CHAPTER 3

'PARADISE REGAINED'? DREAMING OF COMMUNITY WEALTH BUILDING AS A 'SOMEWHERE' UTOPIA

Julian MANLEY

© CIRIEC aisbl, 2024
Université de Liège - HEC
Bâtiment N3a
Rue Saint-Gilles, 199
BE-4000 Liège (Belgium)
ciriec@uliege.be; https://www.ciriec.uliege.be

MANLEY, Julian. **"Chapter 3 'Paradise Regained'? Dreaming of Community Wealth Building as a 'Somewhere' Utopia"**. In: LAPOUTTE, Alexandrine, DUVERGER, Timothée and DACHEUX, Eric (eds). *Imagine, Studying the Relationship between Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) and Imaginary in the Era of Capitalocene.* Liège: CIRIEC, 2024. (CIRIEC Studies Series; 6), pp. 49-61.
https://doi.org/10.25518/ciriec.css6chap3

This publication is indexed and available in RePEc

Chapter 3

'Paradise Regained'? Dreaming of Community Wealth Building as a 'Somewhere' Utopia

Julian MANLEY[*]

Abstract

This chapter is an investigation of the value of dream-thinking as a process for imagining the impossible. The 'impossible' is one aspect of Utopia, or 'no-place'. A connection is made between dream-thinking and the potential for 'ecological thinking' as a process that is expansive, relational and associational instead of linear and causal. Taking a psychosocial approach and the wide inter-disciplinary perspective that such an approach offers, the chapter suggests that the complex inter-relationality that is part of dream and ecological thinking is an opportunity for imagining futures that go beyond standard linear thought processes. In this context, dream-thinking can be linked to the innovative and creative potential for a different kind of social economy. Such a utopian, dream society is compared to contemporary developments in Community Wealth Building (CWB) and its principal exponent, the Preston Model. A further component of the dream utopia behind CWB is the adherence of CWB projects to cooperative values and principles, where cooperation can be viewed as a benign alternative to competition and individualism. In the spirit of innovation and utopian thinking, the chapter concludes by encouraging the reader to live with the uncertainty of progress, an uncertainty without endings and targets, where process is one of continuous renovation as innovation.

Keywords: Utopia, Community Wealth Building, Associative thinking, Ecology, Dreams, Preston Model

---

[*] University of Central Lancashire, Preston (United Kingdom) (jymanley@uclan.ac.uk; https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2548-8033).

Introduction

'Paradise Regained' is the title of English poet John Milton's 17th Century epic sequel to 'Paradise Lost'. 'Paradise Lost?' is the title and question of Paul Hoggett's 2023 book on 'The climate crisis and the human condition'. Milton's lost 'paradise' is the state of humankind before the Fall in the Garden of Eden, identified by Sargent (1994) as an important source for the idea of Utopia in the West (p. 21). In this creation myth and its connection to a lost Utopia, original sin is also the source of the idea of Utopia as being connected to perfectionism, in other words an earnestly desired but impossible state. Hence the 'nowhere-ness' of Utopia. In Hoggett's work, the title has a poignant contemporary relevance in its identification of Paradise with the Earth that is being lost to climate change. Hoggett largely attributes this loss to the neo-liberal system that has dominated the USA and Europe especially (and subsequently much of the world) since approximately the 1980s, with a focus on what Hoggett calls 'hyper-individualism'. In such a world, consumer markets driven by ruthless competition have been extended to include the social sphere - 'our ways of relating to each other' - and the natural environment, which has been 'infected by the market relationship'. Consumerism and quantification have taken over human existence and this hyper-individuality has driven humankind to the rejection of any idea of the common good. 'The only good' in the hyper-individualistic world, says Hoggett, 'was the good of the individual and his family' (p. 37). It seems, (as Hoggett admits in a footnote (p. 41, note 1)) that hyper-individualism as the primary manifestation of neoliberalism, may be about to expire, encouraged in this demise by an increasingly obvious failure to tackle social inequalities and the global climate crisis. In addition, the COVID-19 pandemic may have hastened this re-evaluation of neoliberalism (Blakeley, 2020). There is, therefore, a dawning of a new realization among many scholars and popular writers that the end of capitalism as we know may be fast approaching (among others, for example, see Wilkinson and Pickett, 2009, 2018; Adler, 2014, 2019; Klein, 2014; Piketty, 2014; Mason, 2016; Monbiot, 2016; Raworth, 2017; Trebeck and Williams, 2019; Varoufakis, 2017) and a surge of interest in alternative models of social and economic organization. However, this begs the question how do we achieve an alternative to a neoliberal system that was dubbed by Margaret Thatcher as having 'no alternative'? In other words, is there a new space available for the development of a Social and Solidarity Economy (SSE) and if so, what would this system-space or 'ecosystem', as it is often dubbed, look like? There is no room in this chapter to define the naming of such an alternative system that might replace the neoliberal approach, but it is worth at least mentioning that 'ecosystem' has obvious roots in ecology and complex dynamic systems that recognize complexity as opposed to the relative simplicity of capitalism (Nielsen, 2007; Meyer et al., 2005); related to this concept is Guattari's 'ecososphy' and the concept of the 'three ecologies' (Guattari, 2000), bringing together natural and social systems. Such systems of complexity, that begin in ecology, suggest an objectively natural system for the future, one that Nielsen calls an 'eco-mimetic development of society' (Nielsen, 2007, p. 1651) and that Fritjof Capra more broadly called the 'web of life' (Capra, 1997; see also, Capra and Luigi, 2014). This would suggest an *Ecological* Social and Solidarity Economy, a return to paradise or utopia, perhaps? This chapter considers this question

