Chapter -1

Introduction

Environmental issues may be measurable scientific phenomenon, but actions on them, has more to do beliefs and politics than practical science. This is the lesson that the decade of the nineties has taught us. Since most environmental issues are transboundary in nature. The impact of the problem is not confined within national borders. It therefore, involves interaction between countries. It is this aspect which makes environmental issues a factor in the foreign relations of countries, more so in the case of the tiny atolls of the South Pacific.

The purpose of this study is to show how these issues of formed an important reason for regional and international cooperation in the South Pacific Forum, as well as, how these issues reflect the divide between the North and South quite dramatically. It seeks to analyze the complex dimensions that international environmental issues seem to entail. To discover the complex and often hidden factor that motivates the actions of the countries in the region. In fact, the nineties have witnessed a growing concern over the state of the global environment. A debate the trend of which was set by the Brundtland Commission Report titled 'Our Common Future'.

The Report was important because it represented two major shifts in the thinking on environment. It firstly, brought in the concept of sustainable development. It pointed out that environment was essential to growth and therefore should not be viewed as a constraint. The other contribution of the Report was that it emphasized the need to
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view environmental problems as an integrated whole and not as a set of disparate problems.

Also the previous decade (1980s) saw the emergence of a new conception of national and international security. This concept challenged the traditional definition of security based on the competition in political—military power. Known as comprehensive security or common security, it held that no country could increase its security without at the same time increasing the security of other countries or of the entire international community.²

The common security concept also views traditional security policies as serious obstacles to meeting all these common global threats. The Palme Commission composed of senior political leaders from both the superpowers and from developed and developing nations articulated this new conception of security in its 1982 and 1989 reports. It argued that the abolition or large reduction in weapons of mass destruction and conventional disarmament are necessary to provide momentum for progress on economic, social development and environmental conservation.³

The concept of comprehensive security, as further elaborated by a group of experts recommended by the United Nations Environment Programme, as well as, other specialists on international environmental problems, hold that environmental security is one of the two fundamental aspects of global security along with the assurance against nuclear war. According to this view such threats to the global life support systems as

---

green house warming, ozone depletion and the loss of marine habitats are just as important to the future of the earth as insuring against nuclear catastrophe.⁴

The Norwegian Prime Minister Mrs Gro Harlem Brundtland became the chairperson of the World Commission on Environment and Development, which produced the most important document in the movement for sustainable development. She was already a member of the Palme Commission and thus, steeped in the concept of common security. The report Our Common Future was explicit about the tension between security defined primarily in military terms and environmental security. It criticized global militarism and the vested interests that profited from it. It called on nations to turn away from the destructive logic of an arms culture.⁵ Increasingly, scientists, academics and professionals in the fields of international development and the environment share the assumptions of the common security perspective – that the combination of economic interdependence and global environmental threats are shifting traditional national security concerns to a focus on collective global security.

Conventional security policy is also concerned with the problem of natural resources scarcities, but it views it as yet another reason for waging political-military conflict. It assumes that, since, there are not enough resources to go around, nation states must compete for control of them using all their power and resources. The environmental security perspective, on the other hand, assumes that the real problem is the mismanagement of the resources by all concerned as that the solution to such threats is international cooperation for environmental and resource conservation not futile conflict
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over the degraded resources itself. Thus, environmental security concept cannot be integrated into conventional national security thinking; this definition of security is global rather than national in scope.  
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has also unleashed a new political force – a global environmental movement that undertakes increasingly effective transnational action on various issues. But in each case some states—and certain economic interests—have opposed strong international actions to reduce or eliminate activities that threaten the global environment. 8

The result, say Porter and Brown, is an intensifying struggle over global environmental issues. As global negotiations multiply on issues affecting a wide range of interests around the globe, the stakes for all participants in the struggle will continue to grow. 9

However, the single most important indication of a worldwide paradigm shift was the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992. One hundred seventy-two governments and thousands of nongovernmental organisations around the world participated in two years of discussions on domestic environmental and poverty problems and global environment issues, especially questions of North-South inequities and responsibility. Also completed and signed at Rio were important treaties on climate change and biodiversity. During this two-year exercise, countries were forced to start thinking through the implications of integrating sustainable development goals into the full range of their economic development policies. In many countries, domestic conflicts and debates surfaced on a wide range of issues.

The attempt in this chapter is to explain the importance of environmental issues a subject of international relations between nations. Provide a brief glimpse of the region. Lastly to focus on these main environmental problems that this study proposes to examine. The discussion of
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the problems would be of a general nature to provide a preliminary grounding to carry the discussion forward in the subsequent chapters.

Since the first part has been dealt with in the preceding discussion. A brief introduction of the area is now to be provided 'South Pacific' and South-west pacific' have been interchangeably.

The southwest pacific region comprises of many countries. Some countries like Australia and New Zealand are developed countries and major players in the region. Among the smaller island nations western Samoa because independent in 1962, nature in 1968 Fiji and Tonga (a British Protectorate) in 1970, Papua New Guinea in 1975, Solomon Islands in 1978, Ellice Islands (now known as Tuvalu) in 1978, Kiribati (earlier called Gilbert Islands) in 1979 and Vanuatu (the former New Hebrides) in 1980. Besides these states there are four self-governing states namely. Nine and cook Islands in free association with New Islands, Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of Marshall Islands in free association with the United States of America. Among the other territories are French Polynesia, New Caledonia, American Samoa and Palau. The major foreign actors in the region include the United States of America, France Soviet Union, Japan, Taiwan, and China.

Why are environmental issues important in this region? The geographic location of the region with many of the Islands located in low-lying areas make it particularly prone to flooding. Climate change and rise sea levels may well wipe out some of these Island from the face of the earth. Secondly, the Islands of this region far away from the rest of the world and this has made it a convenient laboratory for nuclear powers to carry out their tests in this region. Power politics and colonialism ensures that these Islanders and their governments can do little to stop these tests. Scant regard for the effect of these tests on the environment and health of the people has
fuelled the protest movements and the strong anti-nuclear stance of many of the countries of the region. The region is rich in natural resources like fisheries, forests, and mines (phosphate) making it the target of metropolitan exploitation.

