

# Sustainability vs economic growth: a third world perspective

Muhammad Arif Mustunsir

*Department of Social Sciences, Iqra University, Islamabad, Pakistan*

312

Received 25 April 2015  
Revised 24 May 2015  
Accepted 16 June 2015

## Abstract

**Purpose** – The rising dominance of sustainable development (SD) and green growth (GG) in contemporary societies have become one of the foremost sources of contentions that most states face today in the developing world. It is often suggested that institutionalizing key policies of the SD and GG present a win-win situation. The purpose of this paper is to scrutinize and evaluate such a debate in the light of existing empirical evidence on SD, GG and economic development (ED). It seeks to answer the question “does the sustainability discourse fit in the modern socioeconomic needs of the developing nations or not.”

**Design/methodology/approach** – This paper adopts a qualitative research technique. It mainly relies on secondary sources of data. In aligning with key technical approach of qualitative research; the secondary sourced data were also subject to content and thematic analyses from which facts, and assumptions were derived to undertake the present study.

**Findings** – The main verdict of the paper is that SD and GG discourses do not fit in the crucial socioeconomic needs of the underdeveloped nations. Endorsing SD and GG policies in emerging countries is essentially about restraining their economic prosperity. In fact, it is an anti-growth agenda in its essence. What makes it anti-growth is the core element of minimal use of critical natural capital to grow economically, which lies at the heart of entire SD and GG. What makes it hard for the emerging nations to comply with core elements of the sustainability is their capacity to comply with alternative growth pathways. Thus, limiting the growth process by promoting the agendas of SD is fundamentally about keeping deprived state/people poor.

**Research limitations/implications** – The work is exclusively limited to the author’s understanding of issues and key concerns of developing world concerning institutionalization of the SD and GG. The author’s comprehension may not fully reflect the foremost concerns of the emerging nations. Moreover, Just a single research approach was employed in this study. A further empirical investigation is required in this field for acknowledging and documenting all the key motives and perspectives of third-world states when endorsing SD and GG policies.

**Originality/value** – The paper sheds light on the political aspects of promoting the SD, and the long-lasting fact that the key concerns of sustainability pose challenges to the very existence poor states in the south. Most of them are highly exposed to socioeconomic shocks. They cannot afford to implement the policies of SD and GG as the majority of their citizens are living under poverty line. The only panacea they have to overcome the existing social deprivation is the massive ED. Furthermore, institutionalizing SD and GG may cause societal clashes in the poor states.

**Keywords** Sustainable development, Developing countries, Anti-growth, Green growth, Politics of sustainability, Socioeconomic development

**Paper type** Research paper

## Introduction

Throughout the recent decades, the developing danger of environmental changes has activated the societies globally around an assortment of undertakings. These endeavors at first were concerned with the pledge to lower the carbon advancement that is fundamentally about the diminishing of the greenhouse-gas discharges. Now it is also about the age as well as the entire discourse of the sustainable development (SD) that aims to tackle the carbon discharges as well as to safeguard rare water sources, delicate biological systems, and biodiversity.



In addition to that, initially the SD started with meeting human needs, but it has extended itself and is also connected with other areas of modern life. Lately, the politically motivated as well as accepted idea of green growth (GG) has developed; that guarantees low-carbon accommodation which is SD with esteemed results, containing but not limited to employment creation, poverty mitigation with high financial prosperity.

Indeed, the conviction that SD and GG embody to a win-win alternative for third-world emerging countries is recommended in numerous latest reports concerning the sustainability of the economy and greening growth. For example, the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in its last report on GG asserted that the:

Green growth means fostering economic growth and development while ensuring that natural assets continue to provide the resources and environmental services on which our well-being relies (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2011).

Alike the United Nation Environmental Program (UNEP) argues that these notions aim at:

[...] improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities (United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), 2011; Smulders *et al.*, 2014).

For United Nation Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) greening progress is about strategy, which focuses on:

[...] environmentally sustainable economic progress to foster low-carbon, socially inclusive development (United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP), 2015).

For other international prominent organizations like International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD), also known as the World Bank has published its views on the GG and SD too. The World Bank maintains that:

Growth that is efficient in its use of natural resources, clean in that it minimizes pollution and environmental impacts, and resilient in that it accounts for natural hazards and the role of environmental management and natural capital in preventing physical disasters (United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, 2015; The World Bank, 2012).

The IBRD's investigators maintain that:

Green growth is about making growth processes resource-efficient, cleaner and more resilient without necessarily slowing them (Hallegatte *et al.*, 2012).

