Chapter 2
FROM ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

TO ASSESS WHY certain norms prevail, the first task is to identify the set of institutionalized norms—or norm-complex—that defines and regulates appropriate behavior, and assigns rights and responsibilities regarding the issue in question. This chapter and the next undertake this task in detail, a step often omitted in institutional analyses of environmental governance. The two chapters are organized around the major defining events in international environmental governance over the last thirty years: the 1972 United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) in Stockholm; the 1987 World Commission on Environment and Development (WCED) report *Our Common Future* (also known as the Brundtland Commission report); and the 1992 United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in Rio de Janeiro.

This chapter tells the story of the politics and outcomes of the first two events, and traces the development of ideas on environmental governance that occurred leading up to each event and in the intervening period. The

trace of norms begins with a relatively detailed account of the Stockholm conference because the origins of the compromise of liberal environmentalism can be found there. At Stockholm, the concerns of conservationists and environmental scientists (primarily from Northern countries) encountered resistance from states more concerned with economic growth and poverty reduction. From this confrontation, new thinking developed that attempted to link environment and development into a single framework under the rubric of "sustainable development."

Chapter 3 picks up the story following the publication of the Brundtland report. The report marked the first real synthesis of the environment and development agendas and reflected a Keynesian-like compromise. In it, liberal interdependence that generated growth would be tempered by managed interventions to cushion and facilitate adjustment in the South and direct development on a path less likely to harm the environment. By 1992 a shift in norms of environmental governance had occurred, characterized by a general acceptance of liberalization in trade and finance as consistent with, and even necessary for, international environmental protection. These norms also promoted market and other economic mechanisms (tradeable pollution permits, privatization of the commons, and so on) over strict regulations (standards, bans, and quotas) as the preferred method of environmental management. The Earth Summit institutionalized this set of norms, which, the chapter will show, continues to guide what are viewed as appropriate responses to global environmental problems.

In both chapters, lists of international norms follow the sections on these three pivotal events. The lists illustrate the evolution from a primary focus on environmental protection to the current norm-complex of liberal environmentalism.

Before launching into the detailed tracing of this normative evolution, I build on my earlier discussion of what norms are in order to clarify how I identify which norms prevailed during the periods under investigation.

IDENTIFYING NORMS

Following from the definition given in the introduction, norms do not necessarily identify actual behavior; rather they identify notions of what appropriate behavior ought to be. Whereas a growing body of international relations scholarship emphasizes the intersubjective, or shared, nature of international norms, this is true only in the sense that they are irreducible

to individual beliefs. What makes a norm "collective" is its *institutionalization*, which concerns the perceived legitimacy of the norm as embodied in law, institutions, or public discourse even if all relevant actors do not accept it or follow it (Onuf 1997:17; Jepperson, Wendt, and Katzentein 1996:54, fn 69; Busumtwi-Sam and Bernstein 1997).

Legitimacy matters because the question is not whether the norm exists, but the political authority the norm enjoys. Institutionalized norms constitute social structure and thus define which political institutions and practices are viewed as appropriate. A claim of legitimacy does not necessarily mean it adheres to a deeper notion of justice. Rather, norms are legitimated externally through political processes; they obligate because of agreement of members of the relevant community (Florini 1996:364–365; Franck 1990:16, 38). The degree of institutionalization is important because it indicates how durable the norm is likely to be, how strongly challenges to it are likely to be contested, and ultimately the ability of the norm to (re)define state interests.

Being collectively held, norms are "discrete positivities" and thus can be operationalized more straightforwardly than often portrayed (Onuf 1997:32; Raymond 1997:219–222). Most international norms are stated explicitly in treaties and conventions, less formal agreements, rules and standards established by international organizations, resolutions, and declarations, including the "soft" declaratory law that has served as a basis for international environmental law and institutions (Chinkin 1989; Dupuy 1991). Uncodified norms may be inferred from these same sources plus judicial decisions, statements by leaders or from state practices in given interactions. In this case, the relevant laws and organizations investigated include declarations and treaties from major environmental conferences, and policies and practices of organizations such as the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Bank, as well as statements, policies, and practices of relevant states. Hence, the empirical outcomes on which I focus are not mere exhortations, but leave behavioral traces and verifiable evidence in the form of treaty commitments, action programs, policies and policy instruments, and so on.

The degree of institutionalization can be inferred primarily from the norm's frequency or "density" in social structure, that is, the amount and range of instruments, statements, and so on, that invoke the norm (Florini 1996; Krasner 1988), and the degree to which actions that violate the norm require justification.[1] Violations often bring a norm into sharp relief because they either require justification (reinforcing the norm) or bring forth denunciations or attempts to replace the norm with an alternative (undermining

the norm's legitimacy) (Finnemore 1996b:158–159). Thus, noncompliance alone does not undermine a norm's legitimacy (Franck 1990:151). Although repeated violations of a norm undermine its legitimacy, more important is when prominent actors denounce the norm or attempt to replace it with a competing one. This corresponds to the practice in international law of inferring custom from the consent of states or failure to "persistently object."

Following these criteria to identify norms, I analyze the outcomes (treaties, declarations, action plans, and so on) of the three major United Nations environmental initiatives listed above to determine the pattern of normative evolution. Scholars point to these initiatives as key turning points that generated political legitimacy for sets of norms that shaped appropriate responses to environmental problems that followed them. They articulated, more than any other events, the consensus (or conflicts) on norms at those times.

The lists of norms that follow the sections on the three events are based on the analysis below of outcomes, related agreements, and scholarly assessments of the lasting influence of the initiatives. Each list classifies norms in three broad categories that correspond to the nature of the actors the norms empower and their rights and responsibilities; the political economy of the issue; and the specific management norms promoted. The categories were chosen mainly for comparison purposes, being relevant to the environmental issue area and because they highlight the main fault lines of contestation. The categories also allow the analytic distinction between norms that constitute basic actor identities and norms that define and regulate the economic and political relationships between those actors. Table 1, which follows the discussion of UNCED norms in chapter 3, summarizes these findings.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON THE HUMAN ENVIRONMENT (UNCHE)[2]

The Stockholm conference's significance lies in its articulation of a nascent set of norms that would become the basis for international environmental law and practice (Schachter 1991; Pallemaerts 1994). Earlier conferences and activities of regional or functional organizations possibly did as much to promote specific actions to protect the environment, but Stockholm began, or at least made explicit, the process of a global response to care for the Earth's ecosystems under a common framework. For example, scien-

tists and diplomats introduced many of the concrete recommendations that came out of Stockholm at UNESCO's Biosphere Conference in 1968. However, the political dynamics of Stockholm were without precedent (Adams 1990:32–36). In the words of one analyst: "Stockholm was without doubt the landmark event in the growth of international environmentalism. It was the first occasion on which the political, social, and economic problems of the global environment were discussed at an intergovernmental forum with a view to actually taking corrective action" (McCormick 1989:88). This interaction of science, public concern, and international politics produced the first real clues as to how the international community as a whole would treat environmental concerns.

The Stockholm Conference was first and foremost an environmental conference. Held June 5–12, 1972, it brought together 113 states, 19 intergovernmental agencies and about 400 NGOs in the parallel Environment Forum. The only notable absences were members of the Soviet Bloc who boycotted the conference in protest over the exclusion of East Germany.[3] Significant outcomes of the conference included the 26 principles of the Declaration on the Human Environment, the 109 recommendations in the Action Plan for the Human Environment, and the creation of UNEP, formally established by the United Nations General Assembly in December 1972 (United Nations 1972a).

I am concerned mainly with the Declaration principles. These principles brought together the interests of the developed and developing world, thus highlighting the tension between environment and development. By forcing that conflict into the open, Stockholm marked a significant step in the development of the current norm-complex of liberal environmentalism. However, Stockholm did not work out the environment/development tension under a unifying set of norms. Rather, the final documents simply juxtaposed the interest in environmental protection by the North with the development concerns of the South. The Declaration and Action Plan introduced macroeconomic issues related to trade and development, but never clearly specified the content of development norms it could support. Before exploring these norms in detail, I trace the dynamics that led to the Stockholm outcome.

Bringing the Developing World In

The Stockholm Conference was prompted mainly by concerns in industrialized countries over transnational pollution from industry and its prod-

ucts. Most accounts gloss over its unusual origins in the person of Swedish soil scientist and television personality Svante Odén. An advisor to the Swedish government, Odén played an instrumental role in convincing politicians and the Swedish people that lakes and rivers in Sweden were becoming acidic partly as the result of sulfur from smokestacks in other countries. Persuaded of the need for international cooperation to limit acid precipitation, Sweden proposed the conference.[4]

The time was also ripe for such an international gathering. By then environmental movements had sprouted up in many Western industrial nations; hence UNCHE reflected increased public anxiety over the state of the environment and the supply of natural resources. Popular publications such as Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* and the Club of Rome's *Limits to Growth* fuelled those concerns (Carson 1962; Meadows et al. 1972). The former documented the effects of chemical insecticides on birds and other animal species (including humans) while the latter utilized a newly developed MIT computer-generated simulation that modeled trends of rising population and declining resource stocks. This early attempt at analysis of complex systems of cause-effect relationships predicted an impending resource crisis within 100 years if trends continued. The increased sensitivity to environmental problems, combined with spectacular environmental disasters such as the 1967 *Torrey Canyon* oil spill off the coast of Cornwall in Great Britain, contributed to the perception that environmental problems were severe, on the rise, and in need of a global response.

