Rediscovering the Environment: Environmental diplomatic culture during the Nixon Presidency

Schaafsma, Jonne

‘Rediscovering the Environment’

Environmental diplomatic culture during the Nixon Presidency

Jonne Schaafsma
S1784994
j.schaafsma.2@leidenuniv.nl
s1784994@vuw.leidenuniv.nl

Leiden University
History (MA): Politics, Cultures and National Identities, 1789 to the Present
Dr. Dario Fazzi
20 EC
March 31, 2023

Index

Introduction	3-7
Chapter 1: Advocating for Nature	8-21
Chapter 2: The Nuclear Era	22-32
Chapter 3: Building Environmental Diplomacy	33-47
Conclusion	48-51
Bibliography	52-57

Introduction

Richard Nixon, the 37th President of the United States, is mostly known for his foreign policies, his opening to China, his contribution to *détente*, the easing of Cold War tensions between the United States and the Soviet Union, and his fall after the Watergate scandal.[1] For what concerns his domestic policies, Nixon is generally regarded as the prime example of a President who combined pragmatism with strong Republican values.[2] However, contrary to this view upon Nixon's presidency, there are those who argue that President Nixon was not just a champion of conservative ideas but his agenda went beyond them. American historian John Brooks Flippen argues that Nixon is not given enough credits for his progressive ideals, especially regarding institutionalized environmental protection.[3] Nixon founded, for example, the Environmental Protection Agency in 1970, the first government funded agency which only focused on environmental protection, and advocated for international cooperation in this field through the establishment of the White House's Council on Environmental Quality Council.

The environmental turn that Nixon took impacted US foreign policy making too. One of the main changes was the launch of a committed environmental diplomacy. Although the integration of the terms 'environmental' and 'diplomacy' is relatively new, according to French political scientist Amandine Orsini environmental diplomacy can be seen as a branch of diplomacy that stemmed from fourteenth century European attempts to manage fishing resources through bilateral agreements.[4] Following the gradual development of environmental agreements in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, 1972 is often seen as the year environmental diplomacy was institutionalized. This year, the United Nations organized a Conference on the Human Environment in Stockholm. This conference was the first world conference where the environment was made a major issue.[5] Attended by delegates from all over the world, the conference appeared to legitimize environmentalism at the highest

[1] Jeremy Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, (London 2010) 226.

[2] Stephen Ambrose, *Nixon: The Triumph of a Politician, 1962-1972*, (New York 1989) 171.

[3] John Brooks Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*, (Albuquerque 2000) 4.

[4] Amandine Orsini, 'Environmental Diplomacy' in: Thierry Balzacq eds., *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (New York 2020) 239-252; 240.

[5] United Nations, https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/stockholm1972 (consulted 22 February 2023).

diplomatic level.[6] Despite the fact that institutionalized environmental protection in world history is an increasing topic of interest to diplomatic historians, there is little literature on the emergence of environmental diplomacy before 1972. The historiography on environmental diplomacy - works such as Jacob Darwin Hamblin's *Environmental Diplomacy in the Cold War: The Disposal of Radioactive Waste at Sea during the 1960s*, Kurkpatrick Dorsey's *Whales & Nations* and Paul Harris' *Routledge Handbook of Global Environmental Politics* - focuses on efforts which institutionalized environmental diplomacy.[7] Environmental diplomacy, in these instances, was not the result of individual actions but of a changing system where international cooperation became more legitimized.

This thesis explores the origins of environmental diplomacy through the experiences of the negotiators and the culture they were imbued with right when Nixon decisively took such a regulatory turn, both at home and abroad. What was the role of diplomats in fostering such a nascent environmental regime? How did a growing environmental awareness affect this process? Why did this all sprout in the early 1970s and how did it develop? These will be some of the questions at the center of this work.

In recent years, the construction of the global environment has moved to the center of diplomatic history.[8] There have been calls for diplomatic historians to put the globe at the center of international relations and for environmental historians to incorporate the very critical role of international interactions through diplomats into their work.[9] One such attempt, with a specific focus on Nixon's role, came from Dorsey. He argues that even though environmental diplomacy has always been looked at as a secondary, or even tertiary, goal of US foreign policy, there is growing belief that Nixon's time as president was more meaningful to this topic than

[6] John Robert McNeill, Peter Engelke, *The Great Acceleration. An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*, (Cambridge 2014) 199.

[7] Sources on the emergence of environmental diplomacy can be found in Jacob Darwin Hamblin, '*Environmental Diplomacy in the Cold War: The Disposal of Radioactive Waste at Sea during the 1960s*' The International History Review, 24:2 (2002) 348-375; Kurkpatrick Dorsey, *Whales & Nations. Environmental Diplomacy at the High Seas*, (Seattle 2013); Russell Train, *Prescription for a Planet. The Ninth Bronfman Lecture*, (Washington 1970); Paul Harris, *Routledge Handbook of Global Environmental Politics* (Canberra 2022).

[8] McNeil, Engelke, *The Great Acceleration*; Thomas Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment: Global Population Growth and the Birth of American Environmentalism*, (New Brunswick 2012).

[9] Mark Lytle, 'An Environmental Approach to American Diplomatic History', *Diplomatic History*, 20:2 (1996), 279-300; 281.

previously thought.[10] According to environmental historian John Robert McNeill, is environmentalism in part a politically motivated 'package of ideas' not always backed by conviction, requiring only the creation of 'green' identities with easily employed tropes about ecology and sustainability.[11] Scholars like Jacob Darwin Hamblin, John Brooks Flippen and John McCormick all argue that Richard Nixon and Russell Train fundamentally changed environmental diplomacy through the creation of green institutions.[12] However, they all refer to the 1972 United Nations Conference of the Human Environment in Stockholm, which was the first big international conference solely concerned with the protection of the environment.

American scholars Stephen Macekura and Thomas Robertson argue that environmental concern emerged earlier alongside a number of international issues such as terrorism, human rights, space technology, illegal drug shipments and Malthusian concerns over overpopulation and starvation, and that environmentalism was the product of a broader movement which had been establishing itself since the Second World War.[13] But, as argued before, Nixon also challenged established patterns of diplomacy rigorously and changed the diplomatic culture of the United States. According to Jeremy Black, diplomatic culture stands apart from policy as it is also concerning the way diplomats carry out their respective field of operation. Therefore, this thesis will research how Richard Nixon and Russell Train influenced the establishment of first and foremost a diplomatic culture of the environmental, which in turn influenced US diplomacy and contributed to the launch and consolidation of an institutionalized international environmental governance.

The first chapter of this thesis will seek out the origin of environmental diplomacy in the United States. Environmental historian Raf de Bont argues that environmental diplomacy was carried out by non-diplomats. This was, according to historian Jeremy Black, because in the 1890s most appointments in the American Diplomatic and Consular Services and the

---

[10] American Foreign Relations, https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Environmental-Diplomacy.html, (consulted 08-12-2022).

[11] John Robert McNeill, *Something New Under the Sun. An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World*, (London 2000) 420.

[12] Jacob Darwin Hamblin, 'Gods and Devils in the Details: Marine Pollution, Radioactive Waste, and an Environmental Regime circa 1972, *Diplomatic History*, 32:4 (2008) 539-560; Brooks Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*; John McCormick, 'The Origins of the World Conservation Strategy', *Environmental Review*, 10:3 (1986), 177-187.

[13] Stephen Macekura, 'The Limits of the global community: The Nixon administration and global environmental politics', *Cold War History* 11:4 (Abingdon 2011) 489-518; 489; Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*.

Department of State were the product of political patronage, with the East Coast establishment dominating the system.[14] Even though most consulates were salaried positions, those salaries were generally low and therefore the United States Foreign Service relied heavily on individuals who could sustain themselves. According to historian Richard Hume Werking, this often led to corruption as these individuals saw business opportunities in falsifying invoices.[15] Professional diplomats were not concerned with the environment and therefore private citizens took up this responsibility. De Bont argues that these private citizens had to mobilize both governmental and nongovernmental forced to achieve their goals and by doing so, they created ideas and practices which inspired the first generation of professional environmental diplomats in the United States.

The second chapter of this thesis will seek out how politics changed in the fifties and sixties and how environmental concern achieved greater political prominence and influence within this system. The first environmental advocates laid a basis upon which environmental protection became a legitimate field of policy in the United States. After the Second World War, the need for environmental protection became even clearer because of the potential destructive power of nuclear weapons. Scientists were the first to mention the potential damage nuclear weapons and nuclear applications on society posed to the environment. During the 1960s, great social and political development in the United States made environmental concern a public concern. The pressure of nuclear weapons and the Cold War forced Presidents Kennedy and Johnson to change American foreign and domestic policy and this opened up opportunities for the environment to influence politics.

The third chapter is a study, based upon primary documents, to understand what diplomatic culture looked like and how it was applied during the Nixon presidency. Where the first two chapters make use of secondary literature, supported by primary documents, this chapter heavily relies upon interviews, memoires and governmental documents. The most important source in this chapter is Russell Train's own memoire: *Politics, Pollution, and Pandas*. Besides Train's own memoire, this chapter also made use of the website of *The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training (ADST)*. This association has been conducting and collecting interviews with American diplomats for decades. The interviews are used for

[14] Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, 175.

[15] Richard Hume Werking, *The Master Architects: Building the United States Foreign Services 1890-1913*, (Lexington 1977) 5.

educational purposes, to show future American diplomats their heritage, and is a viable source for diplomatic historians.

This thesis will contribute to the historiography of environmental diplomacy by examining how the American context of Nixon's presidency influenced environmental diplomatic culture, which in turn influenced US diplomacy and contributed to the launch and consolidation of an institutionalized international environmental governance. Through the use of Train's personal memoire and John Brooks Flippen's *Nixon and the Environment* this thesis will try to explain how Russell Train experienced his period of time as most important environmental diplomat during the Nixon presidency and how he influenced President Nixon. This thesis will consider the sources of the ADST crucial to the creation of a diplomatic culture because the interviews that were conducted by this organization show how environmental diplomats reflect upon their own time as environmental diplomat as they sketch their activities and contacts. Comparing these insights to the findings from secondary literature, this thesis will show how environmental concerns changed the body of an environmental diplomat. The clear argument this thesis will make is that this emerging culture that sustained environmental diplomacy from the early 1970s onward was actually the result of a longer deep-rooted historical tradition in the United States of conservationism, environmentalism and a utilitarian approach to nature.

Chapter 1: Advocating for Nature

Progress along the road to Stockholm 1972 was neither straightforward nor evenly paced. At the beginning of the twentieth century, neither environment as an integrative, ecological concept nor the biosphere was an object of public international concern.[16] According to historian Lynton Keith Caldwell, international efforts which focused upon resource conservation did so largely for economic strategic reasons.[17] Diplomats were expected to encourage international arbitration and become practitioners of what was seen as the science of public international law, but they were also very much a product of political patronage and thus relied heavily upon their patrons in Washington.[18] So, in order for environmental policies to become internationally accepted, it first had to become legitimized at the national level.[19]

Though there were some state laws on the books to protect wildlife, enforcement was limited throughout the nineteenth century.[20] In the absence of effective government regulation and management, other initiatives to protect nature emerged. According to historian and sociologist Dorceta Taylor, in the United States, many of the initiatives to protect nature began among nineteenth century urban elites. Though several factors contributed to the rise of pro-environmental behavior, the way elites perceived and related to the city was, according to her, an important dimension of environmental protection.[21] What eventually emerged as the conservation movement of the twentieth century was built on the activism that began a century earlier in urban areas.[22] From the start, it was a movement of the elite, but still a diverse one.

The first conservationists were scientists who wanted to use their knowledge to attack the waste of natural resources. Early adherents, such as the famous forester Gifford Pinchot, focused on the need to manage renewable resources for the use of future generations. They urged efficient use and scientific control of America's natural resources. Generally known as utilitarians, they did not aim to save natural beauty or appealing animals but rather to ensure the long-term health of the American economy. Beginning in the 1880s, a small group of

---

[16] Lynton Keith Caldwell, *International Environmental Policy. Emergence and Dimensions*, (Durham 1984) 20.

[17] Ibidem.

[18] Black, *A History of* Diplomacy, 175-179.

[19] Caldwell, *International Environmental Policy*, 21.

[20] Dorceta Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement. Power, Privilege, and Environmental Protection*, (Durham 2016) 221.

[21] Ibidem.

[22] Ibidem.

dedicated people lobbied state legislatures to protect wildlife. This movement came to be known as preservationism. Whereas the utilitarians tended to be elite scientists with government connections, these preservationists were a broader group of biologists and other concerned citizens who strove to protect natural beauty from excessive destruction. While not eschewing economics, they tended to agitate for the legal protection of areas and species of aesthetic value. As trends, preservationism and utilitarianism often intertwined, and in fact conservation as an effective political force depended on strong links between the two.[23]

According to Kurkpatrick Dorsey, the conservationists of the Progressive Era were the true pioneers in crafting a diplomacy of natural resource protection.[24] Just like the environmental diplomats of the 1970s, the conservationists of the Progressive Era had to come up with creative solutions to problems unthought of in previous generations.[25] Spurred on by the continuing assault on nature and a growing faith in the power of applied science, the United States and Canada blazed a new trail by concluding three treaties that prioritized the goals of conservation movement: the Inland Fisheries Treaty of 1908, the North Pacific Fur Seal Convention of 1911, and the Migratory Bird Treaty of 1916.[26] The United States and Canada allowed utilitarians and preservationists to influence the course of diplomacy. Their attempts to assist international and global efforts to preserve wildlife set important standards of which nature was worthy of protection, of how this protection was to organized and who should be included in this enterprise. They also mapped out a policy field, developed certain codes of conduct and fostered transimperial exchange of information on forestry, on natural resources conservation and exploitation.[27] Their belief even became a title which was worn by Russell Train.[28]

Therefore, this chapter examines how American conservationist mobilized the forces necessary to realize their aims, explored the possibility of networking with likeminded

---

[23] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 1.

