



Sustainable Development And Human Development Challenges And Hopes

الدكتورة /شيري وليم سلامة

مدرس بقسم الهندسة المعمارية بالمعهد العالي للهندسة والتكنولوجيا بالعبور - مصر

طالب سنة أولى دكتوراه اللقب واسم الباحث: قزقوز فاتح الرتبة:

النشاط البدني الرياضي التربوي التخصص:

الجامعة: جامعة بومرداس المعهد: معهد علوم وتقنيات النشاطات البدنية والرياضية

ABSTRACT

The integration of the various ideological views by the academic community around the great problems facing the planet has allowed the establishment of a complex system of practical and theoretical relationships between man and nature, generating a strong connection between sustainable development and human development, and conferring greater prominence to the role of human beings, according to their powers, liberties and actions for achieving and maximizing their individual and collective well-being. In this regard, this paper aims to identify Sustainable development and human development the challenges and hopes and how people can expand their freedoms, enlarging their choices, enhancing their capabilities and improving their opportunities. which is a process as well as an outcome. Economic growth and income are means to human development but not ends in themselves—

because it is the richness of people's lives, not the richness of economies, that ultimately is valuable to people. With such a simple but powerful notion.

Keywords: sustainable development, human development, challenges , hopes.

ملخص المداخلة:

لقد سمح تكامل وجهات النظر الأيديولوجية المختلفة من قبل المجتمع الأكاديمي حول المشاكل العظيمة التي تواجه كوكبنا في إنشاء نظام معقد من العلاقات العملية والنظرية بين الإنسان والطبيعة ، مما يولد علاقة قوية بين التنمية المستدامة والتنمية البشرية ، ويمنح بروز دور البشر ، وفقا لقوتهم وسلطتهم ، الحريات والإجراءات لتحقيق أقصى قدر من الرفاهية الفردية والجماعية. في هذا الصدد ، تهدف هذه الدراسة إلى التعرف على التنمية المستدامة والتنمية البشرية التحديات والآفاق وكيف يمكن للناس توسيع حرياتهم ، وتوسيع خياراتهم ، وتعزيز قدراتهم وتحسين فرصهم. وهي عملية و في نفس الوقت نتيجة. إن النمو الاقتصادي والدخل هما وسيلة للتنمية البشرية وليست مخرجات في حد ذاتها - لأنها ثراء حياة الأفراد ، وليس ثراء الاقتصادات ، وهي في النهاية قيمة للناس كفكرة بسيطة لكنها قوية.

الكلمات الدالة: التنمية المستدامة، التنمية البشرية، التحديات، الآفاق.



Introduction

Human development is all about human freedoms: freedom to realize the full potential of every human life, not just of a few, nor of most, but of all lives in every corner of the world—now and in the future. Such universalism gives the human development approach its uniqueness. However, the principle of universalism is one thing; translating it into practice is another. Over the past quarter-century there has been impressive progress on many fronts in human development, with people living longer, more people rising out of extreme poverty and fewer people being malnourished. Human development has enriched human lives—but unfortunately not all to the same extent, and even worse, not every life.

Sustainability and growth have been the objects of many studies during the last century. Sustainable development has been defined in many ways, but the most frequently quoted definition is from Our Common Future, also known as the Brundtland Report, in 1987, the Brundtland Commission published its report, in an

effort to link the issues of economic development and environmental stability. In doing so, this report provided the oft-cited definition of sustainable development as “development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs” (United Nations General Assembly, 1987). Albeit somewhat vague, this concept of sustainable development aims to maintain economic advancement and progress while protecting the long-term value of the environment; it “provides a framework for the integration of environment policies and development strategies” (United Nations General Assembly, 1987). However, long before the late 20th century, scholars argued that there need not be a trade-off between environmental sustainability and economic development.

Human development has been defined as enlarging people’s choices in a way which enables them to lead longer, healthier and fuller lives. The Human Development Index (HDI) is a composite statistic of life expectancy, education, and income indices used to rank countries into four tiers of human development. In the 2010 Human Development Report a further Inequality-adjusted Human Development Index (IHDI) was introduced. While the simple HDI remains useful, it stated that “the IHDI is the actual level of human development (accounting for inequality)” and the “the HDI can be viewed as an index of “potential” human development (or the maximum IHDI that could be achieved if there were no inequality)” (UNDP, 2012).

