

IMPACT OF INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCES ON ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ON NATIONAL POLICIES: ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN AND BRAZILIAN CASES



<https://doi.org/10.56238/arev7n2-004>

Submitted on: 01/03/2025

Publication date: 02/03/2025

Ygor Ribeiro de Oliveira Carneiro da Silva¹ and Waldeck Carneiro².

ABSTRACT

This article analyzes the influence of international environmental education conferences on the national policies adopted in this area by the United States and Brazil. The research contextualizes the debate on environmental education in the countries analyzed, as well as examines legal diplomas and official texts of public policies in the area of environmental education, in order to ascertain whether these national policies of the sector are influenced by the recommendations adopted by the global forums of environmental education. It is concluded that, both in the United States and in Brazil, the impact of the final documents of the main global conferences on environmental education on the formulation of public policies on this theme in those countries is unequivocal.

Keywords: Environmental Education. International Conferences on Environmental Education. Public Policy for Environmental Education - United States. Public Policy for Environmental Education - Brazil.

¹ Bachelor of Arts in International Relations
Federal University of Rio de Janeiro

² Dr. in Educational Sciences
Fluminense Federal University (UFF-GRUPPE)

INTRODUCTION

Since the first international conference on the environment, in Stockholm, in 1972, or, more specifically, since the first international forum on environmental education, in Belgrade, in 1975, the main content of its final documents has remained relatively similar. With technological and economic advances in most parts of the world, it is possible to observe significant updates regarding methods, guidelines and objectives. However, the recommendations set out in the final documents of these conferences on the theme of environmental education are repeatedly presented at new conferences, with only minor changes in their ³formulations.

One hypothesis for the constancy of the recommendations of these conferences is the insufficient progress observed in the period between them. In fact, the final documents of the Moscow Conference (1987), Rio de Janeiro Conference (1992) and Thessaloniki Conference (1997) explicitly mention the insufficiency of the actions adopted by international institutions and the countries participating in these conferences in the period between their accomplishments (Silva, 2024; Silva; Carneiro, 2025).

In the first example (Moscow, 1987), the concern expressed by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) is crystal clear:

Despite the growing awareness of environmental problems and the undeniable efforts of many countries to develop the technical and institutional means to deal with them, we are obliged to recognize that, in general, the actions undertaken to date have proved insufficient to counteract the steady deterioration in the quality of the environment (UNESCO, 1987, p. 5).

In the same direction, with regard to the second example (Rio de Janeiro, 1992), the United Nations (UN) considers is equally explicit:

There is still very little awareness of the interrelationship between all human activities and the environment due to insufficient or inaccurate information. Developing countries, in particular, lack the technology and competent experts (UN, 1992, p. 434).

³ There has been a significant change in the vocabulary used in international conferences on environmental education in recent years, especially regarding the term "environmental education" itself, in view of the advance of the concept of "sustainable development". However, this change is not the subject of this article and, despite its advent, the proposals present in the final documents of the most recent conferences still generally follow the same pattern adopted since Belgrade (Tudor, 1991).

In relation to the third example (Thessaloniki, 1997), the official document is blunt, along the same lines: "Insufficient progress has occurred in the five years after the Rio Conference, as recognized by the international community" (UNESCO, 1997, p. 1).

In other words, although the environmental issue is seen as a global problem, the international system, however, limits the direct influence that decisions adopted in international forums may have on the internal political scenario of countries, which certainly occurs in different thematic areas. In most cases, as can also be seen with regard to international conferences on environmental education, the propositions and referrals approved by global forums are nothing more than suggestions or recommendations. As such, they depend, with a view to their implementation, on the commitment of national states and their political leaders to establish programs, legislation and institutions that promote, as a public policy, what is defined by the conferences, which is not always materialized (Rocha, 2003).

Although it is not binding, participation in the formulation of the final document of an international conference demonstrates, in theory, a clear interest on the part of the participating countries to establish an internal discussion to then define whether, when and how the referrals proposed by the conference should be included in existing national programs or institutions or instituted by new policies and programs. In order to assimilate international decisions in the domestic sphere. From the moment these policies and programs are implemented, the question that this work seeks to answer - specifically with regard to public policies on environmental education - is whether such public policies are directly influenced by the decisions of international conferences on environmental education and, if so, how deeply such influence is expressed.

For example, there is a consensus in the literature on the history of environmental policies according to which the Stockholm Conference, held in 1972, played a central role in the creation, the following year, in Brazil, of the Special Secretariat for the Environment (SEMA), a fact also confirmed by its first and longest-serving secretary, Paulo Nogueira Neto, who stated in this regard:

The Special Secretariat for the Environment itself is a direct result of Stockholm. The Brazilian delegation that went to the conference - chaired by Minister Costa Cavalcante, who was accompanied by Henrique Cavalcante, then secretary general of the ministry - strongly felt that this was the time to produce changes, since Brazil, until then, had maintained a very skeptical position - to be elegant - in relation to the environment. In fact, any environmental initiative was always received with suspicion, as a possible obstacle to progress (Nogueira Neto *apud* Silveira, 2015, p. 6).

In a symmetrical way, the creation of the Ministry of the Environment, in the structure of the Brazilian federal government, after the Rio de Janeiro Conference, which took place in 1992, reinforces the idea that these conferences exerted a direct influence on the establishment of a national policy focused on the environmental issue, notably regarding the approach to climate, not only through the proposals formulated in them, but especially due to the consolidation of the relevance of the theme, which raised the importance of the environment in the international scenario and, consequently, caused the growth and deepening of the debate on the environmental agenda in different national contexts.

However, in terms of relevance, historical conferences such as Stockholm (1972) and Rio 92 cannot be compared with international conferences on environmental education. The disparity in the scale of these two groups of conferences, either because they were organized by different institutions - the UN, in the case of the Stockholm and Rio de Janeiro conferences, and UNESCO, in the case of the main environmental education conferences, such as Belgrade, Tbilisi and Thessaloniki - or because of the number and size of the delegations present, shows that the unequivocal influence of the Stockholm and Rio conferences on national environmental policies cannot be observed so easily when it comes to environmental education conferences.

Therefore, in order to identify whether this type of influence is observable in the case of international conferences on environmental education, it is necessary to establish another type of analysis. In this sense, this article, which is based on recently completed research (Silva, 2024), will analyze two examples of countries involved in global environmental education conferences and that develop national environmental education policies and programs, namely the United States (USA) and Brazil, seeking to verify whether there is an influence of those conferences in the formulation of their respective official actions.

