

## Concepts of the International Environment แนวความคิดเกี่ยวกับสิ่งแวดล้อมระหว่างประเทศ

Jak Sangchai\*  
จ๊ก แซงชัย

### บทคัดย่อ

ปัญหาสิ่งแวดล้อมเป็นประเด็นระหว่างประเทศมานานก่อนการเริ่มต้นของการเมืองสิ่งแวดล้อม โลกสมัยใหม่ ปัญหาสิ่งแวดล้อมทวีความสำคัญมากขึ้น เนื่องมาจากผลกระทบจากกระบวนการพัฒนาที่มุ่งเน้นการเจริญเติบโตทางเศรษฐกิจและการพัฒนาอุตสาหกรรม การพัฒนานั้นเกี่ยวข้องโดยตรงกับสองแนวคิดหลักที่ขัดแย้งกันคือ การพัฒนาและสิ่งแวดล้อม ซึ่งได้แบ่งแยกโลกออกเป็นสองกลุ่มคือ กลุ่มประเทศที่พัฒนาแล้วกับกลุ่มประเทศที่กำลังพัฒนา โดยกลุ่มประเทศที่พัฒนาแล้วให้ความสำคัญกับคุณภาพชีวิตของประชาชน ในขณะที่กลุ่มประเทศโลกฝ่ายใต้ให้ความสำคัญกับปัญหาความยากจนและความหิวโหยของประชาชน แนวทางการแก้ไขปัญหามลพิษทางสิ่งแวดล้อมอยู่บนรากฐานความเชื่อสองความเชื่อใหญ่ๆ คือ technocentrism และ ecocentrism ความเชื่อทั้งสองนี้มีอิทธิพลต่อแนวความคิดและกิจกรรมด้านการพัฒนาของทั้งสองกลุ่มประเทศอย่างมาก

การพัฒนาที่ยั่งยืนเป็นแนวคิดทางการพัฒนาที่ได้รับการยอมรับอย่างแพร่หลาย และเป็นความพยายามที่จะประสานระหว่างแนวความคิดการพัฒนาที่เน้นการเจริญเติบโตกับแนวความคิดด้านการอนุรักษ์สิ่งแวดล้อม แนวความคิดการพัฒนาที่ยั่งยืนให้ความสำคัญกับความเท่าเทียมกันระหว่างคนในแต่ละยุคสมัยและการพัฒนาคุณภาพชีวิต แนวความคิดนี้ระบุถึงความยั่งยืนสี่ประการ ได้แก่ ความยั่งยืนทางเศรษฐกิจ ความยั่งยืนทางสังคม ความยั่งยืนทางวัฒนธรรม และความยั่งยืนทางสิ่งแวดล้อม ซึ่งความยั่งยืนทางวัฒนธรรมนั้นคล้ายคลึงกับแนวความคิดการพัฒนาทางวัฒนธรรมที่ UNESCO ได้ส่งเสริมเพื่อกำจัดปัญหาสิ่งแวดล้อม โดยการเปลี่ยนแปลงพฤติกรรมและทัศนคติการดำเนินชีวิตของคนให้เป็นมิตรต่อสิ่งแวดล้อมมากขึ้น ได้มีความพยายามในประเทศไทยที่จะผสมผสานคำสอนทางพุทธศาสนาเข้ากับแนวความคิดในการอนุรักษ์และป้องกันสิ่งแวดล้อม ศาสนาพุทธกับสิ่งแวดล้อมนั้นมีความสัมพันธ์กันมานานแล้ว เพราะคำสอนในศาสนาพุทธได้สอดแทรกหลักการการอยู่ร่วมกันระหว่างคนกับธรรมชาติไว้ ศาสนาพุทธในประเทศไทยไม่ยอมรับลัทธิวัตถุนิยมและยอมรับกฎแห่งกรรม ศาสนาพุทธชี้ให้เห็นว่า เมื่อมนุษย์ทำให้อุบัติภัยเกิดขึ้น มนุษย์จึงควรที่จะปรับปรุงตัวเอง

ในขณะที่แนวความคิดการพัฒนาที่ยั่งยืนต้องการแก้ไขปัญหามลพิษทางสิ่งแวดล้อมโดยเครื่องมือทางเศรษฐกิจ แนวความคิด การพัฒนาทางวัฒนธรรมกลับมุ่งที่จะใช้วัฒนธรรมเป็นทางเลือกอื่นในการแก้ไขปัญหามลพิษ และในขณะเดียวกัน หลักคำสอนของพุทธศาสนาก็มุ่งตรงไปยังจุดกำเนิดของปัญหา ซึ่งก็คือมนุษย์นั่นเอง

\* Ph.D. Candidate of Leeds University, U.K., on leave from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs

### Abstract

Environmental problems have become international agendas long before the beginning of modern global environmental-political era. The issues have become more prominent due to a setback of development process, which emphasises economic growth and industrialisation. Debates about development at international level can be seen as conflict between two major ideas: development and environment. The conflict between developed and developing countries, or so-called North and South respectively, have appeared overtly since 1972. The North is concerned with the quality of life of the people, while the South is worried about the people's poverty and hunger. Also, environmental solutions base on ideology, which could be classified into two major ideologies: technocentrism and ecocentrism. These two competing ideologies have played significant part in developmental concepts and practices in both Northern and Southern countries.

Sustainable development emerged as the now widely accepted concept of development, which is an effort to compromise between growth development and environmental conservation. The concept emphasises intergenerational equity and the improvement of the quality of life. Four types of sustainability were defined for environmental actions: economic, social, cultural and environmental sustainability. Cultural sustainability is similar to the cultural development concept promoted by UNESCO. It states that environmental problems can be solved by changing people's behaviours and attitudes towards more environmentally friendly lifestyles. In Thailand, there is an effort to combine Buddhist precepts with the concept of environmental conservation. There has been a link between Buddhism and environment since Buddhism has incorporated the principles of ecological harmony in its teaching. Buddhism rejects materialism and accepts law of consequences. It believes that since problems are caused by human beings, then humans must ameliorate themselves.

Sustainable development concept seeks to solve environmental problems by economic instruments; cultural development suggests culture, which is a tool that shapes people and societies, as an alternative. At the same time, Buddhist doctrine goes straight to the root of the problems, the human being.

### Introduction

Environmental problems have become international issues since the 1960s. Infact, the problem had already become bilateral and multilateral agendas among countries for years before the 1960s as shown by some early environmental agreements,<sup>1</sup> but they were not

really regarded as mainstream international agendas on a par with security issues, particularly in the early period of the Cold War. Environmental issues were put behind the economic and development issue. However, they were not hidden for long: the development process itself soon exposed serious

consequences of environmental degradation. Such disasters as crude oil spillage in the sea, the explosion of chemical factories or nuclear plants, and the like, have raised people's concern for safety, health and environmental problems.<sup>2</sup> This caused people to re-assess their concept of development.

This paper addresses the importance of environmental problems as international agendas mainly by illustrating the arguments of the two major conflicting concepts, development and environment. The two competing ideas have not only created tensions between countries, but also reflects the world's present division: North and South, or developed and developing countries. The most widely known concept of environmental protection is sustainable development. But there are other suggested ideas as well, for instance ecological modernisation and cultural development.

### From Stockholm to Rio

The environmental concerns during the 1960s led to the organisation of the UN Conference on the Human Environment in 1972 in Stockholm. It aimed to set up "an international framework to promote a more coordinated approach to pollution and other environmental problems."<sup>3</sup> At the Conference, some principles were agreed upon, and institutions and programmes were established. The themes and practices which emerged at the Conference have remained central to international environmental politics for years.

