

SUPREME COURTS ABOUT THE AIR: THE IMPACT OF TRANSNATIONAL NORMATIVE AIR POLLUTION CONTROL STANDARDS ON THE DECISIONS OF THE SUPREME COURT (USA) AND THE FEDERAL SUPREME COURT (BRAZIL) IN TIMES OF POPULISM¹

Marcio Ricardo Staffen²

Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI) |

ABSTRACT

The first half of 2022 is marked by the discussion in the area of constitutionality control, in the Supreme Court (United States of America) and in the Federal Supreme Court (Brazil), of actions in which the normative standards of air pollution control are judged through the precepts of the Constitution. Both Courts recognize the material relevance of environmental protection, the need to take a stand about the challenges of climate change and the protection of the environment as a diffuse legal claim. This article aims to analyze, in view of the thematic similarity of the judgments produced, by homonymous Courts, the impact of transnational normative standards in debates and in the reasoning of decisions, considering that the countries in question are part of the same international legal agreements and have relationships deeply marked by transnationality/globalization, including an express recognition of transnationality in previous decisions. To develop this research, the comparative method was used, operationalized by the operational concept techniques, bibliographic research and jurisprudential analysis. The product of the comparative analysis performed makes

¹ Text produced from the Center for Studies on Law and Transnationality (UNIVALI/CNPq) as a result of the Summer School “Populism and the New Foreign Relations Law” at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law – Heidelberg, between June 8 and 10, 2022. Thanks to professors Anne Peters, Karen Knop, Paulo Márcio Cruz, Maurizio Oliviero and Luís Alberto Petit Guerra for the contributions and shared bibliographies. Article finished on July 10, 2022.

² PhD in Comparative Public Law from the Università degli Studi di Perugia (UNIPG). PhD and Master in Legal Science at the Universidade do Vale do Itajaí (UNIVALI). Post-Doctoral Internship in Transnational Law at UNIPG. Professor in the Master’s and PhD courses in Legal Science at UNIVALI. Visiting professor at the Dipartimento di Giurisprudenza at UNIPG. Visiting scholar at the Max Planck Institute for Comparative Public Law and International Law – Heidelberg Doctor Honoris Causa from Universidad Antonio Guillermo Urello (UPAGU). Honorary Professor at the Faculdade de Direito e Ciências Sociais da Universidad Inca Garcilaso de la Vega (UIGV). Attorney (OAB/SC). Lattes Curriculum: <http://lattes.cnpq.br/1045997125432864> / ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1334-3489> / e-mail: marcio.staffen@gmail.com

it possible to classify the decision-making pattern in the case of *West Virginia v. EPA* as completely unrelated to non-national law, while the Direct Action of Unconstitutionality no. 6,148/2019, constantly mentions transnational legal links and, in the case of regulatory omission by the Brazilian State, indicates the prevalence of World Health Organization standards.

Keywords: Constitutional Courts. Air pollution. Populism. Transnational Law.

***SUPREMAS CORTES PELOS ARES: O IMPACTO DOS PADRÕES
NORMATIVOS TRANSNACIONAIS DE CONTROLE DE
POLUIÇÃO DO AR NAS DECISÕES DA SUPREMA CORTE (EUA)
E DO SUPREMO TRIBUNAL FEDERAL (BRASIL) EM TEMPOS
DE POPULISMO***

RESUMO

*O primeiro semestre de 2022 é marcado pela discussão em sede de controle de constitucionalidade, na Suprema Corte (Estados Unidos da América) e no Supremo Tribunal Federal (Brasil), de ações em que se julgam os padrões normativos de controle de poluição do ar mediante os preceitos da Constituição. Ambas as Cortes reconhecem a relevância material da proteção ambiental, da necessidade de posicionamento ante os desafios das mudanças climáticas e a tutela do meio ambiente como pretensão jurídica difusa. O presente artigo objetiva analisar, diante da similitude temática dos julgamentos produzidos, por Tribunais homônimos, o impacto dos padrões normativos transnacionais nos debates e na fundamentação das decisões, considerando que os países em referência integram os mesmos acordos jurídicos internacionais e têm relações profundamente marcadas pela transnacionalidade/globalização, inclusive como reconhecimento expresso da transnacionalidade em decisões antecedentes. Utilizou-se, para o desenvolvimento da presente pesquisa, o método comparativo, operacionalizado pelas técnicas de conceito operacional, da pesquisa bibliográfica e de análise jurisprudencial. O produto da análise comparativa realizada permite classificar o padrão decisório do caso *West Virginia v. EPA* completamente alheio ao direito não nacional, ao passo em que a Ação Direta de Inconstitucionalidade n. 6.148/2019, constantemente*

menciona vínculos jurídicos transnacionais e, indica, no caso de omissão regulatória do Estado brasileiro, a prevalência de normas da Organização Mundial da Saúde.

Palavras-chave: Cortes Constitucionais. Poluição do Ar. Populismo. Direito Transnacional.

INTRODUCTION

Starting from the premise that constitutional norms, in addition to governing sovereign States, together with rules of International Law produce implications for transnational actors and claims, this article is dedicated to the analysis of the decision-making and persuasive reasons of the Constitutional Courts of the United States of America and of Brazil when considering the constitutionality of regulatory models on air quality and, consequently, on the environment, health and climate change.

