

**Bharat H. Desai (ed.), *Envisioning Our Environmental Future: Stockholm+50 And Beyond* (Amsterdam, Berlin, Washington DC, IOS Press, 2022), pp. 257+xiii**

Recently we have witnessed the Stockholm+50 Conference (2-3 June 2022)<sup>1</sup>, which marked 50 years of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment (UNCHE) that was held in Stockholm (Sweden) from 5-16 June, 1972. It was the historic Stockholm Moment<sup>2</sup> that inspired a generation for the global movement of environment protection. The corpus of international environmental law-making<sup>3</sup> has progressed exponentially in the last five decades (1972-2022) since the Stockholm Conference. It has also percolated down to the domestic levels through ‘greening’ of the constitutions, new legislations, policies and institutional mechanisms for environment protection.

If we track the progress of the “global conferencing techniques”<sup>4</sup> following the Stockholm Conference, which resulted in Stockholm declaration,<sup>5</sup> a flurry of sector-specific multilateral environmental agreements<sup>6</sup> have been crystallized. For instance, climate change itself has seen three instruments: the 1992 UNFCCC,<sup>7</sup> the 1997 Kyoto Protocol<sup>8</sup> and the 2015 Paris Agreement.<sup>9</sup> The different nomenclatures used in international environmental law-making process has brought in diverse instruments, treaties, convention, agreements and protocols. They have, in turn, facilitated a plethora of domestic legislation to give effect to international obligations. Significantly, these international instruments have also helped the judiciary to make environmental rights justiciable.

---

1 *Stockholm+50: A Healthy Planet for the Prosperity of All – Our Responsibility, Our Opportunity*, Stockholm+50, available at: <<https://www.stockholm50.global/>> accessed on 28 October.

2 Bharat H. Desai, “The Stockholm Moment”, *Environmental Policy and Law*, vol. 52 (2022), pp. 171-172.

3 Bharat H. Desai, *International Environmental Law-making*, in Bharat H. Desai, *Our Earth Matters: Pathways to a Better Common Environmental Future* (IOS Press, 2021), pp. 43-62.

4 Bharat H. Desai, *Institutional Environmental Law*, Chapter 3 (Transnational Publishers, Ardsley, New York, 2004).

5 United Nations (1972), Report of the United Nations Conference on the Human Environment, Stockholm, 5-16 June 1972.

6 Bharat H. Desai, *Multilateral Environmental Agreements: Legal Status of the Secretariats* (Cambridge University Press, New York, NY, 2010).

7 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1992 (1771 UNTS 107).

8 Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 1997 (2303 UNTS 162).

9 Paris Agreement under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 2015 (3156 UNTS).

Another important development since the Stockholm Conference has been the move from anthropocentric to eco-centric approach for the conservation of nature. Moreover, an emphasis on a world environment legal order has been attempted with efforts to define environmental crimes as ecocide. Furthermore, transboundary environmental challenges and climate change continue to push the frontiers of international environmental law. We have also witnessed a growing collaboration between international environmental organizations, to create a possible integrated environmental world order. For instance, with the 1982 UNCLOS providing a forum to negotiate the drafting of a new legal regime for biodiversity beyond the limits of national jurisdiction [BBNJ].

However, while the journey from Stockholm has many milestones, there are definitely some roadblocks, some missed opportunities and a host of issues and challenges that remain to be adequately addressed. Hence, while we celebrate this historic 50 year milestone, it is also equally important to reflect and critically assess the current “environmental *problematique*”.

In this context, the publication of the book *Envisioning Our Environmental Future: Stockholm+50 and Beyond*, painstakingly curated by Professor Bharat H. Desai,<sup>10</sup> is not only timely but also highly relevant to look ahead for our better future. It is an audacious venture undertaken by Professor Desai that seeks to address three critical questions: (i) What went wrong in the trajectory travelled so far? (ii) What is the current status of the things? and (iii) What lies ahead and how can we move forward in reshaping and repositioning environmental law and policy discourse? Writing a review for the present book is both a matter of great privilege and responsibility because of the remarkable quality of cutting-edge scholarship encapsulated in 274 pages that envisions the environmental future on planet Earth. It is not only an intellectual delight to read but it also entailed high degree of attention, critical reflection and respect.

