee hiring and training, and public awareness campaigns.

Determining the Ecological Effects of Money Volumes and Flows

Ecological economics generates as many issues as it does solutions, and it is beyond the scope of this article to enumerate all of them. Given the possibility that ecological and financial crises are growing simultaneously, one topic comes out as being particularly pertinent and urgently in need of a response. In terms that are most pertinent to both sustainable size and financial soundness, the issue is "What is the nature of money?" in specific ecological terms[9], [10].

Some have suggested that accurate scale indicators are quantities or flows of real (inflation-adjusted) money. If this is the case, a society may assess its sustainability using real GDP, for instance. And estimates of the maximum and optimal size might also be represented in GDP terms, considerably simplifying the application of ecological economics to macroeconomic policies. In other words, real GDP would work as a substitute for the ecological footprint.

The ecological character of money, however, is a topic on which ecological economists have a great deal of debate. Some people believe that money cannot be used as a scale indicator since supply and demand both affect prices, and demand is a psychological rather than an ecological function. Additionally, when new technologies are created and various products and services join the market, the throughput-to-money ratio may alter over time. This prevents policymakers from correlating money amounts and flows with environmental effect.Ecological economics should make a determined effort to do research because it may be possible to use money amounts and flows as scale indicators. One of the most significant academic achievements of the twenty-first century might be a clear and persuasive proof that scale can be determined using common metrics of money flows or quantities. The development of macroeconomic policy objectives, the implementation of monetary and banking policies, and the expectations of global financial institutions and capital markets would all be guided by it.

Possibility of De-Growth Need

Dalyist tradition experts have advocated for decades that communities and polities engage in intentional planning for steady state economies in order to prevent the ill effects of "overshoot" with a focus on sustainable size. Complete avoidance appears to be impossible today. Peak oil, climate change, the literature on ecological footprinting, and financial crises all indicate that the global economy has already done significant ecological and economic harm that is well beyond what is long-term sustainable. Rapid economic expansion in China and India in the twenty-first century seems to guarantee that massive regional economies and the global economy will experience a lengthy and devastating recession, especially in light of the large ecological footprints that affluent countries like the United States already have. Overshoot damages, however, could be reduced to the degree that economic development can be purposefully halted by determined polities (with people acting as conscientious consumers in addition to policymakers working towards economic policy reform). The movement for La Décroissance (The Decline) in western Europe is one example of how some academics and activists have started to call for rapid and sustained economic "de-growth."

Some of the most vociferous proponents of economic de-growth have even gone so far as to say that the steady state economy objective is already antiquated and inadequate for ecological and economic sustainability in the twenty-first century. This criticism has logical

validity, as was briefly mentioned in the paragraph above. On the other hand, a declining economy is no more sustainable over time than one that is expanding.Therefore, the challenge for ecological economics is to include de-growth research and policy consequences while maintaining focus on the long-term objective of a steady state economy. The following are some queries for academics to consider: 1) How far is the economy from its carrying capacity? The term "the economy" may refer to either the global economy or an economy at any level of geography, such a state or province. (For economies that are not global, size may be examined in relation to the various endowments of natural resources.) 2) What is the economy's long-run maximum sustainable scale? 3) What scale should you use? 4) How much is carrying capacity compromised when maximum sustainable size is broken, and how rapidly must an economy contract to prevent further compromising of carrying capacity? 5) How will maximum and optimal scales vary over time as a result of natural and manmade causes, breaching or not? 6) What kinds of institutions and policies are necessary for steady state economies and de-growth?

Economics is at a crossroads in light of factors including climate change, Peak Oil, financial collapses, resource disputes, and other signs of an environmental and economic catastrophe. There are several economic thinking paths available to citizens, economists, and policymakers. Neoclassical economics, with its emphasis on the effective distribution of resources, is the widely accepted option. But regardless of how well it is travelled, the road laid out by neoclassical economics does not go from crisis to sustainability, according to historical perspective and scientific analysis.

Neoclassical economics' actual and perceived inadequacies in part led to the development of ecological economics. According to ecological economics, the laws of thermodynamics and ecological principles serve as direct causes of the limitations to economic development. The idea that efficiency has its own boundaries means that continually improving efficiency is not an option and may not be able to overcome the constraints on economic development.

The concept of scale, or the size of the economy in relation to its enclosing, supporting environment, must be added to economic theory and practise in order to overcome growth constraints. Addressing the distribution of wealth follows from this. If the world economy's tide can only rise so high, only a small fleet may be supported. Economic justice, according to ecological economics, does not include striving to raise the tide beyond what is physically possible, but rather involves making sure that little, law-abiding boats do not capsize in the wake of enormous luxury liners.

A critical consideration of economic development as a policy objective raises several issues for ecological economics, most notably the political problems this entails. There are many theoretical and methodological concerns to be established, and the list of such difficulties is likely to grow as the body of study grows, as with any endeavour that develops in academia before emerging in society. Ecological economics research is anticipated to have a significant impact on consumer behaviour, economic policy, and global diplomacy to the degree that it is done, conveyed, and understood by publics and polities.

CONCLUSION

In addition, explores the complexity of issues including climate change, biodiversity loss, and resource depletion. It highlights how crucial it is for ecological economics to solve these issues by creative policy reforms, radical adjustments to consumer and production habits, and cross-border collaboration. The contribution of institutions and governance to the development of ecological economics. It addresses the need for legislative changes, administrative controls, and institutional frameworks that internalise environmental costs,

advance sustainable resource management, and support deliberative processes. It emphasises the value of promoting public awareness, education, and capacity-building in ecological economics in its last sentence. It highlights the need of information distribution, interaction with politicians and the general public, and the promotion of ecological literacy to bring about significant change. Overall, this abstract focuses on the obstacles and future directions ecological economics will encounter as it works towards sustainability. It highlights the significance of multidisciplinary cooperation, transformational policy solutions, and taking on difficult global concerns. Ecological economics may keep playing a significant role in establishing a more sustainable and just future for people and the earth by accepting these difficulties and possibilities.

REFERENCES:

[1] E. Pirgmaier and J. K. Steinberger, "Roots, riots, and radical change-A road less travelled for ecological economics," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11072001.

[2] M. B. Wironen, R. V. Bartlett, and J. D. Erickson, "Deliberation and the promise of a deeply democratic sustainability transition," *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. 2019. doi: 10.3390/su11041023.

[3] S. Sievers-Glotzbach and J. Tschersich, "Overcoming the process-structure divide in conceptions of Social-Ecological Transformation: Assessing the transformative character and impact of change processes," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106361.

[4] I. V. Roncancio *et al.*, "From the Anthropocene to mutual thriving: An Agenda for higher education in the Ecozoic," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/SU11123312.

[5] A. M. York, A. Sullivan, and J. C. Bausch, "Cross-scale interactions of socio-hydrological subsystems: Examining the frontier of common pool resource governance in Arizona," *Environ. Res. Lett.*, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/ab51be.

[6] A. Melkonyan, K. Krumme, T. Gruchmann, S. Spinler, T. Schumacher, and R. Bleischwitz, "Scenario and strategy planning for transformative supply chains within a sustainable economy," *J. Clean. Prod.*, 2019, doi: 10.1016/j.jclepro.2019.05.222.

[7] L. Coscieme *et al.*, "Overcoming the myths of mainstream economics to enable a newwellbeing economy," *Sustain.*, 2019, doi: 10.3390/su11164374.

[8] M. Nissanke and J. A. Ocampo, "Introduction to the Handbook," in *The Palgrave Handbook of Development Economics: Critical Reflections on Globalisation and Development*, 2019. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-14000-7_1.

[9] M. Seid, "The Veer from Frontier Economics to Eco-development Paradigm: Approaches, Policies and Strategies of Sustainable Development - The Case of Environmental Governance in Ethiopia," *J. Energy, Environ. Chem. Eng.*, 2019, doi: 10.11648/j.jeece.20190402.11.

[10] A. Nadler, "Nature's Economy and News Ecology: Scrutinizing the news ecosystem metaphor," *Journal. Stud.*, 2019, doi: 10.1080/1461670X.2018.1427000.

CHAPTER 8

AN ANALYSIS OF PRESENT HUMANITY'S CONFLICT

Dr. Dasinis Nathan Annette Christinal
Assistant Professor,Masters in Business Administration (E-Commerce),
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: annette.c@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

A wide range of interconnected problems and conflicts make up the current struggle facing humanity, which is influencing how we will all live together in the future. With a focus on the intricate linkages between social, economic, environmental, and political elements that are causing strife and obstructing development, this abstract examines the major aspects of this struggle. The study starts off by recognising how complex the current battle between humans is. It includes a number of urgent problems, including as socioeconomic inequality, political polarisation, environmental deterioration, resource shortages, military conflicts, and the decline of faith in institutions. These issues are interrelated and feed off one another, creating a complicated web of interdependence that exacerbates tensions and makes solutions more difficult. The abstract then analyses how the disagreement is socially framed. It draws attention to the expanding gaps between many social groupings, including financial disparity, racial and ethnic differences, gender inequities, and social exclusion. Due to these social injustices, there is an increase in anger, social discontent, and a feeling of unfairness, which causes social division and strife within communities. The abstract also looks at how the war is economically impacted. It acknowledges the difficulties caused by inequitable economic growth, unemployment, poverty, and the concentration of wealth and power in the hands of a select few. The cycle of poverty and exclusion is continued by economic disparity and the sense of an unequal allocation of resources, which causes social discontent and conflicts.

KEYWORDS:

Environmental, Harm, Pollution, Social, Sub-system.

INTRODUCTION

In the past, human awareness of their influence on the environment has regularly trailed behind the severity of the harm they have caused, severely undermining attempts to contain the harm. Even now, proponents of technology and others continue to overlook the accumulating evidence of environmental deterioration until it more directly affects their own well-being. Even some serious students find solace in the following justifications: Global GDP numbers are rising in most places. The average life expectancy is rising in several countries. There is conflicting evidence of greenhouse warming. Some environmental damage allegations have been overstated. Environmental disaster has not occurred as predicted in the past[1], [2].

All of these assertions are true. However, none of these should lead to complacency; rather, when considered together, they provide as compelling evidence of the need for a novel strategy for environmental study and management. The gross domestic product (GDP) and other commonly used national income accounting metrics are infamous for over-emphasising market activity, understating resource depletion, missing pollution-related harm, and failing to capture true improvements in well-being. For instance, despite significant improvements in resource-depleting throughput, the Index of Sustainable Eco- nomic Welfare indicates a much

lower improvement in actual benefits[3], [4]. By contrast, rising life expectancies in many countries obviously indicate welfare benefits. However, if these increases are not supported by corresponding drops in birth rates, there is a danger that population expansion may accelerate, aggravating all other environmental issues. Sharply rising newborn mortality rates and real life expectancy declines in the former USSR witness to the risks posed by huge pollution stock accumulations and public health negligence.

Scientists' differing opinions on the greenhouse effect highlight how ubiquitous ambiguity is about the fundamental makeup of our ecological life-support systems and highlight the need of including precautionary minimum safe criteria into environmental regulations. The urgency of our responsibilities to look for underlying patterns from several indications of what is happening to the "balance of the earth" is not diminished by the fact that certain environmental concerns have been overstated and that the severity of any one of these problems might be disputed or dismissed[5], [6].

It has only lately been feasible to make a more thorough evaluation of local and global environmental degradation because to developments in environmental sciences, global remote sensing, and other monitoring technologies. Evidence is mounting that the world's rain forests are disappearing faster than they can be replaced, species are going extinct, ocean fisheries are becoming depleted, there is a shortage of fresh water in some places and an increase in flooding in others, soil erosion is taking place, underground aquifers are being depleted and polluted, irrigation and drinking water supply and quality are declining, and there is increasing pollution of the atmosphere and oceans, even in the polar regions. Without a doubt, the exponential rise in human populations is displacing other species before we have fully realised how reliant we are on species diversity. Although ethnic differences play a role in some post-Cold War conflicts, like those in Haiti, Somalia, Sudan, and Rwanda, territorial overpopulation and food shortages are also contributing factors. As a result, they serve as additional early warning signs of escalating global environmental problems[7], [8].

It is evident that current policy approaches for remediation have been limited, insufficient, and incomplete. Early policy talks and the solutions that followed tended to concentrate on the symptoms of environmental harm rather than the fundamental causes, and the instruments of policy tended to be haphazard rather than carefully planned for effectiveness, equity, and sustainability. For instance, in the 1970s, end-of-pipe pollution control was emphasised. While this was a serious issue, it was actually a symptom of expanding populations and ineffective technologies that fueled exponential growth in material and energy throughput while endangering the ability of the planet's life-support systems to recover[9], [10].Early views of environmental harm led to significant learning about policies and tools for combating pollution. These newfound understandings will be useful in addressing the more important and difficult environmental problems mentioned below. The fundamental issues that call for novel policy and management tools are as follows:

1. Unreasonably high and continuing human populations that exceed the earth's carrying capacity
2. Highly entropy-increasing technology that drain the earth's resources and contaminate the air, water, and land with their leftover wastes
3. land conversion that hastens the loss of species diversity, worsens soil erosion, and eliminates habitat.

These issues are evidence that the material scale of human activity surpasses the earth's carrying capacity, as has been emphasised throughout this study. We contend that in order to solve these issues, we should take steps to ensure that opportunities and resources are fairly

distributed among different groups within the current generation as well as between it and future generations. These strategies need to be based on a resource allocation that is economically efficient and fully takes into consideration the need to conserve the stock of natural capital. This section looks at historical precedent and the newly developing field of ecological economics to provide direction for creating policies and tools that may address these issues.

DISCUSSION

In the past, when people learned to use highly entropy-increasing technical techniques for agriculture, substantial anthropogenic harm to specific parts of the planet started to occur. During the industrial revolution in Europe, factory manufacturing drastically increased this damage. Early public policy responses were weak to nonexistent, enabling polluters to obtain de facto property rights to release pollutants into the common property resources of air and water. These polluters' political and economic might came to surpass that of the feudal magnates. In England, serious action was not done until urban agglomeration in London with its choking smoke from coal burning so unnerved Parliament. Smog-related fatalities as a consequence of vehicles and modern industries started to happen around the middle of the 20th century. A steel mill working in Donora, Pennsylvania, during a week-long temperature inversion in 1948 created a "killer smog" that claimed the lives of many individuals and sickened thousands of others. The pollution from home and industrial coal burning caused many thousand deaths in London one winter night in 1952. In actuality, these events sparked the adoption of clean air laws and advanced engineering.

Before new scientific understanding of the function of microorganisms encouraged the development of sewage treatment and water purification systems, even more significant loss of life due to the spread of water-borne diseases was viewed as a normal part of human existence. Investing heavily in such systems helped cities finally stop losing so many people to the unregulated discharge of human waste into shared waterways. It took the application of appropriate science, technology, and community will to lessen the costly loss of human life brought on by unanticipated population growth, the concentration of people in unplanned urban areas, and unjustified appropriation of resources from common property for waste disposal.

In its comparatively lengthy and very successful history, Homo sapiens is now at another pivotal crossroads. The activities of our species on the earth are now so extensive that they are starting to have an impact on the ecological life-support system itself. To address the expanding number of interconnected social, economic, and environmental issues, the fundamental idea of economic development has to be reconsidered. The interconnectedness and interdependence of all facets of life on the earth must be explicitly acknowledged in order for us to move towards meaningful economic and social growth. We must go from an economy that downplays this connection to one that values it. We must create an economy that, in its core understanding of the issues confronting our species at this pivotal juncture in its history, is profoundly ecological.

In a very real sense, this new ecological economics represents a return to economics' classical foundations. It represents a move back to a time when economics and the other disciplines were merged rather than, as they are today, academically separated. The goal of ecological economics is to break through the rigid disciplinary boundaries that have developed over the last 90 years and apply the full force of our intellectual capital to the enormous difficulties we are now facing.

Our species is currently facing a conundrum that can be summed up in ecological terms as follows: We have transitioned from an early successional "empty world" where the emphasis and rewards were on rapid growth and expansion, fierce competition, and open waste cycles to a maturing "full world" where the needs are for qualitative improvement of the linkages between components, cooperative alliances, and recycled "closed loop" waste, whether perceived by decision makers or not.

Can we identify these fundamental shifts and restructure society quickly enough to prevent a disastrous overshoot? Can we admit the enormous uncertainty involved and take steps to save ourselves from their most severe effects? Can we effectively create policies to address the complex problems of income distribution, population control, global commerce, and energy supply in a world where the easy fix of "more growth" is no longer a viable option? Can our global, national, and local governing structures be changed to better meet these fresh, challenging challenges?

