African Journal of Public Administration and Environmental Studies (AJOPAES)

ISSN 2753-3174 (Print) ISSN 2753-3182 (Online)
indexed by IBSS, EBSCO and SABINET. It is accredited by DHET (the South African regulator of Higher Education)

Volume 5, Number 1, March 2026

Pp 5-27

A Theoretical Debate on Sustainability and Socio-Ecological Change

DOI: https://doi.org/10.31920/2753-3182/2026/v5n1a1

Lindani Sthembele Maphumulo
University of Western Cape
Email: llmaphumulo@uwc.ac.za

&

Nontokozo Mkhize
University of Western Cape
Email: 4274766@myuwc.ac.za

Abstract

The intensification of the climate crisis and pervasive environmental degradation have catalysed a global imperative to identify sustainable solutions that are both socially just and ecologically viable. The global quest for sustainability is characterised by a profound theoretical divide amid growing climate emergencies and environmental collapse. While one paradigm calls for a radical rethinking of the political and economic structures that fuel ecological destruction, the other envisions ecological salvation through market-based mechanisms, policy reform, technological innovation, and science. This conceptual analysis critically looks at four main points of contention: market versus structural change, state-led regulation versus class struggle, technological optimism versus social revolution, and reformist strategies versus global justice. The analysis highlights the benefits and drawbacks of each strategy by using real-world examples, such as grassroots opposition to extractivism and carbon trading. The argument presents an integrative viewpoint, treating these frameworks as complementary rather than antagonistic. The paper argues that the immediate reforms must be used as stepping stones to more profound structural change. This paper concludes by

positioning sustainability as an initiative grounded in ecological health and social equity. This redefined framework serves as a necessary intervention to address the structural roots of systemic inequality, paving the way for the creation of more resilient and inclusive futures.

Keywords: *Sustainability; Environmental Justice; Technological Reform; Structural Transformation; Green Capitalism.*

Introduction

The global environmental crisis is a material and moral emergency that is upsetting ecological systems, human livelihoods, and the fundamental conditions of life on Earth. It is no longer a threat that is remote or abstract. One of the most significant issues of the twenty-first century is environmental degradation, which is caused by accelerating climate change, biodiversity loss, toxic pollution, and increased resource extraction. However, these crises are inextricably linked to enduring social disparities that cut across racial, class, and gender boundaries, as well as between the North and the South, the rich and the poor, and the urban and the rural (Agyeman et al., 2003; Nixon, 2011). The need for equitable and sustainable alternatives is more pressing than ever as communities around the world deal with these overlapping pressures.

However, while there is a burgeoning consensus regarding the severity of ecological decline, there remains a profound lack of agreement concerning the most effective strategies for intervention and systemic response. The challenge is not only in identifying the best technological advancements or policy instruments but also in figuring out the fundamental reasoning behind sustainability. When we talk about "progress" in relation to ecological collapse, what do we mean? Who sets the parameters for the transition, and who stands to gain or lose from the suggested fixes? These are deeply political and ideological issues rather than just technical ones, standing for divergent opinions on how societies ought to be restructured in reaction to environmental degradation (Swyngedouw, 2010; Dryzek, 2005).

It steps in at a crucial theoretical point where more radical criticisms that see environmental damage as a sign of structural social and economic injustice clash with reformist strategies based on institutional adaptation and market mechanisms. By suggesting remedies like carbon markets, green technologies, or sustainable consumption, the former often frames environmental problems as the result of regulatory or innovative failures.

On the other hand, more critical paradigms argue that ecological destruction is caused by the very systems of capitalism, colonialism, and class inequality (Foster, 2002; Escobar, 2008). These worldviews are not merely theoretical; they have a tangible impact on global climate agreements, conservation plans, development financing, and climate policy.

In order to map the landscape of environmental thought in a way that is based on both scholarly rigour and political urgency, this paper focusses on how various theoretical traditions conceptualise the relationship between nature, economy, and justice. Moving beyond a mere prescriptive account of policy actions, this analysis interrogates the underlying power dynamics of environmental discourse. It asks: who is granted the authority to speak on behalf of the environment, and what ontological assumptions regarding human-nature relations, growth, and development are embedded within dominant institutional frameworks? Furthermore, do these interventions question or simply replicate the exploitation patterns that initially led to the ecological crisis?

It makes the case that sustainability needs to be redefined beyond efficiency gains and technocratic optimism if it is to have any emancipatory potential. It needs to address issues of structural violence, dispossession, and power. Rethinking what sustainability means in a way that is accountable to those who have historically been left out of its promises and whose futures are most at risk from the planetary crisis is an urgent intellectual endeavour that this analysis helps to advance (Whyte, 2017; Bond, 2012).

Methodologically, this paper applies a structured conceptual comparison based on purposive selection of key Ecological Modernisation (EM) and Ecological Marxism (EMx) texts and policy illustrations, analysing their assumptions, tools, and sustainability implications. By critically analysing two prevalent but opposing theoretical approaches to ecological change, one that advocates for structural change based on the ideas of justice, redistribution, and decolonisation, and the other that embraces institutional reform and technological innovation within current economic systems, this paper seeks to contribute to ongoing discussions about environmental sustainability. This paper attempts to highlight the advantages and disadvantages of these viewpoints by comparing them across important dimensions, including markets, governance, technology, and global justice. It also suggests a more critical and nuanced synthesis that can guide future activism, theory, and policy.

