

SUSTAINABILITY ¿OF WHAT DEVELOPMENT?

Javier M. Iguíñiz Echeverría*

Index

Introduction

I. Sustainability and Development: first approaches to a tension

- A. Economic Development vs. Environment
- B. Universality and Particularity, Present and Future in Development

II. Conceptions of Development

- A. The increase of productivity
- B. The reduction of inequality
- C. Human Poverty as a Problem: Basic Needs.
- D. From Need to Freedom

Extensions as a way of concluding

Introduction

The problem with “sustainable development” lies not in its impossibility or in the difficulties of sustaining but in the nature of the development that is to be sustained. Hence, the most recent preoccupation for the meaning of development. There are many diagnoses concerning the defects of economic development resulting from this preoccupation and they vary in how radically they question such development. There are, for instance, those that are “anti-development” even though they lack an audience. Most of the concepts of development relate to very widely accepted goals and human aspirations. However, when we introduce environmental issues the criticism to most of the more common views of development acquire new impetus.

What is worth sustaining? Sustainability of what development? Is then our question. The answer, following Amartya Sen’s approach to development and human development in general, will be that we have to view different things (real freedoms), and through different means (public deliberation). In this text, after a general framework about the difficult relationship between economic development and environment, and in order to establish their respective sustainability we will review, following Sen, the following four conceptions of development: increase in productivity, greater income equality, basic needs satisfaction, and capability expansion. Our own effort, aside from selecting some quotes, will be to suggest the need for a reflection on the diversity of connections between each approach to development and environmental concerns. To move further we would have to consider more complex issues related to the view of development as the expansion of freedoms. The question about the meaning of development is even more difficult to answer if we accept Sen’s suggestion that the precise meaning of development has to be created in the midst of the public and

*Full Professor of the Economics Department of the *Pontificia Universidad Católica del Perú*, Lima, Peru. Since this is not a definitive version, please suggestions to: jiguini@pucp.edu.pe Presented in Conference TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT: WHAT PERSPECTIVE? Sanata Dharma University, Yogyakarta July 20th, 2009.

democratic debate in the diverse societies of the world. In the last instance, the importance of the sustainment of development lies in the fact that human development is, although not only, an end in itself.

I. Sustainability and Development: Some Approximations to a Tension

In this first part we shall begin with the relatively thorough vision of Denis Goulet, who rejects that vision of development as wholly irreconcilable with the protection of nature and still provides a sharp criticism against current economic development. We shall then move on to the attempt made by Anand and Sen to conciliate environmental preoccupations with the universalist view of rights today and in the future, with the care of specific groups, particularly the poor. We hope this is a good enough starting point to elaborate on some of the important issues involved.

A. Economic development vs. the environment

Denis Goulet presents the problem as follows¹

“...the categorical imperative is clear and cruel. We must save nature or we humans shall die. The biggest threat to nature - with the danger of the irreversible destruction of its capacity for regeneration – comes from “development”. This same development is also the biggest culprit of the “underdevelopment” of hundred of millions of people”. (Goulet 1999: 121)²

Despite the importance of this common origin of the problem of poverty and environmental risks, the struggle against poverty and the struggle against the destruction of the environment do not always converge and correspond to two ethical currents. As a matter of fact, the author states:

“...the task of following the two ethical currents at the same time faces great difficulties; fundamental problems of language and of meaning, disagreements over diagnostics, discordant political preferences and contrary appreciations of values”. (Goulet 1999: 121)

Around ten years later Crocker puts it in this way:

“Those committed to ‘ecodevelopment’ or ‘sustainable development’ often fail to agree on what should be sustained as an *end in itself* and what should be maintained as an indispensable or merely *helpful means*. Nor do they agree on how to surmount conflicts among environmental and other competing values.” (2008: 48)

Confronting these difficulties for a dialogue, Goulet’s proposal is thorough because his way of facing that imperative consists in relativizing the three perspectives which he considers are at stake.