Nonetheless, for this paper, the SD and the GG's key notions and policies are considered as violating the key interests of the nation's economy in the developing world. The ideas put forth by SD are actually restraining the economic development (ED) of the poor state in the south. They are only perceived well in terms of their utility for small household level projects such as providing solar plates in underprivileged communities for meeting their energy shortage.

However, designing policies in accordance with SD discourse and reducing carbon in the south means increasing domestic poverty. Given the reason that the developing world has a more agricultural population than industrialized countries and most of its population is still under the poverty line with agriculture as its main source of livelihood. Thus, designing and the execution of SD policies have a direct impact on the fate of millions of poor living in rural areas.

This is something the emerging south cannot afford to have, and cannot do as it is still the center of the world for many things included but not limited to poverty, illiteracy, unemployment with poor education and health services. The alternatives that the SD and GG outline for the world may have long-term environmental benefits, but they do not suit the developing poor in the south in their current circumstances. Since they are yet to be fully industrialized, modernized and experience the desirable living standards. Thus, to be pro SD is to be anti-development from the southern perspectives. Anti-growth means anti-poor keeping the poor in poorer conditions.

### **The discourse of sustainability and developing countries**

Few contemporary philosophies in social sciences or global affairs have caused as much dispute as that of SD. There are numerous ways in which, the concept of SD has been considered since 1987. From early need based theory to right based approaches to modern green capitalism, the entire discourse of SD is surrounded by many contested notions. Furthermore, there is no sole authority on the definition of SD, which is what makes it more contested as well as a hard concept to follow (Moon, 2007).

The concept of sustainability has advanced since the very first publication of the Brundtland Commission report on our common future (formally known as the World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED)) in 1987 (Hopwood *et al.*, 2005; Mebratu, 1998; Robert *et al.*, 2005; Steer and Will Wade, 1993, 2007; Yates, 2012; Lele, 1991; Redclift, 2005; Bowen, 2014; Mitcham, 1995). The WCED's definition of SD is still intact as it explained that SD is a:

[...] development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs (World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED), 1987).

According to the statement of the WCED, the SD is, thus, similar to the motherhood and the apple tart, that is to say, it appears too respectable and everyone can agree with it with their particular explanations. However, it is worth noting here that the definition emphasizes on meeting needs rather than stimulating progress and filling consumer gratifications.

This is something very problematic as it contradicts with the extreme human nature of pursuing self-interest and preferences. In practice, people like to have whatever they are capable of and satisfy their choices. In fact, no state would hold up its production or reduce the greenhouse-gas emission even it experiences to lose in its natural environment on the cost of mere economic growth. It is also suggested by many scholars that developing states, which accepts the environment friendly policies, must make sure to not simply implement policies that are ecological friendly at the cost of their ED (Beg *et al.*, 2002).

This is why the world has witnessed sharp changes in the very concept of SD since its beginning as it is highly influenced by political, economic realities of modern times (Giddings *et al.*, 2002). In fact, it is much contested thought that has varied connotations. Thus, the simple definition of SD is very illusory with its major flaws as Redclift argued that:

It is clear that "needs" themselves change, so it is unlikely (as the definition implies) that those of future generations will be the same as those of the present generation (Redclift, 2005).

This is precisely true for both the north and south. As the needs of emerging countries are quite different from those of the north. The argument is that the needs vary and will

certainly be not same for the coming generations. Alike, how do we define and determine the needs of forthcoming generations? This is something that is highly neglected by SD, despite its theoretical underpinning since 1987 (Redclift, 2005).

Furthermore, another key aspect, which is highly ignored by the very idea of SD, is that of needs that how these are defined in different cultures and countries. For instance, the present need of Pakistan is to have massive ED as its 115.52 million population lives in rural areas out of 188.2 million (Mazhar, 2014) and another 21.04 percent people live under the poverty line (The newspaper's staff reporter, 2014). Thus, it is highly desirable for Pakistan to grow its economy in order to tackle the challenge of hunger and poverty and gets its population out of misery.

This is what makes it hard to follow the definitions of SD across the globe in different countries and cultures. It is worth emphasizing here that it is exactly this sort of compromise, which is obvious in underdeveloped nations like Pakistan nowadays. At the point when the additions from the quickened monetary development guarantee quick remunerates, and natural extenuation seems generally to be thing that benefits someone else, perhaps the rich west.

The poor states are not willing to trade off their economic growth that is being suggested by SD and GG discourse. It challenges their very existence given their present social circumstances. SD and GG may not have anything or any strong alternative for the developing state in the south except mere lip services as Stefan Dercon rightly pointed out that:

Much of the discussion on "green growth" remains relatively vague in terms of specifics, including for poor countries (Dercon, 2012).

