

64 Identity Politics in the Age of Genocide
The Holocaust and historical representation
David B. MacDonald

65 Globalisation, Public Opinion and the State
Western Europe and East and Southeast Asia
Edited by Takashi Inoguchi and Ian Marsh

66 Urbicide
The politics of urban destruction
Martin Coward

67 Transnational Activism in the UN and the EU
A comparative study
Jutta Joachim and Birgit Locher

68 Gender Inclusive
Essays on violence, men and feminist international relations
Adam Jones

69 Capitalism, Democracy and the Prevention of War and Poverty
Edited by Peter Graeff and Guido Mehlkop


70 Environmental Change and Foreign Policy
Theory and practice
Edited by Paul G. Harris

71 Climate Change and Foreign Policy
Case studies from East to West
Edited by Paul G. Harris

Environmental Change and Foreign Policy

Theory and practice

**Edited by
Paul G. Harris**

 **Routledge**
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 2009
by Routledge
2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxon OX14 4RN

Simultaneously published in the USA and Canada
by Routledge
270 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor & Francis Group, an informa business

© 2009 Paul G. Harris selection and editorial matter; individual contributors, their contributions

Typeset in Times New Roman by
Taylor & Francis Books
Printed and bound in Great Britain by
CPI Anthony Rowe, Chippenham, Wiltshire

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Environmental change and foreign policy : theory and practice / edited by Paul G. Harris.

p. cm. – (Routledge advances in international relations and global politics ; 70)

Includes bibliographical references and index.

1. Global environmental change. 2. International relations. I. Harris, Paul G.

GE149.E58 2009

363.7'0526–dc22

2008037555

ISBN 10: 0-415-48343-3 (hbk)

ISBN 10: 0-203-88143-5 (ebk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-415-48343-8 (hbk)

ISBN 13: 978-0-203-88143-9 (ebk)

Contents

<i>List of figures</i>	xii
<i>List of tables</i>	xiii
<i>List of contributors</i>	xv
<i>Preface</i>	xvii
<i>List of abbreviations</i>	
1 Environmental foreign policy in theory and practice PAUL G. HARRIS	1
PART I	
Theory	17
2 Theories of environmental foreign policy: power, interests, and ideas JOHN BARKDULL AND PAUL G. HARRIS	19
3 The symbolism of environmental policy: foreign policy commitments as signaling tools LOREN R. CASS	41
4 Pluralistic politics and public choice: theories of business and government responses to climate change THOMAS L. BREWER	57
5 The politics of socio-natures: images of environmental foreign policy MAXIMILIAN MAYER AND FRIEDRICH J. ARNDT	74

PART II

Practice

6	The domestication of international environmental conventions: biodiversity in Ugandan foreign policy DAVID R. MUTEKANGA	91 93
7	From local protest to the International Court of Justice: forging environmental foreign policy in Argentina ISABELLA ALCAÑIZ AND RICARDO A. GUTIÉRREZ	109
8	Finnish environment and foreign policy: supranationalism, pragmatism, and consensus building MIKA MERVIÖ	121
9	Canada's foreign policy on persistent organic pollutants: the making of an environmental leader KEN WILKENING AND CHARLES THRIFT	136
10	Greening the streams: water in EU and US foreign policy SARA HUGHES AND LENA PARTZSCH	153
11	Trade and the environment: foreign policies of developing countries in Asia YOHEI HARASHIMA	169
12	Financing for the environment: explaining unequal burden sharing AIKE MÜLLER	186
13	Environmental foreign policy: towards a conceptual framework MIHAELA PAPA	202
	<i>Index</i>	221

Figures

5.1	Images as heuristic devices	75
10.1	The ACP countries: focus of EU water funds	158
10.2	Coverage of improved drinking water resources	158
11.1	Share of industrial product exports	182
11.2	Share of agricultural product exports	182
12.1	Generosity ratio for Bilateral Environmental Aid, 1991–2005	191
12.2	Generosity ratio to the GEF, 1991–2006	192

TRIPS	Trade-Related Aspects of Intellectual Property Rights
TVA	Tennessee Valley Association
UK	United Kingdom
UN	United Nations
UNCED	United Nations Conference on Environment and Development
UNDP	United Nations Development Program
UNECE	United Nations Economic Commission for Europe
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
US	United States
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USSR	United Soviet Socialist Republic
UWA	Uganda Wildlife Authority
WCED	World Commission on Environment and Development
WFD	EU Water Framework Directive
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

1 Environmental foreign policy in theory and practice

Paul G. Harris

Environmental changes are among the greatest threats to the well-being and possibly the long-term survival of humankind, and they present profound challenges to many other species. It is therefore crucial that scholars and policy-makers do all that they can to understand the human relationship to the environment and the potential means of mitigating our impact on the planet. Much has been done to do this, but it is clear from ongoing global pollution, overuse of natural resources, and the failure of international regimes to adequately address most environmental problems, that the trend is – despite some successes – very much in the wrong direction. Species and habitats are being destroyed, water and air quality deteriorate unabated in most parts of the world, greenhouse gas emissions grow even as signs of climate change become increasingly unmistakable and dangerous – in addition to a huge range of other problems arising from industrialization and modern life. Given our failure to stop, let alone reverse, this trend, it seems reasonable and even imperative to look for new ways of understanding what is happening and why, and to find new ways for people and their governments to respond to environmental problems.