in the context of community wealth building (CWB) projects, especially that known as the 'Preston Model', which is often cited as a prime example of such alternative socio-economic models (Manley and Whyman, 2021).

This chapter investigates the value of dream-thinking as a process for imagining the impossible, making a place out of no-place. I begin by discussing the potentially ecological nature of a thinking process that is expansive, relational and associational instead of linear and causal, with the latter being identified as a feature of a traditional neoliberal approach to life and work. To admit complex inter-relationality is to open the doors to the consideration of modes of thinking that are not necessarily restricted to basic linear processes which might lead to easily measurable targets and outcomes. One of the most obvious alternatives to such narrowly targeted and bound thoughts is located in dream-thinking, which the chapter considers as such an alternative that can be linked to the potential for a different kind of social economy. The utopian, dream society is compared to the development of Community Wealth Building (CWB) and its principal exponent, the Preston Model (summarized below). Attached to CWB is the interweaving component of cooperation that speaks to a society woven around inter-relationality as opposed to individualism. The chapter concludes by encouraging the reader to willingly accept the uncertainty of progress without end and without targets, since any end is only the beginning of the new, continuously.

A note on the Preston Model

In this chapter, reference will be made to the Preston Model, a full description of which can be found in Manley and Whyman (2021). To briefly summarize, the Preston Model is a version of CWB that has been developed in the city of Preston (UK) since 2011-13 and continues to the present day. The Preston Model aims to generate and retain local wealth for the benefit of communities. It rejects methods of urban regeneration that rely on inward investment. In the case of inward investment, although wealth might be created, it can also rapidly leak out of the local area (for example, in the case of global corporative investment, locally generated wealth can swiftly leak out into the bank accounts of shareholders who are far removed from the local area). The Preston Model encourages local 'anchor institutions' (meaning institutions that are 'anchored' to place, whatever the economic circumstances, such as the Hospital, the Local Authority, the University, and so on) to change their procurement habits so that more is purchased locally than had been the case before. Cooperation as a set of principles and values, which might also find a voice through cooperative businesses, is encouraged as an alternative to individualism and competition. As a result of this shift in focus, quality employment is stimulated and there is an increase in empowerment, agency and health and wellbeing.

The relational, associational and inter-connectedness in complexity

If there is one striking aspect of ecological systems that contrasts with the linear, hierarchical and pyramidal system of capitalism, it is the unequivocal rhizomatic, systemic, associational and networked interconnectedness of all things. This is not, these days, new thinking. Capra calls this 'systems thinking' and puts it succinctly as follows:

> According to the systems view, the essential properties of an organism, or living system, are properties of the whole, which none of the parts have. They arise from the interactions and relationships between the parts. These properties are destroyed when the system is dissected, either physically or theoretically, into isolated elements. Although we can discern individual parts in any system, these parts are not isolated… (Capra, 1997, p. 29)

A system of power based on hierarchies, with individuals connected through lines of management or governance dictated (falsely) by the idea that the individual at the top of the pyramid is there through merit – in other words the system that typically governs management structures that define capitalism, not just at work but in social systems in general – is in direct opposition to an ecosystem of inter-connected relationships. This is the difference between Deleuze and Guattari's rejection of a 'tree-like' system as opposed to the 'rhizome' which 'connects any point to any other point', with the former being interconnected through a guiding 'trunk' that works its way upwards, while the latter spreads itself out underground in inter-connected ways that are difficult to predict (Deleuze and Guattari, 1988, p. 21).