Therefore, the function of the Courts responsible for guarding the Constitution also exceeds their territorial limits of jurisdiction, generating effects in other sovereign States, in other Constitutional Courts or in other bodies of the State itself to which they are linked in the exercise of international attributions, impacting the law's transnational performance.

In times of transnationalism, transjudicialism and the emergence of Transnational Law, the role of Constitutional Courts advances beyond the frameworks expressed in the Constitutions. In legal systems that are increasingly interdependent and permeable, in which the dividing line between public and private norms dissolves in simple confrontations, the Constitutional Courts of each sovereign State assume a leading role in the face of foreign relations law in order to impose *lato sensu* international standards and induce national governments to interact with the world, even if they hinder attempts to report or withdraw (BRADLEY, 2019).

In the opposite direction, in the wake of populist and denialist governments that refute the flows and effects of transnationalism and the emergence of Transnational Law, some manifestations of Constitutional Courts also deny and/or pass unscathed by influences that are not domestic. Therefore, before considerations that assert the monolithic and uniform version of the Constitutional Courts in times of globalization, it is necessary to make a more detailed and focused approach to the legal, political and persuasive arguments handled *in concreto*.

The first half of 2022 is marked by the discussion in the area of constitutionality control, in the Supreme Court (United States of America) and in the Federal Supreme Court (Brazil), of actions in which the normative standards of air pollution control are judged against the precepts of the Constitution. Both Courts recognize the material relevance of environmental protection, the need to take a stand about the challenges of climate change and the protection of the environment as a diffuse legal claim.

This article aims to analyze, in view of the thematic similarity of the judgments produced, by homonymous Courts, the impact of transnational normative standards in the debates and in the reasoning of decisions, considering that the countries in question are part of the same international legal agreements and have relationships deeply marked by transnationality/globalization, including an express recognition of transnationality in previous decisions.

Furthermore, the investigation is justified as a sampling of the Constitutional Courts' institutional capacity to base their decisions in scenarios marked by transnationalism and the emergence of Transnational Law, either by adopting arguments from different national spaces, or by seeking to refute the influence of foreign foundations. Following on from other research (in the pre-publication phase), this one aims to consolidate the analysis of the behavior that the jurisdiction adopts to position itself in times of global legal interdependence.

For developing this research, the inductive method was used, operationalized by the operational concept techniques, bibliographic research and jurisprudential analysis.

1 DOMESTIC LAW BEFORE INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

The consolidation of globalization as a behavior attacks the premise of the classical principle of sovereignty, according to which States are independent communities in the exercise of their *imperium*. This is the framework for the phenomenon that is immediately relevant: global, transnational, supranational and international organizations affect social interaction in States in such a way, and with such autonomy, that sovereignty cannot assume the whole construct, but make it engraved with greater complexity, especially due to the multiplication of actors and demands with which the State relates or is impacted (SASSEN, 2015).

The recurrence of events of economic, environmental, health, humanitarian, and energy crises, as well as the rise of risks arising from

the terrorist threat, accelerated the formation of polycentric clusters for managing and regulating these new manifestations. On the other hand, the accelerated development of new technologies, goods and services caused the regulation of these to come from different flows of the State.

Given this context, it becomes possible to set a standard guided much more by channels of communication and presentation of precepts endowed with greater effectiveness for each phenomenon, given its specialty. Even if, at times, juxtapositions and/or overlaps are observed, the means of communication contribute to the development of Law, if faced in a substantial way. As a consequence, the notion that normative prescriptions do not originate in formal, vertical, descending flows, in an up-down style, gains strength (STAFFEN, 2018). Political guidelines are also challenged beyond the domestic territorial space of each State and its citizens.

As a consequence, social dynamics, in addition to facing the problem of the place of production of the norm, under the aspect of national/international geography, create bases of hybridism regarding the sources of Law, its methods and its place of production in times of globalization (ARNAUD, 2007). Such movements constitute scenarios for the political tension to also be resized, with the conversion of previously hermetic borders now into zones of porosity. Therefore, doing politics nationally involves positioning oneself politically in the face of transnationality (PETERS, 2021).

Given this context, Sabino Cassese (2013) points out that such political practice is governed by the domain of networks with fluid development and variable alliances, winning the one with the greatest ability to establish direct connections with civil society. In summary: verticalized relationships mediated by the State are minimized; channels for the circulation of legal models are facilitated; and the search for analogue functionalities for previously domestic challenges is encouraged³.

In general terms, globalization promotes a radical change in the powers operating at the most diverse levels, including ideological, institutional and normative power, with the respective social interactions that are constantly finding new arrangements.

3 At the same time, Alessio lo Giudice (2011, p. 74) presents the following thesis: Quest'ultima considerazione permette un ulteriore chiarimento del concetto di postnazionalità: superamento del paradigma nazionalistico non equivale a destrutturazione degli Stati nazionali, né tanto meno equivale all'ideale istituzionale di un Superstato. Il postnazionale implica invece la costruzione di uno spazio istituzionale di unità politica che superi l'elemento nazionale come esclusivo fattore di coesione sociale. Per queste ragioni la dimensione postnazionale potrebbe rinviare alla costruzione di uno spazio pubblico entro cui articolare e sperimentare forme di solidarietà sociale denazionalizzate".

