

贫困与生态环境相互关系研究述评

祁新华, 林荣平, 程 煜, 叶士琳

(福建师范大学地理科学学院, 福建 福州 350007)

摘要: 扶贫与生态环境保护作为可持续发展的重要组成部分, 已经成为全世界共同关注的焦点。然而实践中实现两者协同的案例非常鲜见, 迄今对贫困与生态环境退化相互关系的认识仍然比较模糊, 甚至还存在较大争论。围绕贫困与生态环境相互关系的理论渊源与研究脉络, 梳理了学术界关于其原因与结果的争论的不同思想流派。在此基础上, 指出目前研究的特点与趋势: 总体层面上将贫困与生态环境问题置于同一分析框架内, 微观层面上关注贫困人群并强调对其生计的保护, 宏观层面探讨全球气候变化对贫困的影响及贫困人群与扶贫政策的适应, 视角上尝试多学科交叉并推进多尺度融合。研究有助于揭示贫困与生态环境演变相互作用的内在机制, 并为中国和其他发展中国家制定协同扶贫与生态环境保护的政策提供有益借鉴。

关键词: 贫困; 生态环境; 可持续发展; 气候变化

中图分类号: K902 **文献标识码:** A **文章编号:** 1000-0690(2013)12-1498-08

贫困、生态环境退化及其相互关系问题从20世纪80年代以来就占据了主流的研究^[1]。自从1992年联合国可持续发展世界首脑会议和2002年环境与发展大会以来, 扶贫与生态环境保护作为可持续发展的重要组成部分^[2-6], 已经成为全世界共同关注的焦点^[7,8], 尤其是在发展中国家的生态脆弱区与贫困地区, 更是其核心内容与重要议程^[9]。两者在实践中相互交叉而不可分离, 这已经成为政府和学术界的广泛共识, 并期望达到脱贫与生态环境保护的最佳平衡点。遗憾的是, 残酷的现实背离了可持续发展的预期。扶贫与生态环境保护在实践中并未真正实现协同^[10,11], 许多处理贫困与环境退化问题的政策或失败或仅取得有限的成效^[12], 创造性的尝试与成功的案例非常鲜见^[6,9]。世界银行的一些专家对40个国家的扶贫战略文件的评估发现, 同时对2个议题强烈关注的只占12.5%^[13]; 世界银行的另一份报告也显示, 在扶贫与生物多样性保护项目中只有16%能同时在2个目标上有大进展^[11]。

于是, 学界与实践部门通常被2个疑问所困

扰: 为何协同扶贫与生态环境保护的成功案例寥寥无几? 为何迄今对贫困与生态环境退化相互关系的认识仍然比较模糊, 甚至还有较大的争论? 为了解答这些问题, 有必要梳理一下贫困与生态环境相互关系的研究脉络, 揭示贫困与生态环境演变相互作用的内在机制, 为发展中国家制定有效的政策提供有益借鉴。

1 研究脉络与争论焦点

1.1 研究脉络

纵观贫困与生态环境相互关系研究, 有2条比较清晰的理论渊源与研究脉络, 一是悲观主义的论调, 主要是受“贫困陷阱”与“环境库兹涅兹曲线”的影响; 二是相对乐观主义的论调, 强调技术手段进步使协同扶贫与生态环境保护成为必要与可能。

1) “贫困陷阱”的诅咒将政府置于两难境地。早在18世纪末, 贫困与生态环境问题密切相关的观点已经引起学者的注意, 并不断地被重新发现与研究^[14], 其中最著名的当属“贫困陷阱”

收稿日期: 2013-04-08; **修订日期:** 2013-07-05

基金项目: 国家自然科学基金(31000298)、国家基础科学人才培养基金项目(J1210067)、福建省自然科学基金(2011J01266)、福建省教育厅A类项目(JA10082)和福建师范大学优秀青年骨干教师培养基金(fjsdj2012071)资助。

作者简介: 祁新华(1974-), 男, 福建莆田人, 博士, 副教授。主要从事人文地理学与生态学教学研究工作。E-mail: fjqxh74@163.com

通讯作者: 程 煜, 副教授, 博士。E-mail: chengyu76@163.com

(poverty trap)。“贫困陷阱”将贫困与环境视为一个相互依赖与相互强化的螺旋下降过程^[3,15,16]。这似乎已经成为一个“诅咒”,束缚着贫困地区及生态脆弱区的发展。尽管付出了巨大的努力,发展中国家仍然饱受着贫困与生态环境退化恶性循环的困扰。政府在处理贫困与环境退化问题时,往往面临着尴尬的选择。一方面,欠发达地区的扶贫通常依赖于本地资源开发,在获得经济快速发展的同时,却由于落后的技术手段、粗放的发展模式与掠夺型的资源开发方式引发了严重的生态后果。另一方面,在实施自然保护区、生态防护林等生态环境保护工程时,由于制度设计缺陷或有限的补偿基金,在一定程度上损害了贫困人群的利益,最终导致相关项目难以达到预期目标^[17]。