The 'tree-system' or pyramid of capitalism is inherently anti-democratic because it assumes greater knowledge or expertise at the 'top' and it expects respect for the individual who reaches the heights, with this respect diminishing in accordance with the lesser status of another individual in that structure. Although this is hardly a novel observation, such realization becomes more relevant to a world where the system that supports this thinking is under strain or indeed may be nearing its end. An alternative society that respects all individuals equally because they are equal in relationship, and therefore a world of participatory democracy that is able to sweep away gross inequalities that are fueled by capitalism, might indeed be viewed as a Utopia by many, even by those who are sympathetic to such a vision. Yet, paradoxically, the same sceptics might also be attracted by the almost self-evident truths of those visions of Utopia through the ages since Thomas More's original text. For example, William Morris' *News from Nowhere* discusses a market that is based on healthy relationships as opposed to competition, and who would fail to be attracted to this Utopia?

> "The wares which we make are made because they are needed. Men make for their neighbours' use as if they were making for themselves, not for a vague market of which they know nothing, and over which they have no control." (Morris, 2023 [1890], p. 75)

This 'market' of relationships and genuine value incentivizes democracy by removing consumer value - especially as it relates to the individual - and the competition that goes with such value. Once again, this is nothing new, and the same invocation

to 'true value' has been made through the ages, it is just the lens that changes. Where Morris called upon a blossoming of new, collaborative thinking via socialism, Fromm, about sixty years later, would use a psychological lens to say a very similar thing but with added sophistication. Fromm points out the inherent paradox, bordering on insanity of supposing that individualism can be for the benefit of the individual's neighbour:

> Keep your own advantage in mind, act according to what is best for you; by so doing you will also be acting for the greatest advantage of all others. As a matter of fact, the idea that egotism is the basis of the general welfare is the principle on which competitive society has been built. (Fromm, 2003 [1947], p. 95)

This manner of thinking, where the individual acting for individual interests is at the same time acting in the best interests of the collective is described as 'utopian' by Baudrillard (Baudrillard, 1988 [1970], p. 40). Here, the utopian become dystopian in the use of utopia to describe a crude perception of individual consumer greed as a panacea for communities in society.

More recently, the idea of relationships has been interpreted as 'association', both in terms of political and governance structures (Hirst, 1994) and as part of Actor Network Theory (ANT), especially through the work of Bruno Latour and the so-called 'sociology of associations' (Latour, 2005, p. 9). More recently still, Graeber has developed the connection between a sense of value and how value is 'measured' in terms of relationships: 'we are all, and have always been, projects of mutual creation… Labor is virtuous if it helps others' (Graeber, 2013). Similarly, value is virtuous in correlation to the quality of relationships. Hoggett takes this a step further by substituting 'value' for virtue in a discussion of 'democratic virtues' (Hoggett, 2009, p. 150). Key to eliciting the transformation of economic 'value' to the value of mutuality in Graeber or the virtues of democracy in Hoggett, is the igniting and sustaining of the imagination (the 'moral imagination' in Hoggett, 2009, p. 142) which is staunchly resisted, contained, repressed and constrained within a neoliberal framework: 'imagination, desire, individual creativity, all those things that were to be liberated in the last great world revolution, were to be contained strictly in the domain of consumerism' (Graeber, 2013). A 'utopian' revolution should be 'practical' and based on 'common sense', unlike violent revolutions of old, according to Graeber, and yet it must remain the stuff of dreams. Again, because of this, dreams are to be destroyed by the system: 'We are talking about the murdering of dreams, the imposition of an apparatus of hopelessness, designed to squelch any sense of an alternative future' (Graeber, 2013). The idea of 'murder' here is evocative of the vital life elicited in dreams and brought into design through utopias. It is not that many people believe in actual utopias as a final template for society (it is, after all 'nowhere'), but even without the physical concept of utopia there exists (in a sense that is open to 'murder') a very real conceptual life of utopia that is vital for continuing on a road of progress without a final destination. Concepts are not no-things, they are things that exist in continuously created innovations which are never new since the passing of time makes them are old upon birth. It is the creation of concepts that is the life force of Deleuzian philosophy