In the past, Homo sapiens has effectively adapted to enormous obstacles. In reaction to the limitations of hunting and gathering, we established agriculture. To take use of the possibilities of concentrated types of energy, we created an industrial civilization. Living sustainably and comfortably within the material constraints of a limited world is now the task. More so than any other animal, humans are capable of conceptualising their environment and predicting the future. The authors are optimistic that the skills of conceptualising and foresight will help the human species tackle the new challenge of sustainability. That problem is what ecological economics aims to address.

The world's ecological system and the economic system

Resource consumption expressed as a function of population per capita is a very valuable measure of the severity of our environmental situation. This is the size of the human economic subsystem in relation to the size of the larger global ecosystem, which it is a part of and is dependent upon. The global ecosystem serves as both the source of all the material inputs and the sink for all the wastes that are produced by the economic subsystem. The entire movement, or throughput, of resources from the ecosystem to the economic subsystem and subsequently back to the ecosystem as waste is determined by population times per capita resource consumption. The top graphic depicts a time in the past when the scale of the global ecosystem's economic subsystem was minimal. The scenario shown in the bottom picture is much more similar to that of today, when the economic subsystem is quite huge in comparison to the global environment.

The ability of the source and sink functions of the global ecosystem to sustain the economic subsystem is substantial but constrained. Therefore, it is essential to keep the scale of the global economy within the limits of the ecosystem's ability to support it. To reach the $600 billion/year GDP of 1900, it took all of human history. The global economy now expands by this much every two years. One generation from now, the $16 trillion global economy may be five times larger if unchecked.

Even the Brundtland Commission's proposed "five- to ten-fold increase" in the industrial economy looks unlikely to be feasible for the planet. Growth in output is not the path to sustainability; we cannot "grow" our way there. The global ecology, which provides the economic subsystem with all of its resources, is finite and has a finite capacity for regeneration and assimilation. Although it appears inevitable that there will be twice as many people consuming resources and polluting sinks in the next century, it seems unlikely that they can be sustained sustainably at levels of material consumption comparable to those in the West today. We have already started to run into several restrictions on further material

growth. Instead,then quantitatively increasing throughput, qualitative improvement will be the key to achieving long-term improvements in the human condition.

From Regional to Global Limits

Important source and sink constraints have already been met or surpassed by the economic subsystem. We have already trampled some of our nest, and there is hardly somewhere on earth where evidence of our economic activity is lacking. Human trash is visible and growing from Mount Everest to Antarctica's centre. There isn't a single ocean water sample that doesn't include some of the 20 billion tonnes of human garbage that are added every year. In the marine ecology, PCBs, other persistently harmful substances like DDT, and heavy metal complexes have already accumulated. One-fifth of the world's population breaths air that is more hazardous than what the World Health Organisation recommends, and lead exposure may have mentally stunted an entire generation of youngsters in Mexico City.

Since the Club of Rome's 1972 "Limits to Growth," the focus has switched from source constraints to sink restrictions. Source constraints are more localised, more susceptible to private ownership, and more subject to replacement. As a result, they are easier for markets and pricing to govern. Where markets fail, sink limitations include community property. The argument that there are limitations to throughput increase on the sink side has become much stronger since 1972. Some of these restrictions are manageable, and they are being addressed, such as the Montreal Protocol's phase-out of CFCs. Other constraints, including rising CO2 emissions and the large human appropriation of biomass, are more difficult to overcome. Landfill sites are another example, and they are becoming more harder to locate. In pursuit of empty sinks, garbage is being transported thousands of kilometres from industrial to developing nations. For the United States, it has so far proven impossible. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will pay $100 million to rent a nuclear waste facility. In 1987, China and Germany's Kraft-Werk Union agreed to bury nuclear waste in Mongolia's Gobi Desert. These data attest to the reality that sinks, such as hazardous dumps and landfills, are becoming harder to locate. The usage of fossil fuels has a sink restriction, which is a significant limit. As a result, the pace of the transition to sustainable practises and renewable energy sources, such as solar energy, is similar. Technological optimists also include the potential for affordable fusion energy by 2050. We ought to remain tech neutral in the face of such serious uncertainty. While we should support environmentally friendly technology advancement, we shouldn't rely on it to address all environmental issues. Since sink management and input reduction have received less attention from researchers, these areas are likely to have the greatest potential for significant technical advancements.

Utilization of human biomass is the first indication of limits. The figure by Vitousek et al. that the human economy uses—directly or indirectly—about 40% of the net primary output of terrestrial photosyn- thesis currently is the greatest proof that there are impending constraints. Additionally, as population growth and urbanisation spread, there is an increase in soil erosion, blacktopping, desertification, pollution, and urban encroachment on agricultural land. This indicates that we will exhaust 80% of the available resources in only one population doubling, and 100% soon after. 100% appropriation, as Daly notes, is environmentally impossible, but even if it were, it would be socially unacceptable. Regardless of whether the washbasin is filled or the source is eaten, the globe will progress from being half-full to being full in one doubling time.

Climate change is the second indication of limits.Climate change is the second indication that the boundaries have been reached. The hottest year in more than a century of record-keeping was 1990. The past 11 years have seen seven of the warmest years on record. While 1990

was 1.25 F warmer than the 1880s, the 1980s were just 1 F warmer. This stands in stark contrast to the preindustrial stability, during which the earth's temperature did not change by more than 2 to 4 degrees Fahrenheit for the previous 10,000 years. Over the last 7000 years, the whole social and cultural infrastructure of humanity has developed in a temperature that has never varied by more than 2 degrees Fahrenheit from the current environment.

The natural climatic fluctuation is too considerable for perfect confidence; it is still too early to say with certainty that global change has started. The potential consequences are considerably more unknown. However, all available evidence points to the possibility that global warming has already begun, that CO2 levels have been rising for some time, as Svante Arrhenius predicted in 1896, and that the situation is becoming worse quickly. Even while there are still disagreements over the rates and effects, scientists are now almost unanimous in their belief that such change will occur. The American National Academy of Science issued a warning that the most important international problem of the twenty-first century may very likely be climate change. Only a small percentage of scientists continue to be atheists. More so than the projections, the policy responses are the subject of contention.

The dominant factor for the buildup of greenhouse gases is the size of the human economy based on fossil fuels today. Carbon dioxide, which is emitted by the combustion of coal, oil, and natural gas, is the main cause of global warming. More than one tonne of coal is burned yearly by the world's 5.8 billion inhabitants. Methane, CFCs, and nitrous oxide are the next most significant greenhouse gas contributors to climate change, followed by all other pollutants emitted by the economy that are beyond the biosphere's absorptive capacity. Despite being far less prevalent than carbon dioxide, these three pollutants are orders of magnitude more damaging. Although the true opportunity cost might end up being astronomical, employing atmospheric sink capacity for carbon dioxide disposal is now available to polluters at no cost. Even though more than 180 countries had signed a convention to internalise these costs by 1993, economists nearly universally continue to externalise the costs of CO2 emissions.

A few exceptions to the harmful effects of global warming may exist, such as the quicker growth of plants in CO2-enriched labs where water and nutrients are not scarce. However, it seems more plausible that in the actual world, crop belts will not move rapidly enough in response to climate change or that they won't develop faster because another element will become a limiting factor. Although the temperature in the prosperous North American breadbasket may actually move north, the deep, rich prairie soils will remain in place, and Canadian boreal soils and muskeg are very barren. As a result, the breadbasket will not move north with the climate.

In the event that the greenhouse hypothesis is confirmed, the costs of doing so outweigh the costs of adopting the theory. It will undoubtedly be too late to prevent intolerable consequences, such as the migration of millions of migrants from low-lying coastal regions, harm to ports and coastal towns, increases in storm severity, and most importantly, harm to agriculture, by the time the data is conclusive. Even if merely for insurance purposes, the danger from greenhouse gas emissions is more than enough to warrant action right now. How much insurance to purchase is the current issue to be handled.

Uncertainty, it must be said, reigns. But doubt has two sides. "Business as usual" or "wait and see" is a foolish, if not reckless, course of action given the scale of the risks involved. Recent research indicate that humans constantly underestimate dangers, despite the fact that underestimation of threats related to climate change or the ozone shield is just as probable as overestimation. May 1991 saw the U.S. In June 1991, the EPA increased its estimate of UV-

cancer mortality by a factor of 20 and reduced their estimate of the earth's capacity to absorb methane by a factor of 25%. Prudence should take precedence in the face of uncertainty about the state of the environment on a global scale.

The close connection between the quantity of automobiles issued and the size of the material economy is an important factor in this case. Since the industrial revolution, yearly increases in global carbon emissions have averaged 4%. Carbon emissions serve as a gauge of the size of the material economy to the degree that energy usage and economic activity are congruent. 78% of the country's energy comes from fossil fuels.

Both in the major emerging economies like China, Brazil, and India as well as in all industrialised economies, it is conceivable to reduce the intensity of fossil fuel use. Making the switch to renewable energy sources like biomass, solar, and hydroelectric power is the primary way to increase energy consumption without increasing CO2 emissions. Deforestation, the second significant source of carbon emissions, similarly reflects the size of the economy. The frontier is pushed back by more people's demand for more territory. However, these geopolitical borders are disappearing quickly now.

The seven billion tonnes of carbon that humans emit into the atmosphere each year build up, and for all intents and purposes, carbon buildup seems to be irreversible. Therefore, it is very important for ensuring the sustainability of future generations. The price of electricity can increase by a factor of two if carbon dioxide is removed from stacks using chemical or liquefaction methods. The most that technology can do is at most mitigate this significant expense.

Third Limitation Evidence: Ozone Shield Breach

The destruction of the ozone layer is the third indication that there are no more resources available on Earth. The cosmic holes in the ozone layer are among the strongest indications that human activity has already harmed our life-support systems. Sherwood Rowland and Mario Molina anticipated that CFCs would harm the ozone layer as early as 1974. However, there was such a strong scepticism when the damage was first discovered—in 1985 in Antarctica—that the data were rejected as emanating from malfunctioning sensors. Retesting and an examination of previously unread computer printouts revealed that the hole not only existed in 1985 but also that it has surfaced every spring since 1979. A gaping hole larger than the United States and higher than Mount Everest has gone undetected by the planet, endangering human life and food supply.

The one ozone hole in Antarctica has now spread worldwide. All subsequent studies have shown that the global ozone layer is decreasing far more quickly than projected by models. Later, a second hole was found over the Arctic, and more recently, ozone shield loss has been seen across temperate latitudes in both the north and south, notably over northern Europe and North America. Additionally, the temperature holes are moving from the less hazardous winter into the spring, increasing the harm to people and the crops that are just beginning to blossom.

The link between increased UV "b" radiation and skin cancers and cataracts is quite well understood. Every 1% reduction in the ozone layer causes a 5% rise in certain skin cancers. In certain areas, this is already worrying. Among those still living now, 1 billion more cases of skin cancer, many of them deadly, are inevitable. The probably more harmful impact on human health is a depressed immune system, which makes us more susceptible to various infections, parasites, and infectious illnesses. Additionally, agriculture output and marine fisheries suffer when the barrier deteriorates. The ambiguity, though, may have the most

severe effects, disturbing natural vegetation's usual balances. Keystone species, or those on which many other species rely for existence, may become less common, which would disrupt environmental services broadly and hasten extinction rates.

approximately a million tonnes of CFCs are released into the biosphere every year, and it takes them approximately ten years to reach the ozone layer, where they have a half-life of roughly one hundred years. Even if it is severe, the harm done now merely reflects the early 1980s's little CFC emission. Even if CFC emissions are stopped today, the world will still be forced to expand dam- age for another 10 years.

Over the next century, this would then gradually revert to predamage levels. This demonstrates that the ability of the global ecosystem to absorb CFC contamination has been surpassed. Mankind faces harm to environmental services, human health, and food production since the boundaries have been reached and surpassed. Eighty-five percent of CFCs are released in the industrial north, but the major hole in the ozone layer, 20 kilometres up in the stratosphere, developed in Antarctica, demonstrating the extent and genuinely global nature of the harm.

Fourth Limitation Evidence: Land Degradation

Degradation of the land is not new. Since the beginning of civilization, people have been destroying the land, and in many instances that land is still unusable now. However, the size has exploded and is significant since, contrary to aquatic or ocean systems, almost all of our food is produced on land. Degradation is an indication that we have outgrown the ability of the earth's soil supply since 35% of the planet's land is already degraded, and this percentage is rising and essentially irreversible in any time scale of importance to civilization.

According to Pimentel et al. and Kendall and Pimentel, soil erosion is a substantial issue in the majority of agricultural regions of the globe, and it is becoming worse as more marginal land is used for farming. Soil formation rates are typically at least ten times slower than soil loss rates, which typically range from 10 to 100 t/ha/yr. Possibly 6 million hectares each year are subject to erosion, salinization, or waterlogging as a result of agriculture. This problem has the potential to negatively impact how long the global food supply can last.

At a time when one billion people are already undernourished, exceeding the boundaries of this specific environmental source function increases food costs and exacerbates wealth disparity. Crop residues and manure are converted from agriculture to fuel because one-third of the populace in developing countries are now facing a fuelwood shortage. Land degradation, hunger, and poverty are all made worse by overharvesting fuelwood and this diversion.

Biodiversity loss is the fifth indication of limits.There is no longer space for all species in the ark due to the size of the human economy. The loss of species and the destruction of natural habitat are happening at rates that are faster than ever before in human history. Tropical forests, which are the most abundant kind of habitat on earth, have already been destroyed to a degree of 55%, and the pace of loss now surpasses 168,000 square kilometres per year. It is hard to calculate accurate extinction rates since the total number of existing species is not yet known to the closest order of magnitude.

The pace of irreversible extinction of the species in our inherited genetic library, according to conservative estimates, is more than 5000 each year. About 10,000 times as quickly as before the appearance of humans. Less cautious projections put the pace at 150,000 species annually. Many people consider such anthropocentrism to be haughty and unethical.

Additionally, it makes overshoot more likely. Many biological systems have built-in redundancy, but we are unsure of how close we are to the thresholds.

CONCLUSION

The critical need to address resource depletion, biodiversity loss, environmental degradation, and climate change is emphasised. The overuse of natural resources and the disdain for ecological boundaries endangers not just the stability of ecosystems but also the existence and well-being of human populations. Long-term sustainability is threatened by environmental deterioration, which exacerbates social and economic disparities and leads to disputes over finite resources. A discussion of the political aspects of the war is also included in the abstract. It recognises the deteriorating public opinion of political institutions, the rise of populism and nationalism, and the polarisation of society. Political polarisation obstructs inclusive policy development, undermines international collaboration, and makes government less effective. The problems societies confront are made worse by a lack of political cooperation and will, which also restricts our capacity to come up with general answers. The war that mankind is now experiencing is multifaceted and linked. Societies may progress in the direction of being more inclusive, egalitarian, and sustainable if they address the social, economic, environmental, and political aspects of the conflict. For mankind to overcome its current strife and create a better future for everyone, cooperation, empathy, and a shared dedication to the wellbeing of both present and future generations are crucial.

REFERENCES:

[1] M. B. Wironen and J. D. Erickson, "A critically modern ecological economics for the Anthropocene," *Anthropocene Review*. 2020. doi: 10.1177/2053019619884485.

[2] K. Hanaček, B. Roy, S. Avila, and G. Kallis, "Ecological economics and degrowth: Proposing a future research agenda from the margins," *Ecological Economics*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106495.

[3] B. Akbulut and F. Adaman, "The Ecological Economics of Economic Democracy," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106750.

[4] C. L. Spash, "A tale of three paradigms: Realising the revolutionary potential of ecological economics," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106518.

[5] A. Buchs, O. Petit, and P. Roman, "Can social ecological economics of water reinforce the 'big tent'?," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106553.

[6] R. Muradian and U. Pascual, "Ecological economics in the age of fear," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106498.

[7] B. Colby, "Acquiring environmental flows: ecological economics of policy development in western U.S.," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2020.106655.

[8] C. Rammelt, "The spiralling economy: Connecting marxian theory with ecological economics," *Environ. Values*, 2020, doi: 10.3197/096327119X15747870303881.

[9] A. Vatn, "Institutions for sustainability—Towards an expanded research program for ecological economics," *Ecol. Econ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106507.

[10] C. Herrmann-Pillath, "The art of co-creation: An intervention in the philosophy of ecological economics," *Ecological Economics*. 2020. doi: 10.1016/j.ecolecon.2019.106526.