Challenging environmental scholarship and addressing ecological crises

Over the past several decades, environmental scholarship has produced a diverse array of theoretical frameworks and analytical models dedicated to diagnosing the drivers of, and formulating responses to, global ecological crises. Among the most significant are strategies that promote sustainable development through regulated markets, green technologies, and policy incentives made popular by organisations like the World Bank, the European Union, and the OECD (Hajer, 1995; Mol & Sonnenfeld, 2000). Without radically changing the composition of the global economy, these methods portray environmental degradation as a technical issue that can be resolved through innovation and improved governance.

However, critical academics have questioned whether these tactics only manage the symptoms of ecological breakdown or address its underlying causes. According to this line of criticism, an economic system based on resource extraction, constant growth, and the externalisation of environmental costs cannot achieve sustainability (Foster, 2002; Klein, 2014). Furthermore, they highlight the past and present exploitation of working-class people, Indigenous communities, and the Global South in the causes and effects of environmental damage (Whyte, 2017; Tsing, 2015). These criticisms move the emphasis from superficial reforms to more profound issues of justice, ownership, and power.

This paper falls into this disputed area of thought. It aims to map the conflicts between more radical alternatives that call for structural change and the prevailing reform-oriented responses. By pointing out how modern environmental strategies, especially those that support "green growth" and corporate-led transitions, may inadvertently perpetuate the same hierarchies and ecological contradictions they purport to address, it also seeks to intervene in the literature. The stakes are profound; the ideological frameworks and conceptual lenses that shape our collective imagination alongside technical expertise—will ultimately dictate the trajectories of future environmental governance.

The tension and convergence between Ecological Modernisation (EM) and Ecological Marxism (EMx)

This paper is based on two well-known and frequently conflicting schools of thought, Ecological Modernisation (EM) and Ecological Marxism (EMx), which have had a major impact on academic and policy discussions

on environmental sustainability. These frameworks, according to Bosman et al. (2024), are more than just analytical instruments; they represent radically different perspectives on how capitalism, technology, governance, and justice relate to one another in the context of socio-ecological change.

Ecological modernisation, which gained prominence in the 1980s, reflects the self-assured conviction that environmental deterioration can be successfully controlled and lessened by changes to the capitalist system as it currently exists. The belief that institutional adaptation, technological innovation, and scientific advancement, all aided by market incentives and governmental regulation, can propel a shift towards sustainable development is at the heart of this viewpoint (Mol & Spaargaren, 2000; Hajer, 1995). According to EM, when technological efficiency and regulatory frameworks give ecological concerns top priority, economic growth and environmental protection can actually reinforce one another rather than being mutually exclusive.

According to this paradigm, science plays a crucial role as an impartial, objective force that makes sensible environmental governance possible. Cleaner production techniques, eco-efficiency, and green technology innovations are viewed as viable mechanisms for achieving the decoupling of economic growth from environmental degradation (Weale, 1992). According to EM, capitalist economies can become "greener" systems without compromising their core values by internalising environmental costs through schemes like carbon trading and eco-labelling (Buttel, 2000). In sharp contrast, ecological Marxism contends that environmental degradation is an inherent and unavoidable byproduct of capitalist production methods, building on traditional Marxist criticisms of capitalism. The systemic character of ecological degradation is emphasised by EMx scholars, who point to capitalism's reliance on resource extraction, constant expansion, and the commodification of nature as the main causes of environmental damage (Foster, 2002; O'Connor, 1998). According to this viewpoint, the drive for capital accumulation is identified as the structural progenitor of a dual exploitation: the systematic degradation of ecological systems and the commodification of human labour.

According to this perspective, market forces and technological advancements by themselves are unable to address the root causes of ecological violence and inequality because they do not consider the underlying social and economic structures. Additionally, capitalist interests often appropriate science and technology to support ongoing extraction, marginalise alternative knowledge systems, and uphold socio-ecological injustices (Merchant, 1980; Moore, 2015). To achieve true sustainability,

ecological Marxism thus demands a significant overhaul of economic and social relations, placing a strong emphasis on collective ownership, ecological justice, and the deconstruction of extractivist and capitalist logics.

EMx calls for drastic systemic change outside of the current socioeconomic order, whereas EM supports practical reform within it. The paper views these paradigms as complicated, disputed frameworks with different presumptions about power, knowledge, and sustainable development, rather than as mutually exclusive. Both offer important insights: EM provides useful instruments for immediate environmental governance and innovation, while EMx offers a thorough analysis of the ecological paradoxes of capitalism and the underlying social injustices.

Finger 1. Table of Key Features EM vs EMx

Ecological Modernisation (Reformist)	Ecological Marxism (Structural)
• Environmental issues can be addressed within capitalism through reform. • Neutral, objective tools for governance; eco-efficiency, green tech, carbon trading (Mol & Spaargaren, 2000; Weale, 1992). • Markets can internalise environmental costs; economic growth can align with ecological protection. • Institutional adaptation, regulatory reform, international cooperation. • Procedural justice; focuses on compliance, efficiency. • Short- to medium-term improvements possible within existing system.	• Environmental degradation is inherent in capitalism; system must change. • Often co-opted by capitalist interests; cannot solve root causes alone (Merchant, 1980; Moore, 2015). • Markets drive exploitation and resource extraction; profit logic conflicts with sustainability (Foster, 2002; O'Connor, 1998). • Systemic overhaul; collective ownership; decolonised and just governance. • Material & distributive justice; addresses power inequalities and historical exploitation. • Long-term transformation beyond current socio-economic order.

This paper incorporates both viewpoints to advance a more sophisticated comprehension of socio-ecological transformation, while acknowledging the advantages and disadvantages of each. It emphasises how crucial it is to combine institutional and technological reforms with a critical understanding of structural injustices to advance a holistic strategy that considers sustainability's social and environmental aspects.