Similarly, much of the sustainability debate has completely ignored the culturally specific trends and attitudes toward SD (Beckerman, 1994). To illustrate, who told the world's poor residing in the countryside and depending on natural resources – mainly forests for their survival that what is to be sustained. Communities in rural south have lived with consuming nature and of course, they have a better sense of what it is to be sustained and what not.

Since the SD's entire discourse cannot provide such communities with any alternatives. They are already poor and cannot survive without extracting the nature. This is what western led SD debates have never acknowledged – essentially the role of native people in SD and providing them with livelihood alternatives for the better results.

Alike, how would we establish that which approach is ecological or environmentally friendly? Plan of action to the perspective that social orders must choose for themselves is not extremely accommodating. Who chooses? On what premise are the choices made? This is what compels one to assert that central decision making of SD is primarily limited to west it has nothing to do with the east and nor does the latter has any say in anything that the west does or decides.

What gets clearer from the theoretical arguments and literature concerning SD that is that there is no basic reasoning? There are such a large number of elucidations of SD. It is plausible to argue that there exists nothing as sustainable developmentism if one contrasts this notion with the thought of neo-liberalism or socialism (Giddings *et al.*, 2002).

It is obvious all through the writing that there still exists extensive perplexity regarding what it is that ought to be sustained. This is something that all the distinctive talks of SD in some cases neglect to address (Nayar, 1994). Additionally,

the discourses such as right-based development, etc. are attached with SD are what makes it to survive otherwise the concept in itself is hardly pragmatic (Redclift, 2005; Hopwood *et al.*, 2005). In short, it just does not fit the key motives of the poor's at all (O'Connor, 1994).

### **What it is envisaged to be economic growth?**

The economists maintain that the financial progress is simply a metric that mirrors the accumulation of the capital over time, typically centered on universalized US dollars (USD). They characterize it in three parts. First, the progress in work that alludes to increment over the quantity of individual employed. Second, the progress in the wealth, this deals with the developments in the accessibility of things, which may be utilized by employees during the practice of creating merchandise such as basic life-sustaining nutrition's and facilities like producing medical instruments (Sagoff, 1988).

Third, expanding efficiency that may be considered as enhancements in the effectiveness with which we transform labor and capital into merchandise and services (Shearer, 2007; Kuznets, 1955). Thus, the economic growth is an amount of progress in the industrious ability of an economy, which is essentially about the growth taken together yield of products and services delivered. This is quantified as the progress in gross domestic product (GDP) per capita (Callen, 2012; Cornwall, 2014; Levy, 2010).

### **Socio-political necessities vs the sustainability**

The economy being one of the pivotal and foremost concerns of every nation in the global planet has influenced the fate of humanity since very long. It is, perhaps, the only key ingredient of contemporary state survival that is connected to every aspect of current state society. Given the political necessity and dominating nature of the modern economy, it becomes vital to examine its societal and the governmental reality vs the whole discourse of sustainability.

The environmental economists and green economy activists argue that present economic growth across the globe is not sustainable, and it possesses a real and long-lasting threat to the very existence of humankind (OECD, 2011; Bowen and Hepburn, 2014; Diamond, 2011; The World Bank, 2012; McKibben, 2011; Gore, 2013; Toman, 2012). They further maintain that it mainly depends on nature to grow. That is the fact too since there will be no growth if countries do not extract the nature for the economic gains. All the goods and services are actually exchanged against the natural resource, and they are closely linked with critical natural capital (Todaro and Smith, 2012).

To some extent and given the world's current conditions, they all are right to argue that man-made things are destroying the nature, and the human led alternatives to the crucial natural resources are not a sound alternative to the challenges that the globe is facing today. At the heart of their arguments, all that the environmentalists and ecologists are stating is that the existing economic structure, steady merely with evolution and is highly reliant on a vast quantity of natural critical capital.

Now such arguments raise several issues such as, who owns the natural resources and questions such as, how they are distributed in modern societies (Irwin, 2001). One may not forget the fact that the small communities, individuals and groups of people possess the environmental resources, in whatever form and of whatever conditions across the globe. This is what makes it very hard to pursue the arguments promoted by environmentalists in the presence of several such factors.

---

Alike, one of the key thought that has dominated most of the modern political struggle and thought is that of the notion of private property rights. We know from the history that the world has witnessed a long-lasting struggle to achieve the notions such as of the universal personal property rights (Hague and Harrop, 2010; Ferguson and Mansbach, 2004). The weak state cannot possibly violate the very existence of universally established norms and values of persona priority rights. The violation is regarded here in the sense that if they design policies to curtail the damages caused by local communities while using the natural resources for their livelihoods. They just cannot regulate groups or *per se* violate their basic rights as they already lack the capacity to provide alternatives for people whose livelihoods mainly depend on extraction of natural resources.

