

Views on the Environment and the Concept of Development

Case Study: Colombia

Sandra Milena Silva Arroyave¹ Germán Vargas Larios²

ABSTRACT: *This article aims to present the way in which different types of societies throughout human history have perceived the environment and how these perceptions have evolved according to a concept of development that arose concomitantly with capitalism. As a social formation, capitalism is fundamentally ordered along economic lines, every process oriented towards profit-making, extracting private benefits, and, consequently, permanently improving productive forces as a fundamental means of production. This constitutes a boundless process in which nature itself comes to be seen as a factor of production, rather than as a condition for the sustenance of life.*

Under these circumstances, different meanings of the concept of development are revised, integrating variables such as environment, society and culture, but bearing in mind that the ultimate end of capitalism continues to be the generation and accumulation of wealth and its absolute concentration, as an inevitable tendency. In this sense, the improvement of productive processes, efficiency and competition between countries, as fundamental means of accumulation, hinder the care and protection of natural resources and constitute the main risk for the preservation of the environment.

As a conclusion, it could be said that throughout human evolution, the environment has been seen from different perspectives, from a wide understanding as a physical setting which makes living conditions and well-being possible, to a reductionist view, which sees it as just another factor of production. It is under this perspective that it is seen as something rather than life-sustaining, as life-threatening for man's survival and for the development of society. As long as this capitalist view of the environment persists, without any measure being taken to achieve change, it will be difficult to achieve the goal of preserving and caring for natural resources. Reaching such a point implies modifying the way society is organized, which means combining or even substituting the principles of utilitarianism and private appropriation of benefits, –which lead to an exacerbated cult of the individual–with different principles that recapture an ethical character and focus on collective benefits and on the other, and only then on the individual, and not the other way around. It does not imply the removal of the market as a starting point but the modification of its status from end to means: the market is no longer the yardstick for measuring the value of things- on the contrary, it must be driven and regulated by social values that dignify human beings. To achieve these changes, paradoxically, according to Polanyi, it is necessary to return to organizing principles of pre-capitalist societies of the past, such as reciprocity and mandate, which

¹ Environmental Engineer, University of Medellín, Medellín, Colombia. Doctor in Organizational Studies, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana, Mexico City, Mexico (Title in process). Master in Administration, Universidad de Medellín, Medellín, Colombia. Faculty member of the Faculty of Architecture and Engineering of the University Institution Colegio Mayor de Antioquia, Medellín, Colombia. Research Group: Environment, Habitat and Heritage. Address: Cra43A N° 16B-50 - 3002836597. sandra.silva@colmayor.edu.co

² Master in Public Administration, Centro de Investigación y Docencia Económicas (CIDE). Doctor in Organizational Studies, Universidad Autónoma Metropolitana (UAM). General Coordinator of PICA (Posgrado Integral en Ciencias Administrativas of the UAM) Mexico. germanv88@yahoo.com

clearly respond to the communal, social and political sense of environmental action. Therefore, this historical survey of environmental conceptions in these societies is undertaken.

KEY WORDS: environment, economic development, human development, sustainable cultural human development, capitalism.

I. INTRODUCTION

As defined by Gonzalez and Valencia (2013, p. 3 - 4), the environment could be understood as *“the way to represent the result of interactions between the biophysical system and the cultural system that have historically resulted in different types of structural configuration of the human social apparatus”*. The above entails several elements, the first –and perhaps the most important— being the fact that the environment is made up of physical factors, such as natural resources, water, air and soil, biotic elements such as fauna and flora, and a social component. In this context, human beings play a preponderant role in the definition of the concept of environment, since this definition includes the cultural, social, political and economic elements underpinning society and that cannot be left aside when analysing it.

However, arriving at this concept has meant going a long way and seeing how the problems of environmental pollution were intensified, culminating in the current global warming crisis, which not only involves the increase in the temperature of the planet, but also as proposed by Reyes (2015, p. 1 - 2) at the World Economic Forum in 2015:

Climate change is exacerbating more than ever the risks associated with water crises, food shortages, reduced economic growth, weakened social cohesion and increased security risks. At the same time, geopolitical instability exposes companies to cancelled projects, rejected licenses, production interruptions, damaged assets and restriction of cross-border capital movements. At the same time, these political conflicts further hinder the fight against global warming, since they reduce the potential for political cooperation and favour the diversion of resources, innovation and time that could be devoted to strategies of prevention and resilience to climate change.

In order to demonstrate the transformation that human beings have undergone with respect to their relationship with the environment and the concept of development, this paper aims to analyse the different ideas and strategies that have emerged in today's society as a reaction mechanism for human beings. While understanding themselves as part of the environment, humans have not been able to effectively solve the problem of environmental pollution, as the results of their efforts are marginal and even contradictory due to the fact that the strategies undertaken do not transcend the framework of the market and its determinations and, therefore, they do not drive or regulate the market, but on the contrary are governed by it.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND RESEARCH METHODS

The following section presents the concept of environment as understood by different communities throughout human history, as well as the concept of development and its different meanings from economic, human, cultural and sustainability-based perspectives.

1. The concept of environment in different communities throughout human history

When human beings overexploit the natural resources available, they begin to realise that they themselves are a fundamental part of the concept of environment. It is only when permanent exploitation of different natural

resources becomes impossible, and when nature mercilessly strikes back in response to the negative environmental impacts mankind has caused over time, that they understand how the mastery over nature they thought they had seen as a utopia. Without being able to accurately predict natural occurrences, societies have been immersed in a set of natural catastrophes about which they have not been able to do much more than to try to save life and protect themselves. The wrath of nature has been so intense that it has devastated entire regions, regardless of political, administrative or physical boundaries of countries and territories. Nature understands itself as a unity, and the planet earth in its immensity is in fact one and does not follow the divisions that human beings created to dominate it.

However, under the ongoing social system, human beings still do not seem to understand that if they do not implement different strategies to allow them to live in harmony with nature, their own survival becomes compromised. This is so, on the one hand, because of the negative environmental impacts previously mentioned, and on the other hand, because they will no longer have the opportunity to extract goods and services for the creation of social satisfiers. This will ultimately only generate one result—the impossibility for human beings to survive.

But things have not always been this way. Humanity has gone through different evolutionary stages in which the concepts of the environment and natural resources were slowly transformed, going from being seen as a fundamental element of life to a simple means of production. Below are some characteristics of the communities that have existed throughout the history of planet earth and the way in which they have understood the environment. The purpose of this overview is to highlight that, ever since the emergence of capitalist society, the environment has been seen only as a means to meet human needs.

1.1 Primitive communities

Primitive communities emerged as the earliest social formations, at a time when the separation between human beings and the animal world became clearer. They are characterised by the fact that in it natural resources and the environment are a fundamental element for human survival, since from them they obtain food and materials to favour their protection at a time when nature itself was threatening them.

At that point, social satisfiers closely corresponded to the satisfaction of basic needs, such as food and protection, and for which they use rudimentary tools, built precisely with the elements available as natural resources. For example, the stick, the stone axe and the spear, as well as the bow and arrow that were developed over time.

Given the characteristics of the type of production tools, it is clear that in this type of community there was a low level of development of this production. In terms of care and protection of natural resources, this was an advantage in the sense that they were forced to let the land rest: after having extracted natural resources from an ecosystem and requiring them again, it was necessary to look for other similar places where resources were still available. As a result, the ecosystem that had been intervened had the opportunity to heal itself, and to become, after some time had passed, available again for exploitation.