In this sense, environmental protection, with all its capillarity (natural, cultural, digital, work environment, health, climate change, etc.) (GAR-CIA, 2016), is an outstanding illustrative agenda for the clashes between domestic law and international relations. Regardless of the level of maturity of national legal treatment, international negotiations, transnational actors, local social demands and global public opinion make the defense of the environment an item of prime necessity for transnationalism that impacts national law. The recognition of the environment as a universal, diffuse and transgenerational legal asset conditions the regulation of each State according to transnational parameters, treading directions for a political unit around environmental protection due to the possibility of continuity of life on Earth.

On the other hand, this state of the art reveals the perception of the existence of Legislatures without legislators, Executives without rulers and dispute resolution without judicial courts, as Eric Posner (2009) ventilates, prompting political reactions that seek to appropriate the feeling of popular frustration and configure a new pattern of populism that, opportunistically and selectively, elects the international, transnational or global dimension as a new enemy to be fought with fiery rhetoric.

The events of the last five decades that have marked an overflow of national political and legal guidelines to transnational spaces, in the last five years have been hampered by reactionary speeches and actions that intensify a dialectic that seeks to deny international relations in the name of nationalist priorities, even if contrary to the Rule of Law, which presents itself as a new type of populism.

As ambiguous and polymorphic as the concept of populism may be, as Heike Krieger (2019) well attests, rejecting the effectiveness of international mechanisms for the legal protection of relevant goods, delegitimizing public opinion coming from the press, civil society and non-governmental organizations, seeking to counterattack the manifestations of globalization, have become common actions in States under populist governments, in the style of Trump, Salvini, Duda, Orbán and Bolsonaro.

In common, these populist governments affect the nature and function of international law at two different levels: through politics, their practices change the general environment in which norms are interpreted and, in the legal sphere, in which populist governments guide changes in the interpretation of consolidated international legal standards (KRIEGER, 2019).

It should also be noted that the agenda of populist governments

chooses classic arguments from international law to justify their actions and options, frequently resorting to discourses that praise sovereignty, non-intervention and people's self-determination. As a result, they do not just make use of the practice of "cherry picking" (KRIEGER, 2019, p. 977), but reduce International Law to useful purposes for State reasons and refute the institutions that guide the legal dimension that comprises International Law with a humanist foundation, Transnational Law and Global Law, described by part of its administration as "globalism" (ARAÚJO, 2019). In summary, the main target is not in International Law, but in the transnationalization of Law and in its global dimension, as it is seen as a threat because it relativizes the totalizing claims of production of legal norms by the State (SILVA; DERANI, 2021).

The crusade against the transnationalization of Law and against the configuration of its actors, transits through the refutation of transnational dialogue networks, through the new configurations of social representations and denial of the emergence of new Rights. In line with the precepts of Heike Krieger (2019), contemporary populism inhibits full democratic participation, excluded civil society from public debates and empties control functions, including the control of external observers.

As a consequence, populism encourages the rupture between local and global levels of politics, representation and standardization. It does so in the name of defending traditional values, defending the sovereign homeland and the originalism of its institutions with the purpose of removing the effectiveness of transnational legal precepts, delegitimizing the validity of Human Rights, attacking Democracy, discrediting the role of non-governmental organizations and transnational corporations, denying concern for the environment and climate change.

In the focused approach proposed by this article, the sphere of environmental protection is seen, by such governments, as a mere figure of a globalist elite that intends to intervene in domestic affairs, when not sabotaging the sovereign State. Environmental protection results in competitive lag in the global market. The circulation of non-governmental organizations interested in the environmental agenda is understood as a breach of national sovereignty and, as such, the presence of these institutions must be controlled. The assumption of transnational environmental protection commitments is an ideological manifestation that attacks the State.

In addition, the combination of denialist and bellicose populism against international relations and the environmental protection agenda finds an

even more complex variable, which puts environmental protection at risk, that is, the aversion to science (VENTURA; MARTINS, 2020). Populist narratives and their appeals to civil society set public opinion against science. Thus, not only are international organizations and their normative precepts attacked, but they are also forced to doubt their validity and effectiveness. With each discredit sown, a delay in environmental protection.

However, the dialectic that intensifies between transnational normative standards and national legal precepts, potentiated by populist rulers in societies that do not believe in political projects, also spreads to decisions of the respective Constitutional Courts. As a result, the courts guarding the Constitutions assume a position in the face of norms that escape the hegemony of the State, whether at a national or transnational level, as their decisions result in a paradigm for other courts and/or rulers. Constitutional Courts, in such a way, do not remain neutral in the face of the transnationalization of Law and the populist expedients of national rulers.

2 THE SUPREME COURT AND THE WEST VIRGINIA V. EPA CASE

Globalization supposes the transforming force of each national reality, capable of bringing with it an element of integration and development at the local level, which is carried out through the rules of a universal legal language, within the cultural framework of each constitutional order.