From a methodological point of view, we used the *process tracing method*, based on the examination of policies, their programs, and also the specialized literature on the subject, in order to find empirical evidence, in light of the methodological procedure described by Beach and Pedersen (2019), whereby the observable result, in this case, the national environmental education policies and programs, arises from the hypothetical cause, namely, the content of the final documents of the International Conferences on Environmental Education.

The following two sections will briefly restore the historical context of the two countries analyzed, with regard to the theme of environmental education.

THE UNITED STATES AND ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

Unlike most of the countries participating in the international conferences on the environment, which began on the subject in the 1970s, the United States was already experiencing an internal debate on this agenda, which was extremely developed, especially in academia, but also in civil society and in political discussions, even before the advent of the conferences. The 1960s firmly established the threat of climate change in the North American imagination, starting with the seminal works "*Silent Spring*" (Carson, 1962) and "*The Quiet Crisis*" (Udall, 1963). The debate on the impacts of human action on the environment has become constant in the country, leading to the strengthening of political, social, and academic organizations focused on ecology (Silva, 2024).

Despite the media and historical concentration on the protests against the Vietnam War and the civil rights movement in the USA in the 1960s, the so-called "protest culture" (Rome, 2003) favored that period to also be significant in expressing the concerns of the population, especially the younger ones, regarding the preservation of the environment and predictions about the future. Carter and Simmons (2010) state that these concerns are reflected in the multiple national policies passed in that decade, aimed at the environment, namely: the *Wilderness Act*, of 1964; the *Species Conservation Act*, of 1966; the *Wild and Scenic River Act*, of 1968; the *Solid Waste Disposal Act*, of 1965; and the *Clean Air Act*, also from 1965. In addition to the high number of legal norms approved in this period on the subject, academic production was also significant and, specifically with regard to environmental education, it is essential to mention William Stapp (1969), who publishes, in the first issue of the *Journal of Environmental Education*, the article "*The concept of environmental education*".

Despite the growth in the relevance of the environmental theme in the academic, political and even social debate in the United States during the 1960s, the year 1970 can be considered the most important year for the environmental cause until then (Carter; Simmons, 2010). On January 1, 1970, the *National Environmental Policy Act*, passed the previous year, came into force, which remains, with amendments, like the country's environmental legislation, requiring federal agencies to analyze the environmental impacts of a proposed action, before decisions are made on its implementation.

In addition to this legislation, an event of even greater impact for the debate on the environmental issue came from the culture of protests, still present in the early 1970s. Initially articulated as a strategy of peaceful manifestation of the civil rights movement, the "*sit-ins*" protests consist of occupying a place, of economic or sociocultural relevance, to prevent its normal functioning. Having become a format of popular protest in universities, especially about the rejection of the Vietnam War, this modality of collective action gave rise to a new strategy of protests, resulting from the "*sit-in*", namely, the "*teach-in*", inspired by the acts against the Vietnam War. In Hall's words:

The "*teach-ins*" consisted of lectures, debates and discussion groups (...). As Charles de Benedetti stated, "the vacuum of understanding they exposed created a market for information", and this need was met by a cadre of academic experts who challenged national policy and established an alternative source of information (Hall, 2005, p. 22).

For the environmental issue, it was the "*teach-in*" of April 1970 that had a great influence, having been promoted in approximately 1,500 *university campuses, involving about 20 million people* (Rome *apud* Carter; Simmons, 2010). Earth Day, as it became known, was a huge demonstration of strength by legislators and climate activists, which, in addition to the already established national law for the environment, made explicit the national interest in broadening the debate on the environmental agenda. To corroborate this view, a study organized by the National Association of Science Teachers (NSTA) pointed to the latent need for curriculum reform to include the approach to the environment. This formulation stems from the effort made in the analysis of schools and school districts in all 50 states of the country, where only 54 curricula were found that presented some content related to environmental education (NSTA *apud* Carter; Simmons, 2010).

In addition to this research, the American president at the time, Richard Nixon, in a speech given to the US Congress in August of that same year, stated:

It is also vital that our whole society develops a new understanding and a new awareness of man's relationship with his environment - what could be called 'environmental literacy'. This will require the development and teaching of environmental concepts at all times of the educational process (Nixon *apud* Carter; Simmons, 2010, p. 7).

The research carried out by the NSTA and President Nixon's speech demonstrated a gap in the existing legislation so far that the so-called "environmental literacy" could be promoted, a gap that would be filled, in October of the same year, with the enactment of

the *Environmental Education Act*, which established the Environmental Education Agency with the objective of enabling the financing of environmental education programs in the states.

The increase in the importance of the climate issue and the promotion of environmental education, based on federal financing legislation, in less than a decade - if we take as the starting point of the generalized debate in the USA the publication of Carson's book (1962) and the enactment of legislation on environmental education (1970) - allow us to understand the speed with which the environmental theme was deepened in the country. In fact, all these events precede the first international conference on the environment, which would only take place in 1972. Thus, it is noted that, at least initially, it is not possible to observe an influence of the conferences on the national political process in the USA. Strictly speaking, it was the internal political and academic movements of the country that had an influence on the international debate on the subject, in view of the international relevance of Carson's book (1962) and, more specifically in environmental education, the central role of Stapp (1969) in the formulation and dissemination of the concepts of environmental education, a role that, by the way, led him to be the first director of UNESCO's International Environmental Education Programme (PIEA).⁴

The 1970s saw further advances for environmental education in the U.S., with the establishment of environmental education coordinators in the school systems of all 50 states before the end of the decade. Despite this and the growing relevance of the theme on an international scale, due to the Stockholm (1972), Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977) conferences, the *Environmental Education Act*, sanctioned in 1970, and its funding had a short useful life, being suppressed only five years after its approval (Carter; Simmons, 2010). As a result, the advances in the environmental education agenda experienced in the United States during the 1960s and early 1970s began to slow down, exactly at the moment when the agenda was gaining strength on the international agenda.