[24] Kurkpatrick Dorsey, 'Scientists, Citizens, and Statesmen: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era', *Diplomatic History* 19:3 (1995) 407-429; 407.

[25] Ibidem.

[26] Ibidem, 408.

[27] Raf de Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, (Pittsburgh 2021) 7; John Soluri, 'Fur Sealing and Unsettled Sovereignties' in: Kristin Lee Hoganson, Jay Sexton eds., *Crossing Empires. Taking U.S. History into Transimperial Terrain* (Durham 2020) 25-45.

[28] Forest History Society, https://foresthistory.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Train_Russell_E.ohi_.pdf (consulted 07 February 2023).

conservationist in Europe and the Americas to promote their vision and influenced the idea of environmentalism as a part of diplomatic culture. This chapter argues that those who pushed for international agreements to guard natural resources understood that environmental problems did not confine themselves to political boundaries and that because of their efforts conservation was made a legitimate subject for diplomats to get intertwined with.[29] At the same time, this chapter stresses the deep-rooted history of environmental advocacy in the United States, and the role of such an advocacy in the creation of a peculiar cultural approach to nature.

The origins of conservationism can be traced back to nineteenth century Europe and North America. As a movement, conservationism arose in opposition to the myth of superabundance widely held in American society. From the days of the first European settlements of North America, nature's bounty seemed unlimited, especially in contrast to depleted Europe. For centuries, Americans had found more resources whenever the need arose.[30] However, in line with Thomas Robert Malthus's central claim on population; population always existed within natural limits.[31] As the population grew, so had its natural resources. Improved transportation and technology compounded the problems caused by this belief in unlimited resources. Railroad expansion opened once pristine wilderness to economic activity and hunting and better firearms and fishing apparatus allowed people to take more resources for the same effort.[32]

In the United States, areas of wilderness took on a special significance for the preservation movement. American wilderness was celebrated in nineteenth-century art and literature and became a core part of American identity. As scientists revealed a universe that was at once vast, complex and harmonious, they strengthened the belief that this majestic and marvelous creation had a divine source.[33] Before, nature was seen as something that could be controlled, molded and used for personal gain, but now, nature was seen as handiwork of God if not his very image.[34] Men found it increasingly possible to praise, even worship, what they

[29] Dorsey, 'Scientists, Citizens, and Statesmen', 429

[30] Kurkpatrick Dorsey, *The Dawn of Conservation Diplomacy: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era*, (Seattle 1998) 12.

[31] Alsin Basford, Joyce E. Chaplin, 'Malthus and the new world', in: Robert J. Mayhew eds., *New Perspectives on Malthus*, (Cambridge 2016) 105-127; 105.

[32] Dorsey, *The Dawn of Conservation Diplomacy*, 12.

[33] Roderick Frazier Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, (New Haven 1982) 45.

[34] Ibidem.

had formerly despised. Nature was being romanticized. Even though 'Romanticism' resists definition, American historian Roderick Frazier Nash argues that it implies an enthusiasm for the strange, remote, solitary and mysterious.[35] The untouched wilderness of the American west coast intrigued European Romantics as they visited and wrote about it. While Romanticism created a climate in which wilderness could be appreciated, nationalists began investigating the significance of nature for their own cause.[36] American nationalists sought for ways they could make the United States stand out from Europe. At first, they hoped to exploit the romantic notion of nature's beauty, but the American nature was too wild. Then, the American nationalists started to interpret wilderness with strength and used the wildness of the American wilderness as a synonym for its country. Wild and strength became intertwined and wilderness would mostly be discussed in terms of romantic or nationalistic cliches.

Despite the appreciation for American wilderness, the nation's growth contributed to the deteriation of the wild in many ways. Concern over the loss of wilderness necessarily preceded the first calls for its protection. Important philosophical contributors to these calls were George Perkins Marsh and Henry David Thoreau. Marsh's *Man and Nature* made a growing public aware of how massively humans transformed their milieus.[37] According to historian Robert Dorman, believed Marsh that progression was not the same as frontier expansion and that growing cities and industrialization changed nature in a way it was not meant to change[38] Marsh wanted people to be more conscious of their impact on nature and consider the consequences of their actions on nature. Thoreau was more romantic in his notion towards nature than Marsh. Thoreau believed in solitude and simple living.[39] Thoreau wanted to reform social norms through ascetic living and communion with nature. Thoreau was sick of the cities he lived in and wanted to aspire people to leave the city behind and restore their inner bond with nature. Marsh and Thoreau were among the earliest of the budding preservationists and conservationists to clearly articulate the belief that nature had healing powers that counteracted the effects of the city. These transcendentalists, as they were called, were concerned about loss

[35] On the Romantic Movement as a whole see Arthur Oncken Lovejoy, 'The Meaning of Romanticism for the Historian of Ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2 (1941) 257-278; Merle Curti, *The Growth of American Thought*, (New York 1952) 478-482; Ian Whyte, *A Dictionary of Environmental History*, (London 2013) 383.

[36] Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 67.

[37] David Lowenthal, *George Perkins Marsh: Prophet of Conservation*, (Seattle 2000) 268.

[38] Robert L. Dorman, *A Word for Nature: Four Pioneering Environmental Advocates, 1845-1913*, (Chapel Hill 2000) 15.

[39] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 63.

of nature and decreasing quality of life in the cities.[40] The transcendentalists provided social and literary commentary on what they saw and therefore influenced a lot of people to reconsider their view upon nature. However, transcendentalists failed to unite their views and influence local, national, let alone international politics, at a significant way.

A rise in nature tourism starting in the 1820s and 1830s also helped build public support for nature protection measures. The visible loss of wilderness encouraged environmental groups to lobby for the creation of national parks.[41] In these largely middle-class organizations it was literary intellectuals, poets, social reformers and representatives of tourist organizations who initially took the lead and even though they were often explicitly nationalists, almost all these intellectuals maintained extensive contacts across borders.[42] One of these groups was the Sierra Club, created in 1892 by John Muir and a group of Californian nature lovers and mountaineers, originally set out to campaign for the preservation of 'forests and other natural features of the Sierra Nevada Mountains', but soon developed into a nation-wide movement.[43]

Muir was born in Scotland in 1838 and migrated to the United States in 1849. Inspired by European Romanticism, Marsh and Thoreau, Muir believed there was unity in nature and that unity revealed the nature of God.[44] At the time, Muir developed his own unique ideas about how people could and should relate to nature. The ideas with mass following remained the great religions and, in his work, he suggested that the American people were damaging both the work of God and the natural beauty of the United States and refused to accept economic utilitarianism as the only option for nature protection.[45]

> Every other civilized nation in the world has been compelled to care for its forests, and so must we if waste and destruction are not to go on to the bitter end, leaving America as barren as Palestine or Spain. In its calmer moments, in the midst of bewildering hunger and war and restless over-industry, Prussia has learned that the forest plays an important part in human progress, and that the advance in civilization only makes it more indispensable … It seems therefore, that almost every civilized nation can give us a lesson on the management and care of forests. So far, our government has done nothing effective with

[40] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 58.

[41] Robert Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, (New York 2021) 86.

[42] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, 26-27.

[43] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 86.

[44] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 65.

[45] McNeill, *Something New Under the Sun*, 327; Donato Bergandi, Patrick Blandin, 'De la Protection de la nature au développement durable: Genèse d'un oxymora étehique et politique', *Revue d'histoire des sciences* 65:1 (2012), 103-142; 110.

> its forests, though the best in the world, but it like a rich and foolish spendthrift who has inherited a magnificent estate in perfect order, and then has left his fields and meadows, forests and parks, to be sold and plundered and wasted at will, depending on their inexhaustible abundance.[46]

Muir's high-minded and nationalistic approach to nature appealed to America's elites. Muir's conservation thoughts became an integral part of environmental urban activism and by the end of the nineteenth century Muir emerged as one of the nation's leading ecologists and experts on the nation's western landscapes. He also became influential in environmental policy making, was appointed to presidential commissions and was invited to travel on prestigious scientific expeditions.[47] Muir was one of the first transcendentalists who was able to make a significant impact in politics.

One of the most important outcomes of the landscape preservation movement was the creation of national parks and other protected areas. Muir's appeal to nationalism and God helped to create the Forest Reserve Act of 1891. Rather than seeking to exploit the natural landscape, Americans and the United States government sought to understand and preserve it and the wildlife it contained.[48] The act allowed the president to create forest reserves, within which no person could cut down trees, build roads, mine minerals or graze animals. The act gave the president an unprecedented amount of power when it came to federal land management and was a clear sign that the nation became more accepting of federal executive interference upon nature.[49]

Even though wildlife protection organizations became more commonplace in the late nineteenth century, activists noted that little was being done to protect big, migrating animals. Somewhat paradoxical, hunters were the most significant in making sure this changed in the late nineteenth- and early twentieth century. Big game hunting was still a prestigious and highly desirable pastime, and men of new wealth wanted to experience it. [50] As resources dwindled and early wildlife protection laws did little to stem the rampant destruction of wildlife, private citizens began to take collective action to protect wild animals. In an 1887 editorial in *Forest*

---

[46] John Muir, *Our National Parks*, (Project Gutenberg 2019) 337.

[47] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 66.

[48] Scott Randolph, 'Evolution or Revolution: The Cultural Development of American Conservationism from U.S. Grant to Theodore Roosevelt', *The Cardinal Edge* 1:1 (2021) 2-7; 2.

[49] Ibidem, 4.

[50] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 162.

and Stream George Bird Grinnell suggested that an organization be formed to develop and pass state and federal conservation policies and laws.[51] One private citizen who responded to this call was Theodore Roosevelt. Roosevelt dreamt of becoming a cattle baron, but a ferocious winter cost him half of his herd and Roosevelt returned to New York. Shortly after his return, Roosevelt convened a meeting of the nation's leading big game hunters, writers, explorers, military men, scientists and political leaders to discuss game and park issues in the West. Roosevelt called a dinner meeting and before the diners parted ways for the evening, the sportsmen formed the Boone and Crockett Club.[52] The club promoted 'manly sports with the rifle' as well as the preservation of game through the establishment of nature reserves.[53] To qualify for regular membership one had to be a wealthy white male who had 'killed with the rifle in fair chase'.

While its original focus had been the protection (and hunting) of American megafauna, when the number of bison in Yellowstone dropped precipitously, the geographical horizons of its members quickly expanded to natural areas considered to be more unspoiled than those of the American interior.[54] Members of the club came in contact with their European counterparts and because European empires were in control of large parts of unspoiled nature in Africa and Asia, the opportunities for big game hunting grew. Many of the members undertook foreign hunting trips. However, these trips came at a time when social pressure was mounting on those who were wealthy enough to donate some of their fortune to enhance the public good. The Boone and Crockett club therefore decided to organize and finance scientific expedition, next to their masculine hunting parties. This led to science and environment emerging as prestigious outlets for charitable giving. Because of these scientific expedition, scientific knowledge over the environment grew. This shift in activities influenced members of the Boone and Crockett Club significantly. One of these members who was influenced by science was founding member Theodore Roosevelt.

As Roosevelt grew older, he cared less about the killing of animals and became more interested in the preservation of nature at both the domestic and international level.[55] Roosevelt was an outspoken admirer of John Muir and his preservation thoughts, however, unlike Muir,

---

[51] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 181.

[52] Ibidem, 182.

[53] De Bont, *Nature's* Diplomats, 53.

[54] Ibidem.

[55] Theodore Roosevelt Center, Https://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Research/Digital-Library/Record/ImageViewer?libID=o159539&imageNo=1 (consulted 03 January 2023).

Roosevelt did not rule out economic utilitarianism. Roosevelt acknowledged the diplomatic potential of an economic utilitarian approach to conservation. As President, Roosevelt's conservation policies and laws were more in line with Gifford Pinchot, the American forester with whom he enjoyed a friendly relationship with. Pinchot believed that because natural resources are finite, the public good required that economic activity be conducted to ensure their sustainability.[56] According to French historians Donati Bergandi and Patrick Blandin, Pinchot feared that, should the government fail to ensure that certain business groups did not become the sole beneficiaries of nature, increasingly powerful monopolies would seize control of natural resources and manipulate regulation to serve their interests instead of the public good.[57] Both Pinchot and Roosevelt believed that equal access of citizens to resources had to be guaranteed.[58] Therefore, when Roosevelt became President in 1901, he made Pinchot an important part of his inner circle, and together they convinced Congress to establish the United States Forest Service, an agency charged with overseeing the country's forest reserves.[59]

Roosevelt was also the first head of state to attempt to internationalize conservation policy.[60] After hosting a US conservation conference, Roosevelt used the momentum to address the need for international cooperation with Canada and Mexico to 'conserve natural resources upon the continent'.[61] Roosevelt wrote a personal letter to both the presidents of Canada and Mexico, proposing a conference where they could discuss the threat from the rapid depletion of forests, coal and water resources in North America.[62] The conference passed a concluding Declaration of Principles, which suggested that 'all nations should be invited to join together in conference on the subject of world resources and their inventory, conservation and wise utilization.[63] Roosevelt also proposed the idea of a world conservation body, a council that would promote research, establish a global inventory and advise governments on 'conservation,

[56] Gifford Pinchot, Gerald Nash, *The Fight for Conservation*, (Seattle 1967) 75.

[57] Bergandi, Blandin, 'De la Protection de la nature au développement durable', 113.

[58] Ibidem.

[59] Char Miller, *Gifford Pinchot and the Making of Modern Environmentalism*, (Washington 2001) 156-158.

[60] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 92.

[61] Theodore Roosevelt Center, Https://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Research/Digital-Library/Record/ImageViewer?libID=o205825&imageNo=1 (consulted 03 January 2023).

[62] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 93.

[63] Ibidem.

development and replenishment.[64] Roosevelt's initiative was initially met with support. However, Roosevelt's proposal came to nothing and as soon as Roosevelt's second term in office ended, his successor, William Howard Taft, abandoned Roosevelt's National Conservation Commission and lost interest in his predecessor's international initiative.