2) “环境库兹涅曲线”的应验使先污染后治理成为定律。“环境库兹涅曲线”(Environmental Kuznets Curve)在工业革命后逐步在学术界广泛传播^[18]。尽管受到种种批评与质疑,但仍然受到政府与企业的追捧并成为制定政策的圭臬。“环境库兹涅曲线”将环境退化当作消除贫困一个不可逾越的阶段,认为只有当经济发达达到较高程度以后,环境退化的趋势才能得到抑制或扭转。这种理论依据极大地迎合了政府发展经济的迫切愿望,被广泛认同并付诸实践。先污染后治理的发展道路首先被工业国家所验证,并被急于摆脱贫困的发展中国家所效仿。尽管多数政府均推崇兼顾发展经济与保护生态环境的可持续发展模式,但在实践中却迫于摆脱贫困的压力而不得不将生态环境保护置于相对次要的位置。于是,区域发展往往以牺牲环境为代价。不可否认,部分国家与地方政府尝试超越“环境库兹涅曲线”的束缚,但让人沮丧的是成功的案例凤毛麟角^[19]。

3) 技术进步为协同扶贫与生态环境保护提供契机。当然,学术界也并非完全笼罩在上述悲观的氛围之下,仍有一些学者依据技术与进步,乐观地强调将消除贫困当作生态环境保护的一部分或将保护生态环境融入扶贫实践中^[10,20,21],认为统筹考虑与解决贫困与生态环境这两个问题不仅是可能的,更是紧迫的^[9]。技术进步以及相关政策调整实现了当前与未来、人与自然、环境与经济目标以及不同群体的利益的权衡(trade-off),为生物多样性保护^[10]、生态补偿^[22-24]、生态恢复与重建等^[25]提供良好的契机,并取得了一定的成效。

1.2 主要争论焦点

贫困与生态环境退化双向互动的内在因果关系历来是不同思想流派争论的焦点^[1,2]。贫困是生态环境退化的一个结果或穷人是生态环境退化受害者的观点引起许多学者的共鸣。相对于富裕家庭,贫困家庭更依赖于自然资源与环境。显然,资源环境作为重要的生计资本,其退化会导致贫困的发生或加深贫困的程度^[26-30]。然而,关于贫困是否引发生态环境退化的思想流派却大相径庭。其中一个流派将生态环境恶化过分归咎于贫困(或穷人)。事实上,相当长时间内,主流研究大都认为贫困(穷人)是生态环境退化的主要原因^[14,15]。其中最为突出的莫过于布伦特兰委员会报告(Brunntland Commission Report)中的一个结论(这个报告经常被当作生态环境保护的一个蓝本),明确提出贫困是生态环境退化的一个主要原因^[12]。另一个典型是世界银行的论点,穷人因为没有能力也不愿意投资于自然资源管理,加剧了生态环境恶化^[3]。此类观点为许多学者所支持,并被非洲与亚洲地区的诸多案例所证实^[31]。这个思想流派所引申的结果是,扶贫是有效解决环境问题的一个必要条件,欲处理生态环境问题必先处理贫困问题。这本身并无太大的问题,只是与此同时,也产生了一个不良的倾向,即穷人往往过多承担了导致生态环境退化的指责^[12]。

第二个思想流派则将生态环境退化的原因归结于相对富裕的国家、地区或人群,认为是富人或有权势的人将边缘人群逼入贫困的最初因素,进而才引发生态环境退化^[12]。例如,Leslie等明确质疑将生态环境退化归咎于穷人而忽略其他过程与作用主体的观点^[7]。尼加拉瓜山区等地的案例也证明生态环境退化的直接原因不是穷人,恰恰是非穷人的事实,并警告过度将生态环境恶化的原因归结于穷人的战略导向可能导致更严重的生态环境恶化^[32]。另外,基于微观农户调查,贫困与生态环境退化的关系更大程度上应当视为一种巧合而非“贫困陷阱”理论所描述的螺旋下降的因果关系^[33,34]。恰恰相反,许多农户能够对环境资源的主要效用作出正确的估价,并通过对自然资产的投资来刻意来改善环境资源。这个流派的观点是富裕家庭总体上使用更多的自然资源,理应承担生态环境退化的后果^[35];同时富裕人群从生态环境保护中受益更多,应当承担更多的治理费用^[36]。