CHAPTER 9

ANALYSIS OF POPULATION AND DEPRIVATION

Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mounicav@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

A complicated and varied problem, the link between population and deprivation has substantial effects on the social, economic, and environmental well-being. The relationships between population growth, demographic trends, and deprivation levels are explored in this abstract, which emphasises the necessity for a nuanced knowledge and focused actions to solve the problems caused by population-driven deprivation. The complicated interactions between population expansion and impoverishment are first looked at in the study. While population expansion may put strain on resources and services, resulting in increasing deprivation, it is acknowledged that deprivation is not only determined by population growth. Levels of deprivation among a community are significantly influenced by a number of other variables, including socioeconomic disparity, access to essential services, governmental frameworks, and environmental deterioration. The demographic shifts that might affect deprivation patterns. It draws attention to how the distribution and level of disadvantage are shaped by age structures, birth rates, migratory patterns, and urbanisation. For developing tailored policies and interventions that meet the unique needs and difficulties of various population groups, it is crucial to comprehend these demographic dynamics. The abstract also examines the multifaceted nature of deprivation. It acknowledges that deprivation involves not just physical poverty but also a lack of access to social opportunities, clean water, clean air, and healthcare. Policymakers and academics may create comprehensive plans that address the many aspects of deprivation and promote holistic human development by adopting a multidimensional viewpoint.

KEYWORDS:

Development, Natural, Population, Sciences, Sustainability.

INTRODUCTION

The need of using context-specific strategies to reduce population-driven impoverishment. It acknowledges that various locations, nations, and groups may experience deprivation in a variety of ways. To address the underlying causes of impoverishment and advance sustainable development, interventions must be specifically tailored to take into account regional settings, cultural norms, and community involvement. The abstract also emphasises the significance of comprehensive strategies that take into account both population dynamics and disadvantage. It emphasises the need of spending money on social infrastructure, healthcare, and education in order to satisfy the demands of an expanding population and combat deprivation. Breaking the cycle of poverty and deprivation also depends on empowering women, supporting reproductive health and rights, and guaranteeing fair access to opportunities and resources [1], [2].

Inequality promotes population increase. Direct poverty alleviation is crucial; continuing with poverty alleviation as usual would be irresponsible. According to MacNeill,reducing rates of population growth" are a need for achieving sustainability. This is crucial in industrialised

nations just as much as it is in undeveloped nations, if not more so. Industrialised nations are by far the major contributors to our approach to the limits since they overconsume per person, overpollute as a result, and overproduce. Over 70% of the world's commercial energy is used by the wealthiest 20% of people. It is not utopian to anticipate that more countries will follow the 25 that now have virtually steady population sizes [3], [4].

Because they are now so numerous and because their populations are growing faster than their economies can support them, developing nations are a major contributor to going over limitations. In certain places, real earnings are falling. If the problem isn't addressed, it may take until the middle of the twenty-first century for the number of births to return even to their high levels. Even if per capita consumption maintained at current insufficient levels, population growth in developing nations alone would account for a 75% rise in their commercial energy use by 2025. These nations need such rapid scale expansion that this can only be made possible by the industrialised world's shift to sustainability [5], [6].

The impoverished must be given a chance, must get assistance, and will justifiably demand access to the remaining natural resource base in order to attain at least minimum acceptable material living standards. More resources and environmental services will be available for the South's required growth when industrial countries transition from input growth to qualitative development. Following the fossil fuel paradigm is detrimental to emerging nations and the global commons. Industrialised nations should support alternatives since it is in their best interest. Dr. Qu Wenhu of The Chinese Academy of Sciences echoes this opinion when he states: if 'needs' include one vehicle for each of a billion Chinese, it is impossible. Currently, just 17% of all commercial energy demand is accounted for by developing populations, but if current trends continue, this will more than quadruple by 2020 [7], [8].

Even just providing for unmet family planning need would be very beneficial. The next most beneficial action is undoubtedly to educate young women and give them credit for good endeavours and job prospects. In the United States, 25% of births are to unmarried women or moms who are still in their teen years, who are less likely to provide for their children. Since many of these births are unintended, there is often less attention given to them. International development organisations should undoubtedly help countries with rapid population growth get closer to the global average as a necessary first step, rather than focusing only on expanding infrastructure without taking population-related measures [9], [10].

DISCUSSION

Past the Brundtland: The Brundtland report's growth recommendations will dangerously exacerbate exceeding the above limits if the economic subsystem has indeed grown significantly in relation to the global ecosystem on which it depends and the regenerative and assimilative capacities of its sources and sinks are being exceeded. Opinions vary. According to MacNeill, "a minimum of 3% annual per capita income growth is needed to reach sustainability during the first part of the next century," and given population projections, this would need more increase in national income. Sustainability will only be attained to the extent that quantitative throughput growth stabilises and is replaced by qualitative development, holding inputs constant or even decreasing them. Hueting disagrees, concluding that "...what we need least is an increase in national income." Since population multiplied by per capita resource consumption determines the size of the economy, both per capita resource consumption and population must decrease.

Three of the four prerequisites for sustainabilityproducing more with less resources, reducing the population expansion, and redistribution from overconsumers to the poor—are exceptionally well met by Brundtland. Brundtland presumably left the fourth essential

requirement ambiguous for political reasons. This is the transition from increasing inputs and expanding the size of the economy to increasing quality while keeping the size of the economy in line with the capacity of the world's life-support systems for regeneration and assimilation. The Brundtland report makes hints at this throughout. Births replace deaths and qualitatively better assets take the place of depreciated ones, renewing and even improving the stocks of wealth and people. An economy that is developing is one that is growing better—not necessarily biggerso that population well-being increases. An economy with increasing output merely expands, pushes boundaries, and compromises the planet's ability to self-repair.

The very minimum necessities for the impoverished are food, clothes, and housing. These necessities necessitate throughput expansion for developing nations, with compensatory slowdowns in development in developed nations. Aside from colonial resource depletions, industrial country expansion historically has created markets for raw materials from emerging countries, supposedly to the advantage of underdeveloped nations. However, industrial nation development must slow down to provide place in the environment for the minimal expansion required by impoverished country economies. The clearest formulation comes from Tinbergen and Hueting: "...no further expansion in output in affluent nations. If the important objectives of eradicating poverty and stopping the destruction of the world's life-support systems are to be attained, all sustainability strategies must internalise this restriction.

Aiming towards Sustainability

Throughput growth may alter to growth that is less harmful to sources and sinks as economies shift from agricultural to industrial to more service-oriented. We must quickly transition to less throughput-intensive manufacturing methods. The Brundtland Commission and subsequent follow-up authors probably refer to this as "growth, but of a different kind." Vigorous promotion of this trend will indeed help the transition to sustainability and is probably essential. We must accelerate technical improvements in resource productivity, Brundtland's "producing more with less." It is also entirely true that if environmental externalities are internalised, efforts to save energy, increase efficiency, and recycle may become lucrative.

However, although being vital, this strategy will fall short for four reasons. All material development, including Brundtland's hypothetical new sort of growth, uses resources and generates wastes due to the unavoidable rules of thermodynamics. First off, throughput growth that exceeds these limitations won't herald sustainability since we have surpassed the ecosystem's regenerative and assimilative capacity constraints. Second, there are limitations to the growth of the service sector in relation to the manufacture of commodities. Third, a lot of services, like tourism, higher education, and health care, need a lot of throughput. Fourth, and most importantly, less capital-intensive growth is "hi-tech"; as a result, the one location where there must be more growth—tiny, underdeveloped, developing-country economiesis less likely to be able to support Brundtland's "new" growth.

The Splitting of the Natural Sciences and Economics

Let's first examine why the challenging problems posed in the preceding sections are in the first place so challenging. We have organised our intellectual pursuits in a manner that contributes significantly to the issue. The issues mentioned above are widespread, long-lasting, and they touch on many academic fields, particularly the links across fields. The fact that academic fields are now relatively disconnected from one another makes it difficult to respond to the problems raised above. But it wasn't always like that.

The integration of economics and the other disciplines was rather strong up until around the turn of the 20th century. One may argue that since there were so few scientists back then, they had to communicate with people from other fields simply to have someone to speak to. But after that, the perspective changed. It evolved into the mainstream academic paradigm, Newtonian physics. It advocated the division of science into several fields because it saw the world as a collection of linear, separable mechanical subsystems that could be simply aggregated to produce the behaviour of the whole system. The issue with size was another. It got harder to cope with academics and the corpus of information as a whole as they increased. It has to be separated increasingly more precisely for ease.

The next chapter of the book explores how early, pre-fragmentation economics and the "natural" sciences constantly interacted with one another. Only in the middle of the 20th century, with the concepts of holism and system integration, did ecology become a recognised science. In order to construct a worldview that is suitable for dealing with complex living systems, it diverged from the Newtonian physics paradigm. It is nonlinear and evolu- tionary, and it admits the impossibility of scaling by straightforward aggregation. In this sense, "ecology" is evolving into the preeminent scientific paradigm and is essentially multidisciplinary and "systems" oriented. Ecological economics is an effort to recast economics in this alternative scientific paradigm and to reintegrate the several scholarly threads required to weave the sustainability fabric as a whole.

The Ecology and Ecology's Historical Development

In relation to the nature of the universe, social order, and moral obligation, philosophers developed systematic, logical arguments as recently as three hundred years ago. Empiricism was mostly used to describe the vast geographic disparities between different places and cultures. The fusion of systematic thought with empirical examinations of many facets of the natural world gave rise to the sciences as we know them today. Francis Bacon argued in favour of combining empiricism with logic. Telescopic observations by Galileo Galilei served as proof for Nicolaus Copernicus' sun-centered systematic hypothesis. Isaac Newton's theoretical contributions to gravity and mechanics of motion allowed him to reconcile discrepancies between Copernicus' theory and astronomical evidence. Following this, scientific fields started to emerge, characterised by the topics to which logical thought was applied as opposed to the logic patterns utilised. But for many centuries, researchers carried on their work in a variety of fields of study. Along with physics, Newton also wrote on morality and religion. Even though his most significant contributions to social philosophy were to medicine and the revival of the notion of atoms, John Locke made contributions to both fields. Through the 19th century, this academic tradition of contributions from several fields persisted. Many academics kept up with trends outside of their field far into the 20th century. For instance, Frank Knight went into great detail on current physics research and how it relates to economic theory and methods. But during the second part of the 20th century, transdisciplinary research was very uncommon.

In the heart of the transdisciplinary tradition, economics emerged. The formal subject of economics originated from moral philosophy in the second half of the 18th century, a period of significant social upheaval and scientific promise. Long-standing moral problems about individuals' responsibilities to wider communal aims were being put to the test by the growth of markets and technological advancements, both of which gave new chances for individual material advancement and stoked high expectations for a prosperous future. People were worried that pursuing one's personal interests may be detrimental to society as a whole back then, in the second half of the 18th century, just as they are now, towards the end of the 20th.

Economists started to argueand still dothose markets influenced people's decisions in a way that served the greater good, almost like a "invisible hand."

A century or so later, biology and natural history gave rise to the academic science of ecology. Like economics, it was interested in how systems as a whole might function for the benefit of the many species that made up those systems. Both fields have theoretical similarities and have sometimes borrowed from one another's advancements. It's an intriguing tale how two ostensibly complimentary areas came to be linked with such diametrically opposed recommendations for how individuals need to interact with their surroundings.

And in order for ecological economics to emerge from the many disciplines, it is a tale that must be understood. The chapters in this part provide a short historical overview of the two disciplines, demonstrating how they have been able to learn from one another and explaining how they were able to produce such disparate environmental prescriptions from similar conceptual frameworks. Economic theory, particularly as it is practised in the United States and by international organisations, is essentially monolithic, while ecology is made up of a variety of competing and overlapping conceptual frameworks. Similar to this, contemporary environmental economics presents itself as a single, elaborately designed, cohesive theory. The following chapters describe how contemporary environmental economics was developed from older economic theories, while the underlying presuppositions that guide the theories' policy implications are based on widely held notions of nature and technological advancement. The older ideas, which were formerly very prominent in economics, are now essential to comprehending the environment. Eco- logy differs from economics in that it has blended with a very distinct, though still prevalent, set of views about both nature and technology. It also varies with economics in that it maintains its various theoretical underpinnings.

Some of these widely held notions have a lengthy history. Up until 300 years ago, financial stability was seen as one of the benefits of moral behaviour. But following the Renaissance, there was a growing argument that establishing material stability was necessary to provide the circumstances for moral advancement. Scarcity made people work so hard that they had little time for spiritual reflection or moral living, which led to avarice and even war. In other words, in order to create the circumstances for moral advancement, material progress was required. The individual pursuit of materialism was thus justified as economics first developed two centuries ago on the presumption that once people's basic material needssuch as those for food, clothing, and shelter—were met, they would have the time and resources to work towards both their own personal moral advancement and the advancement of society as a whole. These early worries about moral and societal development have now completely been forgotten, and for many individuals, individual materialism has become an aim in itself.

Both then and today, technical optimists believed that the advancement of human understanding will ultimately lead to the mastery of underlying natural principles, so guaranteeing the necessities of existence. It has been assumed that since these rules are relatively limited in number, mastering them would eliminate our reliance on the specific processes through which nature, and people's role within it, arose. The assumption of such mastery meant that individuals did not have to worry about long-term scarcities or how their other actions may effect the future to those just concerned with material well-being. Scientists have emphasised the ultimate control of nature throughout the last 200 years and have used this as justification for their studies. Even scientists frequently invoke the persistently held, environmentally destructive, unsustainable belief that scientific advancement will inevitably result in the control of nature and material abundance to support further population growth, technological advancement, and economic development.

Within the framework of these prevalent moral, material, and scientific views, economic philosophy developed. The social and environmental issues linked to economic development have weakened past prevailing ideas and strengthened alternate interpretations, yet reality does not always play out as planned. Ecologists and then natural historians have long expressed doubts about the wisdom of human alteration of natural settings. The majority of scientists no longer believe that the world is a system that will soon be comprehended and under control. Instead, the world is a dynamic, intricate, and unpredictable system. Scientists tend to be more modest and adopt a preventative approach since they have less faith in their capacity for prediction and prescription. The most renowned among them are environmental scientists, ecologists, and conservation biologists who contend that we should focus the majority of our educational efforts and the best of our scientific knowledge on discovering how to coexist with nature. Environmental ethicists are also criticising the vanity of individual material advancement for its own sake. Although economic philosophy is starting to change in light of these more recent discoveries, historical assumptions continue to dominate the profession as a whole and have an impact on environmental economics.

The next chapters will demonstrate how economics and the natural sciences have interacted heavily over the majority of their historical history. Of course, there were fewer scientists back then, and specialisation and fragmentation, which are features of contemporary academia, had not yet developed to the extent they have today. The field of ecological economics is an effort to resurrect the spirit of problem-solving via integrated interaction that characterised the early history of science. We can only expect to comprehend and address our most critical and challenging societal issues via this reintegrated understanding.The parts that follow provide a quick summary of how economics and the natural sciences, particularly ecology, have developed historically. Each part is organized around an influential figure whose lines of inquiry have been carried on and expanded upon by other researchers. Ecological economics attempts to reorganize these lines, which have become entangled through time, into a rational whole.

CONCLUSION

The difficulties and complexity of tackling population-driven impoverishment. It acknowledges the conflicts between environmental sustainability and population increase as well as the need of striking a balance between social equality and economic prosperity. In planning and carrying out interventions that respect the dignity and well-being of people and communities, it also recognizes the significance of ethical issues and human rights values. The summary concludes by highlighting the significance of multidisciplinary cooperation and evidence-based policy-making in tackling population-driven disadvantage. To comprehend the precise dynamics and relationships between population and deprivation, further study, data gathering, and analysis are required. Effective policies and interventions need close cooperation between politicians, academics, civil society organizations, and local communities. It emphasizes the nuanced connection between population and deprivation. It acknowledges the need for a thorough and context-specific comprehension of the dynamics at work. Societies may seek to reduce deprivation and promote sustainable human development for everyone by addressing the multifaceted nature of deprivation, taking demographic trends into account, and implementing inclusive and evidence-based policies.

REFERENCES:

[1] G. Lewis *et al.*, “Assessment of the Role of IQ in Associations between Population Density and Deprivation and Nonaffective Psychosis,” *JAMA Psychiatry*, 2020, doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2020.0103.

[2] A. Gonzalez and Q. Tyminski, "Sleep deprivation in an American homeless population," *Sleep Heal.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.sleh.2020.01.002.

[3] I. Bray, A. Gibson, and J. White, "Coronavirus disease 2019 mortality: a multivariate ecological analysis in relation to ethnicity, population density, obesity, deprivation and pollution," *Public Health*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.puhe.2020.06.056.

[4] K. C. Madhav, E. Oral, S. Straif-Bourgeois, A. L. Rung, and E. S. Peters, "The effect of area deprivation on COVID-19 risk in Louisiana," *PLoS One*, 2020, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0243028.

[5] K. L. Heap, A. Berrington, and R. Ingham, "Understanding the decline in under-18 conception rates throughout England's local authorities between 1998 and 2017," *Heal. Place*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.healthplace.2020.102467.

