From Stockholm to Rio: Critical Reading of Global Environmental Governance

Verdinand Robertua
Department of International Relations
Christian University of Indonesia (UKI) Jakarta, Indonesia
verdinand.robertua@gmail.com

Arry Bainus
Department of International Relations
University of Padjajaran, West Java, Indonesia

Abstrak

Tata kelola lingkungan global dewasa ini tersandung banyak hal akibat dari fungsi yang tumpang-tindih serta kurangnya pendanaan. Maka dari itu, penting halnya untuk menelusuri sejarah pembentukan tata kelola lingkungan global sebagai suatu institusi. Artikel berikut bertujuan untuk memahami dinamika tata kelola lingkungan global dari Konferensi Stockholm pada 1972 hingga Konferensi Rio pada 1992. Perubahan antara Konferensi Stockholm dan Konferensi Rio akan ditelaah menggunakan teori *English School*. Teori *English School* berpotensi untuk terlibat dengan norma-norma dan institusi yang telah ditetapkan secara kritis. Pluralisme dan solidarisme, sebagai sayap normative *English School* mampu menjelaskan inti pendorong dari tata kelola lingkungan global. Artikel ini diharapkan dapat turut berkontribusi pada perkembangan studi lingkungan dari teori *English School* dan perumusan tata kelola lingkungan global.

Kata kunci: tata kelola lingkungan global, teori English School, Konferensi Rio, Konferensi Stockholm, pembangunan berkelanjutan

Abstract

Global environmental governance is deeply undermined due to the problem of overlapping function and lack of funding. It is then important to trace the history of the construction of global environmental governance as an institution. This article would like to understand the dynamics of global environmental governance from Stockholm Conference in 1972 to Rio Conference in 1992. The changes between Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference will be analyzed using English School theory. English School theory has the potential to critically engage with the taken-for-granted norms and institutions. Pluralism and solidarism as the normative wings of English School can elaborate the key driver of global environmental governance. It is expected that this article can contribute to development of environmental studies of English School theory and the formulation of global environmental governance.

Keywords: *global environmental governance, English School theory, Rio Conference, Stockholm Conference, sustainable development*

Introduction

Today it is taken-for-granted that states have responsibility to collectively mitigate the impact of environmental degradation and biodiversity loss. Sustainable development is perceived as

the key platform for leaders to formulate policies and strategies in promoting awareness on environmental issues. However, there is lack of interest regarding the history of the current global environmental governance (GEG). Critical assessment regarding the construction process of GEG is essential to strengthen the effectiveness of contemporary policies and strategies taken by the governments.

Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference will be selected as the case studies to trace the dynamics of GEG. United Nations Conference on Human and Environment or Stockholm Conference is the first global summit discussing the environmental issues and producing global environmental agreement. It is interesting to see the rift between developed and developing countries regarding the solution of global environmental issues (Bernstein 2001). Developed countries wanted to involve developing countries in taking the responsibility meanwhile developing countries argued that is the issue only for developed countries (Clapp and Dauvergne 2005, 56).

The rivalry between developed and developing countries led to a deadlock. Developing countries wanted to preserve their rights in achieving ambitious economic growth. Sovereignty of developing countries was threatened by the global initiatives meanwhile transboundary environmental disaster is a global issue that threatens the economic and political stability of governments. Stockholm Conference was a huge fighting arena for countries to protect their contradicting national interest.

Interestingly 20 years after Stockholm Conference, the tension was significantly disappeared. Leaders came to Rio de Janeiro to discuss global environmental issues with an agreement that there must be joint strategies and policies in addressing problems and disasters. United Nations Conference on Environment and Development or Rio Conference resulted to Agenda 21 that signed and ratified by all countries. There is a shift from conflictual relationship in Stockholm Conference to cooperative relationship in Rio Conference.

The shift from conflict to cooperation is an important inquiry for English School scholars. Barry Buzan (2004) has developed international society into six spectrum namely asocial, conflict, coexistence, cooperative, convergence and confederative. Buzan's conceptualization of international society enabled researchers to understand conflict and cooperation within a single theoretical frame.

Instead of using Buzan's concept, this research will use pluralism and solidarism as the tool to critically analyze Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference. Bain (2007) and Wienert (2011) argued that pluralism and solidarism are the normative wings of English School that enabled to understand the complexity of the taken-for-granted concepts and norms. By deconstructing global environmental governance with pluralism and solidarism, we can see the bigger picture of the phenomena and issues within the environmental dimension.