第三个思想流派则秉持相对中庸的态度。他们认为贫困或生态环境退化受系列复杂因素的影响,传统的贫困与生态环境的线性关系过于简单而武断^[12]。例如,农村环境退化更多的是与外在复杂因素相关联,而非起源于贫困^[33];生态环境退化与农民生产活动密切相关(取决于他们拥有的资产类型)^[34],而与他们是否贫困或富裕并无直接联系。最典型的是经济学研究文献认为这个多维问题的简单总结经常是错误的,并且遗漏了许多重要的内容,强调了一系列复杂的重要变量(如人口、文化、制度、市场等)在贫困与生态环境退化相互关系中的综合作用^[12]。

尽管学者在关于贫困与生态环境因果关系方面已经获取了一些关键性的成果,但是总体而言,对贫困与生态环境退化(或扶贫与生态环境保护)相互作用过程与内在机制研究仍是薄弱与片面的^[37],主要体现在以下3个方面:首先,生态环境保护与扶贫两者的协同往往仅停留在理念上,在边际上权衡(trade-off)的实践中并未得到真正的重视。典型的如世界银行1990年与2000年的世界发展报告中,生态环境在消除贫困中仅作为边缘的议题,甚至是一个奢侈品(luxury)^[9]。上文中世界银行的专家对40个国家的扶贫战略文件的评估发现,尽管存在一些成功的案例,但事实上对环境问题的关注仍然是不足的^[13]。其次,尽管各自的研究成果相当丰富,但扶贫与生态环境保护的研究要么相对割裂,要么比较片面,至今鲜有统筹贫困与环境退化的系统的、深入的实证研究与探讨。这种状况导致在实践中困难重重,成效甚微^[9,34,38,39]。第三,贫困与环境问题具有显著的区域差异性,目前研究缺乏有说服力的典型案例与系统的数据支撑。例如在发展中国家,农村家庭与环境之间关系的研究往往被缺乏数据所困扰^[12],严格的将环境变量与标准家庭调查相结合的实证研究基本没有^[5]。在某种程度上,贫困与生态环境相互作用的内在机制仍然是一个未完全解开的谜,也就是说两者的相互关系研究仍是一个需要学术界广泛探讨的“大问题”(big question)^[40-44]。

2 研究热点与趋势

在不断的争论过程中,扶贫与生态环境相互关系研究逐步形成4个鲜明的特点,并成为主要趋势:

2.1 总体层面上将贫困与生态环境问题置于同一分析框架内

尽管有着各自的观点,存在着激烈的争论,甚至较大的困惑,学者对贫困与生态环境是一对多维的、复杂多变的互动过程还是有广泛的共识。当前的研究试图超越“贫困陷阱”与“环境库兹涅兹曲线”的传统预期^[25],采用更加整体和客观的方法,在同一分析框架内探讨贫困与生态环境退化的过程与内在机制,寻求不同发展阶段的生态环境和经济代价在边际上的权衡(trade-off),并在贫困的生态环境效应、生态环境退化对贫困的影响等方面取得关键性的成果,尤其是在可持续发展的原则下,探讨扶贫与生态环境保护协同的模式与机制方面取得了重要的进展^[45]。源自非洲、亚洲与拉丁美洲等地30多个实证研究表明,尽管不是刻意设计而且案例呈现多样化,但贫困与生态环境一致呈现强烈的相关性,将其置于同一分析框架内有助于理解贫困与生态环境退化相互作用的过程与机制^[46]。

2.2 微观层面上强调对贫困人群的关注与保护

生态环境保护与经济社会福利是互补的,这种密切联系在特别依赖于自然资源开发的农村地区的贫困家庭非常重要(依赖于自然资源可能占收入的40%)^[35]。在传统研究中,他们往往成为受到忽视或损害的弱势群体,而当前研究中,保护与尊重贫困人群的利益成为共识,强调只有贫困社区被视为利益相关者而不仅仅是破坏者或受害者,改善环境的努力才能成功^[33],消除贫困的目标才有可能实现。因为只有当贫困人群感觉到环境保护项目是有价值的,收益与损失是可接受的,他们才会积极参与项目中。其中最为关键的是保护穷人的生计。例如,在生物多样性与资源保护方面,各国均认同有必要协同旨在维持本地居民生计的扶贫战略^[47]。相反,如果缺乏有效的制度设计和长效的激励机制,受环境项目影响的贫困农民为了生存,不得不绕开环保的规定,很可能被迫恢复他们原先的行为方式,这样即破坏了环境又无济于脱贫^[48]。