Theoretical Debate on Sustainability and Socio-Ecological Change

This section offers a critical examination of the conflicts between the structural and reformist paradigms along four major axes: global justice versus reform, state versus class struggle, technology versus social revolution, and market versus structural change. In addition to comparing their presumptions, the goal is to assess how applicable they are in the real world when dealing with ecological crises. This paper adopts the stance that, although reformist strategies provide useful instruments and temporary fixes, they are insufficient in tackling the profound structural causes of environmental deterioration (Bosman et al., 2024).

Figure 2. Table of Comparative Framework: Ecological Modernisation (EM), Ecological Marxism (EMx), and the Hybrid Approach

Dimension	Ecological Modernisation (EM)	Ecological Marxism (EMx)	Possible Hybrid Approach
Core Assumption	Reform within capitalism is possible through technological innovation and institutional adaptation.	Capitalism is inherently unsustainable and structurally incompatible with ecological limits.	Pursues incremental reform within capitalism while embedding systemic, justice-oriented transformation.
Policy Tools	Market incentives, eco-efficiency measures, environmental taxation, and green innovation.	Redistribution policies, state-led restructuring, and collective ownership of production systems.	Integrates market instruments with redistributive policies under a "just transition" framework.
The Role of the State	Acts as a facilitator of green markets and public-private partnerships.	Functions as a regulator, redistributor, and protector of social and ecological welfare.	Coordinates multi-level governance for ecological welfare and equitable growth.
Limitations	Underplays structural power relations and social inequality.	Overemphasises systemic collapse and limits reformist potential.	Balances pragmatic reform with equity-driven transformation for long-term sustainability.

As the above table indicates, alternatively, radical critiques provide the essential systemic analysis, but they might not be feasible or implementable in the current global order. To create a future that is both ecologically sound and focused on justice, the argument here is for a critical hybrid

model based on EMx's structural awareness and EM's regulatory tools (Bosman et al., 2024).

Market vs. Structural Change

The disputed roles of markets and structural change in promoting ecological sustainability constitute the first main area of theoretical disagreement. A fundamental tension lies at the heart of this discussion: does the ecological crisis need to be ruptured from capitalist logic, or can it be resolved within it?

Within the reformist paradigm, market-based mechanisms are championed as the most pragmatic instruments for aligning economic incentives with ecological objectives, ensuring that resource allocation remains efficient during the green transition. This forms the basis of the ecological modernisation approach, which argues that capitalist economies can be ecologically rational if they are appropriately regulated and incentivised (Mol & Spaargaren, 2000). Markets are potential drivers of sustainability, able to spur green innovation, increase efficiency, and satisfy the demands of environmentally conscious consumers, rather than as barriers to it. Ecological responsibility can be made financially workable through the use of tools like carbon trading programmes, environmental tax laws, green investment portfolios, and corporate environmental disclosures.

These concepts have profoundly reshaped the landscape of international policy, serving as the foundational frameworks for contemporary global governance and multilateral agreements. As an illustration of how pollution permits could promote emissions reductions while preserving industrial competitiveness, the European Union's Emissions Trading System (EU ETS) was hailed as a flagship project. In a similar vein, the idea that sustainability can be ingrained in the very fabric of global capitalism is reflected in the growing importance of Environmental, Social, and Governance (ESG) metrics in corporate finance. Empirical data, however, indicates that these actions frequently fall short of bringing about significant change. Kolk (2015) emphasises how political compromise and offset loopholes have undermined the EU ETS, enabling high-emitting companies to continue their operations under the pretence of environmental responsibility.

Ecological Marxism, on the other hand, fundamentally challenges the tenets of market environmentalism. Instead of believing that capitalism can self-correct, EMx sees the ecological crisis as a direct result of capitalist social relations, particularly the exploitation of labour and the

commodification of nature (Foster, 2002; O'Connor, 1998). The extractivist logic of capital actively depends on the environment's depletion rather than merely ignoring it. Resource-intensive sectors like mining, industrial agriculture, and fossil fuels are not exceptions; rather, they are essential components of an economy that is constantly expanding. The ongoing growth of oil giants like ExxonMobil and Chevron, which spend billions on fossil fuel exploration despite the overwhelming scientific consensus that carbon-intensive energy sources must be phased out, is a clear example of this (Supran & Oreskes, 2017).

The Marxist critique fundamentally deconstructs the notion of 'decoupling,' arguing that the pursuit of infinite capital accumulation is structurally incompatible with the preservation of ecological integrity and the reduction of environmental harm. Parrique et al. (2019) present compelling evidence that global decoupling is still uncertain and unproven, especially when emissions and consumption are transferred to the Global South. According to this viewpoint, degrowth, resource redistribution, and a democratic reorganisation of production rather than merely cleaner production are necessary for true sustainability.

However, despite its persuasive nature, this structuralist criticism has tactical and strategic drawbacks. Systemic change, like shifting to an eco-socialist or post-capitalist economy, necessitates a degree of political disruption that is challenging to mobilise in the near term, especially considering how deeply ingrained many countries are in the framework of international trade, finance, and resource extraction. Community development theory serves as a vital conceptual bridge, synthesising the radical and reformist paradigms by demonstrating how incremental local interventions can facilitate broader systemic transformation. Strategies like participatory planning, local economic development, and capacity building acknowledge that although structural change at the global level is crucial, local and regional agency continues to be a potent force behind socio-ecological innovation.