[6] H. C. Ho, H. Y. Man, M. S. Wong, Y. Shi, and B. B. Walker, "Perceived differences in the (re)production of environmental deprivation between sub-populations: A study combining citizens' perceptions with remote-sensed and administrative data," *Build. Environ.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.buildenv.2020.106769.

[7] M. D. Verhagen, D. M. Brazel, J. B. Dowd, I. Kashnitsky, I. Kashnitsky, and M. C. Mills, "Forecasting spatial, socioeconomic and demographic variation in COVID-19 health care demand in England and Wales," *BMC Med.*, 2020, doi: 10.1186/s12916-020-01646-2.

[8] K. M. Fairfield *et al.*, "Area deprivation index and rurality in relation to lung cancer prevalence and mortality in a rural state," *JNCI Cancer Spectr.*, 2020, doi: 10.1093/JNCICS/PKAA011.

[9] S. Herrando-Pérez *et al.*, "Water deprivation drives intraspecific variability in lizard heat tolerance," *Basic Appl. Ecol.*, 2020, doi: 10.1016/j.baae.2020.08.001.

[10] L. P. Rajendran, C. T. Boyko, C. J. Coulton, J. D. Hale, and R. F. D. Cooper, "A socio-spatial approach to enable inclusive well-being in cities: A case study of Birmingham, UK," *Soc. Sci.*, 2020, doi: 10.3390/SOCSCI9060109.

CHAPTER 10

ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS SEPARATE AND SPECIALIZE

Mr. Yelahanka Lokesh
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: lokesh.yr@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Ecological economics is an interdisciplinary area that understands the need to move away from conventional economic theories and methods and adopt a more comprehensive and integrated viewpoint. In order to handle complex socio-environmental issues and advance sustainability, this abstract examines the notion of separating and specialising within ecological economics. The notion of specialisation and separation as a cornerstone of ecological economics is covered in the first section of the article. The acknowledgment that ecological and economic systems have different traits, purposes, and operational scales is emphasised. Separating is separating and examining the ecological and economic aspects of a system independently while comprehending their own dynamics and processes. Acknowledging the distinctive contributions of ecology and economics, specialisation entails expanding knowledge and experience within each discipline. The abstract also focuses on the advantages of dividing and specialising within ecological economics. It enables a more thorough and precise evaluation of how economic activity and policy affect the environment. Identification of trade-offs, synergies, and feedback loops that occur between these systems is made possible by separating the ecological and economic elements. Specialising within each field helps people develop a better grasp of the concepts, procedures, and instruments unique to ecology and economics, fostering interdisciplinary cooperation and efficient problem-solving.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Nature, Science, Traditional.

INTRODUCTION

The difficulties and constraints that come with splitting and specialising. The separation of ecological and economic aspects is acknowledged, but it does not mean that they are separate or unrelated. In order to prevent oversimplification or missing crucial linkages, the interconnectedness and interactions between different systems must be thoroughly explored and integrated. It also recognises the need of promoting communication and developing common frameworks for cooperation, as well as closing the knowledge gap between the specialised knowledge within each subject [1], [2].

It examines how splitting and specialising within ecological economics may be used. It highlights how this concept influences how decisions about policies, sustainability evaluations, and resource management techniques are made. Ecological economics may aid in the creation of laws and procedures that advance both environmental integrity and financial prosperity by blending ecological insights with economic analyses. It concludes by highlighting how crucial it is to embrace the idea of specialisation and division within ecological economics in order to progress sustainability. The frameworks, processes, and tools that combine ecological and economic viewpoints must be developed and improved via continuing interdisciplinary study, information sharing, and cooperation.

The trend towards more specialization and professionalization in science was well on by the end of the 19th century, and economics as a profession grew in popularity. The so-called "reductionist" approach was starting to gain ground. According to this paradigm, the universe can be divided into relatively isolated components that can each be examined and comprehended independently before being put back together to provide a picture of the whole. This was a highly helpful concept as scientific complexity developed since it enabled breaking the issue down into smaller, more manageable sections that could be handled intensely. Chemists could focus on their studies of chemistry without becoming sidetracked by the systems they were researching. Additionally, the work needed to be organised in some manner due to the sudden rise in the number of scientists who were actively working, and the disciplinary organisation looked like a sensible and practical method to achieve this. Internal reinforcement systems, however, soon developed to reward solely effort in the subject as university departments were established in the different fields. This quickly resulted in a decline in communication across disciplines and a propensity for them to develop their own distinct lingua francas and worldviews [3], [4].

This resulted in a rising isolation of the natural sciences and the natural resources component of the traditional triad of land, labour, and capital in economics. Departments of economics started to place more value on theory than applications, and the field as a whole tried to model itself after physics, which was perhaps the most successful application of the benefits of the disciplinary model of organisation.

This pattern persisted from the early to the middle of the 20th century, and by the time of the 1970s resurgence of environmental consciousness, economics had become highly specialised and detached from its prior links with the natural world. At the time, textbooks mostly ignored environmental issues in favour of focusing on the macroeconomics of GDP growth and manufactured capital increase as well as the microeconomics of supply, demand, and price formation [5], [6].

In parallel, economics was becoming more and more professionalised. According to A. W. Coats, mainstream economists have attempted to increase their intellectual authority and autonomy by excluding certain questions that were either sensitive or couldn't be addressed using their preferred methods and techniques, or both, at least since the marginal revolution of the 1870s. These are the same concerns raised by their professional and lay detractors as well as, more lately, by a large number of economists who cannot be dismissed by their professional peers as being either stupid or inept [7], [8].

Ecology has a slightly different narrative. Ecology is a far more recent discipline, and it has always been more overtly pluralistic and multidisciplinary, as we have already said. However, biology was where it all began, and there was a similar tendency there as well as in other branches of science. Following the first division into botany and zoology, other specialisations in biochemistry, biophysics, molecular biology, and other fields were developed. In ecology, there was a division between systems ecologists, who focused on whole ecosystems, and population ecologists, who focused on specific populations of animals. However, despite the fact that many academic programmes developed a unique flavour in one way or the other, this divide never reached the point of division into separate departments and disciplines [9], [10].

More than any other subject, ecologists have managed to keep the majority of the natural sciences in contact during all of this. Hydrology, soil science, geology, climatology, chemistry, botany, zoology, genetics, and many other fields must be combined in the study of ecosystems. For ecologists, Homo sapiens has served as the dividing line between species.

Despite the fact that Haeckel's original definition expressly includes people and that many ecologists have advocated for and sought to operationalize this integration, the majority of active ecologists believe that the study of humans belongs in the social sciences and is thus beyond the scope of their field. In fact, the majority of ecologists sought for study locations that were as far away from habitation as feasible. This propensity to neglect people in ecology is something that ecological economics seeks to address, along with the parallel inclination to ignore the natural world in social sciences.

Ecological and Economic Reintegration

For the majority of the 20th century, ecology and economics were studied independently. Each has addressed distinct concerns, used different assumptions to arrive at solutions, and supported various interests in the policy-making process, even though they have undoubtedly drawn theoretical ideas from one another and shared patterns of thought from physics and other disciplines. Individual researchers did continue to attempt to include topics covered by natural science into economics, but economists as a whole consistently rejected these efforts. Indeed, both sciences became juxtaposed secular reli- gions in their popular forms as environmentalism and economism, hindering the public understanding and solution of the crucial issues at the nexus of human and natural systems.

A group of academics who saw that integrating these schools of thinking would enhance environmental policy and management and save future generations gave rise to the field of ecological economics in the 1980s. In order to explore the potential for collaboration, several experiments with combined meetings between economists and ecologists were conducted, mainly in Sweden and the United States. During this time, there was also growing dissatisfaction with the flaws in the national accounting system, which produces indicators of economic activity like the gross domestic product while ignoring the depletion of natural resources due to the extraction of resources like petroleum and environmental degradation. Ecologists and economists collaborated to push large international organisations to create accounting systems that took the environment into account. Encouraged by these early initiatives, the International Society for Ecological Economics was established during a workshop of ecologists and economists held in Barcelona in late 1987. The Ecological Economics journal was also launched in 1989. Since then, large worldwide gatherings of ecologists and economists have taken place, several ecological economic institutions have been established across the globe, and numerous publications have been published with the word ecological economics in the title.

Ecological economics is not one new paradigm built on a single set of common theories and presumptions. It symbolises an agreement between economists, ecologists, and others, both academics and practitioners, to share knowledge, explore novel ways of thinking, and make it easier to develop and put into practise innovative economic and environmental policies. Even though certain members may favour one paradigm over another, ecological economics has purposefully maintained conceptual diversity to this point. Consider ecological economics to include ecology, economics, and any existing connections between them, such as resource and environmental economics and environmental impact assessments, as illustrated in Figure 2.6. By applying economic concepts to better understand the nature of biodiversity, extending the materials balance and energetic paradigm of ecology to economic questions, and arguing from biological theory that natural and social systems have coevolved such that neither can be understood apart from the other, ecological economists are rethinking both ecology and economics.Today's ecologists and economists owe a debt of gratitude to certain academics who, despite being primarily ecologists or economists themselves, have upheld and shown the benefits of a transdisciplinary approach. In the parts that follow, we focus on the novel

methods of thinking that many of these researchers have provided, while also recognising that many others have made many, varied contributions to the development of ecological economics.

DISCUSSION

System Theory in General: Systems analysis is the study of systems, which are conceptualised as collections of components that interact and are reliant on one another and are connected by intricate exchanges of information, matter, and energy. There is a significant difference between system science and "classical" science. The foundation of traditional science is the resolution, or reduction, of phenomena into isolatable causal trains and the pursuit of fundamental, or "atomic", components or elements of the system. If the interactions between the pieces are weak, nonexistent, or basically linear such that they may be put together to represent the behaviour of the whole, reductionist techniques are applicable. These requirements are sometimes satisfied by certain physical and simple chemical systems, but they are practically never satisfied by more advanced life systems. Strong, often nonlinear interactions between the pieces define a "living system". Due to the difficulty or impossibility of isolating causal trains as a consequence of such complex feedbacks, small-scale behaviour cannot simply be "added up" to produce large-scale outcomes. This also explains why disciplinary environmental science and economics has generated unsuitable policies and management methods. Of course, this has not stopped scientists from presuming that living systems can be reduced to causal trains and isolatable pieces.

Working with complex systems may be challenging, as some scientists have long acknowledged, as we said before in our discussion of A. J. Lotka. However, Ludwig von Bertalanffy is specifically recognised for his contribution to the development of the formal study of systems in a 1950 work. Others decided to explore the topic with us after being drawn in by this paper. In General System Theory, von Bertalanffy and his associates asserted that comparable patterns of interaction could be discovered in a variety of systems, and they risked the claim that if these fundamental patterns were grasped, all systems could be comprehended. While this has not turned out to be the case, Kenneth Boulding, a member of the general system theory group, wrote a number of books that drew comparisons between economic and ecological systems. These books served as an inspiration for budding ecological economists and assisted in the establishment of ecological economics as a formal endeavour.

Ecological and economic systems unmistakably display the traits of living systems, making it difficult to comprehend them using the techniques of traditional, reductionist science. Although practically every division of the world may be seen as a "system," systems analysts seek for boundaries that reduce the interaction between the system they are studying and the rest of the universe in order to simplify their work. According to some systems theorists, nature "herself" exhibits a useful hierarchy of scales that are rooted in these interaction-saving boundaries, ranging from atoms to molecules to cells to organs to organisms to populations to communities to ecosystems, including eco- nomic, or human-dominated ecosystems, to bioregions to the global system and beyond. One may create hypotheses and test them against other systems to examine their level of generality and predictability by examining the similarities and contrasts between various types of systems at various sizes and resolutions.

Systems analysis may be characterised as the use of the scientific method across and between disciplines, sizes, resolutions, and system kinds. In other words, it represents the scientific

process in an integrated way, as opposed to most conventional or classical scientific disciplines, which seek to break down their issues into smaller and smaller pieces in an effort to get at the core of the issue. Systems analysis, as opposed to traditional, reductionist science, provides a more natural scientific foundation and viewpoint for the intrinsically integrated transdiscipline of ecological economics.

Beyond this contrast between synthesis and reduction, mathematical modelling is often used to address integrative concerns in systems analysis. The fact that systems tend to be complex and that mathematical modelling, particularly on computers, is often required to manage that complexity makes this a typical feature of systems analysis, even if it is not a necessary nor sufficient condition for systems analysis. Von Bertalanffy says that "the system problem is fundamentally a problem of the limits of scientific analytical procedures." The capacity to overcome these constraints and to simulate the complex, non-linear, scale-dependent behaviour of systems has dramatically increased in recent years; as a result, it is commonly recognised that the history of systems analysis and the history of computers are intertwined. Despite the fact that computers were invented in the 1950s, it wasn't until the 1960s and 1970s that they were widely used not take off as a trend until the 1980s. The viability of systems analysis has increased as a result of the availability, power, and "user-friendliness" of computers. Many individuals nowadays can purchase a personal computer and the necessary software to start doing real-world systems analysis. Presently, it is obvious that the constraint is the lack of pertinent data.

Early on, modellers in the fields of economics, ecology, industrial management, and what was then referred to as cybernetics saw the potential for this kind of analysis, and practical applications were created mostly separately. Wassily Leontief, John Von Neumann, and Oscar Morgenstern were early economic "systems analysts" who mostly studied static input-output networks and games. Early in the 1960s, MIT's Jay Forrester started to model complicated industrial systems, which led to the emergence of one of the most well-known schools of systems analysis. H. T. Odum, B. C. Patten, and Bruce Hannon were among the pioneers of both static network analysis and dynamic computer simulation in the field of ecology. An early significant effort to do ecological systems analysis for a variety of environments was the International Biosphere Programme. The global systems model created by Jay Forrester's students, which was mentioned in The Limits to Growth, sparked an outstanding discussion and expanded their analysis.

Institutions for Open-Access Resource Management and Commons

When nature can be split into distinct, individually owned properties, the owners are motivated to take good care of the property so they may utilise it in the future. Problems may develop when nature cannot be so split when a resource is used by a large number of humans. Multiple users will overuse resources if there are no regulations governing their usage. The usage of resources held in common is often governed by regulations developed by both traditional and contemporary cultures. The key idea is that nature seldom actually can be split into distinct pieces, which is the fundamental tenet of systems theory, which was covered in the previous section. As a result, issues produced by the communal use of resources must constantly be addressed. Yes, given the population and mate The conflicts between the indissolubility of nature and the use of private property for environmental management grow more severe as ra- rial consumption rises.

In the 1920s, A. C. Pigou addressed the issue of communal resource usage, and economists since then have created formal models. However, it wasn't until Garret Hardin's essay titled "The Tragedy of the Commons" in Science magazine that the phenomena was widely

recognised. It would be more correct to refer to the issue Hardin raised as "open access" resources rather than "common property." Given how many resources have been effectively managed as commons, common ownership is not always a bad thing.

Open access may arise as a result of the dismantling of institutions that regulate how people utilise resources together, with devastating results. When neither traditional nor contemporary systems of common control are in place, societies in transition between traditional and modern forms usually suffer from the tragedy of overuse. Similar- larly, resources that are hard to regulate, such those on frontiers outside of governmental authority, in the open sea, and wildlife that crosses international borders, are routinely overexploited. Numerous species have gone extinct and their genetic diversity has been greatly diminished as a result of the lack or dissolution of organisations that govern commons.

Imagine an open-access fishery with total expenditures and total income from fishing effort as depicted in Figure 2.7 to better understand the issue with open-access resources. The level of effort at which profits or rents from the fishery are maximised is E1, but with unrestricted access, people would exert more effort until they reached E2, at which point there would be no rent from fishing and no one would think that further effort was worthwhile because costs would now be higher than revenues. Overfishing is more likely to happen in an open-access fishery than in a fishery managed as a commons because more fish are captured at higher levels of effort.

We need collective management institutions to preserve biodiversity for future generations to the degree that it manifests as various genetic features, species, and ecosystems that cannot be owned by people and included in market systems. International accords pertaining to biodiversity started to be created and put into effect around the turn of the 20th century. In certain circumstances, despite modernisation, old common property institutions for the preservation of biodiversity may be preserved. New institutions will be required in other situations. Institutions governed by common property may be local, regional, national, or international. For the purpose of preserving biological variety and the integrity of the ecosystem, the health of institutions at each of these levels will be crucial. Commons institutions are essential to the work of many ecological economists because of this. Similar- ly, it is now widely recognised that the world's climate-regulatory system is a shared resource in need of a unified management structure. Industrialising countries have been spewing carbon dioxide, a byproduct of burning fossil fuels, and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere for centuries without thinking about how this would affect the climate system as a whole. The establishment of common institutions for managing the global climate system is now under negotiation.