The cause of wildlife protection brought together an unusual mix of conservationists, hunters and diplomats, however, most states remained committed to a programme of national economic development that prioritized industrialization and urbanization over environmental sustainability.[65] Until 1790, American cities were small and social inequality was relatively low, save for slavery. The nineteenth century ushered in a wave of financiers, merchants, industrialist, bankers and other tycoons who became millionaires.[66] The social inequality in American cities grew and multitudes of people slid deep into poverty. The urban elites separated themselves of the poor civilians and immigrants who flocked the cities. As a result, the poor became concentrated in neighborhoods that gradually became deplorable slums. By the mid-nineteenth century, the cities were characterized by severe overcrowding, substandard housing, homelessness, noise, pollution, disease, epidemics and illness.[67] Urban elites grew concerned about cities as urban areas became increasingly violent and disorderly and the lower classes rioted against the social inequality in the cities.

According to John Robert McNeill and historian Martin Velosi, these cities concentrated people to levels far higher than the immediate environment could support. As they could not exist in isolation from their surroundings, these cities required access to natural resources and to waste sinks beyond their borders.[68] This quest for natural resources and waste sinks was answered by coal. During the nineteenth century, coal became the dominant energy source used and the emergence of the railroad enabled the cities to develop long-distance trade in the grain, livestock and timber of North America's vast heartland.[69] This development supported the

[64] Ian Tyrrell, *Crisis of the Wasteful Nation. Empire and Conservation in Theodore Roosevelt's America*, (Chicago 2015) 213.

[65] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 89.

[66] Taylor, *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement*, 33.

[67] Ibidem.

[68] McNeill, Engelke, *The Great* Acceleration, 103.

[69] Ibidem*,* 109.

explosive growth of American cities, but also strengthened the idea of American citizens that their supply of natural resources was infinite.[70]

The existence and growth of these cities transformed nature, most notably their water and air. In many areas construction of waste-treatment centers did not keep pace with the greater popularity density. This meant that many communities simply dumped raw sewage into nearby rivers and lakes, magnifying the problem of water pollution. The dumping of sewage led to eutrophication, the overfertilization of water plants, whose subsequent death and decay eliminated the remaining oxygen in the water. This ensured the death of any aquatic wildlife, including fish. In time, the water was devoid of life, its ecosystem destroyed.[71] The impact of nineteenth century cities upon the quality of the air was more straight-forward. The use and combustion of coal polluted the air and warmed it up as well. Over time, according to Robert Falkner, local communities began to see the troubles of water and air pollution and organized protests against air and water pollution as a part of their wider effort to improve the often-appalling living conditions in the densely populated cities.[72] Early protests against pollution, therefore, tended to be responses to the obvious irritations, such as bad-tasting water, eye-smarting smoke, stench-ridden garbage, or noise machinery.[73]

By the end of the nineteenth century, sporadic protests against the irritations of a dirty city led to individual and group efforts to deal with smoke, sewage, garbage and noise.[74] Because the federal government in the United States had no authority to introduce air quality for cities until well into the twentieth century, individual and group efforts turned into professional anti-pollution organizations which sprang up in several cities, from the Anti-Smoke league of Baltimore and the Society for the Prevention of Smoke in Chicago, to the Smoke Abatement League of Cincinnati and the Citizens' Smoke Abatement Association of St Louis.[75] These organizations drew inspiration from wildlife conservation clubs like the Boone and Crockett Club and became increasingly popular when the environmental damage caused by the First World War became clear in 1918.

---

[70] Martin Velosi, *Effluent America: Cities, Industry, Energy, and the Environment*, (Pittsburgh 2000) 23.

[71] McNeil, Engelke, *The Great Acceleration*, 105.

[72] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 84.

[73] Velosi, *Effluent America*, 39.

[74] Ibidem, 40.

[75] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 86.

The First and Second World War were great influencers for both the environment and environmental advocates. Both wars greatly increased the demand for resources from traditional materials like wood to steel and oil, causing upsurges in logging and mining and major landscape impacts like deforestation and oil pollution.[76] The peace settlement after the First World War included the establishment of the League of Nations, an international attempt to create a system of international rules that would forestall the recourse of war. Binding arbitration, neutrality laws, The Hague Peace Conferences and the World Court were all key aspects of a legalistic approach to international affairs, one that provided diplomats with new opportunities, methods and challenges.[77] These international peace conferences also provided an opportunity for states to re-think the fundamental rules which defined international order and lay the foundation for a new order.[78] Environmental campaigners saw the Paris Peace Conference of 1919 as a new opportunity to lobby state leaders with proposals to embed environmental objectives in peace settlements. These campaigners were predominantly from European and North American organizations.

Environmental lobbying at the Paris Peace Conference and later at the League of Nations was dominated by a small number of actors who originated from the nineteenth and early twentieth century preservationists. Because these actors lacked the popular support, they put all their hopes in their access to high-ranking diplomats and government officials. But, despite these efforts. The victorious powers did not include environmental protection in the League's mandate.[79] Compared with pressing problems on the list of international issues such as migration, slave labor, health, and impending political and military conflicts, the care for flora and fauna was marginal.[80]

Despite the setback, environmentalists resumed their campaigns. Because, for the first time, environmentalists had an international organization to focus their lobbying efforts on. They hoped that despite the lack of a formal mandate of the United States for the League, it might be persuaded to become a driving force behind international nature protection efforts. At first, this seemed to have some effect, as the League of Nations secretariat, Paul Sarasin, was prepared to assist the environmental cause. But the deterioration of great power relations during

[76] Whyte, A Dictionary of Environmental History, 13.

[77] Black, *A History of Diplomacy*, *178*.

[78] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 97.

[79] Ibidem, 98.

[80] Anna-Katharina Wöbse, 'Oil on Troubled Waters? Environmental Diplomacy in the League of Nations', *Diplomatic History* 32:1 (2008) 519-537; 524.

the interwar years put an end to the League's legal authority. The League Secretariat continued to encourage environmentalists to expand their transnational networks and keep up their lobbying efforts but could not itself take the initiative to introduce global environmental measures.[81] Environmentalists continued to advocate for the protection of big animals, birds, and marine pollution through civic organizations, which were international continuations of domestic conservation groups like the Boone and Crockett Club.

The first of the civic international organizations for nature protection to be founded was the International Committee for Bird Protection (ICBP). The ICBP was an American initiative, where Thomas Gilbert Pearson continued the tradition of elite naturalist leadership and a widespread romantic appreciation for nature among middle-class Americans.[82] According to de Bont, the 'international' in this organization was very limited.[83] Simultaneously, preservationists in Berlin set up a civic organization focusing on one particular mammal: the European bison. These organizations focused their activities on particular species and one particular class of animals. Following up on these initiatives, an institution that had the ambition to engage with all aspects of global nature protection was set up in 1928, the International Office for the Protection of Nature (IOPN). The self-appointed goal of the institution was to act as a clearinghouse of information.[84] The IOPN collected information on threatened animals and plants, but also on the whereabouts of travelling hunters who showed unsportsmanlike behavior, which showed how great the influence of traditional conservationists still was. At first, the IOPN did not attract much public attention, but its influence should not be underestimated, as it served as an exclusive marketplace for exchanging information among a small and ambitious circle of American and European men.[85] Through the IOPN, international contacts between Western conservationists intensified.[86] After the Second World War, the IOPN would continue to exist in the form of the International Union for the Protection of Nature.

Another problem which greatly influenced conservationists' efforts to protect nature was marine oil pollution. After the First World War, commercial shipping companies

[81] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 100.

[82] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, 50.

[83] Ibidem.

[84] Ibidem.

[85] Anna-Katharina Wöbse, ''The world after all was one': The International Environmental Network of UNESCO and IUPN, 1945-1950', *Contemporary European History* 20:3 (2011), 331-348; 336.

[86] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, 54.

increasingly switched from coal to oil to power their ships.[87] This caused for large amounts of oil to float on the surface and damage coastal wildlife, harbor installations and tourism.[88] Fishermen, port authorities, public health officers, tourist boards and, most important, landowners who thought their properties were threatened by depreciation spoke out against oil pollution.[89] These landowners were so important because some of them were part of the environmental movement of the nineteenth century. The environmentalists who were previously focused upon the conservation of big animals started to push governments to impose serious constraints on industry.

States were unwilling to constrain the industry, so they used a transnational strategy as a way out of their dilemma. By insisting that the problem could only be solved internationally, governments exported the dilemma of domestic policy. The experts of the League of Nations and state diplomats tended to side with industry and dismissed a truly transnational solution.[90] Despite the fact that the League of Nations was used to forestall environmental reform, the creation of a forum where environmental issues could at least be discussed was important for the regard of environmental advocates. The United States convened an international conference in 1926 to discuss an international regulatory framework for shipping. However, because there were only thirteen participating countries, the claim 'international' was hardly a legitimate one. And between these nations, their mutual relationships were deteriorating, which made sure that little progress was made during the interwar years.[91]

Before the Second World War, proto-environmentalism was a movement of the elite, with growing international networks, institutions, ideas and ideals. The Second World War disrupted these networks and institutions of global nature protection in radical ways. The war caused most international societies, committees and offices to cease their activities almost immediately.[92] The devastation wreaked by the Second World War itself played a major role in raising global environmental awareness. Both sides in the global conflict mobilized natural resources and caused pollution on an unprecedented scale, leading to the wholesale militarization of the environment.[93] Experiences with environmental destruction, both during

[87] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 101.

[88] Wöbse, 'Oil on Troubled Waters', 525.

[89] Wöbse, 'Oil on Troubled Waters', 526.

[90] Ibidem, 531.

[91] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 102.

[92] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, *171*.

[93] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 105.

the War and the existential threat that was the invention of the atom bomb, and the planning of resource flows spurred new ways of thinking about the conservation of nature.

Conclusion

The nineteenth and early twentieth century witnessed the transformation of the environmental movement. Thanks to influential people like George Perkins Marsh, Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot, conservation went from a romantic idea to a belief which had to benefit the public good. Wealthy, predominantly white, men united themselves in organizations which lobbied for the protection of nature.

These preservationists invested in scientific research to support their cause. The scientists who were brought into the environmental cause also provided a valuable model for diplomats in their ability to emphasize professional collaboration over nationalistic competition.

In the 1880s scientific conferences and civic organizations still represented relatively new sites of knowledge production and exchange. However, because these scientists became increasingly more important to the preservationist cause, their significance grew. These conferences and organizations became key sites where scientific standards were negotiated, disciplines shaped and the international community of science embodied. Furthermore, they offered occasions for networking with fellow scientists and with people of power, who were usually represented in conference patronage committees.[94]

So, this chapter showed that before the Cold War there were no professional environmental diplomats yet but a nascent culture of environmental diplomacy.

[94] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, 33.

Chapter 2: The Nuclear Era

The first chapter of this thesis showed that during the first two-thirds of the nineteenth century there was an important input from Europe and the European romantic movement into the build-up of thoughts and attitudes of the earliest American conservation movement. Over the twentieth century, the American conservation movement matured and even though there were American attempts to internationalize this proto-environmentalism, like President Theodore Roosevelt's International Conservation Conference in Washington and the ICBP, there was a minimum of interest beyond the wide American frontier. Although serious worldwide initiatives towards environmental protection were still twenty years away, the Second World War and its aftermath changed environmental thinking and advocating significantly.[95] Especially the potential of nuclear weapons was an important contributor to this development. Nuclear weapons changed both the military and civilian landscape after World War II. Their explosive power could destroy cities, even entire countries.[96] The era of nuclear weapons divided the world in two blocs. The leading countries of these blocs, the United States for the western capitalists and the Soviet Union for the eastern communists, bolstered their prestige with mass production of nuclear weapons.

All nuclear powers developed atomic archipelagoes, networks of special sites devoted to nuclear weapons, uranium processing, and weapons manufacturing and testing.[97] These archipelagoes were shielded from the public by Cold War secrecy. The dangers these places posed for the environment and health of the people was, according to decision makers, an acceptable cost for the acquisition of more nuclear weapons. During the first two decades of the Cold War, most people accepted nuclear weapons in society with great enthusiasm.[98] This was, according to historian Jeremi Suri, because nuclear weapons contributed to the spectacular economic development of the United States after the Second World War, to many Americans, nuclear weapons were symbols of national greatness and not of environmental disasters.[99]

---

[95] Max Nicholson, *The Environmental Revolution. A Guide for the New Masters of the World*, (Lancashire 1970) 188.

[96] Jeremi Suri, *Power and Protest. Global revolution and the Rise of Détente*, (Cambridge 2003) 7.

[97] McNeil, Engelke, *The Great Acceleration*, 160.

[98] Gregg Herken, *The Winning Weapon. The Atomic Bomb in the Cold War, 1945-1950*, (Princeton 1988) 7.

[99] Suri, *Power and Protest*, 7.

Instead of regulation, nuclear developments were implemented on all parts of society, such as medicines and agriculture, it was the beginning of the nuclear era.

However, as nuclear science was further implemented in society, like the use of insecticides in agriculture, opposition towards the nuclear destruction rose as well. Edward Max Nicholson, American ornithologist and one of the founding members of the World Wide Foundation (WWF), argued in 1970 that the implications of the nuclear era had led to the emergence of organized opposition towards environmental destruction and politically practicable patterns of organized expression.[100] However, most problems associated with the environmental movement during the Nixon presidency; pesticides, radioactive fallout, suburban sprawl, roadside litter and polluted streams were still unknown to the public after the Second World War. According to American literary scholar Michael Egan, after World War II, the Americans recognized the existence of an environmental crisis in the United States and, as polls indicated, a growing number of American citizens recognized the deterioration in environmental quality posed the potential for nuclear destruction.[101] Amid a period of high Cold War tension, Americans welcomed the rapid expansion of legislation relating to environmental protection and the proliferation of popular publications lamenting the condition of Earth's ecosystems.[102] According to John Brooks Flippen, the nuclear era achieved the environment political value and made it inevitable for Nixon to exclude from his international programme.[103] Therefore, this chapter will research how nuclear fear and opposition to nuclear weapons established a social movement which generated environmental awareness and raised issues which policymakers could not ignore.