(Deleuze and Guattari, 1994) and these are arrayed on a rhizmomatic plane of relationships and associations. In the Deleuzian world, these are associations in relationship between and among a rhizome of affects. For Hoggett, this is a 'democracy of emotions' (Hoggett, 2009, pp. 139-157): it is the same vision viewed through a different lens.

The dreams of utopia that need to live: community wealth building

An example of the importance and value of dreams was described in work carried out as part of a CWB project in Bermuda encapsulated in the hope for the development of a co-operative ecosystem in Bermuda (Manley and Aiken, 2020). In order to proceed with co-operative development, the community was consulted through a series of social dreaming events, bringing out the local desire to encourage the island's relationship with water – relationship with the non-human – and the value of relationships among community members through dreams and associations that re-lived moments of festivity among locals. Notable in their absence were dreams relating to economic development, emphasising this essential difference between consumer value and relational value, as described above. The curiosity of this work on an actual island and the value attributed to that in the dreams is that CWB projects sometimes appear to have an 'island flavour', working locally within local boundaries ('Preston', for example), rejecting the primacy of the global market. The co-operative system in Mondragon, a precursor of the CWB project, has been described as an 'island in a capitalist sea' (Etxeberria, 2019). This is a recurring theme. As far back as 1914, William Henry Watkins was describing co-operative development as a 'state within a state' to be designed 'on harmonious and co-operative lines, rather than the competitive and discordant lines we find in the competitive world' (Watkins, 1914 quoted in Woodwin, 2019, p. 25). During the development stage of the Preston Model, *The Economist* painted the CWB policies in Preston in utopic fashion, with an image of the then Leader of the Opposition walking a road to a shining city in the distance and the Leader of the Council described the CWB project as an isolated example of democratic socialism within a national design of conservative austerity politics: 'You can begin to democratise the economy, even with a Tory government' (Economist, 2017). To 'democratise' the economy is the same as to say to change the way people relate and associate to each other, since the kind of democracy that is being envisaged is participatory or deliberative, as opposed to representational. This is part of the dream, part of the 'community' of CWB and the utopia in question.

CWB prides itself in living a dream within reality, like a dream island. Similarly, in an individual there might be a conscious perception of an external reality on the one hand and an unconscious inner dream perception on the other. In the latter, virtue counts more than the faceless competition of the capitalist reality of the former. It should be remembered that dreams are not completely figures of pure imagination but are concepts created by the mind according to inputs from the reality of the external world. The idea that dreams are individual expressions of individual problems,

dating back to Freud (Freud, 1976 [1900]), is far removed from contemporary theory of dreams that has emerged from the practice of social dreaming. When dreams are shared in social contexts, there is a merging of the individual and the external environment (Manley, 2018; Long and Manley, 2019). If dreams are 'utopic', this does not mean that they are existing in total isolation from the 'real' world; instead, they exist in constant synergetic relationship with that external environment. Dreams do not emerge just from 'nowhere' but from a merging of nowhere with somewhere, or utopia with the real world. Similarly, the reality of CWB is that despite being dubbed as utopic by the 'reality' of the system, both the social and economic realities of a place like Preston have significantly improved (Manley and Whyman, 2021; Prinos and Manley, 2022). Recent work furthermore demonstrates that CWB also improves the health and wellbeing of communities, not just random individuals, but communities as a whole (Rose et al., 2023). What might appear utopic at first actually seems to have tangible results. It took a leap of imagination and a good deal of dreaming as well as a dose of reality, to turn round the fortunes of the small city of Preston. Of course, like a dream, CWB is open to the vagaries of the world. The 'model' in Preston is not a definitive, pre-conceived model of socio-economic organisation, rather it is a constantly shifting and changing possibility, with one possibility being decline or collapse. For example, the CWB project in Barcelona is now threatened by the collapse of the government that promoted it. As Graeber pointed out, alternative models such as CWB are not definitive templates but concepts to be tested and developed: 'such models can be only thought experiments. We cannot really conceive of the problems that will arise when we start trying to build a free society' (Graeber, 2013).

