

From Rio to Rio: A Vicious Circle?

Assoc. Prof. Hakan Evin¹

Prof. Dr. Berkan Demiral²

¹ Adiyaman University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Public Administration, hevin@adiyaman.edu.tr

² Trakya University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Department of Public Administration, berkandemiral@trakya.edu.tr

Abstract: The United Nations (UN) has always been blamed of expressing little interest in environmental issues. Although it has resident substructures in many other fields passing over the environmental issue with only one program (UNEP) and choosing the center of this program in an African country, Kenya, consolidates the thought that the critics have strong basis. That's why the UN organized a series of environment summits starting with "Man and Biosphere" in order to take a strong step about environment. The most famous of these summits is certainly the Rio Summit in 1992.

The Rio Summit had captured the headlines with the number of its participants and content become the center of global Cooperation in the solution of environmental problems. But there was a real disappointment at the era of the summit and nothing worthwhile resulted soft laws, there were no concrete steps and there was no consensus on the sustainable development concept in the final declaration of the summit although this concept titled the summit. However, the five basic documents accepted in the summit (Rio Declaration, Agenda-21, Bio Diversity, Climate Change and Desertification) are still accepted as the most important international environmental documents.

The UN arranged many environmental summits after Rio as if did before Rio+20 (e.g. New York and Johannesburg) but actually it didn't get the expected results either whereupon the UN decide to arrange a Rio environmental summit again. One of the main reasons of arranging the summit in Rio again was the popularity of the previous Rio summit.

In this study the experiences between the two Rio summits and the results of them will be examined comparatively. It is rather thought about the summit known as Rio+20. Also the role of international summits in solving the environmental problems will be discussed in this study.

Key Words: Global Environmental Governance, Rio, Rio+20, Sustainable Development, Turkey

INTRODUCTION: FROM STOCHOLM TO RIO

Mankind has always caused numerous problems on our planet throughout his existence on the face of the earth. However, none of them has ever made as great impact as the ones that are being experienced after the industrial revolution. On one hand, changes happened in the manufacturing types have encouraged masses to live densely in

certain places, on the other hand, they have considerably changed the habits of people's consumption. These changes have taken on another dimension with their impacts on the environment. From the 1960s onward, first they caused a heated debate in civil-society dimension (particularly Roman club), then in the international organizations dimension. The essence of these discussions focused on how much world resources would be sufficient and how long they would exist.

Table 1: The View of the World in the 20th Century

Items	Growth Rate (Between 1890-1990)
World Population	4
World Urban Population	13
In the World Economy	14
Industrial Production	40
In the use of Energy	16
Coal Production	7
Air pollution	Approximately 5
CO ₂ Emission	17
SO ₂ Emission	13
Lead Oscillation in the Atmosphere	Approximately 8
Water Consumption	9
Fishing in Seas	35

The first major international initiative on this issue is "Conference on Human Environment" held by the United Nations in Stocholm on June 5-16, 1972. The U.N. which had been accused of displaying a lack of sensitivity on the environment took the first important step with this conference. Despite the negative impacts of ideological polarizations in the world, economic development and environmental protection was defended for the first time with the concepts of "environmental rights", "mutual responsibility" (Alada vd; 1993). It was seen essential to re-evaluate the regulations on the issue of environmental management that had been thought before the conference (Kivilcim: 2012).

Among the decisions made in this conference, the ones that were put into practice were to establish United Nations Environmental Program, to create an environment fund, and to declare June 5 World Environment Day. The conference was described by pessimistics "a pile of burocratic legacy that justified capitalism" (Lipschutz: 2004). In spite of this, by keeping away from its economical and political implications, it played an active role in taking measures together with international convents and other aid mechanisms concerning the dangers on environmental pollutions.