Furthermore, it is worth pointing that it becomes very tough for state to carry out the ideas put forth by the SD discourse in the presence of widespread poverty and limited human capital. What makes it harder are the political economy concerns that also represent the key interests of the western world as well? Since every nation has right to survive and practice whatever it perceives the best for its interests.

To illustrate, the recent projections of the OECD indicate that soon the economic growth and its significances for the entire universe will be ruled by the present times poor countries. As pointed out by the OECD between 2013 and 2030, 82 percent (Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), 2014) of financial development shall be occurring among the states that are taken as underdeveloped chunks of the globe nowadays. Furthermore, the BP's recent release, namely energy outlook 2,035 (British Petroleum (BP), 2015) also estimates that some 95 percent of the growth of the energy sector ingesting universally will arise in the poor countries of the global south.

One might wonder to ask that what these projections even mean from the political economy of SD perspectives. On one hand, they are meant to highlight the underlying key concern, that is to say, the rich north wish to contain the growth among the poor at least to the level they cannot rise and pose real threats to their hegemony. In fact, the very political reason behind promoting the idea of SD is the rise of global poor state, which the west will never tolerate, and nor it would see them violating their key interests.

On the other hand, one also notes that these projections carry alarming consequences for emerging developing countries in the south from a green perspective. However, the very politics behind dictating the policies and guidelines on SD-related discourse cannot be taken for granted all. The truth is that to be promoting SD and anti-economic progress is essentially to be anti-development with reference to the deprived nations universally. In other words, keeping the world's poor communities indigent. Moreover, the fact that few anti-growth advocates are amenable trying that underprivileged nation's stay deprived enunciates us how influential the SD is in modern international political affairs.

They also undermine the very existence of the present for the poor in the poor countries. What it means to be conserving nature millions for the citizens of South Asia, who has not even the substantial survival and whose entire livelihood depends on the very nature itself. Given the fact that their governments lack the capacity to provide them with an ample living and get them access to state led services such as extensive medical care. Therefore, it is argued that it is essentially a political economy concern, which governs us and most of the debates masking the sustainability in our surroundings. It is further maintained that whatever best serves the interests of the

west is actually promoted and given preference over what is required in the third-world countries. This is done and achieved while taking the support of the several philosophical discourses such as of the SD.

If the greening environment is meant to be too serious or something that is seriously taken by the industrialized world, then, why it becomes hard for them to take the actions. To demonstrate, the recent carbon pollution statistics clearly indicate that top ten CO<sub>2</sub> emitters are actually the advance-industrialized state except for two emerging powers of the Asia, including China and India (The World Bank, 2015; World Resource Institute (WRI), 2011; United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), 2014; United States Environment Protection Agency (USEP), 2015; Statista Inc, 2015; Union of Concerned Scientists, 2015). Interestingly, another IBRD/world bank report suggests that six countries are responsible for 60 percent of global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (The World Bank, 2014).

Large numbers of countries in the west are still not a signatory to the many environmental agreements. Despite the fact that they have initiated such conventions by themselves. A good example is in the USA who is a major player in each and everything that comes out in the United Nations (UN) office ranging from the environment to governing societies. It is worth emphasizing that both the UN and the USA led the Kyoto Protocol, but it was never signed by the USA itself. This does help us to clarify at least one thing that, no state in the north truly cares about what has happened to nature and what will be happening the future of the coming generations. If the promoters of the SD were serious, then they would have shown real progress in dropping their consumption and production patterns and levels substantially.

Nevertheless, this is what is not happening and will not possibly happen in the anarchical world in which we live. The environmentalists who argue that the economic production and consumer consumptions should be minimized do make sense. However, do the countries that already advanced their living standards and their economies are willing to cut down their production and consumption. The USA is, in fact, is beyond the high mass consumption and production stages suggested by economists (Jones, 1998; Todaro and Smith, 2012).

There is nothing inherently wrong in pursuing the high ED and prioritizing poverty reduction as number one policy in the state of the global south who still has larger proportion of their people breathing below ordinary living (Roemer and Gugerty, 1997; Beg *et al.*, 2002). In fact, there is a considerable evidence and most of the empirical research asserts that economic growth is essential for deprived one in broad wisdom that earnings of the underprivileged increases one for one in a streak with regular revenue (Gallup *et al.*, 1998; Kraay, 2006; Dollar and Kraay, 2002; Roemer and Gugerty, 1997; Dercon, 2012). Studies also assert that the poverty headcount proportion drops once the economic experiences high growth. Furthermore, the economic growth is the single key element that offers large-scale solutions for massive poverty reduction (Ravallion *et al.*, 1996; Ravallion, 2000).

