

Politics of development

Technology, Development



We may ask, what is politics of development?

In a layman's interpretation, politics of development may be the politics of the State that implies involvement of all segments of the society, specifically its governance to focus on the shared goal to attain political transformation. What could be then the transformation that could evolve? Would it be beneficial to the sovereign will of the people? Before elaborating further on this query, please allow me to discuss the relationship of “ politics of development” to “ globalization and sustainable development”.

Discussions of issues Politics of development relating Globalization and Sustainable Development According to the e-book entitled: ‘ Globalization and Sustainable Development: Issues and Application’, published in 2006 by Dr. Kiran C. Patel of the Center for Global Solutions at the University of South Florida, globalization is may be embedded in the consequential breakage of economic barrier in international trade and finance, in which globalization link people around the world in an augmented exchange of goods, services and capital.

On the other hand, sustainable development could be best simply explained as to meeting the contemporary economic needs without forfeiting the capability of future economic setting. Thus, we can now correlate the relevance of “ politics of development” in meeting the challenges of future economies. Under the norm of politics of development, transformation could evolve in the framing of state policies that focuses on sustainable development, while globalization is a phenomenal occurrence in the utilization of global economies.

It is a fact that in order for developed and undeveloped countries to subsist in the free market competition, the expansive build up of factories worldwide and increasing transport needs of ballooning population has intensely contributed in threatening effects of air pollution; from which impending global warming and abnormal climate change is felt throughout the world. Socio-political forces relating environment, economy and poverty One that can exemplify politics of development relates the significance of State policy in mitigating environmental devastation.

In the US, the Clean Air Act of 1990 was amended by Congress with empowering provisions to institutionalize the policy by creating the US-Environmental Protection Agency (US-EPA). The US-EPA was mandated to implement the Clean Air Act through mitigating and controlling air pollution from the “ source”, in which the implementation covers a comprehensive program, such as (1) Air Quality and Emission Limitations; (2) Ozone Protection; (3) Prevention of Significant Deterioration of Air Quality; (4) Aircraft Emission Standards; (5) Clean Fuel Vehicles; (6) Acid Deposition Control; and (7) Stratospheric Ozone Protection (US-EPA 2008).

This State policy in environmental protection translates the politics of development in view of sustaining the judicious economic resource. However, according to the 2007 statistics of Gibson Consulting Online (GCO) on top 3 ranking consumers of oil barrels per day, the US with 20 million, China is 5. 6, and Japan is 5. 5 (GCO 2007). This could be translated that the US has the largest consumption of oil from the world consumer market aside from other highly industrialized countries.

We may further proceed in discussing politics of development relating “political economy”, from which our discourse leads to interrelationship of politics and economy. We may perceive that the positioning of US’ foreign economic policy focuses on undeveloped or under developed economies in order to venture out capital investments, in which poor countries depend. This dependency remains an opportunity for the US to explore the vast economic structure of the poor countries.

Another measure that favors US positioning over undeveloped countries’ economy is the implementation of the World Trade Organization-Government Agreement on Tariff and Trades (WTO-GATT). In WTO-GATT, multilateral economic cooperation can only be achieved if supplier countries can efficiently meet the agreed and required supply volume, quality preference and terms of delivery schedule. In effect, the poor countries that are unable to compete and fulfill the mandates of WTO-GATT would rather remain dependent in foreign investment schemes.

Although the primary purpose of GATT to the 1947 first-round of agreement was to reduce the tariff in exportation and importation of goods (GATT 1947: Art. 1). One example of dependency is the Philippines’ domestic production inefficiency that remains dependent on foreign capital investments as largely aided by US, aside from China, Japan and other European Countries. To cite, continuing factional politics, corruption, uprising and revolts in the Philippines resulted lack of financial capital to maintain economic balance and growth (Bell, Davis & Gordon 2005: p.). Although foreign investments in the Philippines help rebuild its impoverished economy, the magnitude of investment in mining, urban zoning, technological industries and aqua-

marine exploration for oil and minerals have resulted to over-utilization of the ecosystem. Economic analysts believe that over-utilization of Philippines' economic resources is an abuse and exploits the natural habitation of flora and fauna that results forest denudation and imbalance to the base of economy that has three-fold effect to poverty.

Again we may emphasize political economy relating to “meet” the demands of US' economic structure. Perceptions and analysis on the US war to Iraq was entangled to the “opportunistic” retaliation of US in the name of justice and democracy from the aftermath of the 9/11 tragedy. We may say opportunistic for the perception that the war on terrorism has given the US with an opportunity to pursue its political and economic interests in the Middle East, specifically paving its way in gaining the momentum of foreign diplomacy and the implementation of its foreign policies.