Dreaming the social as a thought experiment

The value of dreams – whether these are actual night-time dreams, daydreams or 'dreams' in terms of desires and ambitions – is in fostering a locus of possibility, a place where new thoughts can be born, (hence the name given to the social dreaming group - a matrix). Ideas that are difficult to conceive in the context of consultation exercises, surveys, focus groups and suchlike – due to range of issues but largely and importantly because such consultations are designed around a conscious knowledge of past facts and figures – can easily be created in dreams and the creative imagination that is associated to utopic thinking. The qualities of dreams lend themselves immediately to inclusivity, diversity and the joining together of what 'in reality' might appear to be contradictory notions or even mad juxtapositions. The participant in dream thinking soon realises that the boundary between madness – as mad as dream images may often appear - and sense - associated to the rational – is more moveable and thinner than we might have supposed; and, as Foucault also showed in *Madness and Civilization*, there may be an underlying unconscious recognition and attraction of the forces of the imagination denominated 'mad', a desire to approach such fecundity, which is held back by fear of the unknown and therefore contained by the 'reason' of confinement (Foucault, 2001a [1961], pp. 195-198). Maybe this is why dreams are (madly) attractive. Perhaps dreams open a window to and a permission for 'madness'

and in this way turn confinement and a fear of the madness of innovation into a creative act. To reject fear is a creative act of truth-telling, according to Foucault, since it is fear that prevents the speaker from speaking truth (Foucault, 2001b). But speaking truth is not principally about creating ideas, rather it is a thought process. This is why Foucault places truth-telling in the field of thinking before idea creation. Foucault's history of thought is a demonstration of how truth emerges by a thinking process that challenges the taken-for-grantedness of ideas:

> The history of thought is the analysis of the way an unproblematic field of experience, or set of practices, which were accepted without question, which were familiar and "silent", out of discussion, becomes a problem, raises discussion and debate, incites new reactions and induces a crisis in the previously silent behavior, habits, practices, and institutions. (Foucault, 2001b, p. 74)

CWB and the development of a future SSE are thus to be understood as processes of thought that challenge the capitalist and consumerist system which for decades has been accepted without question. The comfortable certainty that the consumerist marketplace is the only option available to society becomes an uncomfortable disturbance when that idea that has passed its time. Neoliberal 'givens' are now central to crisis, not because a new idea has emerged but because truth as a thinking process is making an old idea defunct. 'Mad' thinking is paradoxically bringing out the madness of the neoliberal system that western society (and indeed much of global society) is embedded in.

From this perspective, it is easier to see that 'madness' (such as CWB) might actually be a truth that is often left unspoken. Dreams and utopias offer a possibility of truth-speaking through bypassing fear and by allowing dreams to 'speak'. In social dreaming (Lawrence, 2005; Manley, 2018), this is what is often termed expressing the 'unthought known' (Bollas, 1987), that is to say the thinking process in the sharing of dreams and associations to those dreams that allows people's unspoken knowledge to emerge. This is the result of what Freud identified as two principle features of the dream image: condensation (Freud, 1976 [1900], pp. 383-414) and free association or 'involuntary ideas' and how these flow into and are linked *in relationship* (Freud, 1976 [1900], pp. 18-178). 'Condensation' describes the quality in dream images to place in a single image various otherwise unconnected images and feelings attached to undigested knowledge; in social dreaming, this effect is further accumulated through the linking up of various of these images from different dreams. Condensation in dream images is unacceptable in conscious discourse due to the apparently incomprehensible 'madness' of the image(s), so it is only through the context of dreams that these thought processes can be accepted and therefore worked with. 'Free association' is the process whereby a person contributes to the thinking process through spontaneous connections made to thoughts, feelings and images that may occur at any moment and without interruption. This process is connected to dream thinking and utopian visions in the sense that it bypasses conscious obstacles (based on fear and previously held ideas) and allows for the expression of the unthought known.

