

GLOBAL COMMONS: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY IS IT?

Priyamvada Mishra ^a

^a Department of Political Science, Jamia Millia Islamia, Delhi-110032, India.

^a Corresponding author: pmpriyamvada@gmail.com

©Ontario International Development Agency ISSN: 1923-6654 (print)

ISSN 1923-6662 (online). Available at <http://www.ssrn.com/link/OIDA-Intl-Journal-Sustainable-Dev.html>

Abstract: Our planet is a finite place. It represents a closed resource system except for the inflow of sunlight from outer space. It is endowed with finite stocks of natural capital, made (by humans) capital and human capital (embodied in persons) at any point of time. Human well being is described by the outcomes of use of these capital stocks. The distribution of these outcomes determines the opportunities that individuals have to make choices. Among the different kind of stocks, made capital is a derivative of the past use of natural resources, human labour and technology. Human capital, on the other hand represents human population human population with its skill and ability of creating values by the use of scientific knowledge and technology. The stock of natural resources- biotic and abiotic- including solar energy flow at any point of time, on the other hand, is entirely given by nature. It is driven by bio- physical laws of natural sciences, although their potential of contribution to human well being depends on the level of development and use of the knowledge base, along with the social and institutional order of the economic system.

The problem of man and biosphere is not only interdisciplinary but also has an international dimension. There are studies of individual countries and of groups thereof, reflecting the specific features of their natural environment, economic system, and social structure and so on. An important aspect of these refers to what is a rational assimilation of natural resources and the economic evaluation of both the positive and negative consequences of man's interaction with his environment. The concept of territorial Production Complexes which is increasingly being employed in national economic plans is an offshoot of these developments and has considerable bearing on resource studies, their economic evaluation, and estimation of their sufficiency or otherwise, resource cycles etc.

The concept of sustainable development has become currently a fashionable buzzword in the international environmental lobby as well as national policies on environment and development. Every international agency from World Bank to UNICEF now has its

own definition of the concept. For the environmentalists, sustainable development denotes a radical change from the past. For the economists and MNCs, the concept means simply "sustained growth" or "sustained profits" while others interpret sustainable development mere as a shift to local self reliance and empowerment of the marginalized poor, where ecology provides the guiding principle. The Economists view sustainable development as economic progress in which the quantity and quality of one stocks of natural resources and the integrity of biochemical cycles are sustained and passed on to future generations unimpaired.

Any discussion on sustainable development has to focus on environment and economy relationship, which is not only close and interconnected, but it is two- way as all economic activities either affects or are affected by environmental resources [Economic Survey 1999]. Almost all economic activities, such as, processing and manufacturing, mining and extraction, consumption, transport, and disposal affect environment in three ways: (i) they change the stock of natural resources through direct consumption, (ii) they add stress to the existing environmental systems, and (iii) they introduce waste to environmental media which require treatment. In any situation, supply and quality of natural resources would influence the productivity of an economic system.

Environmental resources, on the other hand get closely linked to economic activities through three different but related channels: (a) natural resources are used as inputs into production; (b) production process generates waste related to the environment's assimilative capacity, and (c) they are directly consumed as life support services and for aesthetic amenities. The natural and environmental resources such as water, soil, air, biological, forest and fisheries resources thus are important productive assets. Their quality helps determine the productivity of the economy. The economic management of the environment and the environmental quality has important repercussions on the efficient working of the economy.

Sustainable development as a desirable objective requires a dynamic, participatory and an interdisciplinary approach. Given the tangible damage to the nature and the disharmony between man and nature with emerging uncertainty over the life support which we may all have to witness once the society undergoes a radical shift in the nature, structure and composition of an ecosystem, we must take into account depletion and degradation of natural capital on the one hand, and follow people oriented participatory and interdisciplinary approach to achieve the goals of sustainable development on the other.

Keywords: Consumption, Development, Environment, International, Natural Resources.

INTRODUCTION

“Earth provides enough to satisfy every man’s needs, but not every man’s greed.”
Mahatma Gandhi

“Generations to come will scarcely believe that such a one as this, ever in flesh and blood walked upon this earth.” Albert Einstein on Mahatma Gandhi

Growth is not an end in itself. However, it makes it possible to achieve other objectives, by creating resources, such as education, health care, employment and other Millennium Development Goals. In other words growth is necessary but not sufficient condition for human development unless measures are taken to remove poverty and drudgery. Some of these measures are efficient delivery of public goods and services, infrastructure development and appropriate government procedures and regulations. Without rapid growth, potential entrants to the work force will not find a satisfactory job. Maintaining a reasonable growth rate is also essential for social stability and peace.