The election of Ronald Reagan as president of the United States in 1980 was a major factor in changes in the domestic political scenario, involving the climate issue. Through neoliberal legislation, a political-economic model that began to be structured in a more organic way during the Reagan administration, with a focus on economic

⁴ Another important point about the influence of the internal debate in the US on the global stage is the role of this country in the international order itself, which has become increasingly relevant in the post-war period, especially from the 1960s and 1970s, in the midst of the Cold War (Silva, 2024).

development to the detriment of the environment, Reagan's presidential octenium (1981-1988) was responsible for eliminating almost all the advances established by the *Environmental Education Act*, in addition to revising many other environmental laws from the 1960s and 1970s, seeking to relieve the federal government and induce greater participation of sectors outside the federal administration. The agencies and ministries responsible for issues that covered the environment, such as Energy, Agriculture, and the Ministry of the Interior, were commanded based on ideological indications made by Reagan. In addition, the growing influence of the private sector in the administration, through *lobbying* and conservative *think tanks*, has strengthened the neoliberal strategy of cutting public spending, leading to significant reductions or, in certain cases, complete cuts in the financing of environmental programs. On this aspect, Kraft (2011, p. 29) states: "in retrospect, it is evident that such a strategy basically had no chance of success and that it would delay the reform of environmental policies by a decade or more".

In examining the Reagan administration's actions on spending cuts in environmental programs and environmental deregulation to safeguard the interests of the business sector, the author adds:

The administration paid much less attention to the reform of environmental laws and administrative practices that could have improved the effectiveness and efficiency of environmental programs. In fact, the president's administrative strategy seemed to have been designed to reverse the process of institutionalization described above, rather than to increase the effectiveness of the agency or to improve state-level capabilities (Kraft, 2011, p. 29).

While the 1980s can be seen as a period of setbacks in the environmental issue in the USA, the election of George H. W. Bush in 1988 promoted the elevation of the issue. Although he was Reagan's vice president in his two presidential terms, Bush proved to be opposed to his predecessor's position on the environmental issue. He even stated in a campaign speech, made in 1988, that he would be an "environmentalist president" (Kraft, 2011), implying that he perceived the impact of human activity on nature and how such activity should be regulated to ensure the conservation of the environment. Thus, in his second year in office, in 1990, the *National Environmental Education Act* (NEEA) was established, responsible for enabling federal funding for environmental education programs and projects, in a way reestablishing the purpose of the *Environmental Education Act* of 1970, which had, as we have seen, ephemeral validity.

Despite the advances during the Bush administration and also during the following administration, President Bill Clinton, the US Congress increasingly established itself as a voice of opposition to funding programs and regulations in the environmental area. Contrary to what had been observed during the Reagan administration, when Congress repeatedly opposed the president's interests in dismantling environmental legislation (Kraft, 2011), congressmen began an "anti-environmentalist turn", which was further strengthened during the Clinton administration, when the Republicans won a majority in the House of Representatives. In this regard, Kraft points out:

Congress's new environmental agenda was remarkably similar to the one initiated in the early 1980s under the Reagan administration. But this time the roles of Congress and the White House have been reversed, with Congress eager to cut environmental budgets and weaken regulation and the White House rising to their defense (Kraft, 2011, p. 32).

Because of pressure exerted by Congress and its refusal to strengthen environmental legislation, the authorization for NEEA funding was not renewed after the 1996 legislative year, although funds were reallocated by Congress for this purpose. Furthermore, despite attempts at amendments and (re)authorizations of funding during the last decades, NEEA has become responsible only for the preparation of didactic material - both for the training of teachers in the area, and directly for students - and for subsidies for researchers. It is worth noting several attempts to reinstate the NEEA in more recent times, including its name changed to *No Child Left Inside Act*, having been sent to parliamentary committees several times, such as in 2007, 2008 and 2010, but shelved. In 2023, a new version of this bill was presented in the Senate, being sent again to a specific parliamentary committee, without definition until the year 2024 (Silva, 2024).

Despite these setbacks, the organizations and associations subsidized by the legislation and the Environmental Protection Agency, originally responsible for managing the NEEA, still produce didactic material to support pedagogical support for schools and teachers. The so-called Guidelines for Excellence, produced by the *North American Association for Environmental Education* (NAAEE), are publications that establish general principles for quality environmental education. As it is the main material produced in the context of the United States on environmental education, capable of directing state and local programs on the subject, these Guidelines were part of the empirical references of the research on which this article is based, in the search for evidence of the influence of international conferences on environmental education on the US policy for the sector.

In the following section, the contextualization of the Brazilian situation on the environmental education agenda will be presented, focusing on the evolution of its presence (or absence) in the planning of the national education policy.

THE PLACE OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION IN EDUCATIONAL POLICY IN BRAZIL

After the proclamation of Independence, in 1822, Brazil lived, the following year, its first constituent experience, with the installation of the Constituent and Legislative Assembly of the Empire, by order of Emperor Dom Pedro I, whose main objective was to draft and approve the first Constitution of the new sovereign country.

It was in this context that, for the first time, the need to draw up a "Complete Treaty on the Education of Brazilian Youth" was discussed, with a strong protagonism of the constituent deputy Martim Francisco Machado, who defended the thesis that the instruction of the people should be a duty of the imperial State. However, the elaboration of the aforementioned treaty did not go ahead, nor did the Constituent and Legislative Assembly of the Empire itself, dissolved by the authoritarian emperor, who, from the height of his Moderating Power, granted Brazil the first Constitution, in 1824, without any mention of the education treaty or any other educational planning mechanism. Strictly speaking, on the subject of education, the first Brazilian Constitution made only one mention: "Primary education is free to all citizens" (Saviani, 2007).

It took more than a hundred years for Brazil to resume the discussion of a national education plan, covering all stages of schooling, which took place again in the debates of the Constituent Assembly that promulgated the Magna Carta of 1934, the second Brazilian republican Constitution. The new constitutional text assigned to the National Council of Education (CNE) the mission of drafting a "National Education Code". Mission given, the CNE sent to the National Congress a proposal on the aforementioned Code, with 504 articles, but the parliamentarians were surprised that such a proposal for a legal text had been prepared by the Council, which had no competence to approve laws, despite the commandment established by the 1934 Constitution.

With wounded susceptibilities, the National Congress did not vote on the matter. Shortly after, the proposal of the Code, the current Constitution and Congress itself were trampled by the establishment of the dictatorship of the Estado Novo, in 1937, which granted the Brazilian people a new Constitution, revoking the previous ephemeral constitutional provision and omitting itself from the agenda of national education planning.

By the way, on the subject of environmental education, both the Constitutions of the 1930s, both the democratic (1934) and the authoritarian (1937), did not even mention the theme or any related subject (Cury, 2015).

Finally, in the early 1960s, during the João Goulart government, the first Law of Guidelines and Bases of National Education (LDBEN No. 4,024/1961) was approved, which was silent about environmental education, but determined the elaboration of a National Education Plan (PNE) by the now called Federal Council of Education (CFE). Within the scope of the CFE, Councilor Anísio Teixeira was appointed as rapporteur, who presented a proposal for a PNE, especially focused on quantitative goals on the number of enrollments in the different stages of schooling; in some qualitative goals on teacher training, integral education and professional initiation; and in the structuring of funds for financing primary, secondary education and higher education. Approved in the plenary of the CFE on September 12, 1962, the proposal was quickly ratified, less than ten days later, by the Ministry of Education, at the time under the command of Darcy Ribeiro (Amâncio; Castioni, 2021).