Not surprisingly, then, when in 1968 the United Nations proposed a global conference on the environment, the concerns of industrial pollution and the perceived need to conserve natural and biological resources initially dominated the agenda. Governments believed that such problems of industrialization required international cooperation and regulation. The initial United Nations resolution in December 1968 that called for the conference reflected this thinking, noting "that the relationship between man and his environment is undergoing profound changes in the wake of modern scientific and technological developments." The resolution identified physical effects of pollution and their immediate causes, but tended to see such problems in isolation from socioeconomic structures. Environmental concerns covered only "the continuing and accelerated impairment of the quality of the human environment caused by such factors as air and water pollution, erosion and other forms of soil deterioration, waste, noise and secondary effects of biocides, which are accentuated by rapidly increasing population and accelerating urbanization" (UNGA Res. 2398 (XXIII) A/L.533 December 3, 1968 in YUN 1968: 477).

Developing countries expressed concern over this narrow environmental focus. They successfully used the United Nations multilateral setting to demand the inclusion of development issues. In particular, many developing states feared an emphasis on lifeboat ethics or no-growth philosophy implied in studies such as *Limits to Growth* (e.g., de Almeida 1972:37–56; *Founex Report* 1972:12–13, 27). Some states also voiced concerns that high-profile pollution and disasters would overshadow links between environment, culture, and economics. In particular, developing countries worried that trade barriers would be erected under the guise of environmental protection. For example, food exporters who relied on chemical pesticides worried they would lose markets in the developed world if tough regulations were imposed. If developing countries were to participate—which was crucial to the success of the conference—these concerns could not be ignored.

The change from 1968 to 1972 in United Nations Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) and General Assembly (UNGA) resolutions demonstrated the progressive movement of developing world concerns to the mainstream, if not the center, of Stockholm's agenda. Initially, resolutions marginalized developing countries. They treated developing countries concerns as an afterthought, merely expressing a general conviction that attention to the human environment is "essential for economic and social development." Developing countries used resolutions in subsequent years to shift the position of development on the agenda. For example, a 1969 resolution for the first time placed the concerns of developing countries within the main purpose of the conference. UNGA resolution 2581 (XXIV) "affirms" that the primary purpose of the conference remained "to serve as a practical means to encourage, and to provide guidelines for, action by governments and international organizations designed to protect and improve the environment . . . bearing in mind the particular importance of enabling developing countries to forestall the occurrence of such problems" (YUN 1970:393).

In response to the report of the first session of the conference's Preparatory Committee (PrepCom) in New York (March 10–20, 1970), resolutions went further in an attempt to balance environmental problems of developed and developing countries. In particular, ECOSOC resolution 1536 (XLIX) stressed the need to take into account "such environmental problems as are particularly acute in developing countries and relevant to their needs." More significantly, in terms of articulating a particular set of norms, the same resolution, "*Earnestly hopes* [that the conference] . . . will promote, in particular, the aims of the Second United Nations Development Decade by contribut-

ing to sound economic and social development" (YUN 1970:451). However, the General Assembly, which had until then used ECOSOC language in its own resolution (2657 [XXV]) on the conference, simply took note of the ECOSOC resolution. A North/South split was apparent.

By 1971 the split was in the open. That year marked a significant shift in how the United Nations would treat global environmental concerns: they no longer could be discussed in isolation from development. The General Assembly resolutions for the first time directly linked the two concepts, stating that "development plans should be compatible with a sound ecology and that adequate environmental conditions can best be ensured by the promotion of development, both at the national and international level" (UNGA Res. 2849 (XXVI) in YUN 1971:311–312)). Other relevant language in the resolution reflected political and development goals of the Group of 77 developing nations (G-77). In response, the United States and Great Britain voted against the resolution and all other developed countries, East and West, abstained. However, it still easily reached the necessary two-thirds majority for passage.

Developing countries used the resolution to forcefully argue two points: first, that "pollution of world-wide impact is being caused primarily by some highly developed countries . . . therefore, the main responsibility for the financing of corrective measures falls upon those countries"; second, that most environmental problems in developing countries resulted from underdevelopment itself. In addition, among the provisions, developing countries stressed that states must respect sovereignty over resources and internal economic planning, that environmental provisions must not impede development, and that measures must avoid any adverse consequences for trade, technology transfer, or development assistance. In particular, the resolution asked for additional financial and technical resources "beyond the resources already contemplated in the International Development Strategy."[5] The resolution also listed a number of specific requests that later appeared in modified form in the Stockholm Declaration. The unmistakable underlying theme was that developing countries wanted assurances that environmental concerns would in no way impede their development goals.

Despite the impression of unanimity among developing countries in United Nations resolutions, not all developing countries found common cause on every issue. For example, the People's Republic of China (a latecomer to the conference process) took a strong stand against the United States' involvement in Vietnam while other developing countries took positions against China's and France's nuclear testing programs. However,

on the core environmental and economic positions, the developing world acted largely as a bloc in an attempt to maximize its political power. It took advantage of Northern concerns that, in the future, the South could be the locale of the world's worst environmental problems. Not surprisingly, leadership in the South fell to countries such as India and Brazil (and later China) that traditionally filled that role. However, their importance to the global environment gave them added bargaining power. For example, India's large population and Brazil's sovereign control over huge rainforests gave those countries both power and an interest in the outcome of Stockholm.

The position of developing countries did not arise in isolation from more general development goals that had taken shape during the 1960s in fora such as the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD) and G-77 meetings. These organizations had begun to push for various reforms in international institutions and to the international management of production, trade, and finance (with an emphasis on aid). The proposed reforms eventually coalesced in the early 1970s in demands for a New International Economic Order (NIEO). The demands included sovereignty over resources (and a general entrenchment of the norm of sovereignty and territorial integrity), increased aid flows from North to South, commodity price stability, increased participation and voting power in international economic institutions, and restructuring of trade to allow greater access to Northern markets and exceptions to the norm of reciprocity.[6]

Following in this context, two key meetings in the lead-up to Stockholm articulated an emerging developing country position on environmental problems: the November 1971 Second Ministerial Meeting of the G-77 in Lima, Peru; and the meeting of the Panel of Experts on Development and Environment in Founex, Switzerland on June 4–12, 1971. Significantly, Founex came three months before the third PrepCom for Stockholm where the intergovernmental working group presented the first draft of the Declaration on the Human Environment. Since Founex had a more direct relationship to UNCHE, I will discuss it in more detail following a brief discussion of the Lima meeting.

The G-77 ministers' meeting is more interesting for what it did not say about the environment than what it did. Despite the flurry of United Nations activity around the issue, the environment only merited one small item on a lengthy agenda dominated by trade and financial matters. Hence, the final report contained only a brief statement on "The impact of environmental policies on trade and development" (Group of 77 1981 2:210). Apart from a general acknowledgement that all humankind[7] should be

concerned about the environment, the statement focused on the negative effects of environmental policies for developing countries. It listed four concerns: environmental policies should not adversely affect development; specifically, environmental policies should not adversely affect the flow or terms of financial assistance, set new conditions on international trade nor obstruct any efforts "towards the sustained economic development of developing countries"; environmental trade barriers should be removed; and environmental policies in developed countries should facilitate development in developing countries.

As can be seen, the language of sustainable development already existed in demands of developing countries, but it lacked the same connotations promoted in the Brundtland report. Thus one must use caution in interpreting such language. For example, the economic program pushed by developing countries in the early 1970s, while growth oriented, certainly was not consistent with liberal economic regimes (Krasner 1985). "Sustained economic development" meant simply that development must make economic growth its priority, regardless of how it would be achieved. As I will demonstrate later, the use of sustainable growth language has reemerged in line with neoliberalism in international economic institutional arrangements. Thus the manipulation of discourse plays an important role in justifying a series of changes to the norms invoked in the name of "sustainable development" more generally.

The Founex meeting marked a more thorough attempt than Lima to articulate concerns of developing countries. UNCHE secretary-general Maurice Strong convened the meeting of 27 experts in the fields of development and the environment in an attempt to repair the rift between the developed and developing world on the focus of Stockholm. In conjunction with four follow-up regional seminars in the developing world, Founex succeeded on at least three counts. First, it allowed respected experts somewhat sympathetic to environmental issues to express concerns in an environmental forum that placed the developing world front and center. Second, it cemented the linkage between environment and development issues, with the assertion that they could be combined to optimize sound economic and ecological systems, even if the relationship remained vague and ill-defined. Third, those experts became valuable political assets who helped convince developing world leaders to send delegations to Stockholm, and to attend themselves.

The four regional conferences, co-sponsored by the United Nations secretariat and convened by economic commissions in Addis Ababa, Bangkok, Mexico City, and Beirut, also generated developing country interest. Envi-

ronmental scientists and administrators from developing countries dominated the conferences. Although continued skepticism about the Northern emphasis on pollution control prevailed, the added influence these meetings provided to developing-country experts allowed them to push their governments toward a moderate position in the preparations for Stockholm. They also provided momentum for the building of domestic environmental administrative capacity and concern (Engfeldt 1973:403). These meetings and Founex prevented Stockholm from being a political failure.

Substantively, the Founex report supported the two conclusions that appeared in the 1971 UNGA resolution's language above. First, it noted that, "To a large extent, the current concern with environmental issues has merged out of the problems experienced by the industrially advanced countries." Furthermore, these problems largely resulted from a high level of economic growth with its attending negative consequences for local and global environments. While developing countries wished to avoid "mistakes and distortions" that resulted in the most severe negative consequences of development, the report strongly argued that environmental problems in the South resulted largely from underdevelopment itself (the second conclusion of the 1971 resolution). "They [environmental problems] are predominately problems that reflect the poverty and very lack of development of their societies. They are problems, in other words, of both rural and urban poverty . . . [and] can be overcome by the process of development itself" (*Founex Report* 1972:10).