However, these conditions were changing, because primitive people began to develop more and more of their productive forces as a way of protecting themselves and countering the effects of nature. Melting metal gave way to a new set of instruments that allowed for more arduous tasks to be performed. The domestication of animals also gave societies the possibility of improving their labour, while providing an additional force that humans alone did not have.

With these modifications, the first social division of labour began to emerge. Small craft industries appeared, the exchange of products expanded and the moment came when the work of the whole community became unnecessary while private property was being generated, making exploitation possible, as Kuusinen et al (1962, p. 1) have explained: “*production had progressed so much that the human labour force was already producing more than was necessary for the simple sustenance of the worker himself*”.

With the above-mentioned conditions, a new type of social formation, slavery, became possible, as detailed below.

1.2 Slavery

The first form of class society was slavery, which arose as a consequence of the disintegration and fall of the primitive communal system. The population was divided into free people and slaves. The free had every civil, property and political right. The slaves were deprived of all these rights and the relations of production of the slave society were based on the fact that not only the means of production, but also the slaves themselves, were property, which in addition to being exploited could be bought and sold like cattle. To a great extent, the exploitation of natural resources took place in satisfaction of the slave-owners needs and to reduce consumption on the part of the slaves to the minimum possible, that is to say, to the basic quantities that they required in order not to starve.

In this form of community, the creation of the State brought with it new customs and a specific ideology in which the contempt for physical work was gradually extended. As Kuusinen et al (1962, p. 2) put it, farm work began to be seen as an unworthy occupation of free people; thus strengthening the inequality between them and the slaves.

Production and exploitation of natural resources became more intensive in slave societies than in the primitive community, but it can still be considered low. Extraction was still carried out by means of human activity and animals provided greater strength for the execution of tasks, as did new work tools. Slave labour was distinguished by its extremely low productivity as slaves were not interested in the results of their work.

In this sense, in slave society, the environment was perceived only as land, which provided food and the possibility of obtaining a usufruct from its commercialisation.

Taking into account the above-mentioned characteristics and the displeasure of the slaves about their way of life, a social revolution was gestated that ended up giving way to the feudal age.

1.3 Feudalism

Kuusinen et al (1962, p. 2) state that:

The basis of the relations of production of this regime is the ownership of the feudal lords over the means of production, and first of all over the land (the term “feudalism” comes from the Latin word “feodum”; this was the name of the lands that the king distributed among his relatives, in exchange for which they were to perform military service).

This means that in this type of society, the land, along with the other resources available in it, is seen as a source of food and materials that allow for the generation of new products.

During the existence of feudalism, according to Kuusinen et al (1962, p. 2), numerous relevant discoveries were made that had a great influence on the history of humanity: humans learned to turn cast iron into molten iron, to

build sailing boats suitable for long journeys, to prepare simple optical instruments (spectacles, glasses) and they invented the compass, gunpowder, paper, the printing press and the winding clock. The muscular energy of humans and animals was complemented and superseded by the force of the wind (e.g. windmills, sailboats) and from waterfalls (water mills and the water wheels - the most primitive engine that was used extensively during the Middle Ages).

Knowledge about natural resources was deepened, as these had to be analysed and recognised in great detail for the benefit of princes, who, according to Machiavelli (1532, p.99), exercised a military role as they had the responsibility of protecting their own people, as evidenced by the fortresses built during this period. In this context, hunting animals was an exercise that allowed them to perform two main functions: accustoming the body to fatigue and knowing the nature of the land, the altitude of the mountains, the access to the valleys, the location of the plains, the course of the rivers and the extent of the swamps. This allowed them first, to know the region where they lived and defend it better; and later, to make it easier to know a region where eventually human action would be necessary, since the shape of the hills, valleys, plains, rivers and marshes of a location could have some similarity with those of others.

In this sense, it is important to highlight how the environment and its natural resources serve as a source of materials and goods used in the different productive processes of the time. Agriculture and the handicraft industry are prominent, although organisation as an exchange society (market) has not yet been achieved.

In this kind of society, the social division of labour and social and economic inequality also increased; situations that end up giving rise to the formation of a capitalist society. The transition between these two types of societies was experienced more harshly, for example, in Spain, where, at the beginning of the 6th century as proposed by Álvarez (1984), was torn between two contradictory models: feudal and capitalist economy. As established by Moreno (2010), most of the population lived then in the countryside, with production having feudal forms and being generally destined for self-consumption. The land was concentrated in a few hands, and the social structure was very polarised: at the top of the pyramid were a few privileged people, while at the broad base were the rural people who worked in the countryside. In addition to the concentration of wealth, the tax burden was regressive, goods were scarce and prices ran very high.

At this time “one could not easily separate the economic motivations or even the economic actions of the great mass of humankind from the normal round of existence itself. The peasant following his immemorial ways was hardly conscious of acting according to ‘economic’ motives; indeed, he did not—he heeded the orders of his lord or the dictates of custom. Nor was the lord himself economically oriented. His interests were military or political or religious, and not basically oriented toward the idea of gain or increase” (Heilbroner, 1962, p. 70).

The aforementioned inequalities, together with the bourgeoisie’s need for a free people, emancipated from servitude but without property so that they could work in their factories, ends up creating capitalist society.

1.4 Capitalism

This type of society is based on the private property of the capitalist class over the means or factors of production. While workers are recently emancipated from the old feudal society, they lack the means to generate the sustenance that allows them to survive. “No longer was ‘labour’ part of an explicit social relationship in which one man (serf or apprentice) worked for another (lord or guildmaster) in return for at least an assurance of subsistence. Labour was now a mere quantum of effort, a “commodity” to be disposed of in the marketplace for the best price it could bring, quite devoid of any reciprocal responsibilities on the part of the buyer, beyond the payment of wages.” (Heilbroner, 1962, p. 71).

Peasants are forced to turn to the factories in order not to starve themselves. Due to the lack of means of subsistence, they only have the option of selling their labour force, thus becoming landless labourers (Heilbroner, 1962).

According to Martínez (2003, p. 45) “the link between the company and the rest of society was established through the labour market, the key piece of which was a contract that included the worker’s implicit acceptance of the company’s internal hierarchy”.

During this period, the individual acquires a structure of individualistic, selfish thought that is driven by the internal determinations of desire, which must overcome any limit that opposes its achievement. Its only natural end is the unlimited or indeterminate acquisition of goods to satisfy a likewise unlimited desire. In this way, relationships between people disappear as a foundation of the social order, since now it is the relation between the individual and things (which become objects of desire) that organise human sociability (Lahera, 2000, p. 38).

Additionally, the exploitation of natural resources is greatly intensified, as the steam engine appears as a factor of production, which allows, on the one hand, a faster extraction of resources and, on the other hand, a greater quantity. As Noah states (2014, p. 385) “The industrial revolution opened up new ways to convert energy and to produce goods, largely liberating humankind from its dependence on the surrounding ecosystem. Humans cut down forests, drained swamps, dammed rivers, flooded plains, laid down tens of thousands of kilometres of railroad tracks, and built sky-scraping metropolises”.

The increase in production volumes and the generation of negative environmental impacts degrades natural resources and increases extraction rates, making it impossible for ecosystems to return to their original conditions on their own. Carrying capacities are far exceeded - understood as the maximum concentration of a contaminant that can reach a natural resource without changing its original conditions. This technological development, from which a greater deterioration of natural resources results, has as its aim to achieve the maximum control over things and people themselves, focusing humanity’s mission on progress, increasingly outperforming itself (Jonas, 1979, p. 36).