Brazil thus began to have its First National Education Plan, which, in relation to what interests us in this text, mentioned nothing about the theme of environmental education. This effort to plan national education was also run over by an authoritarian whirlwind when the civil-military dictatorship was installed on April 1, 1964, which rendered the Plan ineffective, in addition to banning the rapporteur who had prepared it in the CFE and the Minister of Education who had ratified it (Saviani, 2007; Amâncio; Castioni, 2021).

In the early 1980s, with the approval of Law No. 6,938/1981, the National Environmental Policy (PNMA) was instituted in Brazil, which defines, in its article 2, item X, environmental education as one of the principles of the new public policy, in the following terms: "environmental education at all levels of education, including community education, aiming to enable them to actively participate in the defense of the environment".

After 21 years of dictatorship (1964-1985), Brazil consolidated its process of redemocratization with a new constitutional framework. In fact, the Constitution promulgated on October 5, 1988 represents a pact entered into by Brazilian society with the Democratic Rule of Law. In the new Magna Carta, there is a substantial advance with regard to environmental education, since, in its article 225, § 1, item VI, it can be read that, in order to realize the right of all citizens "to an ecologically balanced environment", the Government must "promote environmental education at all levels of education and public

awareness for the preservation of the environment". Thus, the promotion of environmental education by the State, in the school context, at all levels of education, was inscribed as a constitutional commandment.

In 1992, within the framework of the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (Rio 92), the I Conference on Environmental Education was held, which became a reference for the field of environmental education in Brazil, when the Treaty on Environmental Education for Sustainable Societies and Global Responsibility was drafted, produced by environmental educators, young people and environmental activists from various countries around the world. Organized into principles (16 paragraphs) and action goals (22 paragraphs), this document was adopted as the Charter of Principles of the Brazilian Network of Environmental Education, becoming a reference matrix for public policies of environmental education in the country (De Luca; Lagazzi, 2016).

Throughout the 1990s, the National Environmental Education Program (ProNEA, 1994) and the National Environmental Education Policy (PNEA, 1999) were launched, still in the wake of the impacts of Rio 92 and, notably, the I Environmental Education Conference held in the context of that international environmental conference. ProNEA and PNEA will be the objects of analysis of the Brazilian case, due to their constancy in Brazilian legislation and, also, because such a choice allows us to work with similar official initiatives, considering the American and Brazilian contexts, the focus of our analytical endeavor.

In the period from 1998 to the early 2010s, environmental education began to be included in national curriculum documents established by the National Council of Education and the Ministry of Education, within the scope of the national curriculum parameters and the national curriculum guidelines for basic education. In 2012, however, another very important legal milestone was inscribed in the history of Brazilian environmental education, when Law No. 12,608/2012 amended LDBEN No. 9,394/1996 to include paragraph 7 in article 26, with the following wording: "Elementary and secondary school curricula must include the principles of civil protection and defense and environmental education in an integrated manner with the mandatory contents." Following this change in the LDBEN, Resolution No. 2, of June 15, 2012, was approved two months later, by the National Education Council, which establishes the National Curriculum Guidelines for Environmental Education.

However, with the entry into force of the controversial Law No. 13,415/2017, which instituted the so-called "new high school", the target of much controversy, to this day, in the Brazilian educational field (Santana; Carneiro, 2024), the explicit mention of the inclusion of environmental education in the mandatory contents of basic education was suppressed. Very recently, that legal norm of 2017 was modified, with the approval of Law No. 14,945/2024, which, however, did not restore the explicitness of the place of environmental education in the curriculum of Brazilian basic education.

Despite these clear advances in Brazilian educational legislation, although crossed by controversies and contradictions, with regard to the consolidation of environmental education as a mandatory curricular component in basic education (Loureiro, 2014), the National Education Plan (2001-2010), approved by Law No. 10,172/2001, and the National Education Plan (2014-2024), approved by Law No. 13,005/2014, they did not give adequate treatment to the theme, which was not aimed at in any goal, in either of the two Plans, having been contemplated only with generic mentions, insufficient for its effectiveness as an integral part of the national education policy (Borges; Sánchez, 2012; Frizzo; Carvalho, 2018).

For this reason, at a time when Brazil is preparing to approve the new National Education Plan, prepared to take effect in the 2025-2035 decade, it will be necessary to closely monitor the processing and discussion, in the National Congress, of Bill (PL) No. 2,614/2024, which the Lula III government sent to parliament with a view to approving the new Plan. It is noteworthy, from the outset, that, unlike the content of the Final Document of the National Education Conference (CONAE), held in January 2024, in Brasília, at the initiative of the federal government, there is no objective or goal related to environmental education in the aforementioned Bill.

In fact, in CONAE's Final Document, whose title is "National Education Plan (2024-2034): State policy to guarantee education as a human right, with social justice and sustainable socio-environmental development" (CONAE, 2024), there is an organization in seven thematic axes, from which propositions and strategies emerge. The last axis (Axis VII) is exactly the one that addresses themes such as the "protection of biodiversity" and "sustainable socio-environmental development to guarantee quality life on the planet", which unfold into two propositions specifically aimed at environmental education, namely: a) Proposition 1, which deals with the offer, as a State policy, of mandatory environmental education at all levels, stages and modalities of education, which correspond to 27

strategies; b) Proposition 3, which deals with the continuing education of education professionals in the area of environmental education, which corresponds to three strategies.

Certainly, it will be necessary to investigate the reason why PL No. 2,614/2024, forwarded by the federal government to the National Congress, a few months after the end of CONAE 2024, disregarded the important advances in the formulations of this Conference on the theme of environmental education, once again casting a "noisy" silence on it.

We will then move on to the main analyses of the influence of international conferences on environmental education on national policies in the sector, in the USA and Brazil, taking as references of the policies examined certain documents representative of their principles, guidelines and objectives. Such documents were selected not only because they have relevant meaning as public policy texts, but also because they express similarities between environmental education policies in the two countries investigated.