### **I. STRUCTURE OF THE BOOK: TESTING TIMES, GLOBAL & SECTORAL IDEAS**

The book is specially dedicated for the Stockholm+50 Conference (2-3 June 2022) by collating carefully invited 22 scholarly contributions from 31 illustrious and eminent thought leaders from around the world. The articles in the book not only celebrate the historic occasion of Stockholm+50 but also provides a critical assessment of the trajectory of global environmental regulatory enterprise from a sharp scholarly lens. They not only trace the journey from Stockholm but also encourage the readers to think and envision the future march of environmental law.

---

10 Bharat H. Desai (ed.), *Envisioning Environmental Future: Stockholm+50 And Beyond* (IOS Press, Amsterdam, Berlin, Washington DC, 2022).

These articles, having already been published in earlier volumes of the journal *Environmental Policy and Law*,<sup>11</sup> have been put together and curated by the Editor, Prof. Desai, in this rare and pathbreaking book as a contribution to the global knowledge pool at this critical juncture of human progress. The central thrust woven together by the Editor revolves around the idea: “Time is of the essence; it waits for no one and it is running out”. The book is organised into three parts: I. Testing times, II. Global Ideas and III. Sectoral Ideas.

The first part *Testing Times* contains five articles contributed by Prof. Nicholas A. Robinson (Pace University), Prof. Peter M. Haas (University of Massachusetts), Elizabeth Dowdeswell (Lieutenant Governor of Ontario & former UNEP Executive Director), Karan Singh (Former MP & Union Cabinet Minister) and Donald W. Kaniaru (former UNEP senior official). The chapter by Prof. Robinson titled *Depleting Time Itself: The Plight of Today’s “Human” Environment* while highlighting the accomplishments of the past five decades, envisages “time” and “political will” as non-renewable and renewable resources respectively and advocates for their efficient use in order to attain sustainable development. The other chapters of this part focus on the issues of environmental politics in the post-Westphalia global governance structure,<sup>12</sup> the role of United Nations in environment protection especially the role of UNEP,<sup>13</sup> and its future.<sup>14</sup> The chapter contributed by Dr. Karan Singh<sup>15</sup> will be of particular interest to the Indian readers. As the author was the Union Minister in Prime Minister Indira Gandhi’s Cabinet, the insights shared by him provide a glimpse into the vision of the then Indian Prime Minister, who along with Sven Olof Joachim Palme (Prime Minister of Sweden) were the only two Heads of the Government present at the 1972 Stockholm Conference. Indira Gandhi’s historic speech linking environment to poverty alleviation and development still reverberates in global environmental negotiations and continues to inspire environmental law scholarship.

The second and third parts of the book titled *Global Ideas* and *Sectoral Ideas*, respectively, contain 17 articles including an article by Prof. Desai himself. The part on *Global Ideas* discusses global issues such as: the emergence of the concept

---

11 One article from EPL issue 51.6.2021, two articles from EPL issue 52.1.2022, eight articles from EPL issue 52.2.2022 and eleven articles from EPL issue 52.3.2022.

12 Peter M. Haas, “A Look Ahead in International Environmental Politics”, in Desai, *note 10*.

13 Elizabeth Dowdeswell, “The United Nations and the Environment: Some Personal Reflections”, in Desai, *note 10*.

14 Donald W. Kaniaru, “Future of UNEP”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp 34-40.

15 Karan Singh, “Looking Through Indira Gandhi’s Vision: Some Reflections”, Desai, *note 10*, pp. 29-33.

of global common interest and shift from the notion of sovereignty;<sup>16</sup> revival of UN Trusteeship Council and entrusting it with the task of supervising the scattered legal regime for environmental protection as well as the global commons;<sup>17</sup> limitations of state-centric approach in international environmental law and the need to make shift from state centrism in order to make non-state actors directly accountable;<sup>18</sup> the problem of proliferation and fragmentation of international environmental law instruments and need for convergence to maintain coherence;<sup>19</sup> the need to address human rights adequately in environmental law conventions;<sup>20</sup> the concept of “common security” (the idea that nations and peoples can only feel safe when their counterparts feel safe) in light of the Common Security 2022 initiative,<sup>21</sup> and the issues faced by the Third Pole Region.<sup>22</sup> The article by Jordi Jaria-Manzano<sup>23</sup> encourages the reader to look beyond the idea of sustainability, which has become cornerstone of environmental law today. It offers a critique of sustainability paradigm and its inability to capture implications of planetary transformation and urges the reader to explore the alternative concept of resilience. Resilience, in the context of environmental law, has been defined as “the ability of institutions and governance to grapple with change, surprise and multiple interactions between human-environmental systems”.<sup>24</sup>