The concept of development is anchored precisely to this historical evolution, because as different processes were implemented to extract natural resources, these were directed to generate economic development for the communities. The land, for example, “Formerly conceived as the territory of a great lord, as inviolable as the territory of a modern nation-state, land was now also seen in its economic aspect as something to be bought or leased for the economic return it yielded (...) The dues, the payments in kind, the intangibles of prestige and power that once had flowed from the ownership of land gave way to the single return of rent; that is, to a money return derived from putting land to profitable use.” (Heilbroner, 1962, p. 71).

In the same way, “property was a sum of tangible wealth, a hoard, a treasury of plate, bullion, or jewels (...) However, with the monetization and commercialization of society, property, too, became expressible in a monetary equivalent (...) Property became capital, manifesting itself no longer in specific goods, but as an abstract sum of infinitely flexible use whose “value” was its capacity to earn interest or profits.” (Heilbroner, 1962, p. 72).

Based on the above elements for each type of society, it can be said that before capitalism, humans did not have to worry about the care and protection of natural resources, as the exploitation of them was not so intense. As Jonas (1979, p. 27) puts it, in ancient times, “Much as he harries the Earth, the greatest of gods, year after year with his plough—she is ageless and unwearied; her enduring patience he must and can trust, and must conform

(...) man's inroads into nature, as seen by himself, were essentially superficial, and powerless to upset its appointed balance."

At this time (primitive, feudal, and slave communities), the economic component was not animated with a life of its own, but it was rather subsumed under the political and social elements of society. It is not until the capitalist social formation that the economic sphere becomes more relevant, becoming the ground for said type of society. Labour becomes important and the concept of development is created, evolving from a reduced concept within an economic dimension, associated only with growth and not with the distribution of income, to a complex vision that incorporates aspects related to social inequality, the position of countries and asymmetries of power within a given country and the incorporation of human and environmental aspects. As it will be shown below, diverse understandings of development—even in its later iterations such as “sustainable development”, or “human development”, with their focus on environmental or human concerns—all share in their effort to preserve the *social status quo*, rather than the environment itself.

II. THE CONCEPT OF DEVELOPMENT

The word development has had different conceptions throughout time, as it has evolved according to the mindset and specificities of societies. However, the idea of development will always be linked to the idea of the future, relating to how a society intends to see itself in a given period of time.

As Edelman and Haugerud (2005, p. 5-9) put it, the notion of development emerged at the end of the 18th and throughout the 19th centuries, as a measure of order for the disorder of progress. Subsequently, from 1960 to the early 1970s, the understanding of development focused on reaching the consumption levels of industrialised countries. It then went on to have the objective of redistributing with growth, seeking to satisfy the basic needs of the poor (without expectation of equity with wealthier nations) by the end of the 1970s; and finally in the 1980s, development focused on fiscal austerity under structural adjustment programmes that often sacrificed the poor (Leys, 1996, p. 26, quoted by Edelman and Haugerud, 2005). In the late 1980s, argues Leys (1996, p. 26, 24, quoted by Edelman and Haugerud, 2005), the recently expanded powers of world capital markets over national economies, along with other global economic changes, indicated that the “development theory” was in serious trouble; in fact, “the only development policy that was officially approved was to let the market allocate resources, not the State”.

In short (...) institutional changes in the global economy and financial system (...) accompanied a gradual redefinition of development itself in the 1970s, with large institutions such as the World Bank shifting their focus from economic specialization within a national framework to specialization in a world economy; thus, for the Bank, development became “participation in the world market” (...). [In addition] the debt crisis shifted the terms of development from a national to a global concern. States still pursue development goals, but these goals have more to do with global positioning than with management of the national ‘household’”(McMichael 2000, p. 150, quoted by Edelman and Haugerud, 2005).

What is under debate is the very concept of development and its relevance as a national, regional and local project in a context of globalisation; the extent to which local projects are compatible with the interests of large transnational corporations and foreign capital; and fundamentally, whether in these circumstances, the “free market” is the only possible alternative as preached by global commercial and financial bodies; or whether it is possible to return to the essence of development as a volitional, non-evolutionary act, as a process associated with the self-determination and sovereignty of peoples; and finally, what *institutional capacities* are required of our governments to choose between following or rejecting globalising tendencies that subordinate national interests to those of capital and multinational companies. It is considered that these aspects must be specified in

a concept of development and are crucial for the preservation of the environment, which is why the evolution of the concept of development in close connection with these socio-political variables is discussed below.

1.5 Economic development defined as growth

One of the first terms associated with 'development' was that of economic growth (Mallorquin, 1998, p. 20; Sunkel, 1970, p. 30). That is, development is confused or equated with the process of capital accumulation. This binomial, development and economic growth, from which it is difficult to separate the current more complex welfare measures such as those associated with human development proposed by Sen, such as the Human Development Index (HDI), takes into consideration *per capita* GDP. This concept has its origins in the interwar period (Serrano *et al*, 2014) due to the growing optimism in state intervention, oriented towards planning for progress and economic improvement.

It is as such, as Castillo (2011, p. 3) mentions, a "*process of transformation of society or a process of progressive improvement of the living conditions of each individual or family in a country or community*". The association made between growth and development allows for the distinction between developed countries and underdeveloped countries by measuring legal economic activities. A country that grows faster is generally referred to as being rich, developed or emerging into development. Therefore, one of the indicators of development since its emergence has been the Gross Domestic Product (GDP) of nations.

Although this idea may intuitively make sense, the problem with this notion is that it represents a spurious relationship. The fact that the economy has accelerated growth may be associated with employment growth as well as with the growth of environmental devastation (Furtado, 1975). The association of development with *per capita* economic growth, according to Sen (1998), can have at least five problems:

- i) It leaves aside the problems of distribution and poverty;
- ii) Externalities and non-market issues;
- iii) Implicit biases in the choice of market prices;
- iv) It gives an incomplete picture of people's lives;
- v) That GDP *per capita* at best can reflect a certain amount of goods that ends up being an insufficient approximation if you want to have any notion about the real access to those goods (Sen, 1998).

For the purposes of this article, the second problem relating to externalities refers to the fact that economists typically make monetary forecasts or estimates, and those things that do not have a price, such as a forest or pollution, have been assigned (allocated) a price and thus can be incorporated in the creation and design of a policy in a market context. Nevertheless, the estimates are highly subjective; consequently, the GDP measure is not consistent enough to take into account the externalities and therefore these conceptual and methodological bases on which the modern environmental economy is based must be considered with much caution.

Beyond the problem of measuring externalities, this concept of development involves the accumulation of wealth, in which the exploitation of natural resources is increasingly intensive in order to achieve the creation of capital at all costs. Economic development highlights the need to create goods and services of a certain quality to meet the needs of customers, without considering at any time the relations of organisms with their external environment, the natural resources, except the 'good judgment' of the consumer that is valued from the "surcharge" they would be willing to pay for the externality relative to the deterioration of the environment, from the perspective of the environmental economy (Albi, 2000).