The bulk of literature on environmental policy and politics has tended to focus on various aspects of international cooperation and regimes, on one hand, and the processes of domestic environmental management and sustainable development, on another (see, for example, Lafferty and Meadowcroft 2001; Breitmeier *et al.* 2006). However, less attention has been given to what falls between and across the domestic and the international levels of analysis.¹ There is a “level” of policy that is both internal *and* external to states that also deserves attention. We can call this level of policy practice (which is also a level of policy analysis) *foreign policy*. Foreign policy can play an important, even central, role in determining whether governments and other environmental policy actors actually take steps to address ecological problems effectively. The aim of this book is to define and explore that role.

From a scholarly perspective, foreign policy is a subfield of political science and the study of international relations. It involves the *interplay* between domestic forces, institutions and actors – such as democratic principles, civil society, executive and legislative power structures, government agencies, and

diplomatic personnel – and international forces, institutions and actors – such as the processes of globalization (economic, environmental, cultural), international organizations and regimes, and powerful countries, corporations, and nongovernmental organizations. As Gerner (1995: 17) observes:

Although no subfield in political science is completely self-contained, the study of foreign policy is somewhat unusual in that it deals with both domestic and international arenas, jumping from individual to state to systemic levels of analysis, and attempts to integrate all of these aspects into a coherent whole.

In this chapter, I want to introduce the case studies that follow by starting to answer several questions: What is foreign policy? How can we analyze, understand and explain foreign policy. That is, what is foreign policy analysis? What is *environmental* foreign policy? How can studying environmental foreign policy, and how might environmental foreign policy analysis, help us to better understand how people and especially governments organize themselves to address pollution and ecological decline?

Foreign policy and foreign policy analysis were popular subjects among political scientists in past decades. I want to step back and look at it again. I then want to ask how more concerted, conscious and systematic scholarly attention to foreign policy and foreign policy analysis might aid in finding solutions to environmental problems. I want to point out what is special about the processes of foreign policy for domestic and international environmental action, and to suggest how foreign policy analysis can move us closer to understanding important variables influencing that action. I devote attention to the second question – What is foreign policy analysis? – because foreign policy analysis has been largely closeted for a generation, and because its methodology has not been widely applied to environmental problems. Environmental foreign policy analysis can help to close the gap between the problems we face and our understanding of them.

Subsequent chapters in this book explore conceptions and theories of environmental foreign policy and analyze environmental foreign policy as practiced in a number of important issue areas. Those chapters are summarized below. Together, they help to delineate the field of *environmental* foreign policy analysis and demonstrate its utility in helping to illuminate the human dimensions of environmental change.

Foreign policy

“Foreign policy” is a concept that means different things to different people, so it can be difficult to define.² Generally speaking, foreign policy is *and* is not that which is normally the central focus of many other approaches to understanding international relations: it is what comes between strictly or mostly domestic politics *and* what is strictly or mostly happening at the

international and global levels, while being connected to and affected by both. Foreign policy is not *purely* about either international policy (as the term might suggest) or domestic policy, but neither is it separate from either. James Rosenau (1968: 310) defined foreign policy as “governmental undertakings directed toward the external environment.” Foreign policy is, in one sense, the “interpenetration of individual states by interests and forces that necessarily restrain or limit the freedom of action of their political leaders and decision makers” (Thompson and Macridis 1976: 2). F.S. Northredge, one of the most prescient observers of foreign policy, wrote of the “paradox of foreign policy”:

that its aims, the product of interaction between pressures internal and external to the state, have a certain perennial quality about them ... and yet the implementation of these aims in the concrete circumstances of the time has to bow to ever-changing realities.

(Northredge 1968: 12)

Indeed, globalization and other forces of modernization, notably transboundary and global environmental changes, mean that more of what was once purely national is now the subject of foreign policy. Thus, Morse (1970: 376) points out that “linkages between domestic and foreign policies constitute the basic characteristic of the breakdown in the distinction between foreign and domestic affairs in the modernized, interdependent international system.”

In short, foreign policy – albeit related to the external world (as the term suggests) – cannot be divorced from domestic affairs. It is about the interactions between domestic and international affairs. From a policy perspective, foreign policy encompasses the *objectives* that officials of national governments seek to attain; the *values and principles* underlying those objectives; the *methods* by which the objectives are sought; the *processes* by which these objectives, principles and methods are developed and implemented; and the *actors and forces* – international and domestic – shaping these attributes (cf. Kegley and Wittkopf 1996: 7). As Rosenau (1968: 314) acknowledged, to the dismay of many foreign policy analysts, foreign policy encompasses “a vast range of phenomena. Circumstances can arise whereby virtually every aspect of local, national, and international politics may be part of the initiatory or responsive stage of the foreign policy process.” To be sure, this suggests a high degree of complexity in foreign policy processes and analyses of them. But all is not lost; we can use theory and method to tease out key actors, variables and forces. What we cannot do is ignore the vast range of phenomena to which Rosenau points.