Our planet is a finite place. It represents a closed resource system except for the inflow of sunlight from outer space. It is endowed with finite stocks of natural capital, made (by humans) capital and human capital (embodied in persons) at any point of time. Human well being is described by the outcomes of use of these capital stocks. The distribution of these outcomes determines the opportunities that individuals have to make choices. Among the different kind of stocks, made capital is a derivative of the past use of natural resources, human labour and technology. Human capital, on the other hand represents human population human population with its skill and ability of creating values by the use of scientific knowledge and technology. The stock of natural resources- biotic and abiotic- including solar energy flow at any point of time, on the other hand, is entirely given by nature. It is driven by bio- physical laws of natural sciences, although their potential of

contribution to human well being depends on the level of development and use of the knowledge base, along with the social and institutional order of the economic system. A given stock, composition & productivity of society’s capital can contribute towards meeting basic needs of human beings in a sustained manner over time, but only up to a maximum limit. Human population, natural resources, knowledge base and institutions are thus distinct yet fundamental factors that determine the development of various dimensions of human well beings. Those would include for instance, calorie and protein intake of people, levels of attainment in education and health, the availability of infrastructural services such as energy, transport and communication, drinking water, sanitation, environmental quality and political and social empowerment. It is also worth noting that urbanization is an inevitable consequence of the spread of industrialization and the provision of infrastructural support to these hotspots of population and industrial concentration, is, in fact, a major concern.

“The pride of having reached the moon is cancelled out by the humiliation of having gone so far towards making a slum of our own native planet.” This simple statement of the famous conservationist Max Nicholson sums up the grave dilemma with which mankind is faced today. The industrial and technical revolution of modern times, unaccompanied as it is by proper approach towards environment, contains such basic contradictions that, instead of becoming an instrument of human health and happiness, it is causing the growth of a ‘sick, degenerate, materialistic, power drunk and sex crazy civilization.’

It should be clearly understood that the causes of environmental deterioration in the developing countries are different from those of the developed countries. In the latter, the environmental deterioration is the by-product of a ‘socially retarded civilization’. It has been caused by misdirected affluence and excessive and uncontrolled industrialization and urbanization. Knowledge of science and technology has been used not in enlarging general human happiness, but in recklessly destroying Nature and in making everyday life more mechanical and artificial. On the other hand, in the developing countries it is the crude and clumsy machine of poverty that causes the gravest environmental hazard. In a country like India, where 40% of the population lives below the poverty line, where 25% of the urban dwellers live in slushy and stinking slums and 75% of the villagers are without wholesome and clean water supply, the talk of sea and air pollution has hardly any meaning. Mrs. Indira Gandhi in her speech in the Stockholm Conference correctly posed the question, “How can we speak to

those who live in villages and slums about keeping the ocean, river and the air clean when their own lives are contaminated at the source?" the environment cannot improve the conditions of poverty.

The problem of man and biosphere is not only interdisciplinary but also has an international dimension. There are studies of individual countries and of groups thereof, reflecting the specific features of their natural environment, economic system, social structure and so on. An important aspect of these refers to what is a rational assimilation of natural resources and the economic evaluation of both the positive and negative consequences of man's interaction with his environment. The concept of territorial Production Complexes which is increasingly being employed in national economic plans is an offshoot of these developments and has considerable bearing on resource studies, their economic evaluation, estimation of their sufficiency or otherwise, resource cycles etc.

As long as last century Fredrick Engels warned: "Let us not, however, flatter ourselves overmuch on account of our human victories over nature. For each such victory nature takes its revenge on us. Each victory, it is true, in the first place brings about the results we expected, but in the second and third places it has quite different, unforeseen effects which only too often cancel the first." {F. Engels, *Dialects of Nature*, Moscow, Progress Publishers, 1974, p.180}

The ultimate concern of economic development is the development of the state of well being of the human population of a society. A particular concept of human development has been introduced by UNDP. This evolving concept has broadened the conceptual framework of development policy and evaluation criteria of development programmes by widening the concept of well being much beyond what conventional indicators like per capita national income or any of its distributionally sensitive variants would represent. Human Development has been envisaged as a process of enlarging opportunities, or expanding the domain of choices that people can avail for their betterment of their quality of life as well as for raising the level of attainment of material well being. GDP or income is an important means to achieve such ends or desirable state of affairs, but is not an end in itself. This approach to human development shifts the focus from the flow of consumption of commodities to the ends it helps to attain. It is in this sense that human well being is perceived as a continuous improvement of health levels of education, quality of the environment as described by availability and adequacy of safe water, sanitation, shelter, electricity, clean air and other amenities.