In fact the countries of the region seem to be under the grip of a vicious circle of colonial exploitation much to the detriment of the environment of the region. Why is this so? Most of the countries in the region are colonial legacies. Their small size prevents them from attaining self-sufficiency. The former colonial powers have used the raw materials from this area. The subordinate economies of Pacific Island nations are still heavily dependent on aid inputs and market outlets supplied and regulated by developed market economies from within and outside the region. The balance of trade obviously is in favour of the developed world, which sustains their economic dominance in the region. As a consequence these countries are helping to perpetuate the environmental problems arising from economic pressures on natural resources in the Pacific. The Island nations are unable to deal with problems of development due to the scarcity of the three essential component: manpower, finance, and resources. This makes it imperative for joint efforts at a bilateral, regional, and global level the main reason behind the importance of environment issues in foreign relations of the region.11

This study has selected three problems that to some extent appear to be unique to the area for as detailed examination. They are:

(1) Climate Change
(2) Nuclear Testing
(3) Driftnet fishing

11 *Ibid*
The Problem of Climate Change

Global Climate change is the prototype of the global commons issue. All nations are affected by the earth’s climate system, and broad international cooperation is required to mitigate the threat of global warming. Although the impact of greenhouse warming is expected to vary from one region to another, suggesting to some the possibility of winners and losers, that notion is based on erroneous assumption that greenhouse warming will stop at a predictable point. In fact in the absence of a global agreement to reduce greenhouse gases, no state can anticipate any stabilization in the climate. Continued warming may well overwhelm its capacity for adaptation. Building a regime to mitigate global climate change is technically and economically feasible. But it is complicated by the multiple sources of emissions that contribute to global warming, by scientific uncertainties. Even more important, however, is the fact that energy is central to every nation’s economy, and the policy changes required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions raise politically difficult policy questions of who should bear the immediate costs. Even to stabilize the global concentrations of carbon dioxide (which would not reduce the warming which the earlier emissions have already committed the earth) would require reducing current emissions by roughly one-half. That would necessitate major gains in conservation and switching from coal and oil to natural gas and renewable sources, which would affect powerful economic and political interests in many countries. And this is what this study seeks to examine how the states are negotiating on the issue of targets and timetables.

Today almost everyone is concerned about the problem of climate change. The Age in an editorial pointed out “There is growing recognition that far from being a figment of scientists
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imagination the greenhouse effect is indeed cause for world concern. The environment minister Senator Richardson was not exaggerating when he told last weekend's greenhouse conference that the greenhouse effect was the greatest environmental problem facing humanity this century. Greenhouse could not be dismissed as just another isolated environmental problem, he says. It was powerful evidence that our continuing abuse and overuse of the earth's finite and life sustaining resources must stop".13

Why is this climate change occurring? A background paper prepared by the Australian legislative series points out that the last two centuries have seen tremendous growth in industry agriculture transport and energy use. This has increased the levels of certain gases in the atmosphere known collectively as the 'greenhouse gases'.

The greenhouse effect occurs when warming of the atmosphere as short wavelength radiate energy that reaches the earth is surface is re-radiated at a longer wavelength. The greenhouse gases absorb this re-radiated longer wavelength radiate energy. As greenhouse gases increase in level more heat is retained in the atmosphere resulting in a warming the greenhouse effect.

A preliminary understanding of the issue as provided by the International Panel on Climate Change describes it as thus,

- **Human activities are releasing greenhouse gases into the atmosphere.** Carbon dioxide is produced when fossil fuels are used to generate energy and when forests are cut down and burned. Methane and nitrous oxide are emitted from agricultural activities, changes in land use, and other sources. CFCs and other gases are released by industrial processes, while ozone in the lower atmosphere is generated indirectly by automobile exhaust fumes.
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• **Rising levels of greenhouse gases are expected to cause climate change.** By absorbing infrared radiation, these gases control the flow of natural energy through the climate system. The climate must somehow adjust to the "thickening blanket" of greenhouse gases in order to maintain the balance between energy arriving from the sun and energy escaping back into space.

• **Climate models predict that the global temperature will rise by about 1-3.5°C by the year 2100.** This projected change is larger than any climate change experienced over the last 10,000 years. It is based on current emissions trends and assumes that no efforts are made to limit greenhouse gas emissions. There are many uncertainties about the scale and impacts of climate change, particularly at the regional level. Because of the delaying effect of the oceans, surface temperatures do not respond immediately to greenhouse gas emissions, so climate change will continue for many decades after atmospheric concentrations have stabilized. Meanwhile, the balance of the evidence suggests a discernable human influence on the global climate.

• **Climate change is likely to have a significant impact on the global environment.** In general, the faster the climate changes, the greater will be the risk of damage. The mean sea level is expected to rise 15-95 cm by the year 2100, causing flooding of low-lying areas and other damage. Climatic zones (and thus ecosystems and agricultural zones) could shift towards the poles by 150-550 km in the mid-latitude regions. Forests, deserts, rangelands, and other unmanaged ecosystems would face new climatic stresses. As a result, many will decline or fragment, and individual species will become extinct.
• **Human society will face new risks and pressures.** Food security is unlikely to be threatened at the global level, but some regions are likely to experience food shortages and hunger. Water resources will be affected as precipitation and evaporation patterns change around the world. Physical infrastructure may be damaged, particularly by sea-level rise and by extreme weather events. Economic activities, human settlements, and human health will experience many direct and indirect effects. The poor and disadvantaged are the most vulnerable to the negative consequences of climate change.

• **People and ecosystems will need to adapt to future climatic regimes.** Past and current emissions have already committed the earth to some degree of climate change in the 21st century. Adapting to these effects will require a good understanding of socio-economic and natural systems, their sensitivity to climate change, and their inherent ability to adapt. Many strategies are available for adapting to the expected effects of climate change.