The most important international development in the era of from Stocholm to Rio is the report titled "Our Common Future" prepared by an independent commission (Commision on Environment and Development) set up by experts from world countries upon the request of the United Nations (Oxford University: 1991). The report tried to reveal the common grounds for the relations of "environment and development" in developed or less developed countries. It drew attention by introducing 'environment right', and 'sustainable development' concepts to the environment thought. The biggest contribution of the report on the concept of the sustainable development is that it is the first and single international convent that made the definition of sustainable development.

This summit led to important results for developed and less developed countries. Developed countries view that they need to change their habits of production and consumption, while less developed contries view that population increase led to important results. However, both of them tended to see that this report was an effort made against them (Müezzinoğlu: 1992).

1. RIO 1992: UN. CONFERENCE ON ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT-UNCED

Members of the U.N. took the decision to organize Rio Conference on December,1989 in order to make joint management action plan so that problems such as global structures of the environmental problems, namely climate change, ozon layer spoil, cross-border air and water pollution could be solved with the participation of all countries (Paellemaerts: 1992).

Rio de Janerio summit presented a new brand energy contribution about global environmental management. Multiple character structure was ever-increasingly seen about global environment policies (from local to global, from local communities to multi-national networks). This conference brought brand new management experiences and viewpoints on environment. The effect of Rio and its legacy are far beyond these and it encompasses changes on global environment management.

Rio summit set an example for multi-lateral and multi-national negotiations at global dimension. This conference gained a new perspective on the global environment management with the effect of global actors of international organizations and multi-lateral environment agreements. Rio conference reinforced the idea to institutionalize global issues (Andanova and Hoffman: 2012).

The topics of debate at the summit clearly revealed this transformation. That "sustainable development" concept was accepted as the basic principle of the conference resulted in sigh of relief about the solutions for the environmental problems. This situation was reflected in the descriptions of the topics about the global problems on the development and the trade. The scientific evaluations that constitute the foundation of the topics at the summit helped to understand the systems concerning human ecology.

The complexity of the global environmental issues requires multi-lateral cooperation and being experienced. Two intergovernmental agreements that were accepted in Rio in 1992 (climate change, environmental agreement, and Biological diversity agreement) are important for seeing these effects. These agreements, including Kyoto Protocol inspired many actors at various levels in the process. NGO's and the business sector attempted

to enable the infrastructure of carbon markets and to form the network between the local governments and cities and to develop society based protection and development. The centralized, top-down, and single management approach that had been brought by classical management underwent considerable changes.

Rio Conference started its work on June 1992 after its preliminary preparations made between the dates of June 1 and 2, 1992. It ended on June 14, 1992 with the participation of 118 prime ministers or presidents and lots of delegations. The conference was delivered on five basic topics: Climate Change Convention, Biological Diversity Convention, Rio Declaration, Agenda 21, and the List of Principles for the Protection of Forests and Their Improvement).

1.1. Climate Change Conventions

The most important purpose of this convention is to provide financial and technological transfer for developing countries in order to reduce CO₂ and other greenhouse gas emissions that cause climate change and to take precautions in line with this objective. Besides, it was accepted that each country would keep its quantity of gas emitted in the air at the 1997 level (Scheurs: 2012-a). Particularly, in the preface of the convention, the importance of the global climate was stressed for the humanity of today and future generations.

The convention was signed by 153 countries and European Union (at that time European Community). Then Kyoto Protocol was negotiated in 1997 with a big battle of words and it was accepted in 2005.

In fact, in the first half of the year 2010, the emissions of global greenhouse gas were sounding a note of alarm. Few countries tried to reduce their greenhouse gas emissions under necessary levels. Unfortunately, the supporter of Kyoto Protocol lost many key countries. Although the protocol had lots of national and local supporters, it was not approved by one of the most important emission releasers (U.S.A.). Canada, which has had important increasing greenhouse gas emissions in the last twenty years, has recently withdrawn from the protocol officially.

