

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

1

The North–South Divide in International Environmental
Law: Framing the Issues*Sumudu Atapattu and Carmen G. Gonzalez*

1. INTRODUCTION

The unprecedented degradation of the planet's vital ecosystems is one of the most pressing issues confronting the international community today. From the 1972 Stockholm Conference on the Human Environment¹ through the 2012 Rio +20 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development,² the international community has responded to this crisis by adopting numerous treaties, declarations, UN General Assembly resolutions, customary rules, and judicial decisions that address specific environmental threats.

Despite the proliferation of laws and legal instruments to combat environmental degradation, the global economy continues to exceed ecosystem limits, thereby jeopardizing the health and well-being of present and future generations and threatening the integrity of the planet's biodiversity.³ States differ in their contribution to global ecological destruction, their vulnerability to environmental harm, their capacity to address environmental problems, and the economic and political power they wield in multilateral environmental negotiations. While international cooperation is necessary to address global environmental degradation, the global environmental agenda has often been dominated by the priorities and concerns of affluent countries (such as nature conservation). The concerns of poor countries (such as social and economic development and poverty alleviation) are frequently marginalized.⁴

¹ UN, *Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment*, Stockholm, Sweden, 5–16 June 1972, UN Doc. A/Conf.48/14/Rev. 1.

² UN, *Report of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development*, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil, 20–22 June 2012, UN Doc. A/Conf.216/16.

³ United Nations Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, *Ecosystems and Human Well-Being: Synthesis* (Washington, DC: Island Press, 2005), pp. 1–24.

⁴ R. Anand, *International Environmental Justice: A North-South Dimension* (Hampshire: Ashgate, 2004), pp. 3–6; C. G. Gonzalez, "Beyond Eco-Imperialism: An Environmental Justice Critique of Free Trade" (2001) 78 *Denver University Law Review* 979 at 985–986.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Because environmental issues are closely intertwined with economic issues, international environmental law has been and continues to be the site of intense contestation over environmental priorities, over the allocation of responsibility for current and historic environmental harm, and over the relationship between economic development and environmental protection. These conflicts have often resulted in inadequate compliance with existing environmental agreements as well as deadlocks in ongoing treaty negotiations, most notably climate change negotiations.⁵

2. SIGNIFICANCE OF THE VOLUME

This volume examines the ways in which the North–South divide has compromised the effectiveness of international environmental law and proposes a variety of strategies to bridge the divide. In this volume, the terms *North* and *South* distinguish wealthy industrialized nations (including the United States, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, Japan, and the member states of the European Union) from their generally less prosperous counterparts in Asia, Africa, and Latin America. Despite its heterogeneity, the global South shares a history of Northern economic and political domination, and Southern nations have often negotiated as a bloc (the Group of 77 plus China) to demand greater equity in international economic and environmental law.⁶

However, this volume also recognizes the conflicts and tensions *within* the North and the South. As the negotiations over climate change illustrate, the environmental priorities of certain Southern states, such as India and China, often diverge from those of more ecologically vulnerable nations, such as the small island states.⁷ Furthermore, China's growing economic clout in the global South and middle-income Southern nations' acquisition of agricultural lands in Asia, Africa, and Latin America for biofuels production and to satisfy domestic food needs (the so-called land grabs) have generated South–South debates about sustainable investment.⁸ Similarly, the European Union and the United States have frequently clashed over environmental policy, most notably over the regulation of genetically modified organisms and toxic chemicals and over efforts to address climate change.⁹

⁵ Anand, note 4, pp. 5–9, 126–131.

⁶ C. G. Gonzalez, "Environmental Justice and International Environmental Law," in S. Alam, M. J. H. Bhuiyan, T. M. R. Chowdhury, and E. J. Techera (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of International Environmental Law* (New York: Routledge, 2013), 77–97, p. 81.

⁷ See chapter 20, M. Burkett, "A Justice Paradox: Climate Change, Small Island Developing States, and the Absence of International Legal Remedy"; and chapter 10, R. Maguire and X. Jiang, "Emerging Powerful Southern Voices: Role of BASIC Nations in Shaping Climate Change Mitigation Commitments."