One example is the acknowledgment of states' sovereignty over their natural resources. It was agreed that "states have responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond limits of national jurisdiction."<sup>4</sup> Subsequently, the UN Environment Programme (UNEP) was established as a key international actor for environmental protection activities at international, regional and national levels. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, many environmental agreements were concluded. Some are for specific regions (such as Mediterranean, North Sea, Baltic Sea), some are for specific aspects of the commons (such as sea, ocean, atmosphere) and some have global objectives (such as protection of the ozone layer, and prevention of global warming).

Environmental problems have caused an unclear border between the international, national and domestic levels, since these problems can occur in any areas of any country, but may affect other areas of other countries. Such problems have to be solved by cooperation between countries, and resulting solutions have to be implemented at the domestic level. This is why environmental context is mentioned as "think globally and act locally."<sup>5</sup> Moreover, the environmental problems have challenged conventional political theories, such as realism and neo realism. The notion of realism is state-centric: states are the main actors in the international stage; but in the environmental context non-state actors are as

important as states and they can penetrate through barriers between levels. At the international level, nongovernmental organisations (NGOs) can pressure states in environmental negotiation and implementation of the environmental conventions. At the national level, they form alliances to push for a change in government policy process (policy making and implementation). At the domestic level, they can raise public awareness of environmental degradation.

However, that which was achieved at the Stockholm Conference was not closely followed up. Environmental protection was not integrated into development concerns, and a series of environmental disasters continued to occur. Economic and development issues are still more important than the environmental issues. As a result, the UN set up a World Commission on Environment and Development, chaired by Gro Harlem Brundtland, the then Prime Minister of Norway, to find the way out for the conflict between development and environment ideas. The Commission's Brundtland Report in 1987 proposed the solution, 'sustainable development,' as a compromise between the two competing concepts. It received wide international support, although the exact meaning of 'sustainable development' remained contested.

The UN Conference on Environment and Development (Earth Summit) was convened in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 in order to promote and develop sustainable development. It turned out to be one of the largest summit meetings ever held; 150 states participated and about

45,000 people attended. Several agreements were signed: the two main documents were a statement of agreed principles or Rio Declaration and a detailed programme of action for sustainable development, or Agenda 21. These documents were aimed at defining and promoting the goal of sustainable development. Apart from the Rio Declaration and Agenda 21, there are also two specific conventions, namely the Framework Convention on Climate Change, and the Convention on Biological Diversity, in addition to the Forest Principles.

Overall, the Earth Summit was successful in terms of number of participants, the number of agreements and number of signatories, but in terms of quality only a limited number of agreements have been implemented. The Climate Change and Biodiversity agreements are framework conventions which established basic aims, principles, institutions and procedures for co-ordinating international actions. All of these initiatives are supposed to be subsequently developed by series of meetings of the framework convention (Conference of the Parties--CoPs). It will take time to see the result of the Earth Summit and any prediction of success or failure would be premature at this stage.<sup>6</sup> Nevertheless, it can be said that the 1992 Conference was a turning point of history of global environmental politics, in that the whole world recognised that environmental problems have to be tackled by cooperation at the global level: the problems were no longer merely domestic or national problems.

## Environmental regimes

In the age of globalisation, countries have become more interdependent. They have highly been involved in complex rules and institutions which control international behaviour. It is because the international system is anarchical and has no central government, that any acts of cooperation among countries, including establishment of the institutions, have to be done under agreed rules and signed agreements.

Those rules and institutions are not the regime, but they are parts of regimes. The regime is more than just a set of rules; it is presumed to be a high level of institutionalisation, and is established by countries on the basis of cooperation to promote international order.<sup>7</sup> For Stephen Krasner, a 'regime' does not necessarily need to have a formal international agreement. He defines 'regimes' as "sets of implicit or explicit principles, norms, rules, and decision-making procedures around which actors' expectations converge in a given area of international relations."<sup>8</sup> In this broad definition, it can be applied to all international arrangements. The definition is criticised by Susan Strange for including agreements to disagree and agreements that have no predictability and stability.<sup>9</sup>

Gareth Porter and Janet Welsh Brown give a different definition of 'regime,' as "a system of norms and rules that are specified by a multilateral agreement among the relevant states to regulate national actions on a specific issue or set of interrelated issues."<sup>10</sup>

Many regimes have been formed on specific issue areas, such as trade, money and environment. An example of regimes is the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT) which is now the World Trade Organisation (WTO) after the Uruguay Round negotiations. In the area of environment, specific regimes on certain issues have been established, such as ocean, atmosphere, Antarctica and outer space.<sup>11</sup> It is difficult to identify environmental regimes that do not have explicit agreements. Hundreds of environmental agreements have been signed, but some of them are regarded as symbolic or weak, while there are some which have been effective and have succeeded in tackling the problems for which they were established.<sup>12</sup>

There are several theoretical approaches that try to explain the existence and change of regime, such as structural, game theoretic, and epistemic communities approaches, each of which can demonstrate explanations for one or more international regimes, but they all fail to clarify the environmental regime. First, the structural approach highlights the strength of the countries involved in a certain issue. Weaker countries will be kept under stronger countries' thumbs.<sup>13</sup> The regime is therefore regulated under the leadership of hegemonic countries. This approach can well explain the state of world after the Second World War, the United States of America (USA) is a classic hegemon which set up trade and economic regime. However, environmental regime cannot be illustrated by the structural approach, as the

role of the USA has been limited by two factors; the increasing economic power of Japan and Western Europe have been arisen and the American antagonistic behaviours towards international environmental regulations between 1981 and 1993. The USA cannot lead other countries in the environmental regulations between 1981 and 1993. The USA cannot lead other countries in the environmental regimes, some of which have been successfully established by wide consensus.<sup>14</sup>

Second, the game-theoretic approach focuses on number of parties in the negotiations. It suggests that negotiations between small groups of countries are more likely to be successful than a large number, because each player can more readily understand the bargaining strategies of other players.<sup>15</sup> The large number of participants can create difficulties in negotiating and bargaining the agreement, particularly by veto power. However, it has also been found that bringing in more participants can sometimes help lead to stricter environmental regimes, for instance regimes of whaling and ocean dumping of radioactive wastes.<sup>16</sup>

The epistemic communities model is the third approach. It emphasises international learning, particularly on the basis of scientific research on a given problem, as a factor of regime formation and evolution. Alliances of scientists and officials of international organisations have formed transnational communities of experts sharing common values and approaches to policy problems--

epistemic communities. The consensus of the communities can sometimes lead to international environmental action because some environmental problems like global warming and ozone depletion are threats that cannot be detected and understood without scientific research. For example, the scientific evidence of damaging effects of sulphur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) emissions on European forests brought about the 1985 agreement to reduce the SO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 30 per cent of 1980 level, and a wide consensus of scientists about the threat of greenhouse warming led to formal negotiation of climate change issue in 1988. However, there are some environmental agreements in which the epistemic communities did not play any role or have influence, such as the Antarctica, biodiversity loss, and the like. Some of scientific evidence have even been ignored in making decisions.<sup>17</sup>

It can be seen that none of these theoretical approaches can well explain existing environmental regimes, they can explain some regimes, but at the same time they fail to spell out the others. Moreover, it should be appropriate to consider the influence of the domestic politics, economics and societies of the participants countries which should play pivotal roles in countries' behaviours and decision. Changes in economics and domestic politics or societies can shift the countries' roles and behaviours dramatically. Additionally, it is also necessary to think about relationships among negotiating parties in a wider scope. Some countries' roles and decisions may

depend on roles and decisions of others, because of their political and economic ties, particularly the environmental negotiations which relate to economic issues. These countries can swing votes in the negotiations if their vote to agree or to disagree would affect relations with countries that are politically or economically important.