1.2. Biological Diversity Convention

The second issue was biological diversity convention. Climate Change Convention was about human settlement, economical and agricultural activities, the change patterns of land use,

poaching, the extinction of plants and animal species. Three basic purpose of the convention was described in the first article: the protection of biological diversity, the sustainable use of components, and fair and equal distribution of benefits resulting from genetic resources. The convention aimed at protecting biological resources at national, regional, and international level; preventing threats to these resources; taking precautions against exploiting biological and genetic resources without permission; providing new and additional financial resources for developing countries; and providing technological transfer.

The convention was signed by 164 countries, European Community, and Turkey which attended the conference. World sustainable development was approved in 2002 on condition that there would be significant reduction in the loss of biological diversity by 2010.

In a meeting held in the Japanese city of Nagoya in 2010, several new objectives were accepted: to save at least half of natural habitats, to increase global natural reserves to 17% by 2020 (now it is around 10%) and to increase marine spaces that are under protection now from 1% to 10%.

With this convention, it was recommended that countries should make their national plans to protect their biological diversity. This convention also includes provisions about how to protect their genetic resources. Despite lack of financial resources and efforts to protect biological diversity, political discussions about the biological diversity were less than the ones about climate change convention.

1.3. Rio Declaration

The Rio Declaration accepted in the conference consists of 27 basic principles which regulate the relations of countries with one another and the earth on both environment and development issues. Rio Declaration includes non-binding proposals on the issues of responsibility concerning the common environment, descriptions about human rights on development, and on the issue of identifying basic rights concerning the environment.

When viewing the Rio Declaration carefully, it is possible to see that everything is associated with sustainable development. The declaration receives some criticism on this point. It is said that there are some hot spots. For example, it receives some

criticism like the difficulty in balancing the economic interests of today's generations and the economic interests of the future generations. Also balancing the institutional interests and individual interests has the same level of difficulty (Palmer: 1992).

Some principles set forth in this declaration have come to the forefront for the first time. For example, the "principle of preventiveness" and the principle of "common but differentiated responsibilities" get ahead of the others. The declaration tried to direct states, private sectors, and non-governmental organizations to work collaboratively on long term environment and development issues. While examining the declaration, it also includes striking principles like "the one who pollutes pays the price", or "caution".

The 10th principle of the declaration directs the relationship between state and individual concerning the environmental problems at national level. Here it has been drawn attention to the implementation of principle of clarity for individuals to access information possessed by the public authority on the environment. Thus, it has been drawn attention that public sensitivity and participation can be possible.

The 20th, 21st, and 22nd principles of the Rio Declaration reflect the effects of social movements that we have recently witnessed. These are guided by women, youth, greenpeace, and enriching everything which is local.

1.4. Agenda 21

Agenda 21, which is the application document of the declaration principles, is an action plan aimed at integrating the issues of development and environment at international level from the 1990s onward to 2000 and subsequent years. It consists of 4 basic chapters and 40 subchapters. Targets, activities, and action mechanisms of application programmes of every chapter have been defined.

The title of the first chapter is Social and Economic Dimension. The main subheadings are the international cooperation for the acceleration of sustainable development of developing countries, poverty, consumption patterns, demographic movement, public health, the improvement of residential areas, the production of development policies. Of all the topics dealing with as part of this chapter, the issue of new and additional financial resources that will be provided for the developing

countries received the most attention in the conference (Alada vd: 1992).

The fact that sustainable development is assured in developing countries depends on the increasing of investments. Conversely, most of the countries in question transferred abroad all their financial resources to pay their debts in the years left behind. In order to implement Agenda21 for these countries to implement Agenda 21, their amount of the estimated annual expenditure is around 600 billion dollars in the periods between 1993 and 2000. The annual 125 billion dollars of the this amount will be provided for the developing countries by developed countries and international financial organizations. At that time, the amount of foreign aid provided for the developing countries is 55 billion dollars. The remaining 475 billion dollars will be met by the budget of the countries. The fact that developed countries increased the contribution provided for the developing countries to the rate of 07% of the national income caused a lot of discussions. While developing countries demanded to reach this rate by 2000, the U.S.A. and Japan objected to determining the target year (Palmer: 1992).