The third part, as the title suggests is devoted to sector specific issues such as: rights of trees and ecocide in the context of the 1998 Rome Statute;<sup>25</sup> the need of

- 
- 16 Yann Agulia and Marie-Cecile de Bellis, “On the Concept of Global Common Interest: Some Reflections”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 45-52.
  - 17 Bharat H. Desai, “The Repurposed UN Trusteeship Council for the Future”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 53-65.
  - 18 David Hunter, “Moving Beyond State-Centrism in International Environmental Law”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 66-77.
  - 19 Owen McIntyre, “Convergence in International Environmental and Natural Resources Law”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 78-92.
  - 20 Klaus Bosselmann, “Human Rights and Responsibilities Towards the Earth System”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 105-114.
  - 21 Anna Sundstrom, “Our Shared Future: Common Security 2022 and Beyond”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 115-128.
  - 22 Krishna Prasad Oli et al., “Envisioning the Future of the Third Pole: A Look Ahead”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 129-139.
  - 23 Jordi Jaria-Manzano, “Beyond Sustainability: Challenges for Environmental Law in the Era of Uncertainty”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 93-104.
  - 24 *Ibid.*, pp. 102.
  - 25 Eleanor Sharpston, “From “Do Trees Have Rights?” to Wondering About Ecocide: Some Legal Reflections”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 157-171.

addressing climate change in wetland conservation;<sup>26</sup> the question of legitimacy and reparation for climate-induced migration;<sup>27</sup> need for international cooperation to tackle transboundary movement of plastic waste;<sup>28</sup> the nexus between international trade law and climate governance in post Stockholm+50 and BrettonWoods+80 world;<sup>29</sup> and the criminalisation of environmental terrorism.<sup>30</sup> Furthermore, the two articles, one contributed by Phillippe Cullet and Lovleen Bhullar, that deals nexus between Antimicrobial resistance (AMR) and access to Water, Sanitation and Hygiene (WASH),<sup>31</sup> and the second by Chris Backes and Marlon Boeve on circular economy and environmental protection,<sup>32</sup> are relevant in the context of the recent Covid-19 pandemic due to which countries all over the world started to shift towards building self-sustaining economies.

Lastly, it is only befitting that a book which features scholarly contributions by such eminent scholars from across the globe also features a *foreword* authored by none other than Prof. Edith Brown Weiss,<sup>33</sup> a pioneer whose name is synonymous with the evolution of International Environmental Law. The work of many international organizations and practitioners has been influenced and shaped by Prof. Weiss' work and expertise.<sup>34</sup> In her foreword, Prof. Weiss emphasises upon the need to undertake comprehensive, inclusive and practical approaches to address the problems faced by environment. "States are essential, but we must also involve

- 
- 26 Shailesh Nayak, "Factoring Climate Risks in the Wetlands Governance: A Policy Look Ahead", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 172-183.
- 27 Kirk W. Junker et. al., "A Question of Trust: A Reparative Legal Regime for Climate-induced Migration", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 184-195.
- 28 Surya P. Subedi & Amrisha Pandey, "Legal Lamination to Transboundary Movement of Plastic Pollutants", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 218-228.
- 29 Oliver C. Ruppel & Cleo Dobers, "Greening Trade Law for Global Climate Governance", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 229-244.
- 30 Gregory Rose, "Environmental Terrorism: Not Yet a Crime in International Law", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 245-254.
- 31 Phillippe Cullet and Lovleen Bhullar, "The Regulation of Planetary Health Challenges: A Co-Benefits Approach for AMR and WASH", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 196-206.
- 32 Chris Backes & Marlon Boeve, "Envisioning Future of the Circular Economy: A Legal Perspective", in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 207-217.
- 33 Edith Brown Weiss, University Professor, Georgetown Law, Georgetown University, Washington DC, USA. As noted by Arnold Kreilhuber & Angela Kariuki in their article *Environmental Rule of Law in the Context of Sustainable Development* ("no discussion on the topic of environmental rule of law in the context of sustainable development would be complete without extensive reference to and appreciation of the work and contributions of Prof. Edith Brown Weiss").
- 34 See Arnold Kreilhuber & Angela Kariuki, "Environmental Rule of Law in the Context of Sustainable Development", *The Georgetown Environmental Law Review*, vol. 32 (2020), p. 591.

many other actors, including the private sector, non-governmental organizations, communities, civil society, and individuals.”<sup>35</sup> The inclusion of private actors and individuals in the realm of international environmental law, undoubtedly, will be critical especially in addressing the challenges of planetary proportions.