Community wealth building and co-operative solidarity

CWB is therefore not really an idea (and the Preston Model is not really a 'model' (Manley, 2021)), a template that can be applied to all, but rather a thinking process. As such, development is akin to transforming the thinking process from the understanding of ideas in linearity (consumerism, competition and the 'laws' of the marketplace) to rhizomatic processes in complexity (a 'somewhere' utopia). As Homer-Dixon (2014) points out in a chapter on complexity within a post-growth co-operative society, future thinking processes must shift from the ratio-logico-linear to a sense of multiplicity and relationality. Such thinking processes include concepts of 'emergence, disproportional causation and multiple equilibria' (Homer-Dixon, 2014, p. 127). If elements of the thinking process are in 'emergence', those are in a state of continuum, states which process themselves according to Deleuzian 'becomings', constantly shifting, moving towards Foucauldian 'truths' without ever stating the truth or reaching an end. The uncertainty inherent in never reaching that end, that utopia, the place of 'nowhere', is something that has to be lived with and accepted as part of the thinking process. The idea of utopia cannot be reached and the ends held by that idea cannot be achieved. However, this does not mean that progress cannot be made. On the contrary, it is by constantly moving towards the idea, accepting the knowledge that this will never be completed, that a healthy striving for change is made motivational and transformational. This also speaks to disproportional causation (as opposed to the weightings of a Cartesian cause-and-effect): as small things emerge, big things can happen. This is how small acts of compassion and solidarity, based on emerging trust among actors, were able to produce big changes during the Covid-19 pandemic. The point is made by Igwe et al. (2020), that developing solidarity through mutually beneficial small acts of support on the basis of trust was a vital component for survival in Nigeria and, it is assumed, in many developing countries where state support is minimal. In this case, solidarity is not an idea but a thought process that becomes reality through experience. In resonance with the present chapter, solidarity in Igwe et al.'s (2020) article is identified as a virtue rather than a value and the individual is 'becoming' collective: 'Solidarity has an organic or ethical category–civic virtues and collective identity' (Igwe et al., 2020, p. 1195). The complexity concept of multiple equilibria also demands new processes of thinking, since the simplicity of neoliberal ideas that demands a faith in the equilibrium implicit in the 'trickle down' hierarchical ladder of competition was made absurd when the pandemic revealed that it was in fact the lowest paid workers in society – the nurses, waste collectors, shop assistants and so on – who were identified as 'key workers' and vital for survival. A balanced society will admit to many varied balances that truly reflect the multiple complexities of existence.

With this in mind, it is possible to better understand how the development of CWB and SSE must be based not on a thing or an idea but on less tangible and difficult-to-define principles, values and virtues. This is clearly evident in the network of 'co-operative Councils' in the UK calling themselves the Co-operative Councils Innovation Network (CCIN) (https://www.councils.coop/), which bases its CWB development on principles

that adhere to co-operative values and principles, but not to an idea in the sense of a design that they or anyone one else has to apply. What the co-operative Councils work towards as a process is a series of ways of being which can be applied in a mix-and match fashion according to circumstance and local needs. In other words, one co-operative Council does not *look like* another, necessarily, but it does *behave like* another; and this behaviour will be similar in direction but different in intensity, in the recognition that no two Councils are the same. The long list of CCIN principles and values can be seen in their Statement of Principles and Values document (CCIN n.d.). As is immediately evident from the Statement, these are not a list of ideas, but rather of processes regarding behaviour:

- Social partnership
- Democratic engagement
- Co-production
- Enterprise and social economy
- Maximising social value
- Community leadership and a new role for councillors
- New models of meeting priority needs
- Innovation
- Learning
- Walking the talk

Evidently, these are directions without end. There is no end to 'innovation', no final conclusion to 'walking the talk', no limit to 'co-production', and so on. Maybe 'new models of meeting priority needs' sounds as if the 'model' could be a defined idea, but aside from this, the other principles and values are abstract and perpetually work-in-progress. As such, they comply with the idea of process and complexity that forms the basis for the development of a future SSE. Should all these behaviours end in a defined template with no further improvement possible, then we would have that utopia that otherwise we can only dream about.