Most of such outcomes of a development process are valuable ends in themselves, while some of them are important also as a means for furthering other aspects of well being in future. Education and health attainment are in fact important examples of the latter as they are not only valued as ends in themselves but they play important roles in determining access to opportunities and the size of the choice set for individuals in society. Amartya Sen's capability approach of development emphasizes the expansion of freedom in choosing among the alternative states of achievement. The potential of attainment of well being of an individual depends on entitlements described by the set of alternatives that a person can command by using all the rights and opportunities available.

It is, however, true that the achievements and opportunities which an individual's income or material attainment can offer would depend also on factors beyond health and education, such as social, cultural and political process of a society and how an individual is situated in it. Important public goods like social institution of education, health care, governance of legal, political, economic and cultural systems are critical in determining access to opportunities. Indeed, this access or lack of it is equally important as entitlements to material goods. Together, they define the extent of deprivation or empowerment of different sections of society.

Definitions abound in the discourse on sustainable development whichever way one look at the complex set of issues involved, there are two basic problems that have to be addressed and resolved. The first is the question of promoting economic growth while minimizing externalities leading to depletion or degradation of the environmental resource base of a society. The second question, interrelated with the first, pertains to reducing the intensity of currents as well as future resource use and environmental stress. In discussing and designing best use strategies for renewable and non-renewable natural resources, a concern for intra generational and intergenerational equity is unavoidable.

Since the early 1970s, the international communities and developmental agencies have been seriously aware of the organic linkages between development, poverty and environmental degradation. In some of the international conferences and summits i.e. the UN Conference of "Human Environment" in 1972 (Stockholm, Sweden); a report by the world Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) entitled as "Our Common Future" (1987); the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro on Sustainable Development in 1992, the International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD) held in Cairo in September 1994; the World Summit on Social

Development held in March 1995 at Copenhagen and the World Summit on Sustainable Development held at Johannesburg during 26 August- 04 September 2002- the issue related to the failure of the post independent governments in the developing and underdeveloped countries in resolving the problems of poverty, underdevelopment, growing inequalities and environmental deterioration have been highlighted. Thus, from time to time, alternative strategies and agendas of development have been identified by the global agents of development. One such alternative agenda or strategy of development was on Sustainable Development as advocated and supported by the international communities and it was later reinforced by Governmental Organisations as well as NGOs which were supposed to work as the main agencies of Sustainable Development.

The concept of sustainable development has become currently a fashionable buzzword in the international environmental lobby as well as national policies on environment and development. Every international agency from World Bank to UNICEF, now has its own definition of the concept. For the environmentalists, sustainable development denotes a radical change from the past. For the economists and MNCs, the concept means simply "sustained growth" or "sustained profits" while others interpret sustainable development mere as a shift to local self reliance and empowerment of the marginalized poor, where ecology provides the guiding principle. The Economists view sustainable development as economic progress in which the quantity and quality of one stocks of natural resources and the integrity of biochemical cycles are sustained and passed on to future generations unimpaired.

In fact, the definitions of sustainable development are varied depending on the nature of problems addressed. Despite a long debate on the concept, no single definition is yet available which can be acceptable by all. But, no such concrete and practical prescriptions have emerged from the academic debates which can really guide the people in this earth to work towards a true sustainable development.

The discourse on sustainable development, however, goes on without finding an appropriate solution to the global crisis of environment and development. What is crucial to the understanding of the universal problems of the world is the issue of moral degeneration. Thus, what is desperately needed to save the world from such global crisis in the 'transvaluation of values.' A number of environmental philosophers and social scientists have turned their table towards importance of value system in society. In this context, one reference is made here to Alan Thien Durning (1992), who, in his book, "How much is enough?: The consumer Society and

the future of the Earth" makes it evident that in this consumerist culture the Americans are engaged in a fruitless attempt to find happiness in material things and in the race for riches have lost family values, leisure and social relations. In this race, all others in the world over follow or try to catch up the American Consumerist lifestyle which in the long run is destructive in nature. Thus, Durning called upon individuals to turn to the family and community as "it has been proved by wise men from Buddha to the Mohammed- who preached that money cannot buy happiness." A change in the affluent lifestyle and internalization of universal values which alone can ensure an environmentally sound earth and all round development for the mankind. Therefore, there is need of a broader social movement to create a "culture of permanence" a way of life that can contain use of ecologically destructive things and cultivate deeper, spiritual and non- material sources of fulfillment that can bring happiness and prosperity in the whole universe.