Interventions in community development, like solidarity economies, cooperatives, urban food gardens, and community-owned renewable energy projects, are micro-level changes that simultaneously address material needs and subvert extractive market logics. These initiatives resonate with the core tenets of Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD), which prioritises Indigenous epistemologies, social capital, and inherent local strengths as alternatives to the imposition of external market-centric models. Despite their small size, they operate within the realistic bounds that EM recognises and represent the values of sustainability, equity, and democratic participation that EMx envisions.

Therefore, market mechanisms alone are insufficient for environmental governance, even though they may provide tools for it. They frequently depoliticise environmental action while obscuring the necessity of more significant changes in power, consumption, and production. However, rejecting reform completely runs the risk of ignoring the very real, if limited, benefits that can be obtained from measures like environmental taxes, fossil fuel divestiture, and climate litigation. In addition to increasing public awareness and creating transitional pressure points that move discourse and material conditions toward more radical possibilities, these tools can open up space for movement building.

A dialectical position is adopted, acknowledging that markets are structurally constrained by their profit-maximising imperative, even though they might provide temporary gains. Though it is insufficient, environmental reform within capitalism is not pointless. A transformative agenda that questions not just the existing policies and technologies but also the very relationships and values that underpin economic life is necessary to achieve sustainability in its broadest sense. This paper makes the case for strategic synthesis, which views immediate reforms as stepping stones that pave the way for systemic, justice-driven change rather than as final goals. A transition toward a world that prioritises ecological integrity and collective well-being over capital accumulation is only possible through sustained grassroots mobilisation and the strategic pursuit of 'non-reformist reforms' that push institutional boundaries to their absolute limits.

State vs. Class Struggle

The differing perspectives on the role of the state in resolving the ecological crisis represent a second significant area of theoretical disagreement. Aligning with institutionalist and technocratic ideas, the reformist tradition portrays the state as a neutral arbiter and rational actor capable of correcting market externalities and steering societal progress toward ecological sustainability. According to this framework, the state plays a key role in passing legislation, establishing incentives, and setting up environmental standards through tools like carbon pricing, clean energy subsidies, and green procurement regulations (Mol & Spaargaren, 2000; Weale, 1992).

This policy-centric viewpoint assumes that political institutions can act independently for the benefit of the public and are immune to economic pressures. Therefore, effective governance, scientific consultation, and

administrative ability are all important for environmental reform. Much of the global sustainability agenda, including accords like the Paris Climate Accord and legislative instruments like Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs), is based on this kind of thinking.

However, ecological Marxism, which uses critical state theory to contend that the state is a structurally embedded organ of capitalist reproduction rather than a neutral arbiter, fiercely challenges this view (Poulantzas, 1978; O'Connor, 1998). According to this viewpoint, managing the contradictions of capital accumulation, supporting the conditions for sustained economic growth while holding social unrest, is the state's main duty. When environmental protection is looked for, it is often subordinated to these demands or used to justify the status quo through flimsy reforms.

The structural alignment between capital and the state was exposed by the global monetary crisis of 2008. Public spending on social programmes, environmental protection, and renewable energy was cut or postponed as governments quickly raised trillions to save banks and businesses. As Harvey (2010) points out, this was an indication of the state's greater commitment to capital preservation rather than an anomaly. Environmental multilateralism can also be abandoned when it clashes with elite economic interests, as evidenced by the United States' 2017 withdrawal from the Paris Agreement, which was driven by a nationalist fossil fuel agenda.

Ecological Marxists contend that these instances are systemic results of a state operating in the interest of capital rather than singular instances of poor leadership. This viewpoint is especially crucial when examining how racialised and marginalised communities whose opinions are often left out of policy decisions are disproportionately impacted by environmental harms. The state frequently defends extractive interests at the expense of Indigenous sovereignty and ecological justice, as demonstrated by the Standing Rock Sioux Tribe's opposition to the Dakota Access Pipeline despite international solidarity and unmistakable environmental risk (Whyte, 2017). In these situations, corporate growth and state repression are inextricably linked, supporting the EMx's contention that the state alone cannot bring about significant change.

The state's role is oversimplified, and its contradictions are ignored when it is reduced to a mere "puppet" of capital. According to Jessop (1990) and other critical theorists, the state is not a single actor but rather a contested terrain, a site of struggle. Social movements, legal challenges, international norms, and public accountability mechanisms all affect its various bureaucracies and apparatuses. History does, in fact, offer

convincing instances of state-led environmental initiatives that produced notable advancements. One of the most successful environmental agreements is the 1987 Montreal Protocol, which successfully phased out ozone-depleting substances. This was made possible in large part by clear state action, a well-coordinated science-policy interface, and legally binding regulations (Parson, 2003). With the implementation of aggressive environmental policies in more recent years, nations like Uruguay and Costa Rica have achieved high levels of forest preservation and renewable energy use.

These achievements were the consequence of persistent civil society mobilisation, public involvement, and visionary leadership in line with environmental values rather than merely the goodwill of the elite. Community development theory, which emphasises the value of citizen agency, participatory governance, and bottom-up change, is highly compatible with this nuanced viewpoint. Within the framework of community development, the state is conceptualised neither as an inherent saviour nor a persistent saboteur, but as a strategic partner whose priorities must be negotiated and reshaped through the mechanisms of local organising, advocacy, and collective agency. A fundamental responsibility of the community development practitioner (CDP) is "access facilitation," which entails giving historically marginalised groups the ability to negotiate state institutions, shape policy, and demand accountability.