⁸ T. Ferrando, "Land Grabbing Under the Cover of Law: Are BRICS–South Relationships any Different?" September 2014, www.tni.org. See chapter 11, C. Oguanaman, "Sustainable Development in the Era of Bioenergy and Agricultural Land Grab."

⁹ D. E. Adelman, "A Cautiously Optimistic Appraisal of Trends in Toxics Regulation" (2010) 12 *Washington University Journal of Law and Public Policy* 377; C. G. Gonzalez, "Genetically

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Sumudu Atapattu and Carmen G. Gonzalez

3

A systematic examination of international environmental law from a North–South perspective has never been conducted, and this volume seeks to fill that void. While some scholars have analyzed the North–South divide in relation to particular environmental problems¹⁰ or principles¹¹ and have investigated how the colonial encounter shaped the doctrines and institutions of international law,¹² this is the first volume that examines the North–South divide in international environmental law in its historical context.

This book also acknowledges the important role of non-state actors in this field. For example, transnational corporations can serve as a significant source of financing for climate change mitigation and adaptation,¹³ and corporate environmental and social responsibility initiatives have proliferated in recent years.¹⁴ However, multinational companies headquartered in the North have been responsible for many of the environmental and human rights violations in the South,¹⁵ as demonstrated by the *Ogoniland* case in Nigeria¹⁶ and the litigation against Chevron in Ecuador.¹⁷ Since they operate in the gray zone between international law and national law, transnational corporations have traditionally escaped scrutiny and accountability at the international level.¹⁸ International trade, investment, and financial institutions (such as the World Bank, the World Trade Organization,

Modified Organisms and Justice: The International Environmental Justice Implications of Biotechnology” (2007) 19 *Georgetown Environmental Law Review* 583; see Chapter 10 R. Maguire and X. Jiang, “Emerging Powerful Southern Voices: Role of BASIC Nations in Shaping Climate Change Mitigation Commitments”.

¹⁰ Anand, note 4 (examining the North–South divide in relation to climate change, ozone depletion, and the hazardous water trade); K. Mickelson, “Leading Toward a Level Playing Field, Repaying Ecological Debt, or Making Environmental Space: Three Stories About International Environmental Cooperation” (2005) 43 *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 138; K. Mickelson, “Competing Narratives of Justice in North–South Environmental Relations: The Case of Ozone Layer Depletion,” in J. Ebbesson and P. Okowa (eds.), *Environmental Law and Justice in Context* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2009).

¹¹ L. Rajamani, *Differential Treatment in International Environmental Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

¹² R. Falk, B. Rajagopal, and J. Stevens (eds.), *International Law and the Third World: Reshaping Justice* (New York: Routledge-Cavendish, 2008).

¹³ United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Secretariat, “Investment and Financial Flows to Address Climate Change,” 2007, <http://unfccc.int>.

¹⁴ L. Catá Backer, “Multinational Corporations, Transnational Law: The United Nation’s Norms on the Responsibility of Transnational Corporations as Harbingers of Corporate Social Responsibility as International Law” (2006) 37 *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 287.

¹⁵ B. Stephens, “The Amoral of Profit: Transnational Corporations and Human Rights” (2002) 20 *Berkeley Journal of International Law* 45 at 49–53.

¹⁶ See *Social and Economic Rights Action Center and Center for Economic and Social Rights v. Nigeria* (the *Ogoniland Case*), Case No. ACHPR/COMM/AO44/1, OAUDoc.CAB/LEG/67/3 (2001), www.achpr.org/files/sessions/30th/comunications/155.96/achpr30_155_96_eng.pdf.

¹⁷ M. A. Gómez, “The Global Chase: Seeking Recognition and Enforcement of the Lago Agrio Judgment Outside of Ecuador” (2013) 1 *Stanford Journal of Complex Litigation* 429; S. Romero and C. Krauss, “Ecuador Orders Chevron to Pay \$9 Billion,” *New York Times*, 14 February 2011.