In fact, in the East, particularly in India, a number of contemporary social philosophers and social reformers like Gandhi, Gurudev Rabindranath Tagore, Vinoba Bhave, Mahadev Phule and some others who have visualized the symbiotic relationship between various needs of human beings and the capability of existing environment to fulfill them for generations. Almost all of them have identified "moral degeneration among human beings" as the single most influential force that has caused not only the recent ecological crisis in the world but also economic stagnation, political instability and social disorganization.

The approach of growth with equity has been followed in India since independence. The state is an important actor which intervenes directly or indirectly in many activities of the state in production and distribution are thus important for inclusion and exclusion both.

The discourse on sustainable development in India has passed through three phases: suspicion, reconciliation, and reorientation. The initial response was and still is that of suspicion and interrogation. The prevailing definition of sustainable development in terms of intergenerational equity in the use of natural resources is debunked for concealing the ground reality of interregional disparities. It is argued that the developed countries comprising roughly 20% of the global population control about 80% natural resources of the world, and it is they who have been the biggest energy consumers and the biggest pollutant emitters. Further, the very goal of sustainable development is challenged by pointing out that it shows a kind of development in which one sixth of the earth's population enjoys a

disproportionate five- sixths of its wealth. More pointedly: it asks: sustainable for whom? Additionally it is contended that the overall stress on ecological sustainability is not without a purpose, as it diverts attention from the question of socio-cultural unsustainability of the prevailing capitalist mode of development. For all these reasons, sustainable development is viewed as a game plan, a clever design, a bogey, nay a conspiracy of the developed capitalist nations to stall the development, or at least slow down its pace, so as to keep them in a state of perpetual dependency.

When framing policies for making trade and the environment mutually compatible, it is important to understand the complexity of their interlinkages, particularly when they are juxtaposed against development. Trade liberalization may under some circumstances be beneficial to the environment by, for instance, improving resource allocation, but under other circumstances it may exacerbate existing environmental problems. Similarly, environmental rules in developed countries may constitute barriers to trade and imply onerous adjustments for developing countries in some instances, but in others may provide an opportunity to improve the environment and simultaneously gain trade benefits.

George Bernard Shaw (Nobel Laureate 1925) once said, if you and me, each have an apple and exchange those, we will still be left with only one apple but if we exchange each other's ideas, then each of us will have two ideas. Extending this point further would mean sharing ideas, knowledge and experience with one another paves way not only for more learning, but also helps in working out better approaches to problems at hand. It is our conviction that academic ideas be integrated if they are to be translated into feasible actions. Such an approach is required for a theme like sustainable development, which is truly an interdisciplinary subject.

Sustainable Development like Globalisation has become a buzzword. It has assumed importance of an avowed goal to be achieved not only at the national level, but also at the international level particularly after the Earth Summit held at Rio de Janeiro, where world leaders committed themselves to the goal of Sustainable Development. The global community is further warned by the Living Planet Report 2004- we no longer live within the sustainable limits of the planet, and that "the time to act is now." Defined as "improving the quality of human life while living within the carrying capacity of supportive ecosystems." Or defined in any other acceptable perspective, sustainable development is analytically a difficult term.

The concept of sustainable development though designed to achieve a desired balance between

economic growth and environmental preservation has been defined in many ways suggesting different interpretations. One finds many terms like sustained, survivable development, weak sustainability, strong sustainability, sensible sustainability etc to explain the term sustainable development. In all such definitions, the symptoms of sustainability as discussed in all these terms is more or less the same. These include deforestation, greenhouse effect, climate change, ozone depletion, atmospheric acidification, toxic pollution, biological species extinction, depletion of non- renewable resources and other natural capitals and so on.

Sustainable development aims at accelerating development in an environmentally responsible manner keeping in mind the intra generational and intergenerational equity requirements. For analytical purposes, Sustainable Development brings in the scope of "environmental accounting" into the development policy framework. This requires that the national income or GNP must be adjusted for (a) depreciation of manufactured capital (b) depreciation of environment capital (c) the expenditure required for restoring environment capital and (d) expenditure required for averting destruction of environment.