This is what the history of the countries who has successfully reduced poverty among their masses suggests (Acemoglu and James, 2012). Thus, the key concerns of SD are actually not and cannot be the key concerns of the developing countries. Because, the only way they can improve the lives of their people is to have an ED at any cost. This becomes more evident when one looks at the social settings of the poor countries. Most of their population lives in agricultural setup and thus is highly prone to risks that result in due to the climatic changes and other natural hazards, whether fabricated or not.

The poor people as well as their respective governments' lack capacity to cope with the environmental risks and changes that are directly affecting their every aspect of life. Thus, the ED is perhaps the only thing that helps poor nations to build the resilience to alterations occurring in the natural environments. Therefore, economic prosperity becomes essential to reduce large-scale poverty in the developing world.

The fact cannot also be undermined that most of the emerging countries are affected by the changes which the SD discourses talk about. This is because the advanced world continues to drop a considerable amount of its poisonous waste and, of course, the filthy technologies in these poor states (Mehra and Das, 2008). One should not ignore another fact that the north still depends on developing countries for its numerous needs, including but not limited to garments, energy, food and mineral. The poor southern countries are highly dependent on the north for meeting many of their modern needs, including but not limited to, access to modern technology to prosper their economic growth so on and so forth.

### **The engines of prosperity**

Contemporary economists maintain that the engines of prosperity in our times as well as in history have always been the technological inventions and the education (Acemoglu and James, 2012). Traditionally, both have been limited to the west and poor south lack the very engines of prosperity. It has never been able to invent any new ideas, which causes high dependency that is there for very long. The dependence on the western world for everything has actually hindered the development of the engines of prosperity in the global south. Alike the engines of prosperity are not well nourished in the developing world. We know it from the history that, the powerful groups of state have never favored the engines of prosperity even in their own societies. For instance, the case of Austro-Hungarian and the Russian empires in the seventeenth and eighteenth century. Both empires went against the industrialization that took place in the UK (Acemoglu and James, 2012).

The fear of losing ruling power was what forced these Monarch states to stand against the industrialization. This is what the rich north fears again today if the south becomes prosperous and self-reliant than the needs of the north cannot be met at all. After all the south is the only place on the earth, that fulfills almost all the modern needs of the western world. Thus, no one would like to see the rise of let say the emerging India or Brazil or the China against their interests. This is exactly what the policies of the west do in modern days. They do not seem to have vivid enforcing power, but they do affect the outcomes across the globe. In the sense that they are able, to create the soft power tools to dictate to the developing world that what they must do to rid of poverty.

They suggest them to have open markets and free trade and reduce the trade barriers, but they never provide them with the power to participate in the institutions they have created to affect the outcomes. This is apparent in many cases, for instance, the case of world trade organization and the fates of developing countries (The North-South Institute, 2002; Hudec, 1987). It is worth noting here that the powerful west is actually against the engines of economic growth when it comes to the poor south. Technology among other is the key engine of economic prosperity in our times. What the west does is that it does suggest to the developing countries to opt for green technologies as they help in saving natural critical capital.

At the same time, it never provides them with any of it. In other words, all the green technologies are very expensive to have. What choices does the south have? Should it



spend its limited wealth to acquire the environmental friendly technologies and meet the requirements for greening the economy or should it really be working for its citizens to have them out of poverty? Alternatively, should it dedicate a large portion of its GDP to education, research and development or to the alternative growth pathways? Such questions are rarely addressed by the whole philosophy of GG and SD (Dercon, 2012).

Furthermore, there is considerable evidence from developing countries that suggest that poor countries in the south actually design GG policies and comply with the environmental standards promoted by the industrialized counties (Resnick *et al.*, 2012). In turn, they are facing massive social troubles too. There is often an ample anti-reform coalition in the developing countries whose interests are in conflict with GG agendas. That is because they are not clearly meeting the basic life sustaining and developmental necessities such as economic and food security, fossil fuel and energy needs of their inhabitants (Resnick *et al.*, 2012).

Thus, promoting sustainability discourse is one of the biggest ironies of our times that try to dominate crucial strata of every society across the globe with its hidden political motives that only benefit a smaller and a richer proportion of the globe. It may not have anything to offer for the rest of the poorer proportion of the global population.