The report listed a second set of problems related to the development process that required attention from developing countries. These problems included unemployment, urban growth, population growth without corresponding economic growth, and the threat of deforestation. Founex also acknowledged the potential problems associated with large-scale irrigation, use of pesticides, and industrialization in general (1972:12). The remainder of the report spelled out specific environmental concerns and policy recommendations.

The report's significance, particularly for my purposes here, lies less in its recommendations or responses to particular environmental problems than in its influence on norm creation. Its substantive influence lies in three areas. First, the report demonstrated that developing countries were concerned about environmental problems, but were deeply suspicious of how the international community would deal with such problems if treated in isolation from development. Second, the report differentiated the environmental concerns of developing countries from those of developed countries. Whereas developed countries wished to control byproducts of industrialization, de-

veloping countries' primary environmental concerns were disease, poor water quality and sanitation, nutrition, and poor housing.

Finally, the report presented environmental problems in the context of international norms consistent with developing country concerns, in particular those expressed in the Strategy for the Second Development Decade. For example, it emphasized the sovereign control of developing countries over their economic development and their own resources. That norm would later be entrenched in Principle 21 of the Stockholm Declaration. Hence, where conflict existed between the goals of social, cultural and economic development, trade-offs "can only be made by the countries themselves in the light of their own situations and development strategies and cannot be determined by any rules established *a priori*." Furthermore, the report reiterated this concern under a section on environmental policy formation: "The formulation of environmental goals, as indeed the formulation of economic and social policies in general, falls entirely and exclusively within the sovereign competence of the developing countries" (1972:11, 12).

Despite its emphasis on development, Founex did not present a specific set of development norms. It fostered an expanded notion of development beyond economic growth that included other social and cultural goals. However, it established no clear definition of development nor did it specify the relationship between broader social goals and economic growth. The achievement of this inclusive notion of development seemed to be taken as a matter of faith. The report only discussed trade-offs in the broadest sense and maintained a cautious approach to any measures that might limit short-term growth. For example, the report highlighted the opportunity for developing countries to house polluting industries (such as petroleum, pulp and paper, and chemical industries) from the North, and presumed that the worst environmental costs of such industries could be avoided. "Such a development," the report stated, "opens up an opportunity for the developing countries to move into some of these industries if their natural resource endowments, including relatively less used environmental resources, create a comparative advantage in these fields."[8] Founex also noted, "to the extent that these objectives [environmental, social, and cultural] support or reinforce economic growth—and it can be shown that some of them do—their place would be more readily established" (1972:11). Economic development still clearly took priority.

Assessments of the Founex meeting differ on whether it truly achieved a synthesis of environment and development concerns. For example, Adams suggests the meeting primarily served to allay developing world fears about the economic effects of environmental policy. "In fact the Founex meeting

did not break new conceptual ground. It simply repeated the statement of faith that development and environment could be combined in some way which would optimize ecological and economic systems" (1990:37).

Similarly, an independent assessment of implementation done ten years after Stockholm suggested that Founex successfully made the interests of developing countries known, but Stockholm as a whole did not produce the resources or commitment necessary to address those issues. It also downplayed the conceptual contribution of Founex. "Although the Founex report represented a useful start for the continuing debate on environment and development, at the time of the Stockholm Conference the issue was still largely perceived as a choice between environment or economic growth."[9] Consequently, developing countries mainly argued that they needed additional resources and assistance to enable them to take the environment into account. On this, Stockholm did not deliver (The Agesta Group AB Sweden 1982:3).

In sharp contrast, McCormick (1989:92–93) argues that Founex produced a consensus, forged by development economists, that the environment is a critical dimension of successful development. Founex also destroyed the idea that the two concepts were necessarily incompatible. McCormick argues that Founex convinced participants of the widespread nature of environmental concerns and that they should not be a barrier to development, but part of the process. Nonetheless, representatives at Founex, to quote Maurice Strong (1977:166), also "made it clear that they thought under-development and poverty constituted the most acute and immediate threat to the environment of their peoples."

Founex also demonstrated much about the complex interaction between personal diplomacy, political and economic interests, and science in the lead up to Stockholm. Founex would not have occurred without Maurice Strong's leadership. One analyst credited his "patient missionary work" with developing country governments and experts for avoiding a major North/South rift. Strong used meetings such as Founex and a scientific meeting in Canberra to air out the strongest aspects of the North/South rhetoric. And, in the PrepComs and in discussions with developing world governments, he constantly emphasized the compatibility between environment and development (McCormick 1989:95).

Strong's influence extended beyond his role as a good organizer, facilitator, and negotiator, for which he received similar accolades at the Earth Summit. First, Strong's appointment as secretary-general of UNCHE signified the politicization of the Stockholm conference. His appointment came relatively late in the preparatory process when he replaced Jean Moussard,

a Swiss biologist originally chosen in 1969 as the Director of Studies responsible for the Conference proceedings. By mid-1970 it had become apparent to the United Nations leadership that Moussard, though successful in gathering scientific data, would not provide effective leadership needed to make the conference a success. UN Secretary-General U Thant, with the support of UN Under Secretary for Economic Affairs Philippe de Seynes, who had appointed Moussard, picked Strong, who had been head of the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA) and a former President of Power Corporation in Canada, a large energy and resources holding company. According to Strong, his appointment came about after Swedish Ambassador to the UN Sverker Astrom contacted him "through a mutual friend" after the Swedish government "began to worry" that preparations had made very little progress by early 1970.[10] Astrom then recommended Strong to de Seynes.

Strong was particularly suited for the job because of his personal connections with developing country leaders through his work at CIDA, but also his earlier professional and voluntary activities. His proven commitment to development gave him credibility and respect in many countries in the South (Herter, Jr. and Binder 1993:12–13). For example, early in the preparations he met personally with Indian leader Indira Ghandi, using contacts close to her that he had developed in his work with CIDA, and convinced her to attend. Given her stature and the leadership of India in the developing world, the promise of her participation greatly enhanced the prestige of the conference and made a developing world boycott unlikely (Strong 2000:126–127; Herter, Jr. and Binder 1993:26). Strong also played an instrumental role in getting China to participate through a direct appeal to People's Republic of China (PRC) leader Zhou Enlai. Although the Chinese presence created additional political wrangling, it also increased the credibility of the conference and strengthened the developing world view.[11] Whereas Moussard saw the problem of the environment as a scientific one, Strong recognized the pragmatic requirements of multilateral negotiations. His personal style succeeded in brokering compromises among disparate political interests, building trust, and creating momentum for agreement.

Strong also directly influenced how the problem of the human environment would be characterized. Almost immediately upon his appointment in January 1971, Strong convened a meeting of five or six experts at MIT, including Donella Meadows and Jay Forrester of *Limits to Growth*. Carroll Wilson, a friend of Strong's and one of the leaders of the Club of Rome at MIT, set up the meeting. Peter Thacher, of the U.S. Mission to the United Nations, also attended. In a published interview, Strong said, "Basically, our

objective was to entrench the issue of the control of the environment with the economic-development process, both in developing and industrialized countries" (Herter, Jr. and Binder 1993:21). That meeting produced the slogan that summarized the Stockholm mission: "to protect and enhance the environment for present and future generations" (Herter, Jr. and Binder 1993:21). The U.S. influence shows through in that this slogan essentially represented a conservation ethic already present in the U.S. National Environmental Policy Act (1969). Its first goal is to "fulfill the responsibilities of each generation as trustee of the environment for succeeding generations." With an emphasis on intergenerational equity, this slogan presaged only the conservation side of sustainable development, not the integration of environment and development.

However, Strong also convened a meeting of development experts that he called "the single most influential meeting in terms of my development of the agenda" (author's interview). This meeting in New York specifically aimed to bring development onto the Stockholm agenda. It provided a forum to hash out many of the issues that would be aired more formally in the Founex meeting, and many of the participants overlapped. Strong asked Barbara Ward (Lady Jackson), a well-known British developmental economist, to bring together a small group of prominent development experts. Most of the experts were economists from the developing world, many of whom continued to have a major influence on environment and development governance. The group included Gamani Corea of Ceylon (later secretary-general of UNCTAD), Mahbub ul Haq of Pakistan (later positions included a World Bank vice president, finance minister of Pakistan, and architect of the United Nations Development Programme human development reports), Abdlatif Y. Al-Hamad of Kuwait, Inrique Iglesias of Uruguay (who served as foreign minister, later headed the Brundtland Commission's advisory panel on energy, and then worked at the Interamerican Development Bank), and James Wolfensohn (who at the time of writing is president of the World Bank). Strong said his "whole thesis" when he agreed to run UNCHE was the need to integrate environment and development and this meeting helped to formulate how that could be done to reshape the Stockholm agenda.

The Declaration on the Human Environment

Of the outcomes of UNCHE, the Declaration best expresses the norm-complex that emerged and the compromises it embodied. The final draft

declaration had changed in purpose and substance from its original conception in March 1970 as a largely educational and inspirational document of basic principles. By the third PrepCom in September 1971, the influence of Founex and increased public attention had combined to put pressure on the intergovernmental working group to produce a document that represented concrete action (Rowland 1973:87).

