International Journal Of History And Political Sciences

VOLUME Vol.06 Issue11 2026
PAGE NO. 1-8

Engineering Progress and Environmental Injustice: A Socio-Ecological Framework for Examining the St. Lawrence Seaway Development

Arjun Mehta
Department of Political Science, National Institute of Social Studies, New Delhi, India

Received: 07 September 2026; **Accepted:** 04 October 2026; **Published:** 01 November 2026

Abstract: Large-scale infrastructure projects are frequently represented as instruments of economic modernization, technological advancement, and regional integration. However, the benefits generated by infrastructural development may coexist with unequal distributions of environmental risks, political authority, and social costs. This article develops a socio-ecological framework for examining the St. Lawrence Seaway as a case of engineering progress that can be critically assessed through the interconnected dimensions of political economy, imperial power, resource control, environmental transformation, and distributive justice. The study employs a qualitative conceptual methodology based exclusively on the supplied literature, particularly works addressing imperialism, international political economy, state power, resource governance, and unequal relationships between powerful institutions and affected populations. Because the provided references do not directly document the environmental history of the St. Lawrence Seaway, the article does not claim to provide an empirical reconstruction of specific Seaway impacts. Instead, it develops an analytical model that can be applied to such infrastructure development. The framework demonstrates that technological achievement cannot be evaluated independently from questions concerning who defines development objectives, who controls resources, who receives economic benefits, and who bears environmental and social costs. The analysis further identifies the importance of examining infrastructure through multiple scales of power rather than treating engineering decisions as politically neutral. The study contributes a transferable socio-ecological approach for future empirical research on the St. Lawrence Seaway and comparable large-scale infrastructure projects.

Keywords: St. Lawrence Seaway, environmental injustice, engineering progress, socio-ecological framework, infrastructure development, political economy, imperialism, resource governance, environmental transformation.

1. Introduction:

1.1 Problem Statement

Large infrastructure projects occupy an important position in modern development because they physically reorganize landscapes while simultaneously restructuring economic relationships, patterns of resource access, and institutional authority. Canals, waterways, transportation corridors, dams, ports, and industrial networks are commonly justified through their anticipated contributions to trade, economic growth, technological modernization, and regional connectivity. Such representations, however, can obscure the unequal distribution of benefits and costs associated with development.

The St. Lawrence Seaway provides an important analytical setting for examining this tension between engineering progress and environmental justice. As a major infrastructure system associated with navigation, trade, industrial connectivity, and the

transformation of a riverine environment, it can be approached not simply as an engineering achievement but as a socio-ecological intervention. The central question is therefore not whether infrastructure produces economic value, but how that value is generated, distributed, governed, and accompanied by environmental transformation.

The theoretical literature supplied for this study does not directly provide a historical environmental account of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Instead, it contains substantial material on imperialism, resource politics, international power, sanctions, political conflict, and the relationship between economic interests and state authority. Abrahamian's analyses demonstrate how political structures and historical power relations influence institutional transformation (Abrahamian, 1979; Abrahamian, 1980). Similarly, Tabb conceptualizes imperialism through relationships between economic structures and political power (Tabb, 2006). These perspectives provide theoretical tools for investigating infrastructure as an expression of political-economic organization rather than as an exclusively technical undertaking.

1.2 Research Relevance

The environmental-justice perspective is particularly significant because development decisions can produce differentiated consequences across social groups and geographical locations. A project may generate aggregate economic benefits while simultaneously imposing concentrated environmental disruption on particular communities. Consequently, an assessment based exclusively on aggregate economic indicators may fail to identify distributive inequalities.

The supplied literature repeatedly illustrates the importance of examining economic resources through political structures. Katouzian and Shahidi emphasize the relationship between politics, economics, and conflict in Iran, while Gelvin situates political development within broader historical structures (Katouzian and Shahidi, 2008; Gelvin, 2011). Khanna similarly demonstrates how global systems of influence affect relationships among states and regions (Khanna, 2008). These approaches can be translated into a socio-ecological analysis of infrastructure by asking how technological projects interact with broader systems of authority and economic interest.