### Conclusion

It is evident that ecological changes are influencing the poor people excessively and the economic growth is fundamental for poverty reduction. The SD and GG are then offered in acknowledgment of the essentiality to maintain growth as needed for combating the destitution while assuring that the environmental expenses are internalized. However, the deliberations of sustainability and GG have little or nothing to say about how the discourse of sustainability is to be comprehended. Nevertheless, it rests only on the ordinary measures for externality embodiment and advancement. Furthermore, a little has been said concerning the prospective outcomes for poverty reduction of sets of strategies that guide an economy on an ecologically sustainable route.

Alike, the present study reasoned that the Westphalian states are imprisoned by their national interests. They cannot be expected to carry on their affairs based on universal ideologies and moral value judgments. This is what comes clearer when one looks at the contemporary day's key anxieties; whether SD, GG or any other challenges that, a modern state has to counter.

It is asserted that no matter what the contemporary statesmanship demands to pursue only national interests, and this is exactly what the countries are doing across the globe. They are growing their economies at the highest rate while depleting most of the critical natural resources. Countries do not care whatever comes their way until it compromises their economic prosperity.

Thus, the reality of today's life is that the economy dominates every aspect of society, whether its greening environment or the conservation of the natural resources. The industrialized world continues to dominate the key decision of global affairs. It has created new modes to enforce its will and policies on the rest of the world that still struggles with high poverty, unemployment and illiteracy. The fact cannot be ignored that the rich north cannot afford to have the poor countries from south to violate its interests in an anarchical world environment.

This why it always has something to impose on the poor state, sometimes in the form of environmental regulation while other times in the form of economic sanctions. SD is truly an oxymoron, which largely ignored most of the key interest of the indigent

developing countries with its politically motivated intervening nature. The entire philosophy of GG and SD does not fit the key interests of the developing countries in the southern part of the world. It actually threatens their very existence.

Furthermore, this study maintains that that SD and GG discourses do not fit in the crucial socioeconomic needs of the underdeveloped nations. Endorsing SD and GG policies in emerging countries is essentially about restraining their economic prosperity, as it is an anti-growth agenda in its essence. What makes it anti-growth is the core element of minimal use of critical natural capital to grow economically, which lies at the heart of entire SD and GG discourse. This is what makes it hard for the emerging nations to comply with core elements of the sustainability as they already lack access and do not have the capacity to comply with alternative growth pathways to grow in a sustainable way. Thus, limiting the growth process while promoting the agenda of minimal use of natural critical capital is fundamentally about keeping deprived state/people poor.

## References

- Acemoglu, D. and James, A.R. (2012), *Why Nations Fail: the Origins of Power, Prosperity, and Poverty*, Crown Publishers, New York, NY, pp. 84-95.
- Beckerman, W. (1994), "‘Sustainable development’: is it a useful concept", *Environmental Values*, Vol. 3 No. 3, pp. 191-209.
- Beg, N., Morlot, J.C., Davidson, O., Okesse, Y.A., Tyani, L., Denton, F., Sokona, Y., Thomasc, J.P., Rovere, E.L.L., Parikh, J.K., Parikh, K. and Rahman, A.A. (2002), "Review: linkages between climate change and sustainable development", *Climate Policy*, Vol. 2 Nos 2/3, pp. 129-144.
- Bowen, A. (2014), "The scope for ‘green growth’ and a new technological revolution", in Stern, N., Bowen, A. and Whalley, J. (Eds), *The Global Development of Policy Regimes to Combat Climate Change*, World Scientific Publishing Company, London, pp. 139-142.
- Bowen, A. and Hepburn, C. (2014), "Green growth: an assessment", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 407-422.
- British Petroleum (BP) (2015), *BP Energy Outlook 2035*, British Petroleum (BP), London.
- Callen, T. (2012), *Gross Domestic Product: An Economy's All. Finance and Development (F&D)*, International Monetary Fund (IMF), Washington, DC.
- Cornwall, J.L. (2014), "Economic growth", Encyclopædia Britannica Inc., Chicago, available at: [www.britannica.com/topic/economic-growth](http://www.britannica.com/topic/economic-growth) (accessed September 10, 2014).
- Dercon, S. (2012), "Is green growth good for the poor", Working Paper No. 6231, Development Research Group Policy Research, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Diamond, J. (2011), *Collapse: How Societies Choose to Fail or Succeed: Revised Edition*, Penguin Books, London, pp. 351-361.
- Dollar, D. and Kraay, A. (2002), "Growth is good for the poor", *Journal of Economic Growth*, Vol. 7 No. 3, pp. 195-225.
- Ferguson, Y.H. and Mansbach, R.W. (2004), *Remapping Global Politics History's Revenge and Future Shock*, Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, pp. 110-115.
- Gallup, J.L., Radelet, S. and Warner, A. (1998), "Economic growth and the income of the poor", CAER II Discussion Paper No. 36, Center for International Development, Harvard, MA.
- Giddings, B., Hopwood, B. and O'Brien, G. (2002), "Environment, economy and society: fitting them together into sustainable development", *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 10 No. 4, pp. 187-196.
- Gore, A. (2013), *The Future: Six Drivers of Global Change*, Random House, New York, NY, pp. 290-296.