Under the capitalist system, in which economic development is considered the foundation of society, the concern for the conservation and protection of the environment is based on businessmen becoming environmentally responsible, even if it is under the concept of development only seen as accumulation of capital

and wealth. As Friedman puts it (1962, p. 112) “there is one and only one social responsibility of business: to use its resources and engage in activities designed to increase its profits so long as it stays in the rules of the game, which is to say, engages in open and free competition, without deception or fraud”, which implies that the only responsibility of organizations within the capitalist system is in fact the generation of profits.

From the above, it can then be said that in order to incorporate the environmental element into the concept of economic development as such, the latter must be expanded and restructured. Due to the inclusion of each of the factors that determine economic growth (human resources, natural resources, capital and technology), it becomes impossible for human beings to continue validating development as solely economic. As mentioned above, the concepts of human development and sustainable development that have been promoted by international financial organisations such as the World Bank are also not a consistent response insofar as they do not succeed in overcoming the development-growth binomial. As they do not go beyond the institutional frameworks of a market economy, but under the postulates of the environmental economy their proposals are subordinated to this framework. Thus, the incorporation of the human element and the concept of sustainability is no more than a discourse for the maintenance of the social *status quo* rather than for the preservation of the environment, as shown below.

1.6 Human development and sustainable development: myths and realities

The United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1990) defines human development as the choice of individuals that aims to expand the range of opportunities open to people to live a healthy and creative life, with adequate means to develop in their social environment.

This means that human development associates the concept of development to the process of expanding people’s capabilities so that they can choose their way of life, increase their quality of life, happiness and comfort, thus questioning whether development depends solely on the expansion of physical capital. Thus, the concept of human development according to Dubois (2002) replaces an understanding of development centred on the production of goods with one centred on the expansion of people’s capacities. Amartya Sen (1988, p. 11), establishes precisely that “the enhancement of living conditions must clearly be an essential- if not the essential- object of the entire economic exercise and that enhancement is an integral part of the concept of development”.

Based on the claims of human development, it is important to look at a fundamental element that integrates this concept: the protection of the environment of which the human being is part, insofar as it refers to the expansion of people’s capabilities to live a healthy, creative life, and with adequate means to develop in their environment. Therefore it is fundamental to take into account natural resources and their proper use and management, bearing in mind that the environment and its natural resources are precisely those which, depending on their permanence over time, make it possible for human beings to enjoy food, landscape, the shade of a tree, clothing, moments of leisure, among others.

Thus, environmental conservation gives rise to the development of the concept of sustainable human development or simply sustainable development as it is generally known and which was raised in 1987 in the Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development (known as the Brundtland Report), which refers to the possibility that both present and future generations have the ability to meet their needs from the proper use of natural resources. The World Commission on Environment and Development (1987) states that sustainable development is “*development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs*”.

Although it is difficult to disagree with these statements, the same cautionary statements that have previously been made for environmental economics approaches still apply. It became the “turn of the screw” after the

1980s that has taken place since the introduction and widespread use of the notion of human development—a theory with universal ambitions that worked perfectly to dismantle the criticism directed at development, in its traditional association to growth. Nowadays, development is understood as high school-enrolment rates, low mortality and high income: the black box where all the millennium goals fit-³. The problems of income and regional inequality, as well as power asymmetries are hidden, among other categories that ECLAC had introduced in the post-war period.

With this discourse, the social transformations that are inevitably implicit in development have to be referred to the individual, everything depending on whether this social subject is endowed with the conditions for their free action. In this context, freedom, as the superior value of humanity, is crucial for their individual fulfilment and also for their social fulfilment. We believe that this discourse shows a special characteristic of government-fostered neoliberal policy: governments have renewed their form of intervention, thus expanding their power and influence. This belies the myth of the weakening power of the state, which prevails today in the current conceptions of “govern without government”, in which the state is supposed to be replaced by the market in processes of social management and regulation (Pierre and Peters, 2000; Weis, 1998).

One aspect that highlights this new conceptual hegemony (Alvarez Leguizamón, 2008) is that it shares the trait with its predecessor, that of development associated with economic growth. It is still part of a governmental program, although extended to a kind of “multinational or global state”. Thus, human development has become part of a framework enthusiastically promoted by international agencies such as the UN, through instrumental freedoms such as political freedoms, economic services, guarantees of transparency, social opportunities and protective security. It ends up being one more element of neoliberal governmentality.⁴

In this new era, it is fashionable to speak of social policy with conditional transfers, of war against poverty, of ‘weak’ and ‘strong’ institutions. The new public administrators construct their discourses and plans by conceptualising economic violence as a consequence of asymmetry in access to education, the health system, erroneous incentives that lead to informality or generate corruption. In fact, growth and development now depend only on a large stock of capital: “The poor are poor because they lack the resources and capabilities” (Spicker, Alvarez Leguizamon, & Gordon, 2009, p. 91).

Human development has been treated as a universal discourse and indirectly promotes the removal of the differentiated treatment that was promoted by peripheral countries in the post-war period. The overthrowing of that post-war perspective, which dominated even the UN discussions – and from which the Resolution of December 12, 1974 bore the name of the *Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States*, serves as a particularly telling example.⁵

³ The objectives of sustainable development are a kind of updating of texts where UN officials are updating the wish list and also the waiting list for its fulfilment.

⁴ A term Foucault uses to refer to the set of daily actions, apparently distanced from the government, such as those of educational, cultural or NGOs, which in practice are activities of political control under the ‘liquid’ concept of power of this author, that is, as something that flows, which is not static, but dynamic, where all are victims and perpetrators at the same time.

⁵ In the final provisions of that charter, articles 31 and 32 state that all States have the duty to contribute to the balanced expansion of the world economy taking into account the economic situation of developing countries and also forbid any State from using economic, political or any other type of measures for the purpose of coercing another State to obtain from it the subordination of its sovereign rights or to secure advantages of any kind.

Globalisation has in many ways entailed the end of politics and the legitimisation of expert government. It has brought about the end of politics embodied by collective subjects and its substitution by the empowered individual articulated in collectives or societies. It has marked the end of development as a collective, social phenomenon, which has begun to be treated as a matter of individual capacities and individual freedom to choose.

In this context, Jonas's remarks (1979, p. 37) take on full relevance when he states that "if the realm of making has invaded the space of essential action, then morality must invade the realm of making, from which it had formerly stayed aloof, and must do so in the form of public policy". This suggests that such a concept of development is dynamic through time. It depends on a search for balance among social, economic and natural elements. These will, in turn, depend on specific social transformations of societies and on the way they respond to the different situations that may arise as a result of development. Therefore, sustainable development actions cannot come from isolated individuals, from their individual (or individualistic) thoughts, but from political actions, that is, from collective actions through public policies. Sustainable development is inevitably a political process, it is not about programmes imposed from above by the government, therefore, aimed at the preservation of the social *status quo* and not precisely of natural resources and the environment. It is a process of social construction of sustainable development, of an alternative social project, therefore, of a project that has to come from below (Gilly, 1988). In short, sustainable development necessarily implies a political question, it is a political process that confronts not only different but contradictory conceptions, which finally leads us to the current debate of endogenous development: for or by the people.

1.7 Endogenous development: for or by the people. What course to take?

Agamben (2013) states that the current concept of development is toxic and harmful, so it is necessary to think of an endogenous development between the conceptions devised by the people, under which the community proposes its own vision and development scheme and for the people, which is imposed, and where the State has a transcendental role in the creation of directives, guidelines and public policies that allow to modify social action. On the other hand, Sachs (1996, p. 105) states: "(...) We are now forced to concern ourselves with the impacts of ecological stress—degradation of soils, water regimes, atmosphere, and forests—upon our economic prospects".