There are at least three forms of agreement which are occasionally used in adopting the environmental agreements. The first of these is hard law; a legally binding agreement. The agreement, mostly named *convention*, is drafted by a preparation committee which lays out the texts of the final agreement. The agreement is often completed by the preparation committee; the final meeting of the parties to form an agreement is in fact just a formal ceremony which its only importance is the signing of the agreement by the assembled parties. The different form of agreement is called a *framework convention* if the agreement is negotiated in anticipation of one or more later elaborating texts, which aims to form a set of norms, principles, goals and formal mechanisms, rather than put binding obligations on the parties. Also, there is a regular conference of the parties (CoPs) to make policy and implementation decisions. The framework convention is followed by negotiation of one or more protocols which impose more specific obligations. The negotiations on framework convention and protocols may take many years. The second form, **soft law**, is a non-binding agreement

which leaves the countries to implement in a more flexible way. The soft law can be in a form of non-binding principles, standards and guidelines, and some soft laws can become hard laws over time, such as the 1987 Cairo guidelines on hazardous-waste disposal and transport, which hardened into the Basel Convention on Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes. Third, **action plans** are aimed to produce understanding document to direct the national policies. Like soft law, the action plans are not binding, but they are presumed to lead to binding agreements in due time. An example of these action plans is the widely-known Agenda 21 which is about environmental objectives and proposed policy measures to achieve them.<sup>18</sup> The Agenda 21 has no legal binding, enforcement, deadline and punishment for countries that fails to act.

There are five phases for the processes of environmental regime development, namely agenda formation, negotiation, decision making, implementation and further development,<sup>19</sup> the roles of the concerning actors are important as they create the regimes, negotiate, sign agreements which formalise the regime and implement the agreements as well as evaluating the outcome of the implementation. In the formation of the regimes, negotiations in the meetings are significant because they are stages for participant countries to bargain for interests concerning how much benefit they will gain or lose. In most cases, countries try

to lose as little as possible; some countries veto by making considerable reservations in the draft agreements, or even rejecting compromise and prolonging the negotiations. More importantly, if the countries which oppose the agreements form "veto coalitions", they will become more powerful in the negotiations and can weaken the agreements. Likewise, the countries which foresee benefit gaining from the regimes could form their coalitions in order to expedite formation processes of regimes. There are "lead" states as well as "veto" states. As a result, the agreements sometimes came into effect with the lowest common denominators which might affect the effectiveness of the agreements. In environmental regimes, the countries are often divided into two groups -- developed or industrialised countries (North) and developing countries (South).

### North-South issues

Environmental awareness seems to occur clearly and strongly in the industrialised countries or the North, and is less common in the South where most of countries are on a different path because they still emphasise economic and industrial development. The North has already passed the stage of development being experienced now by the South. Northern people are interested in a better quality of life because their standard of living is high already, whereas the standard of living in the South is lower. Although developing countries realise the importance of environmental protection, it is not their first

priority, which is to improve standard of living of the people. Indira Gandhi, the then Prime Minister of India, once declared: "How can we speak to those who live in villages and in slums about keeping the oceans, rivers and the air clean when their own lives are contaminated at the source?"<sup>20</sup> Nevertheless, developing countries have passed environmental laws and set up executive environmental agencies.

When it has widely been accepted that global environmental problems have occurred, and have to be solved, the question is then raised: who causes the problems and who is responsible for them, the over-consuming North or the overpopulated South? The North blames the South for uneven development and high population growth whereas the South accuses the North of excessive lifestyles.<sup>21</sup> The South identifies the North's pattern of consumption as a significant cause of global environmental degradation; for instance developed countries have 28 times more cars and use 13 times more paper products per capita than developing countries.<sup>22</sup> The North accepts that it holds responsibility more than the South for environmental problems the world is now facing. In fact, the North is not wrong to point at the overpopulation of the South, but it fails to recognise it self as a driving force behind the South population growth and unsustainable development or the so-called colonial legacies. On the Southern side, most of the leaders refused to acknowledge that corruption and negligence were parts of problem. The colonial legacies and lack of assistance could not



be blamed as the only causes of the environmental problems.<sup>23</sup>

Also, developing countries insist that developed countries are primarily responsible for global environmental problems, that they have less historical responsibility for the global pollution and resource depletion, and any actions for environmental protection initiated have to consider the promotion of their economic and social development without putting more financial burdens on them.<sup>24</sup> Clearly, they fear the high cost of environmental protection, and its effects on economic growth. Furthermore, some of them believe that the environmental cooperation can be a mechanism for Northern countries to control Southern countries, particularly on issues concerning trade and economics, it is a new form of imperialism or colonialism, which is known as 'eco imperialism'.<sup>25</sup>

Furthermore, the environmental issue is linked to the issues of trade, financial aid, loan and debt, and transfer of technology. The North and the South have different objectives. For the South, environmental degradation is a by-product of industrialisation and economic growth; the worst pollutant is poverty.<sup>26</sup> Transfer of technology and financial aid from the North can help Southern countries to survive in world economy so that they can take care of the environment later. But this may be an over-confident view: uneven development may deteriorate the environment and there may be nothing to protect after developing countries achieve their goal of development. They

may be preoccupied with maintaining the level of development rather than looking after the environment. In addition, loans from the North are needed for development projects, but loans result in a growing amount of debt. Many Southern countries have fallen into a vicious circle of debt, and needed more loans every year.<sup>27</sup>

The real objective of the arguments about who is responsible for the degraded state of environment is to find a person who has to pay for fixing the environment. In fact, it seems to be pointless to find responsible person, the question is asked just for irresponsibly lifting environmental burden from one's shoulders and putting it on the others.' Both North and South bear responsibility of causing the problems, and there is no need to find out who has caused more or less problems than the others. Moreover, the problems have already happened and required cooperation from every country in order to solve the problems because everyone lives in the inseparable natural world.

However, Northern countries have stressed that environmental solutions need cooperation and contribution from every country. It may imply that the North does not want the South to repeat the Northern history of development.<sup>28</sup> The question that should be asked in order not to worsen environmental problems is: how can the South avoid developing into the second North? The concept of development that the South derived from the North and embraced it is viewed as a foundation of the problems and needs to be

re-conceptualised. Then, the next questions are: what are the alternatives, and is it necessary to adopt new concept of development? One must not forget that the development concept is broad and complex, and relates to many issues involving politics, society, culture, and economy in particular.

### Debates about environment : Environmentalism

Development after the post-war period stressed economic development and political stability. Development has been defined as the "constant improvement of an entire population's well-being."<sup>29</sup> It was believed that higher standard of living and development would help limit spread of communism because poverty and disparities between the rich and the poor may lead to uprising and revolution. Therefore, it was necessary to improve lives of the people, particularly in the developing countries, in order to satisfy needs of people and prevent an outcry for equity. The concept of development was associated with modernisation or westernisation. In this context, it could be applied to the relations between countries, too, especially between the North and the South. For the North, it was necessary to bring the South closer by using modernisation methods to narrow down the gap between the North and the South not only in economic terms, but also in political, social and cultural terms. Thus,

there would be less differences of interests and viewpoints among countries.<sup>30</sup> Additionally, another issue of the development concept concerned population. Because it is people who consume products and use resources, it is important to control population growth. The more people there are, the more resources have to be used.