Some measures were taken for the improvements that were thought of achieving in the economies of the developing countries. Fixing the interests rates, the interconvertible of exchange rates, reviving the savings, reducing financial deficits, the stability of international economy, and its predictability should be promoted.

The second chapter of Agenda 21 was allocated to the protection of resources and management for the development. These include the protection of the environment physically and technically, the planning and management of land resources deforestation, desertation, combat against drought, agriculture, the protection of biological diversity, biotechnology, the protection of seas and coastal areas, the protection of fresh water areas, toxic chemicals, and the management of dangerous waste, and the management of radioactive waste.

The third chapter was allocated to the reinforcement of the roles of active social groups and organizational groups such as women, local people, civil organizations, local authorities, workers and unions, business and industrial circles, science and technology circles, and farmers.

In the fourth chapter where application mechanisms were described, the issues of

developing countries, the financial resources that would be provided, technology transfer, science, education, determining national capacities for sustainable development, international institutional regulations, international legal tools, and creating data centres were discussed.

1.5. Management of Forests

One of the important outcomes in Rio is the declaration on forests. The negotiations made for a binding hard law before Rio was a gleam of hope for the issues on biological diversity and climate change. However, especially the developing countries successfully prevented a binding law from passing. Deep differences of views between the north and south came up to the surface again. In the end, the list of forests principles that did not have legal binding was accepted.

1.6. Rio+20

UN general secretary Ban ki Moon stated in his expressions in his article published in New York Times on May 23 “we are aware that we have taken a step toward a new age. Some even call this a new geological era in which the world has radically changed its motion”.

What do all these mean for Rio+20? Most of the basic issues like sustainable development, poverty, environmental protection, the decrease in biological diversity, and climate change have come to agenda in the last 20-40 years. The process was directed from viewing the facts from a narrow frame to more concrete, measurable, and confirmable targets. Sustainable development and environmental protection are being shown more and more interest and awareness.

However, when considering the fact that the population of the world is around 7 billion and that it will have risen to 9 billion by 2050, the burden on our planet and its continuous increase is being experienced in some parts of Europe, Russia, Japan, and South Korea despite population decrease.

Income inequality in most countries is another problem. A very small group in the world is carrying out a very big part of the world consumption.

Rio+20 summit had been thought to be an opportunity for the realizations of the objectives that were determined in Rio summit. But they were yet to be realized. These objectives were ordered as follows:

1. To fix greenhouse gas emissions to destroy the effect of harmful gases in the atmosphere that cause climate change (Article 2, United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change).
2. The protection of biological diversity, the sustainable use of the components and fair and equal distribution of benefits resulted from the use of genetic resources (Article 1, United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity).
3. To diminish the effects of drought and combat against desertification (Article 2, United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification).
4. To establish a global partnership to understand the challenges on environment and development (Agenda 21).

Even though there are some developments on the issues of global awareness, scientific data about sustainable development, and on the issues of local, national, and international governance, it is not much possible to be optimistic as Evin (2012) stated. For example, NASA (2011) has declared the year 2010 as the hottest year that the whole world has ever experienced since 1880. The CO₂ rate in the atmosphere increased to 390 ppm. Although we are in the year 2010s, the 2002 objectives about the loss of biological diversity have not been accomplished yet. 11% of all the bird species, 25% of the mammals, 41% of the amphibians have faced the danger of extinction (IUCN, 2011).

Little progress have been made on the other issues that were among the millenium development objectives such as the decrease of poverty, access to safe drinking water, the decrease of infant mortality rates and disease control.

There is a global acceptance on the issue of reducing the heat prior the industrial revolution to minus 2 degree by fixing the greenhouse gases. However, the essential political will is too weak to implement this. An agreement was reached to move on to the next section for the Kyoto Protocol in the 17th COP meeting held by U.N. on the

Climate Change Framework Convention¹. But it was revealed that the second section would take place in a more narrow scope compared with the first one. For example, Canada announced its withdrawal from the Kyoto Protocol. Japan and Russia stated that they would not assume new obligations. The U.S.A. had not signed the protocol after all. Thus, it seems that the solution of the problem is assigned to Europe, Australia, and New Zealand which are already uncommitted to new promises.