English School conception of global environmental governance (GEG) will be tested in their effectiveness of implementing global environmental agenda. There were many problems

regarding coordination, funding and functions of GEG which potentially undermine the existence of GEG. It is then important for English School scholars in reformulating GEG suitable to the concept of effectiveness.

This article will be divided into three main parts. Firstly, the article will address the application of the debate between pluralism and solidarism in the context of global environmental governance. This contextualization will be the basis for closing the gap between theory-practice researches. Secondly, the article will explore the dynamics around the establishment of Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference. It will determine the shape and the format of global environmental governance using English School perspective. Lastly, this article will address the implication of Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference to the development of environmental studies of English School and global environmental governance.

Pluralism & Solidarism: Perpetual Debate?

The challenge for ESES scholars is to reconceptualize pluralism and solidarism based on specific issue. Barry Buzan has conveyed some key characteristic of pluralism and solidarism. For example, Buzan(2014, 85) noted: "pluralism following the realist injunction to focus on the empirical study of what is and solidarism following the normative path of campaigning for what should be". The problem with the classical debate of pluralism and solidarism is that it doesn't focus to certain issues. How do we apply Buzan's distinction on pluralism and solidarism into global environmental politics?

There are two English Scholars that attempted to contextualize pluralism and solidarism debate. Wienert (2011) argued that human security definition debate triggered the debate of pluralism and solidarism. Meanwhile, Nicholas Wheeler (2000) reformulate pluralism and solidarism based on the case of humanitarian intervention in some parts of the world. In sum, Peter Wilson (2012) has advised English Scholars to use grounded theory in order to define and identify some basic concepts of English School including solidarism and pluralism.

The second challenge for ESES scholars is to trace the relationship between pluralism and solidarism. In the classical English School literature, pluralism and solidarism has conflictual relationship because they have contradicting characteristics and mutually exclusive. Bain (2007) and Buzan (2004) said that there is common perception that pluralism and solidarism are incommensurable. Bain (2007, 562) criticized that English School scholars has a hierarchy on solidarism and pluralism, preferring hegemony of pluralism over solidarism or vice versa. Buzan (2004) also said that pluralism and solidarism debate are parallel to recurring tension of realism and liberalism thinkers. Pluralism equals to realism meanwhile solidarism equals to solidarism.

In the context of global environmental politics, the antagonistic perception of pluralism and solidarism can be reflected in the debate between developed and developing countries regarding the primacy of national interest over environmental protection. Hedley Bull is the

first English School scholar that produced the concept of pluralism and solidarism. In Bull's article, he depicted: "In the view it takes of the area of actual or potential agreement among the member states of international society it may be called pluralist where the Grotian doctrine is solidarist" (Bull 1966, 52).

Bull became further interested in formulating pluralism in his Book's Anarchical Society (Bull 1977). He defined international order based on sovereignty and independence of states. Any threat toward the preservation of sovereignty is the threat to international order. It confirmed the primacy of pluralism over solidarism. In the context of global environmental politics, Bull considered environmental protection as marginal issue because there was still huge differences among states regarding "the goal of economic growth, food, energy and other raw materials are used as weapons in international conflict; some countries pollute the air and water used by others; and a traditional convention that the high seas and its resources are held in common is being eroded" (Bull 1977, 283).

To force environmental protection within global political agenda will harm international order. If there is no universal agreement among states to put environmental protection as urgent global issues, we will face conflicts and chaos. There will be some states force other states imposing certain environmental standards that are incommensurable. Armed conflict and war are possible due to securitization of environmental issues (Allenby 2000, Flyod 2008, Edwards and Heiduk 2015). Another scenario is to create bigger authority beyond states to effectively established global environmental rules. It can lead to global government that superior over national government. These scenarios will not likely happen if there is universal agreement regarding environmental protection.

Pluralists wanted to preserve states system in global environmental politics. It means that states actually can change its policies to control their population, to limit resource exploitation and not to harm other states via pollution or water. Bull (1977, 284) emphasized that states do have capability and capacity to deal with global environmental problems. The question is on how to socialize environmental norms to peoples, corporation and governments.