Sustainable Development Definition and Principles

Although many definitions abound, the most often used definition of sustainable development is that proposed by the Brundtland Commission (Cerin, 2006; Dernbach J. C., 1998; Dernbach J. C., 2003; Stoddart, 2011). This broad definition, which will be used in this dissertation, does not limit the scope of sustainability. The explanation does, however, touch on the importance of intergenerational equity. This concept of conserving resources for future generations is one of the major features that distinguish sustainable development policy from traditional environmental policy, which also seeks to internalize the externalities of environmental degradation. The overall goal of sustainable development (SD) is the long-



term stability of the economy and environment; this is only achievable through the integration and acknowledgement of economic, environmental, and social concerns throughout the decision making process.

often used definition of sustainable development is that proposed by the Brundtland Commission (Cerin, 2006; Dernbach J. C., 1998; Dernbach J. C., 2003; Stoddart, 2011). This broad definition, which will be used in this dissertation, does not limit the scope of sustainability. The explanation does, however, touch on the importance of intergenerational equity. This concept of conserving resources for future generations is one of the major features that distinguish sustainable development policy from traditional environmental policy, which also seeks to internalize the externalities of environmental degradation. The overall goal of sustainable development (SD) is the long-term stability of the economy and environment; this is only achievable through the integration and acknowledgement of economic, environmental, and social concerns throughout the decision making process.

In the application of this definition of sustainable development, one issue concerns the substitutability of capital. There are several types of capital: social, natural, and man-made. The definition of weak sustainable development explains that only the aggregate level of capital matters: man-made, or manufactured, capital is an adequate alternative to natural capital. Strong sustainability, on the other hand, recognizes the unique features of natural resources that cannot be replaced by manufactured capital. Most ecologists and environmentalists are proponents of the strong sustainability definition (Stoddart, 2011).

In addition to substitutability, this definition of sustainability is also founded on several other important principles. Contained within the common definition of sustainable development, intergenerational equity recognizes the long-term scale of sustainability in order to address the needs of future generations (Dernbach J. C., 1998; Stoddart, 2011). Also, the polluter pays principle states that “governments should require polluting entities to bear the costs of their pollution rather than impose those costs on others or on the environment” (Dernbach J. C., 1998, p. 58). Thus, government policy should ensure that environmental costs are internalized wherever possible; this also serves to minimize externalities.

Economics of Sustainability

By utilizing economic tools, early theorists offered that policies to protect the environment could also promote innovation and turn a profit. In 1920, Arthur Pigou noted that the presence of incidental, uncharged services act as a barrier to achieving equilibrium in the market. In his work “The Economics of Welfare”, Pigou noted that the divergence between marginal private costs and benefits and marginal social costs and benefits create what we now call “externalities” (Pigou, 1920). These externalities are conceived as transaction spillovers, or costs and benefits unaccounted for in the given price of a good or service. In order to correct the market failure, Pigou proposed a tax on those activities that produce negative externalities at a rate equal to those external costs. By levying this charge, called a Pigouvian tax, the market price will more accurately reflect the comprehensive costs and benefits of the activity.

From this, Michael Porter and Claas van der Linde theorized that pollution is a sign of inefficient resource use. Therefore, win-win opportunities for the environment and economy



can be captured through improvements which reduce pollution in production processes (Porter & van der Linde, 1999). These authors argue that competitive advantages rely on the capacity for innovation; thus, “by stimulating innovation, strict environmental regulations can actually enhance competitiveness” (Porter & van der Linde, 1995). As the Porter Hypothesis states, properly designed environmental policies that make use of market incentives can encourage the introduction of new technologies and reduce production waste. The tests of this theory have yielded mixed results, but scholars generally agree that policy design and public support are crucial elements to the success of these incentives. Nonetheless, market-based environmental tools are generally perceived as more “business friendly” than traditional command and control policies (Cooper & Vargas, 2004).

Human development and wealth

The foundational task of scrutinizing the demands of sustainable human development also provides an appropriate occasion to see how the “human development” approach relates to the more conventional analyses to be found in the standard economic literature -from Adam Smith (1776, 1790) onwards.

Interest in human development is not new in economics. Indeed, this motivating concern is explicitly present in the writings of the early founders of quantitative economics (such as William Petty, Gregory King, Francois Quesnay, Antoine Lavoisier, and Joseph Lagrange) as well as the pioneers of political economy (such as Adam Smith, David Ricardo, Robert Malthus, Karl Marx, and John Stuart Mill). There is, in this sense, no foundational departure in making economic analysis and policy take extensive note of the demands of human development. The approach reclaims an old and established heritage, rather than importing or implanting a new diversion.

Economics has never been a subject of one tradition only. The interest in human development has had to compete with other priorities and pursuits within the same body of main stream economics. The preoccupation with commodity production, opulence and financial success can also be traced in professional economics through several centuries involving many leading economists as well as businessmen and bureaucrats, who have preferred to concentrate more on the characteristics of overall material success than on the deprivation and development of human lives. Indeed, the dominant contemporary tradition of focusing on such variables as per capita gross national product or national wealth is a continuation perhaps even an intensification of the old opulence-oriented approach.