## II. A BRIEF ANALYSIS OF THE KEY CONTRIBUTIONS

Although every article of this magnificent work is unique in its own right, there are a few contributions that have elevated the status of this ideational scholarly treatise into an outstanding one. The first one, and the “crown jewel” of this book, in my humble opinion, is the article *Depleting Time Itself: The Plight of Today’s “Human” Environment* contributed by Prof. Nicholas A. Robinson.<sup>36</sup> When we think of resources in terms of environment protection, we think of forests, wildlife, fossil fuels, minerals, biodiversity and the like. However, Prof. Robinson has conceptualised two more resources which are very important for environmental protection. First one, is *time* itself. Prof. Robinson articulates that, “beyond depleting the resources of Earth’s nature and physical environment humanity has also depleted time itself. There is not enough time left to permit the pace of environmental law-making to lead to success”.<sup>37</sup> In this conceptualisation, *time* is envisaged as a non-renewable resource that is depleting very fast and hence, the growth in the body of environmental law making, which has been remarkable since the 1972 Stockholm Conference, has to increase its pace and address the existing challenges before time runs out. Second resource conceptualised by Prof. Robinson is “political will” which, although has been lukewarm since the Stockholm Conference, is a renewable resource. A strong political will is imperative for the successful environmental protection and implementation of 2030 Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). One solution, according to Prof. Robinson, lies with the judiciary that over the years have made significant strides in making environmental law justiciable. An active judiciary that takes SDGs seriously through environmental rights can mobilise public sentiment and replenish the political will to the level which was experienced in 1972 Stockholm Conference. That appeared to be missing at the 2022 Stockholm Conference.

Next, the article *The Repurposed UN Trusteeship Council for the Future*, authored by Prof. Bharat Desai,<sup>38</sup> is also critically significant. It engages the reader into a critical discussion regarding the future of United Nations Trusteeship Council

---

35 Edith Brown Weiss, *Foreword to Desai, note 10*.

36 Nicholas A. Robinson, “Depleting Time Itself: The Plight of Today’s “Human” Environment”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 3-11.

37 *Ibid.*

38 Bharat H. Desai, “The Repurposed UN Trusteeship Council for the Future”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp.53-65.

(UNTC). It proposes for the revival and repurposing of the UNTC, which has been lying dormant since 1994. The UNTC is one of the principal organs established through the United Nations Charter.<sup>39</sup> Its main objective was supervision of the administration of trust territories that fall within the UN Trusteeship System. After the independence of Palau, the last trust territory, in 1994, the mission of UNTC came to an end but it continues to exist on paper. Since then there have been two scholarly strands regarding the future of UNTC. One strand recommends abolishment of UNTC<sup>40</sup> while the other advocates for repurposing the UNTC with a new and expanded mandate including environmental protection and administration of “global commons” that are outside national jurisdictions such as oceans, atmosphere, Antarctica, and outer space.<sup>41</sup> The article by Prof. Desai is supportive of this second strand and provides an in-depth analysis of how it can be achieved. In light of the evolution of jurisprudence on “global commons” since the Stockholm Conference and wide acceptance of Public Trust Doctrine as a foundational principle of environment protection, repurposing of UNTC to make it an international institution for environmental protection entrusted with “trusteeship of the planet”<sup>42</sup> definitely appears to be a pragmatic proposal. And, although there is considerable scholarly support for this proposal, but since such a reform entails an amendment of UN Charter especially articles 87 and 88, the possibility of it being achieved, given the current global political scenario, is as slim as that of the abolishment of UNTC, which also requires amendment of UN Charter. However, it is definitely an idea that requires a deliberation at the global level and deserves to be part of *Beyond Stockholm+50 Agenda*.