Although Garret Hardin, a biologist, "discovered" a phenomena that economists had long known about, Hardin was able to explain the phenomenon's deeper significance to a wide audience and persuade natural scientists of the need of institutions in environmental management. His paper continues to rank among the texts for environmental courses that are most commonly discovered. Hardin had a role in the development of ecological economics by bridging disciplines and illustrating the importance of economics and ecology in policymaking.

CONCLUSION

The ramifications of dividing and specialising within ecological economics are then looked at in the abstract. It acknowledges that ecological economics uses information and ideas from both fields to create a thorough picture of how human activities interact with the natural world. Ecological economics may combine ecological concepts like ecosystem resilience,

dynamics, and carrying capacity with economic analysis concepts like market dynamics, valuation, and policy interventions by separating and specialising. Overall, this abstract emphasises how important it is to divide up and focus on different areas of ecological economics. It acknowledges the special contributions that ecology and economics have made, the need of integration, and the value of multidisciplinary cooperation. Ecological economics may help with the creation of sustainable solutions and policies by separating and specializing to provide a thorough and nuanced knowledge of socio-environmental systems.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Akter, S. Naish, W. Hu, and S. Tong, "Socio-demographic, ecological factors and dengue infection trends in Australia," *PLoS One*, 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185551.

[2] I. Røpke, "Sustainability and the Governance of the Financial System: What role for full reserve banking?," *Environ. Policy Gov.*, 2017, doi: 10.1002/eet.1753.

[3] S. G. Zador *et al.*, "Linking ecosystem processes to communities of practice through commercially fished species in the Gulf of Alaska," in *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 2017. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fsx054.

[4] H. K. Lee and H. Y. Kim, "A Crossing-Line Between Transportation Evaluation and Natural Capital Assessment: Perspectives on Ecological Economics and Project Evaluation," *Open Transp. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2174/1874447801711010044.

[5] R. W. Lake, *Readings in urban analysis: Perspectives on urban form and structure*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315128061.

[6] J. T. Costlow, "Community Engagement through an Environmental Studies Lens," *Peer Rev.*, 2017.

[7] I. Filipiak and M. Wierzbowski, "Capacity market in Poland - Evalutaion of the proposed solution," in *International Conference on the European Energy Market, EEM*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/EEM.2017.7982029.

[8] E. Pashnezhad, M. Rafieyan, and M. Pourtaheri, "Spatial Assessment of the Relationship between Environmental Vulnerability and Rural Community Resilience in East-Azerbaijan Province," *J. Res. Rural Plan.*, 2017.

[9] J. Kenny, "The role of economic perceptions in influencing views on climate change: an experimental analysis with British respondents," *Clim. Policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14693062.2017.1414026.

[10] J. F. Shogren and C. Nowell, "Economics and ecology: A comparison of experimental methodologies and philosophies," in *Experiments in Environmental Economics*, 2018.

CHAPTER 11

ANALYSIS OF SYSTEMS AND ENERGETICS

Dr. Dasinis Nathan Annette Christinal
Assistant Professor,Masters in Business Administration (E-Commerce),
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: annette.c@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

An essential method in ecological economics that sheds light on the operation and dynamics of intricate socio-ecological systems is the study of systems and energetics. The foundations and applications of systems analysis and energetics are examined in this abstract, which also emphasises their importance in understanding resource flows, energy transformations, and sustainability. The abstract then delves into the idea of energetics, which is concerned with how energy moves through systems and is transformed there. According to energetics, all biological, ecological, and economic systems are fundamentally driven by energy. It entails calculating energy flows, analysing energy effectiveness, and evaluating the effects of energy consumption on society and the environment. Understanding the connections between resource consumption, economic activity, and environmental sustainability may be done with the help of energetic analysis. The abstract also emphasises how systems analysis and energetics are used in ecological economics. It talks about how complex issues like resource depletion, biodiversity loss, and climate change may be analysed using systems thinking. The identification of leverage points and possibilities for action to increase sustainability and resilience is made possible through systems analysis. On the other hand, energetic analysis offers perceptions into the effectiveness of energy usage, the energy inherent in goods and services, and the possibility for renewable energy transitions. In order to fully understand the complexity of socio-ecological systems, it emphasises the need of cooperation amongst ecologists, economists, engineers, and social scientists. The linkages between human activity, resource consumption, and environmental repercussions may be better understood when ecological concepts are combined with economic analysis and energy concerns.

KEYWORDS:

Ecosystem, Energetics, Flow, Knowledge, Technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Two renowned academics, one an economist and the other a prominent environmentalist, who had not yet met each other, released two major works in 1971. Both works dealt with energy, entropy, power, systems, and society; they differed greatly in style and in many other respects, yet they both contributed significantly to laying the groundwork for ecological economics. The first was Environment, Power, and Society by Howard T. Odum, and the second was The Entropy Law and the Economic Process by Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen.The general relevance of energy to individuals in contemporary economies at the time piqued the curiosity of very few people. The Arab oil embargo and the OPEC's decision to drastically raise the price of oil, however, quickly focused the public's attention in the latter half of 1973. Both industrial and emerging economies were severely impacted by subsequent energy price hikes during the Iran-Iraq War in the late 1970s and a subsequent sharp drop in oil prices in the middle of the 1980s. As a result, the function of energy in economic systems and human interaction with the environment started to be seen as a major issue [1], [2].

Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen was born in Romania, had his education in mathematical statistics in France, held academic and governmental jobs there before emigrating to the US after World War II to pursue a career as an economist and study under Professor Joseph Schumpeter at Harvard. He was honoured by being named a Distinguished Fellow of the American Economic Association for his contributions to the further mathematical development of traditional neoclassical economics in the fields of utility and consumer choice, production theory, input-output analysis, and development economics. However, he is most known for his contributions to the study of entropy and economics, which continue to spark heated debate among economists [3], [4].

All economic operations, according to Georgescu-Roegen, involve the consumption of energy, and the second rule of thermodynamicsalso known as the equilibrium lawclearly shows that the amount of energy that is accessible in a closed system can only decrease. Like others before him, he saw the similarity between the decline in energy availability and the deterioration of material order. Economic activities, for instance, need the use of relatively concentrated iron resources, which are then more concentrated via the use of energy, but finally wind up being distributed as rust and garbage, which are less concentrated than the initial iron ore. Degradation of the biosphere might be seen as a comparable issue. New technologies just make it possible for humans to use up energy, material order, and biological diversity more quickly. They do not "create" new resources.The planet is not a closed system, according to detractors, who contend that the entropy rule has no real application. It gets sunlight every day and will likely do so for many more billion years. However, the energy that powers modern industrial economies is derived from fossil hydrocarbons, which are accumulations of obviously finite amounts of historical solar energy. In contrast, present solar energy has a very low flow and concentration.

DISCUSSION

The message of Georgescu-Roegen is contentious in part because it goes against the progressivism that economists still firmly believe in. The lack of information on how rapidly we need to switch from stock energy resources to flow energy resources makes the message even more difficult to understand. The entropy law itself does not give extra information in this sense; instead, we simply need to consider resource restrictions as well as the capacity of the global system to absorb carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. However, the sirens being heard by scientists researching climate change, biodiversity loss, and soil degradation do have a powerful bass beat provided by the entropy law. Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen influenced many people to consider the numerous ways the entropy law helps us comprehend irreversibility, systems and organisation, and our alternatives for the future in addition to inspiring one of his pupils, Herman Daly, to address the long-term human situation [5], [6].

By seeing the sand in the top chamber as the sun's energy reserve, the hourglass metaphor may be expanded. The hourglass's narrow centre, which regulates the pace at which sand falls, controls the flow of solar energy that reaches earth. Consider the possibility that before the sand had completely fallen, some of the falling material may have been lodged against the bottom chamber's inner surface near the top of the chamber during earlier geologic periods. This turns into a low-entropy terrestrial dowry, a store that we may exhaust at our own pace. We make use of it by cutting holes in it so that the sand that has been caught may pass through and fall to the lower chamber's floor. Unlike the sun, whose energy comes at a set flow rate, this terrestrial source of low entropy may be exploited at a pace of our choice. We cannot "mine" the sun to use tomorrow's sunshine today, but we can mine terrestrial reserves and, in a way, use up tomorrow's petroleum now.

Consequently, there is a significant asymmetry between our two sources of low entropy. The solar source has a large amount of stock but little flow. The terrestrial source has a little stock but a large flow. The solar flow was the only source of food for peasant communities, but industrial society have grown to rely heavily on massive supplements from unsustainable terrestrial sources [7], [8].

This dependence's reversal will represent a significant evolutionary change. According to Georgescu-Roegen, evolution in the past has consisted of gradual changes to our solar-powered endosomatic organs. Our exosomatic organs, which rely on low entropy in the terrestrial environment, are now the focus of fast adaptations in evolution. According to Georgescu-Roegen, the cause of social strife in industrial civilizations is the unequal distribution of ownership of exosomatic organs and the low entropy of the earthly materials used to create them.

Howard T. Odum, the son of eminent sociologist Howard W. Odum, was born in Durham, North Carolina in 1924. He earned an A.B. and worked as a meteorologist in the American tropics during World War II. a B.S. in Zoology from the University of North Carolina in 1947 and a Ph.D. in Ecology under the guidance of G. It's Evelyn Hutchinson. In his renowned study of Silver Springs, Florida, he developed one of the first energy flow descriptions of an entire ecosystem. He has been interested in material cycles and energy flow in eco-systems. He also made significant contributions to Fundamentals of Ecology, an acclaimed textbook written by his brother Eugene P. Odum and initially published in 1953. For many years, this textbook served as the industry standard for ecology education and was instrumental in popularising a number of significant ecological ideas. The notion of the ecosystem in particular was completely explored and quantified using units of material and energy fluxes [9], [10].

Hutchinson and his father H. were also present. Lotka and von Bertalanffy had an impact on the thought of W. Odum, H. T. Odum, who shared many of Georgescu-Roegen's concerns. But unlike Georgescu-Roegen, he used a larger perspective, considering systems in general, from straightforward physical and chemical systems to biological and ecological systems to economic and social systems. He outlined a thorough system integration in Environment, Power, and Society, with energy flow serving as the connecting element. He even created his own symbolic language to aid in describing and simulating the basic characteristics of systems. This language served as both a crucial tool for the initiated practitioner in understanding systems principles and a barrier to entry for those outside the field.

An enormous amount of work by his students and others, ranging from input-output studies of energy and material flow in ecological and economic systems to dynamic simulation models of entire ecosystems and integrated ecological economic systems, was inspired by or at least paralleled and encouraged by Odum's work on energy flow through systems and dynamic modelling of systems. Probably the most succinct and comprehensive analysis of the use of several of H. The 1986 book by C. adapted T. Odum's theories to ecological economics. C. Cleveland, A. S. Hall, and R. Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process is the title given by Kaufmann.

E. P. as well as H. A entire generation of ecologists has been motivated by T. Odum's work to explore ecology as a systems science and to connect it to economics and other fields. Although many of H. The controversial theories of T. Odum have sparked debate regarding the issues that, in our opinion, ought to be asked: How do systems work? How do they grow and transform? How do ecosystems and human systems change throughout time? How can an interdisciplinary understanding of systems be developed? Which trajectories of human

growth can be sustained? H was the one asking all of these questions. T. and E. P. Odum in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s and are now some of the fundamental questions in ecological economics.

Stable-State Economics and the Spaceship Earth

With its description of the shift from "frontier economics" of the past, where growth in human welfare implied growth in material consumption, to "spaceship economics" of the future, where growth in welfare can no longer be fueled by growth in material consumption, Kenneth Boulding's classic "The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth" laid the foundation for ecological economics. Daly emphasised on this basic difference in vision and perspective by redefining economics as a living science, more closely related to biology and ecology than a physical science like chemistry or physics. It is impossible to overstate how significant this change in "pre-analytic vi-sion" is. It suggests a fundamental shift in how the issues around resource allocation are seen, as well as how to deal with them. More specifically, it suggests that the biophysical underpinnings of linked ecological and economic systems should be the focus of inquiry rather than the sold resources in the economic system.

The "steady state economics" work of Daly, which explored the ramifications of accepting that the Earth is materially limited and non-growing and that the economy is a part of this finite global system, further developed this issue. As a result, the economy cannot continue to develop, and a sustainable steady state is eventually required. It is not necessary for this steady state to be completely constant and unchanging. In a steady-state economy, things change continuously in both periodic and aperiodic ways, much as in ecosystems. The important thing to remember is that these changes are limited and the system does not exhibit a long-term trend. One of the main immediate precursors of ecological economics is Daly's work in steady-state economics.

Environmental Management That Adapts

An ecologist from Canada named C. The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis appointed S. Holling as its director. As a result of his earlier research on spruce budworm outbreaks in northern boreal forests, he developed a complex and dynamic understanding of ecosystems that eventually replaced the more "equilibrium" ideas that had previously been prevalent. Additionally, he was interested in how people interacted with ecosystems and why their feeble efforts at "management" ended so disastrously. All of this culminated in the pioneering book Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management, which was released in 1978.

By fusing science and management, adaptive environmental management redraws established lines. Holling came to the conclusion that data from laboratory and carefully monitored field trials on discrete ecological systems could not be used to comprehend the system as a whole. We experiment, at best, when we manage ecosystems. Of course, we only get knowledge from experiments if we conduct a sufficient number of them, monitor them carefully, and are eager to gain knowledge from them. Therefore, environmental management organisations must actively participate in experimenting and learning rather than relying on science to determine what constitutes excellent management practise. Furthermore, Holling contended that ecosystems do not favour a particular equilibrium state. Instead, they have a number of equilibriums and change throughout time. Because of this, researchers studying ecosystems must continually modify their management experiments in order to comprehend a dynamic system. This implies that rather than being seen as the last say, models and policies based on them are instead used to direct an iterative process of experimentation inside the regional

system. Instead of using the model to obscure and justify a policy that doesn't reflect reality, more focus is put on monitoring and feedback to verify and improve the model.

Understanding and controlling complex, dynamic systems that are subject to significant uncertainty has shown to be effective when using an adaptive environmental management strategy. Although this method was developed from ecology and applied to management, it has significant implications for social organisation. Environmental managers, members of related communities, and members of the general public with a particular interest in environmental concerns should raise questions, help with the monitoring, and participate in the learning. This perspective is considerably different from that of objective scientists who determine the facts about environmental systems, managers who put it into practise, and the people who ultimately benefit from it. It is a fundamental idea in ecological economics and recognises the reciprocal development of ecological and economic systems.

Ecological and economic systems are coevolving.The assumption that ecological and economic systems are distinct and do not need to be understood together has been one of the biggest obstacles to the fusion of economics and ecology. While the great majority of natural scientists believe that natural systems are separate from humans, economists believe that economic systems are distinct from nature. In fact, the broad consensus among social scientists has been that all social phenomena are culturally driven. Natural scientists "naturally" turn to natural law to explain social phenomena when they do take social phenomena into consideration. Thus, there is often a "line in the sand" between cultural and environmental determinists, with economists belonging to the former group and ecologists to the latter. The unsustainability of contemporary civilizations is explained by this approach, which, as we have observed, embodies traditional Western assumptions about systems and science.

The significance of species coevolution was initially made known to the scientific community by evolutionary ecologists Paul Ehrlich and Peter Raven. The most common way to characterise the niche to which organisms adapt is as a fixed, physical niche is. Once the niche's traits are established, evolution gains focus, and most evolutionary tales depict the species gradually becoming more and more compatible with the niche's qualities. Since human evolution is the ultimate narrative of development, evolutionary stories are typically tales of advancement. Simply said, coevolution recognises that at any one moment, other species and their traits mostly make up a species' niche. As a result, each given species' traits are chosen in relation to those of other species and vice versa; as a result, species coevolve. Coevolution explains why species fit together into ecosystems while species and ecosystems continue to develop, even while evolutionary direction and the analogue to Western ideas in progress are gone.

Norgaard provides an example of how comprehending the coevolutionary process might aid in our understanding of the connections between and changes in social and natural systems. In light of this, he offers fresh ideas for social organisation that will improve social fairness, environmental sustainability, and human dignity. Think of development as the process of knowledge, values, organisation, technology, and the environment co-evolving together. Each of these subsystems is connected to the others while also changing and, via selection, influencing change in the others. Each subsystem experiences deliberate innovations, accidental discoveries, and random changes that have an impact on the distribution and quality of components in each of the other subsystems via natural selection. The characteristics of each of the subsystems at the moment determine whether new components prove to be suitable. They coevolve in a way that one mirrors the other because each

subsystem exerts selection pressure on each of the others. Thus, everything is connected, but it is also changing.