'No development without sustainability; no sustainability without development' is the formula which establishes the newly formed bond. 'Development' emerges rejuvenated from this liaison, the ailing concept gaining another lease of life. This is nothing less than the repeat of a proven ruse: every time in the last thirty years when the destructive effects of development were recognized, the concept was stretched in such a way as to include both injury and therapy. For example, when it became obvious, around 1970, that the pursuit of development actually intensified poverty, the notion of 'equitable development' was invented so as to reconcile the irreconcilable: the creation of poverty with the abolition of poverty. In the same vein, the Brundtland Report incorporated concern for the environment into the concept of development by erecting 'sustainable development' as the conceptual roof for both violating and healing the environment (Sachs, 1996, p. 106).

Thus, sustainable development, according to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization - UNESCO (1997, p. 9), "Does not necessarily set fixed limits on 'development' but rather recognizes that (...) sustainability calls for a dynamic balance among many factors, including the social, cultural and economic requirements of humankind and the imperative need to safeguard the natural environment of which humanity is a part".

In the end, the dynamic balance between social, cultural and economic factors and the need to safeguard the environment, defined in the concept of sustainable development, is reduced to a conception where what is fundamental is not economics, or politics, but culture is the integrating framework, as proposed by UNESCO (2010, p. 4) “culture is that which offers the context, values, subjectivity, attitudes and skills on which the development process must take place”.

With the creation of this proposed concept of *sustainable cultural human development*, the importance of the environment is considered to depend largely on the cultural conditions of a given community. It can be said that the development of a society is mediated by the culture of its members, development then being a consequence of culture. The problem with this interpretationistview is that it leaves aside the paths that lead to a “culture of environmental preservation”, that is, the problem of institutional and organisational changes, or in short, the social transformation that must necessarily be driven by political means.

According to this idea, Yudice (2005, quoted by Solís and others, 2014, p. 131) points out that “*cultural development is not posed exclusively in relation to cultural industries, but to its link with poverty and the sustainability of natural resources*”. Therefore, as it is associatedwith the concept of development, culture mediates the relations of human beings with their environment. This means that the concept of culture needs to be present in the promotion of environmental care and protection as a strategic foundation in public policy,if the purpose is to improve the environmental management of a territory. This is the sense that must prevail in the articulation of a conception of sustainable development as an essentially voluntary process, that is, a collection of wills that are expressed as public policies, and which have to deal with or circumvent territorial cultures. Thus, Polanyi (1989 - 1994) in his work *The Great Transformation* and particularly in *The Livelihood of Man* when proposing a “political mobilisation to transform reality”, which demands the development of a “thought for transforming action”, realise that this is non-existent in the context of currentmarket societies, in their organisation and culture, so it is necessary to go back to the pre-capitalist societies of the past. He finds his answers in the principles of reciprocity and mandate of those old society.⁶

Similarly, Jonas (1979) advocates for a new kind of ethicsgiven the absence of values in our technological civilisation:the ethics of responsibility. The threat and risks represented by the actions of *homo faber*regarding the preservation of the environment, for this author, can only take place through public policies, that is, at the same level as the actions of *homo faber*: as an expression of collective wills. Finally, culture seems to be, in the most recent conceptions, the foundation of public policies. Authors such as Subirat, Bourdieu or Majone, agree that the effectiveness of policy lies in the participation of the people, in argumentation, persuasion and conviction of the public (Roth, 2010; Subirats, 2001; Majone, 2005).

In short, culture as the set of beliefs, symbols, values and cognitive elements that underlie human behaviour is something that is already part of a society, so it is an element that does not necessarily change or is modified at will, which also means that when a change of culture is generated, it is because there was also a social, economic and political change. In this sense, culture cannot be seen strictly as a social obstacle with respect to the concept of sustainable development. It does need to be seen, however, as an element that increases the complexity of the transition from a society with a traditional production model to a clean production model. In this model, more production is encouraged, although with using as few natural resources as possible, and preventing or reducing the generation of negative environmental impacts.

Thus, it can be said that the concept of sustainable development must take into account that of culture, understood as the substratum under which a society is organised, in order to be able to establish strategies and

⁶ Principles that denote the social essence of economic and production processes, fully visible in ancient societies up to feudalism and ‘hidden’ in capitalist society.

tools that are functional for that type of society (with its given characteristics). This is so because the measures applied to one community will not necessarily apply in the same way to another, as long as its social foundations, that is to say, its cultural elements, differ from each other.

From the aforementioned considerations, it can be said that the way forward is, in itself, the search for development *by the people*, in which employment is generated, in which the quality of life of the community is improved and the environment is treated with respect. The paths to be taken are not unique, often the community's understanding of development apparently contradicting or rejecting conventional conceptions. Womack's *Zapata* begins with a sentence that captures the peasant identity of revolutionary Mexico at the beginning of the 20th century:

“This is a book about country people who did not want to move and therefore got into a revolution.”

Development for indigenous peoples and peasants of Mexico, owners of almost half of the territory, has been nothing more than the history of defence against the invasion of their lands and the dispossession of their natural assets by extractive and energy projects, supported and promoted by successive neoliberal governments and their laws. Even in the current progressive government of Andres Manuel López, they intend to implement an electricity program and economic zones, although not in a way imposed by the state but through “democratic formulas” of popular consultations.

The above shows that development strategies are diverse, complex and dynamic, as they must adapt to social interactions in which a multiplicity of actors with diverse values and interests intervene; where the complexity of situations exceeds any ability to prepare for them; all this under dynamic social processes of permanent change (Kooiman, 2005). However, the strategies implemented today to preserve the environment do not fit into this context of complexity; they obey to more reductionist views on development, under which property rights and environmental management systems are structured, such as those proposed in the current environmental economy, for example. Thus, by way of conclusion in the following section, a review of some of the strategies that have been implemented to promote the preservation of the environment in Latin America and Colombia will be presented. We will establish their nature and scope in terms of their transforming potential from their value in a *continuum* that goes from the reductionist extreme of the environmental economy, to other strategies of greater complexity such as the creation of public policies and command and control instruments, which aim more at a development under which the forms of societal organisation are modified as well as the way in which societies deal with the resources that surround them.

RESULT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

2. SOME IDEAS OR STRATEGIES CREATED BY HUMAN BEINGS TO PRESERVE THE ENVIRONMENT

From the 1970s onwards, some ideas or strategies have been put forward to reduce the risk to which societies are subjected with regard to ecology. These include property rights, cleaner production, environmental management systems and green markets, some of which are currently only under consideration and others, on the contrary, have already been or are being developed and implemented.

2.1 Property rights

The concept of property rights finds its origins in economic theory. Usaquén (2008, p. 353) defines it as the possibility that “*a right holder, supported by the norm, may appropriate and exploit, transfer or donate a resource*”. This means that when a person owns the land or a natural resource, they have all the power over it, both to exploit it and to protect it. Therefore, it is considered that a way to prevent and / or control

environmental pollution is by granting property rights to individuals over natural resources. Since they own them, they will be more concerned about maintaining them in optimal conditions so as to be able to use them over time. This would not happen if they were not their own, as the existence of collective goods can generate in some human beings the perception that the protection and care of natural resources is not their responsibility, because there are thousands of people who can access them, both to take care of them and to exploit them.