• **Stabilizing atmospheric concentrations of greenhouse gases will demand a major effort.** Based on current trends, the total climatic impact of rising greenhouse gas levels will be equal to that caused by a doubling of pre-industrial CO₂ concentrations by 2030, and a trebling or more by 2100. Freezing global CO₂ emissions at their current levels would postpone CO₂-doubling to 2100. Emissions would eventually have to fall to about 30% of their current levels for concentrations to stabilize at doubled-CO₂ levels sometime in the future. Given an expanding world economy and growing populations, this would require dramatic improvements in energy efficiency and fundamental changes in other economic sectors.

• **The international community is tackling this challenge through the Climate Change Convention.** Adopted in 1992, the Convention seeks to stabilize atmospheric
concentrations of greenhouse gases at safe levels. Some 165 countries have become Parties. Developed countries are committed to taking measures aimed at returning their emissions to 1990 levels by the year 2000; they will commit themselves to making further emissions cuts after the year 2000 in a new agreement to be finalized by the end of 1997. Developed countries are also committed to promoting financial and technological transfers to developing countries to help them address climate change. Meanwhile, all Parties are gathering information on their national emissions and developing strategies for adapting to and minimizing climate change.

- Many options for limiting emissions are available in the short- and medium-term. Policymakers can encourage energy efficiency and other climate-friendly trends in both the supply and consumption of energy. Key consumers of energy include industries, homes, offices, vehicles, and farms. Efficiency can be improved in large part by providing an appropriate economic and regulatory framework for consumers and investors. This framework should promote cost-effective actions, the best current and future technologies, and "no regrets" solutions that make economic and environmental sense irrespective of climate change. Taxes, regulatory standards, tradable emissions permits, information programmes, voluntary programmes, and the phase-out of counterproductive subsidies can all play a role. Changes in practices and lifestyles, from better urban transport planning to personal habits such as turning out the lights, are also important.

- Energy efficiency gains of 10-30% above baseline trends can be realized over the next 20-30 years at no net cost. Some researchers believe that much greater gains are also feasible during this period and beyond. Improvements over the baseline can be achieved in all major economic sectors with current knowledge and with today's best technologies. In
the longer term, it will be possible to move close to a zero-emissions industrial economy — with the innumerable environmental and economic benefits that this implies.

- **Reducing uncertainties about climate change, its impacts, and the costs of various response options is vital.** In the meantime, it will be necessary to balance concerns about risks and damages with concerns about economic development. The prudent response to climate change, therefore, is to adopt a portfolio of actions aimed at controlling emissions, adapting to impacts, and encouraging scientific, technological, and socio-economic research.¹⁴

The issue in any discussion on climate change or global warming is to what extent can human activity precipitate changes which result are rapid variations in climate and sea level. Though there is considerable controversy as to when the occurrence will be it is now an established scientific fact that industrial activity and burning of fossil fuels leads to heating up of the atmosphere. And therefore it is a logical conclusion that by lowering the burning of fossil fuels and emission of greenhouse gases it would be possible to control the problem. The significance of this issue in international relations is that this issue is not confined to any single state or group of nations rather it is a global phenomenon that requires a global solution.¹⁵

This is the reason that the stand on the issue has tended to be perceived by the countries within the perspective of their own domestic political, economic and environment considerations rather than as an issue of scientific concern which requires a scientific resolution. As we shall see in the later chapters this issue has been coloured by the country’s own development status. The developing and developed country divide is clearly visible not just in the approach of the states internationally but also within the region.
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Chapter 2 and 3 will provide a glimpse of how the underdeveloped and developed even within the South Pacific region have a differing view on the issue even though the cost of global warming will affect both in good measure.

Climate change became an international issue when scientists tried to draw international attention to the seriousness of it as the 1985 Villach conference. The conference was a joint effort Meteorological Organization UNEP, International Confederation of Scientific Unions (ICSU) meeting. Ros Taplin argues that this was the time that it attracted the attention of international decision-makers.\(^{16}\)

This set in motion many task force groups which tried to study the various aspects and likely impact of the phenomenon. In March 1987 regional task teams were established for the Mediterranean, the wider Caribbean, The South Pacific the East Asian, Seas, the South Asian Seas and the Southeast Pacific under the auspices of the UNEP's Regional Seas Programme.\(^{17}\)

That was also the year (1987) when Maldives was severely flooded prompting the government to believe that global warming may have contributed to it. In September 1988, the Maltese government perturbed about greenhouse predictions submitted a request for the issue of climate change to be placed in the Agenda of the 43rd session of the UN General Assembly. Malta submitted a draft proposal for creating a co-ordinate global response to climate change in continuing the work towards a framework convention on climate change. The draft was accepted unanimously as Resolution 43/53 Protection of global climate for present and future generations of mankind. French Adami point out that this resolution introduced a new concept in that respect. The


principle of domestic jurisdiction cannot be used as an absolute defence when global environmental wellbeing is at stake.\textsuperscript{18}

Ros Taplin says that this step by Malta at the UN was a first and most important political move in initiating the process of formation of the special purpose regime for climate and it was made by a Small Island state.\textsuperscript{19} This move by Malta is significant because it shows the initiative and foresight that Small Island states have had on this issue. It also shows their concern their own vulnerability as much as of their decease for international services action on the issue. What needs to be understood and emphasized is the fast that small Island states whether in the South-west Pacific or elsewhere may be politically economically or even foully diverse but they are all connected by the common threat of global warming. For many island states in the Southwest Pacific like Tuvalu, Kiribati etc it means being wiped off the face of the earth itself.

The work done by the South Pacific Task team was done under the aegis of the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) and the Association of Pacific Environmental Institutions (ASPEI). We shall be discussing the Majuro declaration in chapter 2 which deals with the South Pacific Forum and Small Island States of the region.

But while the Small Islands were interested in the issue, economics and finance for attending meeting were scarce. For instance when the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) commenced in November 1988 with its first Plenary session the IPCC being the special purpose organization created for the development scientific and policy advance on climate change
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no representations from the Small Island states attended this first meetings. The reason no funds were available to assist the participation of developing countries at IPCC meetings at that stage.