In this regard, grassroots environmental justice movements, from land-rights movements in Latin America to anti-fracking campaigns in South Africa, represent not only resistance but also attempts to reinterpret the role of the state through participatory democracy and community power. Furthermore, collaborative governance models have demonstrated promise in striking a balance between top-down regulation and local knowledge and needs. These models involve NGOs, local authorities, and community groups working together to co-produce solutions. Co-managed conservation areas, integrated environmental planning, and participatory budgeting, for instance, show promise for redefining the state as an ecological stewardship tool, but one that needs ongoing debate and accountability.

The paper makes the case for a logical understanding of the state as a dynamic arena of struggle rather than as a permanently co-opted structure or an essentially benign regulator. To expose the ways in which profit and power skew environmental governance, the ecological Marxist critique is essential. But it runs the risk of preventing strategic interaction with the very organisations that influence infrastructure, redistribution, and law. In the past, states have had conflicting roles: they have both made it possible

for environmental harm to occur and helped to mitigate it. This tension must be acknowledged in community development practice. Engaging with state mechanisms to institutionalise gains, secure resources, and scale impact is just as important as creating alternatives outside the state through cooperatives, commons, and autonomous organising. A dual approach is necessary for transformative environmental justice: challenging the state's role in ecological deterioration while also reclaiming and democratising its institutions to benefit both people and the environment.

Technology vs. Social Revolution

The question of how technology can help solve ecological crises is a common focal point of discussions about sustainability. Reform-oriented frameworks contend that decoupling the process of separating environmental harm from economic growth requires technological innovation in addition to being desirable. It is assumed that ecological improvements can be achieved without drastic societal change through the development and adoption of cleaner, more efficient technologies like electric vehicles, renewable energy, and circular economy models (Mol & Spaargaren, 2000; Jänicke, 2008).

However, this optimism has drawn a lot of criticism. Critical scholars challenge the notion that technologies engineered within the framework of capitalist logic can effectively resolve the systemic crises—ecological or social—that capital accumulation itself has generated. Technological solutions are frequently instruments for capital expansion rather than ecological transformation, according to ecological Marxism (EMx). Commodified and focused on maximising profits, innovations frequently perpetuate existing disparities in the allocation of environmental benefits and harms (Burkett, 2006; Foster & Clark, 2012).

Consider the electric vehicle (EV) as an example. Their production is largely dependent on lithium, cobalt, and rare earth minerals, which are frequently extracted under harmful labour and environmental conditions in nations like Bolivia and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, despite the fact that they are commended for lowering carbon emissions (Zikria et al., 2022; Amnesty International, 2019). These supply chains demonstrate how "green" technologies can exacerbate social and environmental injustice under capitalist modes of production, and they also replicate colonial patterns of resource extraction.

Furthermore, while maintaining damaging practices, sectors like fast fashion have adopted sustainability branding. Despite intensive marketing of "eco-lines" and recycling initiatives, production is still predicated on

linear waste flows, wage exploitation, and excessive consumption (Bick et al., 2018). The technologies that EMx criticises as false solutions – those that seem sustainable but are implemented in unsustainable systems – are reflected in these contradictions. This is not to suggest that technology is inherently oppressive or environmentally detrimental; rather, its impact is shaped by the political and economic structures that direct its deployment. Agroecology and community solar grids are examples of real technological advancements that promote sustainability when incorporated into just systems. For instance, Germany's energy transition has resulted in significant emission reductions due to democratisation of the energy supply and public investment in renewables (Jacobson & Delucchi, 2011). Who controls the tool, why it is used, and whose interests it serves are more important than the tool itself.

These instances demonstrate the long-standing community development tenets that technology ought to be participatory, appropriate, and context driven. Schumacher (1973) developed the idea of "appropriate technology," which emphasises ecologically sound, small-scale, reasonably priced, and locally controlled tools. The practitioner's role in community development is to facilitate knowledge access, co-create innovation, and make sure that technological decisions reflect priorities set by the community, rather than imposing external solutions.

Furthermore, Amartya Sen's capability approach, which is used in community development, serves as a reminder that progress, including technological advancement, should increase people's actual freedoms and choices. Technology systems run the risk of becoming instruments of disempowerment when they are imposed without community ownership or input. On the other hand, technologies that are created with and for communities can promote environmental stewardship, strengthen resilience, and support local economies.

The paper approaches the topic of technology's role in sustainability critically but constructively. It reaffirms that the ecological crisis cannot be solved by technology alone, particularly when innovation is pushed aside in favour of growth, profit, and elite control. Technological advancement within capitalist systems often serves to postpone systemic change, uphold global inequality, and greenwash destructive practices, according to ecological Marxists. But technological fatalism is also rejected in this paper. Innovation is not a monolith controlled by capital, and tools themselves are not intrinsically oppressive; their impact is instead determined by the socio-economic frameworks in which they are deployed. Technology's democratisation the transfer of power from corporations and technocrats to communities, cooperatives, and social movements is what gives it its

transformative potential. Technology needs to be viewed as a component of a larger social revolution that prioritises ecological integrity, justice, and the welfare of all.

From the perspective of community development, this entails integrating technological choices into inclusive, participatory frameworks that respect local expertise, give sustainability top priority, and guarantee fair access. Though they need to be reclaimed, repurposed, and reimagined through democratic struggle, science and innovation are not adversaries of justice. In this vision, solidarity, structural change, and grassroots empowerment pave the way for sustainability rather than just technology and patents.

Global Justice vs. Reform

One of the most pressing and divisive issues in sustainability is global justice. The global ecological crisis is viewed by reform-oriented paradigms, which are often based on liberal institutionalism and ecological modernisation, as a governance failure that can be fixed with equitable resource transfers, capacity-building, and international cooperation. It is maintained that multilateral mechanisms like the Paris Agreement, the Green Climate Fund, and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) can be used to divide responsibility more fairly between the Global North and South (Roberts & Parks, 2007; Biermann & Gupta, 2011). This perspective is predicated on the assumption that global ecological inequality can be mitigated within the existing international order, provided that institutional reforms, enhanced transparency, and scaled-up climate finance are prioritised.