By creating G-20 type forums, the summit focused on issues such as finding solutions at subnational level to climate change and biological diversity, direct or indirect removal of subsidies on fossil fuels, the expansion of incentives for renewable energy, prevailing the "green" understanding to meet the needs of managements, the promotion of tree planting by reducing deforestation, promoting increased taxes on luxury consumption, and education on climate change. The works in the summit focused on two main axes:

1. Sustainable development and green economy for poverty reduction and
2. The institutional framework of sustainable development

The U.N. Environment Programme (UNEP) defines green economy as 'the system of economic activities concerning the production of goods and services, their distribution and consumption that will long term increase people's welfare without exposing future generations to environment risks. The green economy simply means exploiting resources efficiently, releasing low carbon, and being socially inclusive. In a green economy, income and employment should be increased with the public and private investments, the emission of carbon and pollution should be reduced, the use of energy and resources should be efficient, and the reduction of biological diversity should be prevented.

The concept of green economy, of course, cannot be substituted for the concept of sustainable development. However, it can easily be said that it raises a significant awareness for ensuring sustainability especially for obtaining economic rights. The defenders of green economy have been

insisting on the fact that the "brown economy" which has been tried to be created for decades, has fallen beyond the development goals of the millennium (Shiva: 2012).

Shifting to a green economy is possible by fulfilling certain conditions. The ground that is essential for the fulfillment of these conditions is only possible through national regulations, policies, subsidies, international markets, legal regulations, and bringing together the trade and aid protocols.

The things that need to be done at national level for shifting to a green economy are the change in monetary policies, reform, the reduction of the environmentally damaging incentives, the promotion of employment for the new market, the harmonization of the investment targets in the public sector with the "green economy" by making the necessary legal regulations for the protection and development of the environment (UNEP: 2011).

The things that need to be done at international level are the adding of infrastructure facilities for the improvement of the flow of trade and aid for the current structure and promoting more international cooperation (Krugman, 2010).

In the preparatory process of the Rio+20 conference, seven fields were emphasized that they were of prime importance: job opportunities, energy, sustainable cities, food security, sustainable agriculture, water, oceans, and disasters (Kivilcim: 2012).

The summit officially began on June 13, 2012. A text called "zero draft" was opened to discussion for approval. When the third preparatory committee (Prepcom III) ended its works, the general secretary of Rio+20 Sha Zukang stated that they had reached an agreement about the 37 % of the result document. In spite of this, it was clear that the important issues remained unresolved (Shiva: 2012).

Among the issues on which an agreement was not reached were the transfer of technology, the provision of financing for developing countries, and the increase of capacity. Among the countries that objected to these issues most were Japan, Russia, and the U.S.A. (Kivilcim, 2012).

1 See for a detailed assessment about COP summits. Demiral, B. N. Demiral and H. Evin.; "A Cry in the Dark Vol.:15: Copenhagen and Beyond", 1st International

Congress on Urban and Environmental Issues and Policies, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey, 547-563, (2010).

The most important achievement emerged from the end of the conference was the acceptance of draft result document that was submitted to presidents and the contents of which were determined in negotiations. When inspected carefully, it can be seen that one-third of the text was the confirmation of the decisions made before. The second one-third of the pie chart consists of thoughts about obligations on various issues assigned to governments. The last one-third of the text deals with various issues with which most of us are familiar such as oceans, cities, water, food security, economic development, and institutional design (UNCSD: 2012):

1. Sustainable Development: Unfortunately, even an agreed definition did not emerge from this summit either as from other U.N. summits. One of the most striking issues about this topic is the use of the concept of sustainable growth instead of the concept of sustainable development. It was agreed that a private working group should submit its development goals to U.N. in such a way to include all countries. In fact, 1.5 years ago, states agreed to implement their sustainable development goals. This indicates that they fell behind the one that was agreed in Rio.