The United Nations General Assembly resolved in December 1990 to initiate a negotiating process for the climate change connection by establishing the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee (INC) for a framework convention on Climate change. The resolution considered that the connection should be completed for the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED) in June 1992. Wensley points out that the first session turned into a lengthy and difficult debate on procedures and mechanisms for conducting the negotiations it was disappointed as it failed to move beyond all this. In the later sessions the Alliance of Small Island States emerged as an influential bloc.

At the UNCED Conference in Rio, Tuvalu and Nauru, neither UN members, were the first to sign the climate change convention. It was a symbolic act to show the importance of these conventions to the Small Island nations. They had already achieved prominence when the Maldives and Vanuatu were elected vice president of the conference -- Japan and India having stood down in their favour.

The climate change convention failed to set guidelines and targets for greenhouse gas emissions or any serious transfer of resources to help the developing countries to avoid the mistakes of the already industrialized world. But at least, it provided a solid platform for regional association the South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) the South Pacific Forum

---
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and AOSIS to ask for more. To helped to push their presence on international stage into the hearts and minds of the newspaper readers and television viewers.24

The United Nations Global Conference on Sustainable Development of Small Island Developing State was held in Barbados in April 1994. It sought to establish a regional disaster emergency fund to assist with problems in rebuilding economic assets after disaster strikes.25

The United Nations on 7 April 1995 adopted a deal setting up a procedure to reduce emission of climate altering gases into the next century. The deal represented a compromise between the European Union and developing countries which wanted clear cut reduction targets and leading producers Carbon dioxide producers such as United States Japan and Australia which had wanted looser formulations.

The United Nations held a 5 years after Rio de Janeiro in 1997. The International Climate Change Summit was held in Dec 1997, 160 nations reached agreement in Kyoto (Japan) on limiting emissions of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases. Many analysts claim that the Kyoto protocol as a significant victory for advocates who have sought to persuade world leaders to address climate change.26

Pacific Island delegates to an international conference on global warming have joined an agreement that places certain limits the emission of greenhouse gases. Delegations from 150 nations adopted the Kyoto Protocol by consensus on 11 December in Kyoto, Japan. It seeks to cut emissions of carbon dioxide and five other atmospheric gases to pre-1990 levels between 2008 and 2012. The cuts amount to about six per cent of the 1990 levels. Under the treaty, 39 industrialised countries agree to accept binding targets for reducing their emissions of the three most common
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gases - carbon dioxide, methane, nitrous oxide - and three other gases. The United States is to cut back by seven percent; Japan by six per cent and the European Union by eight per cent below 1990 levels by 2008. The other industrialised countries will accept similar cuts between 2008 and 2012. For the two developed countries in the Forum group, Australia is allowed an eight per cent increase while New Zealand will stabilise its emissions at the 1990 levels. Developing countries will make voluntary commitments to reduce their emissions.27

Limits would be placed on future emissions of greenhouse gases and that the acceptance by industrialized countries of bringing emissions limits would make developing countries more willing to take emissions limiting actions appropriate to their own circumstances.28

Yet the SPF countries remain frustrated at the attempts by countries to stall the process. Papua New Guinea at the Buenos Aires Conference in 1998 said, “We are aware that some of the developed countries are holding back on ratifying the protocol until major developing country emitters of greenhouse gases also commit themselves to reductions, we must find a way forward and reach a consensus.” The Federated States of Micronesia delegate Ms Jane Chigyal of the Ministry of Multilateral Affairs, was hopeful that additional funding will be available to small island states to help them adapt to the impact of climate change. “It is a caucus that will discuss measures such as adaptation as a means to combat climate change. These measures require financial and technical assistance; that we have difficulty in providing on our own. We contribute little to emissions, we are amongst the most vulnerable and least able to adapt to the adverse effects of climate change such as global warming and sea level rise.”29 At a recent meeting at Bonn the frustration was again voiced. Pacific island delegates reminded the meeting that while the best
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scientific advice says emission reductions of 60 - 80 percent are needed to stop climate change, to date developed countries have only agreed to reduce their emissions by 6.5 percent, by 2020.

South Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP) International Negotiations Officer Dr Mahendra Kumar, who attended the meeting, said AOSIS members were also taking a strong stand on the inadequacy to date of plans to help vulnerable countries combat the adverse effects of climate change and sea-level rise.30

Dr Kumar said AOSIS members, who form part of the larger bloc of developing countries, the G77 and China, also wanted this forum to press strongly for urgent actions to meet the specific needs of developing countries most vulnerable to climate change and sea-level rise.

"Small Island states have already put a significant amount of work into establishing how they would suffer as sea level rises and the climate changes. They are now eager to get international support for adaptation measures that in many cases are needed now, to soften the adverse effects of climate change," Dr Kumar said. "However, they are becoming frustrated by some other developing countries' insistence that they should also get special attention or compensation because they would suffer if the world started using less oil and petroleum products."31

We discuss more of the politics of climate change negotiations in the subsequent chapters. However it is proposed to give here a brief summary of the international response to the problem of climate change, as summarised from UNEP fact sheet on climate change.
The international response to climate change: A history

- Climate change was recognized as a serious problem by the First World Climate Conference in 1979. This scientific gathering explored how climate change might affect human activities. It issued a declaration calling on the world's governments "to foresee and prevent potential man-made changes in climate that might be adverse to the well-being of humanity". It also endorsed plans to establish a World Climate Programme (WCP) under the joint responsibility of the World Meteorological Organization (WMO), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the International Council of Scientific Unions (ICSU).

- A number of intergovernmental conferences focusing on climate change were held in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Together with increasing scientific evidence, these conferences helped to raise international concern about the issue. Participants included government policymakers, scientists, and environmentalists. The meetings addressed both scientific and policy issues and called for global action. The key events were the Villach Conference (October 1985), the Toronto Conference (June 1988), the Ottawa Conference (February 1989), the Tata Conference (February 1989), the Hague Conference and Declaration (March 1989), the Noordwijk Ministerial Conference (November 1989), the Cairo Compact (December 1989), and the Bergen Conference (May 1990).