¹⁸ P. Simons, “International Law’s Invisible Hand and the Future of Corporate Accountability for Violations of Human Rights” (2012) 3 *Journal of Human Rights and the Environment* 5.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

and the International Monetary Fund) and sovereign wealth funds have likewise influenced both economic and environmental policy in the global South.¹⁹ Finally, the book discusses the impact of indigenous mobilization, grassroots social movements, and transnational networks on the evolution of international environmental law.²⁰ These examples illustrate that the international community includes a range of actors and that it has moved away from the state-centric notion of traditional international law.

Virtually all areas of environmental concern display North–South divisions, and this volume has chosen some of these issues for in-depth analysis: water conflicts,²¹ access to food,²² forests and indigenous peoples,²³ trade,²⁴ investment,²⁵ energy,²⁶ extractive industries,²⁷ human rights,²⁸ climate change,²⁹ biodiversity,³⁰ land grabs,³¹ and the hazardous waste trade.³² While it is impossible to cover all environmental issues that give rise to the North–South divide in one volume, the

¹⁹ See chapter 17, B. J. Richardson, “International Environmental Law and Sovereign Wealth Funds”; chapter 14, S. Alam, “Trade and the Environment: Perspectives from the Global South”; chapter 15, S. Puvimanasinghe, “From a Divided Heritage to a Common Future? International Investment Law, Human Rights, and Sustainable Development”; chapter 19, C. G. Gonzalez, “Food Justice: An Environmental Justice Critique of the Global Food System”; and chapter 28, J. Razzaque, “Access to Remedies in Environmental Matters and the North–South Divide.”

²⁰ See chapter 18, S. L. Seck, “Transnational Corporations and Extractive Industries”; chapter 21, E. A. Kronk Warner, “South of South: Examining the International Climate Regime from an Indigenous Perspective”; chapter 22, J. Dugard and E. Koek, “Water Wars: Anti-Privatization Struggles in the Global South”; and chapter 24, D. Bonilla Maldonado, “International Law, Cultural Diversity, and the Environment: The Case of the General Forestry Law in Colombia.”

²¹ See chapter 22, J. Dugard and E. Koek, “Water Wars: Anti-Privatization Struggles in the Global South.”

²² See chapter 19, C. G. Gonzalez, “Food Justice: An Environmental Justice Critique of the Global Food System.”

²³ See chapter 24, D. Bonilla Maldonado, “International Law, Cultural Diversity, and the Environment: The Case of the General Forestry Law in Colombia.”

²⁴ See chapter 14, S. Alam, “Trade and the Environment: Perspectives from the Global South.”

²⁵ See chapter 15, S. Puvimanasinghe, “From a Divided Heritage to a Common Future? International Investment Law, Human Rights and Sustainable Development.”

²⁶ See chapter 25, L. Guruswamy, “The Contours of Energy Justice.”

²⁷ See chapter 18, S. Seck, “Transnational Corporations and Extractive Industries.”

²⁸ See chapter 8, L. J. Kotze, “Human Rights, the Environment and the Global South.”

²⁹ See chapter 20, M. Burkett, “A Justice Paradox: Climate Change, Small Island Developing States, and the Absence of International Legal Remedy”; chapter 10, R. Maguire and X. Jiang, “Emerging Powerful Southern Voices: Role of BASIC Nations in Shaping Climate Change Mitigation Commitments”; chapter 21, E. A. Kronk Warner, “South of South: Examining the International Climate Regime from an Indigenous Perspective”; and chapter 23, P. Govind and R. R. M. Verchik, “Natural Disaster and Climate Change.”

³⁰ See chapter 9, J. Cabrera Medaglia, “Access and Benefit Sharing: North–South Challenges in Implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity and its Nagoya Protocol.”

³¹ See chapter 11, C. Oguanaman, “Sustainable Development in the Era of Bioenergy and Agricultural Land Grab.”

³² See chapter 12, Z. Lipman, “Trade in Hazardous Waste.”