The first move in this direction came from an early Canadian draft. It proposed a legalistic document that listed substantive norms and principles that could be a basis for international law (reproduced in Rowland 1973:88). The principles included norms of sovereignty and state responsibility for pollution produced within one's own territory that caused damage in other states or in common areas beyond national jurisdiction. In addition, states whose pollution harmed neighbors would be obligated to compensate them and would be required to consult neighbors when such pollution was likely to result. Although the final draft declaration would retain these principles relatively unchanged in Principles 21 and 22,[12] the Canadian document, stated in terms of rights and obligations, said virtually nothing about the relationship between environment and development.

By the end of the conference, however, the environment/development compromise played a central role, while negotiators watered down the strict legal language of rights and obligations. Although some of those changes occurred before the intergovernmental working group handed the draft over to the fourth PrepCom in March 1972, many occurred afterward in the more politicized atmosphere of the conference itself.

The Chinese delegation played a major role in reopening the Declaration to amendments and discussion. Its motives ranged from a simple desire to be heard (the PRC had been left out of deliberations by the intergovernmental working group) to an attempt to use the Declaration for ideological purposes. In the end, the PRC did play a positive role in reintroducing many of the development issues that appeared in working papers, such as the Founex Report and Report by the Secretary-General on Development and Environment largely based on Founex.

The Chinese delegation presented a ten-point statement to the draft committee and also leaked it to the press through an NGO newspaper, ECO. The first point brought forward a view of environment and development that epitomized the uneasy meshing of concepts that characterized the current stage in international environmental norm creation. The statement on the "relationship between economic development and environment" read as follows:

> Economic development and social progress are necessary for the welfare of mankind and the further improvement of the environment. The developing countries want to build modern industry and agriculture to safeguard their national independence and assure their development. A distinction must be made between these countries and a few highly developed countries. The environmental policies of each nation must not impede development (Rowland 1973:92).

Other points included a statement that downplayed the then popular cataclysmic forecasts on population growth and called for moderate national responses, such as control of urban population and family planning; national sovereignty over resources; a proposal on pollution compensation (in line with the original Canadian proposal); and a proposal for technology transfer. Although subsequent discussions sometimes broke down into North/South rhetoric and acrimony (with the U.S. taking the hardest line against the Chinese proposals) and specific proposals caused splits within blocs as well, a consensus gradually emerged on many of the key issues. For example, Canadian and Chinese positions overlapped on many of the core legal principles and some developed states actively supported Chinese and African positions on development issues. Traditionally divisive issues such as colonialism, nuclear weapons, and the war in Indochina sometimes appeared ready to sabotage agreement, but in the end did not have a substantial impact on the general consensus achieved in the final declaration.

Negotiations over the final wording in many cases came down to incorporating developing country proposals, particularly China's, into the wording of the draft declaration. For example, language in paragraph four of the preamble came from a Chinese proposal that identified underdevelopment as the cause of most environmental problems in the developing world. Similarly, a Chinese proposal changed the emphasis in paragraph five on population from a position that "excessive population growth can defeat man's efforts to preserve the [E]arth's environment" to a position that identifies people as "the most precious" of things in the world and the source of social progress and wealth, while acknowledging "problems" that can accompany population growth.[13]

The final negotiations also moved the Declaration more toward distributive policies and away from a strict focus on conservation. For example, Principle 5 states that "The non-renewable resources of the [E]arth must be employed in such a way as to guard against the danger of their future exhaustion and to ensure that benefits from such employment are

shared by all mankind." Early drafts concerned only conservation of resources until a Pakistani proposal at Stockholm added the second part, that would "ensure that benefits . . . are shared by all mankind." As Sohn points out, this language of distributive justice was consistent with language in other declarations, such as the 1970 UNGA Sea-bed Declaration. Similarly, Principle 10, newly proposed at Stockholm by nine African states, notes that "stability of prices and adequate earnings for primary commodities and raw material are essential to environmental management" for developing countries. These principles fit with the general thrust of Principle 2 as well, which implies a duty to preserve the Earth's resources for the benefit of all people.

The principles can be divided into three general categories: conservation; development; and state sovereignty and responsibility.[14] As the above discussion suggests, the themes sometimes overlap within various principles, reflecting compromises worked out during the course of negotiations.

Principles 1–7 primarily delineate facets of human activity that require attention for conservation and environmental protection. Principle 1 is a general statement about the responsibility to preserve the environment for "present and future generations" (although it also contains admonitions against apartheid, discrimination, and foreign domination). Principles 2–7 cover specific aspects of that responsibility, from preserving wildlife (4) and natural resources (2), both renewable (3) and nonrenewable (5), to pollution concerns on land, in the air (6) and in the seas (7). As mentioned, some of these principles were altered to stress a greater emphasis on distributional concerns, not simply conservation.

Principles 9 through 13 specifically address concerns of development in developing countries. Most significantly, Principle 9 calls for "accelerated development through the transfer of substantial quantities of financial and technological assistance" as the best response to environmental problems in the developing world. It also directly links environmental vulnerabilities to underdevelopment. Principle 10 asserts that stability of commodity prices is essential for developing countries to manage the environment effectively. Principle 11 admonishes states against the use of any measures to protect the environment that could adversely affect development or the ability to raise the standard of living in developing countries. Principle 12 calls for additional financial and technical assistance (above other development aid) for environmental protection in developing countries. Principle 13 places development as the primary concern in planning, but says it should be ". . . compatible with the need to protect and improve the human environment. . . ."

Principles 14–20 do not fit into the three categories above, but deserve brief mention to keep the remainder of the Declaration in context.

Principles 14–17 focus on national and regional planning. The significant aspect of these principles is the faith they conveyed in the ability of "rational planning" (14) to reconcile the needs of development and the need to protect the environment. Principle 15 calls for planning in human settlements. Principle 16, on population, is a weak statement that governments, based on their own priorities and without prejudice to human rights, should apply demographic policies (either to decrease or increase populations) as it suits environment and development goals.

Principles 18–20 focus on scientific research and public education. Principle 20 also includes a call for the transfer of information, experience, and technology to developing countries, without economic burden, to facilitate research and development.

Principles 21 and 22 contain statements on rights and duties of states. As previously mentioned, the original desire of some states to create strict rules of liability did not materialize in the final document, although the basis for the future development of such rules remained. (Nonetheless, little development of rules of liability in international environmental law has occurred since Stockholm, as will be shown later in the section on UNCED.) Environmental lawyers identify Principle 21 as the key norm for modern environmental law (Sands et al. 1994:7; Schrijver 1997). In conjunction with the United Nations charter and various General Assembly resolutions (e.g., 1803/62 of 14 Dec. 1962 on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources) it cemented the notion that states have "a sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental policies." It advanced earlier United Nations resolutions because it also creates a responsibility on the part of states to ensure that their activities do not cause environmental damage beyond their own jurisdiction. Principle 22 originally meant to create liability from states that cause environmental harm beyond their borders and a duty by them to compensate the victims of pollution. However, the final version only requires states to "co-operate to develop further the international law regarding liability and compensation. . . ." As noted in endnote 12 to this chapter, another principle originally proposed that would have created an obligation for states to notify others of activities that might cause environmental damage did not make it to the final declaration.

From a strict legal standpoint, it should be noted that the norms embodied in Principles 21 and 22 did not originate with Stockholm solely, nor did the nonbinding Declaration create a consensus on their precise status in international law. For example, norms of state sovereignty over re-

sources have roots both in widely accepted rules around sovereignty and territorial integrity as well as in various United Nations declarations and decisions of international tribunals that say that states have a responsibility not to cause damage to the environment of other states. This responsibility has been acknowledged at least as far back as the widely cited Trail Smelter case (1941), when an arbitration tribunal found Canada was responsible for damage in Washington State caused by fumes originating at a smelter in British Columbia.[15] The Stockholm Declaration itself is considered soft law, which in recent history often represents a first step for new areas of international law to be accepted by states as customary law. Regardless of its origins, much of the Stockholm Declaration, especially Principle 21, is now considered customary international law.

Principles 23 and 24 are not easily categorized. The former generally recognizes concerns of developing countries that each state can determine its own environmental standards based on its own values, but also emphasizes that standards "which are valid for the most advanced countries . . . may be inappropriate and of social cost for the developing countries." In this way it fits with Principle 21 and the general concerns of developing countries covered in other principles already mentioned. Principle 24 calls for international cooperation through bilateral and multilateral arrangements to protect the environment.

Finally, Principle 25 calls for the support of international environmental organizations, and Principle 26 calls on states to eliminate nuclear weapons.

The Norm-Complex

The preceding discussion indicates that a weak norm-complex of *environmental protection* resulted consistent with the view of Western environmentalists that development and environmental protection are different, often competing tasks, the latter being concerned with regulating "externalities" (Colby 1990:8). It included an uneasy mix of conservation, economic development, sovereignty, and state responsibility norms, but essentially highlighted the incompatibility of many development and environmental goals, not a synthesis. The Action Plan reinforced this view. Only eight of 109 recommendations address development and environment, and are stated primarily in the negative, that is, environmental policies should not harm development, trade, and so on (Adams 1990:39; United Nations 1972a,b). The Stockholm outcomes as a whole contain goals of conservation and environmental protection side by side with a vi-

sion of development consistent with G-77 formulations, but lack any specification of trade-offs or how to make linkages.

Since the significance of these outcomes is that they embody a nascent form of the current norm-complex, the following list identifies the norms most relevant to this evolving norm-complex, organized under the categories listed earlier. The list nonetheless indicates that while the germs of the current norm-complex of liberal environmentalism are present, multiple pathways to very different futures could also be imagined.