The issue is also relevant to contemporary understandings of resource governance. The discussion surrounding energy sanctions demonstrates that apparently economic decisions are deeply embedded in international political relationships. Gardner's account of sanctions affecting China, India, and South Korea illustrates how resource-related policies operate across multiple national and economic interests rather than within a single political jurisdiction (Gardner, 2013). Although this source does not concern the St. Lawrence Seaway, its analytical significance lies in demonstrating how infrastructure and resource systems can become embedded in wider political-economic networks.

1.3 Objectives

This study has four primary objectives. First, it develops a socio-ecological framework for analyzing the relationship between engineering development and environmental injustice. Second, it identifies the political-economic dimensions through which infrastructure projects can distribute benefits and burdens unequally. Third, it examines how concepts of imperialism, state power, resource control, and international influence can strengthen analysis of large-scale infrastructure. Fourth, it identifies methodological requirements for future empirical research on the environmental and social consequences of the St. Lawrence Seaway.

1.4 Scope and Significance

The study is conceptual rather than archival or field-based. It does not introduce unsupported historical claims about particular communities, ecological effects, relocation figures, or engineering decisions concerning the Seaway. Its contribution is instead methodological: it establishes a framework through which such evidence can subsequently be investigated.

This distinction is essential for scholarly reliability. Applying theories developed in studies of Iran, imperialism, and international political economy to the St. Lawrence Seaway can generate useful analytical questions, but it cannot substitute for primary environmental and historical evidence concerning the Seaway itself. The study therefore treats the supplied literature as a theoretical foundation rather than as direct evidence of Seaway history.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 Political Power and Structural Transformation

Abrahamian's work provides a foundation for understanding political transformation through structural rather than purely individual explanations. His analysis of the Iranian Revolution emphasizes underlying political and social structures, while his study of the Constitutional Revolution similarly directs attention toward historical transformations in institutional and political relationships (Abrahamian, 1979; Abrahamian, 1980). For infrastructure studies, this approach suggests that engineering projects should be analyzed within the institutional structures that authorize, finance, regulate, and benefit from them.

Gelvin's historical treatment of the modern Middle East further emphasizes the importance of examining political events within interconnected historical contexts rather than as isolated occurrences (Gelvin, 2011). This historical sensitivity is relevant to infrastructure because projects are embedded in particular periods of state formation, economic development, technological confidence, and geopolitical competition.

2.2 Imperialism and Political Economy

Imperialism provides another important conceptual dimension. Bashir's examination of Israel within the U.S. imperial system and Tabb's discussion of imperialism highlight the connection between political authority and economic structures (Bashir, 2006; Tabb, 2006). These perspectives make it possible to question the assumption that large infrastructure projects represent purely neutral technological progress.

The relevance of this approach becomes clearer when resource systems are considered. Delpech's discussion of nuclear politics and Kamrava's analysis of the nuclear question in the Middle East show that resources and technologies become politically significant when they intersect with questions of sovereignty, security, international authority, and strategic interest (Delpech, 2007; Kamrava, 2012). A comparable analytical logic can be applied to transportation infrastructure: waterways and transportation corridors can become strategically important because they connect resources, markets, industries, and political jurisdictions.

2.3 Global Influence and Unequal Development

Khanna's analysis of global influence demonstrates that international systems cannot be understood solely through formal state relationships because economic and political influence operates across multiple levels (Khanna, 2008). Logevall and Preston likewise demonstrate the importance of international relationships in shaping national policy and foreign economic strategy (Logevall and Preston, 2008).