ANALYSIS OF THE AMERICAN CASE: THE *NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT* AND THE GUIDELINES FOR EXCELLENCE

As mentioned earlier, the historical context of the debate on environmental education in the USA precedes the first international conferences on the subject. This is also the case of his first legislation that provides for environmental education. However, from its most recent version, the *National Environmental Education Act*, dated 1990 (NEEA/1990), it is possible to establish relationships between its content and the recommendations of the conferences, especially the Tbilisi Conference (1977). That North American legal diploma is limited to establishing bureaucratic and budgetary issues, such as financing capacity, creation of offices and specialized organizations, awards and scholarships. These same themes are discussed at length in the final document of the 1977 conference, the Tbilisi Declaration.

Despite the thirteen years that separate the aforementioned conference from the aforementioned legal norm, it is important to reinforce the centrality of the Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977) conferences in the international debate on the environmental issue, since their agendas were continuously referenced and endorsed in subsequent conferences. Therefore, it is possible to infer that several recommendations adopted at these conferences, formulated in the first editions or endorsed by more contemporary

conferences, with regard to the establishment of guidelines or legal acts, have a direct impact on the content of legislation approved in certain countries. In the specific case of the analysis of NEEA/1990, it is worth remembering that Recommendation 6 and the second paragraph of Recommendation 7, both part of the Tbilisi Declaration (1977), deal with the following topics, as shown in the respective citations below:

It is recommended that Member States strengthen or create appropriate organisational structures as far as possible (...). Among the functions would be: facilitating the relationship with UNESCO, UNEP and other organizations involved in environmental education; coordinate initiatives in environmental education; serve as an advisory body on environmental education at the government level; to develop awareness and knowledge about the issues associated with environmental education in the country in the various social and professional groups; promote collaborative relationships between environmental education associations, citizen groups and scientific, research and education communities; (...) provide structures and guidelines for the establishment of environmental education action committees in the country; (...) encourage and facilitate the contribution to environmental education programs of non-governmental organizations, including voluntary entities. (UNESCO, 1977, p. 29)

To achieve the above-mentioned objectives, the Conference recommends that Member States establish a specialized unit, by the competent authorities, to serve environmental education with terms of reference that include: training leaders in environmental areas; development of school curricula compatible with the needs of the environment at the local, regional and global levels; preparation of books and scientific reference works necessary for the improvement of curricula; (...). (UNESCO, 1977, p. 30)

In the two recommendations, which focus on the organizational and systemic issue of environmental education, there is a call for the creation of a governmental structure responsible for advising on environmental education issues, within the scope of public administration, and for the formulation of guidelines and tools for the improvement of national curricula, in order to include environmental education in the curriculum proposal of schools. In addition, they value the strengthening and assistance of non-governmental organizations focused on the area. US legislation divides these functions into multiple structures, but their objectives are clearly aligned with those envisaged in the Tbilisi recommendations. The Office of Environmental Education, assigned to the Environmental Protection Agency, established in article 4 of the NEEA/1990, has the following objectives, under the terms of the law:

Develop and support related programs and efforts, in consultation and coordination with other federal agencies, to improve understanding of the natural and built environment and the relationships between humans and their environment, including the global aspects of environmental problems; support the development and widest possible dissemination of model curricula, educational materials, and training programs for middle and high school students and other interested groups,

including older Americans; develop and disseminate, in cooperation with other federal agencies, nonprofit educational and environmental organizations, state agencies, and noncommercial educational broadcasting entities, environmental education publications and audiovisual and other media materials; develop and support environmental education seminars, training programs, teleconferences and workshops for environmental education professionals, as provided for in article 5 of this Law; assess, in coordination with other federal agencies, the demand for professional skills and training needed to respond to current and anticipated environmental problems and cooperates with appropriate institutions, organizations, and agencies to develop training programs, curricula, and continuing education programs for teachers, schools, administrators, and related professionals; Provide information on environmental education and training programs to local education agencies, state education and natural resources agencies, and others. (United States of America, 1990, Art. 4)

It is noted that the functions established for the Office, such as the strengthening of environmental awareness; support for the development of teaching materials and curricula; the dissemination of these materials by various media outlets; and the development of training programs for education professionals, administrative professionals and members of civil society, in general, are directly in line with recommendations 6 and 7 of the Tbilisi Conference. In addition to the Office of Environmental Education, the Environmental Training and Education Program is also created, based on the provisions of article 5 of the law, which expands what is established in the previous article, being more focused on the qualification of education professionals, in addition to becoming responsible for the maintenance of a library of didactic materials, specialized literature and information on environmental education, as well as support for conferences, seminars and forums, both national and international, that deal with environmental education, also covering the development of didactic materials, curricula and training in the area.

The advisory council on environmental education, established in article 9, is responsible, as its name indicates, for advising and making recommendations to the administration on issues related to environmental education activities, functions and policies, as well as defining one of the functions of the national organizational structure, as recommended by Tbilisi: "to serve as an advisory body on environmental education at the governmental level" (UNESCO, 1977, p. 29).

Finally, the creation of the National Foundation for Environmental Education, provided for in article 10 of the law, and the establishment of its financing capacity, with the objective of expanding and assisting the functioning of the Office of Environmental Education and the Environmental Training and Education Program, from a non-governmental structure, goes beyond what is presented as the role of the organizational

structure proposed in Recommendation 6: in fact, this Recommendation indicates support for non-governmental entities, while U.S. legislation not only enshrines this support, but also establishes the non-governmental organization itself. In addition to this organization, the Environmental Protection Agency, responsible for the Office of Environmental Education, and the other structures created from the *National Environmental Education Act* also assist in the financing of another non-governmental organization, the NAAEE, which, since 1993, has been responsible for the elaboration of the so-called Guidelines for Excellence, that is, the guidelines for environmental education programs on a national scale. state and local, in the USA.

In the latest update of these Guidelines, released in different editions between 2016 and 2022, several direct mentions are found to the Belgrade and Tbilisi conferences, but also to Thessaloniki and, in the more general environmental scenario, to the Rio 92 Conference. In addition to these mentions, the content of the guidelines directly assimilates the recommendations of the conferences, especially the Tbilisi Declaration, considering that this was, among the final documents of the aforementioned conferences, the one that was most willing to unravel the theme of environmental education, presenting a total of 41 recommendations.

In their introduction to the edition focused on the training of educators (2019), the Guidelines strengthen the interpretation that the concept of environmental education and its bases were based on the Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977) conferences, emphasizing that these documents continue to be relevant:

The guidelines are based on a common understanding of effective environmental education. For many environmental educators, this understanding is rooted in two founding documents in the field: the Belgrade Charter (UNESCO, 1975) and the Tbilisi Declaration (UNESCO, 1977). (...) They continue to be a solid foundation for an international vision of the fundamental concepts and competencies that environmentally-savvy citizens need (NAAEE, 2019, p. 8-9).