During the nuclear era, threats of destruction and promises of greatness went hand in hand.[104] In the United States, the atomic bombing of Hiroshima and Nagasaki created an enormous sensation. Like the War, the bombing was widely supported by the general public, with the major criticism of it coming from pacifists and some religious leaders. Harry Truman's presidential victory in 1948 fractured postwar liberalism, leaving establishment liberals to rally

[100] Nicholson, *The Environmental Revolution*, 216.

[101] Michael Egan, *Barry Commoner and the science of survival: The remaking of American environmentalism*, (Cambridge 2007) 1; Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*, 19.

[102] Ibidem, 1-2.

[103] Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*,

[104] Black, 7.

around Truman and the warfare state.[105] But the advent of the nuclear age also inspired a sense of awe and, especially, fear.[106] These fears were bolstered by Malthusian worries about overpopulation-driven scarcities. The United States experienced an economic boom after the Second World War. In the decade and a half after the conclusion of the hostilities, the nation's gross national product grew from 200 million dollar to 500 million and the population increased by thirty-five million.[107] Just like in the United States, the world also experienced an economic burst. A big part of the global growth spurt derived merely from global population growth. Initially, no one worried about this in the 1930s, but by the late 1940s a few voices raised doubts about the implications of further growth.[108] These voices provoked acute fears of famine, resource depletion and overcrowding that would diminish the quality of life.[109]

Two of the most influential voices were those of American paleontologist, geologist and eugenics advocate Fairfield Osborn and American ecologist and ornithologist William Vogt. Their books *Our Plundered Planet* and *Road to Survival* conceptualized the imbalance between resources and human populations. Osborn and Vogt pleaded with policymakers to think through the environmental consequences of exporting industrialization and consumption based economic growth models worldwide. Ignoring sustainability issues, they warned, would bring more war.[110] Osborn and Vogt tried to change the perspective of what conservation meant and in a world that was being rebuild, they became part of a dialogue about how conservation could contribute the postwar world. Through foreign aid programs, like the Marshall Plan, the United States was a great influence in the world. Osborn and Vogt pleaded with policy makers to make wise use of natural resources part of the Marshall Plan. But President Truman argued different. Truman believed that economic development was only obtainable through the extensive use of natural resources and a nuclear superiority over the Soviet Union.[111] However, the creation of

---

[105] Henry Richard Maar III, *Freeze! The Grassroots Movement to Halt the Arms Race and End the Cold War*, (New York 2021) 8.

[106] Lawrence S. Wittner, *Confronting the Bomb. A Short History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement*, (Stanford 2009) 12.

[107] Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*, 2.

[108] John Robert McNeill, 'The Environment, Environmentalism, and International Society' in: Niall Ferguson, Charles S. Maier, Erez Manela, Daniel J. Sargent eds., *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective*, (Boston 2010) 263-278; 267.

[109] Ibidem.

[110] Robertson, *The Malthusian Moment*, 42.

[111] Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman (1949), https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/PPP-1949-book1 (consulted 6 March 2023) 112-116.

the United Nations, and particularly of its Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and its Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) in the late 1940's laid a solid foundation upon which conservationists were quick to avail themselves.[112] The simultaneous growth of international aviation, and the multiplication of international contacts and conference which it permitted stimulated international interest for conservationism.

The nuclear arms race between the Soviet Union and the United States helped to normalize a widely accepted doctrine of nuclear deterrence in which the United States had to retain 'the best, the biggest and the most' atomic weapons in order to efficiently dissuade the Soviet Union from being aggressive.[113] Because of this doctrine, the physical environmental sciences gained influence within U.S. foreign policy.[114] In an era where the United States government tried to promote the positive effects of resource plundering and bold nuclear policies, science and scientists became tools of the state. This created a striking contradiction. Scientists had also been the first to oppose nuclear weapons, beginning their activism almost simultaneously with the atomic destruction of Hiroshima and Nagasaki in Augusts 1945.[115] In the aftermath of the atomic bombing, atomic scientists associations sprang up at numerous Manhattan Project work sites. That November, the groups from Chicago, Oak Ridge, Los Alamos, and New York joined together to launch the Federation of Atomic Scientists, which, the following month, reorganized itself as the Federation of American Scientists.[116] However, the Cold War made opposition against nuclear weapons, initially, impossible. Most scientists believed that the establishment of a world government was the solution to the problem, but they also recognized that developing such an institution would take time.[117] Therefore, until such an

[112] Nicholson, *The Environmental Revolution*, 199.

[113] Paul Boyer, *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, (Chapel Hill 1994) 102.

[114] Ronald E. Doel and Kristine C. Harper, 'Prometheus Unleashed: Science as a Diplomatic Weapon in the Lyndon B. Johnson Administration', Osiris 21:1 (2006) 66-85; 67.

[115] Paul Rubinson, 'American Scientists in 'Communist Conclaves:' Pugwash and Anti-communism in the United States, 1957-1968' in: Alison Kraft and Carola Sachse eds., *Science, (anti)communism and diplomacy: the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs in the early Cold War* (Leiden 2020) 156-189; 156.

[116] Wittner, *Confronting the* Bomb, 13.

[117] Relevant literature is voluminous. See, e.g., Lawrence Badash, *Scientists and the Development of Nuclear Weapons: From Fission to the Limited Test Ban Treaty, 1939-1963*, (Atlantic Highlands 1995); Gregg Herken, *Cardinal Choices: Presidential Science Advising from the Atomic Bomb to SDI*, (New York 1992); Spencer R. Weart, *Scientists in Power*, (Cambridge 1979).

institution was to be established, they rallied behind the idea of international control of atomic energy. Physicists became visible figures in efforts to negotiate treaties, shape world opinion and articulate models of international governance.

Reliance on nuclear deterrence and a growing significance for physicists did not, however, extinguish growing concerns about the harmful effects of these weapons on human civilization. Remarkably, most of the imperiled people were not citizens of the United States.[118] This concern only grew stronger after the development of the new thermonuclear bomb. Edward Teller, who was regarded as the father of this bomb, argued that this kind of weapon could stabilize the international system.[119] However, these bombs had become so powerful that even testing them posed grave hazards. The ecological effects of a thermonuclear explosion were profound and irreversible. In the mid-1950s scientists in Europe and North America began to observe rising levels of radiation in rain, soil, milk, and even human bones. The entire infrastructure of life on Earth was jeopardized in a way inconceivable only a few years earlier. Radioactive fallout knew no boundaries. Limits on thermonuclear development -including tests- received growing support among citizens, intellectuals and policymakers around the world.

Although antinuclear scientists failed in their attempts to build a formal international organization, they did manage to develop an informal network of concerned scientists. Determined to 'promote an interchange of information and ideas' leading to 'international atomic energy control', the Federation of American Scientists (FAS) mailed over 10.000 pamphlets on the nuclear issue to scientists in more than 60 nations.[120] The first International Technical Conference on the Protection of Nature, organized by the International Union and by UNESCO at Lake Success, New York in August 1949, included a well-balanced review of consequences detrimental to man from the generalized use of insecticides or of modern herbicides. Emphasis was laid on avoiding 'the blind use of Dichloro-Diphenyl-Trichloroethane (DDT)' and on using such products only where absolutely necessary, and discouraging indiscriminate commercial or private spraying.[121]

---

[118] McNeill, Engelke, *The Great Acceleration*, 162.

[119] Dario Fazzi, 'A Voice of Conscience: How Eleanor Roosevelt Helped to Popularize the Debate on Nuclear Fallout, 1950-1954' in: *Journal of American Studies* 50:3 (2016) 699-730; 709.

[120] Wittner, *Confronting the Bomb*, 23-24.

[121] Nicholson, *The Environmental Revolution*, 217.

Where Moscow and Washington could not even agree on some basic measures to reduce the risks of nuclear miscalculation, American scientists linked with their eastern counterparts through the Pugwash organization and discussed how both nations could possibly reduce the environmental and health risks of nuclear weapons through cooperation. British philosopher Bertrand Russell was the main inspiration for this international cause.[122] For nearly a decade after the atomic explosion in Japan, he had warned the world about the cataclysmic consequences of nuclear war. In 1955 he teamed up with Albert Einstein, who was the most prominent physicist of his age, to create the Russell-Einstein manifesto. In this manifest, they made an appeal to the world where they urged everyone; 'East and West, capitalist and communists' to put aside their differences and acknowledge the possibility of their destruction. This manifest also urged scientists to seek for cooperation and pressure governments to steer away from nuclear weapons.

> In the tragic situation which confronts humanity, we feel that science should assemble in conference to appraise the perils that have arisen as a result of the development of weapons of mass destruction … The general public, and even many men in positions of authority, have not realized what would be involved in a war with nuclear bombs.[123]

As a result, the Pugwash organization was founded in 1957. This organization organized worldwide conferences where they linked scientists who opposed the nuclear arms race with like-minded government policymakers.[124] Combining science and policymakers through international conferences was a practice they learned from the pre- World War Two preservationists. The first conference ended after a few short days, but, according to historian Jonathan Lewis, nonetheless it set precedents for the future.[125] The first group of scientists that convened in Pugwash also included three Soviets, three Japanese and one Chinese scientist.[126] Lewis argues that the scientists discussed important issues of concern to all the world's citizens,

---

[122] Jonathan E. Lewis, *SpyCapitalism: ITEK and the CIA*, (London 2002) 97.

[123] Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs, https://pugwash.org/1955/07/09/statement-manifesto/ (consulted 15 March 2023).

[124] Paul Rubinson, 'American Scientists in 'Communist Conclaves:' Pugwash and Anti-communism in the United States, 1957-1968' in: Alison Kraft and Carola Sachse eds., *Science, (anti)communism and diplomacy: the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs in the early Cold War* (Leiden 2020) 156-189; 156.

[125] Lewis, *SpyCapitalism*, 98.

[126] Petra Goedde, *The Politics of Peace: A Global Cold War* History, (New York 2019) 79.

but its most important contribution was that in an age where the world was edging ever closer to the abyss of nuclear annihilation, the fact that these conferences took place at all was its greatest significance.[127]

At Pugwash conferences the assembled scientists discussed the scientific and technical implications of atomic energy, paying special attention to the political problems which were the background to international negotiations.[128] According to historian Paul Rubinson, the relatively unstructured and informal private meetings attempted to create a cooperative atmosphere for the enlightening exchange of views from each side of the Iron Curtain.[129] Pugwash participants hoped to encourage disarmament in three ways: by influencing governments, by forming a channel of communication between scientists and by educating public opinion.[130] According to historian Henry Richard Maar III, did American scientists open a debate in the society over the health hazards posed by radioactive fallout.[131] While the US government claimed fallout had little impact on human health, scientists from Washington University published the results of their study on the effects of fallout on human anatomy through the examination of baby teeth.[132] Studies like this inspired pacifists and anti-nuclear activist to unite and lobby for disarmament.[133] Pugwash helped to revive scientists' role in politics. In the United States, pressured by growing nuclear fear and awareness, President Eisenhower made a number of attempts to reduce the dangers of conflict arising from miscalculation, accident, or a simple misreading of intentions.[134]

Nuclear weapons forestalled war among the great powers, but despite this accomplishment, by 1961 nuclear deterrence had become a source of perceived insecurity.[135] the style and substance of American nuclear policy only changed radically with the inauguration

---

[127] Goedde, *The Politics of Peace*, 79.

[128] Joseph Rotblat, *Scientists in the Quest for Peace: A History of the Pugwash Conferences*, (Cambridge 1972) 141.

[129] Paul Rubinson, *Redefining Science: Scientists, the National Security State, and Nuclear Weapons in Cold War America*, (Boston 2016) 95.

[130] Ibidem, 96.

[131] Maar, *Freeze!*, 8

[132] Ibidem.

[133] The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/national-committee-sane-nuclear-policy-sane (consulted 6 March 2023).

[134] Suri, *Power and Protest*, 10.

[135] Ibidem, 15.

of John Fitzgerald Kennedy as 35th President of the United States. Kennedy wanted to transcend the restraints of the nuclear world. However, in the fall of 1962 the world came just one word away from nuclear Armageddon. That October, reconnaissance photographs uncovered the construction of a launch pad in Cuba capable of firing nuclear missiles at nearly any place in the continental United States.[136] Even though the Cuban Missile Crisis ended after thirteen days without there being fired a single nuclear missile, the crisis had further put fear of nuclear deterrence in the picture of the American people, Kennedy had to discuss nuclear regulations with the Soviet Union and the scientists of Pugwash would play an active role in helping bring about the 1963 Limited Nuclear Test Ban Treaty.[137]

The signing of the Test Ban Treaty was a major achievement for the antinuclear movement. According to Paul Rubinson, the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty (LTBT) catalyzed the transition from aggressive confrontation to *détente* between the super powers. Because the test ban hinged on scientific expertise, it also showed how scientists were divided into two camps: those who worked with the state for nuclear deterrence and those outside the state who opposed it.[138] Because the scientists could not speak with one mouth, the formal diplomatic negotiations in Geneva were accompanied by a series of informal talks facilitated by unlikely interlocutors.[139] One of these was Norman Cousins. Cousins was a prominent pacifist and actively involved in discussions with leading pacifists to form a provisional committee of the Americans Friends Service Committee (AFSC) that worked to stop the testing of nuclear weapons in the atmosphere.[140] The committee believed that informed citizens had to bring the voice of sanity to the people and therefore, quickly after its establishment, changed its name to SANE; National Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy.[141] SANE's campaign against atmospheric testing received endorsements and praise from mainstream social-political figures, such as Eleanor Roosevelt and Martin Luther King Jr.; leading physicists, such as Leo Szilard

[136] Maar, *Freeze!*, 11.

[137] Rubinson, *Redefining Science*, 93.

[138] Ibidem.

[139] Goedde, *The Politic of Peace*, 91.

[140] Maar, *Freeze!*, 9.