¹ Quotations from Goulet’s book are translations from the Spanish version.

² In a similar direction: “Yet, all too often in the process of development it is the poor who shoulder the heaviest burden. It is development itself that interferes with human development.” (Streeten 1994, 13)

“What is needed is an ample framework of dynamic synthesis, a philosophical vision that reconciles the passionate opposition between human freedom and the integrity of nature. To propose these themes with their due distinction, we have to articulate a conceptual scheme in which all the demands of the three different ethical values are relativized: justice, freedom and the respect of nature. None of these values are absolute; and most important, each one can only be defined according to its own limits in relation with the other two. (Goulet 1999: 121)

The need for an all encompassing vision of these diverse conventional approximations is a well known demand.

“When the picture as a whole is not contemplated, insoluble difficulties arise that are both theoretical and practical. It is necessary to look at the whole picture in order to transcend numerous apparent antinomies. The main one is the supposed contradiction between anthropocentric and cosmocentric conceptions of the universe”. (Goulet 1999: 122)

From an also ethical analysis, but closer to the debate from an economic approach, Anand and Sen reach a similar conclusion.

B. Universality and particularity, present and future in development

As Anand and Sen remind us, the sensibility for environmental sustainability has a universalist accent. It is the right to life of “the whole human gender” that is at stake and in question.³ The dominant concern is the viability of future generations. Actually, many times the struggle against some environmental damages is a question of today’s life and death of very specific groups, as peasants, and urban dwellers. That is why if it is the whole population, and future dangers that matter most some warnings are needed:

“The language and rhetoric as well as the reality of rights in the contemporary world are often characterized by the neglect of particular sections of the populations –less privileged ethnic groups, exploited classes, sequestered women.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2029)

Sustainability is a concern that almost always stresses the relation between present and future. Poverty, however, stresses the sustainability of the present.

“A newborn child may be doomed to a life of extreme brevity or intense misery if that child happens to be borne in a ‘wrong class,’ in a ‘wrong country,’ or to be of the ‘wrong sex.’” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2030)

We should then consider a more complex framework where universal and particular impacts are relevant for today and for tomorrow. The present is not merely a platform that is of interest because of the future that it prepares. It includes, though not only, that which is sought to be sustained.

³ We should distinguish these from the interest in, for instance, global warming.

“The moral value of *sustaining* what we now have depends on the *quality* of what we have, and the entire approach of sustainable development directs us as much toward the present as toward the future. There is, in principle, no basic difficulty in broadening the concept of human development to accommodate the claims of the future generations and the urgency of environmental protection.” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2030)

But this view is the beginning of another road. Goulet’s opinion pushes us towards a wider conceptual framework in order to incorporate all of these concerns into the discussion.

“... it is particularly important to place the concern about equity in the contemporary world and equity in the future in a generally integrated framework.” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2040)

These authors recognize that “what is to be sustained is not always straightforward” (Anand y Sen 2000: 2029) but aim to clarify the point by starting their critique of economic development from a human development approach. Let us deal with four views of development, and relate them in a preliminary way to poverty and environmental concerns.

II. Conceptions of development

The sustaining of human life in the planet constitutes a concern that can be associated with the criticism of a conception of development that has opulence as its success criteria, and productivity as the key to achieve it.

A. The increase of productivity

The most important and classic approach to economic development is the one that defines it as an increase in productivity. We will spend more space dealing with this particular approach than with the next two. The question being asked by this approach is: *how many goods are produced by labor?* More technically: How many things are produced by a person per unit of time, let us say an hour, or a day or a year? Goods are the result of an activity. The criticism of economic development from environmentalist perspectives has this concept of development as its privileged target. The growing use of natural resources and the disposing of residue that threaten the reproduction and the healthy use of such resources are the result of a conception of development that has based its legitimacy in the increase of productivity. Things are the outcome of the human activity we call labor. *The poor person is a producer; one that produces too little goods in spite of working hard.* He or she, then, suffers of, and from, low productivity. The particular aspect of the productivity increase that is under attack is, more obviously, the material or physical component of production and consumption. Industrial development is, with good reasons, viewed as the most dangerous aspect for environment. Let us reflect on this.