In this coevolutionary account of development, environmental subsystems are handled symmetrically with the subsystems of values, knowledge, social organisation, and technology. For instance, when species develop, new technological demands are placed on them, which in turn drives the selection of new traits within the species. Similar to how the ecosystem is changing, new perspectives on the biosphere are chosen. For instance, the use of pesticides promotes resistance and secondary pest reappearance, which favours the development of new pesticides as well as more methodical approaches to pest management. Pests, pesticides, production, institutions, and policy, as well as how we value chemicals in the environment and how we perceive pest management, all show an exceptionally close and quick coevolution in the latter part of this century. People may be considered to be responding to market signals or their absence in the short term by engaging with their surroundings. Longer-term evolutionary feedbacks are included in the coevolutionary model, however. To emphasise co-evolutionary processes is not to discount human direct intervention and environmental change. The coevolutionary perspective emphasises the subsequent sequence of events and how various interventions change the selective pressure and, consequently, the relative dominance of environmental traits. These environmental traits then select for values, knowledge, organisation, and technology, and consequently, further environmental interventions.

Let's utilize this model to specifically discuss technology because the coevolutionary approach regards changes in the different subsystems equally. Over thousands of years, people have engaged with their surroundings in a variety of ways, many of which have proven to be durable over extremely long times and others which have not. At the intensities historically used, several old agricultural practises likely boosted biological diversity. There is broad evidence that agricultural methods using old technology incorporated biodiversity-conserving techniques at the level at which they were used. However, it is widely believed that technology is a major factor in the decline of biodiversity. Modern agricultural and cultural methods replace nature, but only temporarily and locally. In no way can they "control" nature. Some pests are killed by pesticides, eliminating the immediate danger to crops. However, the insect's empty niche is quickly replaced by another species of pest, chemicals drift to interfere with other farmers' agricultural practices, and pesticides and their byproducts build up in soil and groundwater aquifers to wreak havoc on human health and output for years to come. Each farmer tries to manage nature, yet doing so causes new issues for people outside of their own farms and in the next seasons. Since World War II, preharvest crop losses due to pests have stayed at roughly 35% although pesticide usage has expanded significantly. This is because so many new issues have been developed that extend beyond the particular farm in space and time.

There is a desperate need for new technologies that support rather than interfere with natural processes. Technologies have essentially evolved from physics, chemistry, and, at best, microbiology during the previous two centuries. Ecologists and evolutionary biologists were never given the chance to comprehensively study such technologies, and it is unclear if our current knowledge of ecology and evolution is sufficient to do so. Some agricultural innovations, including the employment of other biologicals to manage pests in agriculture, are a direct result of ecological theory. The use of DDT in agriculture after World War II, however, virtually ended research and technological development in biological control. Research and development of agricultural technologies that require fewer energy and material inputs eventually received significant support in industrialised nations after the rise in energy

prices during the 1970s and the American farm financial crises in the early 1980s. However, there is currently little support for agroecology, for methods focused on the management of complementarities between various species, including soil organisms. Since the majority of our knowledge has been built to fully utilise the potential of fossil fuels, learning how to utilise renewable energy sources will be time-consuming and challenging. Public awareness of the drawbacks of present technologies and the potential for ecologically oriented technologies is low, and our universities and other research institutes are still organised around disci- plinaryrather than systemic thinking. Science and technology can react slowly to changes in the public's knowledge of environmental concerns since scientists and technologists directly regulate and educate themselves as well as their institutions.

It is easier to understand how economies have changed from coevolving with their environments to coevolving around the burning of fossil fuels when seen from a coevolutionary viewpoint. People have been liberated from the environmental feedbacks on their economic actions that they experienced as groups and individuals rather swiftly via this shift. The remaining feedbacks, however, take place over longer times and further away and are felt collectively, even worldwide, by many individuals, making them harder to detect and combat. By using fossil fuels, Western nations were able to escape many of the challenges associated with interacting with environmental systems, at least in the short to medium term. Fossil hydrocarbons had a role in coevolution. Animal power was replaced by tractors, interplanting crops that were excellent hosts of nitro-gen-fixing bacteria with crops that weren't was complicated by fertilisers, and biological controls offered by increasingly complex agroecosystems were replaced by pesticides.

A further benefit of cheap energy was that crops could be moved further and preserved for longer. Social organisations swiftly coevolved around these novel possibilities. Each of these achievements was founded on a partial comprehension of distinct disciplines and distinct technology. At least in the near term and "on the farm," individual changes of the components seemed to fit into a cohesive, stable whole.

From an agroecosystem culture of mostly self-sufficient communities, agriculture evolved into an agroindustrial culture with several dispersed, distant players connected by global markets. Despite the reality that issues were only being transferred outside of the farm and onto future generations, the vast advancements in technology and organisation gave people the impression that they had control over nature and could actively plan their destiny.

This coevolutionary explanation for why modern societies are unsustainable is simply that development based on fossil hydrocarbons allowed people to temporarily control their immediate environments while shifting environmental impacts to ever-larger audiences and on to future generations in ways that have proven to be difficult to understand. These more distant effects may have an influence on our social structure as we become aware of their long-term and global ramifications and decide how to react beforehand, or they may have an impact immediately as they are felt in the future. It is at least as difficult to manage these collective, longer-term, and more unpredictable interrelationships as it was in the past. People's faith in our capacity to handle these new issues closely relates to their confidence in the sustainability of progress.

The coevolutionary viewpoint enables us to see that solving the issue of how people interact with their environment goes beyond merely creating market incentives or sensible property use regulations. Fossil fuels have played a vital role in the evolution of our beliefs, knowledge, and social structure. Our fossil fuel-based economy has not only changed the environment; it has also chosen individualist, materialist values, encouraged the growth of

reductionist knowledge at the expense of systemic knowledge, and preferred a bureaucratic, centralised form of control that is better suited for steady-state industrial management than for the complex, unexpected dynamics of ecosystem management. The coevolutionary framework also emphasises how severely confined our capacity to detect and address environmental issues within the predominate ways of valuing, thinking, and organising is. The coevolutionary paradigm developed by Norgaard completes the work of anthropologists' cultural ecologists. It has sparked fresh ideas among political economists and is starting to influence ecological economics.

CONCLUSION

The introduction of systems analysis, which entails examining the linkages and feedback loops between various system components, is the first section of the essay. It places emphasis on the understanding that social and economic institutions are ingrained in and linked to the natural environment.

Systems analysis offers a comprehensive framework for understanding how complex systems behave, identifying important drivers and processes, and forecasting the effects of policy changes.

The relevance of systems analysis and energetics in ecological economics is emphasised throughout this abstract. It highlights their importance in comprehending the complexity of socio-ecological systems, measuring resource flows and energy transformations, and assisting in the development of sustainable decision-making. Ecological economics may help to a more thorough knowledge of the dynamics and difficulties of sustainability by merging various techniques.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Vian *et al.*, "The Energetics and Physiological Impact of Cohesin Extrusion," *Cell*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2018.03.072.

[2] D. Abdurrachim and J. J. Prompers, "Evaluation of cardiac energetics by non-invasive 31P magnetic resonance spectroscopy," *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Molecular Basis of Disease*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.bbadis.2017.11.013.

[3] M. Milyavsky *et al.*, "To Reappraise or Not to Reappraise? Emotion Regulation Choice and Cognitive Energetics," *Emotion*, 2018, doi: 10.1037/emo0000498.

[4] B. X. W. Liew, C. C. Drovandi, S. Clifford, J. W. L. Keogh, S. Morris, and K. Netto, "Joint-level energetics differentiate isoinertial from speed-power resistance training-a Bayesian analysis," *PeerJ*, 2018, doi: 10.7717/peerj.4620.

[5] J. Yang *et al.*, "Oxygen- and Water-Induced Energetics Degradation in Organometal Halide Perovskites," *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2018, doi: 10.1021/acsami.8b04182.

[6] A. Vologodskii and M. D. Frank-Kamenetskii, "DNA melting and energetics of the double helix," *Physics of Life Reviews*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.plrev.2017.11.012.

[7] K. P. Sebens, G. Sarà, and E. Carrington, "Estimation of fitness from energetics and life-history data: An example using mussels," *Ecol. Evol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/ece3.4004.

[8] M. R. Bennett, L. Farnell, and W. G. Gibson, "Quantitative relations between bold responses, cortical energetics, and impulse firing," *J. Neurophysiol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1152/jn.00352.2017.

[9] B. Pinter, A. Chankisjijev, P. Geerlings, J. N. Harvey, and F. De Proft, "Conceptual Insights into DFT Spin-State Energetics of Octahedral Transition-Metal Complexes through a Density Difference Analysis," *Chem. - A Eur. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/chem.201704657.

[10] F. M. Rijnberg *et al.*, "Energetics of Blood Flow in Cardiovascular Disease," *Circulation*, 2018, doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.117.033359.

CHAPTER 12

ECOLOGICAL ECONOMICS SEPARATE AND SPECIALIZE

Dr. Mounica Vallabhaneni
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id:mounicav@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

Ecological economics is an interdisciplinary area that understands the need to move away from conventional economic theories and methods and adopt a more comprehensive and integrated viewpoint. In order to handle complex socio-environmental issues and advance sustainability, this abstract examines the notion of separating and specialising within ecological economics. The notion of specialisation and separation as a cornerstone of ecological economics is covered in the first section of the article. The acknowledgment that ecological and economic systems have different traits, purposes, and operational scales is emphasised. Separating is separating and examining the ecological and economic aspects of a system independently while comprehending their own dynamics and processes. Acknowledging the distinctive contributions of ecology and economics, specialisation entails expanding knowledge and experience within each discipline. The abstract also focuses on the advantages of dividing and specialising within ecological economics. It enables a more thorough and precise evaluation of how economic activity and policy affect the environment. Identification of trade-offs, synergies, and feedback loops that occur between these systems is made possible by separating the ecological and economic elements. Specialising within each field helps people develop a better grasp of the concepts, procedures, and instruments unique to ecology and economics, fostering interdisciplinary cooperation and efficient problem-solving.

KEYWORDS:

Ecological, Economics, Nature, Science, Traditional.

INTRODUCTION

The difficulties and constraints that come with splitting and specialising. The separation of ecological and economic aspects is acknowledged, but it does not mean that they are separate or unrelated. In order to prevent oversimplification or missing crucial linkages, the interconnectedness and interactions between different systems must be thoroughly explored and integrated. It also recognises the need of promoting communication and developing common frameworks for cooperation, as well as closing the knowledge gap between the specialised knowledge within each subject [1], [2].

It examines how splitting and specialising within ecological economics may be used. It highlights how this concept influences how decisions about policies, sustainability evaluations, and resource management techniques are made. Ecological economics may aid in the creation of laws and procedures that advance both environmental integrity and financial prosperity by blending ecological insights with economic analyses. It concludes by highlighting how crucial it is to embrace the idea of specialisation and division within ecological economics in order to progress sustainability. The frameworks, processes, and tools that combine ecological and economic viewpoints must be developed and improved via continuing interdisciplinary study, information sharing, and cooperation.

The trend towards more specialization and professionalization in science was well on by the end of the 19th century, and economics as a profession grew in popularity. The so-called "reductionist" approach was starting to gain ground. According to this paradigm, the universe can be divided into relatively isolated components that can each be examined and comprehended independently before being put back together to provide a picture of the whole. This was a highly helpful concept as scientific complexity developed since it enabled breaking the issue down into smaller, more manageable sections that could be handled intensely. Chemists could focus on their studies of chemistry without becoming sidetracked by the systems they were researching. Additionally, the work needed to be organised in some manner due to the sudden rise in the number of scientists who were actively working, and the disciplinary organisation looked like a sensible and practical method to achieve this. Internal reinforcement systems, however, soon developed to reward solely effort in the subject as university departments were established in the different fields. This quickly resulted in a decline in communication across disciplines and a propensity for them to develop their own distinct lingua francas and worldviews [3], [4].

This resulted in a rising isolation of the natural sciences and the natural resources component of the traditional triad of land, labour, and capital in economics. Departments of economics started to place more value on theory than applications, and the field as a whole tried to model itself after physics, which was perhaps the most successful application of the benefits of the disciplinary model of organisation.This pattern persisted from the early to the middle of the 20th century, and by the time of the 1970s resurgence of environmental consciousness, economics had become highly specialised and detached from its prior links with the natural world. At the time, textbooks mostly ignored environmental issues in favour of focusing on the macroeconomics of GDP growth and manufactured capital increase as well as the microeconomics of supply, demand, and price formation [5], [6].

In parallel, economics was becoming more and more professionalised. According to A. W. Coats, mainstream economists have attempted to increase their intellectual authority and autonomy by excluding certain questions that were either sensitive or couldn't be addressed using their preferred methods and techniques, or both, at least since the marginal revolution of the 1870s. These are the same concerns raised by their professional and lay detractors as well as, more lately, by a large number of economists who cannot be dismissed by their professional peers as being either stupid or inept [7], [8]. Ecology has a slightly different narrative. Ecology is a far more recent discipline, and it has always been more overtly pluralistic and multidisciplinary, as we have already said. However, biology was where it all began, and there was a similar tendency there as well as in other branches of science. Following the first division into botany and zoology, other specialisations in biochemistry, biophysics, molecular biology, and other fields were developed. In ecology, there was a division between systems ecologists, who focused on whole ecosystems, and population ecologists, who focused on specific populations of animals. However, despite the fact that many academic programmes developed a unique flavour in one way or the other, this divide never reached the point of division into separate departments and disciplines [9], [10].

More than any other subject, ecologists have managed to keep the majority of the natural sciences in contact during all of this. Hydrology, soil science, geology, climatology, chemistry, botany, zoology, genetics, and many other fields must be combined in the study of ecosystems. For ecologists, Homo sapiens has served as the dividing line between species. Despite the fact that Haeckel's original definition expressly includes people and that many ecologists have advocated for and sought to operationalize this integration, the majority of active ecologists believe that the study of humans belongs in the social sciences and is thus

beyond the scope of their field. In fact, the majority of ecologists sought for study locations that were as far away from habitation as feasible. This propensity to neglect people in ecology is something that ecological economics seeks to address, along with the parallel inclination to ignore the natural world in social sciences.

Ecological and Economic Reintegration

For the majority of the 20th century, ecology and economics were studied independently. Each has addressed distinct concerns, used different assumptions to arrive at solutions, and supported various interests in the policy-making process, even though they have undoubtedly drawn theoretical ideas from one another and shared patterns of thought from physics and other disciplines. Individual researchers did continue to attempt to include topics covered by natural science into economics, but economists as a whole consistently rejected these efforts. Indeed, both sciences became juxtaposed secular reli- gions in their popular forms as environmentalism and economism, hindering the public understanding and solution of the crucial issues at the nexus of human and natural systems.

A group of academics who saw that integrating these schools of thinking would enhance environmental policy and management and save future generations gave rise to the field of ecological economics in the 1980s. In order to explore the potential for collaboration, several experiments with combined meetings between economists and ecologists were conducted, mainly in Sweden and the United States. During this time, there was also growing dissatisfaction with the flaws in the national accounting system, which produces indicators of economic activity like the gross domestic product while ignoring the depletion of natural resources due to the extraction of resources like petroleum and environmental degradation.

Ecologists and economists collaborated to push large international organizations to create accounting systems that took the environment into account. Encouraged by these early initiatives, the International Society for Ecological Economics was established during a workshop of ecologists and economists held in Barcelona in late 1987. The Ecological Economics journal was also launched in 1989. Since then, large worldwide gatherings of ecologists and economists have taken place, several ecological economic institutions have been established across the globe, and numerous publications have been published with the word ecological economics in the title.

Ecological economics is not one new paradigm built on a single set of common theories and presumptions. It symbolises an agreement between economists, ecologists, and others, both academics and practitioners, to share knowledge, explore novel ways of thinking, and make it easier to develop and put into practice innovative economic and environmental policies. Even though certain members may favour one paradigm over another, ecological economics has purposefully maintained conceptual diversity to this point.

Consider ecological economics to include ecology, economics, and any existing connections between them, such as resource and environmental economics and environmental impact assessments, as illustrated in Figure 2.6. By applying economic concepts to better understand the nature of biodiversity, extending the materials balance and energetic paradigm of ecology to economic questions, and arguing from biological theory that natural and social systems have coevolved such that neither can be understood apart from the other, ecological economists are rethinking both ecology and economics.

Today's ecologists and economists owe a debt of gratitude to certain academics who, despite being primarily ecologists or economists themselves, have upheld and shown the benefits of a transdisciplinary approach. In the parts that follow, we focus on the novel methods of

thinking that many of these researchers have provided, while also recognising that many others have made many, varied contributions to the development of ecological economics.

