

Sustainable development

Adams, W.M. 2001. Green Development: Environment and Sustainability in the Third World (volume 2). London: Routledge

Altieri, Miguel A. (ed.) 1987. *Agroecology: The Scientific Basis of Alternative Agriculture*. Boulder: Westview Press. (chapters 4, “Generating sustainable technologies,” and chapter 16, “Toward sustainable agriculture”)

Bebbington, Anthony 2000. Reencountering development: livelihood transitions and place transformations in the Andes. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 90(3): 495-520.

Neither poststructural nor neoliberal interpretations of development capture the full extent and complexity of rural transformations in the Andes. Poststructural critiques tend to view development as a process of cultural destruction and homogenization, while neoliberal interpretations identify a different development ‘failure’ that inheres in ‘inefficient’ patterns of resource use, and the ‘nonviability’ of large parts of the Andean peasantry. In each case, the state is seen as a problem: as an agent of dominating modernization, or as a brake on market-led transformation. The paper reviews these positions in the light of the transformations in governance, livelihoods, and landscape that have occurred in the regions of Colta, Guamote, and Otavalo, all centers of indigenous Quichua populations in the Ecuadorian Andes. These transformations question the accuracy of arguments about cultural destruction or nonviability. Instead they suggest that people have built economically viable livelihood strategies that, while neither agricultural nor necessarily rural, allow people to sustain a link with rural places, and in turn allow the continued reproduction of these places as distinctively Quichua. The cases also point to the increased indigenous control of political, civil, and economic institutions and the important roles that development interventions, including those of the state, have played in fostering this control. In sum, this suggests the need for more nuanced interpretations of development that emphasize human agency and the room to maneuver that can exist within otherwise constraining institutions and structures. It also suggests the value of placing livelihood and the coproduction of place at the center of any interpretation of the processes and effects of rural development.

Bebbington, Anthony and Thomas Perreault 1999. Social capital, development, and access to resources in highland Ecuador. *Economic Geography*, 75(4): 395-418.

Brown, Ed 2000. Social movements, the state and civil society. Pp. 171-190 in Mohan, Giles, Ed Brown, Bob Milward and Alfred B. Zack-Williams (eds.) 2000. *Structural Adjustment: Theory, Practice and Impacts*. London: Routledge.

Chambers, Robert 1983. *Rural Development: Putting the Last First*. Essex: Longman Scientific and Technical.

Costanza, Robert et al. 1997. The value of the world’s ecosystem services and natural capital. *Nature*, 387: 253-260

The services of ecological systems and the natural capital stocks that produce them are critical to the functioning of the Earth’s life-support system. They

contribute to human welfare, both directly and indirectly, and therefore represent part of the total economic value of the planet. We have estimated the current economic value of 17 ecosystem services for 16 biomes, based on published studies and a few original calculations. For the entire biosphere, the value (most of which is outside the market) is estimated to be in the range of US\$16-54 trillion (10^{12}) per year, with an average of US\$33 trillion per year. Because of the nature of the uncertainties, this must be considered a minimum estimate. Global gross national product total is around US\$18 trillion per year.

Fernando, Jude 2003. The power of unsustainable development: What is to be done? *Annals, American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 590: 6-34.

Regardless of the state of theory and practice in sustain-able development, there is no doubt that an ethical/moral imperative exists to address socioeconomic inequality and degradation of the environment. To realize the goals of sustainable development, it must be liberated from its embeddedness in the ideology and institutional parameters of capitalism. This calls for a departure from the current reformist character of development theory and the practice and articulation of an alternative vision of political economy, as well as a politically strong commitment to realizing it. This endeavor should be global in scope: not in an attempt to create a homogeneous world order but rather to prevent social diversity from being reconfigured and disciplined according to the imperatives of capital. The state must play a pivotal role if social transformative efforts are to bear fruit and break through the impasse capitalism has imposed on realizing the goals of sustainable development.

Fox, Jonathan 1996. How does civil society thicken? The political construction of social capital in rural Mexico. *World Development*, 24(6): 1089-1103.