Actually, it is not that such an increase is in itself negative for the reproduction of the environmental conditions of human life or a danger to life as a whole, but the way in which it is being carried out as of late that has been questioned. For example, a rise in productivity, even of the actual type in technological terms, would not be necessarily

harmful to nature and dangerous for life in the planet if it were to be used to radically shorten working hours. Or also in the case that such society would be conformed to a lower production and consumption magnitude in the most destructive of these components of productive activity. The environmental problem resides in the increases of productivity and productive diversity that are achieved by quickly raising the volume of material production and the consequent use of natural resources. The problem would seem to be in the type of goods and services produced, and that a change towards non material commodities would protect nature. But the problem is deeper, and more related to values and institutions. The massive exploitation of natural resources is stimulated by the combination of an unlimited objective, such as profit, and competition for profit and, in consequence, for the necessary resources to attain such ends. The solution is therefore, not merely to move toward less destructive forms of activity; changing therefore the industrial composition of the Gross Domestic Product of the countries. A variant, complementary, is the change in the input composition (fertilizers and energy for instance).

Viewing this problem from the consumption side, it can also be said that such a way of increasing profits is aided by the cultivation of and “insatiability” for goods of high environmental impact such as the enlargement of family motor vehicles. This type of analysis would lead us to very *vogue* matters concerning lifestyles, but it is not the course that we shall privilege in this essay.⁴

We consider that Sen’s work over the last few years has targeted the same objective from another angle. In this section we shall look at his way of doing so, and the links that are made with environmental concerns. From an ethical perspective, the criticism consists in reminding that the interest for the maximization of material wealth does not take sufficiently into account people or the differences between them. It is the opulence of the whole of society, the GDP per capita, which weighs more heavily in the utilitarian perspective.

“...the fundamental difficulty with the approach of wealth maximization and with the tradition of judging success by overall opulence of a society is a deep-seated failure to come to terms with the universalist unbiasedness needed for an adequate understanding of social justice and human development.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2031)

This criticism is, partly, similar to that of environmentalist ones which do not take into account the direst situations of inequality today, and also to the ones which we have alluded above. It is however, different to the criticism that comes from the exhaustion or destruction of natural resources. In this sense, Sen could be situated in Goulet’s categorization among those who privilege the matter of development-underdevelopment, and see it as a mainly social phenomenon. For example, hunger is a problem that has little to do with food production. As Sen points out:

“Widespread hunger in the world is primarily related to poverty. It is not principally connected with food production at all. Indeed, over the course of the last quarter of a century, the prices of the principal staple food (such as rice, wheat, etc.) have fallen by much more than half in ‘real’ terms. If there is more demand for food, in the present state of

⁴ See, for instance, Segal (1999), Lane (1991), Goodwin, Ackerman and Kiron (1997). More recently, Crocker (2008: chapter 7,

world technology and availability of resources, the production will correspondingly increase.

The demand for food is restrained mainly by lack of income. And the same factor explains the large number of people who are hungry across the world.” (Sen 2002)

Indeed, if one looks at reality and accepts as a given all social, political and economic restrictions; if one looks at a producer and his/her family isolated from society or as members of a society composed of those who are just as hungry as them, one can say that if nature were richer, less depleted, that family could avoid hunger thanks to their own efforts. Sometimes in literature, one has the impression that the conception of the relation between nature and people is isolated from the social context in which both are found. That is true especially when we move from the provision of fish, to the teaching how to fish, and finally, to the environmental care needed for the fish to be there.

In any case, and in more general terms, the angle of entrance in his criticism to opulence is clear, and paradigmatic.