In addition, the editions related to community involvement (2017) and the preparation of materials (2021) both discuss the target audience of environmental education, its formats and objectives. When dealing with the various categories and strategies of education, formal and non-formal (NAAEE, 2017, p. 94), some of the objectives established in Belgrade (1975) are mentioned, specifically, the creation of environmental awareness and concern; a sense of urgency to seek solutions; the development and practice of skills aimed at solving environmental problems. Furthermore,

when dealing with the importance of establishing didactic materials aimed at adult environmental education, the explanation for the importance of engaging adults is based on the Tbilisi Declaration (1977):

As outlined in the Tbilisi Declaration, environmental education is a continuous process throughout life. While schools are essential for children's learning, these institutions provide only about 3 to 7 percent of the average person's lifetime learning. More than 90 percent of lifelong learning takes place outside of schools and focuses on topics that are most important to people as they seek personally relevant learning opportunities (NAAEE, 2021, p. 70).

Returning to the text on the training of environmental education professionals (NAAEE, 2019), among the skills that an environmental educator must be able to demonstrate, according to the Guidelines, is the ability to identify the objectives of environmental education, which were defined by the final documents of Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977). Despite the presence of several recommendations of the conferences, or direct mentions of them and their importance, it should be noted that certain themes present in the Tbilisi recommendations, in particular, do not appear in the Guidelines. This is the case, for example, of the recommendations that deal with research and higher education, since both topics are not addressed in the national Guidelines. However, it should be noted that the role of research is mentioned in the NEEA, when it points to support for academic forums, conferences and seminars, as well as when it provides for the creation of research grants, internships and awards. Therefore, it is possible to perceive that, in relation to certain aspects, even when there is no direct mention of the conferences in the American legislation on environmental education, there is still an important presence of the content of its recommendations, especially the Tbilisi Declaration (1977), in the organizational definitions of environmental education in the country, established by the *National Environmental Education Act*.

In this vein, the constant presence of direct and indirect references to the conferences, especially in Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977), and the inscription of the principles and objectives defined by them in the National Guidelines organized by the NAAEE demonstrate, in a crystal clear way, the clearly observable influence that those conferences and their final documents exerted - and continue to exert - on the North American legislation on the subject and on the educational Guidelines organized on the basis of the in this legislation. In the following section, the analysis of the Brazilian case will be made.

ANALYSIS OF THE BRAZILIAN CASE: THE NATIONAL POLICY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND THE NATIONAL PROGRAM OF ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION

Although there is no record of such an ancient history in the Brazilian context, as in the case of the North American policy of environmental education, this area seems to enjoy much greater significance in contemporary Brazil, compared to the USA. Not only is the governmental structure still in operation, having not been revoked or annulled in its financing capacity, but also the organizational structures for the formulation of guidelines and projects are within the scope of the federal government, under the responsibility of the Ministry of Environment and Climate Change (MMAMC) - the name itself clearly indicates the importance that the current federal administration gives to the environmental issue and its global problems.

In fact, the permanence of the function of formulating guidelines within the scope of the public administration allows greater control of this process, in addition to causing a higher level of influence in the acceptance of these guidelines by the states and municipalities.

The formulation of guidelines and objectives, as well as their fulfillment, are the responsibility of the National Policy for Environmental Education (PNEA) and the National Program for Environmental Education (ProNEA). Law No. 9,795/1999, which instituted the PNEA, provides not only for the structural characteristics of the policy and the establishment of its management body - symmetrically with the North American legislation, which establishes the NEEA, as proposed in the Tbilisi Declaration (1977), in its sixth recommendation - but also focuses on the concept of environmental education, its objectives and principles. This section of Brazilian law, which is not found in the North American NEEA, but only in the Guidelines for Excellence, already traces direct conceptual links with the Belgrade (1975) and Tbilisi (1977) conferences. In the first article of the Brazilian law, which provides for the concept of environmental education, it can be read:

Environmental education is understood as the processes through which the individual and the community build social values, knowledge, skills, attitudes and competencies aimed at the conservation of the environment, a good for the common use of the people, essential to a healthy quality of life and its sustainability (Brasil, 1999, Art. 1).

In this conceptualization, which emphasizes the importance of the construction of social values, knowledge, skills, attitudes and competencies, in addition to the mention of processes, both individual and collective, the influence of the Belgrade Charter (1975) can

be perceived. In fact, this conceptual elaboration is a tributary of the content of the positions adopted in Belgrade, which establish those same points, by emphasizing that the mission of environmental education is:

To develop a world population that is aware of and concerned about the environment and its associated problems, and that has the knowledge, skills, attitudes, motivations and commitment to work individually and collectively in search of solutions to current problems and the prevention of new ones (UNESCO, 1975, p. 3).

In addition, of the eight principles of environmental education established by Belgrade (1975) and reverberated in Tbilisi (1977), four of them can be observed as the basis for the formulation of some principles present in the law that instituted the PNEA (1999) and in the sixth edition of ProNEA (2023). They are:

1. Environmental education must consider the environment in its entirety – natural and artificial, ecological, political, economic, technological, social, legislative, cultural and aesthetic;
2. Environmental education should be a continuous process throughout life, both through formal and non-formal education;
3. Environmental education must be interdisciplinary in its approach;
5. Environmental education should examine major environmental issues from a global point of view, while giving due attention to regional differences (UNESCO, 1975, p. 4).

The principles present in the Brazilian legislation (PNEA), which are similar to principles 1, 2, 3 and 5, are, respectively, principles II, V, III and VII, formulated as follows:

- II - the conception of the environment in its totality, considering the interdependence between the natural, socioeconomic and cultural environments, under the focus of sustainability;
- V – the guarantee of continuity and permanence of the educational process;
- III - the pluralism of ideas and pedagogical conceptions, from the perspective of inter, multi and transdisciplinarity;
- VII – the articulated approach to local, regional, national and global environmental issues (Brasil, 1999, Art. 4).

