

Chapter 1: Loath This Growth: Sources of Sustainability in the Early Modern World

When I read the first chapter I couldn't be thinking anything else than how history repeats itself. There is as clear pattern as in economy. In economy we go up and down in about six or seven years' cycle. When we think about natural resources the cycle is longer but still same kind of pattern repeats itself: we destroy forests, notice they are crucial for our economy and for our living environment and we try to save them again and when they are in a good shape we start destroying them. The same kind of pattern is seen in many other things too. We unnoticeably destroy valuable things which value we understand after it is destroyed. In the first chapter of the book the valuable thing is the forests which are one of the most valuable assets for people in Finland because our economy is highly related to the selling of our wood industry products.

However, also from the first chapter I started thinking that if we compare today to the history the sustainability has only become a buzzword right now. The world has become more sustainable compared to the history but we haven't had a word for that. There has been made choices which today would be seen as sustainable choices and in the past they've been just wise choices which lead to good long-time results.

The first chapter of the book was talking about the forests and the thing that those weren't appreciated well enough. If we think the forests as a metaphor, we could say that our today's forest is the oil. Anyway, the oil isn't a sustainable choice but it could be seen as some kind of forest today.

In a summary the first chapter of the book showed us how there has been different sustainability challenges regarding to economic and ecological sustainability in a history. In the past the forests were the today's oil as I mentioned in the last paragraph.

Chapter 2: The Industrial Revolution and Its Discontents

In the second chapter the book describes industrial revolution and people who didn't want it to happen and people who also wanted. Industrial revolution has been one of the most significant historical events

but usually it is always thought from positive view. The book gave another aspect to the industrial evolution too.

There is the thing that industrial revolution and new technologies decreased the number of employees in companies. Some jobs were made by machines and some machines even used oil. If we're thinking a machine which replaces human employees and uses oil is it sustainable. From today's point of view not. But if the industrial revolution didn't happen where would we be now.

Almost every company today emphasizes using as much automated working force as possible in a form of machines. The machines and IT will replace some jobs which are still today made by humans but it isn't socially sustainable. Many companies today argue that when machines replace employees the employees will become supervisors of machines or they are given some other assignments. Anyway, as time has shown ultimately if machine replaces a human the human will get fired from the company. It is just easy to understand from company point of view that the machine doesn't need any salary, vacations or isn't sick.

Socially this isn't sustainable but from product point of view it could be. If we think about making food in a food factory: people are slower in making food than machines and the machine's food quality is stable. Today we also face a problem that we have too many people in the world and too little food so machines are better from that point of view. The world is full of "sustainable" choices which are sustainable only from one aspect of sustainability: economically, environmentally or socially. The solutions which offer overall sustainable choice from all of those aspects is really sustainable. To link this thinking back to the text: the industrial revolution was sustainable from economic point of view but still then it caused problems later when people became unemployed so the industrial evolution wasn't sustainable from every aspect.

Chapter 3: Eco-Warriors: The Environmental Movement and the Growth of Ecological Wisdom, 1960s–1970s

The third chapter of the book was describing the ecological point of view from sustainability and how it has been seen in the past and how it became a bigger problem in the past. The problem was understood when people started to publish texts from environmental point of view.

The chapter kept my mind in the view that when you're trying to be sustainable in one way you probably aren't in some other way. Anyway, it came to my mind that is it sustainable choice if there is made a choice which is sustainable from one point of view and in a short time it isn't sustainable from other aspects but in a long time is. Let's think about what companies think: they are replacing humans with machines so humans can release their time to innovating new ideas. Let's say it works that when companies are firing humans because the machines are replacing them and the humans have time to innovate new ideas and they succeed in innovating and come up with new innovative business ideas and recreate more working positions for humans. So is it a sustainable choice for the company to replace humans with machines?

The chapter was talking about environmental point of view of sustainability and it can be said that without environmentalism the sustainability as we know it wouldn't exist. The argument is quite harsh but most of the people think that sustainability is the same as eco-friendly when people who know what sustainability means think that it is a lot more than that. Anyway, the aspect that environmentalism is one of the biggest effectors to today's sustainability term is correct from my point of view.

Chapter 4: Eco-Nomics

As the chapter's topic describes it is focusing on economical point of view of sustainability. In the chapter there is introduced some critics of the economical point of view. The economical point of view of sustainability may seem quite capitalistic view but it is still crucial. There lays a little greed in anyone and it can't be underestimated because money is still the force which is making thing happen in this world.

In the chapter there is emphasized the two aspects: economics and environmentalism. The traditional confrontation is always made but I still argue after reading this chapter that some sacrifices has to be made to become overall more sustainable.

I'm not saying that nature should be sacrificed on purpose but there are times which needs some sacrifices so later these mistakes can be corrected. The author of the text asks multiple questions regarding this view and he questions that is economic growth unlimited but I argue that the economic competitiveness has to be one of the sustainability challenges because it is part of the world. If countries didn't perform with money then the economic view could be removed.