This is in stark contrast with the description of pre-capitalist societies and it is precisely with the rise of capitalist society, in which private property as the foundation of its economic and social organisation, that the most serious ecological risks emerge. So, on the contrary, private property is not the solution but the cause of environmental pollution. This means that the prevention and/or control of environmental pollution more than a problem of the private property regime, and consequently of individual powers, is a problem of collective power. It is not a problem for the “invisible hand” (the market) to solve with the sum of individual wills in the “search of their own interest”. As a problem of the collectivity, the answers have to be collective, as Jonas (1979) prescribes a collective will that can only be expressed in societies as public policies, as a regulatory action of the market reorienting it from the private interest, to the public interest.

Roldán (1998), argues that modern societies are hardly governed through culture, because it cannot be manipulated. In order to speak of a new form of organisation of social and cultural life that results in appropriate environmental management, effectively reducing negative environmental impacts that may appear, it is necessary to generate public policies that seek to change the patterns of production and consumption of natural resources, through the gradual implementation of environmentally-friendly mechanisms. Under this idea, some voluntary strategies related to environmental management employed in Colombia are presented below, which have an incipient degree in the preservation of the environment, since in them the protection of natural resources is left to the will of the individual.

2.2 Voluntary strategies: cleaner production policy, environmental management systems and green markets

- **Colombian National Cleaner Production Policy**

As the Colombian Ministry of the Environment initially proposed it in the year 1997, this policy emerged as a mechanism to offer a solution to the environmental problems of the productive sectors, preventing pollution at its origin, instead of treating it once it has been produced. This approach would favour both organisational profitability and natural resource sustainability.

Subsequently, it was updated by what was then the Colombian Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development in 2010 and renamed as *National Policy of Production and Consumption: Towards a Culture of Sustainable Consumption and Productive Transformation* which, in addition to the aforementioned objective, integrates the concept of sustainable consumption (understood as the purchase of goods or services generated from recycled or biodegradable materials), as Colombia understood that environmental pollution problems do not depend solely on production processes or the provision of services, but also on the consumer's behaviour towards them, and their purchase decisions with respect to the different goods present in the market. The purpose of this policy was, on the one hand, to encourage less consumption and, on the other hand, to foster among consumers the preference for environmentally friendly goods and services instead of consuming those that have not incorporated the environmental variable within their process.

This policy was presented as a guideline that organisations may adopt voluntarily, but not obligatorily. Implementation in the market has perhaps not been as expected, because of two reasons. First, most organisations implement activities concerning the care of natural resources only when they are required to

comply with a legal requirement, which, if ignored, could lead to economic sanctions for the organisation. The second scenario occurred when the market's own demands, particularly as occurring in relations with suppliers and clients, generate some pressure to adopt environmental management tools that demonstrate the improvement of this component inside and outside the organisation; in this context, companies perceive that without these measures, economic transactions between the different agents could be compromised. The current problem is that appeals are still made to the individual will, whereas the environment is a collective issue.

- **Environmental Management Systems**

Environmental Management Systems can be defined as organisational schemes that seek to implement environmental management strategies and tools that prevent the generation of new negative environmental impacts and reduce the magnitude of existing ones, while promoting the continuous improvement of environmental processes in organisations. Examples of Environmental Management Systems are ISO 14001, which contains the requirements that can be audited for purposes of certification/registration or self-declaration of the management system. This international standard does not establish absolute requirements for environmental performance, beyond the commitment in environmental policy to comply with legal and other requirements applicable to the organisation, pollution prevention and continuous improvement (ISO, 2004). It is voluntary and has been the scheme most frequently chosen by Colombian organisations when they decide to certify their environmental management system.

Another example is the one mentioned by the Colombian Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Environment (2016): The Eco-Management and Audit Scheme (EMAS) which is a voluntary tool designed by the European Commission for the registration and public recognition of those companies and organisations that have an environmental management system. This allows them to assess, manage and improve their environmental impacts, thus ensuring excellent performance in this area. It is similar to ISO 14001 in that it grants certification or awards to those companies that comply with the environmental standards defined by that organisation. In this case it is noteworthy that the term community does not correspond to a collective construction, but it is a specific system for organisations located within the European community, so that for Colombia it would only apply to companies originating in Europe.

- **Green Markets**

The creation of this strategy dates back to approximately the 1980s. After the emergence of the concept of sustainable development, different countries, most of them developed, began to commercialise goods and services produced or generated from processes less harmful to the environment. Green markets have two main objectives according to Ottman (1998, p. 45):

- To develop products that balance consumer needs, quality, performance, price and convenience with environmental compatibility.
- To project an image of high quality, which includes an environmental sensitivity related to the attributes of the product and at the same time to the environmental achievements of the producing companies.

According to Grant (2007), the green market has three fundamental components:

- It sets new standards: It is based on commercial objectives, communicating that the brand and its products are greener than other alternatives. It seeks to make a difference.
- Shared responsibilities: Commercial and environmental objectives are pursued at the same time; it seeks to change the way people use products through brand experiences, events and education.
- It supports innovation: In addition to the above, cultural objectives are added, generating new ways of life and new business models (Grant, 2007, p.12).

In Colombia, the advances generated in this area take into account the 2006 definition of green products by the Ministry of Environment, Housing and Territorial Development as those that focus on markets specialising in goods and services which, in addition to promoting the sustainable use and conservation of natural resources, foster a fairer and more equitable distribution of the economic benefits generated, since they include social sustainability variables for the groups involved in their production. Later, in 2015, the Assistant Manager for Cultural Affairs at *Banco de la República* established the National Strategic Plan of Green Markets, which seeks to foster commercial transactions for different categories such as clean development mechanisms, sustainable use of natural resources and biodiversity, industrial ecoproducts and environmental services. These, in turn, seek to accentuate the implementation of the National Policy of Production and Sustainable Consumption, where the commercialisation of goods and services is intended to produce less negative environmental impact and, in turn, promote a preference for sustainable consumption in society. This shows that green markets are a relevant issue in the country, incipient and in constant development, because as Echeverri (2008, p. 14) states *“in Colombia, the use of green marketing strategies by companies is in a nascent phase. While the Colombian market is supported by sustainability programs for companies with green market developments, few studies have been conducted on these practices”*.

The first step, therefore, is to create regulations, then to promote changes in the social mindset. At this point, sedimentation occurs, and cognitive patterns for individual behaviour are incorporated. At this point it is essential to be clear that both the State and the market form an essential part of the context of the environment, and it is important to define the type of State that is required for environmental preservation. Thus, these strategies can be considered a step in the establishment of an environmental management system within an organisation, which needs to be increasingly fostered from within. Through rational change, and the creation of new regulation (as well as the modification of existing regulation to it more restrictive), it is possible to understand that human beings, and the organisations within which they work, are a fundamental part of the concept of the environment.

2.3 Regulatory strategies: environmental legislation

The regulatory and control mechanisms for the protection of natural resources are relatively recent in today's societies. In Colombia, for example, they date from approximately the 1970s, when through different global commissions and conventions, the issue of environmental protection began to be dealt with, due to health problems generated by pollution that began to manifest themselves with increasing strength.

This supposes that the regulations, in addition to being recent, have a limited development in some areas such as those related to soil resources. In other areas (such as water and air), regulations are still evidently limited, and in some cases, ineffective. This is so because on the one hand it is not possible to carry out a real implementation of the laws, as communities seem to have little knowledge about them. On the other hand, governmental ability to enforce them is deficient, which means that in many cases the country has the regulatory mechanisms, but they are not effectively enforced.