The essence of these principles remains the same in the sixth edition of ProNEA, launched in 2023. However, the Program presents in its principles themes not addressed in the Belgrade Charter (1975) and in the Brazilian PNEA law (1999), given that agendas such as inclusion and diversity were not present, at least emphatically, in the political debate of those two times. Maintaining the order of enumeration of the principles of the Belgrade Charter (1975) previously declined, principles 1, 10, 9 and 2 of ProNEA are

similar to those inscribed at the Belgrade Conference, respectively, with the following formulation:

1. Conception of the environment in its entirety, considering the systemic interdependence between the natural and the built environment, the socioeconomic, the cultural, the historical trajectory, the spiritual, under the focus of sustainability and considering the territorial specificities.
10. Guarantee of articulated, continuous and permanent educational processes.
9. Respect for the pluralism of ideas, pedagogical conceptions and social practices, with the perspective of a critical approach.
2. Contextualized and articulated approach to local, regional, watershed, territorial, national, transboundary, and global socio-environmental issues (Brasil, 2023, p. 25).

Despite the changes and additions made to the principles of the Belgrade Charter, the central ideas are maintained in both national documents, evidencing the influence of the official text of that international conference in the elaboration of the principles engraved in Brazilian legislation.

As for the Tbilisi recommendations, the definition of the organizational structure of the PNEA and ProNEA allows us to establish a relationship with recommendations 6 and 7 of the Tbilisi Declaration (1977), also observed in the North American case. The mention of actions linked to the PNEA, such as the production and dissemination of educational material and the development of studies, research and experiments, as well as the Lines of Action and strategies 3 and 4 of ProNEA, which discuss, respectively, "communication for environmental education" and "environmental education in educational institutions", reveal a clear correspondence with the final document of the Tbilisi Conference.

Action Line 3 establishes strategies for the promotion of environmental education from the media, as defined by Recommendation 7 of the Tbilisi Declaration, which, among other topics, affirms the importance of "determining educational methods and means, including audiovisual aids necessary to explain and popularize environmental curricula and programmes" (UNESCO, 1977, p. 30). In addition, Action Line 3 also proposes the production of teaching materials, following another section of Recommendation 7, which provides for the "preparation of books and scientific reference works necessary for the improvement of curricula" (UNESCO, 1977, p. 30).

Action Line 4, which deals with the role of environmental education in educational institutions and the incentive for the production of studies, research and extension projects focused on the theme, also reveals similarities with Recommendation 3 of the Tbilisi

Declaration. Among the strategies defined in this section of ProNEA, the following should be highlighted:

- 4.1.2 Build, in a participatory manner, curricular proposals and pedagogical projects at all levels and modalities of education, which contemplate an integrated, transversal and interdisciplinary approach to the socio-environmental theme, in line with the guidelines and regulations of the National Council of Education and with global and local documents and agendas endorsed by environmental education.
- 4.1.4 Strengthen environmental education in schools, contributing to democratic and participatory school management, taking advantage of accumulated experiences.
- 4.1.7 Integrate environmental education into higher education, in a transversal, inter and transdisciplinary way, in the various areas and courses (Brasil, 2023, p. 39).

Strategy 4.1.2, by mentioning that the construction of curricular proposals and pedagogical projects must be in consonance, among other guidelines, "with global documents and agendas (...) referenda of environmental education" (Brasil, 2023, p. 39), directly points to the influence of environmental education documents produced in international forums, such as the conferences organized by the UN and UNESCO. The other two strategies highlighted can be related to the following indications present in Recommendation 3 of the Tbilisi Declaration: "to assign to the school a central role in the entire environmental education system and to organize, with this objective, a systematic action in primary and secondary education; expand environmental studies at the higher education level" (UNESCO, 1977, p. 28). These two orientations are directly related to strategies 4.1.4 and 4.1.7, when they deal with the importance of centralizing, and then strengthening, the role of the school in environmental education and also of promoting the presence of environmental education in higher education.

FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

If compared to the case of the USA, the official Brazilian texts, both PNEA and ProNEA, cover themes and recommendations related to topics present in international conferences on environmental education, in a much more comprehensive way than in the American context, addressing items such as research and higher education, which are not found in the North American legislation and are only partially and briefly mentioned in the educational guidelines, called Guidelines for Excellence.

However, it is important to note that there is a constant presence, in both cases, of the Tbilisi recommendations that involve the formulation of organizational structures responsible for environmental education on a national scale. Therefore, it is possible to

perceive, in the content of the official texts prepared in both countries, the mark of the influence of the final documents of international conferences on environmental education.

In fact, by comparing the content of the selected national documents with the concepts, principles, objectives and recommendations established in the final documents of the conferences, especially the Belgrade Charter (1975) and the Tbilisi Declaration (1977), matrix documents for the foundation of environmental education in the international context, it was possible to conclude, in both cases (USA and Brazil), that several themes or aspects addressed in the national documents are based, explicitly or implicitly, on what was proposed in the final documents of the international conferences, often with direct citations to concepts, referrals and recommendations from those conferences.

However, observing the North American case, it is important to highlight the decrease in the relevance of the theme in the national political debate, highlighting the difficulty in renewing the commitments proposed by NEEA/1990 (Carter; Simmons, 2010). In the Brazilian case, the third Lula government has been resuming the theme, seriously affected by the civilizational delays promoted during the previous government (Brasil, 2023), in order to reestablish the importance of the theme, even if at certain times environmental education is sidelined, as seems to have occurred in Bill No. 2,614/2024, which proposes the new National Education Plan for the decade 2025-2035, forwarded by President Lula to the National Congress in the first half of 2024.

However, it is worth mentioning that the re-edition of ProNEA, in 2023, and the unequivocal presence of environmental education at CONAE 2024 demonstrate significant advances in the Brazilian context and, above all, hope in the revitalization of the theme, especially when compared to the current North American situation, which tends to face serious challenges in the environmental area, given the positions of President Donald Trump, recently sworn in for a new presidential term, admittedly averse to global agreements in the area of the environment.

Finally, it should be emphasized, conclusively, that the present work recognizes the indisputable relevance of international conferences on environmental education in the decision-making process and in the formulation of public policies and programs aimed at environmental education in the countries surveyed.