2.3 宏观层面上重视全球气候变化对贫困的影响及其适应

有令人信服的科学证据表明,一个世纪以来,温室气体增加导致全球气候变暖^[49]。尽管考虑到影响本身的不确定性、区域的差异性以及人类适

应潜力,气候变化(包括全球变暖、极端天气等)对贫困的影响效果是相对的^[50],还不足以逆转贫困的发生趋势^[51,52]。但是气候变化仍被认为在全球范围内放缓扶贫的步伐,并与脆弱性问题联结而对扶贫产生严重的挑战^[53-57]。欠发达国家与贫困人群面临的挑战尤为紧迫与严峻。因为发展中国家更依赖于农业和其他气候敏感的资源以获得收入和财富,他们缺乏必要的财政支持与技术能力来应对不断增加的气候风险^[53]。尽管他们对引发全球变化的作用最小,却要承担最重的后果^[52,58]。同时,气候变化的影响是累退的,也就是说对贫困人群的影响大于富裕人群的影响。气候变化很可能增加本来已经比较脆弱的贫困人群,从而引发对发展中国家贫困的发生率、严重程度与持久性的担忧^[53]。在宏观层面,全球气候变化与贫困人群的相互作用过程及机制引发了学者的强烈兴趣。一方面,是关于气候变化对贫困或贫困人群的影响。目前的研究方法主要有2个,一是在经济增长模型中纳入气候变化的影响,以模拟未来若干年内不同情景下气候变化对贫困的影响程度。例如,一项研究预测,至2100年气候变化会在南亚与非洲撒哈地区分别增加1 200万与2 400万贫困人口^[59]。二是通过特定行业的渠道,获得气候变化对贫困的影响程度、类型等^[53]。其中最为突出的是气候变化对农业的影响^[60-62]。尽管具有显著的区域差异性,但从长远来看,总体上是负面的^[63,64]。另一方面,对气候变化的适应也成为研究的热点之一。消除贫困是政府与政府间组织长期以来的目标,而气候变化则是近年来才出现的目标。大家公认正是由于气候变化的不可避免性,适应才成为必要。各国政府已经开始适应性的计划,但相关的努力仍处于初期阶段^[65],成效也相当有限^[57]。值得注意的是,相关研究也强调本地社区并不全是被动的受害者,而是积极地参与到改变现状的努力中。很多文献报道了农户通过风险管理策略来保护他们自身的财富^[53],例如采取收入调整与组合投资策略^[66]、储蓄^[67]、贷款^[68]、资产变现^[69]或家庭成员的职业多元化^[70]、让孩子休学上班^[71]等来应对与适应气候变化。

2.4 研究视角上尝试多尺度与多学科交叉融合

无论是生态环境退化还是贫困问题,均存在于不同尺度,从个人、家庭、社区、地区、国家乃至全球均有不同的表现形式与特点。与此同时,贫

困与生态环境之间的关系是多维、复杂的^[10],有可能也有必要在不同的尺度上进行探讨。除了上文所述的微观的个人或家庭角度以及宏观的全球视角外,从省域与地区的角度探讨贫困与环境相互关系的研究也较为常见,但在更小的次区域(如县域与乡镇)的研究则相当少^[6]。仅以气候变化中温度上升对贫困的影响为例,就存在多尺度的研究。对134个国家的统计数据显示,温度每上升1℃,人均GDP下降8.9%;国家内部的差异没有如此悬殊,但温度每上升1℃,人均GDP下降1.2~1.9%;温度上升导致人均GDP下降还体现于社区尺度上,并被拉丁美洲5个国家的案例所证实^[72]。与些同时,研究视角更趋于多样化。传统的经济学、环境学或生态学依然将其作为各自的重点领域,其他学科也开始涉及相关问题,并体现出各自独特的优势,如生物学关于生态环境演变的机理与影响问题;心理学关于认知与风险感知的问题;神学关于宿命与信仰的问题;政治学关于民主、利益与权力的问题等。同样以全球气候变化与贫困的相互作用为例,交叉学科研究方法已经成为一个新的趋势。对全球变化的适应已经成为地理学的一个重要主题,地理学者统筹考虑宏观背景的具体地域分析方法对全球变化适应贡献很大^[73]。人文地理学的人地关系视角在探讨贫困与生态环境相互作用时具有不可比拟的优势。最近人文地理学进展论坛(Progress in Human Geography Forum)就探讨了环境决定论的危险性^[74]。社会科学则将气候变化以及相关的适应与缓解过程视作社会过程,认为社会分层、社会隔离也会影响到环境变化的干预与过程^[75,76]。政府间气候变化小组等机构也曾呼吁加强社会科学对气候变化的研究,以加深对贫困与环境变化的相互作用机制的理解^[49]。