- Hague, R. and Harrop, M. (2010), *Comparative Government and Politics*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY, pp. 46-55.
- Hallegatte, S., Heal Geoffrey, F. and Marianne, T.D. (2012), "From growth to green growth", Working Paper No. 17841, National Bureau of Economic Research (NBER), Cambridge, February, pp. 2-3.
- Hopwood, B., Mellor, M. and O'Brien, G. (2005), "Sustainable development: mapping different approaches", *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 13 No. 1, pp. 38-52.
- Hudec, R.E. (1987), *Developing Countries in the GATT/WTO Legal System*, Gower Publishing Company Limited, London, pp. 53-58.
- Irwin, R. (2001), "Posing global environmental problems from conservation to sustainable development", in Stevis, D. and Assetto, J.V. (Eds), *The International Political Economy of the Environment: Critical Perspectives*, Lynne Rienner Publishers Inc., Boulder, CO, pp. 23-31.
- Jones, C.I. (1998), *Introduction to Economic Growth*, W.W. Norton & Company Ltd., New York, NY, pp. 47-55
- Kraay, A. (2006), "When is growth pro-poor? Evidence from a panel of countries", *Journal of Development Economics*, Vol. 80 No. 1, pp. 198-227.
- Kuznets, S. (1955), "Economic growth and income inequality", *The American Economic Review*, Vol. 45 No. 1, pp. 1-28.
- Lele, S.M. (1991), "Sustainable development: a critical review", *World Development*, Vol. 19 No. 6, pp. 607-621.
- Levy, B. (2010), "Development trajectories: an evolutionary approach to integrating governance and growth", in The PREM Network – The World Bank (Ed.), *Economic Premise Note Series*, The World Bank, Washington, DC, pp. 2-7.
- Mckibben, B. (2011), *Eaarth: Making a Life on a Tough New Planet*, Vintage Canada, Toronto, pp. 165-170.
- Mazhar, N. (2014), "Population, labor force and employment", in Ministry of Finance (Ed.), *Pakistan Economic Survey 2013-2014*, Ministry of Finance, Islamabad, pp. 1-2.
- Mebratu, D. (1998), "Sustainability and sustainable development: historical and conceptual review", *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, Vol. 18 No. 6, pp. 493-520.
- Mehra, M.K. and Das, S.P. (2008), "North-south trade and pollution migration: the debate revisited", *Environmental and Resource Economics*, Vol. 40 No. 1, pp. 139-164.
- Mitcham, C. (1995), "The concept of sustainable development: its origins and ambivalence", *Technology in Society*, Vol. 17 No. 3, pp. 311-326.
- Moon, J. (2007), "The contribution of corporate social responsibility to sustainable development", *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 15 No. 5, pp. 296-306.
- Nayar, K.R. (1994), "Politics of 'sustainable development'", *Economic and Political Weekly*, Vol. 29 No. 22, pp. 1327-1329.
- O'Connor, M. (1994), "Is capitalism sustainable?", in O'Connor, M. (Ed.), *Is Capitalism Sustainable?: Political Economy and the Politics of Ecology*, The Guilford Press, New York, NY, pp. 108-112.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2011), *Towards Green Growth. Green Growth*, Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), Paris, pp. 11-18.
- Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) (2014), *OECD Economic Outlook*, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development, Paris.
- Ravallion, M. (2000), "Growth, inequality and poverty: looking behind the averages", *World Development*, Vol. 29 No. 11, pp. 1803-1815.