[141] Maar, *Freeze!*, 9; The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/national-committee-sane-nuclear-policy-sane (consulted 6 March 2023).

and Edward Teller; and Hollywood luminaries, such as Steve Allen and Marlon Brando.[142] SANE's connections with social movements were important for their significance. Social movements like King Jr.'s manifested the voices of dissent and channeled public anxiety. They generated awareness and raised issues that policymakers could not ignore. Because Cousins also maintained good relations with scientific leaders in the Soviet Union, Cousins became a central mediator for the LTBT.[143]

During the 1960s people in both the east and the west were promised progress mostly through the advantages of nuclear power.[144] However, both sides failed to meet these expectations. The rhetoric of capitalism against communism was being used to hold the Cold War responsible for failing expectations they had created themselves. Anti-nuclear activism gained more leverage and the public learned more about the environmental consequences of nuclear fallout. The health damage from nuclear fallout also featured prominently in Rachel Carson's *The Silent Spring*.[145] Carson was a former researcher for the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service who decided to showcase the negative effects of nuclear developments. Her book bemoaned the environmental impact of indiscriminate insecticide use. According to historian Petra Goedde, did Carson's book not reveal any new information about the dangers of radiation and pesticides, but its presentation and timing captured the publics and political establishment's attention, which paved the way for the passage of a series of environmental acts during the Johnson Administration.[146]

The Johnson Administration passed many major laws that made substantial changes in civil rights, health care, welfare and education. The ultimate example of this was President Johnson's Great Society. Johnson's Great Society meant preschool for poor children, college prep for poor teenagers, legal services for indigent defendants, economic redevelopment funds for lagging regions, landmark immigration reform, a Department of Housing and Urban

[142] Maar, *Freeze!*, 9. More about SANE and popularizing the debate on Nuclear Fallout; The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/national-committee-sane-nuclear-policy-sane; Fazzi, 'A Voice of Conscience'; Milton Katz, *Ban the Bomb. A History of SANE, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy*, (Westport 1987).

[143] Norman Cousins, *The improbable triumvirate: John F. Kennedy, Pope John, Nikita Khrushchev*, (New York 1972) 10-11.

[144] Suri, *Power and Protest*, 165.

[145] Goedde, *The Politic of Peace*, 91.

[146] Ibidem.

Development and national endowments for the humanities and arts.[147] However, according to American historian Chad Montrie, the fight for social justice and dignity and the fight for a balanced environment were fought simultaneously.[148] This was also the case for President Johnson. Between 1963 and 1968 the President signed into law almost three hundred conservation and beautification measures, which were supported by more than twelve billion dollars in authorized funds.[149] Among these laws were a highway Beautification Act, a Water Quality Act, a Clean Air Act and the Wilderness Act of 1964, which gave a legal definition to wildlife.

According to scholar Robert Falkner, the rise of nuclear activism also transformed the nature of environmental activism during the Johnson presidency.[150] Older preservation groups, such as the Sierra Club were experiencing a revival of interest and more recent organizations had public and corporate backing to promote the efficient utilization of resources.[151] Modern environmental advocates generally shared an appreciation of the fragility of ecological balances, a notion of intrinsic value of nature, a personal concern for health and fitness, and a commitment to self-reliance.[152] Johnson's Great Society had to fit this new mold of environmental protection, which was a direct result of nuclear activism of the preceding decade and Carson's book. Johnson tried to adapt to the new environmental movement. According to Russell Train, did Johnson's administration pioneer in establishing comprehensive environmental legislation and institutions, but his laws proved inadequate and his White House Conferences on International Cooperation were too often only for show.[153] Even though the Johnson Administration was mere adapting to a new reality, they believed they were personally responsible for this change.[154]

---

[147] Rick Perlstein, *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America*, (New York 2009) 13.

[148] Chad Montrie, *The Myth of Silent Spring: Rethinking the origins of American Environmentalism*, (Berkeley 2018) 1.

[149] Martin V. Melosi, 'Lyndon Johnson and Environmental Policy' in: Robert Divine, eds., *The Johnson Years, Volume Two, The Environment, and Science*, (Lawrence 1987) 113-149; 113.

[150] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 113.

[151] Melosi, 'Lyndon Johnson and Environmental Policy', 116.

[152] Ibidem.

[153] Russell Train, 'International Environmental Policy: Some Recollections and Reflections', in: Larry Rockwood, Ronald Stewart, Thomas Dietz eds., *Foundations of Environmental Sustainability: The Coevolution of Science and Policy*, (New York 2008) 42-46; 44.

[154] Melosi, 'Lyndon Johnson and Environmental Policy', 117.

Conclusion

This chapter sought out to establish how the advent of the nuclear era reshuffled discourses over the global environment. From the early 1950s onward, nuclear anxieties pushed environmental concern into the center of US political debate; environmental issues achieved greater political relevance and urgency. The biggest factor for change was the development of nuclear weapons. The nuclear shadow of the Cold War motivated those who advocated for environmental protection in the progressive era to broaden their field of interest. Romantic notions of the loss of wilderness and species extinction continued to resonate in environmental circles, but Malthusian anxiety and fear of nuclear fallout truly changed the movement.

Osborn and Vogt changed the perspective of what conservation meant and in a world that was being rebuild, they became part of a dialogue about how conservation could contribute to the postwar world. Antinuclear scientists managed to develop an informal network of concerned scientists. Organizations like Pugwash and SANE were determined to promote an interchange of information and ideas which would lead to international atomic energy control. The international network of scientists who were concerned about nuclear deterrence was essential in the establishment of the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Scientists educated the people and their connections with social movements increased their significance greatly. Social Movements like King Jr.'s manifested the voices of dissent and channeled public anxiety. They generated awareness and raised issues that policymakers could not ignore. Scientists and social movements convinced the people that nature was more than forests and animals. President Johnson made legislative changes, which introduced the United States to modern environmentalism.

So, this chapter showed that growing nuclear fear accelerated environmental education amongst the public and created fertile ground for environmentalism during the Nixon presidency, which in turn stimulated environmental diplomacy.

Chapter 3: Building Environmental Diplomacy

The fact that right after his election Nixon appointed a series of transition task forces to provide overviews of various environmental issues and to make the first policy suggestions must therefore be read in continuity with a deep-rooted tradition of environmental concern and with the emergence, from the 1960s onward of a widespread environmental consciousness. One of Nixon's advisory groups was the Task Force on Natural Resources and Environment, a group of twenty academicians and corporative executives, chaired by Russell Train. Unlike Nixon, Train had an extensive record of environmental activism around the globe. Besides this, Train was a lifelong Republican, who first met Nixon when he was still Vice-President and admired him for both his intellect and activism in foreign policy.[155] The report he and his team send to Nixon six months later, were the most forceful and honest statements he read about the environment and changed Nixon's view upon its importance.[156]

> There are traditional concerns for forests and parks, fish and wildlife, soils and water, minerals and fuels. There is the new concern for the urban environment and for bringing outdoor recreation and natural values into the lives of city people. There is need for more effective land-use planning. There is the need for more effective land-use planning. There is the new frontier of the oceans and the development and wise management of marine resources. There is the growing threat to the shorelines and estuaries of the coastal zone. There is the challenge of environmental pollution – air, water, thermal, pesticides, noise and solid waste. There is the massive impact, frequently unpredicted or ill-considered, of technology upon the environment. There is the pressure of evermounting human numbers, probably the most significant single determinant of environmental quality. Internationally, these problems constitute an extraordinary opportunity for United States leadership and new initiatives.
> Environmental quality is a unifying goal that cuts across economic and racial lines, across political and social boundaries. It is a goal that provides a new perspective to many national problems and can give a new direction to public policy. Its values and support come not from the divisions that plague our society but from the common aspirations of all for a life of dignity, health and fulfillment.[157]

The Task Force recommended the President that environmental management be given high priority. But Train also gave the President a more personal advice, that environmental issues could earn him a lot of extra votes. This suggestion of Train was not something he pulled out of thin air. According to polls, the concern for environmental degradation was gathering support

[155] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 618.

[156] Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*, 22.

[157] *Report of the Task Force in Resources and Environment*, https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/2021-01/Report%20of%20the%20Task%20Force%20on%20Resources%20and%20Environment.pdf (consulted 29 January 29 2023).

rapidly. By 1965, a quarter of respondents surveyed labeled air pollution a serious problem. For water quality, the figure was one third. Three years later, two thirds of respondents indicated a serious problem in both areas.[158] Ever the astute politician, Nixon recognized that environmental advocacy promised a new, young constituency, a demographic hardly aligned with the Republican Party of Nixon.[159] Nixon demanded his advisor for domestic affairs to 'seize the initiative', resulting in a wave of administration accomplishments, like the founding of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).[160] However, according to Flippen, this came at the cost of angering Nixon's conservative base. Environmental diplomacy offered a solution; Nixon could appeal the environmentalists without restricting industry or raising taxes.[161]

The United States was not the only country in the world where environmental protection gained political value during the 1960s. The environment became a subject of global significance during the Nixon presidency. It emerged alongside a number of international issues such as terrorism, human rights, space technology and illegal drug shipments that rose to the foreground of world politics.[162] In the minds of many leading policymakers across the world, international environmental protection emerged as a means to bring stability to their own societies and protect their own domestic power. In an era of *détente*, where the United States moved towards institutionalizing multipolarity, the environmental issue seemed ripe with possibilities for encouraging international cooperation as a means to stabilize a turbulent international system.[163] According to Flippen, Nixon was not philosophically against conservation nor did he later think the initial legislation to protect environmental quality was frivolous, it was simply politics.[164] Besides, Nixon did not win the 1968 election because of his position towards the protection of the environment, he recognized the growing conflict in Indochina and used the Vietnam War as his platform for political rebirth. But the Task Force on Natural Resources and Environment convinced Nixon that environmentalism was popular

[158] James McEvoy, 'The American Concern for the Environment', in: William R. Burch Jr. eds., *Social Behavior, Natural Resources, and the Environment* (New York 1972) 214-236.

[159] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russel Train', 617.

[160] Ibidem.

[161] Ibidem.

[162] Macekura, 'The Limits of the global community', 489.

[163] Ibidem, 490.

[164] Flippen, *Nixon and the Environment*, 18.

among European critics of American policies in Vietnam and therefore that environmental diplomacy abroad also carried real political dividend at home.[165]

Under influence of Nixon's environmental revolution, the early 1970s were marked, nearly everywhere around the globe, by a significant upswing in governmental activity on the environment. President Nixon and his cabinet initiated a number of policies that sought to generate a global consensus between states on environmental issues and bring about a global architecture of environmental protection. The administration crafted its approach around three fundamental policies. First, Nixon called for the creation of an environmental component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS).[166] Second, Nixon and his advisers sought a bilateral environmental protection agreement with the Soviet Union, which Nixon viewed as a valuable symbol and useful starting point for negotiating *détente*.[167] Third, and most ambitious, the administration advocated for a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment.[168] During the 1950s and 1960s the UN oversaw a small spate of conferences, one of which produced the successful biosphere reserve program.[169] But this conference had to be different, be bigger and carry more significance. In order to be able to execute the administration's optimistic approach, in a few months, Nixon oversaw a massive expansion of the environmental bureaucracy, both domestically as internationally. But this also came with a challenge. The State Department did not have the expertise to do environmental things.[170] A new culture of environmental diplomacy had to be crafted. A culture which was at one hand a continuation of previous thoughts and ideas which had developed over the previous one hundred years and at the other hand dealt with problems and insights which were completely new. This chapter is about how this culture was brought into practice.

---

[165] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 614.

[166] On the relation between Nixon and the CCMS See Evanthis Hatzivassiliou, *The NATO Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society, 1969-1975*, (New York 2017).

[167] On *détente see* John Gaddis, 'Grand strategies in the Cold War' in: M. Leffler and O. Westad, eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, (Cambridge 2010) 1-21; Richard Nixon, *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, (London 1978).

[168] Stephen Macekura, 'The Nixon administration and global environmental politics', 491.

[169] McNeill, *The Great Acceleration*, 199.

[170] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Mulloy,%20Patrick%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 05 February 2023).

Because of his efforts during Nixon's Presidential campaign, Train was awarded with the position of undersecretary of Interior. Even though this position appeared to offer few opportunities for diplomacy, Train found a way. Congress still had to approve the creation of a central environmental agency and because the international bureau of Interior always advised the Department of State on diplomatic issues, Train insisted his department could lead the way in environmental diplomacy. After some convincing, Train was allowed to represent the Interior Department at a regular joint US-Japan Cabinet meeting in Tokyo. After a long flight, he and other American representatives were invited to a 'lengthy dinner'.[171] After Japanese Ambassador to the United States Nobuhiko Ushiba sang a song of friendship, Train recognized that the protocol called for a response from the American side. In his memoirs, he recalled this moment.

> I looked across the table at Maury Stand, secretary of Commerce. He seemed at least semi-awake. He and I quickly agreed to try a duet, and in a moment, we were singing 'A Bicycle Built for Two'. It was not much, but American honor was saved.[172]

Even though this looks like a minor deal, it does exemplify Train as a diplomat, taking initiative whenever the opportunity arose. Negotiations with Japan also set the template for the personal diplomacy that would characterize later efforts of the environmental diplomats during the Nixon presidency. As neither country had any individual at the ministerial level with responsibility for environmental matters yet, Train was given the responsibility to meet with the Japanese Minister of Fisheries Hasegawa and sign the northern Pacific fisheries agreement.[173] The agreement produced greater protection for the American salmon industry but only minor environmental provisions.[174] Train also met with Emperor Hirohito and Empress Nagako at the imperial palace and stressed the importance of environmental protection. When he returned home, he congratulated the Cabinet Committee, an advisory body composed of various cabinet secretaries, on its wisdom in starting this bilateral program to tackle environmental protection. But in reality, the agreement was only to manage American-Japanese fishing rights, Train broadened the agenda on a personal note.

---

[171] Russell Train, *Politics, Pollution, and Pandas: An Environmental Memoir*, (Washington 2003) 67.

[172] Ibidem.

[173] Train, *Politics, Pollution, and Pandas*, 67.

[174] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 618.