DISCUSSION

System Theory in General: Systems analysis is the study of systems, which are conceptualised as collections of components that interact and are reliant on one another and are connected by intricate exchanges of information, matter, and energy. There is a significant difference between system science and "classical" science. The foundation of traditional science is the resolution, or reduction, of phenomena into isolatable causal trains and the pursuit of fundamental, or "atomic", components or elements of the system. If the interactions between the pieces are weak, nonexistent, or basically linear such that they may be put together to represent the behaviour of the whole, reductionist techniques are applicable. These requirements are sometimes satisfied by certain physical and simple chemical systems, but they are practically never satisfied by more advanced life systems. Strong, often nonlinear interactions between the pieces define a "living system". Due to the difficulty or impossibility of isolating causal trains as a consequence of such complex feedbacks, small-scale behaviour cannot simply be "added up" to produce large-scale outcomes. This also explains why disciplinary environmental science and economics has generated unsuitable policies and management methods. Of course, this has not stopped scientists from presuming that living systems can be reduced to causal trains and isolatable pieces.

Working with complex systems may be challenging, as some scientists have long acknowledged, as we said before in our discussion of A. J. Lotka. However, Ludwig von Bertalanffy is specifically recognised for his contribution to the development of the formal study of systems in a 1950 work. Others decided to explore the topic with us after being drawn in by this paper. In General System Theory, von Bertalanffy and his associates asserted that comparable patterns of interaction could be discovered in a variety of systems, and they risked the claim that if these fundamental patterns were grasped, all systems could be comprehended. While this has not turned out to be the case, Kenneth Boulding, a member of the general system theory group, wrote a number of books that drew comparisons between economic and ecological systems. These books served as an inspiration for budding ecological economists and assisted in the establishment of ecological economics as a formal endeavour.

Ecological and economic systems unmistakably display the traits of living systems, making it difficult to comprehend them using the techniques of traditional, reductionist science. Although practically every division of the world may be seen as a "system," systems analysts seek for boundaries that reduce the interaction between the system they are studying and the rest of the universe in order to simplify their work. According to some systems theorists, nature "herself" exhibits a useful hierarchy of scales that are rooted in these interaction-saving boundaries, ranging from atoms to molecules to cells to organs to organisms to populations to communities to ecosystems, including eco- nomic, or human-dominated ecosystems, to bioregions to the global system and beyond. One may create hypotheses and test them against other systems to examine their level of generality and predictability by examining the similarities and contrasts between various types of systems at various sizes and resolutions.

Systems analysis may be characterised as the use of the scientific method across and between disciplines, sizes, resolutions, and system kinds. In other words, it represents the scientific process in an integrated way, as opposed to most conventional or classical scientific

disciplines, which seek to break down their issues into smaller and smaller pieces in an effort to get at the core of the issue. Systems analysis, as opposed to traditional, reductionist science, provides a more natural scientific foundation and viewpoint for the intrinsically integrated transdiscipline of ecological economics.

Beyond this contrast between synthesis and reduction, mathematical modelling is often used to address integrative concerns in systems analysis. The fact that systems tend to be complex and that mathematical modelling, particularly on computers, is often required to manage that complexity makes this a typical feature of systems analysis, even if it is not a necessary nor sufficient condition for systems analysis. Von Bertalanffy says that "the system problem is fundamentally a problem of the limits of scientific analytical procedures." The capacity to overcome these constraints and to simulate the complex, non-linear, scale-dependent behaviour of systems has dramatically increased in recent years; as a result, it is commonly recognised that the history of systems analysis and the history of computers are intertwined. Despite the fact that computers were invented in the 1950s, it wasn't until the 1960s and 1970s that they were widely used not take off as a trend until the 1980s. The viability of systems analysis has increased as a result of the availability, power, and "user-friendliness" of computers. Many individuals nowadays can purchase a personal computer and the necessary software to start doing real-world systems analysis. Presently, it is obvious that the constraint is the lack of pertinent data.

Early on, modellers in the fields of economics, ecology, industrial management, and what was then referred to as cybernetics saw the potential for this kind of analysis, and practical applications were created mostly separately. Wassily Leontief, John Von Neumann, and Oscar Morgenstern were early economic "systems analysts" who mostly studied static input-output networks and games. Early in the 1960s, MIT's Jay Forrester started to model complicated industrial systems, which led to the emergence of one of the most well-known schools of systems analysis. H. T. Odum, B. C. Patten, and Bruce Hannon were among the pioneers of both static network analysis and dynamic computer simulation in the field of ecology. An early significant effort to do ecological systems analysis for a variety of environments was the International Biosphere Programme. The global systems model created by Jay Forrester's students, which was mentioned in The Limits to Growth, sparked an outstanding discussion and expanded their analysis.

Institutions for Open-Access Resource Management and Commons

When nature can be split into distinct, individually owned properties, the owners are motivated to take good care of the property so they may utilise it in the future. Problems may develop when nature cannot be so split when a resource is used by a large number of humans. Multiple users will overuse resources if there are no regulations governing their usage. The usage of resources held in common is often governed by regulations developed by both traditional and contemporary cultures. The key idea is that nature seldom actually can be split into distinct pieces, which is the fundamental tenet of systems theory, which was covered in the previous section. As a result, issues produced by the communal use of resources must constantly be addressed. Yes, given the population and mate. The conflicts between the indissolubility of nature and the use of private property for environmental management grow more severe as ra- rial consumption rises.

In the 1920s, A. C. Pigou addressed the issue of communal resource usage, and economists since then have created formal models. However, it wasn't until Garret Hardin's essay titled "The Tragedy of the Commons" in Science magazine that the phenomena was widely recognised. It would be more correct to refer to the issue Hardin raised as "open access"

resources rather than "common property." Given how many resources have been effectively managed as commons, common ownership is not always a bad thing.

Open access may arise as a result of the dismantling of institutions that regulate how people utilise resources together, with devastating results. When neither traditional nor contemporary systems of common control are in place, societies in transition between traditional and modern forms usually suffer from the tragedy of overuse. Similar- larly, resources that are hard to regulate, such those on frontiers outside of governmental authority, in the open sea, and wildlife that crosses international borders, are routinely overexploited. Numerous species have gone extinct and their genetic diversity has been greatly diminished as a result of the lack or dissolution of organisations that govern commons.Imagine an open-access fishery with total expenditures and total income from fishing effort as, to better understand the issue with open-access resources. The level of effort at which profits or rents from the fishery are maximised is E1, but with unrestricted access, people would exert more effort until they reached E2, at which point there would be no rent from fishing and no one would think that further effort was worthwhile because costs would now be higher than revenues. Overfishing is more likely to happen in an open-access fishery than in a fishery managed as a common because more fish are captured at higher levels of effort.

We need collective management institutions to preserve biodiversity for future generations to the degree that it manifests as various genetic features, species, and ecosystems that cannot be owned by people and included in market systems. International accords pertaining to biodiversity started to be created and put into effect around the turn of the 20th century. In certain circumstances, despite modernisation, old common property institutions for the preservation of biodiversity may be preserved. New institutions will be required in other situations. Institutions governed by common property may be local, regional, national, or international. For the purpose of preserving biological variety and the integrity of the ecosystem, the health of institutions at each of these levels will be crucial. Commons institutions are essential to the work of many ecological economists because of this. Similarly, it is now widely recognised that the world's climate-regulatory system is a shared resource in need of a unified management structure. Industrialising countries have been spewing carbon dioxide, a byproduct of burning fossil fuels, and other greenhouse gases into the atmosphere for centuries without thinking about how this would affect the climate system as a whole. The establishment of common institutions for managing the global climate system is now under negotiation.Although Garret Hardin, a biologist, "discovered" a phenomena that economists had long known about, Hardin was able to explain the phenomenon's deeper significance to a wide audience and persuade natural scientists of the need of institutions in environmental management. His paper continues to rank among the texts for environmental courses that are most commonly discovered. Hardin had a role in the development of ecological economics by bridging disciplines and illustrating the importance of economics and ecology in policymaking.

CONCLUSION

The ramifications of dividing and specialising within ecological economics are then looked at in the abstract. It acknowledges that ecological economics uses information and ideas from both fields to create a thorough picture of how human activities interact with the natural world. Ecological economics may combine ecological concepts like ecosystem resilience, dynamics, and carrying capacity with economic analysis concepts like market dynamics, valuation, and policy interventions by separating and specialising. Overall, this abstract emphasises how important it is to divide up and focus on different areas of ecological economics. It acknowledges the special contributions that ecology and economics have made,

the need of integration, and the value of multidisciplinary cooperation. Ecological economics may help with the creation of sustainable solutions and policies by separating and specialising to provide a thorough and nuanced knowledge of socio-environmental systems.

REFERENCES:

[1] R. Akter, S. Naish, W. Hu, and S. Tong, "Socio-demographic, ecological factors and dengue infection trends in Australia," *PLoS One*, 2017, doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0185551.

[2] I. Røpke, "Sustainability and the Governance of the Financial System: What role for full reserve banking?," *Environ. Policy Gov.*, 2017, doi: 10.1002/eet.1753.

[3] S. G. Zador *et al.*, "Linking ecosystem processes to communities of practice through commercially fished species in the Gulf of Alaska," in *ICES Journal of Marine Science*, 2017. doi: 10.1093/icesjms/fsx054.

[4] H. K. Lee and H. Y. Kim, "A Crossing-Line Between Transportation Evaluation and Natural Capital Assessment: Perspectives on Ecological Economics and Project Evaluation," *Open Transp. J.*, 2017, doi: 10.2174/1874447801711010044.

[5] R. W. Lake, *Readings in urban analysis: Perspectives on urban form and structure*. 2017. doi: 10.4324/9781315128061.

[6] J. T. Costlow, "Community Engagement through an Environmental Studies Lens," *Peer Rev.*, 2017.

[7] I. Filipiak and M. Wierzbowski, "Capacity market in Poland - Evalutaion of the proposed solution," in *International Conference on the European Energy Market, EEM*, 2017. doi: 10.1109/EEM.2017.7982029.

[8] E. Pashnezhad, M. Rafieyan, and M. Pourtaheri, "Spatial Assessment of the Relationship between Environmental Vulnerability and Rural Community Resilience in East-Azerbaijan Province," *J. Res. Rural Plan.*, 2017.

[9] J. Kenny, "The role of economic perceptions in influencing views on climate change: an experimental analysis with British respondents," *Clim. Policy*, 2018, doi: 10.1080/14693062.2017.1414026.

[10] J. F. Shogren and C. Nowell, "Economics and ecology: A comparison of experimental methodologies and philosophies," in *Experiments in Environmental Economics*, 2018.

CHAPTER 13

ANALYSIS OF SYSTEMS AND ENERGETICS

Mr. Yelahanka Lokesh
Assistant Professor,Department of Commerce and Economics,
Presidency University, Bangalore, India.
Email Id: lokesh.yr@presidencyuniversity.in

ABSTRACT:

An essential method in ecological economics that sheds light on the operation and dynamics of intricate socio-ecological systems is the study of systems and energetics. The foundations and applications of systems analysis and energetics are examined in this abstract, which also emphasises their importance in understanding resource flows, energy transformations, and sustainability. The abstract then delves into the idea of energetics, which is concerned with how energy moves through systems and is transformed there. According to energetics, all biological, ecological, and economic systems are fundamentally driven by energy. It entails calculating energy flows, analysing energy effectiveness, and evaluating the effects of energy consumption on society and the environment. Understanding the connections between resource consumption, economic activity, and environmental sustainability may be done with the help of energetic analysis. The abstract also emphasises how systems analysis and energetics are used in ecological economics. It talks about how complex issues like resource depletion, biodiversity loss, and climate change may be analysed using systems thinking. The identification of leverage points and possibilities for action to increase sustainability and resilience is made possible through systems analysis. On the other hand, energetic analysis offers perceptions into the effectiveness of energy usage, the energy inherent in goods and services, and the possibility for renewable energy transitions. In order to fully understand the complexity of socio-ecological systems, it emphasises the need of cooperation amongst ecologists, economists, engineers, and social scientists. The linkages between human activity, resource consumption, and environmental repercussions may be better understood when ecological concepts are combined with economic analysis and energy concerns.

KEYWORDS:

Ecosystem, Energetics, Flow, Knowledge, Technologies.

INTRODUCTION

Two renowned academics, one an economist and the other a prominent environmentalist, who had not yet met each other, released two major works in 1971. Both works dealt with energy, entropy, power, systems, and society; they differed greatly in style and in many other respects, yet they both contributed significantly to laying the groundwork for ecological economics. The first was Environment, Power, and Society by Howard T. Odum, and the second was The Entropy Law and the Economic Process by Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen.The general relevance of energy to individuals in contemporary economies at the time piqued the curiosity of very few people. The Arab oil embargo and the OPEC's decision to drastically raise the price of oil, however, quickly focused the public's attention in the latter half of 1973. Both industrial and emerging economies were severely impacted by subsequent energy price hikes during the Iran-Iraq War in the late 1970s and a subsequent sharp drop in oil prices in the middle of the 1980s. As a result, the function of energy in economic systems and human interaction with the environment started to be seen as a major issue [1], [2].

Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen was born in Romania, had his education in mathematical statistics in France, held academic and governmental jobs there before emigrating to the US after World War II to pursue a career as an economist and study under Professor Joseph Schumpeter at Harvard. He was honoured by being named a Distinguished Fellow of the American Economic Association for his contributions to the further mathematical development of traditional neoclassical economics in the fields of utility and consumer choice, production theory, input-output analysis, and development economics. However, he is most known for his contributions to the study of entropy and economics, which continue to spark heated debate among economists [3], [4].

All economic operations, according to Georgescu-Roegen, involve the consumption of energy, and the second rule of thermodynamicsalso known as the equilibrium lawclearly shows that the amount of energy that is accessible in a closed system can only decrease. Like others before him, he saw the similarity between the decline in energy availability and the deterioration of material order. Economic activities, for instance, need the use of relatively concentrated iron resources, which are then more concentrated via the use of energy, but finally wind up being distributed as rust and garbage, which are less concentrated than the initial iron ore. Degradation of the biosphere might be seen as a comparable issue. New technologies just make it possible for humans to use up energy, material order, and biological diversity more quickly. They do not "create" new resources.

The planet is not a closed system, according to detractors, who contend that the entropy rule has no real application. It gets sunlight every day and will likely do so for many more billion years. However, the energy that powers modern industrial economies is derived from fossil hydrocarbons, which are accumulations of obviously finite amounts of historical solar energy. In contrast, present solar energy has a very low flow and concentration.

DISCUSSION

The message of Georgescu-Roegen is contentious in part because it goes against the progressivism that economists still firmly believe in. The lack of information on how rapidly we need to switch from stock energy resources to flow energy resources makes the message even more difficult to understand. The entropy law itself does not give extra information in this sense; instead, we simply need to consider resource restrictions as well as the capacity of the global system to absorb carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. However, the sirens being heard by scientists researching climate change, biodiversity loss, and soil degradation do have a powerful bass beat provided by the entropy law. Nicholas Georgescu-Roegen influenced many people to consider the numerous ways the entropy law helps us comprehend irreversibility, systems and organisation, and our alternatives for the future in addition to inspiring one of his pupils, Herman Daly, to address the long-term human situation [5], [6].

By seeing the sand in the top chamber as the sun's energy reserve, the hourglass metaphor may be expanded. The hourglass's narrow centre, which regulates the pace at which sand falls, controls the flow of solar energy that reaches earth. Consider the possibility that before the sand had completely fallen, some of the falling material may have been lodged against the bottom chamber's inner surface near the top of the chamber during earlier geologic periods. This turns into a low-entropy terrestrial dowry, a store that we may exhaust at our own pace. We make use of it by cutting holes in it so that the sand that has been caught may pass through and fall to the lower chamber's floor. Unlike the sun, whose energy comes at a set flow rate, this terrestrial source of low entropy may be exploited at a pace of our choice. We cannot "mine" the sun to use tomorrow's sunshine today, but we can mine terrestrial reserves and, in a way, use up tomorrow's petroleum now.

Consequently, there is a significant asymmetry between our two sources of low entropy. The solar source has a large amount of stock but little flow. The terrestrial source has a little stock but a large flow. The solar flow was the only source of food for peasant communities, but industrial society have grown to rely heavily on massive supplements from unsustainable terrestrial sources [7], [8].

This dependence's reversal will represent a significant evolutionary change. According to Georgescu-Roegen, evolution in the past has consisted of gradual changes to our solar-powered endosomatic organs. Our exosomatic organs, which rely on low entropy in the terrestrial environment, are now the focus of fast adaptations in evolution. According to Georgescu-Roegen, the cause of social strife in industrial civilizations is the unequal distribution of ownership of exosomatic organs and the low entropy of the earthly materials used to create them.