In the context of the Supreme Court of the United States of America, in matters of the environment, this perception was manifested with emphasis in the case of *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* (no. 05-1120/2007). In the dispute in which the competences of the American environmental agency to regulate greenhouse effect gas emission, air quality and terrestrial heating with sea level rise were discussed, the Supreme Court in a narrow vote decided on the duty of Environmental Protection Agency to adequately and objectively regulate the greenhouse gas emission limits and the possibility of member states of the federation to sue the Agency for its inaction or deficient protection (SCOTUS, 2007).

In his dissent, for example, Justice John Glover Roberts Jr. referred to the impossibility of judicial protection by the Supreme Court due to problems of legitimacy and ability to quantify environmental damage, given the diffuse nature of the legal interest and the conduct of China and India that it considers more harmful, therefore, it makes no sense to allow US

administrative limitations if the harmful agents are outside the limits of the Court's jurisdiction.

In the case of *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* (no. 05-1120/2007), Justice Antonin Scalia recorded divergence to, in addition to recognizing the illegitimacy of the claim, analyze the degree of uncertainty about scientific studies related to climate change and greenhouse gases, from the National Research Council and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC/WMO/UN) (SCOTUS, 2007).

For the present article, *Massachusetts v. The Environmental Protection Agency* is relevant because of the environmental issue it faces and, mainly, because of the recurrence of arguments that reflect the Supreme Court's performance in the face of transnational precepts, whether in terms of an opinion of the Court or in dissenting. Although since 1973 (*United States v. SCRAP*) the Court was already dealing with environmental law, the *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* episode is a pioneer in contextualizing environmental protection with transnational models and consequences.

Starting with the Syllabus, the Court already delimits its position towards the planetary emergency of climate change, recognizes the extent of the problem and the need for analysis at a global level, although the core of the claim lies in the normative competences of the Environmental Protection Agency.

As for the winning reasons (Opinion of the Court), nine references to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC/WMO/UN) are counted, adding to its argumentative importance for the outcome of the claim. In the judgment, the adherence by the then President Bush to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change is considered, due to the Rio-92 Convention (1992) and the standards arising from the Kyoto Protocol (1995) and how such alignments resonated in the Congress and US diplomacy.

As a product, it is possible to envision a movement by the Court towards taking a position outside the walls, constituting channels of communication and claiming transnational protagonism in environmental matters. The consolidated contrast in the Supreme Court between originalists and textualists (TRIBE; DORF, 1991) takes on new contours as it seeks to create conditions for coordination between domestic spheres (Congress, Federal Administration and Judiciary) with external commitments and claims. Even though Roberts Jr.'s vote has a consequentialist/pragmatist streak, its

prognosis expands abroad, with mentions and concerns about China and India.

In 2022, the Supreme Court again faces an agenda involving the regulatory functions of the Environmental Protection Agency and control of greenhouse gas emissions. In the case of *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency*, the provocation took place because of the powers granted by the Clean Air Act to the Environmental Protection Agency to set parameters for greenhouse gas emissions to the detriment of state legislatures and the Federal Congress. The plaintiffs (from States governed by Republicans) allege the absence of express delegation from Congress to the Agency, the disrespect for the autonomy of States and the economic consequences of regulation in the coal, oil and gas production chain.

It was up to the Justice Roberts Jr. to write The Opinion of the Court. In contrast, Justice Kagan, accompanied by Justices Breyer and Sotomayor, drew up the manifestation of disagreement. Altogether, the decision in *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* spans 89 pages in which it restricts the powers of the Environmental Protection Agency, conditioning its regulatory power to the express delegation of Congress and the defense of federalism.

In summary, this position of the Court ends up undermining the foundations of US regulatory administrative law, makes environmental protection a by-product in legal protection priorities, expands the notions of non-intervention of the State in the economy and internalization of populist discourses, as in the case of the argument of Justice Gorsuch that is based on people's opinions and their capacity to disagree or the exorbitant costs of changing the energy matrix. So much so that it uses the metaphor "hide elephants in mouseholes" to illustrate the Agency's practices (SCOTUS, 2022).

Especially for the scope of the present investigation, the argumentative and persuasive turn used by the Supreme Court in the *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* case. Preliminarily, in a system marked by the force of precedents, the absence of references to *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* in the Syllabus and Opinion of the Court is innate, ruled on similar factual and normative grounds in 2007, primarily with members of the Court in full exercise of jurisdiction in both cases. The precedent *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency* appears only in the divergence to emphasize the Agency's role and the importance of substantial environmental protection and greenhouse gas control to mitigate climate change effects.

Equally peculiar in the decision of the *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* case is the total absence of mention and/or reference to the transnational system of environmental protection, pollutants control and *lato sensu* international treaties. It silences the Supreme Court through the agreements and commitments signed by the US Government in terms of reducing greenhouse gases and reducing the earth's temperature, for example. Unlike the earlier *Massachusetts v. Environmental Protection Agency*, nothing was mentioned about the Rio 92 Convention, the Kyoto Protocol or the Climate Conferences.

Even the manifestations of dissent were silenced when substantiating their positions from external legal mechanisms, except for a single reference to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. For rhetorical purposes, the judgment was generically restricted only to a search in transnational scientific authorities, the use of expressions such as “better control system for polluting gases” and the global crisis related to the planet's warming, but this was due to dissent.