Conclusion without end

The SSE, in whatever form it takes in a future which is likely to be at least 'post-growth', if not 'de-growth', must be evolutionary and developmental, not static or perfect. Ideas of the future are often dubbed 'utopian' until they come to pass, then they are simply accepted as normal. An example of this in the UK was the introduction of the National Health Service (NHS) in 1948 despite 'realistic' opposition from many politicians and even doctors and nurses regarding the cost. This utopian project was made possible because thinking had been disrupted by the disaster of the Second World War. The fear of the financial problems or utopian concept of a universal health service was secondary to the fear of death and destruction that the war

had inflicted upon the population. The new health service was advertised as the following kind of utopia:

> It will provide you with all medical, dental, and nursing care. Everyone, rich or poor, man, woman or child can use it or any part of it. There are no charges, except for a few special items. There are no insurance qualifications… and it will relieve your money worries in time of illness. (Archive n.d.)

It is hard to over-emphasize the revolutionary nature of this demonstration of solidarity which was dream-like and, in a sense, impossible to achieve.

Failing a disaster such as the Second World War that can shift thought processes in this way, the question for today is how can we transform thinking? not how can we get new ideas? Innovation and creativity will come through thinking as process. This chapter suggests that to overcome the fear that stands in the way of transformative and creative thinking, new methods of enquiry need to be opened out. As part of this, utopian and dream thinking is not only acceptable, it is necessary. Thus, the 'paradise lost' of some previous capitalist ideal can become the 'paradise regained' of some future ideal. One day, that will then also be lost, only to be regained once again. And so on, continuously.

References

Adler, P.S. (2014). "Capitalism in question", *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 23(2): 206–209.

Adler, P.S. (2019). *The 99 Percent Economy: How Democratic Socialism Can Overcome the Crises of Capitalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Archive (n.d.). (https://archive.org/details/thenewnationalhealthserviceleaflet1948) accessed 20.04.2024.

Baudrillard, J. (1988 [1970]). « La Société de consommation », in Poster, M. (ed.), *Selected Writings*. Cambridge: Polity.

Blakely, G. (2020). *The Corona Crash. How the pandemic will change capitalism*. London: Verso.

Bollas, C. (1987). *The Shadow of the Object. Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known*. London: Routledge.

Capra, F. (1997). *The Web of Life. London*: Flamingo.

Capra, F. and Pier Luigi Luisi, P. (2014). *The Systems View of Life: A Unifying Vision*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

CCIN, (n.d.). (https://www.councils.coop/about-us/values-and-principles/) accessed 20.04.2024.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1988). *A Thousand Plateaus*. London: Continuum.

Deleuze, G. and Guattari, F. (1994). *What is Philosophy?* London: Verso.

Economist, The (2017). 'Preston, Jeremy Corbyn's model town' (https://www.economist.com/britain/2017/10/19/preston-jeremy-corbyns-model-town), accessed 20.04.2024.

Etxeberria, A. (2019). 'On Mondragon – Solidarity, Democracy, and the Value of Work: an interview with Ander Etxeberria'. *Renewal* (accessed 20.04.2024).

Foucault, M. (2001a [1961]). *Madness and Civilization*. London: Routledge.

Foucault, M. (2001b). *Fearless Speech*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e).

Freud, S. (1976 [1900]). The Interpretations of Dreams.

Fromm, E. (2003 [1947]). *Man for Himself*. London: Routledge.

Graeber, D. (2013). 'A Practical Utopian's Guide to the Coming Collapse'. *The Baffler*, 22, (A Practical Utopian's Guide to the Coming Collapse (thebaffler.com) accessed 20.04.2024.

Guattari, F. (2000). *The Three Ecologies*. London: The Athlone Press.

Hirst, P. (1994). *Associative Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity.

Hoggett, P. (2009). *Politics, Identity and Emotion*. London: Routledge.

Hoggett, P. (2023). *Paradise Lost? The Climate Crisis and the Human Condition*. Milton Keynes: Simplicity Institute.

Homer-Dixon, T. (2014). "Complexity: Shock, innovation and resilience", in Novkovic, S. and Webb, T. (eds). *Co-operatives in a Post-Growth Era*. London: Zed Books.

Igwe, P.A., Ochinanwata, C., Ochinanwata, N., Adeyeye, J.O., Ikpor, I.M., Nwakpu, S.E., Egbo, O.P., Onyishi, I.E., Vincent, O., Nwekpa, K.C., Nwakpu, K.O., Adeoye, A.A., Odika, P.O., Fakah, H., Ogunnaike, O.O. and Umemezia, E.I. (2020). "Solidarity and social behaviour: how did this help communities to manage COVID-19 pandemic?". *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, Vol. 40 No. 9/10, pp. 1183-1200.