State Sovereignty and Responsibility:

1. States have sovereignty over resources and environmental protection within their jurisdiction and are responsible for pollution they produce beyond their borders (Principles 21–23).

Political Economy of Environment and Development:

2. The sources of environmental problems differ in developed and developing countries and so should responses.
   a. In developing countries, accelerated economic and social development (which are not specified) are compatible with and necessary for environmental protection (Principles 11, 12, and 13).
   b. In developed countries, industrialization and technology require regulation to protect the environment.
3. Free trade must be balanced with commodity price stability (Principle 10).
4. Environmental protection requires substantial transfers of financial aid, technology, and scientific information to developing countries (Principles 9 and 20).
5. States should cooperate to conserve and enhance the global resource base for present and future generations (Principles 1–7 and 24).

Environmental Management:

6. Command-and-control methods of environmental protection are favored over market allocation. The integration of economics and environment is limited to "rational planning," which is left ambiguous in meaning.[16] This last norm seems to apply to national and international planning. However, the economic and social implications of planning are not clearly specified.

Since I am concerned with norms of governance, I have not detailed specific recommendations for environmental protection activities. The action plan is significant for the purposes here only in so far as its recommendations do indeed reinforce the normative framework of the Declaration. I do not mean to downplay the importance of the specific priorities of the action plan, which contains, among other things, recommendations on pollutants to monitor, facets of human settlements that require attention, and a framework to manage natural resources. Rather, my focus has been on the international community's overall attempt to govern such activities, not the targets of action or the effectiveness of environmental protection *per se*.

Despite UNCHE's mix of environment and development, international environmental law and practice following the conference primarily emphasized the environmental protection side of the norm-complex. Developing countries were slow to embrace the environmental protection norms promoted at Stockholm while developed countries focused attention mostly on pollution abatement and clean-up at home. A detailed independent study on the implementation of the Stockholm proposals ten years later found that "The expectations and objectives of the developed countries were largely achieved at and after the Stockholm Conference but, of course, to varying degrees" (The Agesta Group AB Sweden 1982:3). (Although, the report also lamented the decline in political will to address environmental problems in North and South alike by 1982.) Developed countries focused on two priorities: identification and control of pollutants of broad international significance and environmental aspects of natural resource management. In contrast, developing countries received "no significant" additional financial resources to help them deal directly with environmental problems. Despite the success of incorporating developing country concerns into the Declaration, "the issue was still largely perceived as a choice between environment or economic growth."[17]

The above list of norms will serve as the point of comparison when I enumerate the norm-complexes that emerged from the Brundtland Report and UNCED.

FROM STOCKHOLM TO SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

On the path from Stockholm to the Rio Earth Summit, "sustainable development" emerged as the dominant conceptual framework for internation-

al environmental governance. The set of norms produced at Stockholm lacked a unifying theme either to forge a consensus between North and South or to capture the imagination of world opinion. Sustainable development meant to change all that. In one concept, environmentalists, economists, planners, industrialists and governments of all political persuasions could find a unity of purpose, if not agree on how that might be accomplished. As one author put it:

> It is not surprising that such a concept has received widespread support from leaders of the North and South alike, environmental and Third World movements, international bureaucrats and enlightened managers of financial and economic institutions and structures in both capitalist and socialist countries. This is explained by the artful vagueness which the new paradigm of 'sustainable development' casts upon their respective responsibilities (Pallemaerts 1994:14).

Its vagueness, rather than condemning it to the trash heap of development concepts, made it the favored mantra of international environment and development communities.

This section focuses on the evolution of the language of sustainable development in international discourse, its sources, and its eventual delineation in the prominent World Commission on Environment and Development. Divergent paths from Stockholm, roughly corresponding to Northern and Southern positions, eventually converged around the "sustainable development" concept. Two developments in 1974 set the normative character of those paths: the development of guidelines for the Polluter Pays Principle (PPP) in the North and the Cocoyoc Declaration in the South. Whereas international cooperation in the North focused on methods of internalizing environmental costs with minimum disruption to markets, the South sought an overhaul of the international economic order, which it felt relied too heavily on the market to the detriment of the poor.

The North

The development by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) in 1974 of guidelines to implement the PPP set the tone for the North (OECD 1974). The OECD originally developed the PPP two years earlier, not as a rule of liability, but as a means to avoid environ-

mental regulations that might alter the operation of the market and particularly of free trade (OECD 1972, 1975). OECD recommendations in the early 1970s gave PPP a restricted meaning that said that pollution abatement by the private sector should not be subsidized by governments, which would create a burden on the wider community and could distort trade. Properly implemented, PPP would ensure that market prices more closely reflected the social costs of production. However, PPP also implied internalization of environmental costs—a meaning initially downplayed in its implementation, but which subsequently took hold and now dominates.[18] This meaning can be seen even in its earliest formulation, which states that polluters should bear the cost of pollution they cause and resources they use "to ensure that the environment is in an acceptable state" (OECD 1972).

The introduction of the PPP marked the start of a trend to incorporate environmental costs into production, markets, and accounting practices, rather than favor what economists label command-and-control regulation to combat environmental damage. Under PPP, public choice might determine the level of environmental protection sought, but, ideally, implementation of such standards would rely on the manipulation of market incentives, not strict end-of-pipe regulations. Admittedly, PPP in practice often took shape in the form of direct regulations based on standards, permits, and so on, which impose costs on meeting those standards to the polluter. Even in such cases, however, PPP relies on proper pricing so that market signals to consumers, for example, will reflect the full social and environmental cost of goods produced. Furthermore, the spirit of the principle implies the use of market-friendly instruments such as pollution charges and tradeable pollution permits, as evidenced by the trend in supporting such instruments in implementing the PPP in the 1980s and 1990s.

At the international level, the OECD intended the principle to "avoid distortions in international trade and other economic relations which might arise from differences in member countries' pollution control measures" (OECD 1972). Under this principle, subsidies, for example, would not accompany measures to implement the principle since they distort the market. The notion of "getting prices right," and the field of environmental or ecological economics that primarily concerns itself with this task, follow from this basic principle.[19]

Despite the intentions of its framers to limit the PPP to an economic principle, some developing countries have attempted to extend the principle to cover liability and equity concerns between North and South. For example, some interpret PPP to require developed countries, as the historic

site of the majority of practices that damage the environment, to shoulder greater responsibility, and costs, for environmental preservation and management.[20] However, in policy and legal terms, PPP retains the more narrow meaning ascribed to it. Hence, other norms, such as that of "common but differentiated responsibility" supported at Rio, have been required to invoke the broader implications sometimes associated with PPP.

It should also be apparent that the underlying logic of PPP and similar mechanisms ensures support for economic growth. The developers of this principle believed that if environmental protection can be achieved with a minimum distortion of markets, economic efficiency and growth would be maintained, thus minimizing the need for trade-offs between growth and environment. As indicated above, the originators of PPP explicitly meant it to avoid distortions in international trade because that might limit growth.

The OECD's work in this area received a tremendous boost when, in 1984, Environment Director Jim MacNeill organized the "Environment and Economics" conference. The OECD economics establishment fully supported the conference, which helped to make it a major influence on governments and business in the direction of the OECD environment directorate's vision of environmental governance. The conference emphasized the desirability of strengthening the role of economic instruments and the reciprocal positive linkages between environmental protection policies and economic growth (OECD 1985). The pivotal role the conference and the OECD more generally played in legitimating these linkages, thus in influencing the future direction of environmental governance, is discussed further in chapter 5. In short, the conference helped to shift the way governments, business, and the economic establishment at the OECD thought about environmental issues and the best ways to address them. In particular, it cemented the view that economic growth and environmental protection could be compatible. MacNeill's later role as secretary-general of the Brundtland Commission ensured those ideas would also influence efforts at global governance for some time.

Major industrial states during this period, to varying degrees, also began to reformulate the importance and direction of environmental policy. Here, too, one finds that increased attention to environmental concerns led to increased efforts to find a fit between those policies and liberal economic norms. The general trajectory of European Community (EC) goals, for example, followed a similar pattern to that of OECD policy statements, although European policy lagged slightly in comparison.

From the start, Article 2 of the 1957 Treaty of Rome spelled out the fundamental objectives of the Community in economic terms. Whereas one

would not expect this pre-Stockholm document to focus on environmental concerns, significantly the Single European Act of 1987, which contained a new chapter on a legal basis for community action on the environment, left Article 2 with its economic focus. While the Maastricht Treaty finally reformulated EC objectives, it nevertheless calls for the promotion of "a harmonious and balanced development of economic activities [and] sustainable and non-inflationary growth respecting the environment" (Title II: Provisions Amending the Treaty Establishing the European Economic Community With a View to Establishing the European Community, Article G paragraph B.2). Significantly, the language used in the Community debate on sustainability had been that of "sustainable development" at least following the Brundtland report. However, at the Rome Summit of December 1990, which considered the future work of the Intergovernmental Conference on Political Union, heads of government requested that the conference consider protection of the environment to ensure "sustainable growth." Despite some discussion of the change in terminology, the growth language stood during negotiations toward 1992 and no head of government tabled the issue at Maastricht (Verhoeve et al. 1992:14–15). The language of growth and open markets thus circumscribes the language of environmental concerns in EU documents.