The literature concerning Iran's sanctions provides a particularly useful illustration of the interaction between infrastructure-like systems, resource flows, and political authority. Ferrari and Cutler discuss sanctions within the context of U.S. foreign policy, while Leverett and Leverett emphasize tensions involving Iran and China (Ferrari and Cutler, 2013; Leverett and Leverett, 2012). Gardner similarly demonstrates that sanctions affecting oil transactions involved several countries with different economic interests (Gardner, 2013). These sources collectively support a multi-scalar understanding of economic systems.

2.4 Research Gap

A major gap emerges from the supplied literature: none of the references directly provides an environmental-history or socio-ecological study of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Consequently, there is insufficient evidence within the supplied bibliography to make detailed empirical claims about habitat modification, displacement, pollution, Indigenous communities, hydrological changes, or local economic effects.

This gap is not merely a bibliographic inconvenience; it is itself methodologically significant. The literature provides conceptual resources for studying power and political economy but lacks direct environmental evidence concerning the selected case. Therefore, the present study positions itself as a framework-building contribution rather than a definitive historical account.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1 Research Design

The study adopts a qualitative conceptual research design based exclusively on the references supplied by the researcher. A thematic synthesis method is used to identify recurring analytical concepts across the

literature. These concepts are subsequently organized into a socio-ecological framework applicable to large infrastructure development.

The methodological process consists of four stages: conceptual extraction, thematic classification, framework construction, and case-oriented interpretation. The first stage identifies concepts such as imperialism, political authority, economic interests, resource control, international influence, and structural inequality. The second organizes these concepts into interconnected analytical dimensions. The third constructs the socio-ecological framework. The fourth considers how the framework can be applied to the St. Lawrence Seaway without presenting unsupported empirical claims.

3.2 Socio-Ecological Infrastructure Framework

The proposed framework consists of five interconnected dimensions:

Engineering intervention represents the physical and technological transformation undertaken to achieve navigation, transportation, industrial, or economic objectives.

Political authority concerns the institutions capable of defining project objectives, approving interventions, establishing regulatory systems, and determining acceptable costs.

Economic distribution examines the allocation of benefits, investment opportunities, trade advantages, and resource access among different actors.

Environmental transformation considers changes to ecological systems produced directly or indirectly by infrastructural intervention.

Social distribution of costs examines which populations experience displacement, environmental risk, economic disruption, restricted resource access, or other burdens.

These dimensions should not be treated independently. Their analytical value emerges from their interaction. For example, an engineering intervention may generate economic benefits only because political institutions establish rules that permit particular forms of resource use. Environmental consequences may then be concentrated in locations occupied by populations with comparatively limited influence over decision-making.

3.3 Power-Resource-Environment Relationship

The framework can be represented conceptually as:

Engineering Intervention → Resource Reorganization → Economic Benefits → Political Authority → Environmental and Social Distribution

The arrows are not strictly linear. Instead, they represent reciprocal relationships. Political authority determines engineering priorities; engineering changes resource accessibility; resource accessibility influences economic interests; economic interests can influence political decisions; and environmental consequences can subsequently generate political conflict.

This reciprocal model is compatible with the broader theoretical orientation of the supplied literature. Katouzian and Shahidi's political-economic analysis demonstrates how economic relationships cannot be isolated from political conflict (Katouzian and Shahidi, 2008). Tabb's treatment of imperialism similarly encourages analysis of structural relationships between economic interests and political power (Tabb, 2006).

3.4 Environmental Justice as an Analytical Criterion

Environmental justice within the proposed framework is assessed through three questions: distribution, participation, and recognition. Distribution asks who receives benefits and who bears environmental costs. Participation asks who has meaningful influence over project decisions. Recognition asks whether affected populations and their interests are adequately acknowledged within development processes.

The framework therefore moves beyond the question of whether a project is economically successful. A project can be considered technically successful while remaining socially unequal if the distribution of environmental risks and economic gains is highly asymmetrical.

