Sustaining Global Development:
Critique from Local Experience in Questioning Sustainability Discourse

Sustainable development is a discourse promoted as a global scenario to save human civilization; at least, that is what international institutions have developed. Sustainable development should be conceptualized empirically as anxiety over inequality conditions on the African continent or other developing world countries. Once again, the globalization that allows the acceleration of the exploitation scheme called Primitive Accumulation by Marx finds its concrete form, namely in how the circularization of capital is limited to the elite class. Thus, sustainable development as a politically driven discourse does not escape the problems of capital accumulation and limited economic access.

The destiny of capital that permeates social activities and forms social structures is a problem whose validity is seriously questioned. Economic stagnation anxiety occurs because there is capital that settles and cannot generate profits, while the capital market and investors demand generative values. This advantage in the process of capital accumulation is what is needed to drive the global economy. The movement of capital from one point to another, from one person to another, from social processes to the movement of commodities or services, is a prerequisite for how the development order can create life. Then, the fundamental question that needs to be asked is whether anxiety over economic stagnation can create a better life. Or do other fundamental issues need to be considered significantly to reduce massive, uneven development?

Capital and development models are issues that present dependence on developed countries; for example, Cardoso sees economic and political dependence that occurs due to capital intervention and foreign policy models. Instead of prospering the presence of international standards in the process of social change created by development programs, it becomes a trap for a country. What is happening in Zimbabwe, Uganda and Zambia in Africa, then the cases of Sri Lanka, Pakistan, Maldives, and Bangladesh in Asia becomes a marker of how the economic crisis is not just a development issue but is an integral part of reflecting on the global development scheme.

This critique, which dependency theorists pioneered, was built by development practices in third world countries that intervened to receive aid and follow the prescription scheme of development produced by defenders of capitalism. The grand ambition to
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dominate the world economic system through the connectedness of governance and supported by a market culture system is a hallmark of how contemporary capitalism ensures the circularization of the model. It is no different from advanced capitalism, which attacks modern capitalism because of its sophistication in creating false consciousness and the emergence of consumerism. However, the emphasis on contemporary capitalism refers to the ability of capital to determine the articulation of the State not only in regional economic logic; furthermore, this framework of thinking has created integrated pseudo boundaries. The Treaty of Amsterdam or the ASEAN Economic Community Agreement is an example of how contemporary capitalism carries out international policies in a region and creates labour mobility so that the boundaries of state sovereignty are no longer an issue in creating capital accumulation.

Developments with the complexity of the problems that occur or with projected solution designs can create improvements to become study materials continuously revised. Unfortunately, the problem of poverty, inequality of social access and problems inherent in the development model every day take their toll. The State’s existence in the current globalization is experiencing a crisis of sovereignty. Meanwhile, capital flows and development models continue to be institutionalized by international institutions, and in the national context, there is not much that can be done.

Not intending to be pessimistic, this edition looks at some of the crucial issues of how capital policies and development models create political realities and reflect economic structures, which of course, need to be reflected. ‘Against Discrimination: Reviewing Papuan Ethnic from Human Rights Perspective’ is an article that clearly shows the discriminatory practices in the Papua region. The decentralization of development implemented by the Indonesian government is envisioned as a means to create a balance of access. However, Papuan youth has experienced discrimination against the Papuan people caused by racial discrimination in various economic, political, educational, and law enforcement. The problems that are felt or even fought for by the Papuan people find their material form, namely as a means of liberation in an elite-centered development model.

‘The Discourse of Humanity in Covid-19 Pandemic: Study Case of Refugees in Indonesia’ invites the academic community to think about the issue of social mobility, whether it is formed from discriminatory practices or the need to improve living standards, which is an important issue. The limited capacity of the national elite and the lack of economic access shaped by global economic relations encourage the movement of citizens. Again, centralized and sometimes hijacked development for political needs has contributed to the refugee problem.

The problem becomes complicated when a citizen loses protection from his country and prefers to move to the territory of the State. Then, the question that needs to be addressed is who and on what basis human responsibility becomes a void that needs to be reflected to find the solution. When limited capital and the development model being implemented do not recognize the existence of refugees, international institutions cannot reach or guarantee the survival of refugees as part of shared responsibility. Especially when
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development schemes and international policies have not provided protection and recognition, the fate of refugees has become the new face of the concept of humanity. The experience of handling Covid 19 in Indonesia is an important example of how refugees have lost their human essence.

Guarantees for taxes, contained in the development scenario, urgently need to be studied. The emergence of variants of tax concepts and systems, including criticism carried out by a belief tradition, becomes vital to reflect on the practice of tax collection. Development is an important instrument to see how the State takes part of citizens’ income and then uses it to improve social life. ‘EU’s Legal Framework on Personal Income Tax and Suggestions for Asean to Protect the Rights of Taxpayers’ represents lessons learned in ASIA that it is essential to continue to improve, especially what is being done in the EU to make the economic system more competitive. Unfortunately, legal instruments and political will are still obstacles.

Focus on the guarantee of the rights of vulnerable groups in the process of law-making in Vietnam today to unveil difficulties and limitations; on that basis, it makes proposals to ensure the rights of vulnerable groups in the legislative process in the coming time. In line with the Papua case, ‘Ensuring the Rights of Vulnerable Groups in the Legislative Process in Vietnam: Situation and Solutions’ presents the reality that occurs when massive development is carried out. When the scenario design in favour of vulnerable groups is questioned, it is then that development becomes the point to reflect the direction of the State’s policies. Limitation becomes the realm of social advocacy; therefore, strategies for developing or discussing emancipators must continue to be presented in public debates.

The last article, ‘Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) and the Intricacies and Dynamics of Development Administration’, is the closing to see how the governance system works. With an administrative discipline approach, the author of the article believes there are improvements that should be celebrated but need to be criticized. Especially in the SDGs, the issue of the public service system is one indicator of the government’s success in creating equity.

The five articles are an effort by the editorial board to portray sustainable development as a development doctrine. It focuses on the circularization of capital to create a development that puts people, social space, and cultural and economic practices in mind so that the future mass of the planet, people and profit becomes a mantra that is not only capable of creating a social structure that is more humane, but also friendly to nature and the environment. Development ecosystems with all the gaps that allow disasters and ecological crises should be noted in obtaining and accumulating capital. Then most importantly, in carrying out a development model that is open to all races, groups, ethnicities and nations without getting caught up in the problems created by contemporary capitalism.
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