Foreign policy analysis

How can we analyze and thereby understand and explain (and possibly help officials and stakeholders manipulate) foreign policy? What is foreign policy

analysis? It is here where the idea of foreign policy may be useful in understanding today's efforts to address environmental problems that – like foreign policy itself – are so often about what happens both within and beyond national borders. Foreign policy *analysis*, a discipline that arguably had its heyday more than a generation ago, captures variables that are seldom fully examined by methods of studying environmental issues from mostly national or mostly international perspectives.

How can foreign policy be analyzed? Kenneth Thompson and Roy Macridis describe "ideological" and "analytical" approaches to analyzing foreign policy, advocating the latter (Thompson and Macridis 1976: 2–5). The former approach sees foreign policies as the consequences of "prevailing political, social, and religious beliefs" (ibid.: 2). From a psychological viewpoint, foreign policy analysis "looks to the motives or ideologies of leaders or governments as essential, if not the sole, determinant of policy" (ibid.: 3). In contrast, the analytical approach proposes that policy "rests on multiple determinants, including the state's historic tradition, geographic location, national interest, and purposes and security needs. To understand foreign policy, the observer must take into account and analyze a host of factors" (ibid.: 3). Thompson and Macridis argue that foreign policy is "susceptible to analysis in terms of a checklist of elements that exist, that can be identified, and that merge and comprise the bases of foreign policy" (ibid.: 5). This checklist of significant factors in the study of foreign policy includes: (1) "relatively permanent" *material elements* (i.e., geography and natural resources), "less permanent" material elements (i.e., industrial and military establishments, changes in industrial and military capacity), quantitative human elements (population) and qualitative human elements (policy-makers and leaders; the roles of ideology and information); (2) foreign policy-making *process* (executive agencies and legislatures) and non-governmental agencies (political parties, interest groups, media, public opinion); and (3) *trends and ideas*, such as national purposes of security, power and economic development (ibid.: 6). To these national purposes we can add environmental sustainability and "environmental security" (Pirages and Cousins 2005).

Michael Brecher, Blema Steinberg and Janice Stein propose an approach to foreign policy analysis, the "foreign policy system," which comprises a classification of foreign policy components into three categories – inputs, process and outputs – and which is "constantly absorbing demands and channeling them into a policy machine which transforms these inputs into decisions or outputs" (Brecher *et al.* 1969: 80). The *inputs* include the external (global, bilateral, etc.) and internal (economic capability, political structure, interest groups, etc.) environments, communication (including the media), and the "psychological environment" (ideology, personalities, pressure from elites, etc.). The *process* consists of the formulation of strategic and tactical decisions in traditional foreign policy areas (e.g., military–security, political–diplomatic, economic–developmental, cultural–status) and

the implementation of decisions by governmental actors. The *outputs* are the substance of those decisions (ibid.: 80). Brecher, Steinberg, and Stein believe that this sort of foreign policy analysis will achieve "an operationally viable method to explore state behavior in depth and breadth" (ibid.: 93).

Harold Jacobson and William Zimmerman argued that "traditional" explanations of foreign policy can be categorized according to five variables: systemic, environmental, societal, governmental and idiosyncratic/psychological (Jacobson and Zimmerman 1969: 7–9). The *systemic* approach sees foreign policy behavior resulting from the "nature of the international system of which [states] are a part, or because of the role which they [states] have been assigned or have chosen to play within the system" (ibid.: 7). In contrast, the other approaches focus on the characteristics of individual states as being the key variables. The *environmental* approach focuses on a state's geography and raw materials. The *societal* approach sees societal forces and national "personality" as important explanatory variables for analysis. The *governmental* approach examines the characteristics of the ruling regime and the state's system of government. The *idiosyncratic/psychological* approach focuses on personalities. As Jacobson and Zimmerman see it, of these approaches to explaining foreign policy, the systemic approaches are "the most elegant and esthetically attractive. [But] They are also the most difficult to relate to empirical reality" and they "give little indication of the dynamic of state behavior" (ibid.: 9). This is not to say that any one of the other approaches is ideal; each provides valuable insights even while failing to establish a validated theory of foreign policy (ibid.: 10).

Valerie Hudson and Christopher Vore (1995: 212–38) describe three types of foreign policy analysis: comparative foreign policy, foreign policy decision-making and foreign policy context.³ *Comparative* foreign policy has sought to "tease out cross-nationally applicable generalizations about the foreign policy behavior of states in a systematic and scientific fashion" (ibid.: 212).⁴ Rosenau, perhaps the foremost proponent of comparative foreign policy (see Rosenau 1968), in particular, wanted scholars to develop "middle-range theory – theory that mediated between grand principles and the complexity of reality," and he emphasized the integration of information derived from several levels of analysis – from the international system, at one extreme, to the individual decision-maker, at the other (Hudson and Vore 1995: 213; see Rosenau 1966). Rosenau wanted explanations of foreign policy that were "multilevel and multicausal, synthesizing information from a variety of social science knowledge systems" (Hudson and Vore 1995: 213). He took a behavioralist, "scientific" approach to comparative foreign policy (ibid.: 215).