Blank slate for what is presented was the Supreme Court's intention for the *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* case for the purposes of attributing new meanings to regulatory, environmental and international law, in an unequivocal legal setback. The Court to a certain extent validated the speech of the Trump administration, as denounced by Justice Kagan (SCOTUS, 2022, p. 4) – moreover, the turnaround is due to the recomposition of the Supreme Court by appointments sponsored directly by President Trump⁴.

The Supreme Court, by limiting the authority of the Environmental Protection Agency, promoted a veritable hijacking of transnational precepts and normative influences, excluding them from their persuasive bases. From this option, it is assumed: the attempt to justify the autonomy of US law in the face of any link (optional or not) arising from transnational spaces; the proposal to ward off any “invasion” of other normative models in the Court's tradition; to correspond to the populist pressure that sees in international relations and in its legal institutions ways of decomposing the national order and its values and; the decline of cooperation and governance objectives in matters of global interest by the delegitimization of transnational law, international law and their institutions.

⁴ It is important to clarify that the winning votes were cast by all Justices appointed by presidents linked to the Republican Party, whose hegemony had been achieved in the Trump administration. The three lost votes are by J. Kagan, S. Breyer and S. Sotomayor, all appointed in Democratic administrations.

In summary, the outcome of *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency*, in addition to breaking with the force of the tradition of precedents that gives solidity to the Supreme Court, sets up a clear setback in terms of environmental protection and, notably, denies any relevance to the law when it is not produced domestically by the authorities of the United States of America. In addition to the national effects, the recent US court decision conveys a dangerous lesson to homonymous courts, as previously warned by Anne Peters (2021).

3 THE FEDERAL SUPREME COURT AND THE JUDGMENT OF THE DIRECT ACTION OF UNCONSTITUTIONALITY NO. 6.148/2019

Before discussing the judgment of the Direct Action of Unconstitutionality No. 6,148/2019, it is important to contextualize the recent Brazilian past in terms of environmental policy. The course of the last five years indicates Brazil's priority in environmental protection indicators, reduction of the effectiveness of environmental protection, repeal or relaxation of environmental norms, withdrawal or non-acceptance of international commitments, persecution of environmental activists and defenders, and recurrence of disasters resulting from man's action in nature (INPE, 2021).

Before, however, despite the extractive past that marks the construction of the Brazilian State, the last four decades and, particularly the promulgation of the Federal Constitution of 1988 and the construction of the Environmental Rule of Law, consolidated the progressive normative protection in environmental matters that put Brazil in a vanguard position and material reference for the other States, becoming clear from the Rio-92 Convention and the comparison on the constitutionalization of the environment from the Brazilian Constitution.

It turns out that such progress was not enough to ensure a change in the popular imagination that, regardless of the economic conditions of each individual or social class, usually sees in environmental protection causes for economic crises, delay in national progress, competitive damage in the external scenario, increase in production costs and inflation to the final consumer, systematization of corruption and international intervention in Brazil's domestic affairs. This scenario becomes more complex when it involves topics about indigenous peoples, traditional peoples and the Amazon rainforest.

In terms of diplomacy and international organizations, changes were clear in Brazilian behavior at the Climate Summits (COPs), in the management of the Amazon Fund and in the Free Trade Agreement between the European Union and MERCOSUR. In common, the Brazilian government denied its protective and promotional shortcomings of environmental protection and highlighted nationalist criticism of foreign countries, making personal attacks on other heads of state a reason to please their voters and a parliamentary base of support in the National Congress.

However, the biggest confrontation with the rhetoric and the populist and derogatory government measures of the Environmental Rule of Law in the Bolsonaro government are on the agenda of the Federal Supreme Court, the highest body of the Brazilian Judiciary that reconciles the competences of constitutional control with the defense of the federation.

The Federal Supreme Court focused on the Federal Government's actions against the environment as a strategy to obtain greater effectiveness and efficiency. Called the "Green Package", the seven agendas, arising mostly from the Executive under the leadership of President Bolsonaro, involve deforestation in the Amazon, limiting the autonomy of the Brazilian Institute of the Environment and Renewable Natural Resources (Ibama), standards of adequacy to the World Health Organization recommendations on air quality and the exclusion of environmental policies and being mostly under the rapporteurship of Minister Cármen Lúcia^{5,6,7,8,9,10,11}.

5 Allegation of Noncompliance with Fundamental Right no. 760/2020, demands that the government resume the Plan to Prevent and Combat Deforestation in the Amazon. The lawsuit was filed in November 2020 by the parties PSB, REDE, PDT, PT, PSOL, PCdoB and Partido Verde, in conjunction with 10 other entities in the environmental segment.

6 Direct Action of Unconstitutionality by Omission no. 54/2019, a lawsuit filed by Rede Sustentabilidade alleges unconstitutional omission by the President of the Republic, Jair Bolsonaro, and the then Minister of the Environment, Ricardo Salles, to curb the advance of deforestation in the Amazon.

7 Direct Action of Unconstitutionality no. 6,148/2019, questions Resolution 491 of the National Environment Council, which does not satisfactorily regulate acceptable air quality standards.

8 Allegation of Noncompliance with Fundamental Right no. 651/2020, asks for the declaration of unconstitutionality of a decree that does not provide for civil society participation in the National Environment Fund.