Howard T. Odum, the son of eminent sociologist Howard W. Odum, was born in Durham, North Carolina in 1924. He earned an A.B. and worked as a meteorologist in the American tropics during World War II. a B.S. in Zoology from the University of North Carolina in 1947 and a Ph.D. in Ecology under the guidance of G. It's Evelyn Hutchinson. In his renowned study of Silver Springs, Florida, he developed one of the first energy flow descriptions of an entire ecosystem. He has been interested in material cycles and energy flow in eco-systems. He also made significant contributions to Fundamentals of Ecology, an acclaimed textbook written by his brother Eugene P. Odum and initially published in 1953. For many years, this textbook served as the industry standard for ecology education and was instrumental in popularising a number of significant ecological ideas. The notion of the ecosystem in particular was completely explored and quantified using units of material and energy fluxes [9], [10].

Hutchinson and his father H. were also present. Lotka and von Bertalanffy had an impact on the thought of W. Odum, H. T. Odum, who shared many of Georgescu-Roegen's concerns. But unlike Georgescu-Roegen, he used a larger perspective, considering systems in general, from straightforward physical and chemical systems to biological and ecological systems to economic and social systems. He outlined a thorough system integration in Environment, Power, and Society, with energy flow serving as the connecting element. He even created his own symbolic language to aid in describing and simulating the basic characteristics of systems. This language served as both a crucial tool for the initiated practitioner in understanding systems principles and a barrier to entry for those outside the field.

An enormous amount of work by his students and others, ranging from input-output studies of energy and material flow in ecological and economic systems to dynamic simulation models of entire ecosystems and integrated ecological economic systems, was inspired by or at least paralleled and encouraged by Odum's work on energy flow through systems and dynamic modelling of systems. Probably the most succinct and comprehensive analysis of the use of several of H. The 1986 book by C. adapted T. Odum's theories to ecological economics. C. Cleveland, A. S. Hall, and R. Energy and Resource Quality: The Ecology of the Economic Process is the title given by Kaufmann.

E. P. as well as H. A entire generation of ecologists has been motivated by T. Odum's work to explore ecology as a systems science and to connect it to economics and other fields. Although many of H. The controversial theories of T. Odum have sparked debate regarding the issues that, in our opinion, ought to be asked: How do systems work? How do they grow and transform? How do ecosystems and human systems change throughout time? How can an interdisciplinary understanding of systems be developed? Which trajectories of human

growth can be sustained? H was the one asking all of these questions. T. and E. P. Odum in the 1950s, 1960s, and 1970s and are now some of the fundamental questions in ecological economics.

Stable-State Economics and the Spaceship Earth

With its description of the shift from "frontier economics" of the past, where growth in human welfare implied growth in material consumption, to "spaceship economics" of the future, where growth in welfare can no longer be fueled by growth in material consumption, Kenneth Boulding's classic "The Economics of the Coming Spaceship Earth" laid the foundation for ecological economics. Daly emphasised on this basic difference in vision and perspective by redefining economics as a living science, more closely related to biology and ecology than a physical science like chemistry or physics. It is impossible to overstate how significant this change in "pre-analytic vi-sion" is. It suggests a fundamental shift in how the issues around resource allocation are seen, as well as how to deal with them. More specifically, it suggests that the biophysical underpinnings of linked ecological and economic systems should be the focus of inquiry rather than the sold resources in the economic system.

The "steady state economics" work of Daly, which explored the ramifications of accepting that the Earth is materially limited and non-growing and that the economy is a part of this finite global system, further developed this issue. As a result, the economy cannot continue to develop, and a sustainable steady state is eventually required. It is not necessary for this steady state to be completely constant and unchanging. In a steady-state economy, things change continuously in both periodic and aperiodic ways, much as in ecosystems. The important thing to remember is that these changes are limited and the system does not exhibit a long-term trend. One of the main immediate precursors of ecological economics is Daly's work in steady-state economics.

Environmental Management That Adapts

An ecologist from Canada named C. The International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis appointed S. Holling as its director. As a result of his earlier research on spruce budworm outbreaks in northern boreal forests, he developed a complex and dynamic understanding of ecosystems that eventually replaced the more "equilibrium" ideas that had previously been prevalent. Additionally, he was interested in how people interacted with ecosystems and why their feeble efforts at "management" ended so disastrously. All of this culminated in the pioneering book Adaptive Environmental Assessment and Management, which was released in 1978.

By fusing science and management, adaptive environmental management redraws established lines. Holling came to the conclusion that data from laboratory and carefully monitored field trials on discrete ecological systems could not be used to comprehend the system as a whole. We experiment, at best, when we manage ecosystems. Of course, we only get knowledge from experiments if we conduct a sufficient number of them, monitor them carefully, and are eager to gain knowledge from them. Therefore, environmental management organisations must actively participate in experimenting and learning rather than relying on science to determine what constitutes excellent management practise. Furthermore, Holling contended that ecosystems do not favour a particular equilibrium state. Instead, they have a number of equilibriums and change throughout time. Because of this, researchers studying ecosystems must continually modify their management experiments in order to comprehend a dynamic system. This implies that rather than being seen as the last say, models and policies based on them are instead used to direct an iterative process of experimentation inside the regional

system. Instead of using the model to obscure and justify a policy that doesn't reflect reality, more focus is put on monitoring and feedback to verify and improve the model.

Understanding and controlling complex, dynamic systems that are subject to significant uncertainty has shown to be effective when using an adaptive environmental management strategy. Although this method was developed from ecology and applied to management, it has significant implications for social organisation. Environmental managers, members of related communities, and members of the general public with a particular interest in environmental concerns should raise questions, help with the monitoring, and participate in the learning. This perspective is considerably different from that of objective scientists who determine the facts about environmental systems, managers who put it into practise, and the people who ultimately benefit from it. It is a fundamental idea in ecological economics and recognises the reciprocal development of ecological and economic systems.

Ecological and economic systems are coevolving

The assumption that ecological and economic systems are distinct and do not need to be understood together has been one of the biggest obstacles to the fusion of economics and ecology. While the great majority of natural scientists believe that natural systems are separate from humans, economists believe that economic systems are distinct from nature. In fact, the broad consensus among social scientists has been that all social phenomena are culturally driven. Natural scientists "naturally" turn to natural law to explain social phenomena when they do take social phenomena into consideration. Thus, there is often a "line in the sand" between cultural and environmental determinists, with economists belonging to the former group and ecologists to the latter. The unsustainability of contemporary civilizations is explained by this approach, which, as we have observed, embodies traditional Western assumptions about systems and science.

The significance of species coevolution was initially made known to the scientific community by evolutionary ecologists Paul Ehrlich and Peter Raven. The most common way to characterise the niche to which organisms adapt is as a fixed, physical niche is. Once the niche's traits are established, evolution gains focus, and most evolutionary tales depict the species gradually becoming more and more compatible with the niche's qualities. Since human evolution is the ultimate narrative of development, evolutionary stories are typically tales of advancement. Simply said, coevolution recognises that at any one moment, other species and their traits mostly make up a species' niche. As a result, each given species' traits are chosen in relation to those of other species and vice versa; as a result, species coevolve. Coevolution explains why species fit together into ecosystems while species and ecosystems continue to develop, even while evolutionary direction and the analogue to Western ideas in progress are gone.

Norgaard provides an example of how comprehending the coevolutionary process might aid in our understanding of the connections between and changes in social and natural systems. In light of this, he offers fresh ideas for social organisation that will improve social fairness, environmental sustainability, and human dignity. Think of development as the process of knowledge, values, organisation, technology, and the environment co-evolving together. Each of these subsystems is connected to the others while also changing and, via selection, influencing change in the others. Each subsystem experiences deliberate innovations, accidental discoveries, and random changes that have an impact on the distribution and quality of components in each of the other subsystems via natural selection. The characteristics of each of the subsystems at the moment determine whether new components prove to be suitable. They coevolve in a way that one mirrors the other because each

subsystem exerts selection pressure on each of the others. Thus, everything is connected, but it is also changing. In this coevolutionary account of development, environmental subsystems are handled symmetrically with the subsystems of values, knowledge, social organisation, and technology. For instance, when species develop, new technological demands are placed on them, which in turn drives the selection of new traits within the species. Similar to how the ecosystem is changing, new perspectives on the biosphere are chosen. For instance, the use of pesticides promotes resistance and secondary pest reappearance, which favours the development of new pesticides as well as more methodical approaches to pest management. Pests, pesticides, production, institutions, and policy, as well as how we value chemicals in the environment and how we perceive pest management, all show an exceptionally close and quick coevolution in the latter part of this century. People may be considered to be responding to market signals or their absence in the short term by engaging with their surroundings. Longer-term evolutionary feedbacks are included in the coevolutionary model, however. To emphasise co-evolutionary processes is not to discount human direct intervention and environmental change. The coevolutionary perspective emphasises the subsequent sequence of events and how various interventions change the selective pressure and, consequently, the relative dominance of environmental traits. These environmental traits then select for values, knowledge, organisation, and technology, and consequently, further environmental interventions.

Let's utilise this model to specifically discuss technology because the coevolutionary approach regards changes in the different subsystems equally. Over thousands of years, people have engaged with their surroundings in a variety of ways, many of which have proven to be durable over extremely long times and others which have not. At the intensities historically used, several old agricultural practises likely boosted biological diversity. There is broad evidence that agricultural methods using old technology incorporated biodiversity-conserving techniques at the level at which they were used. However, it is widely believed that technology is a major factor in the decline of biodiversity. Modern agricultural and cultural methods replace nature, but only temporarily and locally. In no way can they "control" nature. Some pests are killed by pesticides, eliminating the immediate danger to crops. However, the insect's empty niche is quickly replaced by another species of pest, chemicals drift to interfere with other farmers' agricultural practises, and pesticides and their byproducts build up in soil and groundwater aquifers to wreak havoc on human health and output for years to come. Each farmer tries to manage nature, yet doing so causes new issues for people outside of their own farms and in the next seasons. Since World War II, preharvest crop losses due to pests have stayed at roughly 35% although pesticide usage has expanded significantly. This is because so many new issues have been developed that extend beyond the particular farm in space and time.

There is a desperate need for new technologies that support rather than interfere with natural processes. Technologies have essentially evolved from physics, chemistry, and, at best, microbiology during the previous two centuries. Ecologists and evolutionary biologists were never given the chance to comprehensively study such technologies, and it is unclear if our current knowledge of ecology and evolution is sufficient to do so. Some agricultural innovations, including the employment of other biologicals to manage pests in agriculture, are a direct result of ecological theory. The use of DDT in agriculture after World War II, however, virtually ended research and technological development in biological control. Research and development of agricultural technologies that require fewer energy and material inputs eventually received significant support in industrialised nations after the rise in energy prices during the 1970s and the American farm financial crises in the early 1980s. However, there is currently little support for agroecology, for methods focused on the management of

complementarities between various species, including soil organisms. Since the majority of our knowledge has been built to fully utilise the potential of fossil fuels, learning how to utiliserenewable energy sources will be time-consuming and challenging. Public awareness of the drawbacks of present technologies and the potential for ecologically oriented technologies is low, and our universities and other research institutes are still organised around disci- plinary rather than systemic thinking. Science and technology can react slowly to changes in the public's knowledge of environmental concerns since scientists and technologists directly regulate and educate themselves as well as their institutions.

It is easier to understand how economies have changed from coevolving with their environments to coevolving around the burning of fossil fuels when seen from a coevolutionary viewpoint. People have been liberated from the environmental feedbacks on their economic actions that they experienced as groups and individuals rather swiftly via this shift. The remaining feedbacks, however, take place over longer times and further away and are felt collectively, even worldwide, by many individuals, making them harder to detect and combat. By using fossil fuels, Western nations were able to escape many of the challenges associated with interacting with environmental systems, at least in the short to medium term. Fossil hydrocarbons had a role in coevolution. Animal power was replaced by tractors, interplanting crops that were excellent hosts of nitro-gen-fixing bacteria with crops that weren't was complicated by fertilizers, and biological controls offered by increasingly complex agroecosystems were replaced by pesticides. A further benefit of cheap energy was that crops could be moved further and preserved for longer. Social organizations swiftly coevolved around these novel possibilities. Each of these achievements was founded on a partial comprehension of distinct disciplines and distinct technology. At least in the near term and "on the farm," individual changes of the components seemed to fit into a cohesive, stable whole. From an agroecosystem culture of mostly self-sufficient communities, agriculture evolved into an agro-industrial culture with several dispersed, distant players connected by global markets. Despite the reality that issues were only being transferred outside of the farm and onto future generations, the vast advancements in technology and organization gave people the impression that they had control over nature and could actively plan their destiny.

This coevolutionary explanation for why modern societies are unsustainable is simply that development based on fossil hydrocarbons allowed people to temporarily control their immediate environments while shifting environmental impacts to ever-larger audiences and on to future generations in ways that have proven to be difficult to understand. These more distant effects may have an influence on our social structure as we become aware of their long-term and global ramifications and decide how to react beforehand, or they may have an impact immediately as they are felt in the future. It is at least as difficult to manage these collective, longer-term, and more unpredictable interrelationships as it was in the past. People's faith in our capacity to handle these new issues closely relates to their confidence in the sustainability of progress.The coevolutionary viewpoint enables us to see that solving the issue of how people interact with their environment goes beyond merely creating market incentives or sensible property use regulations. Fossil fuels have played a vital role in the evolution of our beliefs, knowledge, and social structure. Our fossil fuel-based economy has not only changed the environment; it has also chosen individualist, materialist values, encouraged the growth of reductionist knowledge at the expense of systemic knowledge, and preferred a bureaucratic, centralised form of control that is better suited for steady-state industrial management than for the complex, unexpected dynamics of ecosystem management. The coevolutionary framework also emphasises how severely confined our capacity to detect and address environmental issues within the predominate ways of valuing, thinking, and organising is. The coevolutionary paradigm developed by Norgaard completes

the work of anthropologists' cultural ecologists. It has sparked fresh ideas among political economists and is starting to influence ecological economics.

CONCLUSION

The introduction of systems analysis, which entails examining the linkages and feedback loops between various system components, is the first section of the essay. It places emphasis on the understanding that social and economic institutions are ingrained in and linked to the natural environment. Systems analysis offers a comprehensive framework for understanding how complex systems behave, identifying important drivers and processes, and forecasting the effects of policy changes. The relevance of systems analysis and energetics in ecological economics is emphasised throughout this abstract. It highlights their importance in comprehending the complexity of socio-ecological systems, measuring resource flows and energy transformations, and assisting in the development of sustainable decision-making. Ecological economics may help to a more thorough knowledge of the dynamics and difficulties of sustainability by merging various techniques.

REFERENCES:

[1] L. Vian *et al.*, "The Energetics and Physiological Impact of Cohesin Extrusion," *Cell*, 2018, doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2018.03.072.

[2] D. Abdurrachim and J. J. Prompers, "Evaluation of cardiac energetics by non-invasive 31P magnetic resonance spectroscopy," *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta - Molecular Basis of Disease*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.bbadis.2017.11.013.

[3] M. Milyavsky *et al.*, "To Reappraise or Not to Reappraise? Emotion Regulation Choice and Cognitive Energetics," *Emotion*, 2018, doi: 10.1037/emo0000498.

[4] B. X. W. Liew, C. C. Drovandi, S. Clifford, J. W. L. Keogh, S. Morris, and K. Netto, "Joint-level energetics differentiate isoinertial from speed-power resistance training-a Bayesian analysis," *PeerJ*, 2018, doi: 10.7717/peerj.4620.

[5] J. Yang *et al.*, "Oxygen- and Water-Induced Energetics Degradation in Organometal Halide Perovskites," *ACS Appl. Mater. Interfaces*, 2018, doi: 10.1021/acsami.8b04182.

[6] A. Vologodskii and M. D. Frank-Kamenetskii, "DNA melting and energetics of the double helix," *Physics of Life Reviews*. 2018. doi: 10.1016/j.plrev.2017.11.012.

[7] K. P. Sebens, G. Sarà, and E. Carrington, "Estimation of fitness from energetics and life-history data: An example using mussels," *Ecol. Evol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/ece3.4004.

[8] M. R. Bennett, L. Farnell, and W. G. Gibson, "Quantitative relations between bold responses, cortical energetics, and impulse firing," *J. Neurophysiol.*, 2018, doi: 10.1152/jn.00352.2017.

[9] B. Pinter, A. Chankisjijev, P. Geerlings, J. N. Harvey, and F. De Proft, "Conceptual Insights into DFT Spin-State Energetics of Octahedral Transition-Metal Complexes through a Density Difference Analysis," *Chem. - A Eur. J.*, 2018, doi: 10.1002/chem.201704657.

[10] F. M. Rijnberg *et al.*, "Energetics of Blood Flow in Cardiovascular Disease," *Circulation*, 2018, doi: 10.1161/circulationaha.117.033359.