3 政策启示

当务之急是如何将贫困与生态环境退化相互作用的知识转化为扶贫与生态环境保护协同的政策与实践^[77]。这对经受生态环境退化与贫困困扰的当今中国尤为紧迫与重要:一方面中国面临着巨大的生态环境挑战,在接受评估的142个国家中,中国的环境可持续性位于第129位,仅高于尼日利亚(考虑发展阶段可比性)^[78]。另一方面,尽管中国在扶贫上取得举世瞩目的成就,是第一个提前实现联合国千年发展目标贫困人口减半的发展

中国家^[79]。然而中国毕竟是个发展中国家,贫困人口基数依然很大,2011 年人均收入低于每天 1 美元的仍有 1.28 亿,占农村人口的 19.2 %^[80]。因此,政策干预必然要兼顾扶贫与环境改善。

1) 将提高穷人生计与保护生态环境置于同等地位。在处理贫困与生态环境问题的相互关系时,要避免两个不可持续的极端,即牺牲环境换取发展,或以保护生态环境为名损害贫困人群的利益。有效的政策设计要将保护穷人生计与生态环境置于同等重要的地位。而提高贫困人群的生计资本(包括人力资本、自然资本、社会资本、物质资本与金融资本等)是生态环境保护的最终目标^[26,81]。

2) 尊重与保护不同主体的利益。扶贫与生态环境保护是一项复杂的系统工程^[82],不仅需要科学合理的干预政策,更需要多方主体的积极参与,不同利益主体(政府、民众、企业、NGOs)的积极参与是政策能否取得成功的关键。然而,在贫困与环境退化相互关系中不同利益主体的角色往往是冲突的^[12]。要尊重不同利益主体的利益诉求,有效引导与规范他们的资源利用方式,避免引发负面的生态环境后果或产生“生态致贫”现象。

3) 重视政策在不同区域不同尺度的适用性。不同区域的贫困与环境问题的差异很大,全面理解与处理他们的关系必须基于特定的区域背景^[6]。与此同时,贫困与环境问题发生在不同的尺度,而且产生原因、表现形式差异悬殊,相互之间的作用机制也各不相同,因此需要针对性的解决方法与途径。政策应当是适用于具体的区域而非放之四海而皆准^[83]。在制度设计过程中,要在可持续发展的框架内,制定出符合区域特点的扶贫与环境保护政策,促进两者之间的良性循环。

参考文献:

- [1] Bryant R L. Beyond the impasse: the power of political ecology in Third World [J]. Environmental Research Area, 1997, **29**(1): 5-19.
- [2] Lele S M. Sustainable development: a critical review [J]. World Development, 1991, **19**(6): 607-621.
- [3] World Bank. World development report 1992 in development and the environment [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- [4] Forsyth T, Leach M, Scoones I. Poverty and environment: Priorities for research and policy: an overview study [R]. Prepared for the United Nations Development Programme and European Commission. Institute of Development Studies, Falmer, Sussex BN1 9RE, UK, 1998.
- [5] Osuntogun A. Applied poverty-environment indicators: the case of Nigeria [R]. Report Submitted to the Environment Department, World Bank, Washington D C, 2002.
- [6] Dasgupta S, Deichmann U, Meisner C, et al. Where is the poverty-environment nexus? Evidence from Cambodia, Lao PDR, and Vietnam [J]. World Development, 2005, **33**(4): 617-638.
- [7] Leslie C G, William G M. A geographical perspective on poverty- environment interactions [J]. The Geographical Journal, 2005, **171**(1): 9-23.
- [8] Sachs J D, Reid W V. Investments toward sustainable development [J]. Science, 2006, **312**(5776):1002.
- [9] David R. Poverty and the environment: can unsustainable development survive globalization?[J] Natural Resources Forum, 2002, **26**(3):176-84.
- [10] Adams W M, Aveling R, Brockington D, et al. Biodiversity conservation and the eradication of poverty [J]. Science, 2004, **306**(5699): 1146-1149.
- [11] Tallis H, Kareiva P, Marvier M, et al. An ecosystem services framework to support both practical conservation and economic development [J]. Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2008, **105**(28): 9457-9464.
- [12] Duraipappah A K. Poverty and environmental degradation: A review and analysis of the nexus [J]. World Development, 1998, **26** (12): 2166-2179.
- [13] Bojő J, Reddy R C. Poverty reduction strategies and environment: A review of 40 interim and full poverty reduction strategy papers [R]. Washington D C, World Bank, 2002.
- [14] Malthus T. An essay on the principle of population: as it effects the future improvement of society: with remarks on the speculation of Mr. Godwin, M. Condorcet, and other writers [M]. London: J Johnson, 1798.
- [15] World Commission on environment and development. Our common future [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987.
- [16] Bhattacharya H, Innes R. Income and the environment in rural India: Is there a poverty trap? [R]. Part of the UC Center for Energy and Environmental Economics Working Paper Series, 2011.
- [17] Cao S X. Impact of China's large-scale ecological restoration program on the environment and society in arid and semiarid areas of China: Achievements, problems, synthesis, and applications [J]. Critical Reviews in Environmental Science and Technology, 2011: **41**(4):317-335.
- [18] Stern D I, Common M S, Barbier E B. Economic growth and environmental degradation: The environmental Kuznets Curve and sustainable development [J]. World Development, 1996, **24** (7): 1151-1160.
- [19] Stern D I. The rise and fall of the environmental Kuznets Curve [J]. World Development, 2004, **32**(8): 1419-1439.
- [20] Ehrlich P R. Intervening in evolution: Ethics and actions [J].

- Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 2001, **98**(10): 5477-5480.
- [21] Hunter L M, Toney M B. Religion and attitudes toward the environment: A comparison of Mormons and the general U.S. population [J]. *Social Science Journal*, 2005, **42**(1): 25-38.
- [22] Moseley W G. Environmental degradation and "poor" smallholders in the West African Sudano-Sahel: global discourses and local realities[C]//Moseley W G, Logan B I. *African environment and development: rhetoric, programmes, realities*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing, 2004: 41-62.
- [23] Graff G, Roland-Holst D, Zilberman D. Agricultural biotechnology and poverty reduction in low-income countries [J]. *World Development*, 2006, **34**(8): 1430-1445.
- [24] Mabogunje A L. Tackling the African "poverty trap": The Ijebu-Ode experiment [J]. *Proceeding of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2007, **104**(43): 16781-16786.
- [25] Cao S X, Zhong B L, Yu H, et al. Development and testing of a sustainable environmental restoration policy on eradicating the poverty trap in China's Changting County [J]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2009, **106**(26): 10712-10716.
- [26] Sen A. *Poverty and Famines: An essay on entitlement and deprivation* [M]. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981.
- [27] Logan B I, Moseley W G. The political ecology of poverty alleviation in Zimbabwe's Communal Areas Management Programme for Indigenous Resources (CAMPFIRE) [J]. *Geoforum*, 2002, **33**(1): 1-14.
- [28] Swinton S M, Quiroz R. Is poverty to blame for soil, pasture and forest degradation in Peru's Altiplano? [J] *World Development*, 2003, **31**(11): 1903-1919.
- [29] Vinicius M, Finco A. Poverty-environment trap: A non linear probit model applied to rural areas in the north of Brazil [J]. *American-Eurasian Journal of Agricultural & Environmental Science*, 2009, **5**(4): 533-539.
- [30] Milbourne P. The geographies of poverty and welfare [J]. *Geography Compass*, 2010, **4**(2): 158-171.
- [31] Fairhead J, Leach M. *Misreading the African landscape: society and ecology in a forest-savanna mosaic* [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- [32] Ravnborg H M. Poverty and environmental degradation in the Nicaraguan Hillsides [J]. *World Development*, 2003, **31**(11): 1933-1946.
- [33] Prakash S. Poverty and environment linkages in mountains and uplands: Reflections on the "Poverty Trap" thesis [R]. CREED Working Paper No 12, 1997.
- [34] Agudelo C, Rivera B., Tapasco J, et al. Designing policies to reduce rural poverty and environmental degradation in a hillside zone of the Colombian Andes [J]. *World Development*, 2003, **31**(11): 1921-1931.
- [35] Cavendish W. Empirical regularities in the poverty-environmental relationship of rural household: evidence from Zimbabwe [J]. *World Development*, 2000, **28**(11): 1799-2003.
- [36] Pagiola S, Arcenas A, Platais G. Can payments for environmental services help reduce poverty? [J] *An Exploration of the Issues and the Evidence to Date from Latin America*, 2005, **33**(2): 237-253.
- [37] Ekbohm A, Boj  J. Poverty and environment: Evidence of links and integration into the country assistance strategy process (Discussion Paper No. 4) [R]. Environment Group, Africa Region, and the World Bank, 1999.
- [38] Timothy J D. A systematic integrated approach for crafting poverty reduction and sustainable development projects [J]. *Natural Resources Forum*, 2007, **31**(1): 35-50.
- [39] Hengsdijk H, Wang G H, Marrit M, et al. Poverty and biodiversity trade-offs in rural development: A case study for Pujiang County, China [J]. *Agricultural Systems*, 2007, **94**(3): 851-861.
- [40] Kates R W. The human environment: the road not taken, the road still beckoning [J]. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 1987, **77**(4): 525-534.
- [41] Scherr S. A downward spiral? Research evidence on the relationship between and natural resource degradation [J]. *Food Policy*, 2000, **25**(4): 479-498.
- [42] Cutter S L, Gollidge R, Graf W L. The big questions in geography [J]. *The Professional Geographer*, 2002, **54**(3): 305-317.
- [43] Scandrett E. Poverty and the environment: environmental justice. In: *poverty in Scotland 2011: towards a more equal Scotland?* [M] Glasgow: CPAG, 2011: 190-195.
- [44] Ravallion M. Why don't we see poverty convergence? [J] *American Economic Review*, 2012, **102**(1): 504-523.
- [45] Carr E R, Kettle N P, Hoskins A. Evaluating poverty-environment dynamics [J]. *International Journal of Sustainable Development & World Ecology*, 2009, **16**(2): 87-93.
- [46] Wilbanks T K, Kates R W. Global change in local place: how scale matters [J]. *Climatic Change*, 1999, **43**(3): 601-628.
- [47] Kates R W, Dasgupta P. African poverty: A grand challenge for sustainability science [J]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2007, **104**(43): 16747-16750.
- [48] Bo rner J, Mendoza A, Vosti S A. Ecosystem services, agriculture, and rural poverty in the Eastern Brazilian Amazon: Interrelationships and policy prescriptions [J]. *Ecological Economics*, 2007, **64**(2): 356-373.
- [49] IPCC. *Climate change 2007: The physical science basis. Contribution of working group I to the fourth assessment report* [R]. Geneva, Switzerland, 2007.
- [50] Ahmeda S A, Diffenbaugh N S, Hertel T W, et al. Climate volatility and poverty vulnerability in Tanzania [J]. *Global Environmental Change*, 2011, **21**(1): 46-55.
- [51] Nordhaus W. Economic aspects of global warming in a post-copenhagen environment [J]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, 2010, **107**(26): 11721-11726.