Against this backdrop, we need to bear in mind that our current societies exist in the context of a globalised world, in which, according to Messner (2001, p. 49) *“the different universal structures and networks influence each other, interpenetrate each other and create chain effects that may also lead to global systemic risks”*. In this context, for example, the case may arise that direct investments by multinational companies in less developed countries with scarce environmental regulations and/or legal loopholes may further promote the generation of environmental degradation processes.

Thus, we can see how environmental regulations in Colombia take up again the notion that natural resources are a common good, a fundamental right of all citizens where the general good prevails over the particular good or

where legal requirements put a stop to environmental pollution problems. It should not be forgotten, however that this is a process that takes several years; it is still developing and depends on the will of many individuals, so it can be said that the execution of legal requirements is individual, because although the Constitution mentions the common good, the actions are individual and voluntary, or occur through incentives and education, without really arriving at a precise regulation of common goods.

Based on the aforementioned strategies, it is possible to establish that in each one of them and as previously stated, it is necessary to incorporate education in the process of their implementation. In this way, it will be possible to generate consciousness changes in human beings, so that when they implement one or several of the different strategies presented, so that they can really promote a sustainable cultural human development. Without incorporating the educational component, it may not be enough to continue advancing in the care and protection of the environment, given that many of the strategies enunciated require sufficient knowledge, dissemination and motivation to guarantee their execution.

Likewise, it is important to mention that the previous measures have mostly arisen as programs from international organisms, under which the preservation of the capitalist system is sought, rather than the environment as such. Nevertheless, it can be said that the changes that have occurred in history with support from state agencies, imply collective actions (public policies) and it is precisely with these that the existing tendency to generate greater damage to the environment is corrected.

CONCLUSIONS

The environment and economic systems

The environment is directly related to the different economic systems that have evolved throughout history. It is a fundamental element in the concept of development, which was initially seen as the achievement of economic growth associated with productive improvement. It was later understood, in addition to economic growth, in relation to other considerations such as culture, quality of life and the environment as a human right.

It is not until the emergence of capitalist society when natural resources are seen as factors of production and are subjected to unlimited exploitation, based on a regime of improvement of productive processes. This improvement implies finding the best way to exploit nature, so that instead of seeing it as something that should be protected, it is seen as a means for the creation and accumulation of wealth, regardless of the consequences.

Under these circumstances, the protection of natural resources requires going back to the economic principles of ancient societies prior to capitalism (Polanyi, 1947 - 1994): in the economies of tradition, mandate and reciprocity, substituting and/or complementing the principles of exchange in market practices. Here, it becomes necessary to humanise the economic system in which human beings are seen as objects. This is accomplished through the substitution of the utilitarian principles of capitalism for social values that transcend these reified relations that dominate social reality, for essentially human, socially-oriented relations. Thus, to subordinate the processes of technological improvement to the protection and care of nature by means of its state regulation and the construction of public policies (economy of the mandate) allows for society to be aligned with new friendly practices concerning the environment.

Environment and development concepts

Even though in theory development processes have evolved from a solely economic vision to a human-centred concept, in practice there are no significant advances, and the institutions created in this field only constitute a discourse to disguise the real objective of generating economic benefits through the protection of private property, rather than the environment. Thus, sustainable, cultural and human development is only feasible

through a voluntary process, understood as the result of (social) wills, where a new form of organisation of social and cultural life is generated, in which the problem of environmental pollution must be resolved by the community and through the creation of public policies which must be constructed horizontally, as a requirement or condition for their viability.

The creation of property rights and the existence of voluntary strategies do not guarantee the protection of natural resources. In the first case, an individual would have the freedom to exploit the resources of their property and would therefore be in charge of guaranteeing their survival over time, but these actions would be dictated more by the maintenance of their quality of life and the benefits generated by the exploitation of resources than by the fact of caring for nature as a basic component of human existence. In this case, private property is the problem, not the solution. In the second case, there would be no regulation. Therefore, in order to achieve real protection of natural resources, it would be necessary to create a new paradigm regarding the concept of development, where the current capitalist system is adjusted and reformed, incorporating the regulation of the State through public policies where initially the preservation of natural resources is considered and only later, that of private property. It would therefore respond to a communal, public, collective initiative, with policies of governmental intervention.

Environment, incentive economy, and liberalism and public policies (state regulation)

In the case of voluntary strategies, such as the incentive economy, for example, where green markets coerce polluters, their implementation is more a market strategy on the part of organisations. In some cases, the generation of profitability is subordinated to the implementation of practices that promote the protection of natural resources, but once again, this is done to ensure the economic welfare of organisations and therefore of a few individuals, who have an active environmental conscience that promotes the improvement of the environment and therefore of society, where social welfare prevails over private interests (i.e. organisations).

Thus, in order to achieve real environmental protection, it is necessary to go beyond the discursive limit of voluntary strategies, promoted by international organisms, which is oriented to a greater extent to preserve the status quo of the capitalist society, where the interests of companies and hegemonic groups is sought and not the collective interest. Protecting the environment means modifying these behaviours, for which it is necessary at first to enforce coercive mechanisms that gradually generate institutionalisation. Thus, a model of multiple actors and incentives is proposed to achieve greater progress in the institutional platform, in such a way that collective constructions are generated, which allow for agreements to be reached between the parties for the preservation of the environment and thus gradually eliminating coercive actions in favour of consensual political action.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- [1.] Agamben, Giorgio (2013). Por una teoría del poder destituyente. Lobo Suelto! Anarquía Coronada. Disponible en <<http://lobosuelto.com>>. Consultado el 30 de marzo de 2018.
- [2.] Albi Ibáñez, Emilio (2000). Público y privado un acuerdo necesario, Editorial Ariel, Barcelona, España.
- [3.] Amartya Sen (1988). "The Concept of Development" in Handbook of Development Economics, Volume L Edited by H. Chenery and T.N. Srinivasan © Elsevier Science Publishers B.V.
- [4.] Álvarez, Manuel Fernández (1984). La sociedad española en el Siglo de Oro. Madrid: Editorial Nacional, 87p.
- [5.] Castillo Martín, Patricia (2011). Política económica: crecimiento económico, desarrollo económico, desarrollo sostenible. En: Revista Internacional del Mundo Económico y del Derecho. Vol. III. p. 1-12.