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Sumudu Atapattu and Carmen G. Gonzalez*

5

book highlights several significant examples where the divide is apparent and also where positive developments and contributions have helped bridge the divide. In short, the book introduces this rich yet hitherto uncharted area of scholarship. It seeks to provide an illustrative, rather than an exhaustive, list of issues that have been particularly contentious from a North–South perspective. It differs from the traditional environmental law textbook, research handbook, or treatise because it takes the perspective of the South, and emphasizes the need to address historical inequities and inadequacies in the international environmental law regime in order to improve its effectiveness and to reduce the gap between the global North and the global South. The book also recognizes the influential role of countries such as China that straddle the North–South divide. China sometimes replicates the trade and investment patterns of Northern countries (in the land grabs, for example) while at the same time maintaining its “developing country” status by negotiating with the G-77.³³ China’s rise can produce strategic alliances that enhance the bargaining power of the South or, conversely, alliances that marginalize vulnerable states, such as the small island states and least developed countries.³⁴

Recognizing the urgent need for North–South collaboration to address the grave environmental problems confronting the international community, this volume does not restrict itself to identifying obstacles and roadblocks. On the contrary, the book discusses some of the concessions that the South has been successful in winning from the North, such as transfer of technology and establishing international funds to help the Southern countries fulfill their international obligations. However, the book recognizes that these ostensibly positive developments may create additional opportunities for the North to control the South by withholding funds or placing conditions on their use.

3. COLONIAL AND POSTCOLONIAL ORIGINS OF THE NORTH–SOUTH DIVIDE

The persistent mistrust between the global North and the global South is grounded in colonial and postcolonial economic law and policy. The European conquest of Asia, Africa, and Latin America paved the way for contemporary economic and social inequality by transforming self-sufficient economies into economic satellites of Europe, promoting slavery and indentured servitude, and wreaking havoc on the

³³ See generally Ferrando, note 8; J. T. Gathii, “Beyond China’s Human Rights Exceptionalism in Africa: Leveraging Science, Technology and Engineering for Long-Term Growth” (2013) 51 *Columbia Journal of Transnational Law* 664; C. G. Gonzalez, “China’s Engagement with Latin America: Partnership or Plunder?”, in E. Blanco and J. Razzaque (eds.), *Natural Resources and the Green Economy: Redefining the Challenges for People, States, and Corporations* (Leiden: Martinus Nijhoff Publishers, 2012), pp. 37–79.

³⁴ See chapter 10, R. Maguire and X. Jiang, “Emerging Powerful Southern Voices: Role of BASIC Nations in Shaping Climate Change Mitigation Commitments.”

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

livelihoods, ecosystems, cultures, and lifeways of indigenous peoples.³⁵ Over time, Northern countries came to specialize in capital-intensive goods and to enjoy high standards of living while the colonized territories produced minerals, agricultural products, and other raw materials for the benefit of their colonial overlords.³⁶

Most Southern countries were under colonial rule when the global North created the legal architecture for contemporary globalization. The World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), and the 1947 General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) were designed to erode state sovereignty in order to facilitate the free flow of goods, services, and capital across national borders.³⁷ This legal framework enabled the North to fuel its economic expansion through the continued exploitation of the South's natural resources, trapping Southern countries in vicious cycles of poverty and environmental degradation and widening the North–South economic divide.³⁸ Moreover, the economic policies pursued by the North resulted in global environmental harms such as acid rain, ozone depletion, and climate change, with impacts not just on the present generation but also on generations to come.³⁹

Despite commonalities in the colonial experience, it is difficult to define the “postcolonial era” because it does not include just one history and one set of countries, but rather ongoing relationships among multiple countries from the North and South.⁴⁰ However, in spite of the varied political and economic trajectories of the global South in the decades following political independence, most Southern countries were integrated into the global economy as exporters of raw materials and importers of manufactured goods.⁴¹ This economic specialization rendered Southern countries vulnerable to the declining terms of trade for primary commodities relative to manufactured goods⁴² and to the efforts of foreign investors to curtail national sovereignty in order to safeguard the profitability of their investments in resource-extractive industries.⁴³

Newly independent countries of the South banded together in the decades following World War II to create a more equitable postcolonial world order. In 1955, representatives of twenty-nine newly independent nations of Africa and Asia met in Bandung, Indonesia and vowed to promote economic cooperation, human

³⁵ C. Ponting, *A Green History of the World: The Environment and the Collapse of Great Civilizations* (New York: Penguin Books, 1991), pp. 128–140, 194–212.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

³⁷ See chapter 2, R. Islam, “History of the North–South Divide: Colonial Discourses, Sovereignty and Self-Determination.”