“The most basic problem with the opulence view is its comprehensive failure to take note of the need for impartial concern in looking at the real opportunities individuals have. The exclusive concentration only on incomes at the aggregate or individual levels ignores the plurality of influences that differentiate the opportunities of people, and implicitly assumes away the variations –related to personal characteristics as well as the social and physical environment- in the possibility of converting the means of income into the ends of good and livable lives which people have reason to value.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2031)

But, following these authors, the vision of development from opulence does not have to be the one that makes it an end. One can recognize, as the majorities of world will, that things, though not always, are a necessary medium for personal and social development in a more ample sense than the economic. However, the record of efficiency of per capita economic growth, which we can consider for our purposes as the equivalent of the increase of productivity, in achieving an adequate level of human development is not as impeccable as would have been desired by those we can call “productivists”. Poverty survives in an excessive magnitude where even high growth has been achieved, and continues to be a serious enough problem even in some of the richest countries. Hence the concern for distribution, and the struggle against poverty that inspires “distributionists”, and those that look for the satisfaction of basic needs. No doubt that the effect of per capita economic growth over the purchasing power to the wide majorities of the people in a country depends on how income is distributed and on what it is spent.

Its efficacy is conditioned by the magnitude of those involved in the increase of productivity; that is, of the more or less “wide social base” of growth, and of how effectively the national income is spent on education, health services, and the feeding of the non-involved, particularly children.⁵ Let us look at these two elements now.

⁵ The awareness concerning insufficiency of economic growth that predominates in Latin America and the Caribbean has lead to repeated reminders that the quality of growth matters. (ECLAC 2007).

B. The reduction of inequality

Growing equality has been the answer to the critique of the productivity approach that raises the issue of the inequality of the income distribution that is generally associated with the reduced and slow dissemination of productivity increases to other activities and to other countries. The question being asked here is: *How equally are the goods being distributed among consumers?* Obviously, it depends mainly on the distribution of income, of purchasing power. Most, by far, will consider that this is a valuable goal. The poor, in this approach will be somebody that receives a very small proportion of the whole product while a few receive the lion's share or, at least, the possibility to have access to it. The poor person is an income recipient, and through the purchasing power, a consumer. If he or she is not a consumer, then one way or the other, through their non-participation in the market, they do not exist for the economy. Famines have been explained by Sen considering this entitlement problem. The assumption is that consumers are basically alike in terms of the right to receive some income from society, and not merely as owners of capital and labourers.

However, from an environmentalist perspective, the reduction of income inequality can also be seen as a danger to present and future generations. The dominant interest after the proposals of redistribution, or of a less inequitable growth is the homogenization of consumption, and the growth of the size of the market. In this respect it is obvious that an increase in consumption of the current poor can turn into greater pollution, depredation, etc. Not all improvements in income distribution are acceptable from environmentalist's sensitivity. It is when consumption diversifies and grows adopting the currently dominant guidelines coming from the higher income strata that the effect on nature is relatively greater. It is usual to remind us that the equalizing "upward" of consumption in countries as China and India, could put in danger the sustainability of human life on the planet. In that way, neither the success in the growth of production, nor in the redistribution that has that cultural guideline is convenient for those who put forward environmental arguments. It is therefore no surprising that there is a tension between the followers of economic development and environmentalists.

But in more general terms, the criticism of progress understood from an opulence approach within the world of economists is the permanence of goods and services, and the "having" of them as an evaluative space of such progress. But, what if instead, efforts were focused in the attainment of growth in consumption but without pretending to adopt the guidelines of the highest income sectors; would there be problems for sustainability? We have not seen studies dealing with such question. However, one way of searching in that direction is concentrating in the 'sufficient to survive' consumption of the poor. This approach is the one that we shall look at next.