Analysis of foreign policy *decision-making* (ibid.: 213–17; see Snyder *et al.* 1963 and Gold 1978) seeks to illuminate the roles of foreign policy-making in groups, organizations and bureaucracies (the so-called bureaucratic politics approach), and notably the nexus of policy objectives and implementation. This perspective seeks to show how "'rational' foreign policy-making

can be upended by the political entities through which decision makers must work," often because there is "slippage" between policy-making and implementation (Hudson and Vore 1995: 217). The study of foreign policy *context* examines the "psycho-milieu of the individuals and groups making a foreign policy decision" (ibid.: 213) notably the "beliefs, attitudes, values, experiences, emotions, and conceptions of nation and self," as well as the "milieu of decision making that includes culture, history, geography, economics, political institutions, ideology, demographics, and innumerable other factors [that] shape society context in which the decision maker operates" (ibid.: 217; see Sprout and Sprout 1965). From this perspective, the characteristics of individual decision-makers, their perceptions and misperceptions, national attributes of countries, opinions of elites and the masses, societal groups, cultural and social factors – as well as the international system in which these actors operate – matter greatly in determining (and understanding) foreign policy (Hudson and Vore 1995: 217–19, 226). Importantly, the boundaries between these approaches – and of course the real-world actors, institutions and forces they illuminate – often overlap.

Much of foreign policy analysis is about ascertaining how domestic politics, agencies and forces shape foreign policies. Northredge (1968: 23) argued that:

There is virtually nothing existing within the borders of a state, from the politics of the parish pump to the literature the nation reads, which does not have some influence on the postures its government assumes in international affairs. The problem for the observer is one of forming a framework of ideas in terms of which these multitudinous and varied pressures can be handled.

He referred to the "mental hinterland of foreign policy," which includes things like "manners of conducting public affairs in a given country, the political mental [*sic*] habits and inarticulate major premises of a nation colored by tradition and reflected in government policies" (ibid.: 23–4). That this "political style" can profoundly influence foreign policy needs to be considered in foreign policy analysis, even if that means considering a complex set of variables. Thus, Hudson and Vore (1995: 210) point out:

for scholars involved in foreign policy analysis, "the national interest," a concept that lies at the heart of the realist analysis of IR [international relations], is more productively viewed as the interests of various players – not all of which may coincide, and not all of which are coherently related to anything resembling an objective national interest.

This is why, in large measure, foreign policy analysis "focuses on the people and units that comprise the state" (ibid.: 210).

There is of course only so much we can expect from foreign policy analysis. As Macridis (1958; quoted in Brecher *et al.* 1969: 76) put it, "to attempt

generalizations and construction of models that will give us a rigorous scientific understanding and prediction of foreign policy is a hopeless task." Indeed, while systemic theories of International Relations are parsimonious, they can be unsatisfying to many analysts of environmental affairs. To be sure, foreign policy analysis can be data-intensive, time-consuming and often requires expertise in specific countries and regions (Hudson and Vore 1995: 211). However, what some scholars may see as a drawback of foreign policy analysis – its lack of parsimony – may be its strength: it is more realistic.

Hudson and Vore (ibid.: 228) summarize foreign policy analysis as "a bridging field linking international relations theory, comparative politics, and the foreign policy-making community." This latter characteristic is important because it suggests that scholarship can help policy-makers (and other actors) achieve their objectives. The best foreign policy analysis arguably helps bridge the gap between theory and scholarship, on the one hand, and foreign policy practice, on the other (see George 1993 and Zelikow 1994). Berkowitz, Bock and Vincent (1977:11) sum up foreign policy analysis approaches in many respects: "the fundamental issue is *the composition of the 'mix' of foreign and domestic elements within a single policy-making process*, and the effects of this mix on the interaction of political institutions in specific cases." The upshot is that, as William Olson and A.J.R. Groom (1991: 170) put it, foreign policy analysts should recognize that "the distinction between domestic and international politics is confusing, and should be dropped."

Environmental foreign policy and its analysis

Environmental foreign policy can be conceived of as the interplay between domestic forces, institutions and actors involved in environmental decision-making and the implementation of environmental policies, and international forces, institutions and actors, such as environmental changes themselves and their interaction with other forces (e.g., globalization), international organizations and regimes, and influential governments, corporations and non-governmental organizations with a role in shaping human responses to environmental changes.⁵ From a policy perspective, environmental foreign policy is about the international *environmental* objectives that officials of national governments seek to attain; the values and principles underlying them; the methods by which the objectives are sought; the processes by which these objectives, values and principles, and methods are developed and implemented; and the domestic and international actors and forces – including but not exclusively environmental ones – shaping environmental policies and actions, both at home and abroad, and which have some international or external character. To be sure, this is a lot to digest, which is one reason why we might have to bite it off in smaller pieces – something that theory can help us do (see Part I and especially Chapter 2).

Foreign policy objectives, actors and processes can be central in determining whether countries cooperate to address environmental problems.

What is particularly important about *foreign policy* for our understanding of *environmental policy* within and among states is that it involves the *crossover and interaction* between domestic politics and processes, on the one hand, and international relations and institutions ("global politics"), on the other. Looking at purely local or international variables seldom explains environmental policies and agreements. Indeed, environmental issues are often distinctive in the manner in which they ignore state borders; problems in one country affect other countries, and problems restricted to one country often require the involvement of other countries (e.g., through financial assistance and technology transfer) if they are to be resolved or remain local. *Many* issues, actors and forces acting domestically and internationally affect and influence countries' national environmental regulations and their environmental foreign policies, and hence they impact international environmental cooperation. Yet, despite obvious (albeit not fully comprehended) connections between local and international policy processes, many studies of environmental policy do not adequately account for the foreign policy aspects of environmental protection efforts, and frequently ignore foreign policy altogether.