Train his action, however, was not in vain. Presidential adviser Daniel Patrick Moynihan also came to the conclusion that environmental advocacy might have a more significant role to play in international relations, specifically in regard to NATO. Even though NATO, to many people, was seen as a political and military organization, Moynihan suggested that a third dimension might promote social and environmental protection.[175] It was thought that NATO could encourage the establishment of international standards and the exchange of technology, knowledge and experience. One of American foreign relations officers who was involved with this proposal, Donald Kruse, stated that to those who were involved, it sometimes felt weird to be involved, but that over time they grew to see the benefits of it.

> I was involved in this initiative that President Nixon took to get NATO involved in the 'challenges of modern society'. These would be environmental issues, quality of life issues. It had high White House support because President Nixon felt that we had to keep NATO active. It was kind of a strange idea to many people that NATO, which was seen as a mostly political and military organization, would get involved in what you might say were softer issues, issues maybe most people thought would be more of OECD or some economic organization. At this time, there was no United Nations body dealing with the environment so to speak … We got into projects like oil spills, air pollution, road safety, disaster assistance. The idea would be to take advantage of NATO's ability to do things and have a certain amount of technological know-how and, instead of burdening the NATO bureaucracy with a whole new staff, that most of the work would be done by individual nations. We called it a pilot project kind of organization where a nation or several nations would agree to be the pilot project leader and they would do most of the research and the work back in the home countries and then bring their results together for meetings with other NATO countries.[176]

International cooperation with his NATO allies was important to Nixon's foreign policy. That this cooperation could also lead to less expenses for the United States was not of the greatest importance, but not insignificant. Nixon was becoming more interested to the idea of international environmentalism. Especially now that he saw that it could benefit the nation in numerous ways. But the professional diplomats who were connected with NATO showed restrain, Kissinger told Nixon in a meeting:

> Your proposals tend to cut across bureaucratic lines and suggest a NATO role for agencies of Allied Governments outside the foreign ministries, which causes consternation among professional diplomats in the capitals.[177]

---

[175] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 619.

[176] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://www.adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Kruse,%20Donald%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 12 January 2023).

[177] Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d287 (consulted 28 January 2023).

As a part of the Administration's growing interest in environmental protection, Nixon finally followed up to the advice that was given to him by the Task Force on Natural Resources and Environment in 1968 and gave the environment high priority. In order to institutionalize this high priority, Nixon founded the Environmental Quality Council (CEQ). In the statement where Nixon announced the creation of the CEQ, he emphasized the importance of environmental quality and international advocacy to protect the environment.

> I am asking the new Council, with assistance of the Citizens' Advisory Committee, to examine the full range of variable which affect environmental quality. I expect the group to review existing policies and programs and to suggest ways of improving them. Its members must project the impact of new technologies and encourage scientific developments which will help us protect our resources.
> I am hopeful that the Environmental Quality Council will foster greater cooperation in this problem area between our Government and the governments of other nations, between the various levels of American government, and between governmental and relevant nongovernmental organizations.
> Finally, I would suggest that this new body must anticipate new problems even as it focuses on present ones. It is not enough that it provides answers to the questions we are asking today. It must also pose the new questions which will face us tomorrow.[178]

Although the first part of his speech was in line with well-known conservation rhetoric, 'members must project the impact of new technologies and encourage scientific developments which will help us protect our resources', the final part is a clear breach with the past. Conservationists were always focused on conservation, protecting the resources in the present. President Johnson wanted to use environmental legislation to resolve environmental issues that were causing problems at that moment, like the highway Beautification Act. Nixon's attempt to protect nature in the future is a new way of interpreting environmental protection.

As momentum continued to build for environmental diplomacy, Train tried to ensure himself an even more prominent role. He lobbied for the chairmanship of the CEQ and eventually got the job, becoming the president's chief envoy on the environment. As chairman of the CEQ, Train sought to coordinate efforts with the State Department, but experienced obstacles. First of all, the State Department did not have the expertise to really do environmental things, that is why they always needed to bring in other agencies like interior.[179] Secondly, the Foreign

[178] Public Papers of President Richard Nixon, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PPP-1969-book1/pdf/PPP-1969-book1.pdf (consulted 15 January 2023).

[179] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Mulloy,%20Patrick%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 18 January 2023).

Service of the State Department was going through a transition and many senior officers missed the mental capabilities to really do this kind of outstanding work.

> It was a transition. I think this was a period of a transition from a more elitist to a more egalitarian Foreign Service. A lot of the folks who had come into the Foreign Service in earlier days came there from rather successful families. They were bicoastal. They were much more urbane. The Foreign Service Act and some of its reforms and the change in recruitment meant that they were bringing in people from all over the United States much more. I'm sure the record is steeped with this kind of stuff. But there was a real change in terms of the demographics of recruitment and the demographics of people coming into the Foreign Service. But the senior guys then went up and most of them all got embassies. If you were a political officer and you were well connected, you moved forward and you got an embassy. Some of these guys that we saw were really not capable. They really did not have the right stuff, and it was a disappointment. They had the right connections and spoke beautifully and so forth, but they didn't have work discipline, they didn't have the mental capabilities of really doing outstanding work, and that was disappointing.[180]

Nixon's proposal for the CCMS and State Department's incapability to pick this up, was the opening Train needed to hijack the environmental diplomatic tasks from the State Department. While congress debated legislation to limit ocean dumping, the dredge spoils, municipal sewage and industrial wastes often dumped randomly into the sea, all legislation concerning the domestic approach of environmental protection, Train recommended Kissinger to coordinate these issues with other countries, instead of waiting for congress. Train recruited his team of diplomats carefully. People like Jack Perry, Chris Herter Jr. and Patrick Mulloy were young and ambitious. They were part of the generation that put environmental concern into the spotlight of Washington and were therefore better suited to assist him, he believed.

Train was a strong presence at CEQ, according to Flippen.[181] Train believed that the time was ripe for the United States to assume strong international leadership without the use of nuclear weapons, but with strong environmental ideals. Because the State Department seemed unfit to deal with this, the White House started to look at CEQ to handle international aspects of the environmental program. Like Henry Kissinger, Train took a number of foreign trips on behalf of the Administration, often meeting with Nixon personally before and after his trips. Train believed that these trips were important for spreading the gospel of environmentalism as much as reaching specific agreements. But during these trips, Train's efforts seemed to have a major flaw; they were much more anticipated towards NATO, Japan and the Soviet Union and tended to neglect the rest of the world.

---

[180] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Harris.F.Allen.pdf (consulted 24 January 2023).

[181] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 620.

> There was something called CCMS which was a subcommittee of NATO, interestingly enough. Russ Train, later to be the Administrator of EPA, was then the head of the Council for Environmental Quality, which was a White House office. Russ was very interested in international affairs, and EPA itself had an Associate Administrator for International Affairs. I dealt with them a lot. Russ Train and I would go to Europe together to CCMS meetings. We would stay with Don Rumsfeld who was then our Ambassador to NATO. We related internationally with Europe and never did anything with Asian countries. The basic nexus was through CCMS. We worried about acid rain in Europe, we talked about Lake Baikal and its pollution problems.[182]

Even though Train's efforts were mainly focused towards the European continent, by 1972, his personal diplomacy paid off all over the northern part of the globe. His bilateral talks with Japan forced Japan to appoint an environmental counterpart to Train. Discussions during the meeting revolved around the need to balance economic growth and environmental protection.[183] They also analyzed environmental pollution problems facing the two countries and explained their present and future policies for improving environmental quality.[184] Even though the Japanese cabinet was suspicious of the American motives for environmental protection, they succumbed to the pressure Train and the Nixon Administration applied to them and adopted the American agenda to protect the environment. It was agreed in principle that the organizational basis for such cooperation should be periodic meetings of ministerial-level officials – the Chairman of the Council of Environmental Quality and the state minister in charge of environmental pollution countermeasures.[185] Train also achieved similar success with Spain and France. Nixon grew ever more enthusiastic about the potential of environmental protection and instructed Kissinger to make environmental protection a part of *détente*.

Since environmental problems afflicted all societies, communist or capitalist, east and west, Nixon and many within his administration also sought to use environmental agreements as a wedge into his larger components of *détente*. Environment was seen as a 'non-political' issue, a relative safe issue which would not evoke nuclear threat, but also one which crossed

[182] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Fairbanks,%20Richard%20M.III.toc.pdf (consulted 29 January 2023).

[183] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 623.

[184] 'U.S. and Japan Hold Meetings on Environmental Problems', *Department of State Bulletin* (30 November 1970)

[185] 'U.S. and Japan Hold Meetings on Environmental Problems', *Department of State Bulletin* (30 November 1970).

boundaries and could unite nations behind one single goal. Train was the first one to acknowledge this potential.

> Environment is a relatively nonpolitical issue on which cooperation at an early stage through private channels might open up contacts. In the first three areas mentioned above [Earthquake Prediction Programs, Recycling of Industrial Wastes, Arid Land Use and Water Management], a number of universities have active programs, while a number of private conservation groups would be interested in Item 4 [Conservation]. The President's visit would provide the opportunity for a sounding out of any interest. If they are at all interested, we might ask them to designate institutions to work with private institutions in the United States.[186]

Nixon knew that the Soviet-Union was an environmental disaster and that there were already some lower-level delegations and private organizations who corresponded with each other about environmental protection, but there was no official cooperation in this field between the United States and the Soviet Union. When the White House announced late in 1971 that Nixon planned a historic trip to Moscow the following year, Train suggested to Nixon that a US-USSR environmental agreement would be a relatively simple objective to reach and assure success. Train was asked to lead a task force to investigate the possibilities of environmental cooperation between the two world leaders. The task force concluded that the Soviet Union recognized American success in the field and sought to capitalize on this. Train urgently advised Nixon to push for an agreement, while they still had the advantage. This way they could dictate the terms and expedite the process.

> It would be highly desirable for a general agreement establishing a framework for environmental cooperation to be executed and announced at the time of the President's visit to Moscow. It would also be useful at that time to be able to describe the kinds of substantive areas in which it would be expected cooperation would be developed … The task force believes that in the environmental field the Soviet Union is now ready to move beyond the short exchange visits of technicians which have taken place to date … We on the task force shared the view that it is clearly in the US interest to widen and deepen US environmental cooperation with the Soviet Union. First, we stand to gain knowledge in specific areas (e.g., the Arctic environment) which can assist the US in strengthening the management of its own environment. Second, international cooperation is essential to the effective handling of certain kinds of environmental problems, such as ocean pollution. Soviet participation is important to the effectiveness of such cooperation. Third, we may identify potential commercial markets for US pollution control technology. Fourth, increasing emphasis on environmental improvement on the part of the U.S.S.R. to such programs. Fifth, assuming that it is in the political interest of the US to develop closer cooperation with the

[186] Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d311 (consulted 01 February 2023).

> U.S.S.R. generally, environmental problems can provide a strongly positive contribution to this objective.[187]

Since the Soviet Union had reached nuclear parity with the United States, Nixon was looking for ways to top the Soviet Union again. Besides his famed overtures to the People's Republic of China, famously known as ping-pong diplomacy, environmental diplomacy, Train believed, might also help. Train was given the task to draft an agreement. It was this background work that led to Train's meetings with Soviet ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin. Train and Dobrynin had two lunch meetings, Dobrynin made clear to Train that Nixon's strong interest in the environment had made a big impression on his own government. According to Train, Dobrynin volunteered that the most important contribution the U.S. side could make was to encourage the Soviet Union to develop a more effective organization for environmental management.[188] The US-USSR Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection set out eleven areas of cooperation: air pollution, water pollution, environmental pollution associated with agricultural production, enhancement of the urban environment, preservation of nature and organization of wildlife preserves, marine pollution, biological and genetic consequences of environmental pollution, influence of environmental changes on climate, earthquake predictions, arctic and subarctic ecological systems, and, finally, legal and administrative measures for protecting environmental quality.[189] Train also insisted that in order to accomplish these goals the agreement had to envisage regular exchanges of scientists and other experts, the exchange of information and actual joint development of programs and projects.[190] When the agreement was signed on May 23, 1972, praise for both parties was high. For train, more work was to be beckoned. Nixon appointed Train to lead the American contingent of the joint committee. Train took his role seriously, he even thought about a diplomatic gift:

> There was an entertaining sidelight to the preparations for my first visit to Moscow. Learning that the president has taken one or more gifts to Leonid Brezhnev, including a bullet-proof limousine, I cast around for an appropriate gift for my Soviet hosts. My eventual choice was breeding pair of Przewalksi's horse, an animal that was native to the Siberian steppes but had been extinct throughout its natural range for many years.[191]

---

[187] Nicholas Robinson and Gary Waxmonsky, 'The U.S.-U.S.S.R. Agreement to Protect the Environment: 15 Years of Cooperation', *Environmental Law* 18:3 (1988) 403-447; 406.

[188] Train, *Politics, Pollution, and Pandas*, 126-127.

[189] Ibidem, 126.

[190] Ibidem, 127.

[191] Ibidem.

After his first meeting, Train returned every year until 1977, the year he quit working for the government. The US-USSR Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection was instrumental for *détente* as an attempt to improve US-Soviet relations through joint ventures. In the years that followed, Americans became regular visitors to Moscow, in turn hosting the Soviets when they visited Washington.[192] Mutual friendships blossomed and Nixon reiterated that these visits and friendships were crucial, not just for environmental protection but especially for world peace. Jack Perry, who worked for EQC in 1972, and who was closely concerned with the agreement even claimed it were the high tide days of *détente*:

> I played a small part in helping prepare for that signing, and then Russ [ell] Train and the Council were given the job of implementing this agreement, and so I was sent over to help them make this Soviet-American agreement work. I did some other things, too, especially international things, but a lot of what I did the two years I was at the Council had to do with US-Soviet relations. We went on a trip to Moscow in the fall, soon after I joined the Council, and negotiated the agreement that really filled out the umbrella that had been signed by Nixon. We traveled all over the Soviet Union, went out to Lake Baikal and had just a fascinating trip, and then came back and tried to make the thing work. Those were the high tide days both of *détente* and of the environmental movement.[193]

The agreement was a clear indication that the Administration's efforts with NATO, Japan and the Soviet Union reflected a new international consensus Train desperately looked for when he started.