Nevertheless, modernisation theory was likely to be doomed to failure. The gap between North and South widened constantly, there was large-scale poverty and the population in the South continued growing.<sup>31</sup> More importantly, it was clear that development has led to social problem and environmental destruction. High technology advances manufacturing systems, but emits smoke to the air, disposes chemical waste into water and exploits non-renewable resources. Furthermore, renewable resources were likely to become non-renewable, for instance technology has increased capacity in fishing, but at the same time it has severely decreased fish population until nature cannot supply the increasing demand of fishing, and this may lead to extinction of some species.<sup>32</sup> Thus, the development concept has become problematic due to its threat to the environment.

Solutions to environmental problems rest on environmental ideology, which could be either ecocentrism or technocentrism (Table 1).<sup>33</sup>

**Table 1** Technocentric and ecocentric approaches to environmentalism

Technocentrism	Ecocentrism
1. Modified sustainable economic growth.	1. Limits to, and undesirability of, economic growth.
2. Large role for technological development as a provider of solutions for environmental problems.	2. A distrust of science and technological fixes.
3. Environmental solutions can co - exist with existing social and political structures.	3. Radical social and political change necessary. A preference for decentralised social and political organisation.
4. Anthropocentrism and a commitment to intra-generational and inter-generational equity.	4. Intrinsic value of nature or, at least, a weaker version of anthropocentrism; a commitment to social justice within human society and between humans and non-human nature.

Source : Garner, R. (1996) *Environmental Politics*. London : Prentice Hall, p. 30.

First, the two ideas have different views of the **economy**. The ecocentrists view economic growth as incompatible with environmental goals. It has a driving force from a book, *The Limits to Growth*, by researchers at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT). They used computer modeling techniques to test relations between environmental factors, namely industrialisation, resources depletion, pollution, food production and population. It predicted the likely catastrophic results if there is no radical change in levels of production and consumption, and in present political, economic and social institutions since the variables are interdependent.<sup>34</sup>

Interdependence of factors has created a picture of trade-off relations between economic growth and environmental protection; going for economic growth will neglect environmental protection or vice versa. The technocentrists deny this claim and argue that sustainable growth is possible: environmental protection is compatible with economic growth and may even strengthen it. Albert Weale argues that the governments can perform environmental protection without fear of economic effects, which he calls: 'ecological modernisation.' This idea was well accepted in many European countries, especially Germany.<sup>35</sup> But governments have to reaffirm that the economy is sustainable. Environmental

protection can help strengthen the economy as an increasing people's demand for environmentally friendly products which will be a source of future growth. Moreover, the trade-off theorists (ecocentrists) argued that any current changes do not mean that the environmental problem is solved; they may not exacerbate the problem, but the problem exists still, and environmental costs can merely be passed to other sectors of society and to future generations. Therefore, it is not necessary to have radical changes in the present economic system, but the environmental regulations must be adopted in order to control transfer of environmental costs.

The ecocentrists also claim that economic growth has led to a materialist lifestyle which cannot bring about life fulfillment. Nonetheless, it is not easy to convince everyone to give up the present comfortable lifestyle. Who wants less material comfort? More importantly, it is not easy to argue whether or not the materialist life is fulfilling, since it may at least satisfy some people.

It has to be noted here that the debate discussed above is likely to be a very Northern idea. The South may have different opinions. Most of the Southern countries lag behind the North: economic and industrial development is important to them because many Southern people still live in poverty and hunger, and their standard of living is not so high as the Northern people's.<sup>36</sup> This viewpoint does not suggest that the South should ignore non-

material pursuits and stressed only on the development. It is not necessary for the South to follow footsteps of the Northern history of development; there should be other ways that people do not have to experience materialism first and then begin to see the importance of quality-of-life issues, the standard of living and quality of life can be improved together at the same time.

The second difference between ecocentrism and technocentrism concerns **science and technology**. Technocentrists believe that science and technology could help develop a sustainable society whereas ecocentrists doubt this. Nonetheless, the ecocentric standpoint accepts that science has played a pivotal role in identifying environmental problems. Its development has also identified an interdependent natural world which includes humans, and has encouraged a wide acceptance that humans have to suffer from environmental problems as well as other species. Furthermore, the technocentric belief suggests the idea of continued exploitation of natural resources because science will eventually come up with solutions for environmental problems.<sup>37</sup>

Ironically, it is undeniable that scientific and technological development has been a major cause of environmental degradation, and has created technocentric values which separate human beings from nature, and the belief that humans can control nature.

Third, the technocentrists and ecocentrists also have different viewpoints on

the capacity of the present political, economic and social institutions. While the technocentrists believe that the present institutions can cope with environmental problems, the ecocentrists question this, and call for radical reorganisation of the institutions. Also, they call for decentralisation of government power from national level to the local level. Decentralised and participatory communities will require self-sufficiency, so that they will end national and international environmental problems caused by a high level of industrial production. However, it is not clear that self-sufficient communities can end transnational environmental problems. An end to the large-scaled industrial production and international markets would not necessarily mean that these problems will disappear. It is also unclear why decentralised communities will be more environmentally aware, since in some cases severe environmental problems have been caused by farmers in small local communities.<sup>38</sup>

The last difference between ecocentrism and technocentrism is the relationship between people and nature, which concerns environmental ethics. Their difference on this point is quite distinctive. Anthropocentrism, which is a typical technocentric value is human centred, holding that only humans have intrinsic value. On the contrary, ecocentrists believe that the whole of nature has intrinsic value; humans are parts of nature and inseparable. Not only does the idea apply to the relationship between people and nature, but it can also to relations between people. In addition, R.

Eckersley categorises environmental thought ranging from anthropocentrism to ecocentrism into several ideas. She identifies a continuum, ranging respectively from resource conservation, human welfare ecology, preservationism, animal liberation to ecocentrism.<sup>39</sup>

There are some points to be made here concerning the relationship between people, and between people to non-humans and nature. First, the relationship between people in environmentalist aspect rests on relationship between generations. How much does present generation have to care about future generations? There is no question that what people do now to the environment will affect and harm people in the future, but to what extent do people at the present time have to act for interests of the people in the future? Do people in the present have to live with less comfort by leaving material conveniences in order to have a better environmental quality for people in the future? The answers will lie on individual belief. Second, it is difficult to justify the intrinsic value of nature. Because only humans can put intrinsic as well as extrinsic values on other things, there is no proof that the river, rock and mountain can feel anything.

In conclusion, although ecocentrism has raised many interesting points, it seems to be too radical and is not likely to be implemented. The technocentric idea seems to be more pragmatic. However, the concept of ecocentrism cannot be ignored. For instance the idea that human beings cannot separate themselves from

nature, are not 'above' nature, and should not control it, is reasonable. Ecocentric ideas are likely to be opposed when related to 'decentralisation' because the ideas will inevitably be linked to other political issues, such as administration, power and interests. Environmentalism, therefore, will have some influences on developmental concepts and practices both in the North and the South.

### Sustainable Development

The sustainable development concept suggests a new path of development which compromises the conflicting ideas of economic development and environmental protection. New concepts of development like sustainable development are different from traditional development ideas which do not concern the state of the environment and give little attention to environmental destruction. Sustainable development is not an idea for solving the existing environmental problems, but aims for no more environmental deterioration. It is a crystallisation of past experiences in development which are synthesised together for a betterment of human life and of the world as a whole. Sustainable development does not require a dramatic upheaval, but is a slow process of change in the present political, economic and social institutions.