Thus, the US foreign policies outline their economic needs. The primary needs of the US could be equated of its status as a largest oil consumer, in which the Middle East remains a substantial source of oil and major supplier to US. We can now perceive both sides of politics of development from the perspectives of globalization and sustainable development, and its character in political economy relating to geopolitics. We can then shift to discussing politics of development relating “global equity”.

From the point of view of global equity, it perceives politics of development as addressing a State policy that seeks participation to global economies. In Natalia Dinello and Lyn Squire Book entitled: ‘Globalization and equity: Perspectives from the Developing World’, published in 2005, summarized the findings that the Western countries, particularly the US, has driven the <https://assignbuster.com/politics-of-development/>

globalization agenda, ensuring to gain an unequal share of the benefits at the expense of the developing world (Dinello & Squire 2005: p. 355).

In Dinello and Squire Works, it may be perceived that global equity still offer an opportunity for the rich countries to invest. As categorized by our example about the Philippines as a poor country that may be seeking global equity to participate in the world market, the rich country like US facilitates in trade, brokering and legitimize its role as a middle man. Global equity could have been gained by the Philippines through flexible policies on trade and commerce. Instead, what has been gained by the Philippines is its export-import oriented economy.

We have specified the character of the US as one of the socio-political forces central to the environmental issues in the Philippines. In addition, we may as well feature politics of development relating the character of the Soviet Union on its “ new” governmental system in Northern Eurasia. According to the journal entitled: ‘ Environmental degradation in Eastern Europe, Caucasus and Central Asia: past roots, present transition and future hopes’, which was published in 2003 by the Department of Environmental Sciences and Policy, Central European University in Budapest, the Soviet political-economic system from mid-1980s towards early 990s were firmly linked with environmental concerns. To cite, the Soviet politicians have significantly re-focused on reforms which they found that the “ old political system” was known of ineffectiveness and denies public opinion and critically considered as causal to environmental degradation in Northern Eurasia (Cherp, A. & Mnatsakanian, R. 2003: pp. 1-11). The findings from the journal points out to the environmental degradation as inflicted by massive industrialization.

As cited, the Soviet Union was led by the exceedingly centralized government bureaucracy with diminutive consideration to local environmental concerns in which the government has unable to stop environmental deterioration, unlike the socialist (communist) government who has social-environmental agenda. It was found that the government is unable to formulate feasible environmental protection policy and programs that will prevent the manufacturers in using obsolete industrial machines and technologies that largely contributes to air pollution.

It may be reflected that the change of political system in Northern Eurasia, specifically the Soviet Union, has resulted the emergence of domestic industries and liberal economy from which the newly established government needs to re-create and re-structure a strong interstate environmental policy. Moreover, the emergence of socio-political forces in Northern Eurasia could be attributed into two characters, such as (1) the government's inability to hold check-and-balance in governing environmental issues, and (2) proliferation of industrial liberalism, wherein "capitalism" have been resurrected from the grave of a socialist state.

Moreover, an eye opening segment from the variety of our discussions may also briefly tackle the impact of industrialization in poorest of the poor countries, specifically in Africa. From the journal "Political Economy of AIDS in Africa", published in 2004 and reviewed by Julie King in 2006, corroborate to the finding that HIV/AIDS is not only a pandemic disease but a broader social disease needing immediate policy response (King 2006: p. 367). According to King, medical missions only tend to relieve the pain and treat

the disease while larger geographical units of Africa are swallowed by foreign capitalist in mineral exploration.

Further findings reveal that most of highly-infected population belongs from agrarian landholdings that has been isolated and vacated by residents, in which are prospected for industrial claim. Conclusion We may now come to the concluding portion of our discussion by re-examining the transformation process on politics of development. We may then define and classify the characteristics by concluding that politics of development justifies the socio-political role of the State [particularly the superpower countries, like US and Soviet Union] in framing its policy agenda to the global economic and political landscape.

As we have earlier discussed, political economy interlock globalization only for countries that subsist in the competition of the free enterprise. What have then left to the poor countries (like the Philippines) are their domestic policies [and may be patterned from foreign policies] to sustain the economy that is entangled to the global needs, since they have enough arable lands and excess labor that are potentially cheap and available. We may further conclude that politics of development evolves into two categorical settings.

First, political setting is being jointly acquired according to the interstate (domestic) and intrastate (foreign) needs because political undertaking do not only exist in one geographical governance. This conclusion applies to the socio-political role-modeling of the US that shapes its foreign policy. Second, economic setting is being jointly earned through “ economic colonies”, wherein capitalism exists upon a foreign policy that is patronized and solicited by a dependent country.

In contrast, we may conclude that politics of development may evolve the transformation of vibrant political economy wherein reform is acquired and bestowed upon with legitimate global equity that sets unconditional participation to the world market, and sustainable development is globally recognized. Then we may say that politics of development retain the transformation of global economies to survive our future generation.