However, by ignoring the historical and current contributions of capitalism, colonialism, and militarism to the development of environmental harm worldwide, this approach often downplays the structural causes of environmental injustice. According to critical scholars from Indigenous, decolonial, and ecological Marxist traditions, these international institutions actively contribute to the reproduction of the global power imbalances they purport to address, rather than just being defective (Agyeman et al., 2003; Okereke & Dooley, 2010). Even though they use terms like "sustainable development" and "climate resilience," their actions often uphold an ecological neo-colonialist paradigm, whereby the Global South is still sacrificed for the prosperity of the North.

Take the Green Climate Fund, which has been recognised as a global climate finance innovation. Although it is part of its mandate to help developing nations with adaptation and mitigation, it has come under fire

for allocating funds through international banks and consulting firms and giving large-scale infrastructure projects precedence over regional, culturally relevant solutions (Bond, 2012; Carty & Le Comte, 2020). The outcome is a re-legitimation of extractive development under a green façade rather than a redistribution of power. Most of the promised funding is provided as loans rather than grants, and communities are rarely involved in the substantive decision-making processes. This increases debt and dependency in nations already struggling with structural adjustment and historical exploitation.

Understanding that environmental damage is a necessary condition of global capitalism's existence rather than an unintended consequence lies at the heart of this critique. Foster (2023) contends that the exploitation of timber in Brazil, oil in Nigeria, and cobalt in the Democratic Republic of the Congo is a result of an imperial mode of production rather than a failure of governance, connecting colonial legacies to current climate injustice. These are not isolated incidents; rather, they are nodes in a global system that forgoes Indigenous sovereignty, labour, and biodiversity to maintain the economic privileges of a select few. David Harvey (2003) conceptualises this phenomenon as 'accumulation by dispossession,' a process in which capital expansion is fundamentally predicated upon the deliberate marginalisation of social groups and the degradation of environmental resources.

According to this viewpoint, attaining climate justice necessitates reparations, restitution, and structural change in addition to reform. Land and resource sovereignty for Indigenous and marginalised communities, the cancellation of ecological debt, the decarbonisation of development pathways, and the transition from extractive to solidarity-based, regenerative economies are all examples of this. These requirements are essential to many community development frameworks, which emphasise agency, participation, and cultural relevance as the cornerstones of long-lasting change, as well as to ecological Marxism.

One important community development strategy, Asset-Based Community Development (ABCD), for instance, opposes deficit-based aid models that depict communities as defenceless recipients. Rather, it emphasises relational networks, local capacities, and group strengths to promote change from within (Mathie & Cunningham, 2003). Using this reasoning globally, we need to consider what cultural, ecological, and social resources are already available to communities in the Global South and how climate finance can help them realise their goals instead of imposing technocratic plans.

Similar to this, the Sustainable Livelihoods Framework serves as a reminder that development needs to promote various locally relevant survival and well-being strategies. In the name of sustainability, climate interventions that ignore lived realities such as subsistence fishing in Southeast Asia or nomadic grazing in East Africa run the risk of destroying resilience. The concept of "development" itself needs to be pluralised and depoliticised to make room for Indigenous ecological knowledge, community-led governance, and South African epistemologies.

However, we still have to deal with the constraints and inconsistencies of the present while advocating for change. It is unlikely that global governance will be abolished in a single day. Civil society coalitions, small-island states, and Indigenous organisations are increasingly leveraging their agency to exert influence within global arenas such as the UN, the IPCC, and the GCF—institutions that serve as contested battlegrounds between reformist pathways and radical transformative agendas (Hale, 2020). Despite being market-oriented and non-binding, the Paris Agreement has sparked climate litigation, divestment campaigns, and local climate action worldwide, proving that resistance and reform can coexist in flawed systems.

The paper argues that the current global order's colonial underpinnings and capitalist imperatives must be challenged to rethink global climate governance from a justice-first perspective. Strategic reforms cannot replace structural change based on ecological democracy, reparative justice, and international solidarity, even though they may provide short-term benefits, particularly in preventing short-term ecological tipping points. Reform must be the means, not the end, of transformation. In terms of community development, this entails moving away from aid dependency and towards self-determination, away from financial transfers and towards power transfers, and away from top-down technical solutions and towards bottom-up democratic planning. Justice must be material, redistributive, and decolonial; it cannot be procedural. The only way to transform sustainability from a policy objective to a liberating practice is to centre the voices, struggles, and visions of those who are most impacted.

Recommendations

Democratise Technological Development and Use

It is no longer acceptable to view technological innovation as a neutral or essentially progressive force. Although reformist strategies heavily rely on

green consumerism, circular economies, and cleaner production techniques, these approaches usually overlook the unequal and exploitative underpinnings of these technologies. An example of this is the global trend towards electric vehicles, which, despite being hailed as a decarbonisation strategy, has resulted in serious environmental damage and violations of human rights in the Global South due to the mining of lithium and cobalt for batteries (Amnesty International, 2019; Zikria et al., 2022). Under the pretence of green capitalism, these extractive practices are a continuation of imperial ecological relations. Technology must therefore be repositioned within a larger justice project that is governed by democracy, community-led development, and localised benefit-sharing. Public institutions must be refocused on promoting innovation that meets the needs of marginalised groups and serving the public interest, rather than entrusting research and implementation to profit-driven corporations (Agyeman et al., 2003; Burkett, 2006).