- The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) released its First Assessment Report in 1990. Established in 1988 by UNEP and WMO, the IPCC was given a mandate to assess the state of existing knowledge about the climate system and climate change; the
environmental, economic, and social impacts of climate change; and the possible response strategies. It published its findings following a rigorous survey of the world-wide scientific and technical literature. Vetted by experts and government officials, the First Assessment report confirmed the scientific evidence for climate change and enabled governments to base their policy decisions on the most up-to-date information available. It had a powerful effect on both policymakers and the general public and provided the basis for negotiations on the Climate Change Convention.

- The 1990 Second World Climate Conference called for a framework treaty on climate change. Sponsored by WMO, UNEP and other international organizations, this key conference featured negotiations and ministerial-level discussions among 137 states plus the European Community. The final declaration, adopted after hard bargaining, did not specify any international targets for reducing emissions. However, it did support a number of principles later included in the Climate Change Convention. These were climate change as a "common concern of humankind", the importance of equity, the "common but differentiated responsibilities" of countries at different levels of development, sustainable development, and the precautionary principle.

• The 1992 UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was signed by 154 states (plus the EC) at Rio de Janeiro. Twenty years after the 1972 Stockholm Declaration first laid the foundations of contemporary environmental policy, the Earth Summit became the largest-ever gathering of Heads of State. Other agreements adopted at Rio were the Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, the Convention on Biological Diversity, and Forest Principles.

• The Convention entered into force on 21 March 1994. This was 90 days after the receipt of the 50th instrument of ratification (after signing a convention a state must also ratify). The next critical date was 21 September when developed country Parties started submitting national communications describing their climate change strategies. Meanwhile, the INC continued its preparatory work, meeting for another six sessions to discuss matters relating to commitments, arrangements for the financial mechanism, technical and financial support to developing countries, and procedural and institutional matters. The INC was dissolved after its 11th and final session in February 1995, and the Conference of the Parties (COP) became the Convention's ultimate authority.

• The Conference of the Parties held its first session in Berlin from 28 March-7 April 1995. Delegates from 117 Parties and 53 Observer States participated in COP-1, as did over 2,000 observers and journalists. They agreed that the commitments contained in the Convention for developed countries were inadequate and launched the "Berlin Mandate" talks on additional commitments. They also reviewed the first round of national communications and finalized much of the institutional and financial machinery needed to support action under the Convention in the years to come.

• The IPCC adopted its Second Assessment Report in December 1995. Published in April 1996, the Second Assessment Report was written and reviewed by some 2,000 scientists
and experts world-wide. It was soon widely known for concluding that "the balance of evidence suggests that there is a discernible human influence on global climate". However, the Report did much more, for example confirming the availability of so-called no-regrets options and other cost-effective strategies for combating climate change. The IPCC will produce a series of technical papers and special reports before publishing its Third Assessment Report in 2001.

- **The COP will continue to meet on a regular basis.** COP-2 was held at the Palais des Nations in Geneva from 8-19 June 1996.

- **Kyoto meeting.** COP-3 was held from 1-12 December 1997 in Kyoto, Japan. It was expected to adopt a "protocol or another legal instrument" committing developed countries to reducing their greenhouse gas emissions after the year 2000. But most of the countries gave diluted commitments, at least the countries agreed on instruments like emissions trading, clean development mechanism etc.32

**The issue of Nuclear Testing**

Widespread protest greeted the French announcement that it would be abandoning its 1992 moratorium on nuclear testing and that it would conduct eight unclear tests between September 1995 and May 1996, by which time France will be willing to accede to any comprehensive test ban treaty. Ramesh Thakur describes these tests as the 'the last bang before a total ban.'33

---
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The countries in the region responded strongly for, by now, France would conduct 200 tests in the region service its first one in 1960. The Australian and New Zealand governments suspended military cooperation with France. They recalled their ambassadors. The seriousness of the issue can be gauged from what analysts like Ramesh Thakur point out. Examples of democratic countries recalling one another's ambassadors must be almost as rare as democracies going to was with one another yet recalling ambassadors is precisely what Australia and France where reduced to in an escalating cycle of cross-recriminations in 1995.34

However this public outrage had very little effect on France. In 1984 it had bombed the Rainbow Wavier ship of the Auckland harbour. This time (June 1995) it damaged another Greenpeace vessel 'Rainbow warrior II which was planning to take protesters to the atoll.

In the event, six tests where conducted over four months. The first of a modest 8 kilo tonne yield was conducted at Mururoa Atoll on 5 September 1995. The sixth and final test of around 120 kt was conducted at Fangataufa Atoll on 27 January 1996.

For decades nuclear tests have been conducted in the South Pacific by Great Britain USA and France. The USA conducted sixty-six nuclear and thermonuclear explosions in the Pacific. Greg Fry analyses that in the early years of the Cold war parts of the South pacific countries linked directly to the grand strategies of major powers. The remoteness of some atolls and the strategic location of others made attractive sites for missile weapons testing and deployment and the completeness of unreal control made this easy to achieve.35
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The United States began testing atomic bombs over Bikini atoll in the Marshall lands in 1946. Two years later it began testing at Enewetak where the first hydrogen bomb was exploded in 1952. Atmospheric testing continued at these sites until 1958 when the United States moved its testing site to Johnston Atoll, an American Island South of Hawaii 1957 Britain moved its nuclear testing programming from Australia there by the United States four years later until both programs shifted to the Nevada desert after the 1963 Partial Test Ban Treaty. In the same year France established its Pacific Experiments Center and conducted 41 atmospheric tests at Moreover Atoll before 1974, Kwajalein Atoll in the Marshall Island reduces the main testing site for American ballistic missiles.

Nuclear testing has had disastrous implications for the people of the South Pacific. The Marshall Islanders in Kwajalein, Prikeni and Enewatak were forced off their land. Bikini Islands and Enewetak people suffered the effects of radioactivity associated with American tests. All people in the region potentially suffer from the fall out of the 163 atmospheric tests conducted in the region before 1975. It is for this reason that even today, the Enewetak and the Bikini people are not willing to believe news reports that the islands are now rendered safe from radioactivity. In July 1998 the Pacific Islands Monthly reported that for the first time in 13 years, there is a glimmer of hope that exiled Rongelap Islanders will be able to return home in the future.

