

Post-treaty politics: secretariat influence in global environmental governance

Owen Temby

To cite this article: Owen Temby (2015) Post-treaty politics: secretariat influence in global environmental governance, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs*, 28:3, 512-514, DOI: [10.1080/09557571.2015.1058064](https://doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2015.1058064)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2015.1058064>



Published online: 25 Jun 2015.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 36



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

experimental process of aligning social desires in the *time* of common purpose as it is one of a collective liberation of space.

References

- Dardot, Pierre and Christian Laval (2014) *The new way of the world: on neoliberal society* (London: Verso)
Lordon, Frederic (2014) *Willing slaves of capital* (London: Verso)

Nicholas Kiersey © 2015

Ohio University

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2015.1058069>

Notes on contributor

Nicholas Kiersey (PhD, Virginia Tech) is an associate professor in political science at Ohio University. His work focuses on the place of crisis and subjectivity in the reproduction of capitalist power. Recently published articles of his can be found in *Global Society*, *Global Discourse* and *Capital and Class*. He recently co-edited the volume *Battlestar Galactica and International Relations* with Iver Neumann (Routledge, 2013). His current book project is entitled *Negotiating crisis: neoliberal power in austerity Ireland* and is set to be published by Rowman & Littlefield in 2016. Email: kiersey@ohio.edu

Sikina Jinnah, *Post-treaty politics: secretariat influence in global environmental governance*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 2014, ISBN10 0262526557, ISBN13 9780262526555 (pbk), 256 pp

The international relations (IR) issue area of global environmental politics (GEP) examines policy processes that privilege science-derived technical expertise. This is a long-recognized fact, and over the past 25 years a voluminous body of literature has developed examining the properties and influence of the diverse multi-actor networks that technocratically formulate policy in a frequently depoliticized decision-making context. International organizations (IOs) participate in these networks, but they are often underfunded and have weak (or, more typically, non-existent) regulatory authority. At the same time, their secretariats consist of educated and entrepreneurial civil servants who seek to carve out a place for their organization in the relevant policy networks and enable it to fulfil its written mandate. We can intuitively presume that they exercise influence, alongside domestic public agencies and other stakeholders, but a sophisticated articulation of their role and relevance would be beneficial to scholars and practitioners.

In *Post-treaty politics: secretariat influence in global environmental governance*, Sikina Jinnah, an assistant professor at American University's School of International Service, addresses this need with a theory of the conditions under which IO secretariats exercise influence. These secretariats manage treaty regimes addressing, directly or indirectly, environmental issues. Thus, 'post-treaty politics' is what happens after the secretariat has been created and charged with fulfilling

the treaty's and IO's mandate and subsequently seeks relevance and influence in a policy space usually crowded with other treaties and organizations. By 'secretariat influence', Jinnah means shaping 'power relations among states' (52), for example, through distributing and building capacity to address an environmental issue or shaping how states understand a problem by framing it or disseminating information used in decision-making (54). Jinnah's proposed theory contends that two main variables determine whether a secretariat is influential at a particular point in time, namely, the preference solidification of states and the substitutability of the secretariat's functions. On the former, preference solidification, Jinnah explains that new issues, or issues in which the state parties do not view the costs of an unfavourable outcome as high, will exhibit low levels of preference solidification. This relative indifference gives secretariats more autonomy to pursue activities defining the problem and generating procedures and policy proposals. Issues that have been of concern for public bureaucracies for some time, or 'political football' issues, are those on which state preference are more solidified and thus secretariats will have a shorter leash and therefore less influence. The latter variable, substitutability of functions, relates to an IO secretariat's importance and distinctiveness within a network of actors participating in the governance of a given issue. If a secretariat has exclusive access to information and its functions are not replicated by other IOs or non-governmental organizations, it is more likely to be influential. Secretariats whose functions are made redundant by those of another organization are less likely to exercise influence.