Many environmental policy officials are simultaneously pressured to follow international norms and promote national interests and ideals. That is, they are buffeted by domestic *and* international forces. Thinking about foreign policy focuses our attention on interactions among domestic political preferences and positions governments take in negotiations, the balancing of economic growth and popular demands for development with foreign pressures to join environmental regimes, and the rivalries and alliances between foreign policy and domestic policy agencies and the individuals working in them (among many other considerations). A good reason for looking at foreign policy processes more systematically is because doing so can reveal important national and organizational characteristics shaping state environmental behavior, both domestically and internationally.

Foreign policy is, to be sure, about pursuing and promoting national interests. Already complexities arise, however. It is not always clear what a country's national environmental interests are or ought to be, particularly with regard to complex environmental issues, and it is almost always debatable how best to promote them (Webber and Smith 2002: 43–4). This is evidenced by the way that some governments earnestly claim, for example, that their national interests will not allow them to join robust efforts to combat climate change, but when those same governments change, as happened recently in Australia (see Chapter 13), their interests can shift, sometimes markedly, in favor of action. This is an example of how, in the words of Denny Roy, policy-making elites will disagree over national goals and how to achieve them:

Beyond its most basic formulation, the national interest is not a monolithic, objective concept, but rather a dynamic and unsettled one, subject

to constant debate. [Moreover,] powerful groups and individuals are subject to self-interested behavior, and may support the policy option they calculate will enhance their power and prestige, even if it is not necessarily the best option for the nation as a whole.

(Roy 1998: 137–8)

Thus, defining national interests and ways to achieve them is a problematic and complex undertaking, involving actors and institutions seemingly unimportant to the casual observer, even when issues and associated interests are better understood than they usually are in environmental cases. These difficulties are especially likely with environmental issues, which depend on often uncertain or contested science, helping to explain why countries often fail to respond to environmental changes even when those changes are apparent to prominent environmental scientists, activists and even many government officials, as with the failure of the United States to fully join the global climate change regime (see Harris 2000 and Chalecki 2009).

It would be fatuous to suggest that it is possible to *completely* abstract out the forces of foreign policy, particularly if foreign policy is broadly defined. Foreign policy cannot be separated completely from, for example, domestic politics and institutions, at one end of a spectrum, and global regimes and international power balances, at the other end. To suggest this would be just as absurd as suggesting that almost everything that is important can be explained by the international distribution of power (cf. Waltz 1979) – if so, why are "weak" states often so powerful in international environmental politics, as Malaysia and others were in thwarting American efforts at the 1992 Earth Summit to agree a forest treaty? – or domestic interests (cf. Milner 1997) – why, then, do some states adhere to international environmental norms, as have some Eastern European states, even when, by any reasonable measure, important local interests would not be advantaged, or would even be harmed, by doing so? What is useful, perhaps, is to go beyond thinking in terms of domestic and international levels of analysis to a "two-levels-plus" game (see Putnam 1988; Evans *et al.* 1993). That is, we can consider international political dynamics along with national politics and domestic policy-making processes, but we can also think *explicitly* about the additional "level" of foreign policy processes, features of which almost always fall between, but simultaneously overlap, international and domestic factors.

Foreign policy analysis is well suited to studying responses to environmental changes because, to use the words of Rosenau, it considers the "continuing erosion of the distinction between domestic and foreign issues, between the sociopolitical and economic processes that unfold at home and those that transpire abroad" (Rosenau 1987: 3). Applying foreign policy analysis to environmental policy generally may result in interesting findings simply because it is an approach quite distinct from many others and because environmental issues often share with other foreign policy issues

high levels of uncertainty, geographically and often temporally distant impacts, and major disparities in stakeholders' characteristics, capabilities and interests.

Environmental foreign policy in theory and practice

The chapters that follow adopt a variety of potent approaches to understanding the environmental foreign policies of a variety of states, in the process, illuminating important variables that can help us understand why governments and other actors have attempted to deal with environmental problems – or failed to do so. The book is divided into two parts. Part I focuses on theory of environmental foreign policy. Part II presents a number of case studies of environmental foreign policy in practice.

Theory

In Part I, contributors explore a range of theories of environmental foreign policy. In Chapter 2, John Barkdull and Paul G. Harris identify some areas of theoretical inquiry related to environmental foreign policy. They argue that explanations for the environmental foreign policies of states are necessary for a full understanding of global environmental politics. States make the critical decisions on the entire range of environmental issues, from protecting endangered species to regulating the trade in toxic wastes to addressing global climate change. Yet, significant gaps remain in the scholarly research on how and why states decide their foreign policies on the environment. The vast literature on global environmental politics pertains primarily to international relations rather than to the state-level variables that also determine foreign policy behavior. Barkdull and Harris attempt to begin remedying this gap in theory, in part, by suggesting directions for further research on environmental foreign policy.