An US-funded first phase nuclear cleanup and rehabilitation effort kicks off in August and will take about two years. With the completion of the initial $8 million project, Rongelap will have the basic infrastructure - a base camp for workers, new dock, an improved airstrip, power plant and water makers - to support the cleanup of the main island and, if funding is available, the possible extension of the cleanup to Rongelap's more than 50 other islands.
Twenty-five years of scientific research by American scientist William Robison at Bikini and Enewetak is underpinning the hopes of a return home for Bikinians and Rongelapese.

Other islanders, living on three southern islands in Enewetak's circular atoll necklace, are eyeing a cleanup and return of their nearby, but contaminated, northern islands.

However, though Robison, funded by the US Department of Energy, says these atolls are either safe or can become safe with cleanup action. He adds that it is the islanders will have to make their own value judgements about safety levels and methods to use for cleaning up the islands.

For starters, all the islands are employing their own independent scientists to review the US data and analysis. The Bikinians, who broke ground in 1997 to officially kick off their cleanup, are moving cautiously, attempting to get clear assurances from the US government about Bikini's safety. 36

Moreover the strategic interests of the United States and France security constrained the self-data maintain efforts of Islands. It is this concern for the fragile environment as well as the health of the Islanders, which led to the South Pacific forum Countries to sign the South pacific nuclear free zone-treaty (SPNFZ) in Aug 1985. 37 Since the treaty came about during the era of the colder. The competition for influence between the superpowers USA and USSR, as well as the membership of a particular as bloc of a South Pacific nation determined the nation's stand on the nuclear testing issues. In other words, there was no unanimity among the countries of the region ad far as antinuclear sentiments are concerned. The particular standpoint of each currently has been coloured by its foreign polity considerations. In 1975, New Zealand had come up with a Nuclear

36 Pacific Islands Monthly, July 1998 p -15
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Free Zone proposal but the exit of conservative governments in Australia and New Zealand lead to the shelving of this proposal.\(^{38}\)

In August 1983, Australia made another initiative to establish a nuclear free zone. New Zealand labour governments gave it further encouragement. The Australian initiative was perhaps a preemptive bid to stall New Zealand Prime Minister David Lange's proposal for a South Pacific regional security arrangement which could have led to the barring of US nuclear ships in the South west pacific.\(^{39}\)

Security analyst Ramesh Thakur, feels that six issues are of concern to the people of the region: vertical proliferation among the nuclear weapons states (NWS); the possibility of the breakdown of the nuclear peace; the spread of strategic weapons declines; and nuclear weapons deployments in the South Pacific; nuclear testing in the South Pacific. Facilities in the South Pacific which constituted part of the worldwide infrastructure of nuclear logistic and environmental anxieties along with the possible dumping of nuclear waste.

All six uses addressed in the 1985 South Pacific Nuclear Free Zone (SPNFZ). The core applications of, which are most to manufacture or control any nuclear device not to serve as a staging, place for nuclear weapons; not to conduct any nuclear testing and not to dump radioactive wastes at sea anywhere in the zone.\(^{40}\)

While China and the Soviet Union endorsed the SPNFZ the three western NWS did not do so until March 1996, although in the intervening years UK and USA did not violate any

\(^{38}\) Greg Fry, A Nuclear Free Zone For The South West – Prospects And Significance Working paper no 75 (ANU Canberra Sept 1983) p-25

\(^{39}\) Greg Fry, Australian National University interview (Canberra, 21 Aug 1997)

\(^{40}\) Ramesh Thakur, The Last Bang Before A Total Ban French Nuclear Testing In the Pacific International Journal L1 Summer 1996 p-468
zonal requirement. The French attitude, however, was that where it decides to test within French territory, France alone has the right to decide.\textsuperscript{41}

Even the Small Island status did not prevent the South Pacific Forum from having differing perceptions on the issue. While the next chapter shall deal with their views more comprehensively it would suffice here to point out that while the Melanesian states like Papua New Guinea, Solomon Islands and Vanuatu are more vocal in their antinuclear sentiments the Polynesian countries like Western Samoa, Tonga, Cook Islands and Niue were not as radical in their stand.\textsuperscript{42}

Why are the nations of the South Pacific so vocal in their antinuclear sentiments. The answer lies in the health hazard and the damage that such tests have and will in future threat on the environment. Radiation exposure and resultant causes is one such concern. Moreover these tests at times triggers off earthquakes and avalanches. In the same manner cracks may lead to radioactive leakage destroying the marine left in the seas surrounding phase atolls.

It is because of this that the South Pacific nations are equally concerned the USA ' Chemical Disposal system in Johnston atoll, subjects much debate in the SPF but will now be closed in 2000. AD. The Pacific Islands Monthly of May 1999 speaks about it thus, one of the Pacific's worst neighbours is getting ready to move out - hopefully with its plutonium, dioxin and assorted other deadly chemicals in tow.

The US Army's Johnston Atoll Chemical Disposal System (JACADS), on a tiny atoll between Hawaii and the Marshall Islands has since 1990 been destroying tens of thousands of mortar shells, artillery shells, rockets and bombs containing mustard gas and sarin nerve agents.

Johnston would have to be one of the strangest places on Earth. The island itself is only a little larger than the long runway down its middle. On one side a large factory-like building emits

\textsuperscript{41} United States Information Service, \textit{Wireless File} EPF 508, 20 Oct 1995, p-7
\textsuperscript{42} Manmohini Kaul, \textit{Pearls in the Ocean} (New Delhi 1993) p-87
steam from among the dozens of bunkers. On the other side, in seedy tenement-style buildings, the 1200 personnel live.