Stockholm Conference: Developed vs. Developing Countries

United Nations Conference on Human and Environment was held in Stockholm, Sweden in 1972. This is the first global environmental summit. The conference was attended by 113 states including the United States, China, and India (Bernstein 2001). Why Sweden? Olof Palme, the Prime Minister of Sweden at the time, played a very important role in proposing the conference. Andreas Grieger (2012)noted that Swedish delegation that consisted of Sverker Ästrom and Borje Billner submitted the proposal to United Nations General Assembly meeting in 1967. Grieger (2012) emphasized the Swedish entrepreneurship:

> "By the late 1960s, Sweden had established itself as a respected middle power, often times challenging the Superpowers and their Cold War status quo. Instead, Swedish diplomats tried to use the UN system to shift the diplomatic

focus away from a nuclear paradigm towards more concern for international development and environmental protection" (Grieger, 2012).

Despite Sweden belongs to the group of developed states, Swedish government earned trust and legitimacy from developing countries. In his speech, Olof Palme stated that Swedish government would be part of contributor for global environmental fund (Palme 1972). Palme's initiative was also supported by domestic constituency and political parties in Sweden (Black 2012). Stockholm Conference was an attempt to solve the deadlock between developed and developing countries.

The rivalry between developed and developing countries was very intensive in the Stockholm Conference. We can see from the statement of Brazil's representative that mentioned industrial pollution as rich man's problem and the Ivory Coast's representative that mentioned that exploitation by developed countries' capitalism was a core reason for their high levels of poverty and environmental degradation (Clapp and Dauvergne 2005, 56). In sum, developing countries blamed developed countries for global ecological crisis and asked developed countries to be more responsible in mitigating the impact of environmental crisis.

Rachelle Adam (2014) mentioned this contestation as a battle between elephants and ants. Developed countries already invaded developing countries in the era of colonialism. During the phase of colonialism, developed countries exploited the natural resources of developing countries to enrich and empower national capacity of developed countries. After being empowered, developed countries set a high standard of environmental protection within the international environmental agreement regulating biodiversity and natural resources. This western standard will never be achieved by the new independent developing countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America.

An important case of rivalry of developed and developing countries was Austria's policy to ban tropical timber. Austria is the first country linking environment with global trade agenda and followed by the Netherland (Vogel 1995). On behalf of sustainable development, Austria encouraged European customers to replace tropical timber with temperate Austrian timber (Elliott 2003). In GATT's meeting in 1992, Austria's policy was attacked by Indonesia's and Malaysia's representative due to its discriminatory and unilateral characteristic (Vogel 1995). After serious debate, Austria dropped its policy. Developing countries are very suspicious toward the linkage of environment and trade due to its harmful economic and business consequences (Ivanova 2007).

Another case to see the division between developed and developing countries is the creation of United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). One of important results of Stockholm Conference is the creation of UNEP. However, there is intensive debate between developed and developing countries regarding the functions, resources and the location of UNEP's headquarter. The decision to establish UNEP's headquarter is the result of effective alliance between developing countries. The United States is the opponent of UNEP's headquarter in Nairobi (Ivanova 2007). UNEP's financial resources are also debated by the members of Stockholm Conference. Developing countries were against the voluntary contribution

mechanism because there will be additional for developing countries to access the fund (Ivanova 2007).

UNEP's debate is also reflected in other international environmental organizations including ASEAN. In response to the recurring forest fires and transboundary haze in Indonesia, Singapore and Malaysia initiated ASEAN-led comprehensive and binding measures. However, Indonesia rejected the initiative and instead agreed to voluntary mechanism. The problem is worsened with the consensus-based decision-making process which sometimes called as ASEAN Way that resulted to the primacy of regional stability over the environmental protection (Varkkey 2012).

Despite of the rift between developed and developing countries during negotiation process in Rio Conference, Stockholm declaration provided united voices regarding the primacy of environmental first universal basis for environmental management. Singapore used Stockholm Declaration in facing Indonesia regarding the impact of forest fires in Indonesia (Heilman 2015, 104). In the article 21, it is mentioned:

> *"States have, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the principles of international law, the sovereign right to exploit their own resources pursuant to their own environmental policies, and the responsibility to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control do not cause damage to the environment of other States or of areas beyond the limits of national jurisdiction"*.(United Nations 1972)

Despite of normative tension in the beginning of Stockholm Conference, there were tangible and concrete output that benefiting developed and developing countries. There were many regional environmental agreement inspired by the Stockholm Declaration. It became a new customary international law. As mentioned before, Swedish leadership can generate support and trust from developing countries. Not only Stockholm declaration, Stockholm Conference also becomes the starting point for the establishment of UNEP.