Continuing our look at theory, in Chapter 3, Loren R. Cass explores symbolism and "signaling tools" in environmental foreign policy. He points out that environmental foreign policy in practice is frequented with examples of states rhetorically affirming international action to address environmental threats while accepting international commitments that are never implemented. This situation raises troubling questions for the study of environmental foreign policy and compliance with international environmental commitments. One frequent explanation for failure to fulfill commitments is that governments undertake international obligations in good faith but then fail to fulfill them due to domestic political obstacles to implementation. While this is certainly true in many cases, Cass argues that governments frequently utilize environmental foreign policy as a symbolic signaling tool to manage state identities in the eyes of both domestic and international constituencies.

In a similar vein, in Chapter 4, Thomas L. Brewer looks at how theory can help us to better understand both government and business responses to

environmental problems. He shows how theories of pluralistic politics and public choice can advance our understanding of environmental foreign policy-making. These theories of political economy link macro-level variables, including government policies, to the micro-level features of corporate behavior. The linkage between the macro and micro levels becomes particularly evident in a cross-national comparative analytic perspective, which Brewer utilizes. The specific focus of his chapter is business-government interactions in US responses to climate change. Because climate change involves externalities and market failures, there is an argument for government intervention on the grounds of economic efficiency. At the same time, however, governments are creating new markets – specifically markets for greenhouse gas emissions credits.

Continuing the theme of exploring ways of explaining and simplifying – that is, theorizing about – complexities in international environmental affairs, in Chapter 5 Maximilian Mayer and Friedrich Arndt explore divergent visualizations of environmental change and their connections to politics. They use visualizations as heuristic devices for theorizing environmental foreign policy. After introducing divergent visualizations of the environment in industrialized and developing countries, they discuss the connections of these perceptions with strategic discourses in public and in foreign policy. They argue that analysis of these discourses, while providing important insights for analysis, does not get to the core of the issue. Drawing on work from the field of Science Studies, their chapter employs the notion of "socio-nature," which is produced by a complex of political, scientific, technological and cultural practices in which strategic discourses are embedded. Socio-nature overcomes dualist accounts of nature and reveals central variables for the analysis of environmental foreign policy. Indeed, as Arndt and Mayer argue by way of example, opposing views of greenhouse gas emissions from industrialized and developing countries can be understood as stemming from different underlying socio-natures.⁶

Practice

In Part II, the theories presented in Part I, and indeed additional theories, are deployed to analyze and explore the practice of environmental foreign policy. We begin in Chapter 6 with a case study from Africa by David R. Mutekanga. Mutekanga examines the evolution of Uganda's environmental foreign policy on the Convention on Biological Diversity. Uganda is a biodiversity hotspot with a history of poverty, internal conflicts, and military dictatorship. Despite these vulnerabilities, and often because of them, Mutekanga believes that Uganda is in great need of increased tourism and investment from abroad. His chapter describes the role of the major players in Uganda's environmental policies and related foreign policies, including the office of the president, parliament, ministries for environment and foreign affairs, and nongovernmental organizations. Mutekanga argues

for transparency in national and local policies, including their regular review, and for a national planning authority able to ensure that Uganda's foreign policy addresses environmental issues. He also recommends enhanced collaboration and synergy between national-level environmental and foreign policies so as to minimize conflict, especially in policy implementation, among ministries and stakeholders.

In Chapter 7, Isabella Alcañiz and Ricardo A. Gutiérrez explore the environmental foreign policy of Argentina. In 2005, neighbors of a small Argentine city bordering on Uruguay began protesting the planned construction of two pulp plants on the Uruguayan side of the shared Uruguay River. Protesters blocked bridges that connect the two countries, claiming pollution from the plants would devastate the local fishing and tourist industry. They demanded that Uruguay halt construction. As the demonstrations grew, the governments of Argentina and Uruguay became involved, eventually taking the dispute to Mercosur, the World Bank and the International Court of Justice. How did a small-scale environmental protest quickly escalate into an international dispute between two historically allied states? The adoption of radical tactics by mostly middle-class protesters coupled with overlapping jurisdictions in water policy quickly internationalized the conflict. Furthermore, the salience of the issue and the lack of an autonomous environmental agency in Argentina pushed the government to adopt the protesters' agenda, resulting in a new environmental foreign policy for Argentina.

In Chapter 8, Mika Merviö studies Finnish environmental foreign policy. Merviö argues that, in their environmental foreign policies, the Finns constantly redefine their roles as a member of Western international organizations (the European Union, the United Nations and the Nordic group of countries); as speakers of a Finno-Ugric, non-Indo-European language; and as a neighbor to Russia. With multiple cultural identities and relatively high awareness of global environmental problems, Merviö believes that the Finns are well placed to understand the need to build supranational institutions to deal with global environmental issues. His chapter shows how Finland's environmental foreign policy is far less "idealistic" or openly nationalistic than that of its Nordic neighbors and, as such, he demonstrates how and why Finland has a more consensual and pragmatist approach to global issues, including environmental ones.