REFERENCES

1. Amâncio, M. H., & Castioni, R. (2021). Anísio Teixeira e o Plano Nacional de Educação de 1962 - qualidade social na construção da pessoa humana e da sociedade [Anísio Teixeira and the 1962 National Education Plan - social quality in the construction of the human person and society]. *Revista Brasileira de Estudos Pedagógicos*, 102(262), 491–510.
2. Beach, D., & Pedersen, R. (2019). *Process-tracing methods: Foundations and guidelines*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.
3. Borges, J. A., & Sánchez, C. (2012, July 19). O silêncio eloquente da Educação Ambiental no PNE [The eloquent silence of Environmental Education in the PNE]. *EcoDebate*.
4. Brasil. (1999). Lei nº 9.795, de 27 de abril de 1999. Dispõe sobre a educação ambiental, institui a Política Nacional de Educação Ambiental e dá outras providências [Law No. 9.795, of April 27, 1999. Provides for environmental education, establishes the National Environmental Education Policy, and other provisions]. Brasília, Brazil.
5. Brasil. (2023). *Educação ambiental por um Brasil sustentável: ProNEA, marcos legais e normativos* [Environmental education for a sustainable Brazil: ProNEA, legal and regulatory milestones] (6th rev. ed.). Brasília, DF: MMA.
6. Carson, R. (1962). *Silent spring*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
7. Carter, R., & Simmons, B. (2010). The history and philosophy of environmental education. In *The inclusion of environmental education in science teacher education* (pp. 3–16). Springer.
8. Conferência Nacional de Educação. (2024). Documento final [Final document]. Brasília, Brazil: Fórum Nacional de Educação.
9. Cury, C. R. J. (2015). O Plano Nacional de Educação de 1936/1937 [The National Education Plan of 1936/1937]. *Educativa*, 17(2), 1–15.
10. De Luca, A., & Lagazzi, S. M. (2016). Uma análise do discurso materialista do Tratado de Educação Ambiental para Sociedades Sustentáveis e Responsabilidade Global [An analysis of the materialist discourse of the Treaty on Environmental Education for Sustainable Societies and Global Responsibility]. *Cadernos de Estudos Linguísticos*, 58(1), 45–60.
11. Estados Unidos da América. (1990). National Environmental Education Act, Public Law 101-619, Nov. 16, 1990. www.epa.gov/sites/default/files/documents/neeaa.pdf

12. Frizzo, T. C., & Carvalho, I. C. (2018). Políticas públicas atuais no Brasil: O silêncio da educação ambiental [Current public policies in Brazil: The silence of environmental education]. *Revista Eletrônica do Mestrado em Educação Ambiental FURG-RS*, (1), 1–15.
13. Hall, S. (2005). *Peace and freedom: The civil rights and antiwar movements of the 1960s*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
14. Kraft, M. (2011). *Environmental policy and politics* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall.
15. Loureiro, C. F. (2014). Sustentabilidade e educação ambiental: Controvérsias e caminhos do caso brasileiro [Sustainability and environmental education: Controversies and paths of the Brazilian case]. *Sinais Sociais*, 9(26), 12–35.
16. North American Association for Environmental Education. (2017). *Community engagement: Guidelines for excellence*. Washington, DC: Author.
17. North American Association for Environmental Education. (2019). *Professional development of environmental educators: Guidelines for excellence*. Washington, DC: Author.
18. North American Association for Environmental Education. (2021). *Environmental education materials: Guidelines for excellence*. Washington, DC: Author.
19. ONU. (1992). *Conferência das Nações Unidas sobre Meio Ambiente e Desenvolvimento. Agenda 21 (global)* [United Nations Conference on Environment and Development. Agenda 21 (global)]. Rio de Janeiro, Brazil: ONU.
20. Rocha, J. (2003). Política internacional para o meio ambiente: Avanços e entraves pós-conferência de Estocolmo [International environmental policy: Advances and obstacles post-Stockholm Conference]. *Revista Ciências Administrativas*, 9(2), 45–60.
21. Rome, A. (2003). “Give Earth a Chance”: The environmental movement and the Sixties. *Journal of American History*, 90(2), 525–554.
22. Santana, S. K., & Carneiro, W. (2024). Análise da Meta 3 do PNE (2014-2024): Descumprimento do Plano e descompromisso com o Brasil [Analysis of Goal 3 of the PNE (2014-2024): Non-compliance with the Plan and lack of commitment to Brazil]. In W. Carneiro & V. M. Moraes (Eds.), *Plano Nacional de Educação (2014-2024): Balanço e perspectivas* [National Education Plan (2014-2024): Balance and perspectives]. Niterói, Brazil: Intertexto.
23. Saviani, D. (2007). *História das ideias pedagógicas no Brasil* [History of pedagogical ideas in Brazil]. Campinas, Brazil: Autores Associados.

24. Silva, Y. R. O. C. (2024). Influência das conferências internacionais de educação ambiental nas políticas nacionais: Estudo dos casos estadunidense e brasileiro [Influence of international environmental education conferences on national policies: A study of the American and Brazilian cases] (Unpublished bachelor's thesis). Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
25. Silva, Y. R. O. C., & Carneiro, W. (2025). Conferências internacionais de educação ambiental: Contexto e panorama das principais posições adotadas [International environmental education conferences: Context and overview of the main positions adopted]. *Contribuciones a las Ciencias Sociales*, 18(1), 1–23.
26. Silveira, J. (2015). O desenvolvimento econômico e os debates sobre meio ambiente: A Secretaria Especial do Meio Ambiente (SEMA) e a política estratégica de proteção ambiental no Brasil (1973-1981) [Economic development and environmental debates: The Special Secretariat for the Environment (SEMA) and strategic environmental protection policy in Brazil (1973-1981)]. In *Anais do XVIII Simpósio Nacional de História* (pp. 1–17). Florianópolis, Brazil: Simpósio Nacional de História.
27. Stapp, W. (1969). The concept of environmental education. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 1(1), 30–31.
28. Tudor, M. (1991). The 1990 International Environmental Education Conference: A participant's perspective. *The Journal of Environmental Education*, 22(2), 13–17.
29. Udall, S. (1963). *The quiet crisis*. New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
30. UNESCO. (1975). Encontro Internacional de Educação Ambiental. Carta de Belgrado: Uma estrutura global para a Educação Ambiental [International Environmental Education Meeting. Belgrade Charter: A global framework for environmental education]. Belgrade, Yugoslavia: UNESCO.
31. UNESCO. (1977). Conferência Intergovernamental sobre Educação Ambiental. Declaração de Tbilisi [Intergovernmental Conference on Environmental Education. Tbilisi Declaration]. Tbilisi, USSR: UNESCO.
32. UNESCO. (1987). Congresso Internacional sobre Educação e Formação Ambiental. Estratégia Internacional de Ação em Matéria de Educação e Formação Ambiental para o Décênio de 90 - Documento Final [International Congress on Environmental Education and Training. International Action Strategy on Environmental Education and Training for the 1990s - Final Document]. Moscow, USSR: UNESCO.
33. UNESCO. (1997). Conferência Meio Ambiente e Sociedade: Educação e Consciência Pública para a Sustentabilidade. Declaração de Thessaloniki [Environment and Society Conference: Education and Public Awareness for Sustainability. Thessaloniki Declaration]. Thessaloniki, Greece: UNESCO.