The very idea of sustainable development is defined in "Our Common Future," the Brundtland Report of the World Commission on Environment and Development in 1987 as

"Development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs"<sup>40</sup> and has two key concepts<sup>41</sup>:

⇒ The concept of needs, in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given.

⇒ The idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and future needs. The definition can be divided into four concerns<sup>42</sup>:

1. Concern for the relationship between resource use, population growth and technological development.

2. Concern for the production and distribution of resources, food, energy and industry amongst the more developed and less developed nations of the world.

3. Concern for "uneven development" and "underdevelopment," for the gross imbalances between rich and poor nations, and for inequity.

4. Concern for environmental degradation and potential ecological disaster.

Sustainable development involves relationship between development and environment, between the rich and the poor, between developed and less developed countries, and between generations. Development should be achieved by its responses to human needs without destroying the environment, because environment and nature are very important to human life; man cannot live independently without them. Although improvement of the quality of life is the prime

objective of sustainable development, development should maintain economic growth while conserving resources.

There is a contradiction between development and environment. Whereas development projects are in progress, they cannot stop exploiting resources. Notwithstanding, sustainable development does not mean completely giving up resources use, but it means careful exploitation of resources or search for new methods of resources use which serve in a longer term for the future, rather than in short term. The idea of sustainable development seems to be dichotomous. It fundamentally challenges the materialist and consumerist values of the industrialised countries, as well as the desire to be industrialised and developed of many developing countries.

The Brundtland Report emphasises that development is the best way to control population growth in developing countries by still satisfying fundamental needs. And "this means an increase in consumption patterns of many countries, but this cannot occur in the materialist mode of the industrially advanced nations."<sup>43</sup> Therefore, development for the less developed countries should be different from the past experience, and the more developed countries have to alter their consumerist habits.

However, although the sustainable development concept is an attempt to balance different needs of developed and developing countries (North and South, respectively), conflict exists between those countries at many

point because any change, whether rapid or slow, involves costs which have to be borne. The costs for sustainable development are expensive, which some countries in the South cannot accept.

There are several reasons and conditions that the South can use to avoid the costs for change. First, there are historical reasons or colonial legacies for which the South blames the North. The North's unsustainable lifestyle is also criticised by the South. For example the North, with 16 per cent of world population, produce 48 per cent of greenhouse gas emissions; the US per capita CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are 5.7 tonnes as against average for the developing world of under 0.5 tonnes.<sup>44</sup> Thus, the South has called the North to take the lead in tackling global environmental problems. Second, the South demands assistance from the North to cover the costs of specific measures to tackle the environmental problem. Third, Southern countries have connected environmental cooperation to other issues which do not directly relate to environmental problems, such as foreign debt, reduction of level of Northern protectionism, market access, better term of trade.<sup>45</sup> Put simply, Southern countries do not want to bear the costs if the North does not help. For instance, negotiations in the 1992 Earth Summit were fierce and complex, but the main issues of the meeting were not environmental issues. Instead, the importance was placed on the environmental-related issues--trade and environmental cooperation.<sup>46</sup>

The old concept of economic development emphasises the measure of macroeconomic growth (gross national product--GNP) which advocates of sustainable development view as failing to mirror the real physical capability of an economy to render material wealth or to consider the relative well-being of the society in general, because the normative costs of environmental degradation as well as other indicators concerning human welfare measurement are not shown in the GNP accounts. Thus, a new system of accounting, that is environmental accounting, was introduced in the late 1980s to many countries and international organisations. The UN Development Programme's (UNDP) "human indicators" which annually appraise quality of life in all countries are widely accepted.<sup>47</sup> Also, the conventional economic development concept neglects inclusion of environmental costs in the consumer prices which in turn encourage over-consumption and more rapid use and depletion of resources. The prices of goods can be raised by using taxation measure, "green taxes," which is one of the tools under "polluter-pays principle" (PPP) of the Earth Summit's Declaration of Principles (Rio Declaration).

Nowadays, although the sustainable development concept has widely been supported in many countries and organisations, the influence of the old concept of development is still strong. However, the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 marked a paradigm shift from the traditional development concept to a sustainable development

concept. The signatory countries of the Rio environmental agreements had to integrate the sustainable development idea into their national policies, especially economic development policies. Even the international institutions have admitted mistakenly supporting unsustainable development strategies in the past, and have since recommended sustainable development strategies.<sup>48</sup>

The core of the concept still stresses economic development as a pathway to environmental protection, but when looking in more depth, the idea does not connect environmental concerns only with economic well-being, but also with social well-being. Notwithstanding, there was a question about the concept of sustainable development at the Earth Summit because the concept also applies to social and cultural issues which vary in different countries or, in some cases, even within one country. Sustainable development may not have the same meaning and understanding across different cultures and perspectives on human-environmental improvement. Four types of sustainability were therefore defined for guiding environmental action : environmental, social, cultural, and economic.<sup>49</sup> First, environmental sustainability allows an expansion of industrial and agricultural development, but it has to be limited by environmental consideration. Any plans and actions should consider the impacts on the environment. Second, in a context of social sustainability, political participation is urged; people should be provided with correct infor-



mation and have the chance to give careful consideration to proposals. Third, cultural sustainability calls for people to share educational and social opportunities in multicultural and multilingual societies. It also urges people to respect and recognise political and ethnical differences. Fourth, economic sustainability includes equal distribution of wealth and suggests that consumer prices have to include environmental costs.

### Cultural and human development

While the concept of sustainable development has become popular, there is another new concept of development which gives attention to significance of role of culture, that is the concept of cultural development.<sup>60</sup> Culture is not just only arts and letters, but also includes a mode of life, the fundamental rights of human being, value systems, traditions and beliefs. By anthropological definition, it is regarded as "the whole complex of distinctive spiritual, material, intellectual and emotional features that characterise a society or social group."<sup>61</sup> In this sense, culture covers language, thought, innovation, creativity and critical skills. It shapes behaviours and reflexes-- the way people perceive the world and themselves, and how people interact with the world--which constitutes the identity of individuals and societies. Culture is a thread that links the past, present and future of a society and the setting for individual creativity. Culture is therefore a source of major political, economic and

social problems and, in turn, a key factor in solving them.<sup>52</sup>

The cultural development concept suggests that culture can help solve envelopment.<sup>53</sup> Development methods after the Second World War have given emphasis to economics and ignored the socio-cultural context in which development might take place in. Culture was even viewed as "backwardness" by concept of economic development and industrialisation.<sup>54</sup> It is necessary to break down the barriers between economic and scientific policies on the one hand, and cultural policies on the other. In fact, culture is a root of civilisation; economic growth depends on the cultural factors for creativity and adaptability, and culture should be put in the central position of development strategies since it is a major influence in the contemporary world, for instance ethnic conflict is a result of intolerance to cultural differences. Another example of importance of culture is the relationship between society (humans) and nature or, put simply, between culture and environment. Politics and technology are certainly important in solving environmental problems, but that is not enough: the real problem is indeed not political or technical issues. The state of the world's environment mirrors people's values and attitudes. In a word, "the state of the environment is to an important extent a reflection of the state of culture."<sup>55</sup>