The growth of the building-block organizations of an autonomous civil society in an authoritarian environment depends on the "political construction" of social capital. Social capital can be coproduced by state and local societal actors or by the interaction of local societal actors and external actors in civil society. Social capital may also be produced from below, but external allies still turn out to be crucial in the ability of such organizations to survive. An examination of variety in political dynamics across different regions and over time in rural Mexico provides ample illustration of these general points.

Marc Gunther, "Tree Huggers, Soy Lovers, and Profits," *Fortune*, June 23, 2003

As an advocate for social responsibility and DuPont's corporate vice president for safety, health, and environment, Paul Tebo is trying to help transform DuPont from an oil-and-chemicals company into an eco-friendly life-sciences firm. Its new goal is to own a collection of businesses that can go on forever without depleting natural resources. So, for example, the company spun off its massive Conoco oil-and-gas unit five years ago and used the proceeds to buy Pioneer Hi-Bred International, whose seeds produce not only food for people and livestock but renewable materials for commercial uses--turning corn into stretch T-shirts, for example. DuPont is at the cutting edge--and maybe over the edge--of the movement to make corporations more socially responsible. At DuPont, which got its start in 1802 making gunpowder, that now means producing soy protein, creating biodegradable material for plastic silverware, and hiring the former executive director of Greenpeace as a high-level consultant. But corporate social responsibility isn't simple. To the degree that business executives spend more money than they need to--for delivery vehicles with hybrid engines, or to pay higher wages in

developing countries, or even to donate company funds to charity--they are spending shareholders' money to further their own agendas. The trouble is, none of this has paid off in a tangible way for investors, at least not yet.

Gupta, Akhil 1998. *Postcolonial Developments: Agriculture in the Making of Modern India*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Harvey, David 1974. Population, resources, and the ideology of science. *Economic Geography*, 50(3): 256-277.

Healy, Kevin 2001. *Llamas, Weavings, and Organic Chocolate: Multicultural Grassroots Development in the Andes and Amazon of Bolivia*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.

Hecht, Susanna B. 1987. The evolution of agroecological thought. pp. 1-20 in Miguel Altieri (ed.) *Agroecology: The Scientific Basis of Alternative Agriculture*. Boulder: Westview Press.

Knight, Richard L. and T. Luke George 1995. New approaches, new tools: conservation biology. Pp. 279-295 in Richard L. Knight and Sarah F. Bates (eds.), *A New Century for Natural Resource Management*, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Loomis, John B. 1995. Shifting and broadening the economic paradigm toward natural resources. Pp. 221-234 in Richard L. Knight and Sarah F. Bates (eds.), *A New Century for Natural Resource Management*, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Mohan, Giles 2000. The environmental aspects of adjustment. Pp. 95-116 in Mohan, Giles, Ed Brown, Bob Milward and Alfred B. Zack-Williams (eds.) 2000. *Structural Adjustment: Theory, Practice and Impacts*. London: Routledge.

Myers, Norman and Jennifer Kent 2004. *The New Consumers: The Influence of Affluence on the Environment*. Washington, DC: Island Press

Nagar, Richa 1998. The difference that gender makes. pp. 50-60 in Philip Porter and Eric S. Sheppard, *A World of Difference: Society, Nature, Development*. New York: Guilford.

Peet, Richard with Elaine Hartwick 1999. *Theories of Development*. New York: The Guilford Press

Peet, Richard and Michael Watts 1996. Liberation ecologies: development, sustainability and environment in an age of market triumphalism. Pp. 1-45 in Richard Peet and Michael Watts (eds.) *Liberation Ecologies: Environment, Development, Social Movements* (London, Routledge)

Pickett, S.T.A. and Richard S. Ostfeld 1995. The shifting paradigm in ecology. Pp. 261-277 in Richard L. Knight and Sarah F. Bates (eds.), *A New Century for Natural Resource Management*, Washington, DC: Island Press.

Sneddon, Christopher S. 2000. 'Sustainability' in ecological economics, ecology and livelihoods: a review. *Progress in Human Geography*, 24(4): 521-549.