This discussion should not imply that the EU lacks a serious concern for environmental protection within its borders or in its relationship to the developing world. In fact, since 1987 the EU has led the West in pushing forward the international environmental agenda. The above discussion merely points out that the EU's framing of environmental concerns rests on a primary concern with economic growth and that sustainable development is defined in such a way as to be compatible with growth and market forces.

The United States took an even stronger pro-market view, especially under the Reagan administration (McCormick 1989; Kraft and Vig 1984). A convincing case can be made that the shift in policy to deregulation, cost-benefit analysis, and heavier reliance on market incentives came from an ideological shift rather than an assessment of policy effectiveness. For example, Kraft and Vig (1984) traced administrative changes that consistently put political control of the environmental agenda above expert administration. A key turning point in U.S. policy came when the Reagan administration virtually ignored the report of a transition task force on the environment that it had set up. The report advocated moderate reforms that would ease some regulations, reexamine some laws, promote some economic incentives for environmental protection, but generally maintain the momentum for environmental protection. Instead, Reagan's environmen-

tal policy followed the much more radical position advocated by the conservative Heritage Foundation and Secretary of the Interior James Watt. He firmly believed in deregulation and that most resource problems could be solved by opening them up to the free market.

That view extended to U.S. foreign policy. In 1982, at a special session of UNEP to commemorate the tenth anniversary of the Stockholm Conference, Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Anne Gorsuch announced the unequivocal compatibility of growth, environmental protection, and markets:

> Individual ownership of property [and] free and well-developed markets in products and capital are powerful incentives for resource conservation. These institutions best promote the use of renewable resources and the development of substitutes for nonrenewable resources, ensuring continued resource availability and environmental quality (Gorsuch 1982).

The South

While Northern policymakers concerned themselves with methods to internalize environmental costs, the South in 1974 produced the Cocoyoc Declaration at a meeting in Mexico October 8–12. The Symposium on Patterns of Resource Use, Environment, and Development Strategies, billed as Founex II, brought together 33 delegates from eight developed and 14 developing countries (McCormick 1989:152). Maurice Strong, then executive director of UNEP, and Mostafa K. Tolba, who took over the post shortly thereafter,[21] also attended the conference, jointly sponsored by UNEP and UNCTAD. Founex II meant to further the work on environment and development started at Stockholm. Delegates discussed development strategies and international economic relations, analyzed environmental issues and the limits of natural resources in particular, and addressed the debate then occupying the United Nations where developing countries had just introduced the NIEO. The backdrop of the NIEO and the onset of the first oil shock a year earlier set the tone for the vision of environmental management that emerged.

A deep distrust of market mechanisms undergirded the Cocoyoc Declaration (UNEP 1981:109–119). It began with a stark summary of the lack of progress on poverty, hunger, illiteracy, disease, and homelessness, and the

newer problems of resource degradation. It argued that the maldistribution of resources and overconsumption by the wealthy lies behind humanity's inability to meet the "inner limits" of satisfying fundamental human needs and the "outer limits" of the planet's resources. The solution, the report said, "cannot be left to the automatic operation of market mechanisms. The traditional market makes resources available to those who can buy them rather than those who need them, it stimulates artificial demands and builds waste into the production process, and even under-utilizes resources." The critique of the market extended to domestic systems of the time where the benefits of growth accrued to a small percentage of the wealthy while the poorest 20 percent grew poorer still.

The remainder of the Declaration set out the goals of development, which, it stated, should first provide for basic needs. Its recommendations fit with the vision of global economic management sought in the NIEO and the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States, both of which the Declaration explicitly endorsed. The Declaration's recommendations were as follows:

1. Governments, international organizations, and scientific communities should develop and institute policies that aim to satisfy the basic needs of the poorest and redistribute resources where possible. At the same time, they should ensure adequate conservation of resources and protection of the environment.
2. Within the framework of sovereignty over resources, governments and international institutions should promote the management of resources and the environment on a global scale.
3. Strong international regimes should be established for the exploitation of the global commons, and the use of the commons should be taxed for the benefit of the poorest strata of the poor countries.
4. Scientific and technological research and development should establish new priorities to respond to the goals of the report.
5. New development priorities should aim to curb overconsumption in the North and step up the production of essentials for the poor.

As can be seen, Cocoyoc placed the correctives to environmental problems squarely in the context of overall demands for a redistribution of resources. It had a bias toward global management of global resources and schemes for transfers from rich to poor to pay for the maintenance, equal access to, and use of global commons (for example, through taxation of the commons). Again, these proposals conflicted with liberal economic norms

of free trade and market incentives and mechanisms for environmental protection and technology transfer.

Like the NIEO, however, the Cocoyoc Declaration had little lasting influence in terms of practical policy application. Nonetheless, it illustrated the state of development thinking at the time and how United Nations agencies concerned with development would view the environment agenda. As such, it marked the basis of environmental governance initially favored by the development community from the South.

UNEP's Role

Meanwhile, UNEP continued the Stockholm conference's work of reconciling environment and development. Indeed, by 1976, many delegates at UNEP's fourth Governing Council questioned the need to continue to defend the linkage of environment and development, which they felt had already gained wide acceptance (McCormick 1989:150). By 1980, the South appeared to verify this perception when it explicitly used the language of environmental sustainability in The Strategy for the Third United Nations Development Decade:

> It is essential to avoid environmental degradation and give future generations the benefit of a sound environment. There is a need to ensure an economic development process which is environmentally sustainable over the long run and which protects the ecological balance. Determined efforts must be made to prevent deforestation, erosion, soil degradation and desertification. International cooperation in environmental protection should be increased (UNGA 1980).

UNEP played a leadership role in developing this language. The secretariat, under Strong's leadership, worked to clarify the linkage between environment and development with a conceptual middle ground that emphasized economic growth, but of a "sustainable" kind. By the mid-1970s the language of sustainability (although not necessarily sustainable development *per se*) could be found in UNEP documents and speeches of its leaders. Strong thus could announce a solid support for economic growth, but of a new kind that considered the social aspects of development. "Economic and ecological factors must be brought into harmony in developing growth-patterns that are sustainable," he told the first International Environmental Management Seminar in 1975. " 'Eco-growth'

does not mean 'no-growth'; indeed it means better growth, sounder growth, and perhaps even more growth in qualitative terms."[22] He similarly called for a "'new-growth' society" in more forceful language two years later:

> Surely it must be clear that present growth-patterns and practices are self-destructive and cannot be sustained! Is no-growth then the only answer? Let me say with all the force I can muster that no-growth is *NOT* the answer. The real alternative to no-growth is new-growth—a new approach to growth, in both the more industrialized and the less-developed societies [emphasis in original].[23]

Language reminiscent of the G-77 Lima meeting's concern that environmental protection not interfere with "sustained economic development of developing countries" now had a positive environmental spin.

Although Strong labeled this vision "ecodevelopment," the "marriage" of ecology and economics, that term never really caught on with developing world governments. Nonetheless, United Nations agencies such as UNEP, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the World Bank claimed to use the concept as a guide for incorporating environmental concerns into development planning. However, difficulties arose when translating the somewhat ideal language of ecodevelopment to the project level (Caldwell 1990:202–204).

Supporters of the concept point out its consistency with development thinking of the 1970s and its sensitivity to the complexity of ecosystems and how they respond to human interaction (Adams 1990:51–56). Themes such as local participation in projects, an emphasis on intermediate technologies, local self-sufficiency, and basic needs dominated academic and institutional writings in this vein. However, its failure to address broader debates about the global political economy, North-South conflict or questions of macroeconomic management likely accounts for its relative lack of success in capturing the interest of developing world politicians.

In general terms, ecodevelopment literature of the 1970s and 1980s overlapped with that on sustainable development. The main difference was an elimination of neo-Malthusian overtones contained in ecodevelopment's emphasis on small-scale development. UNEP had never really pushed that side of ecodevelopment, however, so the language and speeches of its leadership demonstrated the congruity of the concepts. Hence, ecodevelopment language merged with UNEP's later use of sustainable development terminology.

Shortly after Strong stepped down as UNEP's head, he stated that ecodevelopment "would be designed to assure that the precious natural resources . . . in the less-developed countries are exploited in ways that make the best possible use of their own skills and labor, and harmonize with their own culture and value systems to produce the resource-base on which sustained development depends."[24] An analysis of Tolba's speeches through the 1980s shows many of the same themes emphasized, but with sustainable development language fully substituted. Themes of his included repeated assertions of the interdependence of environment and development, the importance of poverty alleviation as a first priority, and an emphasis on a new qualitative evaluation of growth (Tolba 1987:97–107). Tolba also emphasized UNEP initiatives such as cost-benefit calculations and the general economic benefits of environmental protection.

In this way, UNEP took on the challenge of Cocoyoc but eschewed no-growth langauge. Tolba effectively used NIEO language while he avoided anti-market rhetoric that might alienate support from OECD countries. Sustainable development and sustainable growth became compatible concepts, even if pure growth in GDP no longer sufficed. Thus his submission to the Brundtland Commission, while it discussed many aspects of "sustainable development" consistent with the view of ecodevelopment and sustainable development above, emphasized economic growth as the basis of it all:

> The first and most important premise [to put sustainable development into action] is the generally agreed perception that economic development and environmental quality are interdependent and, in the long term, mutually reinforcing. The rational management of the world's threatened natural resource base forestalls a loss in environmental quality and enhances sustainable economic growth (Tolba 1987:150).

All that was missing was a vision of governance to put such ideas into effect. The Brundtland Commission took on that task.