Advocates of cultural development believe that the world is now facing cultural

crisis because of industrialisation and consumerism which have changed behaviours and attitudes of people in the present generation. "pressures on the environment are the result of the individual choices that millions of people make everyday about the way they lead their lives, the demands they make on resources and the waste they generate."<sup>56</sup> The best way to solve environmental problem is to change people, to change their attitudes to be more concerned with environmental degradation and protection at the grassroots level, that is to change their culture--their "in-vironment."<sup>57</sup>

Conservation of the biological resource base will require new patterns of consumption consisten with sustainable farming forestry and fishery practices. Education-itself an aspect of culture -will have a major part to play in facilitatin this cultural shift as well as in promoting capacity building and technological innovation for sustainable development.<sup>58</sup>

Culture has to be changed, not only in any particular geographical areas, but everywhere in the world. The North has to change its excessive lifestyle, whereas there should be a change in the South which is now following the Northern development pattern as well. Culture can also help solve the discord between North and South because there is one basic thing that the Northern and Southern people share together, that is, they have culture and wisdom as their foundation of life. However, there are some scholars who argue that the South does not have to experience a change of culture. The local traditional culture

has already encouraged people to preserve natural environment, but it has just been put aside by influence of industrialisation and economic development. As a result, there is no need to change the culture, but the traditional culture, beliefs and knowledge of environment of local people have to be brought back to life again by combining with the rigour of modern science.<sup>59</sup>

The cultural development position is not incompatible with the concept of sustainable development. Sustainable development argues that it is necessary to solve environmental problems and encourage environmental protection by using an economic perspective, but the cultural development concept maintains that development must essentially be concerned with culture. Regulations, economic instruments and market mechanisms can facilitate the behavioural change of industry and individuals to take account of environmental costs and benefits. It suggests that in order to create inter-generational equity along the lines of the sustainable development idea, culture is the fundamental element of this long-term mission, because culture is the only thing that has been transmitted through generations. Environmental education and training are eminently significant in influencing future patterns of behaviour and help people to understand the effect of the environment on their well being, the impact of their lifestyles on the environment and the benefits of sustainable development action. Thus, culture

(cultural change) is a means to sustainable development. It is not only a means to sustainability, it is also an end; culture plays the role of determining final destination and it will be a part of sustainable society.

Also, the cultural development concept stresses that it is necessary to accept diversity of cultures. Before the propagation of the concept of economic development and industrialisation, people who lived in different areas of the world had to learn to adapt themselves in order to live in their own environments, which had led to the development of different cultural patterns in response to local conditions in different areas. But every age-old culture has one thing in common, that is values and respect for nature and life which, from the cultural development perspective, should be promoted as a common ethic for sustainable development in the world nowadays.

In short, it can be seen that cultural development has ecocentric value; it is a viewpoint that sees human beings as part of the natural system, not as outsiders who believe that they can control the environment. It is humans who have to adapt themselves towards the environment, rather than adapting the environment towards their needs. On the other hand, cultural development also includes technocentric and anthropocentric concept that human beings have a duty to protect the world and the environment (stewardship). Human beings are the only species that has capability to exploit and protect the environment and every possible

natural resource of the world. However, it does not mean that humans are placed higher than non-human animals and non-living substances. Humans are still under law of nature as well as others.

#### Thai Buddhist ideas on environment and development

Religion is the most important part of basic components of culture. Religion can be regarded as a strong belief or faith which has influence over human patterns of living and behaviour. Since some environmental problems are caused by human activities, there is hence a link between religion and environment.<sup>60</sup> Long before environmental concerns became the centre of attention, religions had established the principles of ecological harmony for centuries through their search for spiritual and physical mutuality, integrated in a system of ethical awareness and moral responsibility.<sup>61</sup>

King Ramkhamhaeng of Sukhothai (1275-1371) established Theravada Buddhism as Thailand's dominant religion. Buddhism had been a reaction against Brahmanism -an Indian religion prevalent in Southeast Asia before the arrival of Buddhism. Buddhism eschews Brahmanism's emphasis on caste and dogma regarding sacrifice and ritual, and at the same time it modified Brahmanic concepts of karma and rebirth.<sup>62</sup> Its doctrine is about how to avoid suffering and how to seek ultimate happiness by self-discipline and understanding. The main theme of Thai Buddhism is an acceptance of natural

law--the law of uncertainty and law of consequence (karma). First, law of uncertainty concerns changes. Nothing is certain, everything changes every single minute. In other words, it is only changes that are certain and natural. There is birth, there is death, and then there is birth again. The sun rises, the sun sets, and then the sun rises again. It is a cycle of rebirth: everything is in this cycle. This view suggests the idea that humans are not excluded from nature, and it rejects anthropocentrism.

This principle teaches people "to lay down" and accept that material matters, such as wealth, the household, and the like, do not contain true values for life. No one can bring along anything with him after death except goodness and evil. Therefore, wealth or any other worldly materials cannot signify whether a man is good or bad; it is what he has done in his lifetime that matters. The principle implies how people should behave towards each other and towards everything. This first law links to the law of consequence (karma); in order to be reborn in a better place, good deeds must be performed physically and spiritually.

The second law is the karma law which concerns cause and effect. "Because the cause was there, the consequences followed; because the cause is there, effects will follow."<sup>63</sup> In its connection to human life, its meaning includes behaviour in the past, present and next life. The man is suffered because of what he has done in the past in this life or probably in the past life. What he has done in this life, will

affect his future and his next life. One's life does not begin with birth and end with death, but is a link in a chain of lives. It is a matter of fact that this teaching tells people to be rational and consider doing everything with consciousness. Buddhist doctrine explains that the difference between human beings and other animals is that the humans have ability to learn. This ability to learn is also an ability to accumulate and pass knowledge to others. Human learning can occur by perceiving and conceiving things rationally. Therefore, correct information and careful consideration are necessary.<sup>64</sup> This can apply very suitably to the environmental problems. Because of the carelessness of humans, their activities have led to unfavourably environmental consequences. Furthermore, Buddhism does not only indicate the differences between human and non-human animals, but it also accepts that humans have different have different levels of learning. Humans are not different in the physical sense that they are humans, but human capabilities are different in each person. But Buddhist concept suggests that, with the ability to learn, humans have the ability to develop themselves for betterment of life. That means humans can be developed by training and practising. And this ability will make all human beings equal.

The principle of cause-consequence points out not only the interconnectedness of life, but also interrelationships of everything. Put simply, the Buddhist concept can build and simplify the complexity of problems by

placing events in sequence, for example air pollution is a result of human activities, it causes acid rain, then the rain falls into lakes and forests, it leads to deforestation and water pollution. It eventually comes back to affect people's lives and well-being. Buddhist position suggests that the whole problem has to be solved at its origins so that it can eliminate the possibility of the consequences. One might argue that although the problems and consequences are solved, the same problems may continue to exist as a result of other human activities. The Buddhist response would repeatedly explain that the problems have to be tackled at source. In essence, Buddhism tries to spell out that if all problems are caused by human activities, then it is humans that are the problem. The concept of Buddhism always encourages people to live with nature in order to understand the nature of change; that is to accept that change is a natural process, and to live without activities that cause environmental destruction which will return to affect people in due course.<sup>65</sup>

The Buddhist doctrines in the context of environmental protection is somewhat similar to cultural development concept. The environmental problem has to be tackled, not only by economic instruments and market mechanisms, but also at the grassroots level of the problem; that is, humans are the problem, the source of environmental problem is not human activities. It is humans that have to change themselves, changes in their activities are not enough. The cultural development

emphasises use of culture as a means to tackle the problem by changing the human behaviour, while the Buddhist idea addresses the roots of human behaviours directly. The cultural development and Buddhist concept on environment and development places confidence in human capacity with a belief that the best way to protect the environment and solve environmental problem is human development.