Brundtland Report and Rio Conference

After Stockholm Conference in 1972, there is a report that changed the perception toward environmental protection. In 1987, UN appointed a team led by former Prime Minister of Norway Gro Harlem Brundtland to undertake independent research regarding the solution of global environmental problems. The team published the finding titled "Our Common Future" which established the concept of sustainable development. Sustainable development is an effort to balance the excessive economic ambition with environmental protection. Sustainable development is "development that meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs" (World Commission on Environment and Development 1987).

The tension between developed and developing countries was disappeared in Rio Conference. The tension was decreased not only because of the invention of the concept of sustainable

development but also the presence of many environmental disasters such as toxic gas in Union Carbide Plant in Bhopal, India in 1984, Chernobyl nuclear leak in 1986, and Exxon Valdez oil spill in 1989. These disasters received serious attention by world community and changed the perception of the peoples in developing country regarding environment and ecosystem (Bernstein 2001, 85).

Rio Conference has strengthened the notion that the major reforms of welfare, political and economic policies are the key tenets to address global environmental problems. Developing countries wanted bigger role in Rio Conference as the poverty alleviation program were synchronized in the sustainable development programs. Majority of government leaders at Rio Conference realized that environmental degradation in developing countries was linked to the failure of resource exploitation welfare strategy (Bernstein 2001, 76).

To make sure the government addressed the poor community, Rio Conference agreed on common but differentiated responsibility. It is said that environmental protection are common responsibility for all nations but has different focus and strategy to promote the environmental protection. For rich nations, the responsibilities are to make sure that developing countries implemented effective policies to address poverty and environmental degradation and developing countries must ensure environmental consideration is included in their economic programs.

Developing countries were giving more attention to have more international aid regarding environmental protection. Agenda 21 is the basis of political legitimacy for obtaining support and assistance from developed countries. There are more bilateral and multilateral agreement in many parts of the world in response to the success of Rio Conference. The conference is a trigger for the creation of many international environmental organizations and international environmental law (Clapp and Dauvergne 2005, 65). United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is one of the results of Rio Conference.

The implication toward Environmental Studies of English School

The case studies of Rio Conference and Stockholm conference are important inquiry for the development of the theory of Environmental Studies of English School (ESES). Firstly, the pessimism of state capability on handling environmental issue is significantly negated. In Rio Conference, we see that Swedish government played significant role in bringing together developing and developed countries. In the midst of conflict between developing and developed countries, there is a middle power that aimed to contribute to betterment of global environmental governance.

The role of middle power is not discussed significantly within English School scholars. Hedley Bull (1977) devoted a special chapter on the role of great power in international society but he didn't give enough space for middle power. United States of America and Soviet Union didn't play important role both in Stockholm Conference and Rio Conference. It is so difficult to expect that the great power devoted bigger attention to environmental issues.

According to Bull (1977, 200-207), there are some responsibilities of great power. Firstly, great powers are obliged to preserve the status quo. Secondly, great power has the responsibility to prevent the potential conflict. If they are failed to prevent the conflict, great power can use military power to intervene the conflicting parties in order to minimize the impact. We can see that Bull didn't see any prospect of great power advancing environmental issues in global environmental governance.

Swedish entrepreneurship in global environmental governance is an important feedback for ESES. Based on the case of Swedish role in Stockholm Conference, we need to formulate the role of middle power. Middle power means that there is significant presence of normative entrepreneurship without the presence of military and economic power. It is also important to think about the responsibility and the duty based on the norms being taken. For example, Sweden advanced the promotion of human rights and democracy and decided to allocate further their spending in overseas development aid in promoting democracy and human rights. This model is also followed by the European Union, Australia and other Scandinavian countries.

This article noted that Swedish entrepreneurship in global environmental governance didn't harm international order. In the pluralist perspective, it is the great power that is able to change the norms and values of international society due to their military and economic power. However, middle power is potentially able to perform the role of agenda setter. The coalition of middle power in promoting certain norms and values would bring significant change to international society including global environmental governance.

In the second sub-chapter, it is mentioned that there is huge difference regarding the hierarchy of environmental norms and national interest. Developing countries and developed countries didn't have the same perception toward environmental responsibility. Developing countries are eager to promote economic growth to be able to achieve greater environmental standard meanwhile developed countries want to have one-size-fits-all standard that privilege environmental protection. As long as the disagreement persists, the hypothesis of pluralism on marginalization of environmental issue is confirmed.