WORLD COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT (WCED)

Two direct influences on WCED deserve mention to put the report in context: The World Conservation Strategy (WCS), often cited as the original source for the popular use of the term sustainable development; and a

group of UN commissioned studies on development—Willy Brandt's *Programme for Survival* and *Common Crisis*—and security—Olaf Palme's *Common Security*.

UNEP commissioned the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) to produce the 1980 World Conservation Strategy (IUCN 1980). The strategy intended to "stimulate a more focused approach to the management of living resources" and provide policy guidance for three groups: government policymakers and advisers, conservationists, and development practitioners, including aid agencies, industry, and trade unions. It received wide attention in those communities and proved somewhat effective in mobilizing national action on nature conservation. However, its lasting effect on norm creation at the international level was undercut by an inattention to political and economic factors that often lay behind stresses on living resources.

The final of three drafts, its authors admitted, was a compromise document. The IUCN prepared the document, but UNEP and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), who financed the project, should be considered nearly equal partners as they played major roles in its preparation and influenced its themes and structure (IUCN 1980, ii). The United Nations Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO) and UNESCO also reviewed the final draft, which reflected wide consultations with interested parties from the conservation and development communities.[25]

The final strategy aimed to "help advance the achievement of sustainable development through the conservation of living resources" (IUCN 1980, iv). As such, it primarily focused on conservation of living resources, although some sections did mirror ecodevelopment thinking, that is, local development consistent with physical, biological and cultural resources, local participation, and so on.[26] It defined conservation as "the management of human use of the biosphere so that it may yield the greatest sustainable benefit to present generations while maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of future generations" (section 1.4). The definition comes close to Brundtland's for sustainable development, except the WCED replaced "management . . . of the biosphere" with "development." The strategy's definition of development, similarly, focused on the "modification of the biosphere and the application of human, financial, and living and non-living resources to satisfy human needs and improve the quality of human life" (section 1.3). The definitional linkages are clear—development, since it alters the biosphere, must take conservation into account to be sustainable. The solution, then, was to give conservation a higher priority.

The strategy contained three major objectives: (1) maintenance of essential ecological processes and life support systems such as soil, forests, agriculture, fisheries, and water; (2) genetic diversity; and (3) sustained utilization of species and ecosystems. It also contained a detailed set of priorities that addressed international concerns, but showed sensitivity to implementation at the local level.

Unfortunately for its supporters, WCS never overcame its lack of attention to the main concerns of developing country governments, nor did it take into account the essentially political nature of development. That problem, for example, meant an insensitivity to powerful interests in developing countries that favored rapid development and growth over environmental protection, or to pressures in the international and domestic political economies to exploit resources. Hence, many of the suggestions lacked context. As one analyst put it, "[WCS] seems to assume that 'people' can exist in some kind of vacuum, outside the influence of equality, class or the structures of power" (Adams 1990:51). On the bureaucratic level, it also ignored the planning process in many developing countries where central planning agencies, not environment ministries, controlled linkages to international development agencies. That, and the politics of those agencies, made it more likely aid would flow to conventional projects such as industry, energy, and agriculture rather than for the development of a conservation strategy (McCormick 1989:169).

Although WCS recognized North-South conflict in the international political economy, it did not successfully incorporate such concerns into the overall strategy. For example, while it explicitly endorsed a "new international economic order," in the same sentence it called for a new environmental ethic, stabilization of populations and "sustainable modes of development" (section 1.1). Similarly, its final chapters listed the demands of the NIEO without specifying why or how they fit with the conservation program in the WCS. It asserted compatibility of those values by definitional fiat: "Development and conservation operate in the same global context, and the underlying problems that must be overcome if either is to be successful are identical" (section 20.1). Then, after listing NIEO demands—a 0.7 percent official development assistance (ODA) target, better terms of trade, accelerated economic growth, and so on—it merely stated that, "Achievement of equitable, sustainable development requires implementation not only of the measures indicated above but also of the World Conservation Strategy." Finally, it urged that those conservation plans be included in the new International Development Strategy (section 20.5). Nowhere does WCS make the linkages between those aims explicit. Hence, its most

lasting effect appears simply to have been the dissemination of the term sustainable development to governments and conservation advocates.

The Brundtland Commission meant to put sustainable development as it appeared in the WCS into a broader, development-oriented context. At the same time, it wished to further the multilateral and cooperative goals of the United Nations system. The Brandt and Palme commissions set the tone of Brundtland's broader objectives of multilateralism and interdependence. Gro Harlem Brundtland saw her task in *Our Common Future* explicitly as the third "call to political action" following on the two earlier projects on North-South economic relations and global security respectively. As such, she called the goal "to persuade nations of the need to return to multilateralism" as "perhaps our most urgent task" (WCED 1987:x).

The Cold War provided another important context. The Commission took on one of the few issues on which East and West could find common cause (Finger 1993:36–38). Already, organizations such as the International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA) in Austria had provided a forum for such cooperation. Brundtland hoped to build on such efforts. The Commission stressed a "same boat" mentality. Images of a single, fragile Earth and interlocking ecosystems marked the introduction of *Our Common Future*. It followed that the planet's preservation required global environmental management and cooperation. Just as World War II produced the impetus for cooperation to build a postwar international economic system, "The challenge of finding sustainable development paths ought to provide the impetus—indeed the imperative—for a renewed search for multilateral solutions and a restructured international economic system of co-operation"(WCED:x).

The WCED Report

The significance of *Our Common Future* is threefold. First its high-profile origins as a UN General Assembly mandated project, unlike the WCS, mobilized sufficient public and political interest to elevate international concern on the environment. Until then, the priority accorded to environmental issues had largely declined in the wake of recession and debt since Stockholm. To generate interest and participation, the Commission's work included public hearings of senior government officials, scientists, other experts, industry, NGOs, and interested members of the public in all parts of the world (WCED 1987:359–361). The hearings generated more than 500 submissions, constituting 10,000 pages of material. In addition, WCED ap-

pointed expert advisers to assist the secretariat in analyzing key issue areas, set up advisory panels on energy, industry, and food security, and commissioned a series of reports from experts and research institutions. These efforts combined to give the report credibility and a high global profile.

Second, WCED cemented the linkage between environment and development that until then had been confined largely to communities directly involved in international efforts to promote such linkages. It also ensured that the relationship between environment and development would be framed in the language of "sustainable development." Third, it attempted to define the set of principles and norms that should underlie international efforts to achieve sustainable development. The first effect is self-explanatory, and the second two will be dealt with in turn.

Sustainable Development

The Brundtland Commission originated in a 1981 UNEP proposal to prepare an environmental perspective to the year 2000 and beyond (YUN 1982:1000). The following year UNEP recommended that a commission of eminent persons should help develop the perspective and mobilize public opinion. Finally, in 1983, after various consultations, the UNGA approved the establishment of a commission in resolution 38/161 without a vote. Its primary mandate was, "To propose long-term environmental strategies for achieving sustainable development to the year 2000 and beyond." Secondarily, its recommendations were to encourage cooperation between countries at different stages of development and to reach mutual objectives which "take account of the interrelationships between people, resources, environment and development."[27] Although WCED rephrased its mandate somewhat, the thrust remained to identify problems of environment and development and to formulate realistic proposals to address them.

The Commission, chaired by Norway's Gro Harlem Brundtland, worked in parallel to the UNEP Council's preparation of the Environment 2000 report.[28] The parallel process resulted not from a division of responsibilities, but from a turf war fought by the UNEP leadership who wanted control of the process.[29] That resulted in the marginalization of the UNEP report, whereas, by 1984, the work of the now-named World Commission on Environment and Development gained a high profile. Both reports were presented to the UNGA in 1987 and came to similar conclusions. However, WCED placed a greater emphasis on the growth side of sustain-

able development whereas Environment 2000 more often used terms such as "environmentally sound development," "effective environmental management," and "sustained environmental improvements" in the statement of its goals. The former view dominated future discussions, at least within the United Nations system, owing to the greater publicity and legitimacy granted to the WCED.

Our Common Future emphatically put environmental concerns in the context of an overall strategy of development. As Brundtland stated in the foreword:

> When the terms of reference of our Commission were originally being discussed in 1982, there were those who wanted its considerations to be limited to 'environmental issues' only. This would have been a grave mistake. The environment does not exist as a sphere separate from human actions, ambitions, and needs. . . .
>
> . . . the 'environment' is where we all live; and 'development' is what we all do in attempting to improve our lot within that abode. The two are inseparable (WCED 1987:xiii).

Chapter 1 of WCED further placed this philosophical position squarely in the context of the international political economy, stating that: "It is therefore futile to attempt to deal with environmental problems without a broader perspective that encompasses the factors underlying world poverty and international inequality" (WCED 1987:3).

Sustainable development was the cornerstone of WCED. Although defined variously, the most quoted definition reads as follows:

> Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs. It contains within it two key concepts:
>
> [1] the concept of 'need', in particular the essential needs of the world's poor, to which overriding priority should be given; and
>
> [2] the idea of limitations imposed by the state of technology and social organization on the environment's ability to meet present and future goals (WCED 1987:43).

Notwithstanding subsequent debates about the concept, WCED provided a relatively specific interpretation. First, needs refer to basic needs as defined by contemporary development discourse. Second, environmental limits are to be socially and technologically defined. Thus WCED framed the envi-

ronment problematique in clearly cornucopian terms, a departure from the more eco-centric and conservation minded WCS.[30] In other words, according to WCED, decisions about limits must be made in the context of socioeconomic goals and what technology allows. The two documents came to similar conclusions on what environmental problems needed attention, but the rationale for concern differed significantly.