It would be a terrorist dream so when the Continental Air Micronesia 727 wings in from Honolulu, 1330 kilometres (825 miles), to the north east, the base goes into a security mode. Armed soldiers surround the plane; only those authorised to get off are allowed to. Out on the gangway the nature of the place is revealed in the hot, incessant wind and the debris of the Cold War.43

Nature is taking it back and as part of the US National Wildlife Refuges system, Johnston is home to tens and noddies, shearwaters and petrels, frigate birds and boobies while the lagoon is a breeding ground for green turtles.

Among the clean up issues is scattered plutonium. A nuclear missile failed to lift-off from the Johnston pad and exploded. The plutonium core did not go critical but was scattered along a thousand-metre (yard) length of shoreline.

Over 25,000 50-gallon steel drums of defoliant Agent Orange, not needed in the Vietnam War, was also stored and destroyed on Johnston, leaving a dangerous residual of dioxin. A large tank of diesel has also been leaking into the atoll.

Since 1971 Johnston has been used to store chemical weapons. In 1985 the US Congress directed the destruction of its chemical weapons and when the US first proposed JACADS the Pacific Forum summit meeting in Vanuatu in 1990 ended in uproar. Then Australian Prime Minister Bob Hawke defended the facility but leaders strongly condemned it and the US compromised by allowing Pacific countries the right to monitor its programme.44

---
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JACADS has worried Hawaii and the Honolulu City Council protested in 1997 to any extension of its operation, saying its record had been "marred by numerous accidents, including fires, explosions and releases of dangerous nerve agents".

Washington promised to close the facility by 2000 and destroy remaining chemical weapons in the US mainland in Oregon, Utah, Colorado, Arkansas, Alabama, Indiana, Kentucky and Maryland into the year 2004.

Driftnet fishing

The South Pacific is the most productive of regions in terms of tuna harvest, due mainly to its abundant skipjack resource and contributes some 40% of the total tuna supplied for canning. The region also supplies a substantial proportion of Japan's sashimi imports.

The region under the South Pacific Communication comprises the statistical area of 22 Pacific Island Countries.45

What are Driftnets? Driftnets are 8-15 meter deep nets made of fine nylon mesh used to fish for stocks of tuna, salmon, and squid. The nets are nearly transparent and are set below the surface to drift overnight. Between 2-90 kms in length, driftnets function as hanging "walls of death" for nearly everything they encounter. Fleets from Japan, South Korea and Taiwan formerly deployed some 50,000 kms of gillnet on a daily basis until the United Nations moratorium which began in these fleets operated in the Pacific, Indian, and Atlantic Oceans.46

Larger mesh nets were also used extensively by these fleets to target billfish and albacore on a worldwide basis. Despite the United Nations moratorium, pirate driftnetters continue to wreak havoc on deep ocean ecosystems. Because of its well-documented history of destruction of marine
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fisheries and wildlife populations, driftnetting is now widely considered to does humankind ever devise the most destructive fishing technology. Combined mortalities to dolphins and other small cetaceans impacted by these nets were measured in the early 1990's to be in excess of several hundred thousand each year. In addition, millions of seabirds, tens of thousands of seals, thousands of sea turtles and great whales, and huge quantities of non-target fish species were killed in these nets each year. Pirate driftnettters—though less numerous than their formerly "legal" counterparts, continue these destructive practices. Driftnet fishing is clearly unsustainable and causes indiscriminate mortalities to wildlife and non-target species. Stopping pirate driftnetting—as commercial driftnetting has been stopped—would preserve marine resources and wildlife populations and offer much needed protection to the majority of fishermen who use viable economic and environmentally sustainable methods of fishing. It would also end the destruction caused by the loss of thousands of miles of net each year. Lost nets, also called "ghost" nets, continue to 'fish' as they float at sea until sinking under the weight of their victims or washing ashore where they entangle seals and seabirds. 47

As far as the legal position on driftnet fishing is concerned—according to customary and conventional law the high seas and its resources are subject to res communications of the law of the commons. Numerous treaties including the United Nations law of the Sea connection (UNCLOS) restrict the use of the global ocean commons to that which is reasonable and does not infringe on the rights of others. "Freedom of fishing for example is subject to a whole host of conditions, this indicates that the would community considers high seas fishing services to be common property resource. 48

47 Earthtrust site Impact of driftnetting (www.earthtrust.org)
UNCLOS (United Nations Law of the Sea Convention) requires nation states to take conservation measures to protect the liming resources of the high seas and to cooperate and enter into negotiations with State whose nationals exploit identical using resources or different liming resources in the same area". So as to maintain or sustain the population of harvested species at levels, which can produce maximum sustainable yield as qualified by relevant environmental and economic factors and various such clauses. In order to claim a result to fish on the high seas a state must fulfill the conditions specified. It those conditions are not met there is no freedom of fishing, no right to have the resources of the global commons. Even then, countries did not desist from indulging in driftnet fishing.

The use of driftnets which some of the Asian countries find economical has dangerous marine and environmental consequences it almost amounts to strip mining the ocean. These nets which are mainly used by the Japanese and the Taiwanese in the South Pacific waters are popularly known as walls of death. This type of fishing not only has disastrous consequences for the economy of these micro states such as the depletion of a natural resources i.e. fish, but, it can it can produce ecological disasters of horrendous proportions.

The non-governmental environment group Greenpeace has played an important role in the campaign against driftnet fishing in the South pacific. It is an excellent example of the influence that non-governmental actions can play on the international area within respect to environmental uses.