The shift from Stockholm Conference to Rio Conference gave important impetus to reform ESES. Developed and developing countries signed and ratified Stockholm Declaration and Agenda 21. The conflict between developed and developing countries was solved and the agreement was reflected in the Stockholm Declaration. Stockholm Declaration becomes the first global agreement stating that environmental issue cannot be categorized as marginal issue. After intensive debate, all countries agree that there is an urgency of reform both in political and economic system for accommodating environmental responsibility.

The success of Swedish diplomat in Stockholm negotiation, the establishment of the concept of sustainable development and smooth institutionalization of sustainable development in Rio Conference marked a big question for Bull's thesis. Diplomats, political leaders and

environmental activists have answered the Bull's question. Environmental norms is indeed possible to be socialized and promoted to be a universal norms. Through dialogue, informal meeting, bilateral and multilateral negotiation as well as media publicity, environmental norms are emerged as an important norm in international order.

The pessimism of pluralism should be based on the reality. The reality is that there are more global-based journalistic media, revolution of communication technology, and massive improvement of transportation infrastructure. It creates a bigger possibility for achieving a united perception regarding the harm of pollution, climate change and overpopulation. A picture of tragic murder of Orangutan in Indonesia will be spread worldwide and create global movement against the tragic killer of the endangered species (Greenpeace 2007).

This article also argues that there is overlapping position of pluralism and solidarism with international system and international society. In the 1966 article, Bull exposed pluralism and solidarism as his conceptual framework but he used international system and international society in his 1977's book. Is there any significant different between those concepts?

According to Bull, international system is "formed when two or more states have sufficient contact between them, and have sufficient impact on one another's decisions, to cause them to behave" (Bull 1977, 9). Meanwhile international society "exists when a group of states, conscious of certain common interests and common values, form a society in the sense that they conceive themselves to be bound by a common set of rules in their relations with one another, and share in the working of common institutions" (Bull 1977,13).

The difference between international system and international society is the existence of common interests, values and rules. Meanwhile the difference between pluralism and solidarism is the existence of international law. In this sense, we can argue that international system and pluralism is similar that both concepts emphasized the minimum conception of order and the deep difference between states. Meanwhile international society and solidarism is similar that both concepts emphasized the feasibility of maximum conception of order.

Based on the similarity between these concepts, we can conclude that the early English School scholars were very interested in developing concepts and theories using comparative methods. It is not only Bull developed these comparative concepts but also Wight (1992) developed realism, rationalism and revolutionism. It is also followed by Buzan (2004) with new spectrum of asocial, coexistence, cooperative, convergence, and confederative. To understand the complexity of values and actors in International Relations, it is useful to grasp the similarities and differences of all these concepts.

The Values of Global Environmental Governance

The problem with Stockholm Conference is the absence of common values uniting developed and developing countries. It gives an impetus of the values, norms and rules of the current structure of global environmental governance (GEG). If states want to successfully mitigate

the differences in solving global environmental crisis, what are the norms and values that we can agree with? This article argues that Brundtland Commission has shaped significantly the values, norms and rules of current structure of GEG by publishing the concept of sustainable development.

Transboundary pollution, overpopulation and biodiversity loss are not only the problem with GEG but also conceptual problem. Government needs a norm that legitimize their policies and rules in preventing global, national and local problems. We have many norms such as ecological reforms, sustainable development or environmental protection. However, it is sustainable development that has been agreed in Rio Conference as the norms for GEG. Then it is important to critically trace the history of this norms and the impact toward the current GEG.

Sustainable development has been used for environmental activist, policy-makers and academician as the normative basis of improving GEG. The problem is that sustainable development becomes essentially contested concept. There are many competing definition of sustainable development that sometimes contradicting and conflictual. According to Brundtland, sustainable development is an effort to balance the aggressive behavior in exploiting natural resources with environmental consideration. It is not a tool to stop economic growth or welfare policies. Sustainable development is an effort to define the middle way between anthropocentric and ecocentric ideology (Hodge and Dunn 1992).

The problem with this middle way approach is a compromise toward the factors of environmental and ecosystem degradation. Sustainable development is used to justify the destructive practices of corporations and states (Lele 1991). According to Baker (Baker, et al. 1997), treadmill approach is also part of sustainable development. As shown in the table 1, Baker has elaborated the concept of sustainable development into five components, namely treadmill, weak, strong and ideal.