3.5 Multi-Scalar Analysis

A central methodological feature is multi-scalar analysis. Infrastructure operates simultaneously at local, regional, national, and international scales. Khanna's discussion of global influence provides theoretical justification for considering how economic and political relationships extend beyond individual national boundaries (Khanna, 2008).

Gardner's discussion of sanctions involving China, India,

and South Korea provides an illustrative example of why economic systems should be analyzed across jurisdictions rather than through a single-state lens (Gardner, 2013). Applied conceptually to the St. Lawrence Seaway, this means future research should investigate local environmental consequences alongside regional trade patterns and international economic relationships.

3.6 Analytical Example

Consider a hypothetical infrastructure expansion in which improved navigation generates increased commercial activity. At the engineering level, the intervention could be classified as successful because transportation efficiency improves. At the economic level, industries connected to the transportation network may obtain substantial benefits. However, at the socio-ecological level, the analysis would ask whether environmental disruption is concentrated in particular communities and whether those communities participate meaningfully in decision-making.

This hypothetical example demonstrates why engineering performance alone cannot establish social sustainability. The same intervention can simultaneously represent technological achievement and environmental injustice.

3.7 Methodological Limitations

The principal limitation is the absence of St. Lawrence Seaway-specific sources in the supplied bibliography. The methodology therefore cannot establish empirical conclusions concerning the project's actual environmental or social impacts. Additionally, several references focus on geopolitical conditions in Iran and the Middle East, which limits direct geographical comparability.

Accordingly, the framework should be understood as theoretically transferable rather than empirically conclusive. Future research should supplement it with archival documents, environmental assessments, engineering records, governmental reports, community testimony, historical demographic evidence, and ecological studies.

4. RESULTS

The conceptual analysis produces four principal findings. First, engineering progress should not be treated as an autonomous technical phenomenon. The literature demonstrates that technological and economic systems are embedded within structures of political authority and resource control. Abrahamian's structural approach and Tabb's analysis of imperialism both support an interpretation in which institutional and economic structures shape developmental outcomes (Abrahamian, 1980; Tabb, 2006).

Second, infrastructure must be evaluated through distributional rather than purely aggregate criteria. Economic development can produce broad benefits while imposing concentrated costs. The political-economic literature indicates that resources and economic opportunities are mediated through institutions, international relationships, and unequal power structures (Katouzian and Shahidi, 2008; Khanna, 2008). This finding provides a conceptual basis for examining whether the benefits associated with the St. Lawrence Seaway were distributed proportionately to the environmental and social burdens created by development.

Third, the analysis demonstrates the necessity of multi-scalar investigation. Gardner's examination of sanctions affecting China, India, and South Korea shows that resource-related economic decisions can produce consequences across several national jurisdictions (Gardner, 2013). The implication for infrastructure research is that the environmental justice assessment of a major transportation corridor should not be restricted to the immediate project site. Regional markets, national policy, and international commerce can influence both the rationale for development and the distribution of its benefits.

Fourth, environmental injustice should be incorporated into infrastructure analysis as a structural issue rather than treated as an unintended technical side effect. The framework identifies a chain connecting engineering intervention, resource reorganization, economic benefits, political authority, and environmental distribution. This approach changes the research question from "Did the project promote economic development?" to "How was development produced, who benefited from it, who bore its environmental costs, and whose interests shaped the decision-making process?"

These findings also expose a significant evidence gap.

The supplied literature does not establish specific environmental outcomes associated with the St. Lawrence Seaway. Therefore, claims about particular ecological or community-level effects require independent empirical investigation. The present framework consequently functions as an analytical architecture for such research rather than as a substitute for case-specific evidence.

5. DISCUSSION

The findings indicate that the conventional opposition between engineering progress and environmental protection is analytically insufficient. The more fundamental issue concerns the political and economic organization of technological development. Infrastructure is constructed through decisions about investment, authority, land, resources, mobility, and economic priorities. Consequently, its environmental consequences are inseparable from the institutions that organize development.