The Buddhist idea applies Buddhist practices for human development with the objective of changing humans and society to be more desirable. However, the concept is quite complicated and difficult to understand and can be easily misinterpreted.<sup>66</sup> First, it explains that compulsion will be futile, the goal is not to force everyone to have the same pattern of life and seek happiness in the same way, but it can be successful by practising level by level. Second, human development does not require immediate action because it will be too hard to achieve and will become compulsive. It accepts compromise, and uses it as the beginning point for human development. For human society which still needs material happiness, there are laws as a frame to limit the unlimited needs. These laws will have different meanings alongside the levels of human development. The laws can also be a tool for practice, but when humans develop to a higher level that each has self-discipline, these laws will be only symbolic, a standard of how to live together in a society.<sup>67</sup>

It can be seen that the Buddhist idea on environment and development emphasises

human development which is not only to solve environmental problems, but it is also to protect the environment over the longest possible term, when compared to sustainable development and cultural development concepts. Because it does not aim to change the economic system, society and any activities created by human beings, it goes straight to the very origin of the problem that is human beings, and it seeks to change human nature as a whole from selfishness to non-selfishness, no self-interest and no power seeking. Man should live with nature in way which does no harm to nature, to other people and to himself. Buddhism believes that humans are special and different from other species. Humans have a special ability; that is the ability to develop and to better themselves, their lives and their world.

### Conclusion

Since the environment has become an international agenda, there have been gatherings many times of representatives from all countries around the world. However, environmental solutions seem to be in vain because there are differences in opinions and interests, which have obstructed cooperation. The most obvious division in the conflicts between the North and the South or between development and developing countries. It is because they are on different paths of development. While Northern countries are the countries which people have already met sufficient standard of living and are now

turning attention to the issues of quality of life, Southern countries are the countries where people are still suffering due to low standard of living and being unable to cope with unsatisfactory basic needs. However, environmental problems are transnational and global in nature. The North therefore cannot ignore the South by not providing assistance; the South at the same time does not consider the environmental problem as an important issue, but it has used conferences relating to environmental issues as stages for bargaining. However, the North has also connected environmental issues to trade issues because it wants to maintain its economic status at the level that it can continue prosperity and provide high standard of well being to its people.

Nevertheless, the environmental issue has been elevated to the international level. Most environmental solutions are based on technocentrism rather than ecocentrism which is considered to be too impractical. However, some parts of the ecocentric concept are widely accepted as important. The ecocentric value of nature is likely to be useful as a fundamental element of environmental protection plans and actions; the notion that humans are not excluded from nature. In the past, humans have been trying to overcome the power of nature and then let this ambition to prevail over themselves. Ecocentrists disagree with this belief, and view human beings as part of nature and under nature's control. Human beings are not as special as people influenced by anthro-

po-centric believe. Human and non-human animals are equal when they face the fate of nature.

The most popular approach to environmental protection is the concept of sustainable development, because it is a compromise between differences of interests and development paths of the North and the South. It is considered as an approach with long-term vision to create inter-generational justice. It encourages people to be aware of environmental consequences of economic development, but it does not reject the importance of development and industrialisation. Also, sustainable development emphasises the use of economic instruments and market mechanisms.

Although the problem may be global, solutions have to be acted at the local level so that the problem will be solved effectively. In this regard, sustainable development encourages both roles of governments and non-governmental organisations (NGOs) in order to create the wide and deep network of cooperation. For instance, Agenda 21 is one of the successes of the Earth Summit in 1992. It is a document containing a detailed programme of action for sustainable development, several chapters of it are on strengthening the role of "major groups," including local authorities, trade unions, business and industry, scientists, women,

indigenous peoples, youth, and farmers.<sup>68</sup>

cultural development is another approach for environmental protection. The concept emerged at the same time as the sustainable development, but it is less known to people. It stresses the role and influence of culture in protecting the environment. It holds the belief that culture can help solve the environmental problem at the grassroots level because society is shaped by culture, and human behaviour and pattern of living are influenced by the culture. Thus, it is necessary to use culture as a means to increase environmental awareness and consciousness of people in society, and the culture (which comprises environmental consciousness) itself will be part of an end--society with sustainability.

The Buddhist idea of environment and development is slightly different from cultural development as it aims to change human behaviour as well. They both suggest the "third factor" which is the human factor to promote sustainable development. They argue that the sustainable development concept should add the perspective of human influence in the concept, because in its original form the sustainable development gives emphasis to only two factor in development process, economy and ecology.



## Foot Note

- <sup>1</sup> For example, the first international treaty on flora was signed in Bern in 1889 due to concern of spreading disease which threatened to destroy European vineyards. The first international agreement on Fauna was 1902. Convention for the Protection of Birds useful to Agriculture. In 1945, the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) was set up with the conservation of natural resources included in its mandate. The International Maritime Organisation (IMO) was formed in 1948, it was given responsibility for implementing the Convention for the Prevention of Pollution of the Sea by Oil in 1954. See, Greene, O. (1997) "Environmental Issues." in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) **The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 313-337.
- <sup>2</sup> Garner, R. (1996) **Environmental Politics**. London: Prentice Hall, p. 5.
- <sup>3</sup> Greene, O. *op. cit.*, p. 316.
- <sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 317.
- <sup>5</sup> Bomberg, E. (1998) **Green Parties and Politics in the European Union**. London: Routledge, p. 63.
- <sup>6</sup> Hempel, L. C. (1996) **Environmental Governance: The Global Challenge**. USA: Island Press, p. 43.
- <sup>7</sup> Little, R. (1997) "International Regimes." in Baylis, J. and Smith, S. (eds.) *op. cit.*, p. 231-235.
- <sup>8</sup> Krasner, S. (1983) **International Regimes**. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press.
- <sup>9</sup> See Strange, S. "Cave! Hic Dragones: A Critique of Regime Analysis." **International Organization**. Vol. 36, Spring 1982, p. 479-496.
- <sup>10</sup> Porter, G. and Brown, J.W. (1996) **Global Environmental Politics**. 2nd ed. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press, p. 16.
- <sup>11</sup> Vogler, J. (1995) **The Global Commons: A Regime Analysis**. Chichester, Great Britain: John Wiley & Sons.
- <sup>12</sup> Haas, P., Keohane, R. and Levy, M. (1993) **Institutions for the Earth: Sources of Effective International Environmental Action**. London: MIT Press.
- <sup>13</sup> Keohane, R. and Nye, J. (1977) **Power and Interdependence**. Boston, Massachusetts: Little, Brown, p. 50-51.
- <sup>14</sup> Young, O. "The Politics of International Regime Formation: Managing Natural Resources and the Environment." *International Organization*. Vol. 43, Summer 1989, p. 355.
- <sup>15</sup> Porter, G. and Brown, J. W. *op. cit.*, p. 20.
- <sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p.21.
- <sup>18</sup> United Nations. (1992) **Agenda 21: Report of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (A/Conf.151/26/Rev.1)**. New York: United Nations.
- <sup>19</sup> Greene, O.*op. cit.*, p. 324-327.
- <sup>20</sup> Cited in Ramakrishna, K. (1992) "North-South Issues, the Common Heritage of Mankind and Global Environmental Change." in Rowlands, I. and Greene, M. (eds.) **Global Environmental Change and International Relations**. Hong Kong: Macmillan, p. 145.
- <sup>21</sup> Miller, M. A. L. (1995) **The Third World in Global Environmental Politics**. Boulder, Colorado : Lynne Rienner.