When the Nixon Administration was sworn in and the State Department was urged to advocate environmental protection in the international field, Secretary Rogers put together a cabinet-level international environment meeting that was held in the State Department in March of 1970. This meeting was called the 'International Standing Committee on Environment'. The team consisted of secretaries Hardin, Stans, Hickel and Romney, Drs. Seaborg and McElroy and Russell Train, along with representatives of a number of other interested agencies. Rogers used the occasion to stress the importance of the international aspects of environmental problems and the relationship with the United States effort. A target date of 1972 was set for the production of specific tangible results in the international field.[194] Train's efforts with NATO, Japan and the Soviet Union already made environmental protection a legitimate subject

[192] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 628.

[193] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://www.adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Perry,%20Jack%20R.toc.pdf (consulted 02 February 2023).

[194] Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d294 (consulted 04 February 2023)

of diplomacy. But by far the most important achievement of this policy was the United Nations Global Environmental Conference, held in Stockholm in June 1972.[195] The conference was attended by delegates from all over the world and appeared to legitimize environmentalism at the highest level. It brought some concrete results, but the conference also revealed important fissures that would bedevil subsequent environmental diplomacy, as some in poorer countries saw environmentalism as a cynical trick by which rich countries could deny them the means to develop.[196]

It was clear from the beginning that deep divisions existed in international society over how strongly environmental protection should be pursued internationally. Even though Train tried to unite all industrialized countries behind the American goals, not all industrialized countries shared a common vision of the global environmental agenda.[197] Despite the disagreements, Stockholm turned into a unique opportunity for world society actors to shape the emerging international agenda. Many scientists and conservation experts were intimately involved in advising diplomatic missions. In the case of the United States, a conservationist gone diplomat, Russell Train, even led the US delegation. Because the Vietnam War was still raging, Train advised Secretary of State Rogers to skip the conference. Train wanted to prevent the world turning this genuine effort into an American bashing conference. Thanks to this suggestion from Train, the conference accomplished some specific agreements. But it mainly set an example for the future, which was the biggest take-away from this moment. Many leading conservationists developed close links with state bureaucrats and political leaders and now saw an opening at the highest level to insert environmental value into the normative fabric of interstate relations.[198] The Stockholm Conference was a first, genuine, attempt to internationalize environmentalism. But the state leaders' newly found enthusiasm for the environment would be short lived. By 1973, the political landscape had begun to change. The Watergate scandal was brewing, preoccupying Nixon, as were energy concerns.[199] After the resignation of Richard Nixon, US-Soviet relations also took a downturn, which did not only influence the stability of the world, but also greatly influenced environmental cooperation, as this idea was greatly based upon *détente* and the Nixon-Kissinger strategy:

---

[195] McNeill, Engelke, *The Great Acceleration*, 199.

[196] John McCormick, *Reclaiming Paradise: The Global Environmental Movement*, (Indianapolis 1989) 88-105.

[197] Falkner, *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, 121.

[198] Ibidem, 120.

[199] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 635.

> I think that a greater problem was keeping the agreement going. Soviet-American relations were taking a downturn. When President Nixon resigned, I was visiting CEQ with a Soviet delegation. Gerald Ford was sworn in as President. The Soviet-American relationship was not in good condition. Relations were already deteriorating. The Soviet-American Environmental Agreement was one of those bridges where well-meaning people on both sides were trying to cooperate. Nevertheless, the background music was getting worse and worse, in Congress and elsewhere.[200]

Despite the downward spiral of interest in environmental protection with President Nixon and diminishing US-Soviet relations, Train maintained an activ approach to environmental foreign policy. Dozens of exchanges of personnel and technology regularly took place with an array of nations.[201] Through personal diplomacy and Kissinger-like trips to other nations, Train continued to expand US connections and sound the environmental alarm.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this chapter sought out how the environmental diplomatic culture was established during the first term of the Nixon presidency. It was part and parcel of a longer and deep-rooted tradition, though Nixon's ideals to advocate for environmental protection both domestically as internationally were not a campaign promise he made; rather, they were the results of feedback and suggestion he took from his own Task Force on Natural Resources and Environment. This group of twenty academicians and corporative executives, chaired by Russell Train, convinced Nixon to generate a global consensus between states on environmental issues and bring about a global architecture of environmental protection. The Administration crafted its approach around three fundamental policies. First, Nixon called for the creation of an environmental component of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), the Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society (CCMS). Second, Nixon and his people sought a bilateral environmental protection agreement with the Soviet Union. Third, and most ambitious, the administration advocated for a United Nations Conference on the Human Environment. Because of his important position and constant support for President Nixon, Train was awarded with a position as under-secretary of Interior and there was a massive expansion of the environmental bureaucracy.

Because Interior always advised the State Department on diplomatic issues and State Department admitted they lacked the knowledge to deal with environmental issues, Train joined

[200] The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Brown,%20William%20Andreas.toc.pdf (consulted 04 February 2023).

[201] Flippen, 'Richard Nixon and Russell Train', 635.

a joint US-Japan Cabinet meeting in Tokyo. Here, Train took the initiative whenever the opportunity arose to advocate for environmental protection. He did this on a personal level, meeting with ministers and emperor *vis-à-vis* and promoting environmental protection even though this was not the mission of the joint meeting. Train's efforts to promote environmental protection earned him a promotion to chairman of the CEQ, one of two government institutions Nixon founded to protect the environment. As chairman of the CEQ, Train became the president's chief envoy on the environment. He sought to coordinate his international efforts with the State Department, but he deemed them unable to deal with environmental issues. Therefore, he hijacked environmental diplomacy from the State Department and recruited his team of diplomats carefully. People like Jack Perry, Chris Herter Jr. and Patrick Mulloy were young and ambitious. They were part of the generation that put environmental concern into the spotlight of Washington and were therefore better suited to assist him, he believed.

Like Henry Kissinger, Train took a number of foreign trips on behalf of the Administration, often meeting with Nixon personally before and after his trips. Train believed that these trips were important for spreading the gospel of environmentalism as much as reaching specific agreements. But during these trips, Train's efforts seemed to have a major flaw; they were much more anticipated towards NATO, Japan and the Soviet Union and tended to neglect the rest of the world. Even though Train's efforts were mainly focused towards the European continent, by 1972, his personal diplomacy paid off all over the northern part of the globe. His bilateral talks with Japan forced Japan to appoint an environmental counterpart to Train and eventually it was agreed that Japan and the United States would work together at ministerial level to combat pollution. Train also achieved similar success with Spain and France.

Since the Soviet Union had reached nuclear parity with the United States, Nixon looked for ways to top the Soviet Union again. Train believed environmental diplomacy could be one of these ways. Train was encouraged to schedule meeting with Soviet ambassador Anatoly Dobrynin to discuss a US-USSR Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection. Dobrynin professed his, and his nations, sincere admiration for the environmental efforts of the Nixon Administration and that they were willing to cooperate closely with the United States in this field. The agreement that was signed set out eleven areas of cooperation and insisted that in order to accomplish these goals the agreement had to envisage regular exchanges of scientists and other experts, the exchange of information and actual joint development of programs and projects. This way, environmental diplomacy became an integral part of *détente* and US-Soviet attempts to end the Cold War through cooperation instead of confrontation.

Train's efforts with NATO, Japan and the Soviet Union already made environmental protection a legitimate subject of diplomacy. But by far the most important achievement of this policy was the United Nations Global Environmental Conference, held in Stockholm in June 1972. The Stockholm Conference was a first, genuine, attempt to internationalize environmentalism. The conference was attended by delegates from all over the world and appeared to legitimize environmentalism at the highest level. It brought some concrete results, but the conference also revealed important fissures that would bedevil subsequent environmental diplomacy, as some in poorer countries saw environmentalism as a cynical trick by which rich countries could deny them the means to develop. Despite the cynicism beforehand, many leading conservationists developed close links with state bureaucrats and political leaders and now saw an opening at the highest level to insert environmental value into the normative fabric of interstate relations. Through personal diplomacy, taking the initiative whenever the opportunity arose and persistence, Train and his team developed a culture of professional diplomats who were solely concerned with the protection of the environment, in the present and the future.

Conclusion

We are not involved in the world because we have commitments; we have commitments because we are involved. Our interests must shape our commitments, rather than the other way around.[202]

Richard Nixon – February 1970

When President Richard Nixon reported to Congress on his foreign policy, his statement seemed a bit vague. However, this thesis has shown that these words are a good representation of Nixon's intentions on foreign policy. Nixon was very committed to foreign policy, but not very much with the bureaucracy that had to represent his policies. He was distrusting towards the bureaucracy built by his democratic predecessors; therefore, he appointed personal envoys who had to dictate world politics through diplomacy, in his name.

When Nixon entered office, he was confronted with a political movement that advocated for environmental protection. During the sixties, this movement gained support rapidly and acquired real political dividend. Despite the fact that Nixon was a Republican hardliner, one who cherished his relationship with big industry, he was also pragmatic and acknowledged the political potential of environmental protection, domestically, but especially internationally. Nixon therefore appointed a personal envoy who had to encourage environmental diplomacy all over the globe, Russell Errol Train. Nixon and Train put environmental protection on the international agenda and made environmental diplomacy a legitimate force in international diplomacy. Historians and other academics often agreed that Nixon's pragmatism was conducive for environmental diplomacy, but too often they overlooked how Nixon and Train influenced the culture of environmental diplomacy with all its beliefs and actions. Therefore, this thesis researched how Richard Nixon and Russell Train influenced the establishment of first and foremost a diplomatic culture of the environmental, which in turn influenced US diplomacy and contributed to the launch and consolidation of an institutionalized international environmental governance.

The first chapter of this thesis argued that the nineteenth and early twentieth century witnessed the transformation of the environmental movement. Thanks to influential people like George Perkins Marsh, Henry David Thoreau, John Muir, Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford

[202] Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v01/d60 (consulted 7 February 2023).

Pinchot, conservation went from a romantic idea to a belief which had to benefit the public good. Wealthy, predominantly white, men united themselves in organizations which lobbied for the protection of nature. To support their cause, these wealthy men invested in scientific research regarding environmental degradation. The scientists who were brought into the environmental cause also provided a valuable model for diplomats in their ability to emphasize professional collaboration over nationalistic competition.

In the 1880s scientific conferences and civic organizations still represented relatively new sites of knowledge production and exchange. However, because these scientists became increasingly more important to the preservationist cause, their significance grew. During the Interwar years these conferences and organizations became key sites where scientific standards were negotiated, disciplines shaped and the international community of science was embodied. Furthermore, they offered occasions for networking with fellow scientists and with people of power, who were usually represented in conference patronage committees.[203] These environmental advocates were no professional environmental diplomats yet but nevertheless developed a nascent culture of environmental diplomacy

The second chapter of this thesis argued that the advent of the nuclear era reshuffled discourses over the global environment. From the early 1950s onward, nuclear anxieties pushed environmental concern into the center of US political debate; environmental issues achieved greater political relevance and urgency. The biggest factor for change was the development of nuclear weapons. The nuclear shadow of the Cold War motivated those who advocated for environmental protection in the progressive era to broaden their field of interest. Romantic notions of the loss of wilderness and species extinction continued to resonate in environmental circles, but Malthusian anxiety and fear of nuclear fallout truly changed the movement.

Antinuclear scientists managed to develop an informal network of concerned scientists in international organizations like Pugwash and SANE. These organizations were determined to promote an interchange of information and ideas, which would lead to international atomic energy control. This international network of scientists who were concerned about nuclear deterrence was essential in the establishment of the Limited Test Ban Treaty of 1963. Antinuclear organization became intertwined with the social movements of the 1960s and therefore generated even more awareness and raised issues that policymakers could not ignore.

[203] De Bont, *Nature's Diplomats*, 33.

So, this chapter showed that growing nuclear fear accelerated environmental education amongst the public and created fertile ground for environmentalism during the Nixon presidency, which in turn stimulated environmental diplomacy.

The third chapter of this thesis argued that during the first term of Nixon's presidency environmental diplomacy was institutionalized and therefore changed its culture significantly. Nixon's ideals to advocate for environmental protection both domestically as internationally were not a campaign promise he made; they were suggestion he took from his own Task Force on Natural Resources and Environment. This group of twenty academicians and corporative executives, chaired by Russell Train, convinced Nixon to generate a global consensus between states on environmental issues and bring about a global architecture of environmental protection.

Because of his efforts during the campaign, Train was awarded with a position as undersecretary of Interior. He used this position to force environmental legislation and awareness upon the international stage. Wherever the opportunity arose, Train and the diplomats around him took the initiative to position the United States as the world leader considering environmentalism. Like Henry Kissinger, Train took a number of foreign trips on behalf of the Administration, often meeting with Nixon personally before and after his trips. Through personal diplomacy, Train achieved considerable results. But his most important achievement was the US-USSR Agreement on Cooperation in the Field of Environmental Protection. Train showed to Nixon that environmental protection could stimulate East-West cooperation and with this, he made environmental diplomacy an integral part of *détente* and US-Soviet attempts to end the Cold War through cooperation instead of confrontation.

Through personal diplomacy, taking the initiative whenever the opportunity arose and persistence, Train and his team developed a culture of professional diplomats who were concerned with the present and future protection of the environment, but also understood that environmental protection was not as important to everyone and therefore had to be advocated carefully and subordinate to other subjects. Their careful persistence made them the first successful generation of environmental diplomats who made significant changes worldwide.