2. Fossil Fuels: It was agreed that fossil fuels would have been initialized by 2020 by reducing the support for it. As a matter of fact, this did not bring anything new because it was an agreed situation with lots of regulations.

3. Oceans: It was agreed that countries would have provided necessary support for the prevention of sea pollution by 2025. But there are still concerns over the fact that countries like U.S.A., Canada, Russia, and Venezuela had softened this heading and that they would go on polluting the oceans (Shiva: 2012, Kivilcim: 2012, Evin: 2012).

4. Forests: It seems that the text on forests shamelessly has no content at all.

5. Institutional Structure: No concrete result emerged from the summit. UNEP could not have an institutional structure. This can be evaluated as an indicator about how much world countries are insensitive about the environment. It is clear that the U.N. receives one of the biggest criticisms on this issue. It is still intensively being criticized that the U.N. which creates a concrete structure on lots of issues and locates the centre of these institutions in the cities of developed countries (like New York) deals with the environmental issue with only one programme and besides it locates

Nairobi-the city of a less developed country-for the centre of the programme.

6. Money and Application Tools: There is an ambiguous promise for the poor about financial aid. Countries will be encouraged to benefit from the relevant funds with U.N. Programmes and with the help of its agents. National programmes will be supported for creating job opportunities. However, there was not an agreement even on the issue of financial transaction tax.

7. Climate Change: Reducing the greenhouse gases by 2020 is the point in question. A rate has not been given on this issue. This has no meaning as mentioned in the prior sections of the work. Apart from this, it has been emphasized that green climate funds will be supported.

8. Green Economy: It has been agreed that decisions will be made by the countries themselves by taking their national strategic priorities into account first. Countries are free about doing nothing on this issue. This means that they have fallen behind even the first Rio summit held twenty years ago.

9. Cities: In the last decade, there have been attribution to waste management, transportation and energy output centered upon the sustainable city plans in order to cover the demands of the growing urban population.

10. Energy: Concrete objectives have not been determined for renewable energy. This summit has caused disappointment for 1.4 billion people who have no access to energy and who cannot meet their needs with renewable energy.

11. Health: It has been agreed that social adaptation in the health system at universal level and sustainable health and economic models will be improved.

12. Education: It has been recommended that other members will adapt to the education programme (2005-2014) for the U.N. sustainable development.

13. Natural Disasters: The importance of the Hyogo Action Framework (2005-2015) is being emphasized.

14. Biological Diversity: 2011-2020 strategic plan is being emphasized.

2. THE FUTURE WE WANT ?

As a matter of fact, the failure of oversimplified initiatives for the complex systems like Rio+20

should not astonish us. However the sad expressions about the results of this summit do not mean the end of everything.

There has been a two-way viewpoint concerning the results of this conference as in every U.N. summit. On one hand, there are those who find the summit unsuccessful since they are not satisfied with the results of the summit. For example, CARE, which is an organization for combating poverty, criticized the summit by stating that "it was nothing more than a political charade." Greenpeace declared the summit as "legendary failure" (Romero and Broder: 2012). BBC (June 22, 2012) labelled the conference as "the biggest failure that had ever been seen" in its evaluation on the final report of the conference. The Economist (June 23, 2012) described the conference as "the weakest promises for making the global economy green" and declared the more famous ancestor of the summit (Rio 92) as the ancestor that had not made any progress.' The academician of Colombia University Jagdish Bhagwati (2012) described the summit as "unsustainable rubbish" and said "If George Orwell were alive, he would get tensed and shocked to see lobbyists who rush into glassware shop like an elephant and who do not know where to spend their money." Even the general secretary of the conference Sha Zukag refused to defend the results of the conference and said "my job is to make everybody equally unhappy" (Rive: 2012).

Not only individuals and non-governmental organizations but also states were disappointed by the results of the conference. Among them is the Europe first. Europe that had taken the role of leadership in conferences before could not find the support it expected and became lonely most of the time (Romero and Broder: 2012).