Table 1 Approach to Sustainable Development

Approach	Role of economy and nature of growth	Geographical Focus	Nature	Policies and Sectoral Integration	Institutions	Policy Instruments and Tools	Redistribution	Civil Society
Ideal	Right livelihood; meeting needs not wants; changes in patterns and levels of production and consumption	Bioregionalism, extensive local self-suffiency	Protecting and promoting biodiversity	Holistic inter-sectoral integration	Decentralization of economic, politic, legal and social institution	Full range of policy tools; sophisticated use of indicators extending to social dimensions	Inter- and intra-generational equity	Bottom-up community structures and control. New approach to valuing work
Strong	Environmentally regulated market; changes in patterns and levels of production and consumption	Heighteneed local economic self-sufficiency, promoted in the global markets	Environmental management and protection	Environmental policy integration across sectors	Some restructuring of institutions	Advanced use of sustainability indicators; wide range of policy tools	Strengthened redistribution policy	Open-ended dialogue and envisioning
Weak	Market-	Initial moves	Replacing	Sector-driven	Minimal	Token use of	Equity a	Top-down

	reliant environmental policy; changes in patterns of consumption	to local economic self-sufficiency; minor initiatives to alleviate the power of global markets	finite resources with capital; exploitation of renewable energy resources	approach	amendments to institutions	environmental indicators; limited range of market-led policy tools	marginal issue	initiatives; limited state-environmental movement dialogue
Treadmill	Exponential growth	Global markets and global economy	Resource exploitation	No change	No change	Conventional Accounting	Equity not an issue	Very limited dialogue between the state and environmental movement

Source: (Baker, et al. 1997, 9)

The Global Environmental Governance must determine which component to be adopted. Keeping the concept deeply contested and vague will make confusion and inconsistent policies among policy makers, environmental activists and academician (Jacobs 1999). Based on the intensive debate in Stockholm and agreement in Rio, GEG should prefer strong approach. There must be significant changes in the patterns of consumption and production and environmental policy integration across sectors. Sustainable development is consistently adopted in global, national and local level.

Maximum resource exploitation in treadmill approach is not accepted. Governments have to be punished for their failure in protecting the ecosystem and human being such as transboundary haze, biodiversity loss and ecological crisis. The signature and ratification of Stockholm Declaration and Agenda 21 are proof that there is no debate regarding different perception regarding environmental standards. Strong sustainable development is the key values of current and the future of GEG. After we know the values we agree with, we need to think on how to make it effective.

Effectiveness of Global Environmental Governance

According to Hurrell (2007), the failure of government to handle environmental problems both in global and national level are the weaknesses of the contemporary GEG. Najam, Papa and Taiyab (2006) also exposed the problem of lack of coordination between government that resulted to overlapping function and role of many multilateral environmental agreements and international institutions. It is worsened that great powers such as the United States are reluctant to join the GEG and contribute to the failure of collective solution toward global environmental disasters.

Of course, it is still too early to evaluate the effectiveness of GEG in implementing strong sustainable development. The absence of great power within the GEG is not the criteria for evaluating GEG. Even though the United States didn't support the creation of United Nations Environmental Program, the organization can implement its function and roles under the support of the coalition of middle powers. It is indeed a complex situation when we have an explosion of multilateral environmental agreement and international institution. It takes times for leaders to streamline and enhance the effectiveness of their coordination.

Therefore, this article argues that the effectiveness of GEG should not be based on the material pursuit and achievement of the organization. GEG should be seen as an institution that has norms and values. English School has many institutions such as war, market, diplomacy or international law. In pursuing GEG as an institution of English School, this article argues that GEG is established as an institution after Rio Conference. Rio Conference is a confirmation of strong sustainable development as the norm of GEG. Without norms and values established in Rio Conference, GEG is ineffective as international institution.

This is the critic toward ES scholars. There are no clear indicators determining a concept as an institution in English School. Bull (1977) mentioned five institutions (war, diplomacy,

great powers, international law and diplomacy) meanwhile Buzan (2004) mentioned eight institutions (sovereignty, territoriality, diplomacy, great power, equality, market, nationalism and environmental stewardship). The problem is that they didn't explicitly explain on how other concepts are not categorized into English School institution. Why GEG is not categorized as the primary institution?

This article argued that primary institutions of English School should be determined by their agreed values and norms and the presence of agreement among scholars regarding certain institution. We need to ask the scholars regarding the values and norms inherent within the institutions. For example, International Political Economist agreed that market has liberal capitalistic norms that encourage global trade and financial integration. Security analyst agreed that great powers play important role in advancing competitive defense equipment and technology. In this regard, it is then important the role of epistemic communities in determining the norms and values of certain institution. Without agreement of the scholars, it is difficult that an institution is successful as an institution in English School.