Another key contribution is the article *A Question of Trust: A Reparative Legal Regime for Climate-Induced Migration*, authored by Prof. Kirk W. Junker, Saskia Munster and Mrinalini Shinde.<sup>43</sup> The authors in this article examine the issue of climate migration from the citizens’ perspective. Beginning with the fact that we

---

39 Charter of the United Nations 1945 Chapter XIII.

40 See e.g., See *Secretary-General’s Reform Recommendations “Did Not Go Far Enough”, Generally Assembly Told, as Debate Begins on “in Larger Freedom”*, UN Press Release GA/10337 (7 April 2005), available at: <<https://unis.unvienna.org/unis/en/pressrels/2005/ga10337.html>> (the former UN Secretary General, Boutros Ghali & Kofi Anan, while proposing structural reforms of the United Nations, proposed complete elimination of the trusteeship council).

41 See United Nations, *Renewing the United Nations: A Program for Reform*, UN Doc A/51/950 (July 14, 1997).

42 Bharat H. Desai, “Our Planet Needs Trusteeship to Meet Challenges”, *Tribune India*, (2 December 2020), available at: <<https://www.tribuneindia.com/news/comment/our-planet-needs-trusteeship-to-meet-challenges-178732>>.

43 Kirk W. Junker et. al., “A Question of Trust: A Reparative Legal Regime for Climate-induced Migration”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 184-195.



already have climate migrants, and shunning the over-emphasis on curating definitions, the authors endeavour to answer one critical question. i.e., how the legal regime that is in existence “now” can be utilised to provide reparative justice to climate refugees who are being harmed “now”. This question has been discussed by the authors keeping in mind the issue of legitimacy from a citizen’s perspective i.e., a citizen should not view the compensation given to him as “charity done towards him” but as a legitimately just compensation for the harm suffered. The debate and discussion on definitions has been strongly critiqued by the authors by quoting Samuel Beckett’s famous play *Waiting for Godot*<sup>44</sup>, “Godot is never going to come and it doesn’t matter”. This drives home the point that most of our language, including legal language, gets its meaning from usage and not from definitions. The authors argue that waiting to define terms such as “terrorism”, “climate refugee”, “environmental refugees”, “environmental migrant”, without acting, allows the *status quo* to continue. The authors urge that instead of this quest for definitions, we should look for solutions in the current international legal regime and create options by utilising the existing international refugee framework. In this context, the authors discuss reparations and utilising the existing loss and damage framework in international refugee law. After analysing few options such as Green Climate Fund, Adaptation Fund, Trust Funds for the victims of ICC, the authors argue in favour of the TFV funding regime. This type of reparation scheme could be transferred to climate harms in the international scenario. Though it is not a perfect solution, it offers an acknowledgement to the person who are harmed “that they are indeed harmed”, and take a shift from charity perspective to recognised legitimate way of reparation. The authors in this article have raised very pertinent question in terms of advocating entitlement and not charity. The charity-based *ex gratia* approach has been in place in several jurisdictions and several environmental norms. This can give way to entitlement-based reparation schemes.

Further, the article contributed by Prof. Oliver C Ruppel and Cleo Dobers, titled *Greening Trade Law for Global Climate Governance*,<sup>45</sup> examines the issue of climate change and how the World Trade Organisation can contribute to the challenge of climate governance. The authors have analysed the issues of interconnectedness of trade law and environmental law not only in light of Stockholm+50 (2022) but also on the way to Bretton Woods+80. The authors have highlighted that the emphasis of the international community on trade has been stronger and more predominant than that on environment. However, these two legal regimes, cannot operate in isolation from one another in the new *Anthropocene* epoch and have to contribute

---

44 Samuel Beckett, *Waiting For Godot* (1953).

45 Oliver C. Ruppel & Cleo Dobers, “Greening Trade Law for Global Climate Governance”, in Desai, *note 10*, pp. 229-244.



to each other. WTO must look into opportunities to serve the environmental cause as well. To this extent, the options such as climate waiver, Environmental Goods Agreement (EGA) and Agreement of Climate Change, Trade and Sustainability (ACCTS) and free trade can be of critical importance in facilitating this convergence.