³⁸ Ponting, note 35, pp. 194–223.

³⁹ *Ibid.*, pp. 383–392.

⁴⁰ P. Childs and P. Williams, *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1997).

⁴¹ L. Young, *World Hunger* (New York: Routledge, 1997), p. 41.

⁴² *Ibid.*, p. 42.

⁴³ K. Miles, *The Origins of International Investment Law: Empire, Environment and the Safeguarding of Capital* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013), pp. 78–100.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

Sumudu Atapattu and Carmen G. Gonzalez

7

rights, and self-determination, and to condemn new forms of imperialism.⁴⁴ The Bandung conference served as the catalyst for the coalition of Asian, African, and Latin American states (later known as the Group of 77 plus China) that would articulate its demands for economic justice and national self-determination through a variety of legal doctrines,⁴⁵ including permanent sovereignty over natural resources,⁴⁶ the right to development,⁴⁷ and the common heritage of mankind principle.⁴⁸ Southern countries used their numerical majority in the United Nations General Assembly to attempt to establish a New International Economic Order (NIEO) that would vindicate these demands and provide debt relief, preferential access to Northern markets, and the stabilization of primary commodity export prices.⁴⁹ Southern countries also sought to redress the enduring inequalities arising from the colonial encounter through the differential and more favorable treatment of Southern countries in both international economic law (special and differential treatment) and international environmental law (common but differentiated responsibility principle).⁵⁰

The debt crisis of the 1980s and the rise of the free market model known as the Washington Consensus marked the untimely death of the NIEO.⁵¹ The structural adjustment policies imposed by the IMF and the World Bank as conditions for debt relief required Southern nations to adopt a standard package of economic reforms that included privatization, deregulation, trade liberalization, reduction or elimination of social safety nets, and expansion of export production to service the foreign debt.⁵²

In order to earn badly needed foreign exchange, debt-ridden Southern countries flooded world markets with minerals, timber, and agricultural products, thereby driving down prices and enabling the North to live beyond the constraints of its

⁴⁴ C. J. Lee, "Introduction: Between a Moment and an Era: The Origins and Afterlives of Bandung," in C. J. Lee (ed.), *Making a World After Empire: The Bandung Moment and Its Political Afterlives* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2010), pp. 1–32.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

⁴⁶ UN General Assembly, *Resolution Adopted by the General Assembly: 1962 General Assembly Resolution on Permanent Sovereignty over Natural Resources*, 14 December 1962, GA Res. 1803 (XVII) / 17 UN GAOR Supp. (No.17) at 15; UN Doc. A/5217 (1962).

⁴⁷ UN General Assembly, *Declaration on the Right to Development*, 4 December 1986, UN Doc. A/Res/41/128.

⁴⁸ For a discussion of this principle, see J. Noyes, "Common Heritage of Mankind: Past, Present and Future" (2011–2012) 40 *Denver Journal of International Law and Policy* 447. See Chapter 4, S. Atapattu, "The Significance of International Environmental Law Principles in Reinforcing or Dismantling the North–South Divide," which discusses the role of this and other principles of international environmental law in relation to the North–South divide.

⁴⁹ R. Gordon, "The Dawn of a New, New International Economic Order?" (2009) 72 *Law and Contemporary Problems* 131 at 142–145; UN General Assembly, *Declaration of the Establishment of a New International Economic Order*, 1 May 1974, A/Res/S-6/3201.

⁵⁰ F. Ismail, "Rediscovering the Role of Developing Countries in GATT Before the Doha Round" (2008) 1 *Law and Development Review* 49 at 58–59; L. Rajamani, *Differential Treatment in International Environmental Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006).

⁵¹ Gordon, note 49 at 145–150.