But there are also those who view this summit positively as in every U.N.summit. The environmental group Pew says: "it is not much true to say that the summit is a failure for the conference held every 10 years" (Romero and Broder: 2012). Allenby (2012) describes this situation as a "power shift."

States are not in the centre of the summit any longer. Private sectors, non-governmental organizations, and activists are in the centre of the summit. In particular, private sectors put their seals in the summit. Companies came to the summit with new ideas and viewpoints. Besides, they take on active roles. For example, Microsoft

said it had aimed at receiving carbon tax from its establishments in around 100 countries and zeroizing carbon emission by 2013. Some said that they would prepare environmental and social conditions tables in addition to financial tables. Some promised to reduce consumption of resources and to increase the efforts to protect them. Femsas, which is a beverage company of Latin American origin, said that it could meet 85% of the energy need of Mexico with the energy obtained through renewable resources. In the end of all these developments, one of the former ministers from Costa Rica Jose Maria Figueres criticized the general secretary of the conference Sha Zukang, stating "1500 CEO from 60 countries around the world attended the conference and made various promises. In this case, Mr. General Secretary, those who disappoint you are only the governments..." (Ciobanu: 2012).

This situation sometimes provided sigh of relief for the summit that had been blocked. For example, the Obama administration chose on focusing small scale development projects such as clean bakers or local energy projects instead of putting forward big public projects in this summit.

Those who view the outcomes of the conference allege that private sectors can be more sensitive to environmental protection in terms of sustainability (Allenby: 2012). According to them, if private sectors do not keep their promises, they will be subjected to pressure by their shareholders, customers, central and local administrations, and non-governmental organizations. For this reason, they will have to fulfil their promises. However, it must be known that when two interests clash with each other, the private sector will prefer to side with its own interests. They will not tend to give an account of their actions. For this reason, it is not possible to unconditionally trust private sectors.

On the other hand, the second thing that must be emphasized is about the concept of sustainable development. It is not a true approach to think that sustainability could continue by moving on the current production and consumption relations to a more production and consumption point. Besides, it is not possible to accomplish sustainability by making the current production and consumption patterns green. For this reason, it is apparent that re-evaluating the approach to sustainable development is beneficial.

It has caused pessimism to reach the conclusion that the conference and its results are at a loose

end. On the contrary, there are very important results that we have obtained from the outcomes of the conference. One of the most important of these is the fact that the current definitions and approaches cause new problems instead of solving the problem and that this problem cannot be solved with Rio and so forth summits. In conclusion, it is too an important achievement to know what we will not do.