This thesis explored the origins of environmental diplomacy through the experiences of the negotiators and the culture they were imbued with right when Nixon decisively took such a regulatory turn, both at home and abroad. In the introduction of this thesis, this statement was linked to three anticipatory questions. These questions can be given the following, tentative, answer. The protection of nature through the diplomatic process came from a long tradition of conservationism and utilitarianism in the United States. Environmental advocates pled for the

protection of nature because of aesthetic, nationalistic and even egocentric reasons. However, they were successful in making international connections and constructing the foundations of an international environmental regime through action groups. Because of the Nuclear Era, environmental awareness grew rapidly among U.S. citizens. The dangers of nuclear weapons accelerated a public debate about the way people should interact with nature. Nixon wanted to strengthen the position of the United States through foreign politics, he believed that the United States had to dictate this environmental debate worldwide. Nixon's environmental diplomats, in particular Train, were sent across the globe to spread the American gospel of conservationism, utilitarianism and nature protection. Their efforts were met with criticism, but they also achieved to establish the first concrete forms of an international environmental regime.

Concluding, this thesis argued that the environmental diplomatic culture which emerged during the Nixon presidency was the apotheosis of nearly two centuries of build-up and rediscovering the environment. Every development of environmental advocacy, after the first urban attempts, rested upon the rediscovering of previous attempts. Russell Train was a conservationist who acknowledged that the opportunity had risen for environmental diplomacy to become institutionalized. He used his own beliefs and combined these with the political opportunity which President Nixon presented him. As the President wanted to refrain from the use of nuclear weapons and pursuit *Détente*, something as harmless and efficient as environmental diplomacy was a perfect fit. Because of Nixon's pragmatism and Train's willingness to take the initiative whenever the opportunity arose, they made environmental diplomacy a legitimate way to perform diplomacy and institutionalized the environmental.

Bibliography

Primary sources

Nixon, R., *The Memoirs of Richard Nixon*, (London 1978).

Train, R., *Politics, Pollution, and Pandas: An Environmental Memoir*, (Washington 2003).

Internet sources (ordered by use)

United Nations, https://www.un.org/en/conferences/environment/stockholm1972 (consulted 22 February 2023).

American Foreign Relations, https://www.americanforeignrelations.com/E-N/Environmental-Diplomacy.html, (consulted 08-12-2022).

Forest History Society, https://foresthistory.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/12/Train_Russell_E.ohi_.pdf (consulted 07 February 2023).

Theodore Roosevelt Center, Https://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Research/Digital-Library/Record/ImageViewer?libID=o159539&imageNo=1 (consulted 03 January 2023).

Theodore Roosevelt Center, Https://www.theodorerooseveltcenter.org/Research/Digital-Library/Record/ImageViewer?libID=o205825&imageNo=1 (consulted 03 January 2023).

Association for Diplomatic Studies & Training, Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States: Harry S. Truman (1949), https://www.govinfo.gov/app/details/PPP-1949-book1 (consulted 6 March 2023).

The Martin Luther King, Jr. Research and Education Institute, https://kinginstitute.stanford.edu/encyclopedia/national-committee-sane-nuclear-policy-sane (consulted 6 March 2023).

Report of the Task Force in Resources and Environment, https://www.nixonlibrary.gov/sites/default/files/2021-01/Report%20of%20the%20Task%20Force%20on%20Resources%20and%20Environment.pdf (Consulted 29 January 2023).

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Mulloy,%20Patrick%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 05 February 2023).

The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://www.adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Kruse,%20Donald%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 12 January 2023).

Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d287 (consulted 28 January 2023).
Public Papers of President Richard Nixon, https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/PPP-1969-book1/pdf/PPP-1969-book1.pdf (consulted 15 January 2023).
The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Mulloy,%20Patrick%20A.toc.pdf (consulted 18 January 2023).
The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Harris.F.Allen.pdf (consulted 24 January 2023).
Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d287 (consulted 28 January 2023).
The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Fairbanks,%20Richard%20M.III.toc.pdf (consulted 29 January 2023).
Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d311 (consulted 01 February 2023).
The Association for Diplomatic Studies and Training, https://www.adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Perry,%20Jack%20R.toc.pdf (consulted 02 February 2023).
Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76ve01/d294 (consulted 04 February 2023).
https://adst.org/OH%20TOCs/Brown,%20William%20Andreas.toc.pdf (consulted 04 February 2023).
Office of the Historian, https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1969-76v01/d60 (consulted 7 February 2023).

Official documents

'U.S. and Japan Hold Meetings on Environmental Problems', *Department of State Bulletin* (30 November 1970)

Secondary sources

Ambrose, S., *Nixon: The Triumph of a Politician, 1962-1972*, (New York 1989).
Badash, L., *Scientists and the Development of Nuclear Weapons: From Fission to the Limited Test Ban Treaty, 1939-1963*, (Atlantic Highlands 1995).
Black, J., *A History of Diplomacy*, (London 2011).

De Bont, R., *Nature's Diplomats*, (Pittsburgh 2021).

Boyer, P., *By the Bomb's Early Light: American Thought and Culture at the Dawn of the Atomic Age*, (Chapel Hill 1994).

Brooks Flippen, J., *Nixon and the Environment*, (Albuquerque 2000).

Caldwell, L., *International Environmental Policy. Emergence and Dimensions*, (Durham 1984).

Cousins, N., *The improbable triumvirate: John F. Kennedy, Pope John, Nikita Khrushchev*, (New York 1972)

Curti, M., *The Growth of American Thought*, (New York 1952).

Dorsey, K., *The Dawn of Conservation Diplomacy: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era*, (Seattle 1998).

Dorman, R., *A Word for Nature: Four Pioneering Environmental Advocates, 1845-1913*, (Chapel Hill 2000).

Dorsey, K., *Whales & Nations. Environmental Diplomacy at the High Seas*, (Seattle 2013).

Egan, M., *Barry Commoner and the science of survival: The remaking of American environmentalism*, (Cambridge 2007).

Garthoff, R., *Détente and Confrontation. American-Soviet Relations from Nixon to Reagan* (Washington 1985).

Goedde, P., *The Politics of Peace: A Global Cold War* History, (New York 2019).

Falkner, R., *Environmentalism and Global International Society*, New York (2021).

Hanhimäki, J., *The Rise and Fall of Détente: American Foreign Policy and the Transformation of the Cold War* (Washington 2013).

Harris, P., *Routledge Handbook of Global Environmental Politics* (Canberra 2022).

Hatzivassiliou, E., *The NATO Committee on the Challenges of Modern Society, 1969-1975*, (New York 2017).

Hays, S., *Conservation and the gospel of efficiency: The progressive conservation movement, 1890-1920*, (Cambridge 1959).

Herken, G., *The Winning Weapon. The Atomic Bomb in the Cold War, 1945-1950*, (Princeton 1988).

Herken, G., *Cardinal Choices: Presidential Science Advising from the Atomic Bomb to SDI*, (New York 1992).

Katz, M., *Ban the Bomb. A History of SANE, the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy*, (Westport 1987).

Lewis, J., *SpyCapitalism: ITEK and the CIA*, (London 2002).

Litwak, R., *Détente and the Nixon Doctrine: American Foreign Policy and the Pursuit of Stability, 1969-1976*, (Cambridge 1984).

Lowenthal, D., *George Perkins Marsh: Prophet of Conservation*, (Seattle 2000).

Maar III, H., *Freeze! The Grassroots Movement to Halt the Arms Race and End the Cold War*, (New York 2021).

McCormick, J., *Reclaiming Paradise: The Global Environmental Movement*, (Indianapolis 1989).

McNeill, J. R., *Something New Under the Sun. An Environmental History of the Twentieth-Century World*, (London 2000).

McNeill, J.R., Engelke, P., *The Great Acceleration. An Environmental History of the Anthropocene since 1945*, (Cambridge 2014).

Miller, C., *Gifford Pinchot and the Making of Modern Environmentalism*, (Washington 2001).

Montrie, C., *The Myth of Silent Spring: Rethinking the origins of American Environmentalism*, (Berkeley 2018).

Muir, J., *Our National Parks*, (Project Gutenberg 2019).

Nash, R., *Wilderness and the American Mind*, (New Haven 1982).

Nicholson, M., *The Environmental Revolution. A Guide for the New Masters of the World*, (Lancashire 1970).

Perlstein, R., *Nixonland: The Rise of a President and the Fracturing of America*, (New York 2009).

Pinchot, G., Nash, G., *The Fight for Conservation*, (Seattle 1967).

Robertson, T., *The Malthusian Moment: Global Population Growth and the Birth of American Environmentalism*, (New Brunswick 2012).

Rotblat, J., *Scientists in the Quest for Peace: A History of the Pugwash Conferences*, (Cambridge 1972).

Rubinson, P., *Redefining Science: Scientists, the National Security State, and Nuclear Weapons in Cold War America*, (Boston 2016).

Suri, J., *Power and Protest. Global revolution and the Rise of Détente*, (Cambridge 2003).

Taylor, D., *The Rise of the American Conservation Movement. Power, Privilege, and Environmental Protection*, (Durham 2016).

Train, R., *Prescription for a Planet. The Ninth Bronfman Lecture*, (Washington 1970).

Tyrrell, I., *Crisis of the Wasteful Nation. Empire and Conservation in Theodore Roosevelt's America*, (Chicago 2015).

Velosi, M., *Effluent America: Cities, Industry, Energy, and the Environment*, (Pittsburgh 2000).

Weart, S., *Scientists in Power*, (Cambridge 1979).
Werking, R., *The Master Architects: Building the United States Foreign Services 1890-1913*, (Lexington 1977).
Whyte, I., *A Dictionary of Environmental History*, (London 2013).
Wittner, L., *Confronting the Bomb. A Short History of the World Nuclear Disarmament Movement*, (Stanford 2009).
Zanchetta, B., *The Remaking of American Global Power, 1969-1976*, (Cambridge 2013).

Articles

Basford, A., Chaplin, J., 'Malthus and the new world', in: R. Mayhew, ed., *New Perspectives on Malthus*, (Cambridge 2016) 105-127.
Bergandi, D., Blandin, P., 'De la Protection de la nature au développement durable: Genèse d'un oxymora étehique et politique', *Revue d'histoire des sciences* 65:1 (2012) 103-142.
Brooks Flippen, J., 'Richard Nixon, Russell Train, and the Birth of Modern American Environmental Diplomacy' *Diplomatic History* 32:4 (2008) 613-638.
Dorsey, K., 'Scientists, Citizens, and Statesmen: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era', *Diplomatic History* 19:3 (1995) 407-429.
Doel, R., Harper, K., 'Prometheus Unleashed: Science as a Diplomatic Weapon in the Lyndon B. Johnson Administration', *Osiris* 21:1 (2006) 66-85.
Fazzi, D., 'A Voice of Conscience: How Eleanor Roosevelt Helped to Popularize the Debate on Nuclear Fallout, 1950-1954' in: *Journal of American Studies* 50:3 (2016) 699-730.
Gaddis, J., 'Grand strategies in the Cold War' in: M. Leffler, O. Westad eds., *The Cambridge History of the Cold War*, (Cambridge 2010) 1-21.
Hamblin, J., '*Environmental Diplomacy in the Cold War: The Disposal of Radioactive Waste at Sea during the 1960s*' The International History Review 24:2 (2002) 348-375.
Hamblin, J., 'Gods and Devils in the Details: Marine Pollution, Radioactive Waste, and an Environmental Regime circa 1972, *Diplomatic History* 32:4 (2008) 539-560.
Heinrichs, W., 'Lyndon B. Johnson: Change and Continuity' in: W. Cohen, N. Tucker eds., *Lyndon Johnson Confronts the World* (Cambridge 2012) 9-30.
Lovejoy, A., 'The Meaning of Romanticism for the Historian of Ideas', *Journal of the History of Ideas* 2 (1941) 257-278.
Lytle, M., 'An Environmental Approach to American Diplomatic History', *Diplomatic History* 20:2 (1996) 279-300.

Macekura, S., ‘The Limits of the global community: The Nixon administration and global environmental politics’, *Cold War History* 11:4 (2011) 489-518.

McCormick, J., ‘The Origins of the World Conservation Strategy’, *Environmental Review* 10:3 (1986) 177-187.

McEvoy, J., ‘The American Concern for the Environment’, in: W. Burch Jr. ed., *Social Behavior, Natural Resources, and the Environment* (New York, 1972) 214-236.

McNeill, J., ‘The Environment, Environmentalism, and International Society’ in: N. Ferguson, C. Maier, E. Manela, D. Sargent eds., *The Shock of the Global: The 1970s in Perspective*, (Boston 2010) 263-278

Melosi, M., ‘Lyndon Johnson and Environmental Policy’ in: R. Divine ed., *The Johnson Years, Volume Two, The Environment, and Science*, (Lawrence 1987) 113-149.

Orsini, A., ‘Environmental Diplomacy’ in: T. Balzacq ed., *Global Diplomacy: An Introduction to Theory and Practice* (New York 2020) 239-252.

Randolph, S., ‘Evolution or Revolution: The Cultural Development of American Conservationism from U.S. Grant to Theodore Roosevelt’, *The Cardinal Edge* 1:1 (2021) 2-7.

Robinson, N., Waxmonsky, G., ‘The U.S.-U.S.S.R. Agreement to Protect the Environment: 15 Years of Cooperation’, *Environmental Law* 18:3 (1988) 403-447.

Rubinson, P., ‘American Scientists in ‘Communist Conclaves:’ Pugwash and Anti-communism in the United States, 1957-1968’ in: A. Kraft, C. Sachse ed., *Science, (anti)communism and diplomacy: the Pugwash Conferences on Science and World Affairs in the early Cold War* (Leiden 2020) 156-189.

Soluri, J., ‘Fur Sealing and Unsettled Sovereignties’ in: K. Hoganson, J. Sexton eds., *Crossing Empires. Taking U.S. History into Transimperial Terrain* (Durham 2020) 25-45

Train, R., ‘International Environmental Policy: Some Recollections and Reflections’, in: L. Rockwood, R. Stewart, T. Dietz eds., *Foundations of Environmental Sustainability: The Coevolution of Science and Policy* (New York 2008) 42-46.

Wöbse, A., ‘Oil on Troubled Waters? Environmental Diplomacy in the League of Nations’, *Diplomatic History* 32:1 (2008) 519-537.

Wöbse, A., ‘‘The world after all was one’: The International Environmental Network of UNESCO and IUPN, 1945-1950’, *Contemporary European History* 20:3 (2011) 331-348.