Humanizing of the concept of development

The most significant conceptual change in development economics begins from the 1970s, motivated by the lack of signs that show a real scope of balanced welfare conditions and needs satisfaction for the entire population within a territory (Miller et al., 2014). The notion of economic growth loses momentum and gives way to another focus: the satisfaction of basic human needs. One of the authors that have validated the configuration and acceptance of alternative approaches to the concept of development is : (Sen 2000), who conceives an alternative way to development as a process of expanding the real freedoms enjoyed by individuals. The same author points out that the fact that society



الأعمال الكاملة للمؤتمر العلمي الثاني عشر بعنوان
التدريب من أجل التشغيل والتنمية
٩-١٠ ديسمبر ٢٠١٨م



focuses its attention on human freedoms contrasts with the strictest visions of development and its identification

with gross domestic product growth, rising personal incomes, industrialization, and technological advances or social modernization (Nussbaum & Mazzoni, 1996).

Alternative ideas to development will materialize in a variety of approaches that advocate for a development with a human face, more focused on ecological balance (Hidalgo, 1998). Among the works and contributions of the past three decades related to the concept of human development, it is first necessary to note the report “Adjustment with a human face” published by UNICEF in 1987 (Cornia & Stewart, 1987). For its attempt to confront the economic orthodoxy under which many structural adjustment and stabilization programs have been implemented in developing countries (Cruz, 2006), this report becomes one of the forerunners of the

approach and concept of human development that begins to integrate itself with the dimensions of sustainability sciences.

The human development approach emerged in the late 1980s within the United Nations, under the influence of the thinking and work of economists Amartya Sen (awarded with the Nobel Prize in Economics in 1998) and Mahbub ul Haq (Lechner, 2000). This concept is institutionalized starting from 1990 through the Human Development Reports prepared by the United Nations Program for Development. The first Report on Human Development of 1990, entitled “*Concept and Measurement of Human Development*”, emerges from a break with traditional thinking of development as economic growth (Ferrero, 2004 ; Valcárcel, 2006).

Conclusion

There are important trends of thought that have been raising questions about the relationship between the conceptualization given to development and the very issues that structure the paradigm of sustainability.

Based on this view, a certain conclusion emerges about the negative effects that the development model imposed by the capitalist system is causing not only in the physical component of the territory but also in its main impact component which is society. In his work “Development: History of a Western belief”, Rist (2002) is even more critical and radical and dares to expose the thesis that sustainable development is really an oxymoron .



Reference

1. CORNIA, G. A., & R STEWART, F. (1987). Ajuste con rostro humano. v. 1: Protección de los grupos vulnerables y promoción del crecimiento. v. 2: Estudio de países Adjustment with a human face. v. 1: Protecting the vulnerables and promoting growth. v. 2: Country case studies (No. 338.9 A312). UNICEF.
2. Cerin, P. (2006). Bringing economic opportunity into line with environmental influence: A Discussion on the Coase theorem and the Porter and van der Linde hypothesis. *Ecological Economics*.
3. CRUZ, I (2006) "Human Development assessment through the Human-Scale Development approach: integrating different perspectives in the contribution to a Sustainable Human Development Theory" Ph.D. dissertation. Universidad Politécnica de Catalunya, Càtedra UNESCO de Sostenibilitat. Accesible en: [<http://www.tesisenxarxa.net/TDX-0308107-121708/index.html>]
4. Dernbach, J. C. (1998). Sustainable development as a framework for national governance. *Case Western Reserve Law Review*.
5. Dernbach, J. C. (2003). Achieving sustainable development: The Centrality and multiple facets of integrated decisionmaking. *Indiana Journal of Global Legal Studies*.
6. HIDALGO, A.L. (1998) El pensamiento económico sobre desarrollo. De los mercantilistas al PNUD. Universidad de Huelva. Accesible en [www.uhu.es/antonio.hidalgo]
7. Stoddart, H. (2011). *A Pocket guide to sustainable development governance*. Stakeholder Forum.
8. Pigou, A. (1920). *The Economics of welfare*. London, England: Macmillan and Company.
9. Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1999). Green and competitive: Ending the stalemate. *Journal of Business Administration and Politics*.
10. Porter, M. E., & van der Linde, C. (1995). Toward a new conception of the environment-competitiveness relationship. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*,
11. Cooper, P. J., & Vargas, M. (2004). *Implementing sustainable development: From global policy to local action*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.
12. MILLER TR, WIEK A, SAREWITZ D, ROBINSON J, OLSSON L, KRIEBEL D, LOORBACH D (2014) The future of sustainability science: a solutions-oriented research agenda. *Sustain Sci* 9(2):239–246. doi:10.1007/s11625-013- 0224-6.
13. SEN, A. (2000) Desarrollo y libertad. Ed. Planeta
14. United Nations General Assembly. (1987). *Report of the world commission on environment and development: Our common future*. Oslo, Norway: United Nations General Assembly, Development and International Co-operation: Environment.