- [52] Stern N. The Economics of climate change: The stern review [M]. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.
- [53] Skoufias E, Rabassa M, Olivieri S. The poverty impacts of climate change: A review of the evidence [R]. Policy Research Working Paper for the World Bank, Poverty Reduction and Equity Unit, 2011.
- [54] Baez J, Mason A. Dealing with climate change: Household risk management and adaptation Latin America. background chapter for low carbon, high growth: Latin American responses to climate change, 2008 [R]. World Bank, Washington, D C, 2008.
- [55] World Bank. Natural hazards and unnatural disasters: The economics of effective prevention [R]. Washington, D C, 2010.
- [56] Brown K, Eriksen S. Sustainable adaptation to climate change [J]. *Climate and Development*, 2011, **3** (1):3-6.
- [57] Rayner S, Malone E L. Climate change, poverty, and intragenerational equity: the national level [J]. *International Journal of Global Environmental Issues*, 2001, **1**(2):175-202.
- [58] Dow L, Kasperson R E, Bohn H. Exploring the social justice implications of adaptation and vulnerability[C]//Adger W N, Paavola J, Huq S, et al. Fairness in adaptation to climate change. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2006:79-96.
- [59] Anderson E. Potential impacts of climate change on \$2 a day poverty and child mortality in sub-saharan Africa and South Asia [R]. Overseas Development Institute, UK, 2006.
- [60] Lobell D B, Field C B, Cahill K N, et al. Impacts of future climate change on California perennial crop yields: model projections with climate and yield uncertainties [J]. *Agricultural Forest Meteorology*, 2006, **141**(2-4), 208-218.
- [61] White M A, Diffenbaugh N S, Jones G V, et al. Extreme heat reduces and shifts United States premium wine production in the 21st century [J]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 2006, **103**(30): 11217-11222.
- [62] Mendelsohn R, Basist A, Dinar A, et al. What explains agricultural performance: climate normals or climate variance? [J] *Climate Change*, 2007, **81**(1): 85-99.
- [63] Cline W. Global Warming and Agriculture: Impact estimates by country [R]. Center for Global Development and Peterson Institute for International Economics, Washington D C, 2007.
- [64] Hertel T, Rosch S. Climate change, agriculture and poverty [J]. *Applied Economics Perspectives and Policy*, 2010, **32**(3): 355-385.
- [65] Farber D A. The challenge of climate change adaptation: learning from national planning efforts in Britain, China, and the USA [J]. *Journal of Environmental Law*, 2011, **23**(3): 359-382.
- [66] Rosenzweig M, Binswanger H. Wealth, weather risk and the composition and profitability of agricultural investments [R]. Technical Department, Latin America and the Caribbean, the World Bank, 1992.
- [67] Paxson C. Using weather variability to estimate the response of savings to transitory income in thailand [J]. *American Economic Review*, 1992, **82**(1): 15-33.
- [68] Udry C. Risk and insurance in a rural credit market: An empirical investigation in Northern Nigeria [J]. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 1994, **61**(3): 495-526.