As Ken Wilkening and Charles Thrift argue in Chapter 9, effective lead states are vital to international environmental problem solving. But why do certain states become leaders while others do not? In their case study of another country bordering the Arctic, Wilkening and Thrift look at the historical development of Canada's foreign policy related to international efforts to address global pollution from persistent organic pollutants. They show that a conjunction of actors and factors, especially some related to interests and ideas, explains Canada's foreign policy and particularly its scientific and political leadership. The key actors have been federal ministries,

the scientific Northern Contaminants Program, aboriginal groups and environmental organizations. The key factors that bound these actors together are cooperation, consultation, and collaboration. This dynamic of actors and factors propelled Canada to leadership status in international efforts to regulate persistent organic pollutants.

One vector and repository of persistent organic pollutants is water. In Chapter 10, Sara Hughes and Lena Partzsch look at the water-related foreign policies of the United States and the European Union. They draw upon the latest research in sustainable water governance to show that water-related foreign policy programs that have been developed by the United States and the European Union have been useful in meeting many important United Nations' technology- and target-driven Millennium Development Goals. However, Hughes and Partzsch argue that those programs have been less well suited to meeting long-term social and environmental objectives. Their case study locates water foreign policy between well-developed domestic regulations and emerging networks and paradigms at the global level. It shows how and why environmental criteria can be fully integrated into target setting and evaluation criteria for foreign policies related to water.

Turning to environmental foreign policy as practiced in Asia, in Chapter 11, Yohei Harashima undertakes an analytical case study of the relationship between trade and the environment. The aim of his chapter is to identify the positions of Asian developing countries at negotiations of the World Trade Organization's (WTO) Committee on Trade and Environment (CTE). While the WTO/CTE has not produced concrete results concerning its mandate, a definite change can be seen in the negotiating positions of developing countries in Asia, as many of them are now participating proactively in WTO/CTE negotiations. Harashima's case study shows the diversity of views on trade and environment that are held by Asian countries. In some cases, their views oppose each other. He also observes that the negotiating positions of each Asian country in the WTO/CTE are closely related to their trade structures, which are derived largely from progress made in the pursuit of their individual national development strategies. As such, the case study in Chapter 12 demonstrates the importance of looking at international *and* domestic variables when searching for explanations of environment-related foreign policies.

Chapter 12, written by Aike Müller, builds on the foreign aid literature and provides a detailed empirical account of financial flows for environmental purposes. By examining internationally financed water and other environmental projects, Müller shows that environmental aid burdens are not shared equally among donor countries. Nordic countries especially, along with Japan and Switzerland, have shared above-average burdens. This can be explained by varying priorities in donor states and by a set of influential variables, including social expenditure, public debt, military spending and the place of green parties in national parliaments. Müller tests the significance of these variables in a statistical analysis of multilateral environmental aid to the United Nations' Global Environment Facility. The main

determinants of the environmental foreign policies she examines are rooted at the domestic level of the donor countries. Müller concludes that domestic factors, as well as state structures, have an especially strong impact on the conduct of environmental foreign policy when money is involved.

We conclude the book with a chapter by Mihaela Papa highlighting many of the theoretical findings from this volume and from additional studies. As Papa shows, despite the fact that the relationship between foreign policy and the environment has been the subject of much debate in academic and policy-making circles, conceptual issues relating to environmental foreign policy have received very little treatment. In response, Chapter 13 provides a comprehensive discussion of the concept of environmental foreign policy, clarifies its meaning and develops a framework for analyzing it. Papa considers the willingness of governments to act on environmental issues in their foreign policies, and explores the opportunities for such action to occur more frequently. Her chapter shows that the challenge of environmental foreign policy is the need for both individual and collective action: It fundamentally questions the responsibilities of states within the contemporary global system.

The upshot is that by thinking more consciously in terms of *foreign policy*, the contributors to this volume illuminate some of the most important actors, ideas and forces shaping the world's responses to pollution and our overuse of natural resources. If taken seriously, their case studies not only can help us understand what is being done to protect the environment, but they can also help policy-makers and stakeholders find new avenues for action to avert further environmental decline and possibly, in the case of climate change, help to avert catastrophe.

Notes

- 1 A partial exception is the field of political ecology, although work in this field usually overlooks foreign policy processes and many of the domestic-global interactions encompassed by environmental foreign policy analysis. See, for example, Neumann (2005).
- 2 For a good summary of the range of interpretations of this term, see Cooper (1972). See also Chapter 13 in this volume. I develop these arguments and apply them to the cases of China, Japan and the United States in Harris (2008).
- 3 Hudson and Vore (1995) further identify three foundational works for these categories: Rosenau (1966); Snyder *et al.* (1954); and Sprout and Sprout (1956).
- 4 For a comprehensive discussion of comparative foreign policy analysis, see Andriole *et al.* (1975).
- 5 See also Chapter 13. In this section I draw on my chapters in Harris (2005, 2007).
- 6 For a variety of case studies exploring the foreign policy of climate change *per se*, see the companion to this volume: Harris (2009).

References

- Andriole, Stephen J., Wilkenfeld, Jonathan and Hopple, Gerald W. (1975) "A Framework for the Comparative Analysis of Foreign Policy Behavior," *International Studies Quarterly*, 19(2): 160-98.