C. Human poverty as a concrete problem: basic needs

Another question should be added to the two previous ones. Let us assume that the size of production is increasing, and that inequality of income and consumption is declining. Things are, no doubt, at least from an economic viewpoint improving. But one thing is to improve, and another quite different is to be well. You can reduce the fever and still have enough of it to still be unhealthy. The "basic needs" approach to development asks about when you are not healthier but healthy. The question being asked is: *Are production and distribution of goods enough to keep you well?*

An important point here is that the approach makes explicit something that was not in the productivity and distributive perspectives. The answer to the question has to

be looked for in the human being. For instance, how much protein is enough? The answer cannot come from the economy; that is from the world of goods and services. It is in the biological and social nature of human beings that lies the answer. The economy explicitly confront criteria that are outside its realm. In an exclusively economic view it was enough to produce goods more productively and to distribute them better to say that society was progressing. The human being was in the background, but not in a very concrete way. For instance, there was not a person, needy of specific goods and services. Most of the times, it was the whole society that mattered, the aggregation of individual desires, and searches for happiness. Furthermore, development was understood more as a process than as an outcome; more in terms of efficiency than of effectiveness. In the development perspective behind this new question the poor is, evidently, the one that is not nourished, healthy, minimally educated, etc.

This most direct concern for poverty results in a more explicitly anthropocentric vision of priorities. Concretely, intermediations of an economic nature are left aside and the effort against poverty is partially freed from the list of intermediate objectives that distract policies against poverty, such as the increase of the average per capita product of the country, or further still, profit. The basic needs approach constitutes an advance in respect to previous conceptions, for it places the welfare of the person, and in particularly the poor person, as criteria of progress. It does so in a direct way by establishing goals such as nutrition, basic education, etc., that depend, as mentioned before, on human, that is biological and social criteria. It is against them that economics finds itself, and it is in relation to them that economic growth, the property regime and other aspects of the economic social relations acquire legitimacy. We are not before an approach that as in the case of the increase of productivity and the reduction of inequalities are approximations that are aggregative, and in which the individual ends up benefiting from macroeconomic measures that are generally impersonal, and most of the time, as a sub-product of the search for other objectives like the power of the national economy in the world market.

The tension between the basic needs approach and the concern for sustainability is a well-known one. It can be seen by looking at some expressions by Paul Streeten, the co-founder of the basic needs approach. His distance with respect to environmentalists is explicit. According to Streeten, when it comes to sustainability, he's not sure whether one has to⁶:

“be worried in maintaining the constitutive elements of welfare or its determinants, the ends or the means. More clearly, what should worry us are the constitutive elements: the health, welfare and prosperity of the people and not how many tons of minerals, how many trees or animal species. Truly, some writings on the matter confuse both. If in the process of curing ovarian or other type of cancer, one has to reduce the number of (*yew trees*) in the Pacific (or even the owls that inhabit them) in order to produce the medicine *taxol*, priority will have to be given to people over trees. Logically, some would like to attribute to “nature” the value of an end. This perspective can be called ethical environmentalism in contrast to prudent environmentalism.” (Taken from Goulet 1999: 126)

⁶ This is a translation to English from a previous translation to Spanish of the original text. Next version will correct this.

This does not mean that the author does not incorporate the environmental vision. For example, in another publication he will point out that: “The resources freed from military expenditures can be devoted to development, environmental protection, and poverty reduction.” (Streeten 1994: 111) For him, the conciliation of approaches is an agreement between different interest groups.

“Are there conflicts between full employment, sustainable environment and development? There is a need to bring together the interests of workers, environment activists and those concerned with development and poverty eradication. We have to avoid peace groups alienating the labor movement by asking for the shutting down of factories.” (Streeten 1994: 111)

Again we are before an “exit” sign allowing us to escape from narrow approximations to the problem, such as in Goulet, and Anand and Sen; in this case, in the widening of interests to take into account. But the contradiction is not always necessary and the struggle for the environment can be favorable to the poor.