Any discussion on sustainable development has to focus on environment and economy relationship, which is not only close and interconnected, but it is two- way as all economic activities either affects or are affected by environmental resources [Economic Survey 1999]. Almost all economic activities, such as, processing and manufacturing, mining and extraction, consumption, transport, and disposal affect environment in three ways: (i) they change the stock of natural resources through direct consumption, (ii) they add stress to the existing environmental systems, and (iii) they introduce waste to environmental media which require treatment. In any situation, supply and quality of natural resources would influence the productivity of an economic system.

Environmental resources, on the other hand get closely linked to economic activities through three different but related channels: (a) natural resources are used as inputs into production; (b) production process generates waste related to the environment's assimilative capacity, and (c) they are directly consumed as life support services and for aesthetic amenities. The natural and environmental resources such as water, soil, air, biological, forest and fisheries resources thus are important productive assets. Their quality helps determine the productivity of the economy. The economic management of the environment and the environmental quality has important repercussions on the efficient working of the economy.

The Brundtland definition while highlighting the need to balance the interests of current and future generations, does not say much on the needs or its implications. Recent definitions explicitly rely on three aspects of sustainability: economic, environmental and social. It is defined as a process of environmentally responsible human development that discourages the present generation to become better off at the cost of future generations. This definition contains five important points: (a) the right to development must be fulfilled to meet the basic needs; (b) the overall quality of life is critically influenced by the quality of environment (c) the natural resources represent a common heritage and must be preserved; (d) the needs of the future generations are equally important and should be taken care off; (e) the process of sustainable development cannot be divorced from the existing state of economic development policy framework and problems including the poverty, population growth, urbanization and rural development the technology used the social framework of the country and the institutional structure of the global economy.

Sustainable development as a desirable objective requires a dynamic, participatory and an interdisciplinary approach. Given the tangible damage to the nature and the disharmony between man and nature with emerging uncertainty over the life support which we may all have to witness once the society undergoes a radical shift in the nature, structure and composition of an ecosystem, we must take into account depletion and degradation of natural capital on the one hand, and follow people oriented participatory and interdisciplinary approach to achieve the goals of sustainable development on the other.

Globalisation no doubt has promoted open societies and open economies along with encouraging relatively freer exchange of goods, ideas and knowledge, and creativity and entrepreneurship in many parts of the world; but let us also not forget that during the course of globalisation, economic risks of the developing countries have become serious and real. Global economic rules and institutions, which can easily prevail over social rules, social structures and social institutions of developing countries, are being questioned by current global realities. Trade in manufactures is liberalized, while agriculture remains protected. Goods and capital move much freely across borders than people do. In times of crisis, developed countries have wider options for macroeconomic policy, while developing countries are constrained by demands for adjustment. International policies are too often implemented without regard for national specificities. Unbalanced global rules not only reinforce initial inequalities, but also accentuate them further. The world trading

system often favours the rich and the mighty, and can easily work against the poor and the weak, irrespective these are countries, companies or communities. The fundamental problems of poverty, unemployment, exclusion, inequality, ill health, corruption are still widespread in developing countries and pushing them towards collapse.

With global governance reaching a critical juncture and the process of globalisation lacking means to keep the balance between democracy and markets, and the market success and failure promoting the attitude of "the winner takes all" has become the ultimate standard of behaviour all around. Globalization induced structural changes in the domestic policy framework, without ensuring social and economic provision for adjustments adequately has brought uncertainty and insecurity to workers and small business everywhere. Provisioning while preserving Earth's natural resources requires new way of thinking, innovation in technology, people oriented business practices, international laws, institutions and governance which are sensitive to the needs of developing countries.

There is emerging imbalance between the economy, society and the polity. As the economy is getting formally global, the informal local economy is also growing simultaneously, but social, political and civil society institutions largely remain local, national or regional. This state may not be unsustainable without endangering the future of large number of people and communities particularly in the poorest pocket of the world subverting social justice with growing polarization.

The goal of sustainable development can be achieved only if both the developed as well as the developing countries work together. The developed countries have to come forward to understand socio-economic realities of the poor and develop sensitivities to contribute to sustainable international political economy order. The developing countries, on the other hand, need to undertake serious socio economic measures to build up capacities, improve policy making environment, governance and social attitude towards life.