In 1989, when driftnet fishing suddenly exploded onto the South Pacific seas in international waters on both sides of New Zealand Green peace embarked on an intense campaign of public information dissemination and lobbying with the governments of the region. That effort

\[49 \text{ ibid} \]
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contributed considerately to the public condemnation of driftnet fishing generating a political climate which enabled regional governments to take strong position against the practice in the region.\textsuperscript{51}

As Michael Hagler points out that mindful of the dangers posed to the marine environment from large scale high seas driftiness and aware of its rapid spread across the world, Greenpeace set a deliberate course of action aimed at bringing the uses to the attention once again of the United Nations and the larger world community. Hagler says it promoted the idea that driftnet fishing was not simply a regional problem but a global one that required a global response. Substantiation this agreement he points out that early in the development of the issue is the region in Feb 1989, it was Queen Peace which called or reigned government to take their concern to the United Nations asking for a resolution on the problem.\textsuperscript{52}

The Greenpeace concern with driftnets were specific:

- It posed a threat to the existing systems designed for the management and conservation of those commercial species targeted by high seas driftnet vessels, for example, tuna, salmon, and squid;

- A threat to marine wild life, like sea birds, turtles, and marine mammals and incidentally to existing arrangements for their protection and preservation;

- A threat to ecosystems caused by ghost nets, which have been lost or abandoned and drift over great distances for indefinite periods, causing accumulating injuries and mortalities to many kinds of species; and

\textsuperscript{51} Greenpeace, \textit{Driflnets or walls of death} leaflet (Wellington May 1992)
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• A threat to vessels, and their crews, whose rudders, engines, or gear may become entangled and seriously damaged by lost or abandoned driftnets, contributing to the more general accumulation of debris at sea.\footnote{ibid.}

It is because these concerns that on 22 December 1989, vide its resolution 44/225, the General Assembly of the United Nations expressed alarm at the over exploitation of living marine resources of the high seas by driftnets. The likelihood that driftnet fishing would have an adverse impact on the marine resources of the exclusive economic zones of the states.\footnote{MB Linda &MSJD Paul, *High Seas Driftnetting: The Plunder of the Global Commons A Compendium* (Kailua, May 1994) pp 12-17}

Another non-governmental organisation which had concentrated its efforts on a ban on driftnet fishing feels that the moratorium on deep-sea driftnets is not only Earthtrust's largest victory, it is possibly the largest environmental victory in history. In terms of biomass, species, fish populations, and number of creatures saved which would have been wastefully destroyed, the numbers are almost incomprehensible.\footnote{www.earthtrust.org} Ironically, though, this huge but partial victory brought certain complacency to the issue. Even though illegal driftnetting is still going on, and "legal" driftnetting is occurring within the 200-mile limits of some nations, contributions and effort to end activities in the Pacific and Indian oceans have virtually dried up. It is estimated that each Taiwanese driftnet boat fishing the Indian Ocean kills roughly 50 sperm whales per season, making this the largest such whale kill in the world today;\footnote{ibid} yet conventional wisdom seems to be that the issue is solved. Difference of views between the North and South and its effect on the environmental issue negotiations.

\begin{flushleft}
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The inequitable economic relations between North and South have been an important element of the political context of global environmental politics. The developing states perceive the global economic structure as a fundamentally unequal one. This view shapes their response both in terms of the policy and the strategy for negotiating on those issues. Unfavourable trends in North-South economic relations since the 1970s have only served to sharpen these inequalities. Consequently the bargaining position of the South has considerably weakened at the negotiating table.

A surge in commodity prices and the Organisation of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) successful manipulation of oil supplies in the early 1970s encouraged the developing countries to attempt to restructure the whole global economic system at the UN General Assembly in 1974. The South gave the call for a New International Economic Order. A bold but unrealistic plan, that included a new system of international commodity agreements. A unilateral reduction of barriers to imports from developing states in industrialised countries, enhancement of developing countries’ capabilities in science and technology, increased Northern financing of technology transfer, and changes in patent laws to lower the cost of such transfers.57

Soon economic trends turned against the South, and the North consequently felt it could disregard such Southern demands for change. Falling commodity prices devastated the economies of those countries that were heavily dependent on commodity exports.58 At the beginning of the 1990s forty countries were spending the equivalent of 30% or more of their export income to pay debts—well beyond what is normally regarded as the threshold level of a financial crisis.59

57 Karl Sauvant and Hajo Hasenpflug (Ed), The New International Economic Order: Confrontation or Cooperation Between North and South? (Boulder, 1977) p-45
59 ibid p-46
During the 1990s trade barriers erected by industrialised countries against imports of manufactured and processed goods from the developing countries continued to increase even as most developing countries under pressure from international financial institutions were lowering their own barriers to imports.\textsuperscript{60} New kinds of nontariff barriers to trade, such as antidumping and countervailing duty actions, export-restraint agreements such as the Multi Fibre Arrangement and direct subsidies have been used to protect industries in the industrialised countries against imports from developing countries.\textsuperscript{61}

The negotiations on liberalisation of world trade were started in 1985 under the auspices of the GATT to help reduce these barriers. The GATT Uruguay round agreement was adopted in 1994, but the overall impact has been slight. The object of the preceding discussion was analyse how the North is responsible for many of the environmental problems, after all, it is the Northern protectionism, which forces developing countries to exploit their natural resources more heavily hence leading to environmental degradation.

Therefore it is but natural that the developing countries views are shaped by its concern for economic development, their fears of high costs of environmental protection and the general distrust of the policies of industrialised states. They have tended to regard most of the environmental negotiations as a Northern agenda. The common Southern view of the relationship between global environment issues and North-South economic relations as shall now be described.

They insist that the industrialised countries, because of their historical dominance in the production and consumption of CFCs and combustion of fossil fuels, are responsible for the thinning of the ozone layer and greenhouse warming. They identify Northern patterns of excessive
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consumption as key cause of global environmental degradation. Therefore they believe that the North should bear the financial burden of measures to reverse the ecological damage. In the negotiation for each global environmental regime, as well as, UNCED negotiations, demands from the South for new and additional funding for developing countries implementation of the agreement has been the central issue.\textsuperscript{62}

Another consistent theme in the Southern views on environmental issues is the inequality in governing structures of international organisations such as the World Bank, which allows a minority of donor countries to outvote the rest of the world. Decisions on how to spend the money on environmental issues should be a global one.\textsuperscript{63} We shall be discussing the conflict between the North and South is almost all the chapters.

The ultimate reckoning over North-South equity and responsibility still lies in the future. Developing countries have been willing to sign and ratify global environmental regimes even though they did not secure the financial and technological arrangements they had demanded. But their willingness to take actions to make convention effective will depend on greater cooperation of the North reflecting a greater commitment from some of the key industrialised countries.
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