That difference was most clearly expressed in Brundtland's emphasis on growth. From its first page, WCED countered the limits to growth reasoning that pitted the developing world against conservationists at Stockholm:

> . . . *Our Common Future*, is not a prediction of ever increasing environmental decay, poverty, and hardship in an ever more polluted world among ever decreasing resources. We see instead the possibility for a new era of economic growth, one that must be based on policies that sustain and expand the environmental resource base (WCED 1987:1).

The report made reviving growth the top strategic priority, in a sharp departure from earlier statements of global environmental policy. Specifically, WCED called for a minimum three percent annual increase in per capita income (which equals a five or six percent of GDP growth per annum) in developing countries and policies to redistribute income to alleviate absolute poverty. That rate would eliminate poverty in 25 years according to the report and would require "accelerated global growth" (WCED 1987:50–51, 89).

The report also recommended a better quality of growth: less material- and energy-intensive. Thus it reiterated the long-standing goals of UNEP noted earlier, while it played up those goals' foundation in economic growth. That foundation, it argued, led to the following other goals (after "reviving growth" and "changing the quality of growth") (WCED 1987:49):

- meeting essential needs for jobs, food, energy, water, and sanitation;
- ensuring a sustainable level of population;
- conserving and enhancing the resource base;
- reorienting technology and managing risk; and
- merging environment and economics in decisionmaking.

These goals undergirded detailed recommendations on reforms and priorities for incorporating sustainable development in the areas of food security, energy policy, urban development, living and nonliving resource conservation, population control and industry.

Two other goals were added in the Tokyo Declaration, made by the Commission in its final meeting on Feb. 27, 1987: to reform international economic relations, and to strengthen international cooperation. The former meant to prescribe the conditions for long-term growth. Specifically, the Declaration called for more equitable trade, capital and technology flows better synchronized with environmental imperatives, and fundamental improvements in market access, technology transfer, and international finance to help developing countries diversify their economic and trade bases and build self-reliance (WCED 1987:365). International cooperation applied to environmental research and monitoring and a general call toward multilateralism.

As these last goals indicate, the Brundtland report paid much more attention to international economic and institutional factors than did the WCS. It explicitly addressed the interactive linkages between poverty, environmental degradation, and macroeconomic relations. For example, it discussed the dependence of many African countries on commodity exports sensitive to declining prices. It also pointed to Latin America where debt crises and subsequent austerity programs had increased poverty and hurt distributional programs. Those governments faced pressure to make repayment a priority, thus they encouraged exports to generate foreign currency and pushed other development goals off or lower on government agendas. Such policies, WCED argued, are neither ecologically nor politically sustainable: "To require relatively poor countries to simultaneously curb their living standards, accept growing poverty, and export growing amounts of scarce resources to maintain external creditworthiness reflects priorities few democratically elected governments are likely to be able to tolerate for long." Furthermore, WCED argued that economic policies of some major industrial countries had depressed and destabilized the international economy, which aggravated these pressures on developing countries (WCED 1987:75).

The Commission favorably noted NIEO attempts to make economic arrangements more equitable, and to improve financial flows, trade, transnational investment, and technology transfer. Then, like WCS, it called for this program to consider ecological dimensions. However,

> In the short run, for most developing countries except the largest[,] a new era of economic growth hinges on effective and co-ordinated economic management among major industrial countries—designed to facilitate expansion, to reduce real interest rates and to halt the slide to protectionism. In the longer term, more changes are also required to

> make consumption and production patterns sustainable in a context of higher global growth (WCED 1987:75).

Some modification of the international economic order would be necessary to achieve this synthesis of environmental concern and development. However, the basis of that order, WCED argued, should remain proper management by the major industrial powers. Hence, the goals of the international order should remain broadly liberal: interdependence, modernization, and free trade to promote economic growth.

The Norm-Complex

The Brundtland Commission promoted a governing norm-complex that encouraged a managed—or what might be loosely termed Keynesian—liberalism in the international economic order, infusing traditional forms of Keynesian intervention with an environmental bent. At the same time, explicitly environmental goals were to be incorporated into domestic development policies and in international institutions such as UNCTAD, the World Bank, and GATT to ensure that the economic order encouraged environmental concerns to be considered in decisionmaking and to prevent a growth-at-all-costs mentality.

The support of international Keynesian liberalism and interdependence remained largely unchanged from the Brandt reports. In this view, a sound global economy rests on free trade as the main engine of economic growth. However, selective interventions are accepted to propel developing countries into a more equitable position where they can better benefit from liberal economic institutions, or at least be cushioned from the impact of unfettered trade. Thus, on the one hand, WCED proposed a reduction in trade restrictions in the North, a reduction in real interest rates to ease debt payments, and an expansion of trade agreements to promote global economic growth. On the other hand, it supported increased financial flows in the form of aid from international development banks and other governmental sources, improved compensatory financing for commodity pricing to even out economic shocks, a strengthened bargaining position for developing countries *vis-à-vis* multinational corporations, and improved technology transfer arrangements, made possible by easing proprietary rights and encouraging joint ventures and cooperative research programs (WCED 1987:67–91).

It also gave the managed interventions it supported an environmental bent by, for example, proposing that increased aid should go toward projects that encourage sustainable development. The likelihood that such projects would involve higher local costs, a higher ratio of recurrent to capital costs, and a greater use of local technology and expertise, were not to deter lending in that direction. Such efforts might include "reforestation and fuelwood development, watershed protection, soil conservation, agroforestry, rehabilitation of irrigation projects, small-scale agriculture, low-cost sanitation measures, and the conversion of crops into fuel" (WCED 1987:77–78). WCED especially targeted the World Bank and IMF for reform since their lending conditions act as benchmarks for other governments and private lenders. Both their internal procedures and selection criteria ought to change, WCED argued, to reflect environmental and social costs and goals. Similarly, domestic policies in the North and South should be reoriented to resource conservation and enhancement.

A comparison with the norms of Stockholm will demonstrate the greater degree of synthesis achieved by Brundtland. However, it did not mark a radical departure. Indeed, it carried forward many of the same compromises on basic norms such as sovereignty over resources. Its difference lies in how it framed the norms of international environmental governance—differences that nonetheless are not insignificant as the new framing opened up avenues for substantial change in the legitimacy of environmental goals and the shape of policies and practices. Two changes stand out. First, for WCED, the synthesis of environmental and developmental goals suggested that governance of both rests on a common normative foundation, with economic growth at the center. Stockholm merely placed the two sets of interests side by side. Second, WCED explicitly spelled out the Keynesian-style compromise that ought to create obligations on the North for sound management and assistance, and responsibility on the South for reform. Below, the norm-complex promoted by WCED is presented with changes from Stockholm highlighted.

State Sovereignty and Responsibility:

1. Unchanged from Stockholm. Although a parallel legal process proposed new norms, they were never incorporated into the report nor were these proposals by a group of environmental experts from the North and South given serious consideration by the UNGA. When legal issues finally moved back onto the agenda in the PrepComs

for the 1992 Earth Summit, this set of legal principles did not form the basis of negotiations (Pallemaerts 1994:4; 1996:627–629).

Political Economy of Environment and Development:

2. The norm of differential obligations is downplayed. Instead, all states have a *common responsibility* to ensure a cleaner environment. Two imperatives apply equally to North and South:
   a. Revive global growth.
   b. Owing to environmental interdependence, require interdependent and shared responses to environment and development problems

      Poverty remains recognized as a source of environmental degradation in the South, and the North is seen to have an obligation to help alleviate it (through aid, and so on). However, a common program of freer and fairer trade to promote global growth combined with responsible regulation at the national level is called for in all countries. For example, developing countries have a responsibility to incorporate pollution costs into prices of pollution-intensive goods. Even the formerly taboo subject of sustainable population resurfaced in the report, albeit still in a weak form.
3. The international Keynesian-style compromise of balancing free trade with commodity price stability remains, although in more explicit terms. Free trade, and liberal economic policies generally, as the engine of growth, lies at the heart of the norm-complex. Managed interventions promote equity.
4. The argument that environmental protection requires substantial transfers of aid and technology for developing countries remains, followed by detailed proposals. Automatic financing, such as a tax on the use of global commons, is proposed in the spirit of the Brandt commission and the Cocoyoc Declaration (UNEP 1981; The Brandt Commission 1983:98–100). However, WCED made clear that political constraints made the implementation of such proposals unlikely in the near term.
5. The norm of cooperation to conserve and enhance the global resource base for present and future generations remains, with global growth a prerequisite.

Environmental Management

6. Encourage a mix of command-and-control regulation and economic/market-based incentives for environmental management. For ex-

> ample, Brundtland's section on industry contained a discussion of economic instruments and recommended implementation of the Polluter Pays Principle (WCED 1987:219–232). Technological differences between North and South are to be considered (although WCED contained no mechanism to prevent PPP from penalizing industries from the developing world that may rely more heavily on subsidies for pollution prevention). However, economic instruments should be considered in the context of an overall strategy that also emphasizes standard setting, environmental assessment and government regulation. In addition, environmental audits should be required for transnational corporations that operate in developing countries.

Our Common Future legitimated the trend toward liberal environmentalism when it called for the integration of environment and economics in decisionmaking. However, the mix of management instruments and emphasis on various interventions in international markets left open a number of possibilities of how the ideas in Brundtland might eventually be institutionalized. Whereas WCED might call the norm-complex it supported "sustainable development," a better description is "managed sustainable growth." This will be contrasted with the liberal environmentalism of UNCED.