9 Allegation of Noncompliance with Fundamental Right no. 735/2020, states that a federal decree and a federal government ordinance limit Ibama's autonomy to promote inspection by defining that the Ministry of Defense coordinates Operation Verde Brasil.

10 Direct Action of Unconstitutionality by Omission no. 59/2020, questions the non-availability, by the federal government, of R\$ 1.5 billion for the Amazon Fund, which provides for environmental preservation projects.

11 Direct Action of Unconstitutionality no. 6808/2021, contests the law that provides for the automatic granting and without analysis of operating permits to environmental licensing for companies, within the National Network for the Simplification of Registration and Legalization of Companies and Businesses (Redesim).

At the beginning of the trial, Minister Cármem Lúcia maintained that the Federal Government is a “confessed defendant” in the practice of environmental transgressions. Creating a metaphor with termites, she set out that institutions are being destroyed from within. “Inefficient public policies, processes of destruction, are promoted. Clear-cutting does not destroy anymore, but what began to happen was destruction from within” (BRASIL, 2022).

In her vote, she defended the existence of an “Unconstitutional State of Things” in the actions of the Federal Government, which means that she sees generalized and systemic violations of fundamental rights and the Environmental Rule of Law, since “the ‘institutional termite infestation’ leads to the breach of structures put in place to guarantee human rights, including the rights to an ecologically balanced environment” (BRASIL, 2022).

With this position, which inaugurates the simultaneous trials, Minister Cármem Lúcia seeks to align the Court’s own precedents to recognize the constitutional limits to the actions of the Brazilian government and ensure the principle of environmental non-retrogression, compelling the federal Executive to promote environmental protection and to abstain from generalized violations, causing populism and denialism by the President of the Republic to be inhibited by the link with the Federal Constitution.

In the same sense, Minister Cármem Lúcia’s statement makes reference to the United Nations’ Agenda 2030, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Agreements signed at the Climate and Climate Change Summits, highlighting the contradictory approach taken by the Brazilian government.

The very joining of the judgments, an unusual fact in the tradition of the Federal Supreme Court, demonstrates the position of the Court before the behavior and speeches of the President of the Republic and the Parliament, which launches itself as a diplomatic agent and a provider of spaces for new governing laws of international relations, aiming to deter systematic violations of the environmental protection legal duty and the populist rhetoric of the Executive, indicating a correctional standard inherent to the Environmental Rule of Law and an institutional capacity preserved for foreign States and international organizations.

This is especially clear when analyzing the Direct Action of Unconstitutionality no. 6.148/2019, proposed by the Attorney General’s Office against the content of Resolution 491, of the National Council for the Environment. Although the contested act was produced during

President Temer's government, its inclusion in the so-called "Green Agenda" occurs due to the repeated behavior of the current government and the mischaracterization that the Council suffered by order of President Jair Bolsonaro, who replaced technical personnel with political names.

The Direct Action of Unconstitutionality no. 6,148/2019, in its initial claim, alleges the emptying of air protection, in the face of previous standards of the Council itself and, also, of the World Health Organization (WHO), seeking to insert itself in the debate about the express Brazilian abandonment of international commitments and use of precarious normative sources produced unilaterally by the Executive to regulate matters involving the right to health, access to information, social security and the environment. For these reasons, it defends the violation of the Federal Constitution and the urgency of returning to WHO standards.

It also maintains that CONAMA Resolution 491/2018 conveyed air quality standards – a component intrinsically related to the protection of fundamental rights to a balanced environment, health and life, with vague, deficient control levels that are out of step with the standards established by WHO. The contested normative act, in turn, replaced the previous one (CONAMA Resolution No. 5, of June 15, 1989), edited about 30 years ago with retrogression situations.

The point of criticism that most affected the Court was the fact that, without fixed deadlines for progress in relation to air quality criteria; and without mechanisms that operated in the implementation of these same criteria – especially in the case of omission or failure on the part of the federated entities – the model recommended by CONAMA Resolution 491/2018 proved to be incapable of generating the desired adhesion effect. Command without sanction would be emptied in its aptitude to induce conduct – and therein would lie the harm to constitutionally protected values.

The decision issued by the Constitutional Court involved the dismissal of the request for recognizing the Resolution's conformity with CONAMA's institutional competences delimited by the Constitution. However, it consigned a "determination" to the regulator to revise the rule discussed within a period of 24 months, with the objective of dealing with the matter of setting air pollution control criteria in order to include the duties of effective environmental protection, in line with the Constitution and international standards.

Afraid that CONAMA will not undertake the adjustments guided by the decision being constructed, the Plenary – at this point, driven by the

insistence of Minister Ricardo Lewandowski – decided to establish consequences for this eventual omission or delay. This led to the return to old substitutive practices, with the prediction that CONAMA’s failure to deliberate within 24 months will result in the “immediate” application of the new guidelines established by WHO.

It is necessary to point out that, in unison, even with different conclusions, all the ministers of the Federal Supreme Court in the presentation of their votes (despite pending publication) brought to the debate normative precepts deriving from transnational legal obligations. Thus, even the dissenting votes presented by ministers appointed by President Bolsonaro reported influences from abroad, signaling the persuasive impact that transnationality causes, different from what was observed in the *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* case.