- Berkowitz, Morton, Bock, P.G. and Fuccillo, Vincent J. (1977) *The Politics of American Foreign Policy*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Brecher, Michael, Steinberg, Blema and Stein, Janice (1969) "A Framework for Research on Foreign Policy Behavior," *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 13(1): 75-94.
- Breitmeier, Helmut, Young, Oran R. and Zurn, Michael (2006) *Analyzing International Environmental Regimes*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Chalecki, Elizabeth L. (2009) "Exceptionalism as Foreign Policy: US Climate Change Policy and an Emerging Norm of Compliance," in Paul G. Harris (ed.) *Climate Change and Foreign Policy*, London: Routledge.
- Cooper, Richard N. (1972) "Economic Interdependence and Foreign Policy in the Seventies," *World Politics*, 24(2): 159-81.
- Evans, Peter B., Jacobson, Harold K. and Putnam, Robert D. (1993) *Double-Edged Diplomacy*, Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- George, Alexander L. (1993) *Bridging the Gap: Theory and Practice in Foreign Policy*, Washington, DC: United States Institute of Peace.
- Gerner, Deborah J. (1995) "The Evolution of the Study of Foreign Policy," in Laura Neack, Jeanne A.K. Hey, and Patrick J. Haney (eds) *Foreign Policy Analysis*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Gold, Hyam (1978) "Foreign Policy Decision-Making and the Environment: The Claims of Snyder, Brecher, and the Sprouts," *International Studies Quarterly*, 22(4): 569-86.
- Harris, Paul G. (ed.) (2000) *Climate Change and American Foreign Policy*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- (2005) *Confronting Environmental Change in East and Southeast Asia*, London: Earthscan/United University Press.
- (2007) *Europe and Global Climate Change*, Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- (2008) "Bringing the In-Between Back In: Foreign Policy in Global Environmental Politics," *Politics and Policy*, 36(6).
- (ed.) (2009) *Climate Change and Foreign Policy: Case Studies from East to West*, London: Routledge.
- Hudson, Valerie M. and Vore, Christopher S. (1995) "Foreign Policy Analysis Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow," *Mershon International Studies Review*, 39: 212-38.
- Jacobson, Harold Karan and Zimmerman, William (1969) *The Shaping of Foreign Policy*, New York: Atherton Press.
- Kegley, Charles W. and Wittkopf, Eugene R. (1996) *American Foreign Policy*, New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Lafferty, William M. and Meadowcroft, James (2001) *Implementing Sustainable Development*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Macridis, Roy C. (1958) "Introductory Remarks," in Roy C. Macridis (ed.) *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Milner, Helen V. (1997) *Interests, Institutions, and Information*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Morse, Edward L. (1970) "The Transformation of Foreign Policies: Modernization, Interdependence, and Externalization," *World Politics*, 22(3): 371-92.
- Neumann, Roderick P. (2005) *Making Political Ecology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Northredge, F.S. (1968) "The Nature of Foreign Policy," in F.S. Northredge (ed.) *The Foreign Policies of the Powers*, New York: Free Press.
- Olson, William C. and Groom, A.J.R. (1991) *International Relations Then and Now*, London: HarperCollins Academic.

- Pirages, Dennis and Cousins, Ken (eds) (2005) *From Resource Scarcity to Ecological Security*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Putnam, Robert D. (1988) "Diplomacy and Domestic Politics: The Logic of Two-Level Games," *International Organization*, 19: 345-66.
- Neumann, Roderick P. (2005) *Making Political Ecology*, New York: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenau, James N. (1966) "Pre-theories and Theories of Foreign Policy," in R. Barry Farrell (ed.) *Approaches in Comparative International Politics*, Evanston, IL: Northwestern University Press.
- (1968) "Comparative Foreign Policy: Fad, Fantasy, or Field," *International Studies Quarterly*, 12(3): 296-329.
- (1987) "Introduction: New Directions and Recurrent Questions in the Comparative Study of Foreign Policy," in Charles F. Hermann, Charles W. Kegley, Jr., and James N. Rosenau (eds) *New Directions in the Study of Foreign Policy*, Winchester, MA: Unwin Hyman.
- Roy, Denny (1998) "Restructuring Foreign and Defense Policy: The People's Republic of China," in Anthony McGrew and Christopher Brook (eds.) *Asia-Pacific in the New World Order*, London: Routledge.
- Snyder, Richard C., Bruck, H.W. and Sapin, Burton (1954) *Decision-Making as an Approach to the Study of International Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1963) *Foreign Policy Decision-Making*, Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Sprout, Harold, and Sprout, Margaret (1956) *Man-Milieu Relationship Hypotheses in the Context of International Politics*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- (1965) *The Ecological Perspective on Human Affairs with Special Reference to International Relations*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Thompson, Kenneth W. and Macridis, Roy C. (1976) "The Comparative Study of Foreign Policy," in Roy C. Macridis (ed.) *Foreign Policy in World Politics*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Waltz, Kenneth (1979) *Theory of International Politics*, Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Webber, Mark, and Smith, Michael (2002) *Foreign Policy in a Transformed World*, Harlow: Prentice Hall.
- Zelikow, Philip (1994) "Foreign Policy Engineering: From Theory to Practice and Back Again," *International Security*, 18(4): 143-71.

Part I

Theory