

The last database is the application **Sustainable Development Indicators** which consists of 4 modules. It is one of very few in Europe publicly accessible tools for sustainable development monitoring. In “Agenda 2030 Module” it is described by only one indicator of reverse Logistics - The national level of waste recycling (%). While in “National Module” in environmental governance 2 indicators related to reverse logistics can be identified - share of municipal waste collected selectively in the total amount of municipal waste (%) and packaging waste recycling (%). As far as “Regional Module” is concerned, in environmental governance there is 1 indicator related to reverse logistics (repeated in PT BDL, STRATEG and “National Module”) - share of municipal waste collected selectively in the total amount of municipal waste (%).

In the selected databases and in the bank there are 12 indicators and 19 statistical characteristics describing reverse logistics. The information in official statistics banks and databases is repeated. In the conducted analysis this fact concerns 2 indicators.

References

1. The Act of 29th June 1995 on official statistics (J. of L. of 2016, item 1068, as amended)
2. Zielińska A. Monitoring of reverse logistics based on official statistics databases, „International Economics Letters”, vol. 6, 2017; Doi: 10.24984 / iel.2017.6.3

Dr hab., Professor **Adam Plachciak**
Faculty of Economics, Management and Tourism in Jelenia Góra
Wroclaw University of Economics, Poland

THE IDEA OF ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

It is undeniable that any theory of environmental justice should consider the duty of sustaining the natural resources as one of the major conditions of life on the Earth. That becomes clear, especially when we talk about the results of environmental pollution, rapid increase of human population, fast urbanization, unsatisfied basic needs of poor people in developing countries and global destabilization of natural and socio – economic systems. Since it is widely proved that there are limits to growth, we should deny the possibility of infinite use of resources and consumption without constraints. But still there is a big infusion within the western political culture concerning the place of green thought in liberal democratic theories (de Geus, 2001).

The authors of Brundtland Report addressing, among others, its statements to the western liberal democratic governments, emphasized that inequality is the planet’s main “environmental” problem (World Commission ..., 1987, p. 6). In the same context, Tim O’Riordan argues that the actions, which might cause an environmental unsustainability, are <...> essentially uncontrollable unless the structural conditions that include poverty and desperation are altered (O’Riordan, 1993, p. 35). Similarly, Rosa Braidotti notices <...> a growing recognition of the connections between the crises in development, the deepening global environment crisis, the growth of poverty (Braidotti, 1994, p. 3). When we assume that there might be a meaningful correlation between environmental sustainability and distribution of wealth, we should consider the fact that poverty and wealth are both major causes of environmental problems (Dobson, 1998, p. 134). It is unquestionable fact as Peter Bartelemus writes that poverty and affluence [can] refer to the pressures of growing populations in poor countries on marginal and vulnerable lands, forests and congested cities (Bartelemus, 1994, p. 11). But later on he continues: In industrial countries, on the other hand, impacts of high-level economic growth and consumption are responsible in most cases for environmental degradation (Bartelemus, 1994, p. 11). So it seems that pushing on reduction of poverty but abandoning at the same time reasonable limits to consumption and material growth in developed countries, would not necessarily result in upholding environmental sustainability.

There are also incidents where inequality and poverty may be an evident result of environmental degradation. The authors of Brundtland Report write: A growing number of the urban poor suffer a high frequency of diseases; most are environmentally based and could be

prevented or dramatically reduced through relatively small investments (World Commission ..., 2001, p. 239). This statement proves that poor people basically occupy poor environments. It was this insight that gave the beginning of the "Environmental Justice Movement" in the USA in the 70s and later on in other countries. Although, the environmental threats which occur in different parts of the world may touch everyone equally, but usually the poorest are the most effected. They are the least who can afford protecting themselves against it. Laura Pulido describes this with the words: It <...> is the poor and marginalized of the world who often bear the brunt of pollution and resource degradation – whether a toxic dump, a lack of arable land, or global climate change – simply because they are more vulnerable and lack alternatives. The privileged can reduce their vulnerability by insulating themselves from environmental problems through assorted mechanisms including consumption and exportations (such as deforestation of other countries) (Pulido, 1996, p. XV – XVI). This may suggest that the environment, we are part of, is an exact type of goods and bads that society must justly distribute among its members. In this case it is important to choose such a principle upon which the distribution of environmental resources would refer to whole humankind.

Theoretically, there are different principles of distribution possible (Płachciak, 2009, p. 105-110). However, we need to choose such a proposition which might be employed to environmental justice.

The list of sources:

1. Bartelemus P., *Environment, Growth and Development: The Concepts and Strategies for Sustainable Development*, Routledge, London 1994.
2. Braidotti R., *Women the Environment and Sustainable Development. Towards a Theoretical Synthesis*, Zed Books, London 1994.
3. de Geus M., *Sustainability, Liberal Democracy, Liberalism*, [w:] J. Barry, M. Wissenburg (eds), *Sustaining Liberal Democracy*, Palgrave, London and New York 2001.
4. Dobson A., *Justice and the Environment. Conceptions of Environmental Sustainability and Dimensions of Social Justice*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1998.
5. O’Riordan T., *The politics of sustainability*, [in:] R. K. Turner, (ed.) *Sustainable Environmental Economics and Management*, Belhaven, London 1993.
6. Płachciak A., *Sustainable Development – the Way of Building Just Society*, "Economics and Society" 2009, Vol. 2, No 1.
7. Pulido L., *Environmentalism and Economic Justice*, University of Arizona Press, Tucson 1996.
8. World Commission on Environment and Development. *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1987.