Sustainable development can be best ensured by developing a holistic perspective systematically as it would allow us to build up the idea of 'sustainability' both as a reliable guide for making suitable choices and as a basis for decision making that does not restrict but in fact encourages a more participatory recourse to a wide range of strategies. The policy making mechanism must take into account human rights, equality of opportunities, and equitable sharing and governance of global commons.

At the heart of sustainable development lies the challenge of reconciling three deeply-held set of values: economic growth, social vitality and ecological integrity. For each there may be an optimal scale horizon; tensions among them vary over time and across cultures. These are minimum scales of functional efficiency which may be essential for economic growth as enterprises negotiate a viable niche for their products within global and national scales. There are also minimum thresholds of size, income and interaction which may be essential for social vitality at local and national scales. Tolerance limits on human intervention in natural processes, or minimum conditions for bio-reproduction are still matters of heated debate; today ecologists are increasingly convinced that human elements must be included in definitions of ecological integrity.

The ultimate harvest of research and action on sustainable development in western countries may be the rediscovery of Gandhian philosophy. Increasingly, people acknowledge the integrity of the earth and its diverse cultures and the need for common norms of behaviour with respect to environment. Changes of mindscape may be more daunting than changes in landscape, especially at a time when changes are occurring at scales (global) and time frame (long-term) which are beyond the grasp of individual experience.

When one begins to unpack “sustainable development” either from a practical or theoretical perspective, it becomes clear that the concept is rife with vagaries and ambiguities. Regardless of its fuzzy conceptual baggage, sustainable development has become a “universal idea” in a wide array of academic disciplines and practical circles. The concept has been discovered by a number of academics interested in the connections and contradictions between policy studies, environmental and science studies, resource use, planning and the like. At the same time, development practitioners representing groups, places, and institutions in both developed and developing countries have embraced sustainable development as a phrase that is useful for achieving a variety of objectives.

Because of its widespread use, sustainable development is a difficult subject for critical analysis. More often than not the product of such an analysis is a series of more complicated questions about what “sustainable” means or on whose terms should “development” be understood. Sustainable development is a concept with the potential to transcend the political and discursive stalemates that arise as individuals, communities, states, and international development or organizations try to achieve the dual goals of environmental conservation and economic growth. A critical geographic

perspective, reveals that sustainable development is best understood as a “multifaceted phenomenon of global proportions.”

All proponents of sustainable development agree that society needs to change, though there are major debates as to the nature of sustainable development, the changes necessary and the tools and actors for these changes. There is no such thing as a single unified philosophy of sustainable development; there is no sustainable development ‘ism’. There is a fundamental divide between the supporters of the status quo and a transformation in their concept of and approach to sustainable development. The status quo approach sees change through management, top-down and incremental, of the existing structures of decision- making. The transformation view is that change will be mainly through political action working both in and outside the existing structures. In most of the world, the issues of sustainable development are not at the top of the world’s policy agenda, even issues such as climate change or mass starvation do not dominate the news or political debate. However, the challenges at the core of sustainable development, the environment and equity, will force it up the political agenda.

The usual model for sustainable development is of three separate but connected rings of environment, society and economy, with the implication that each sector is, at least in part, independent of the others. Defenders of the status quo see the root cause of a lack of sustainable development in the lack of knowledge and appropriate mechanisms, rather than fundamental linkage. This view allows for trade-offs between environmental and social issues, whether it is some pollution is acceptable to increase growth, or loss of some pastureland for a park, or clean air for jobs. These trade-offs indicate a continued conceptual divide between the environment and humanity. The reality is that humanity is dependent on the environment, with society existing within, and dependent on, the environment and economy exists within the society. Human beings live within the environment and depend on it for survival and well-being, we cannot ignore the environment.

Although open to many interpretations, sustainable development has gained wide currency. It crucially embraces the key issues for humanity of how to ensure lives worth living and our relation with the planet and our relations with each other. Rather than discarding the concept of sustainable development, it provides a useful framework in which to debate the choices for humanity. It is argued that sustainable development needs to be based on appreciation of the close links between the environment and society with feedback loops both ways and that social and environmental equity are fundamental ideas.

Given the need for fundamental change, a deep connection between human life and the environment and a common linkage of power structures that exploit both people and planet I would argue that transformation is essential. However, it is not seen as necessary or sensible to make an exclusive commitment to transformation. Reform now is better

than nothing and transformation may not be immediately feasible. However, whilst engaging with government and business for reforms, the main focus should be to raise the issues, successful mobilization of the media and to build coalitions linking researchers, popular protests and direct action.

Author: Priyamvada Mishra