Along the same lines, the current Attorney General of the Republic, Minister Augusto Aras, in his oral argument, who, when differing from his predecessor, responsible for filing the action, on repeated occasions highlighted the normative role of the World Health Organization in terms of air quality. He notes that the World Health Organization has global authority, Brazil recognizing such prevalence since 1990, when the first regulations were made, that the Ministry of the Environment replicates the Organization’s reference standards. He ends by mentioning that the World Health Organization is a “body that reaches out to the planetary community” (BRASIL, 2022).

The representative of the Attorney General’s Office also supports his arguments in defense of the constitutionality of CONAMA Resolution 491/2018 with topics arising from transnational instruments and influences. However, when considering that “it is up to governments to consider local circumstances before conforming them to a legal standard”, it is possible to see a strategy similar to the case considered in 2022 by the Supreme Court of the United States of America.

In summary, in addition to the strict control of constitutionality, in the face of such judgments, the Federal Supreme Court throws itself into the vacuum of the Brazilian Government, to constitute itself as guarantor of intergenerational legal and political obligations that cannot be set back (SARLET; FENSTERSEIFER, 2022), finding a possible institutional solution to inhibit the populism established in the current Brazilian government.

The repeated mentions of the World Health Organization, the

international commitments and obligations previously assumed by Brazil and the dynamics of globalization and global legal interests translate into behavior of the Federal Supreme Court of Brazil in importing the need to align national law with transnational norms.

By recognizing the supplementary condition of WHO standards, in case of inertia of the national Executive, the Brazilian Constitutional Court imposes a strong pattern of adoption of foreign regulatory authorities for national demands that escapes the dual system of internalization of international norms, with the purpose of safeguarding the content of the Rule of Law and mitigating possible effects of a deliberate “abandonment” of Brazil from the international system.

CONCLUSION

Populism, from the perspective of the study, is dynamic to consolidate instruments for authoritarianism and mechanisms of disruption with global flows. This is not an expedient that simply calls into question the transnational legal order as a whole. On the contrary, it moves with chameleonic purposes, taking advantage of essential concepts of classical International Law, potentiated in populism, such as the idea of national sovereignty, non-intervention and self-determination of peoples.

In this space, the Constitutional Courts enjoy new institutional attributions, which oscillate between the overvaluation of national sovereignty to the defense of non-national norms as a material reference to domestic law. Although they defend the hegemony of national law, the Courts end up inducing transnational behavior, assuming a leading role in the transnational mobilization of law.

The United States Supreme Court, in the *West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency* case, by the arguments presented, marked a clear position of denial of non-national normative grounds for determining standards on air pollution, emphasizing the idea of national sovereignty and local interest. It is a rupture that aligns with the populist discourses shaped in the recent policy of that State. Such closure demonstrates the lack of interest in cooperating at a transnational level, even if registering the situation of environmental crisis.

In Brazil, the Federal Supreme Court invokes the condition of a true bastion, or guarantor of transnational legal claims and international law as a brake on this negationist populism of International Law, covering the

prevalence of the protection of Human Rights, Democracy, the Environment and of the Rule of Law, adding, therefore, the prevalence of non-national normative standards.

However, the denialist populism of environmental protection does not only impede the effectiveness and efficacy of international, transnational and/or global legal mechanisms. To weaken the transnational legal order over sensitive and diffuse interests is to weaken Constitutional Law.

Faced with the scenario of populism and denialism through International Law and International Organizations (Public, Private and/or Transnational), associated with the movements of the National Congress, the Brazilian Constitutional Court found a domestic and emergency solution to compensate for the opposition and/or the inaction of the Brazilian State in relation to International Law and its institutions, seeking to constitute resistance from the domestic sphere so as not to deteriorate the Environmental Rule of Law and national political and legal institutions.

The Federal Supreme Court presents itself as a bastion and trench to avoid the disruption of the Brazilian State with the institutions and with the idea of the Rule of Law coming from the international, transnational and global order. It follows that the Federal Supreme Court, in the exercise of its constitutional attributions, in addition to mitigating populist leaps and preserving the assumptions of the rule of law, ensures Brazilian adherence to the collection of rights, guarantees and obligations that make up the current complex legal regime.

In the US case, it is possible to see consequences that stretch from the normative fragmentation and the federative conflict between the respective Member States, passing through the absence of substantial normative protection for the population and difficulty in adapting to the global order of public and private entities. However, there is an immediate risk that is foreseen, the mirroring of the decision-making behavior of the Supreme Court of the United States of America by other Courts, considering the exchange that exists between members of the judiciary.

REFERENCES

ARAÚJO, E. H. F. Globalismo: uma visão a partir do pensamento de Nietzsche. *Cadernos de Política Exterior*, Brasília, DF, v. 5, n. 8, p. 5-14, 2019.

ARNAUD, A.-J. *Governar sem fronteiras: entre globalização e pós-globalização*. Rio de Janeiro: Lumen Juris, 2007.

BRADLEY, C. L. What is Foreign Relations Law? In: BRADLEY, C. L. (ed.). *The Oxford Handbook of Comparative Foreign Relations Law*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019.

BRASIL. Supremo Tribunal Federal. *Ação Direta de Inconstitucionalidade n. 6.148/2019/DF*, Rel. Ministra Carmem Lúcia. Julgamento 5 maio 2022. Available from: <https://portal.stf.jus.br/processos/detalhe.asp?incidente=5707157>. Access on: Jul. 08, 2022.