Buzan has mentioned that environmental stewardship as primary institution of English School. However, he didn't elaborate further the norms and values of this institution. Scholars of environmental studies of English School are then crucial to determine the norms and values of GEG. If the scholars are failed to reach an agreement regarding the nature of GEG, it is then concluded that GEG is not successful to be an institution in English School.

So far, there are three scholars of ESES namely Matthew Paterson, Robert Falkner and SannaKopra. Paterson (2005)argued that English School scholars have neglected the role of civil society in promoting sustainable development. Falkner (2017) also argued that classical English School perspective should be reformed based on the current global movement mitigating the impact climate change. Meanwhile, Kopra (2016) elaborated the concept of climate responsibility based on Chinese foreign policy on climate change. All authors agreed that GEG should be put in a distinct character as an institution.

Therefore, the effectiveness of GEG is determined not only by the material pursuit but also two normative aspects. Firstly, it deals with the norms and values. Dingwerth and Pattberg explained the importance of norms and values: "global governance is not so much an empirical or analytical term as it is a political concept that captures a vision of how societies should address the most pressing global problems" (Dingwerth and Pattberg 2006, 193). Rio Conference has provided an answer that sustainable development is the platform of governments in addressing environmental problems.

Secondly, it deals with the agreement among epistemic communities. Haas defined epistemic communities as "a network of professionals with recognized expertise and competence in a particular domain and an authoritative claim to policy-relevant knowledge within that domain or issue-are" (Haas 1992, 3). The role of epistemic communities is crucial in determining the policies taken by the governments. In regards to GEG, the role of epistemic communities is not only crucial in determining the specific policies but also the format and the structures of

its theoretical prescription. In the theory of environmental studies of English School, GEG is agreed as an established primary institution.

Conclusion

There are three important notions to be discussed in this article. Firstly, this article wanted to re-examine the primacy of self-egoistic national interest in English School discussion. Classical English School perspective believed that it is difficult to find consensus regarding the urgency of global reform to anticipate environmental crisis.

There were different perceptions regarding the importance of environmental consideration in national decision-making process. However, Stockholm Declaration and Agenda 21 are evidences on how governments can form a coalition to promote the environmental values into many regions and sectors.

The aim of pluralism and solidarism is not as a tool to legitimize destructive practices and exploitative policies. It is perceived that developing countries didn't consider environmental damages in their economy due to their focus of national growth. Pluralism and solidarism are not justifying these actions. Pluralism and solidarism are the tool for English School scholars to compare methods in achieving environmental betterment.

Secondly, the norms of global environmental governance need to be identified. After Stockholm Conference, there was Brundtland Report that published the concept of sustainable development. Sustainable development was then used as the driver for key reforms both in developed and developing countries. However, there is a problem of multiple interpretation of sustainable development. The concept became vague and deeply contested. After historical survey in Rio Conference, it is argued that strong sustainable development is suitable for global environmental governance.

Thirdly, global environmental governance as an institution is claimed as ineffective in addressing sophisticated and complicated environmental issues. Due to lack of coordination and funding, the effectiveness of global environmental governance is deeply undermined. This article showed that Rio Conference and the presence of epistemic communities are important foundation in constructing global environmental governance. They are strengthening the function and the role of global environmental governance in International Relations.

References

Adam, Rachelle. 2014. *Elephant Treaties: The Colonial Legacy of the Biodiversity Crisis.* London: University Press of New England.

Allenby, Braden. 2000. "Environmental Security: Concept and Implementation." *International Political Science Review* 5-21.

Bain, William. 2007. "One order, two laws: recovering the 'normative' in English School theory." *Review of International Studies* 557 - 575.

Baker, Susan, Maria Kousis, Dick Richardson, and Stephen Young. 1997. "Introduction: The theory and practice of sustainable development in EU perspective." In *The Politics of Sustainable Development: Theory, Policy and Practice within the European Union*, by Susan Baker, Maria Kousis, Dick Richardson and Stephen Young, 1-41. London: Routledge.

Bernstein, Steven. 2001. *The Compromise of Liberal Environmentalism.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Black, Richard. 2012. *Stockholm: Birth of the green generation.* June 4. Accessed February 3, 2018. http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-18315205.