- <sup>22</sup> Porter, G. and Brown, J. W. *op. cit.*, p. 112-113. See more details in Sage, C. (1996) "Population, poverty and land in the South." In Sloep, P. and Blowers, A. (eds.) **Environmental Policy in an International Context: Environmental Problems as Conflicts of Interest**. London: Arnold, p. 97-125.
- <sup>23</sup> Hempel, L. C. *op. cit.*, p. 38.
- <sup>24</sup> Ramakrishna, K. *op. cit.*, p. 145-168. And Greene, O. *op. cit.*, p. 316.
- <sup>25</sup> Hempel, L. C., *op. cit.*, p. 37.
- <sup>26</sup> Sage, C. (1996) "The scope for North-South co-operation." in Bloweres, A. and Glasbergen, P. (eds.) **Environmental Policy in an International Context: Prospects for environmental Change**. London: Arnold, p. 167-196.
- <sup>27</sup> George, S. (1992) **The Debt Boomerang: How Third World Debt Harms Us All**. London: Pluto Press.
- <sup>28</sup> Porter, G. and Brown, J. W. *op. cit.*, p. 114.
- <sup>29</sup> Oblora, L. A. "Beyond the Rhetoric of a Right to Development." **Law and Policy**. Vol. 18, No. 3-4, 1996, p. 385.
- <sup>30</sup> Etzioni, A. (1962) **The Hard Way to Peace**. London: Crowell-Collier Press, p. 203.
- <sup>31</sup> The relative growth rates of different world regions are quite uneven. While the developed market economies of the North have grown at a rate of 3.5 per cent over the period from 1960 to 1988, rates in the South have been divergent, ranging from 2.53 per cent in sub-Saharan Africa to 3.84 per cent in Latin America to just over 6 per cent in South and Southeast Asia over the same period. Yet it is during the 1980s that these differences have widened, for in africa and Latin America per capita incomes have fallen while they have continued to rise steadily in Asia. Thus, the overall gap between the rich North and poorer South continues to widen. See, Sage, C. (1996) "Population, poverty and land in the South." *op. cit.*, p. 115.
- <sup>32</sup> Sarre, P. (1995) "Paradise Lost, or the Conquest of the Wilderness." in Sarre, P. and Blunden, J. (eds.) **An Overcrowded World? : Population, Resources and the Environment**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 28.
- <sup>33</sup> Garner, R. *op. cit.*
- <sup>34</sup> Meadows, D.H. et. al. (1972) **The Limits to Growth: A Report for the Club of Rome's Project on the Predicament of Mankind**. New York: Universe. The report was updated in 1992: Meadows, D. H. et, al. (1992) **Beyond the Limits: Global Collapse or a Sustainable Society: Sequel to the Limits to Growth**. London: Earthscan. .
- <sup>35</sup> Weale, A. (1992) **The New Politics of Pollution**. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- <sup>36</sup> Ramakrishna, K. *op. cit.*, p. 145.
- <sup>37</sup> Garner, R. *op. cit.*, p. 36-37.
- <sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 40.
- <sup>39</sup> Eckersley, R. (1992) **Environmentalism and Political Theory**. London: University College of London Press, p. 33-47.
- <sup>40</sup> World Commission on Environment and Development. (1987) **Our Common Future**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, p. 43.
- <sup>41</sup> *Ibid.*
- <sup>42</sup> Sarre, P., Smith, p. and Morris, E. (1991) **One World for One Earth: Saving the Environment**. London: Earthscan, p. 152.
- <sup>43</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 156.

- <sup>44</sup> Lunde, L. (1990) *The North/South Dimension in Global Greenhouse Politics*. Lysaker, Norway: Fridtjof Nansen Institute, p. 9.
- <sup>45</sup> Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, B. (1992) "The International Politics of the Environment: An Introduction." in Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, B. (1992) "The International Politics of the Environment: An Introduction." in Hurrell, A. and Kingsbury, B. (eds.) *The International Politics of the Environment: Actors, Interests, and Institutions*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, p. 40-41.
- <sup>46</sup> Porter, G. and Grown, J. W. *op. cit.*, p. 116.
- <sup>47</sup> For example, United Nations Development Programme. (1994) *Human Development Report 1994*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- <sup>48</sup> *Economic Policies for Sustainable Development*. Ministerial brief, Conference on Environment and Development in Asia and the Pacific, 10-16 October 1990, Bangkok, Thailand. Manila: Asian Development Bank.
- <sup>49</sup> Hempel, L. C. *op. cit.*, p. 41-42.
- <sup>50</sup> The United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO) launched the World Decade for Cultural Development between 1988 and 1997.
- <sup>51</sup> Mayor, F. "Crucible for a common ethic." *Our Planet*. Vol. 8, No. 2 1996, p. 4.
- <sup>52</sup> Speech of Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, at the Canadian Institute of International Affairs, Quebec, 21 September 1992.
- <sup>53</sup> Speech of Federico Mayor, Director-General of UNESCO, at the 5th regular session of meeting of Intergovernmental Committee of the World Decade for Cultural Development, Paris, 21-25 April 1997.
- <sup>54</sup> World Commission on Culture and Development (1996) *Our Creative Diversity: A New Paradigm*. Paris: UNESCO, ch. 8.
- <sup>55</sup> Speech of Federico Mayor at the Canadian Institute of International Affairs. *op. cit.*
- <sup>56</sup> Gummer, J. "Valuing the environment." *Our Planet*. *op. cit.*
- <sup>57</sup> Lean, M. "Changing the environment." *Ibid.*
- <sup>58</sup> Mayor, F. *op. cit.*, p. 5.
- <sup>59</sup> UNESCO. "Culture and Environment: Cultural context of natural resource management." *World Decade for Cultural Development*. [www.unesco.org/culture/cd/decade/environment/htm](http://www.unesco.org/culture/cd/decade/environment/htm) 21 December 1998.
- <sup>60</sup> Veerawattananont, V. (1994) *Environment and Development*. Bangkok: Ruenkaew Printing, p. 163. (in Thai)
- <sup>61</sup> Singhvi, L. M. "The East is green." *Our Planet*. *op. cit.*, p. 10.
- <sup>62</sup> Office of the Prime Minister of Thailand. (1995) *Thailand in the 90s*. Revised ed. Bangkok: Office of the Prime Minister., p. 161-162. Also see, Kulick, E. and Wilson, D. (1992) *Thailand's Turn : Profile of a New Dragon*. London: Macmillan, ch. 6.
- <sup>63</sup> Lord Buddha's doctrine quoted in Singhvi, L. M. *op. cit.*, p. 12.
- <sup>64</sup> Pra Rachavoramunee. (1982) *Buddha Dharma*. Revised ed. Bangkok: Khana Radomtham. (in Thai)
- <sup>65</sup> Buddhadas Bhikkhu. (1981) *Core of Buddhism*. 7<sup>th</sup> ed Bangkok: Somchai Printing, p. 101-111. (in Thai)
- <sup>66</sup> Payuthto, P. (1997) *Sustainable Development*. 4<sup>th</sup> ed. Bangkok: Komol Keemthong Foundation. (in Thai)
- <sup>67</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 173.
- <sup>68</sup> Greene, O. *op. cit.*, p. 330-331.