The theoretical relevance of imperialism is especially important. Bashir and Tabb demonstrate how political-economic structures can connect economic interests with broader systems of power (Bashir, 2006; Tabb, 2006). Applying this perspective to the St. Lawrence Seaway does not mean labeling the project itself imperialist without evidence. Rather, it requires researchers to investigate whether power asymmetries influenced decisions concerning whose economic interests were prioritized and whose environmental concerns received institutional recognition.

A second implication concerns the meaning of efficiency. Engineering assessments frequently privilege measurable variables such as transportation capacity, navigation efficiency, construction performance, and economic returns. A socio-ecological assessment adds variables that are less easily reduced to engineering metrics, including ecological disruption, social displacement, unequal exposure to environmental risk, and political participation.

The supplied literature concerning sanctions further demonstrates that economic systems involve trade-offs between national objectives and transnational consequences. Gardner's account of sanctions affecting China, India, and South Korea illustrates how resource policy can produce differentiated consequences for actors positioned differently within international economic networks (Gardner, 2013). Similarly, the St. Lawrence Seaway should theoretically be examined as a network rather than merely a physical waterway. Its significance lies partly in the relationships it establishes among transportation, industry, markets, political jurisdictions, and environmental systems.

Another important implication is that environmental justice requires temporal analysis. Environmental consequences may not occur simultaneously with engineering construction. Some effects can emerge gradually through industrial expansion, changes in land use, altered transportation patterns, or cumulative ecological pressures. Therefore, future Seaway research should distinguish between immediate construction impacts and long-term socio-ecological transformations.

The framework also has limitations. First, the conceptual transfer from Middle Eastern political-economic literature to North American infrastructure requires careful contextualization. The historical conditions examined by Abrahamian, Gelvin, Kamrava, and others cannot simply be equated with the history of the St. Lawrence Seaway (Abrahamian, 1979; Gelvin, 2011; Kamrava, 2012). Second, environmental justice requires empirical evidence concerning affected populations and ecological systems, which is absent from the supplied bibliography. Third, the framework may overemphasize political economy unless future research incorporates ecological science, engineering data, and community-level evidence.

Nevertheless, these limitations do not undermine the value of the proposed framework. Instead, they establish a clear research agenda. Future investigators can operationalize the five dimensions through historical datasets, environmental indicators, demographic information, institutional records, and stakeholder perspectives. The resulting analysis could determine whether and how engineering benefits were accompanied by unequal environmental burdens.

6. CONCLUSION

This study has developed a socio-ecological framework for examining the relationship between engineering progress and environmental injustice in the context of St. Lawrence Seaway development. Rather than treating infrastructure as an exclusively technical achievement, the framework conceptualizes it as a

socio-ecological system shaped by engineering decisions, political authority, economic distribution, environmental transformation, and social inequality.

The principal contribution is theoretical and methodological. Drawing exclusively on the supplied literature, the study demonstrates that concepts of structural power, imperialism, political economy, resource governance, and international influence can provide useful analytical foundations for infrastructure research. Abrahamian's structural approach, Tabb's analysis of imperialism, Khanna's treatment of global influence, and the literature on resource politics collectively support a broader understanding of development as a process embedded in power relationships.

The analysis also demonstrates the importance of multi-scalar investigation. Major infrastructure systems can connect local environmental transformations with regional economic changes and international networks. Gardner's analysis of sanctions involving China, India, and South Korea reinforces the broader methodological principle that economic systems frequently extend beyond a single jurisdiction (Gardner, 2013).

However, the study recognizes a decisive limitation: the supplied references do not directly document the environmental or social history of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Accordingly, the article should not be interpreted as an empirical determination of particular Seaway impacts. Instead, it provides an analytical architecture for future research.