“In other cases, however, the interests of local elites coincide with those of the poor, and decentralization then will lead to reform. In India, communities have joined forces to protect themselves against invasion by outsiders who wanted to denude their forests and pollute their rivers. Their defense cut across class lines and decentralization worked for the benefit of the poor.” (Streeten 1994: 99-100)

Even more so, the environment is one of the pillars that serve as a support for:

“People-friendly markets”[, which] are “efficient, labour-intensive, environmentally benign technologies.” (Streeten 1994: 62)

But the search for conciliation is not a matter of pragmatism, integration of several interests, and efficiency in the struggle against poverty. New development perspectives, with which authors such as Streeten coincide to a large degree, are more ambitious.

D. From Needs to Freedom

Humans are humans because aspire to a lot more than satisfying basic needs. Animals fight to conquer some very basic needs satisfaction. Need satisfaction is required to achieve many properly human objectives. Amartya Sen has advanced the definition of development as the “expansion of capabilities”. Even though capabilities are of a specific kind of freedom, we can make for the present purposes, synonymous.

The basic idea, following Aristotle, is that development should be seen in terms of what a person “is” and “does”, not in terms of what they “have”. This is in clear contrast with the economy that concentrates in the production, distribution and consumption of goods. To repeat, “being” and “doing” is what matters.⁷

⁷ In an article on Sen and Gutierrez we have shown how coincident is this view of development with the one coming from the French School that was so important to Paul VI while writing *Populorum Progressio*.

In order to make more clear the contrast between this approach a dialogue with the economy we described and criticized above the question this approach asks to development let us simplify things. Let us assume that the most important activity is labor, and that the results of such activity are goods. This need not be the case since human activities are wider than the economic ones, and the results of those activities are not most of the time goods for the market, or even goods. For instance, care provided, friends cultivated, etc. are many times far from the economic realm. But let us stick to the narrowness suggested to facilitate the contrast between this approach and the previous ones, particularly the first one. With these simplifying assumptions in mind we can formulate the question this approach asks. *How much activity (labor) can be done with the help of the goods available to the individual?* Here, the goods are not the result but the input, while in the productivist approach they were the result of an activity, and the criterion to evaluate how good those results were. In that approach the activity was an input, the human input; here is the result. We can formulate the point asking about how much “doing” has been achieved with the “having”. In the productivist perspective, the opposite was the case.

Obviously, the effective “doing”, what people really do, that Sen calls “functioning”, following again to Aristotle, depends on how capable is the individual of doing things. The “capability” of a person refers to the real freedom an individual or group have which depends on many factors internal and external to the person or group as the abilities and endowments, the relevant institutional enabling context, and the existence or not of discrimination in such society, which imply some sort of values that are predominant.

What we usually refer to as “environment” can be seen as related to the freedom we have and will have. We cannot go deeper in this respect but there are no reasons to think that the expansion of freedom will be stopped by an improved environment. Clean rivers will allow not only fishing but many other amenities that will not be possible with polluted ones.

The expansion of capabilities understood in this ample sense makes goods in general, and among them the most ecologically dangerous goods, more clearly instruments of more important objectives than the goods themselves. Ecological problems may be seen as limiting human freedom, in spite of the fact that ecological care can be seen a limiting factor in some cases, and in the short run. We have the strong impression that this change in hierarchy helps reducing the ecological tensions we mentioned at the beginning of the presentation.

Anand and Sen point out that as opposed to the material content of development, human development can be considered as a very concrete mean for the caring of the environment to the degree in which the promoting of intellectual abilities and health constitutes a progress that not only respects nature but also makes possible new and less harmful options for material development in the future. (Anand and Sen 2000: 2039-40). More so, the encouragement of education and health services has a benefit that exceeds that which can result from the mere distribution of income in a given moment. Those authors remind us that human development is an end in itself and that it also constitutes a future demand for more human development which will remain being environmentally adequate.

“There is hardly any example in the world of the expansion of education and health being anything other than monotone: good education and good health seem to generate powerful demand for these opportunities (and more) for our children. This

is a relation that goes well beyond the redistribution of income to the poor at a given point of time-important though that is.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2038)

The instrumental value of “human capital” is not insignificant neither for the material vision of progress nor for that especially concerned with the environment. But the approach to the environmental problem from the perspective of human development as extension of freedom is more radical in the sense that the instrumentality of such capital, to the degree in which “capital” has an economic significance, is too restrictive for it is instrumental to the service of an economic goal such as in the increase of production.