- Ravallion, M., Lyn, S. and Bruno, M. (1996), "Equity and growth in developing countries: old and new perspectives on the policy issues", in Tanzi, V. and Chu, K.-Y. (Eds), *Income Distribution and High-Quality Growth*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, pp. 119-125.
- Redclift, M. (2005), "Sustainable development (1987-2005): an oxymoron comes of age", *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 12 No. 4, pp. 212-227.
- Resnick, D., Finn, T. and James, T. (2012), *The Political Economy of Green Growth: Illustrations from Southern Africa*, UNU-WIDER, Helsinki.
- Robert, K.W., Parris, T.M. and Leiserowitz, A.A. (2005), "What is sustainable development: goals, indicators, values, and practice", *Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development*, Vol. 43 No. 3, pp. 9-21.
- Roemer, M. and Gugerty, M.K. (1997), "Does economic growth reduce poverty?", CAER II Discussion Paper No. 4, Institute of International Development, Harvard, MA.
- Sagoff, M. (1988), *The Economy of the Earth: Philosophy, Law, and the Environment*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge and New York, NY, pp. 33-35.
- Shearer, R.A. (2007), "The concept of economic growth", *Kyklos*, Vol. 14 No. 4, pp. 497-532.
- Smulders, S., Toman, M. and Withagen, C. (2014), "Growth theory and 'green growth'", *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, Vol. 30 No. 3, pp. 423-446.
- Statista Inc. (2015), *The Largest Producers of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions Worldwide in 2014, Based on Their Share of Global CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions*, Statista Inc., New York, NY, available at: [www.statista.com/statistics/271748/the-largest-emitters-of-co2-in-the-world/](http://www.statista.com/statistics/271748/the-largest-emitters-of-co2-in-the-world/) (accessed March 8, 2015).
- Steer, A. and Will Wade, G. (1993/2007), "Sustainable development: theory and practice for a sustainable future", *Sustainable Development*, Vol. 1 No. 3, pp. 23-35.
- The newspaper's staff reporter (2014), "Over half of Pakistan lives under poverty line: Dar", *Dawn News*, January 3, p. 2.
- The North-South Institute (2002), *The Reality of Trade: The WTO and Developing Countries*, The North-South Institute, Ontario.
- The World Bank (2012), "Inclusive green growth the pathway to sustainable development", in The World Bank (Ed.), *Inclusive Green Growth*, The World Bank, Washington, DC, pp. 1-2.
- The World Bank (2014), *Globally Networked Carbon Markets*, The World Bank, Washington, DC, available at: [www.worldbank.org/en/topic/climatechange/brief/globally-networked-carbon-markets](http://www.worldbank.org/en/topic/climatechange/brief/globally-networked-carbon-markets) (accessed September 4, 2014).
- The World Bank (2015), *CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions (Metric Tons Per Capita)*, The World Bank, Washington, DC, available at: <http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/EN.ATM.CO2E.PC> (accessed March 4, 2015).
- Todaro, M.P. and Smith, S.C. (2012), *Economic Development*, Addison-Wesley: Pearson, Washington, DC.
- Toman, M. (2012), "'Green growth' an exploratory review", World Bank Policy Research Working Paper No. 6067, The World Bank, Washington, DC.
- Union of Concerned Scientists (2015), *Each Country's Share of CO<sub>2</sub> Emissions*, Union of Concerned Scientists, Washington, DC, available at: [www.ucsusa.org/global\\_warming/science\\_and\\_impacts/science/each-countrys-share-of-co2.html](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_warming/science_and_impacts/science/each-countrys-share-of-co2.html) (accessed March 3, 2015).
- United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (2015), *Green Growth*, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, New York, NY, available at: <https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/index.php?menu=1447> (accessed December 28, 2014).

- United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific (UNESCAP) (2015), *What is Green Growth?*, UNESCAP, Bangkok, available at: [www.greengrowth.org/?q=static-page/sat-10012011-1104/about-green-growth](http://www.greengrowth.org/?q=static-page/sat-10012011-1104/about-green-growth) (accessed February 24, 2015).
- United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) (Ed.) (2011), "Towards a green economy. Pathways to sustainable and poverty eradication (a synthesis for policy makers)", *Green Economy Report*, United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP), Nairobi, pp. 9-10.
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (2014), *Greenhouse Gas Inventory Data*, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Bonn, available at: [http://unfccc.int/ghg\\_data/items/3800.php](http://unfccc.int/ghg_data/items/3800.php) (accessed March 21, 2015).
- United States Environment Protection Agency (USEPA) (2015), *Global Greenhouse Gas Emissions Data*, United States Environment Protection Agency, Washington, DC, available at: [www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/global.html](http://www.epa.gov/climatechange/ghgemissions/global.html) (accessed March 11, 2015).
- World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) (1987), *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, pp. 41-45.
- World Resource Institute (WRI) (2011), *CAIT2.0 WRI's Climate Data Explorer*, World Resource Institute (WRI), Washington, DC.
- Yates, J.J. (2012), "Abundance on trial: the cultural significance of 'sustainability'", *The Hedgehog Review*, Vol. 14 No. 2, pp. 8-25.

#### **About the author**

Muhammad Arif Mustunsir is a former Research Assistant at the University of Azad Jammu & Kashmir (AJKU). Presently, he is an MPhil Candidate at the Department of Social Sciences, Iqra University Islamabad Pakistan. Muhammad Arif Mustunsir can be contacted at: [arif.iuic@gmail.com](mailto:arif.iuic@gmail.com)