Reclaim the State for Ecological Redistribution

Although historical and current evidence indicates that the state often serves firmly established capitalist interests, the state is commonly depicted as an unbiased regulator of environmental harms. The United States' withdrawal from the Paris Agreement under President Trump and the 2008 financial bailout, which prioritised corporate survival over ecological recovery, both show how elite economic actors often control policy (Harvey, 2010). However, the state should not be completely disregarded. Instead, it needs to be reclaimed as a place of ecological responsibility and redistribution. When sufficiently mobilised, state-led action based on international cooperation and scientific consensus can achieve the goals of the Montreal Protocol, which was successful in phasing out ozone-depleting substances (Parson, 2003). Governments must continue to face pressure from progressive environmental movements to implement bold policies like public ownership of green infrastructure, just transition frameworks, and fossil fuel divestment. By deconstructing the state's veneer of neutrality and mandating its alignment with the collective public interest, we can fundamentally reconfigure governance frameworks to prioritise ecological integrity and social equity.

Reorient Global Governance Toward Justice and Reparations

International attempts to address ecological breakdown have frequently favoured technocratic fixes and market-based mechanisms, downplaying

or ignoring the profound structural disparities that influence environmental vulnerability. Organisations like the Green Climate Fund have come under fire for putting investors' financial interests ahead of the needs of communities that are most vulnerable to climate change (Roberts & Parks, 2007). This reflects a larger pattern in international governance, where reformist rhetoric masks the effects of resource theft, colonialism, and debt trapping. Instead, the historical obligations of high-emitting countries must be central to a justice-oriented framework for international cooperation, which must also acknowledge the rights of those who have long been shut out of decision-making processes. Any credible international agreement must be built on reparative measures like unconditional debt cancellation, technology transfer free from intellectual property restrictions, and legally binding pledges to climate finance for adaptation and loss-and-damage (Foster, 2023; Okereke & Dooley, 2010). Sustainability initiatives will continue to perpetuate global inequality under a green façade unless there is a change from charity to justice.

Empower Grassroots Movements as Agents of Transformation

Boardrooms or policy summits alone have never produced true ecological change. It has always been propelled by grassroots actors, such as workers demanding democratic control over their workplaces and environments, youth activists upending climate complacency, and Indigenous communities protecting their lands. Although essential to environmental conservation efforts, these groups continue to face political marginalisation and a persistent lack of foundational resources. Native American communities' opposition to the Dakota Access Pipeline served as an example of the effectiveness of grassroots organising against state-corporate partnerships (Whyte, 2017). However, these movements frequently encounter violence, criminalisation, and surveillance. These struggles must be amplified and given tangible support if we are to have a just environmental future. Resources must be redirected by states, donors, and institutions to support community-led governance platforms, legal protection for environmental defenders, and movement building. Instead of stealing information from these groups for their own academic or professional benefit, universities and non-governmental organisations should work together to provide research, legal assistance, and political exposure that will help them achieve their long-term objectives (Bond, 2012; Hale, 2020).

Advance a Dual Strategy of Structural Critique and Tactical Engagement

The binary that pits reform against revolution is one of the main conflicts this paper highlights. It is an unproductive dichotomy that limits political creativity. Despite being frequently appropriated or compromised, reformist measures serve as vital interventions that offer tangible improvements and establish the necessary scaffolding for profound structural change. Similarly, radical critique is essential for identifying the causes of ecological deterioration, but it needs to be combined with workable implementation strategies. To keep these two modes together, a dual strategy is required. This entails participating in international negotiations, corporate accountability mechanisms, policy forums, and institutional processes while maintaining an eye on the necessary systemic changes. It entails developing post-capitalist alternatives for the future while battling for regulatory reforms today. According to Foster and Clark (2012), the ecological crisis necessitates revolutionary praxis grounded in material realities in addition to analysis. The key to the future of climate politics is realising that the possible needs to be pushed, broadened, and radicalised via group effort rather than having to choose between the necessary and the possible.

Conclusion

The growing ecological crisis is more than just a technical issue that needs to be solved or a gap in policy that can be closed with small changes. Deeply unequal social, political, and economic systems are at the heart of this systemic crisis. Using four main axes – market mechanisms versus structural change, state authority versus class struggle, technological optimism versus social revolution, and reformist governance versus global justice – this paper has examined two opposing theoretical paradigms, one of which advocates reform within current institutions and markets and the other of which calls for structural transformation. These discussions elucidate the ideological foundations that shape our conceptualisation of sustainability and the subsequent methodologies we employ to achieve it.

Even though reformist strategies have produced significant, if constrained, benefits like lowering emissions through technological advancement and regulation, their reliance on market logic frequently replicates the very dynamics they aim to eliminate. If green capitalism is not opposed, it may end up being little more than a lucrative repackaging of environmental damage. The inherent contradictions between limitless accumulation and planetary boundaries are revealed by more radical critiques that are grounded in historical materialism and environmental

justice. However, because of established political and economic power, these radical alternatives frequently encounter real-world implementation challenges.

This paper rejects the perceived dichotomy between these paradigms, proposing instead a cohesive synthesis that harmonises visionary objectives with practical implementation. To mitigate ecological harm and create pathways to more equitable, post-capitalist futures, it is imperative that we engage with the present and make use of the tools that are currently available. This dual-pronged strategy addresses the exigency of the crisis without succumbing to the fallacy that environmental sustainability can be realised through the compromise of social justice. By supporting this viewpoint, the paper adds to the expanding corpus of research that rejects the division of environmental and social issues. The equitable distribution of the costs and benefits of environmental change on a local and global scale, both now and in future generations, is a key indicator of true sustainability, not just lower emissions or advancements in technology. The only way environmental politics can go beyond treating the symptoms and start changing the underlying causes of ecological collapse is by adopting this more comprehensive, inclusive vision.