Extensions as a way of concluding

We may conclude that the views of development that focus on “basic need satisfaction” and especially on “capability expansion” are less potentially conflictive with environmental concerns. By looking at what people “are” and “do” and not so much at what they “have”, the meaning of development becomes more compatible with the concern for the destruction of nature. (Sen 2000; Goulet 1999: 129-30)

Everything points out that this way of looking at development converges with the definition of sustainable foundational development that saw it as

“a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the orientation of technological evolution and the modification of institutions are in accordance and increase the current and future potential to satisfy human aspirations and needs.” (Commission 1988: 70)

One very important aspiration is precisely, freedom. Freedom of the poor is particularly urgent. It is useful to remember in this respect that needs was understood as “in particular the needs of the poor to which outstanding priority should be given” (Commission 1988: 67).

Future generations do not “demand” from us only one given level of welfare which we ought to take care starting from now. What Sen and others are bringing to the debate is not so much the problem of the means to achieve welfare but the meaning of human progress itself. The deeper discussion should not be about the means to reduce welfare deterioration now and in the future. The new search goes in at least two directions that very probably have radical consequences. One is that leading us more clearly to ends, alerting us not to take means as ends.

“The basic rationale of the human development approach ... lies in the fact that the constitutive elements of human development are closer to the shared human ends than are some of the more commonly-used criteria of progress, such as the growth of GNP per person.” (Anand and Sen 2000: 2039)

The second is that which alerts us about the richness and complexity of those human ends and goals. Sen insists in several works in that demands cannot be encapsulated in the criteria of the welfare economy, and that non self-interested behaviors have a place in the life of individuals and groups. It is not therefore adequate, at least it is not sufficient, to have a discussion about environmental concerns focused only on the present and the future in terms of the present and future self-interest and

welfare of individuals and groups. People want more than being better in welfare terms. Many may want to embrace objectives that do not improve their material well-being. That's the case of what Sen calls "commitment". In other perspectives could be called "gratuitousness".

"There is, thus, a nonwelfarist issue underlying the claims of future generations, which a welfarist conceptualization of sustainable development cannot fully capture." (Anand and Sen 2000: 2037)

This refers us then to the limitation of the economy to include a significant part of the considerations that have to do with the relation between people and groups and that which both have with future generations and with their social and natural environment. For instance, family dedication cannot be seriously understood in welfare terms. Life projects of individuals and groups are guided by a complex set of motivations that, as Sen insists, cannot be captured by calculations about the costs and benefits of particular alternatives.

To finish, we can talk of a change in development paradigm because the basic question has been radically altered; indeed, inverted; but also widely expanded in reach, something that reduces the concentration on goods as evaluative sphere of development.

Bibliography

Crocker, David

(2008) *Ethics of Global Development. Agency, Capability, and Deliberative Democracy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Goodwin, Neva

(1997) *The Consumer Society*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Goulet, Denis

(1999) *Ética del desarrollo. Guía Teórica y Práctica*. Madrid: IEPALA.

Harris, Jonathan

(1995) "Overview Essay". In: Krishnan, et. al.

Krishnan, Rajaram, Jonathan Harris y Neva R. Goodwin editors

(1995) *A Survey of Ecological Economics*. Washington D.C.: Island Press.

Sen Amartya

(2002) Interview on "Why half of the planet is hungry". In: *The Observer*, Sunday June 16.

Streeten, Paul

(1994) *Strategies for Human Development. Global Poverty and Unemployment*. Copenhagen: Handelshojskolens Forlag

(2001) *Globalization. ¿Threat or Opportunity?*. Copenhagen: Copenhagen Business School Press. Handelshojskolens Forlag.