Following the first three chapters, in which Jinnah overviews the book's theoretical and methodological approach and situates it within the GEP literature, four chapter-length case studies examine secretariat influence in the management of overlapping treaty regimes (that is, in circumstances in which more than one treaty and secretariat claim authority). Case studies include the accounts of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) secretariat's efforts to manage overlap in the biodiversity regime complex, efforts of the same IO to link the problem of biodiversity loss to climate change, the ways in which the World Trade Organization secretariat manages overlap between trade and environmental regimes, and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species secretariat's management of overlap with the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization. To determine secretariat influence in overlap management for all of the case studies, Jinnah uses a series of three guiding questions. Specifically, she assesses whether one of the mechanisms of secretariat influence she identifies as relevant is being employed by the secretariat, whether the secretariat brought about a change in 'power relations among states' (52) and, using counterfactual analysis, whether the change was attributable to the actions of the secretariat. Once the existence or absence of influence has been determined, Jinnah tests her theory of secretariat influence preconditions by comparing its predictions to the outcomes. Strengthening Jinnah's empirical claims is her case studies' display of temporal variation in the theory's posited relationships: as preference solidification for biodiversity increased over time, the CBD's influence declined (181).

This book provides a rigorous and novel approach to assessing secretariat influence within the ubiquitous networks managing transboundary environmental issues. It is about time. The field is more mature thanks to Jinnah's book, and it should be on the required reading list of all active GEP scholars. I also recommend it for graduate GEP courses and for IO secretariat staffs

wanting to better understand their limitations as well as potential avenues for influence.

Owen Temby © 2015
University of Texas Rio Grande Valley
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09557571.2015.1058064>

Notes on contributor

Owen Temby (PhD, Carleton University) is an assistant professor in the Department of Political Science at the University of Texas Rio Grande Valley. He is the environmental policy book review editor at *Review of Policy Research*, and co-editor of the SUNY Press book series *Environmental Governance: Local–Regional–Global Interactions*. Previously he was a postdoctoral fellow at McGill University and Carleton University. His current research focuses on environmental policy networks, Great Lakes fisheries governance, and air pollution political history. His articles have appeared or will appear in *Journal of Policy History*, *Environment*, *Australasian Journal of Environmental Management*, *Review of Policy Research*, *Cambridge Review of International Affairs* and *Planning Perspectives*, among other journals. Email: owen.temby@utrgv.edu

Katrin Kinzelbach, *The EU's human rights dialogue with China: quiet diplomacy and its limits*, New York, Routledge, 2015, ISBN 13 9780415698467, ISBN 10 0415698464 (hbk), 226 pp

Eva Pils, *China's human rights lawyers: advocacy and resistance*, New York, Routledge, 2015, ISBN 13 9780415870849, ISBN 10 0415870844 (hbk), 298 pp

Katrin Kinzelbach and Eva Pils provide complementary accounts of China's human rights behaviour. In *The EU's human rights dialogue with China*, Kinzelbach examines 15 years of bilateral diplomatic exchanges by focusing on the European Union's (EU's) human rights dialogue with the People's Republic of China (PRC). In contrast to these government-to-government exchanges, in *China's human rights lawyers*, Pils details the work of China's human rights lawyers, who are part of the domestic *weiquan*, or rights protection movement. Both works are meticulously researched, make use of previously unutilized sources and provide groundbreaking accounts of unexamined areas of PRC human rights behaviour. Although the books focus on significantly different aspects of human rights in the PRC, they both portray a Chinese government that is eager to control and limit changes in human rights. Kinzelbach paints a picture of China as uncooperative in its human rights exchanges with the EU. Pils's account is much more sombre, as it includes descriptions of the PRC government's repression of human rights lawyers, including its brutal use of violence. For example, rights defender Guo Feixiong recounts that 'I was nearly beaten to death ... They interrogated me [over 150] times. They did not let me sleep for [over ten] days and nights. They pulled my hair out. And at last they electrocuted me' (208).