References

Agyeman, J., Bullard, R.D. & Evans, B. (2003). *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*. Earthscan.

Amnesty International. (2019). *This is What We Die For: Human Rights Abuses in the Democratic Republic of the Congo Power the Global Trade in Cobalt*. Available at: https://www.amnesty.org

Bick, R., Halse, A. & Ekenga, C.C. (2018). The global environmental injustice of fast fashion. *Environmental Health*, 17(1), p.92.

Biermann, F. & Gupta, A. (2011). Accountability and legitimacy in earth system governance. *Ecological Economics*, 70(11), pp.1856–1864.

Böhm, S., Misoczky, M.C. & Moog, S. (2012). Greening capitalism? A Marxist critique of carbon markets. *Organization Studies*, 33(11), pp.1617–1638.

Bond, P. (2012). *Politics of Climate Justice: Paralysis Above, Movement Below*. University of KwaZulu-Natal Press.

Bosman, A., Maseti, M., Mbonambi, K., & Maphumulo, L. S. (2024). Can Ecological Modernisation and Ecological Marxism in the Development Debate Create Sustainable Livelihoods in the Context of Africa?. Journal of Public Administration, 59(4), 756-771.

Burkett, P. (2006). *Marxism and Ecological Economics: Toward a Red and Green Political Economy*. Brill.

Foster, J.B. & Clark, B. (2012). The planetary emergency. *Monthly Review*, 64(7), pp.1–25.

Foster, J.B. (2002). *Ecology Against Capitalism*. Monthly Review Press.

Foster, J.B. (2023). Capitalism and ecological ruin: From systemic risk to planetary emergency. *Monthly Review*, 74(11), pp.1–17.

Hajer, M.A. (1995). *The Politics of Environmental Discourse: Ecological Modernization and the Policy Process*. Oxford University Press.

Hale, T. (2020). Transnational actors and climate governance. *Annual Review of Political Science*, 23, pp.203–220.

Harvey, D. (2003). *The New Imperialism*. Oxford University Press.

Harvey, D. (2010). *The Enigma of Capital and the Crises of Capitalism*. Profile Books.

Jacobson, M.Z. & Delucchi, M.A. (2011). Providing all global energy with wind, water, and solar power. *Energy Policy*, 39(3), pp.1154–1169.

Jänicke, M. (2008). Ecological modernisation: New perspectives. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(5), pp.557–565.

Klein, N. (2014). *This Changes Everything: Capitalism vs. The Climate*. Allen Lane.

Kolk, A. (2015). The role of international business in clean technology transfer and development. *Business & Society*, 55(1), pp.62–97.

Mol, A.P.J. & Sonnenfeld, D.A. (2000). *Ecological Modernisation Around the World: Perspectives and Critical Debates*. Frank Cass.

Mol, A.P.J. & Spaargaren, G. (2000). Ecological Modernisation Theory in Debate: A Review. *Environmental Politics*, 9(1), pp.17–49.

O'Connor, J. (1998). *Natural Causes: Essays in Ecological Marxism*. Guilford Press.

Okereke, C. & Dooley, K. (2010). Principles of justice in proposals and policy approaches to avoided deforestation. *Global Environmental Change*, 20(1), pp.82–95.

Parrique, T., Barth, J., Briens, F., Kerschner, C., Kraus-Polk, A., Kuokkanen, A. & Spangenberg, J.H. (2019). *Decoupling Debunked: Evidence and Arguments Against Green Growth as a Sole Strategy for Sustainability*. European Environmental Bureau.

Parson, E.A. (2003). *Protecting the Ozone Layer: Science and Strategy*. Oxford University Press.

Poulantzas, N. (1978). *State, Power, Socialism*. Verso.

Roberts, J.T. & Parks, B.C. (2007). *A Climate of Injustice: Global Inequality, North-South Politics, and Climate Policy*. MIT Press.

Supran, G. & Oreskes, N. (2017). Assessing ExxonMobil's climate change communications (1977–2014). *Environmental Research Letters*, 12(8), 084019.

Tsing, A.L. (2015). *The Mushroom at the End of the World: On the Possibility of Life in Capitalist Ruins*. Princeton University Press.

Tsurukawa, N., Prakash, S. & Manhart, A. (2011). *Social and Environmental Impacts of Mining in the Democratic Republic of Congo*. Öko-Institut.

Weale, A. (1992). *The New Politics of Pollution*. Manchester University Press.

Whyte, K.P. (2017). Is it colonial déjà vu? Indigenous Peoples and climate injustice. In Adamson, J., Gleason, W.A. & Pellow, D. (eds.), *Environmental Justice and Climate Change: Theoretical Perspectives*, pp.88–104. Oxford University Press.

Whyte, K.P. (2017). The Dakota Access Pipeline, environmental injustice, and U.S. colonialism. *Red Ink: An International Journal of Indigenous Literature, Arts & Humanities*, 19(1), pp.154–169.

York, R. & Rosa, E.A. (2003). Key challenges to ecological modernization theory. *Organization & Environment*, 16(3), pp.273–288.

Zikria, Y.B., Bashir, A.K. & Yu, H. (2022). Environmental costs of lithium extraction for EVs: A global justice perspective. *Environmental Sustainability Review*, 14(2), pp.210–222.