⁵² *Ibid.*; Gonzalez, note 6, p. 82.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

natural resource base.⁵³ Much of the environmental degradation experienced by Southern countries has been caused by export-oriented production to satisfy Northern demand, rather than by local consumption.⁵⁴ Indeed, communities in the South have traditionally led more sustainable lives than the consumerist societies of the North, as discussed by Judge Weeramantry in his separate opinion in the *Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project*.⁵⁵

The Washington Consensus exacerbated the North–South divide by reinforcing the South’s dependence on the export of raw materials rather than facilitating the development of more dynamic economic sectors.⁵⁶ The World Trade Organization agreements that succeeded the 1947 GATT nominally granted Southern countries special and differential treatment (such as additional time to comply with WTO obligations), but failed to dismantle the subsidies and import barriers of greatest concern to Southern nations (particularly Northern agricultural subsidies that enabled Northern exporters to undercut Southern farmers).⁵⁷ The WTO also restricted the ability of Southern countries to use tariffs and subsidies to strategically promote potentially dynamic industries; dismantled the import barriers that protected nascent Southern industries from more technologically advanced Northern competitors; and imposed onerous new obligations in the areas of intellectual property, services, and investment.⁵⁸ Scholars of economic history have recognized that the United States, Japan, Germany, the United Kingdom, South Korea, and Taiwan achieved economic prosperity through protectionism. By depriving Southern countries of the tools used by the global North and by certain middle-income Southern countries to diversify and industrialize their economies while enhancing the protection of investors and intellectual property, the international economic order institutionalizes Southern poverty.⁵⁹

The primary beneficiaries of the Washington Consensus have been the powerful transnational corporations that dominate the global economy. The reluctance of

⁵³ Ponting, note 35, p. 223.

⁵⁴ W. E. Rees and L. Westra, “When Consumption does Violence: Can There Be Sustainability and Environmental Justice in A Resource-Limited World?”, in J. Agyeman, R. D. Bullard, and B. Evans (eds.), *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2003), pp. 99–124, at 105, 110.

⁵⁵ *Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project* (Hungary v. Slovakia) [1997] ICJ Reports 228.

⁵⁶ Gordon, note 49 at 149–150.

⁵⁷ F. J. Garcia, “Beyond Special and Differential Treatment” (2004) 27 *Boston College International and Comparative Law Review* 291. See chapter 19, C. G. Gonzalez, “Food Justice: An Environmental Justice Critique of the Global Food System.”

⁵⁸ Garcia, note 57 at 298; Y. S. Lee, *Reclaiming Development in the World Trading System* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 41–42.

⁵⁹ H. Chang, *Good Samaritans: The Myth of Free Trade and the Secret History of Capitalism* (New York: Bloomsbury Press, 2008); H. Chang, *Kicking Away the Ladder: Development Strategy in Historical Perspective* (London: Anthem Press, 2002); A. Amsden, *The Developing World’s Journey through Heaven and Hell* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2009); E. Reinert, *How Rich Countries Got Rich... and Why Poor Countries Stay Poor* (New York: Carroll and Graf, 2007).

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)*Sumudu Atapattu and Carmen G. Gonzalez*

9

states to regulate the extraterritorial activities of their corporations and the difficulty of holding parent companies liable for the actions of their subsidiaries have resulted in corporate impunity for human rights and environmental abuses in Southern countries.⁶⁰ While some attempt has been made over the years to make corporate actors more socially responsible, these attempts have resulted in soft law measures without any real sanctions. International investment law has enhanced corporate power by requiring host governments to compensate foreign investors when efforts to regulate in the public interest diminish the profitability of the investment.⁶¹ Even where Southern victims can assert a claim for relief against Northern states or corporations, these victims are hesitant to resort to legal action for fear of reprisal and withholding of aid, thereby reinforcing the North's domination of the South.⁶² In addition, as explained in this volume, a form of financing called "project finance" has exacerbated corporate impunity with regard to human rights and environmental harms caused by large-scale energy and infrastructure projects, by facilitating the externalization of social and environmental risks.⁶³

In sum, the persistence of extreme poverty in the global South is attributable not to random misfortune, but to a global economic order that systematically benefits the wealthy and disenfranchises the poor. As philosopher Thomas Pogge candidly observes:

Our new global economic order is so harsh on the global poor, then, because it is formed in negotiations where our representatives ruthlessly exploit their vastly superior bargaining power and expertise, as well as any weakness, ignorance, or corruptibility they may find in their counterpart negotiators, to tune each agreement for our greater benefit. In such negotiations, the affluent states will make reciprocal concessions to one another, but rarely to the weak. The cumulative result of many such negotiations and agreements is a grossly unfair global economic order under which the lion's share of the benefits of global economic growth flows to the most affluent states.⁶⁴

4. INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL LAW AND THE NORTH–SOUTH DIVIDE

North–South conflicts originating in the economic realm have profoundly shaped the evolution of international environmental law and policy. The global North

⁶⁰ Gonzalez, note 6, pp. 92–94.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 94–95.

⁶² See chapter 28, J. Razzaque, "Access to Remedies in Environmental Matters and the North–South Divide"; chapter 20, M. Burkett, "A Justice Paradox: Climate Change, Small Island Developing States, and the Absence of International Legal Remedy."

⁶³ See chapter 16, S. H. Baker, "Project Finance and Sustainable Development in the Global South."

⁶⁴ T. Pogge, *World Poverty and Human Rights* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2008), p. 27.

Cambridge University Press

978-1-107-05569-8 - International Environmental Law and the Global South

Edited by Shawkat Alam, Sumudu Atapattu, Carmen G. Gonzalez and

Jona Razzaque

Excerpt

[More information](#)

industrialized and developed by exploiting the planet's natural resources without regard for the environmental consequences. Northern consumption patterns, which are increasingly emulated by Southern elites, have brought the planet's ecosystems to the brink of collapse and will constrain the development of options of present and future generations, particularly in the global South.⁶⁵ Indeed, some observers have argued that the North owes an ecological debt to the South for “resource plundering, unfair trade, environmental damage, and the free occupation of environmental space to deposit waste.”⁶⁶

As natural resources become increasingly scarce, Southern countries are concerned about harnessing them to promote social and economic development. Many Southern nations view Northern demands for environmental protection as hypocritical, given the North's enormous ecological footprint, and as a threat to Southern efforts to eradicate poverty and provide citizens with the basic necessities of life.⁶⁷

The global North and the global South also have conflicting environmental priorities and concerns. While the North has historically prioritized global environmental problems (such as ozone depletion and protection of endangered species), the South has often emphasized environmental problems with more immediate impacts on vulnerable local populations, including the hazardous waste trade, desertification, food security, access to safe drinking water and sanitation, and indoor air pollution caused by lack of access to sustainable energy.⁶⁸

As the South has pressed the North to shoulder primary responsibility for major environmental problems (such as climate change) in light of the North's disproportionate contribution to global environmental degradation,⁶⁹ the North has resisted responsibility for past wrongs, and has reluctantly accepted the principle of common but differentiated responsibility on the basis of the North's superior financial and technical resources rather than that of historic responsibility.⁷⁰ While the North has unilaterally imposed environmental requirements on Southern products in order to combat “eco-dumping,” the South has perceived these requirements as disguised protectionism, and as arbitrary and inequitable given the North's voracious consumption of the planet's natural resources and unwillingness

⁶⁵ K. Mickelson, “Leading Toward a Level Playing Field, Repaying Ecological Debt, or Making Environmental Space: Three Stories About International Environmental Cooperation” (2005) 43 *Osgoode Hall Law Journal* 138 at 150–154. See chapter 3, R. Gordon, “Unsustainable Development.”

⁶⁶ E. Paredis, G. Geominne, W. Vanhove, F. Maes, and J. Lambrecht, *The Concept of Ecological Debt: Its Meaning and Applicability in International Policy* (Ghent: Academia Press, 2007), p. 7.

⁶⁷ See chapter 3, R. Gordon, “Unsustainable Development.”

⁶⁸ Gonzalez, note 4 at 1008–1009; Anand, note 4, p. 6.

⁶⁹ Anand, note 4, p. 5.

⁷⁰ Gonzalez, note 6, pp. 91–92. See also chapter 4, S. Atapattu, “The Significance of International Environmental Law Principles in Reinforcing or Dismantling the North–South Divide.”