Lastly, the article *Environmental Terrorism: Not Yet a Crime in International Law*, contributed by Prof. Gregory Rose aims to raise awareness regarding environmental terrorism. It distinguishes between terrorism, eco-terrorism, environmental terrorism, environmental crime, environmental war crimes and ecocide. Prof. Rose brings out the distinction between these terms using the case study of Israel and in particular the *Emerald Case* which discharged enormous quantity of crude oil in Israel's waters in 2021. Prof. Rose defines Environmental terrorism as "*Targeting of environmental assets for attack, in order to coerce a desired political behaviour*". Targeting can take the form of destruction such as arson or inputs such as pollution and discharge of effluents (such as the *Emerald Case*). Through this article, Prof. Rose, urges the reader to look at the nexus between crime and environment. In the absence of any international law governing environmental terrorism, Prof. Rose, suggests the formulation of a new treaty to deal with environmental terrorism and provides an outline for the same. It is true that attention that terrorism received post 9/11 has shifted global focus from the environmental movement and, to an extent, hindered the progress made since the Rio declaration. It has shifted focus towards global crime, terrorism and transnational crimes. In this context, transnational environmental crimes become a bridge between these two legal streams. The issue of translational environmental crime and ecocide has also received considerable attention amidst the ongoing Russia-Ukraine war which poses a generalised threat to the global legal order of which multilateral environmental agreements remain a part. Hence, it is important to bridge the gap between transnational crime and international environmental law, and harness the powers of both by formulating an international treaty on transnational environmental crime.

### III. CONCLUSION

Structured around the central theme "time is of the essence", this precious book, *Envisioning Our Environmental Future: Stockholm+50 and Beyond*, is not only pathbreaking scholarly contribution that looks back to look ahead but also illustrative of the in-depth critical scholarship for which the Editor, Prof. Desai, is globally renowned. It offers rich insights into the developments that have taken place since the 1972 Stockholm Conference, and also provides an in-depth critical analysis of the global regulatory approaches to address the environmental challenges. This book is a sequel to Prof. Desai's another landmark 2021 curated work, *Our Earth*

*Matters: Pathways to a Better Common Environmental Future*,<sup>46</sup> which was published on the World Environment Day (5<sup>th</sup> June 2021). The first 2021 book set the stage for the discourse that is encapsulated in the present 2022 book. Taken together, 43 articles in both these volumes provide us unique and cutting-edge scholarly views that navigate the pre- and post-Stockholm narratives lucidly and comprehensively.

The book encourages the reader to imagine how the global environmental order can progress in the future, not merely at the institutional and regulatory level but at a deeper conceptual and individual level as well. Undoubtedly, the journey from 1972 Stockholm to 2022 Stockholm has seen many achievements, still the access to environmental information, transparency in environmental governance and democratization of decision-making especially in natural resources extraction and wise use could be part of the global agenda beyond 2022 Stockholm Conference. It shall decide the fate of the global efforts in addressing the environmental challenges and natural disasters of planetary scale wherein the future of life itself would be at stake.

The book is well suited for the scholars, decision-makers, legal practitioners, activists and non-governmental actors in the field of international law in general and international environmental law in particular. The ideational scholarly contributions by outstanding scholars from all the continents, meticulously curated by Prof. Desai, are unique, timely and relevant for analysing the prognosis and prospects at the 50<sup>th</sup> anniversary of the 1972 *Stockholm Moment*. It places this 2022 book in the category of the 1972 *Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet*<sup>47</sup> (by Barbara Ward and René Dubos), an unofficial report commissioned by the Secretary-General of the 1972 UNCHE. All the book chapters are presented in lucid and thought-provoking style that would ignite the mind of even a novice and captivate the imagination of faculty members, students and researchers in all the schools and faculties of law in universities and other centres of learning, globally. Everyone can benefit from this pathbreaking global scholarly work. Editor Prof. Desai and IOS Press both deserve to be commended for bringing out two painstakingly curated consecutive (2021 & 2022) scholarly publications that provide futuristic ideas for our better common environmental future.

Sairam Bhat\*

---

46 Bharat H Desai (ed.), *Our Earth Matters: Pathways to a Better Common Environmental Future* (IOS Press, 2021). See also book review published in IJIL, Anupam Jha, “Bharat H. Desai (ed.), *Our Earth Matters: Pathways to a Better Common Environmental Future* (IOS Press, 2021)”, *IJIL*, vol. 61, no. 3-4 (2021), pp. 440-446.

47 Barbara Ward & René Dubos, *Only One Earth: The Care and Maintenance of a Small Planet* (W.W. Norton, New York, 1972).

\* Prof. (Dr.) Sairam Bhat, Professor of Law & Coordinator, Centre for Environmental Law, Education, Research & Advocacy (CEERA), National Law School of India University (NLSIU), Bengaluru.