CASSESE, S. *Chi governa il mondo?* Bologna: Il Mulino, 2013.

CASTELLS, M. *A sociedade em rede: a era da informação*. v. 1. 10. ed. São Paulo: Paz e Terra, 2014.

COPE, K. L.; VERDIER, P.-H., VERSTEEG, M. The global evolution of Foreign Relations Law. *American Journal of International Law*, n. 44, set. 2021.

GARCIA, D. S. S. Dimensão económica da sustentabilidade: uma análise com base na economia verde e a teoria do decrescimento. *Veredas do Direito*, Belo Horizonte, v. 13, n. 25, p. 133-153, jan./abr. 2016.

GIUDICE, A. L. *Istituire il postnazionale: identità europea e legittimazione*. Torino: G. Giappichelli, 2011.

INPE – INSTITUTO NACIONAL DE PESQUISAS ESPACIAIS. *Relatório Anual do Projeto de Monitoramento do Desmatamento na Amazônia Legal por Satélite*. Brasília, DF: INPE, 2021. Available from: <http://www.obt.inpe.br/OBT/assuntos/programas/amazonia/prodes>. Access on: Mar. 28, 2022.

KRIEGER, H. Populist governments and international law. *European Journal of International Law*, n. 30, p. 971-996, 2019.

PETERS, A. The American Law Institute's restatement of the law: bastion, bridge and behemoth. *The European Journal of International Law*, v. 32, n. 4, p. 1377-1398, 2021.

POSNER, E. A. *The perils of global legalism*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2009.

SARLET, I. W.; FENSTERSEIFER, T. Guardian of the Amazon: on the

Brazilian Supreme Court's "Climate Fund Case" decision. *Verfassungsblog*, 6 jul. 2022. Available from: <https://verfassungsblog.de/guardian-of-the-amazon/>. Access on: Jul. 08, 2022.

SASSEN, S. *Territorio, autoridad y derechos: de los ensamblajes medievales a los ensamblajes globales*. Buenos Aires: Katz, 2015.

SCOTUS – SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. *Decision n. 05-1120*. Massachusetts. Environmental Protection Agency. Massachusetts *et al.* V. Environmental Protection Agency *et al.*: Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Washington DC. 2 abr. 2007. Available from: <https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/06pdf/05-1120.pdf>. Access on: Jul. 19, 2022.

SCOTUS – SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. *Decision n. 72-535*. Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit. Washington DC. 18 jun. 1973. United States v. Students Challenging Available from: <https://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/412/669/>. Access on: Jul. 19, 2022.

SCOTUS – SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES. *Decision n. 20-1530*. Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit Washington DC. 30 jun. 2022. West Virginia v. Environmental Protection Agency *et al.* Available from: https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/21pdf/20-1530_n758.pdf. Access on: Jul. 19, 2022.

SILVA, D. S.; DERANI, C. A ordem transnacional como fator de relativização da pretensão totalizante de produção de normas jurídicas pelo Estado. *Revista Novos Estudos Jurídicos*, Itajaí, v. 2, n. 26, p. 508-529, maio/ago. 2021.

STAFFEN, M. R. Indicadores transnacionais de corrupção ambiental: a opacidade na transparência internacional. *Revista de Direito Internacional*, Brasília, DF, v. 17, n. 2, p. 352-364, ago./dez. 2020.

STAFFEN, M. R. *Interfaces do direito global*. 2. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lúmen Juris, 2018.

TASQUETTO, L. S.; RORIZ, J. H. "Deus em Davos": populismo, neoliberalismo e direito internacional no governo Bolsonaro. *Revista de Direito Internacional*, Brasília, DF v. 17, n. 2, p. 122-123, ago./dez. 2020.

TRIBE, L. H; DORF, M. *On reading the Constitution*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1991.

VERDÉLIO, A. V.; VILELA, P. R. Bolsonaro diz que novo marco da biodiversidade deve considerar crise. *Agência Brasil*, 30 set. 2020. Available from: <https://agenciabrasil.ebc.com.br/politica/noticia/2020-09/bolsonaro-diz-que-novo-marco-da-biodiversidade-deve-considerar-crise>. Access on: Jul. 19, 2022.

VENTURA, D.; MARTINS, J. Between science and populism: the Brazilian response to COVID-19 from the perspective of the legal determinants of Global Health. *Revista de Direito Internacional*, Brasília, DF v. 17, n. 2, p. 67-83, ago./dez. 2020.

WHYTOCK, C. A. Transnational judicial governance. *St John's Journal of International & Comparative Law*, v. 2, n. 1, p. 55-68, dec. 2012.

Article received on: 07/21/2022.

Article accepted on: 11/03/2022.

How to cite this article (ABNT):

STAFFEN, M. R. Supreme courts about the air: the impact of transnational normative air pollution control standards on the decisions of the Supreme Court (USA) and the Federal Supreme Court (Brazil) in times of populism. *Veredas do Direito*, Belo Horizonte, v. 19, n. 45, p. 313-333, sep./dec. 2022. Available from: <http://www.domholder.edu.br/revista/index.php/veredas/article/view/2401>. Access on: Month, day, year.