Bull, Hedley. 1966. "Grotian Conception on International Society." In *Diplomatic Investigation: Essays in the Theory of International Politics*, by Herbert Butterfield and Martin Wight, 51-73. Michigan: Allen & Unwin.

Buzan, Barry. 2014. *An Introduction to the English School of International Relations: The Societal Approach.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

—. 2004. *From International to World Society: English School Theory and the Social Structure of Globalisation.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Clapp, Jennifer, and Peter Dauvergne. 2005. *Path to a Green World: the Political Economy of Global Environment.* Masschusets: MIT Press.

Dingwerth, Klaus, and Philipp Pattberg. 2006. "Global Governance as a Perspective on World Politics ." *Global Governance* 185-203.

Edwards, Scott Adam, and Felix Heiduk. 2015. "Hazy Days: Forest Fires and the Politics of Environmental Security in Indonesia." *Journal of Current Southeast Asia Affairs* 65-94.

Elliott, Lorainne. 2003. "ASEAN and Environmental Cooperation: norms, interests and identity." *The Pacific Review* 16 (1): 29-52.

Falkner, Robert. 2017. "The Anarchical Society and Climate Change." In *The Anarchical Society at 40. Contemporary Challenges and Prospects*, by Hidemi Suganami, Madeline Carr and Adam Humphreys, 198-215. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Flyod, Rita. 2008. "The Environmental Security Debate and its Significance for Climate Change." *The International Spectator* 51-65.

Greenpeace. 2007. *Cooking the Climate.* Amsterdam: Greenpeace International.

Grieger, Andreas. 2012. *Only One Earth: Stockholm and the Beginning of Modern Environmental Diplomacy.* Accessed February 3, 2018. http://www.environmentandsociety.org/arcadia/only-one-earth-stockholm-and-beginning-modern-environmental-diplomacy.

Haas, Peter M. 1992. "Epistemic Communities and Interational Policy Coordination." *International Organization* 1-35.

Heilman, Daniel. 2015. "After Indonesia's Ratification: The ASEAN Agreement on Transboundary Haze Pollution and its Effectiveness as a Regional Environmental Governance Tool." *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 95-121.

Hodge, Ian, and Jessica Dunn. 1992. *Rural Change and Sustainability: a Research Review.* London: ESRC.

Hurrell, Andrew. 2007. *On Global Order: Power, Values and the Constitution of International Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ivanova, Maria. 2007. "Designing the United Nations Environment Programme: a story of compromise and confrontation." *International Environmental Agreements* 337-361.

Jacobs, Michael. 1999. "Sustainable Development as a Contested Concept." In *Fairness and Futurity: Essays on Environmental Sustainability and Social Justice*, by Andrew Dobson, 21-32. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kopra, Sanna. 2016. *With Great Power Comes Great Responsibility? China and the International Practice of Climate Responsibility.* Tampere: Tampere University Press.

Lele, Sharachchandra M. 1991. "Sustainable Development: A Critical Review." *World Development* 607-621.

Najam, Adil, Mihaela Papa, and Nadaa Taiyab. 2006. *Global Environmental Governance: A Reform Agenda.* Manitoba: International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Palme, Olof. 1972. "Statement by Prime Minister Olof Palme in the Plenary Meeting ." *Olof Palme.* June 6. Accessed February 3, 2018. http://www.olofpalme.org/wp-content/dokument/720606a_fn_miljo.pdf.

Paterson, Matthew. 2005. "Global Environmental Governance." In *International Society and Its Critics*, by Alex Bellamy, 163-178. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

United Nations. 1972. "Stockhold Declaration." *Declarations of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.* June 5. Accessed October 23, 2016. http://www.un-documents.net/aconf48-14r1.pdf.

Varkkey, Helena Muhammad. 2012. "The ASEAN Way and Haze Mitigation Efforts." *Journal of International Studies* 8: 77-97.

Vogel, David. 1995. *Trading up: Consumer and Environmental Regulation in a Global Economy.* London: Harvard University Press.

Wheeler, Nicholas. 2000. *Saving Strangers: Humanitarian Intervention in International Society.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Wienert, Matthew S. 2011. "Reframing the Pluralist - Solidarist Debate." *Millenium - Journal of International Studies* 21-41.

Wight, Martin. 1992. *International Theory: The Three Tradition* . New York: Holmes & Meier.

Wilson, Peter. 2012. "The English School Meets the Chicago School: The Case for a Grounded Theory of International Institutions." *International Studies Review* 567–590 .

World Commission on Environment and Development. 1987. *Our Common Future.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.