-
- [6.] CMMAD - Comisión Mundial sobre el Medio Ambiente y el Desarrollo(1987).Nuestro Futuro Común. 2p.
- [7.] Dubois, Alfonso(2002).Un concepto de desarrollo para el siglo XXI. Universidad Deusto. España. 11p.
- [8.] Echeverri, lina (2008). Acciones y prácticas de mercadeo verde en empresas colombianas (casos de estudio). Colegio de Estudios Superiores en Administración CESA Bogotá – Colombia.
- [9.] Edelman, Marc. Haugerud, Angelique. (2005). The Anthropology of Development and Globalization. From Classical Political Economy to Contemporary Neoliberalism. Blackwell Publishing. 416 p.
- [10.] Friedman, Milton(1962). Capitalism and Freedom. The University of Chicago Press, Ltd., London. 166 p.
- [11.] Furtado, Celso (1975). El desarrollo económico: un mito. Siglo XXI editores S.A., 1ª Edición en español, México.
- [12.] Gilly, Adolfo (1988).”Nuestra caída a la modernidad”, Ed. Juan Boldo Climent Editores, España.
- [13.] González Ladrón de Guevara, Francisco José y Valencia Cuéllar, Jorge (2013).Conceptos básicos para repensar la problemática ambiental. Revista Gestión y Ambiente. Vol. 16, No. 2, abril, p. 121 – 128.
- [14.] Grant, J. (2007). The Green Marketing Manifiesto. United States: John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- [15.] Heilbroner, Robert. 1962. La formación de la sociedad económica. Fondo de cultura económica. México – Buenos Aires.
- [16.] ISO – Organización Internacional de Estandarización (2004). Norma ISO 14001: Sistemas de gestión ambiental — Requisitos con orientación para su uso. 36p.
- [17.] Jonas, Hans. 1979. El principio de responsabilidad. Ensayo de una ética para la civilización tecnológica. Herder. España. 361 p.
- [18.] Koiman, Jan (2005); Gobernar en Gobernanza en “La gobernanza hoy: 10 textos de referencia; INAP-Madrid. pp. 57- 81
- [19.] Kuusineny otros(1962).La historia como desarrollo y sucesión de formaciones económico – sociales. Fundamentos de Marxismo – Leninismo. Moscú: Editorial del Estado de Literatura Política. 12p.
- [20.] Lahera, Arturo (2000). La crítica de la economía de mercado en Karl Polanyi: el análisis institucional como pensamiento para la acción. Universidad Complutense. Madrid. Pp. 27-52.
- [21.] Majone, G. (2005), Evidencia, argumentación y persuasión en la formulación de políticas, 2ª reimpresión, México, Fondo de Cultura Económica.
- [22.] Mallorquín, C. (1998), Ideas e historia en torno al pensamiento latinoamericano, México, D.F., Plaza y Valdés Editores.
- [23.] Maquiavelo, Nicolás(1532). El Príncipe. Edición Electrónica Escuela de Filosofía Universidad Arcís. p 1 – 71.
- [24.] Martínez, Miguel Alfonso(2003). Los orígenes de la teoría de la empresa. Cuadernos Empresa y Humanismo,No. 88, p. 1-79.
- [25.] Messner, Dirk (2001). Globalización y gobernabilidad global. Nueva Sociedad, No. 176, p.48-66.

-
- [26.] Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente (2016). Sistema Comunitario de Gestión y Auditoría Medioambientales: EMAS.2p.
- [27.] Ministerio del Medio Ambiente (1997).Política Nacional de Producción Más Limpia, Santa Fe de Bogotá. 46p.
- [28.] Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial. (2006). Visión de los Mercados Verdes en Colombia. Bogotá.
- [29.] Ministerio de Ambiente, Vivienda y Desarrollo Territorial (2010).Política de Nacional de Producción y Consumo: Hacia una cultura de consumo sostenible y transformación productiva. 72p.
- [30.] Moreno, Gloria (2010). El nuevo mundo en el pensamiento económico español de los siglos XVI y XVII. *Inventio, la génesis de la cultura universitaria en Morelos*, No. 12, p. 4-13.
- [31.] Noah Harari, Yuval (2014). De animales a dioses. Breve historia de la humanidad. PenguinRandomHouse Grupo Editorial. 492 p.
- [32.] Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura – UNESCO (1997).Educación para un Futuro Sostenible: Una Visión Transdisciplinaria para una Acción Concertada. 49p.
- [33.] Organización de las Naciones Unidas para la Educación, la Ciencia y la Cultura – UNESCO(2010).Cultura y Desarrollo: Evolución y perspectivas. 30p.
- [34.] Ottman, J. (1998). Green Marketing Opportunity for Innovation. New York: Ottman Consulting INC.
- [35.] Pierre, Jon and Peters B. Guy (2000); *Governance, Politics and the State*; ed. Political Analysis.
- [36.] Polanyi K. (1947). Our obsolete market mentality. *Commentary*, N° 3, pp. 109 – 117.
- [37.] Polanyi K. (1966). *Dahomey and the slaves trade*, Seattle, University of Washington Press.
- [38.] Polanyi K. (1968 a). The semiotics of money – uses in Dalton (1968: 175 – 203).
- [39.] Polanyi K. (1968 b). On the comparative treatment of economic institutions in antiquity with illustrations from Athen, Mycenae and Alalakah, in Dalton (1968: 306 - 334).
- [40.] Polanyi K. (1976 a). Intercambio sin Mercado en tiempos de Hammurabi, in K. Polanyi, C. Arensberg y H. Pearson (1976: 289 – 316).
- [41.] Polanyi K. (1976 b). Artístoteles describe la economía, in K. Polanyi, C. Arensberg y H. Pearson (1976: 111 – 141).
- [42.] Polanyi K. (1976 c). La economía como actividad institucionalizada, in K. Polanyi, C. Arensberg y H. Pearson (1976: 289 – 316).
- [43.] Polanyi K. (1989). *La gran transformación*, Madrid. La piqueta.
- [44.] Polanyi K. (1994). *El sustento del hombre*, Barcelona, Mondadori.
- [45.] Reyes, Cecilia(2015).The Global RisksReport 2016: Foro Económico Mundial. 3p.
- [46.] Roldan Tomas (1998).An Inquiry into the Historical Meaning of “The Fifth Discipline”. In:*SystemicPractice and ActionResearch*, Vol. 11, No. 5, p. 1-19.

-
- [47.] Roth, André Noël (2010); “Enfoques para el Análisis de las Políticas Públicas”; Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Bogota.
- [48.] Sachs. W (editor) (1996). Diccionario del desarrollo. Una guía del conocimiento como poder. PRATEC, Perú. 399 p.
- [49.] Serrano, A.M., López, M.C., Pérez, M., Palma, M. y García , G. (2014): “Estado Actual de la Investigación en Emprendimiento : Desafíos y Soluciones”, III Workshop de la Sección de Función Empresarial y Creación de Empresas de ACEDE Nuevas fronteras en la investigación en emprendimiento y en la docencia del emprendimiento, 63-77.
- [50.] Spicker, AlvarezLeguizamon y Gordon (2009). Pobreza. Un glosario internacional. Clacso.
- [51.] Solís, Pedro. Giovanna Mazzotti, Claudia González(2014). Un nuevo enfoque para la gestión de los centros Históricos, y sus implicaciones en el bienestar social.En Investigación y Políticas Públicas. José Gómez y Enrique Vázquez. Grupo Editorial HESS S.A. de C.V. p 121-142.
- [52.] Sunkel O. (Comp.) Integración Política y Económica (pp. 311-344). Santiago de Chile: Editorial Universitaria.
- [53.] Subgerencia Cultural del Banco de la República(2015). Mercados verdes. 2p.
- [54.] Subirats, Joan. (2001). Nuevos mecanismos participativos y democracia: promesas y amenazas, en Font, Joan, (Coordinador), Ciudadanos y decisiones públicas, Barcelona, Ariel Ciencia Política, , pp. 33-42.
- [55.] Usaquén Chía, Martha Inés (2008).Externalidades: más que un problema de derechos de propiedad. En: Revista CIFE, No. 13,septiembre, p. 353 – 369.
- [56.] Yudice, George (2005). Cultura y desarrollo: Análisis y consecuencias, Conferencia para el Seminario Cultura como factor de desarrollo, Universidad de Chile, Santiago de Chile. 16p.