Future studies should combine this framework with archival research, engineering records, environmental assessments, ecological data, demographic evidence, and community-level historical analysis. Particular attention should be directed toward distributional justice, participation in decision-making, resource access, long-term environmental transformation, and the relationship between transportation infrastructure and economic power. Such research could determine whether the promise of engineering progress was accompanied by unequal environmental and social consequences and could contribute to a more comprehensive understanding of sustainable infrastructure development.

REFERENCES

1. Abrahamian, Ervand. "Structural Causes of the Iranian Revolution."Middle East Research and Information Project87 (1980): 21-26. Web. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3011417.
2. Abrahamian, Ervand. “The Causes of the Constitutional Revolution in Iran.” International Journal of Middle East Studies 10.3 (1979).
3. Achcar, Gilbert.The People Want: A Radical Exploration of the Arab Uprising. Berkeley: University of California, 2013.
4. Bashir, Abu-Mannah. "Israel in the U.S. Empire."Monthly Review58.10 (2006): 1-20
5. Delpech, Therese.Iran and the Bomb: The Abdication of International Responsibility. New York: Columbia UP, 2007. Print.
6. Ferrari, Erich C., and Samuel Cutler. "New Sanctions on Iran and Neo-Big Stick Diplomacy."Lobe Log Foreign Policy. N.p., 22 Jan. 2013. Web.
7. Gardner, Timothy. "U.S. Extends Iran Oil Sanctions Waivers to China, India, Suuth Korea."Reuters[Washington] 29 Nov. 2013, U.S. ed.: n. pag. Print
8. Gearan, Anne, and Joby Warrick. "Iran, World Powers Reach Historic Nuclear Deal."Washington Post. N.p., 23 Nov. 2013.
9. Gelvin, James L.The Modern Middle East: A History. New York: Oxford UP, 2011. Print. 3rd Edition.
10. Kamrava, Mehran.The Nuclear Question in the Middle East. New York: Columbia UP, 2012.
11. Katouzian, Homa, and Hossein Shahidi.Iran in the 21st Century: Politics, Economics, and Conflict. London: Routledge, 2008.
12. Khanna, Parag.The Second World: Empires and Influence in the New Global Order. New York: Random House, 2008. Print.
13. Kressin, Wolfgang Kurt.Prime Minister Mossadeghand Ayatullah Kashani from Unity to Enmity: As Viewed from the American Embassy in Tehran, June 1950 -August 1953. Rep. Austin: n.p., 1991.
14. Leverett, Flynt, and Hillary Mann Leverett. "U.S. Sanctions Policy on a Collision Course with Iran; Increasing Tensions with China."The Race for Iran. N.p., 27 June 2012. Web.

15. Lichtman, RIchard. "Scenes from a Nightmare: The Imperialist Construction of Israel."Capitalism, Nature, Socialism13.3 (2002): 125-46.
16. Logevall, Fredrik, and Andrew Preston.Nixon in the World: American Foreign Relations, 1969-1977. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2008.
17. Luan. "China's Iranian Oil Imports "legitimate": FM Spokesman."Xinhua. Xinhua, 21 June 2012. Web.
18. Majidi, Mazda. "Imperialist Threaten Iran with War, Sanctions over Nuclear Energy."Party for Socialism and Liberation29 Aug. 2006, News and Analysis sec.: n. pag. Print.
19. Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT).The Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). New York: United Nations, 2005.
20. Reuters."Brazil Vents Frustration with West over Iran Deal."Today's Zaman22 June 2010: n. pag.
21. Strokan, Sergey. "Russia and Iran: Heading towards a Political Earthquake?"RT News15 Aug. 2012, Op-Edge sec.: n. pag. Print.
22. Tabb, William K. "Imperialism: In Tribute to Harry Magdoff."Monthly Review58.10 (2006): 1-8.
23. Wright, Robin.The Iran Primer: Power, Politics, and U.S. Policy. Washington D.C.: United States Institute of Peace, 2010. Print.