Klein, N. (2014). *This Changes Everything. Capitalism Vs the Climate*. London: Simon & Schuster.

Latour, B. (2005). *Reassembling the Social*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Lawrence, W.G. (2005). *An Introduction to Social Dreaming*. London: Karnac.

Long, S. and Manley, J. (Eds.) (2019). *Social Dreaming: Philosophy, Research, Theory and Practice*. London: Routledge.

Manley, J. (2018). *Social Dreaming: Associative thinking and intensities of affect*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Manley, J. and Aiken, M. (2020). "A socio-economic system for affect: dreaming of cooperative relationships and affect in Bermuda, Preston, and Mondragón". *Organisational & Social Dynamics* 20(2), pp. 173–190.

Manley, J. and Whyman, P.B. (Eds.) (2021). *The Preston Model and Community Wealth Building: Creating a Socio-Economic Democracy for the Future*. London: Routledge.

Manley, J. (2021). "The Preston Model: From top-down to rhizomatic-up", in Manley, J. and Whyman, P.B. (Eds.) (2021). *The Preston Model and Community Wealth Building: Creating a Socio-Economic Democracy for the Future*. London: Routledge, pp. 17-32.

Mason, P. (2016). *Postcapitalism: A Guide to Our Future*. London: Penguin.

Alan D. Meyer, Vibha Gaba, Kenneth A. Colwell, (2005). Organizing Far from Equilibrium: Nonlinear Change in Organizational Fields. Organization Science 16(5):456-473.

Monbiot, G. (2016). *How Did We Get into This Mess*? London: Verso.

Morris, W. (2023 [1890]). *News From Nowhere*. Standard EBooks (StandardEbooks.org).

Nielsen, S.N. (2007). "What has modern ecosystem theory to offer to cleaner production, industrial ecology and society? The views of an ecologist", *Journal of Cleaner Production* 15, pp. 1639-1653.

Piketty, T. (2014). *Capital in the 21st Century*. London: Harvard University Press.

Prinos, I. and Manley, J. (2023). "The Preston Model: Economic Democracy, Cooperation, and Paradoxes in Organisational and Social Identification". *Sociological Research Online*, 28(3), 627-643. https://doi.org/10.1177/13607804211069398

Raworth, K. (2017). *Doughnut Economics: Seven Ways to Think Like a 21st-Century Economist*. Vermont: Chelsea Green.

Rose T.C., Daras K., Manley J., McKeown, M., Halliday, E., Goodwin, T.L., et al. (2023). "The mental health and wellbeing impact of a Community Wealth Building programme in England: a difference-in-differences study". *Lancet Public Health*. Apr 21; S2468-2667(23)00059, pp. 1-8.

Sargent, L.Y. (1994). "The Three Faces of utopianism Revisited". *Utopian Studies*, 1994, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 1-37.

Thatcher, M. (1980). Speech to the Conservative Women's Conference on 21 May 1980, There is no alternative - Wikipedia (accessed 08.04.2024).

Trebeck, K. and Williams, J. (2019). *The Economics of Arrival. Ideas for a Grown up Economy*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Varoufakis, Y. (2017). *Adults in the Room, My Battle with Europe's Deep Establishment*. London: Bodley Head.

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2009). *The Spirit Level: Why More Equal Societies Almost Always Do Better*. London: Allen Lane.

Wilkinson, R. and Pickett, K. (2018). *The Inner Level: How More Equal Societies Reduce Stress, Restore Sanity and Improve Everyone's Wellbeing*. London: Penguin.

Woodwin, T. (2019). "Recovering histories of co-operative education and training: Character, culture and citizenship", in Woodwin, T. and Shaw, L. (eds) *Learning for a Co-operative World*. London: UCLIOE Press, pp. 18-36.

Julian Manley is Professor of Social Innovation at the University of Central Lancashire, Preston, UK. Among recent publications, he is one of the editors of Co-operation and Co-operatives in 21st-Century Europe (2023) published by Bristol University Press. He is one of the developers of the Preston Model of Community Wealth Building and was the founder and first Chair of the Preston Co-operative Development Network. He is currently Secretary of the Preston Co-operative Education Centre.