REFERENCES

- Alada, A. B., Gürpınar, E ve Budak, S (1993); "Rio Konferansı Üzerine Düşünceler", İstanbul Üniversitesi Siyasal Bilgiler Fakültesi Dergisi, sayı 3-4-5: İstanbul (pp. 93-108)
- Allenby, B (2012); "Why Rio+20 a Success (Yes, Really)", *Environmental Quality Management*, Winter, 2012 (pp13-19).
- Andanova, L.B and Hoffman, M.J. (2012); "From Rio to Rio and Beyond: Innovation in Global Environmental Governance", *Journal of Environment and Development*, 21(1) (pp.57-61).
- Bhagwati, J (21 June 2012); "Rio's Unsustainable Nonsense", *New York Times*, retrieved from <http://www.cfr.org/economic-development/rios-unsustainable-nonsense/p28612>, (Accessed on: 12.12.2017)
- BBC (22 June 2012); "Criticism and Discord Mark Rio Summit End", retrieved from <http://www.bbc.com/news/science-environment-18549216>, (Accessed on: 3.03.2018)
- Ciobanu, C. (2012); "Rio Ends With Raft of Voluntary Pledges", *Terraviva*, retrieved from <http://www.ips.org/TV/rio20/rio-ends-with-raft-of-voluntary-pledges/>, (Accessed on: 27.11.2017)
- Demiral, B.; N. Demiral and H. Evin, (2010).; "A Cry in the Dark Vol.15: Copenhagen and Beyond", 1st International Congress on Urban and Environmental Issues and Policies, Karadeniz Technical University, Trabzon, Turkey, (pp. 547-563)
- Evin, M (17 Haziran 2012); "Hani Bana Verdiğin O Güzel Sözler", *Milliyet Cadde*, Retrieved from <http://cadde.milliyet.com.tr/2012/06/17/YazarDetay/1554718/hani-bana-verdigin-o-guzel-sozler> (Accessed on: 13.03.2018)
- IUCN (2011); *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, Summary Statistics, 2011.02*. Retrieved from http://www.iucnredlist.org/about/summary-statistics#How_many_threatened. (Accessed on: 29.01.2018)
- Kıvılcım, İ (Haziran, 2012); "Rio+20 Notları: Umutlu Olmak İçin Yeterli mi?", *İktisadi Kalkınma Vakfı Yayınları*: İstanbul.
- Ki-Moon, B. (10 June 2012); "Arzu Ettiğimiz Gelecek", retrieved from <http://www.bb.undp.org/content/turkey/tr/home/presscenter/news-from-new-horizons/2012/06/ban-ki-moon-writes-the-future-we-want/> (Accessed on: 13.01.2018)
- Krugman, P. (April 2010); "Building Green Economy", *New York Times*, Retrieved from <http://www.nytimes.com/2010/04/11/magazine/11Economy-t.html?pagewanted=print>
- Lipschutz, R. D. (2004); *Global Environmental Politics: Power, Perspectives and Practice*, CQ Press: Washington D.C.
- Müezzinoğlu, A. (1992); "Çevre Zirvesi-Rio de Janeiro", *Çevre ve Mühendislik, Özel Sayı*, (p.4).
- National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) (2011, January 12); "NASA Research Finds 2010 Tied for Warmest Year on Record." *Research News*. Retrieved from <http://www.giss.nasa.gov/research/news/20110112/>. (Accessed on: 11.01.2018)
- Oxford University Press (1991); *Our Common Future*, Oxford University Press: New York-Suffolk.
- Paellemaerts, M. (1992); "International Environmental Law From Stockholm to Rio: Back to the Future", *Review of European Community and International Environmental Law*, 1(3): (pp.254-266).
- Palmer, G (1992); "The Earth Summit: What Went Wrong at Rio?", *Washington University Law Review*, 70(4), (pp1005-1028).
- Romero, S. and Broder J.M. (2012); "Progress on the Sidelines as Rio Conference Ends", 24 June 2012.
- Rive, V. (2012); "Don't worry, be happy? Rio+20 – the Aftermath", 28 June 2012, retrieved from <http://www.idealogue.co.nz/blog/2012/06/dont-worry-be-happy-rio20-aftermath>, (Accessed on: 3.03.2017)
- Scheurs, M. A. (2012-a); "20th Anniversary of The Rio Summit: Taking A Look Back and at the Road Ahead", *GAIA* 21(1) (pp.13-16).

Schreurs, M.A. (2012-b); "Rio+20: Assessing Progress to Date and Future Challenges", *The Journal of Environment&Development*, 21(1), (pp-19-23).

United Nations Environmental Program (UNEP) (2011); "Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication", UNEP: France.

Shiva, V. (02 July 2012); "The Great U-Turn", *Al-Jazeera*, retrieved from.
<http://www.aljazeera.com/indepth/opinion/2012>

</06/20126279180725959.html>, (Accessed on: 13.03.2018)

The Economist (23 June 2012); "Many 'mays' but few 'musts'", retrieved from
<http://www.economist.com/node/21557314>, (Accessed on: 03.03.2018)

UNCSD (2012):"The Future We Want", retrieved from
<http://www.uncsd2012.org/content/documents/727The%20Future%20We%20Want%2019%20June%201230pm.pdf>, (Accessed on: 05.03.2018)