computer models were crude, but they will subscribe to the report's conclusion that the days of uncontrolled growth . . . are numbered' (Dobson, 1991). Green ideology also questions the current dominant paradigm with its foundation in The Enlightenment, science, technology and the objective of rational analysis (Capra, 1985). The Green's world view removes man from centre stage:

> Green politics explicitly seeks to decentre the human being, question mechanistic science and its technological consequences, to refuse to believe that the world was made for human beings – and it does this because it has been led to wonder whether dominant post-industrialism's project of material affluence is either desirable or sustainable. (Dobson, 1990)

Ecologism goes beyond human-instrumental or paternalistic care for the natural world, and argues that the environment has an independent value that should guarantee its existence. Green ideology puts forward the idea that a new paradigm is necessary for solving the problems now faced by mankind. Such a paradigm should be based upon holism – a systems view of the world – and interconnectedness rather than the present mechanistic and reductionist view of nature.

Two most interesting books – *Greening Cities*, edited by Roelofs (1996) and *Design for Sustainability* by Birkeland *et al.* (2002) – move the tone and content of the discussion of design for sustainable development along the spectrum of greens from the paler tints associated with the establishment view towards the full-bodied saturated hue of Green associated with 'Eco-feminism': 'Feminist theory delves into the reasons for this marginalisation of people and nature in environmental design. Feminists . . . have explained how physical and social space is shaped by dichotomies in Western thought. Mind, reason, spirit order, public and permanence have been considered masculine, while ignorance (the occult), body, emotion, chaos, private and change have all been considered feminine. These dichotomies justify the repression of any subject on the feminine side, as these attributes are deemed inferior in Western patriarchal culture. This repression works by making the inferior subject, such as 'nature' conform to its relevant masculine subject, in this case 'culture'.' (Hirst, in Birkeland, 2002).

If politics – as often asserted – is the art of the possible, then the approach to sustainable development will vary from place to place and from time to time in any given place. Sustainable development policies must be politically acceptable, which in a democracy means welcomed – or at least tolerated – by the electorate. In Britain, neither party is advocating radical redistribution of wealth, though the Government's advocacy of the remission of Third World debt is a welcome move in that direction. Both main parties are committed to economic growth as the engine for sustainable development. Clearly, a pragmatic environmentalist in this political situation would advocate policies, which by 'Green' standards would be inequitable and be more or less inadequate for the purpose of sustaining the environment of the planet for long-term human occupation. While this book will be informed by political realism, nevertheless it is surely not too much to expect political leadership on issues other than war and international terror. From time to time more radical ideals of sustainable development may be advocated, or some of

the many exciting 'Green' experiments reported.

Pearce *et al*. (1989), in their report for the UK Government, *Blueprint for a Green Economy*, attempted to integrate ideas about sustainable development within the establishment viewpoint, fully accepting the political consensus aiming at economic growth: 'The call for lifestyle changes usually confuses two things: the growth of an economy, and the growth of resources used to sustain that economic growth. It is possible to have economic growth (more Gross National Product – GNP) and to use up fewer resources. There are very good reasons as to why we should prefer this solution to the problem to one in which 'lifestyle change' means reducing GNP per capita. The first is that GNP and human well-being are inextricably linked for the vast majority of the world's population. Failure to keep GNP high shows up in the misery of unemployment and in poverty. Anti-growth advocates are embarrassingly silent or unrealistic on how they would solve problems of unemployment and poverty'. A 'hair-shirt' policy – however necessary it is thought to be – has less than universal political appeal.

A major problem for sustainable development is the way that values are attached to the environment. For economists – and particularly those who espouse a neo-classical position – the starting point for the discussion is the trade-off between economic growth and environmental protection. Corrections to environmental problems, it is argued, inevitably carry costs for economic growth, and with it the level of consumption. 'This concern with the cost of environmental measures serves to disguise the problem that neo-classical economics has in acknowledging that distributional issues – both within and between generations – lie at the heart of valuation. The "willingness to pay" axiom, with which environmental goods are accorded value, sets aside the central issues which beset the policy agenda: who should pay, and when?' (Redclift, 1999). The two strategies for attaching value to the environment have problems. The first strategy has developed around ways of imputing market values to environmental costs and benefits, through instruments such as subsidies or tax breaks for environmentally friendly services, with pollution charges, and levies such as road charging for those activities that are less environmentally friendly. The second strategy is to 'internalize' externalities, an approach associated in Germany and the Netherlands with 'ecological modernization': here, environmental costs are refashioned into an environmentally friendly good or service, for example, where waste products are recycled and used to support new industrial outlets. Both strategies assume that individuals act alone to calculate their advantage from making market choices: there is no place for society in this view of the economy, reducing human actions to those stimulated by price signals. This perspective also confuses prices and values, so that we are in danger of 'knowing the price of everything and the value of nothing'.

> Externalities are not merely environmental costs which can be refashioned into an environmental good or service. They frequently have distributive consequences and causes which carry political consequences for global markets . . . environmental economics, at least in its mainstream neo-classical version, requires that we ignore the institutional context for decision-making, which in itself