- [69] Deaton A. Understanding consumption, carendon lectures in economics [M]. Oxford : Oxford University press, 1992.
- [70] Menon N. Rainfall uncertainty and occupational choice in agricultural households of rural Nepal [J]. *Journal of Development Studie*, 2009, **45**(6): 864-888.
- [71] Jacoby H, Skoufias E. Risk, financial markets, and human capital in a developing country [J]. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 1997, **64**(3): 311-35.
- [72] Dell M, Jones B, Olken B. Temperature and income: Reconciling new Cross-sectional and panel estimates [J]. *American Economic Review*, 2009, **99**(2): 198-204.
- [73] Pelling M, Manuel-Navarette D. From resilience to transformation: The adaptive cycle in two Mexican urban centers [J]. *Ecology and Society*, 2011, **16**(2): 11-21.
- [74] Radcliffe S, Watson E E, Simmons I, et al. Environmentalist thinking and/in geography [J]. *Progress in Human Geography*, 2010, **34**(1): 98-116.
- [75] Osborne T. Carbon forestry and agrarian change: access and land control in a Mexican Rainforest [J]. *Journal of Peasant Studies*, 2011, **38** (4):859-883.
- [76] Anderson E, Zeriffi H. Global carbon, local development: carbon credits and smallholder agroforestry programs in Uganda [R]. Paper presented at the Association of American Geographers Annual Meeting, Seattle, WA, 2011.
- [77] Scarborough V L. How to interpret an ancient landscape [J]. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 2003, **100**(8): 4366-4368.
- [78] Liu J, Diamond J. China's environment in a globalizing world: how China and the rest of the world affect each other [J]. *Nature*, 2005, **435**: 1179-1186.
- [79] 中共中央, 国务院. 中国农村扶贫开发纲要(2011~2010年) [R]. 北京, 2011.
- [80] 中国科学院可持续发展战略研究组. 中国可持续发展战略报告 2012 [M]. 北京: 科学出版社, 2012.
- [81] 张大维. 生计资本视角下连片特困区的现状与治理——以集中连片特困地区武陵山区为对象 [J]. *华中师范大学学报(人文社会科学版)*, 2011, **50**(4): 16~23.
- [82] 蔡运龙, 蒙古军. 退化土地的生态重建: 社会工程途径[J]. *地理科学*, 1999, **19** (3): 198~204.
- [83] Lamb D, Erskine P D, Parrotta J A. Restoration of degraded tropical forest landscapes [J]. *Science*, 2005, **310**(5754): 1628-1632.

The Review of the Relationship Between Poverty and Environment

QI Xin-hua, LIN Rong-ping, CHENG Yu, YE Shi-lin

(School of Geographical Sciences, Fujian Normal University, Fuzhou, Fujian 350007, China)

Abstract: As two essential parts of sustainable development, the poverty alleviation and environmental protection have become the focuses around the world. However, there are few successful attempts that aimed to integrate the economic and environmental objectives in practice. The knowledge of the relationship between the poverty and environmental degradation is still obscure and sometimes in debate so far. Historically, there are two theoretical origins on the relationship between poverty and environment. One is the some of pessimism affected by poverty trap and Environmental Kuznets Curve, which regards poverty and environmental degradation as a downward spiral or a mutually reinforcing vicious cycle. The other is the relatively optimistic argument, which emphasizes the possibility of integrating poverty alleviation and environmental protection due to the progress of technology. There are many debates about the causality of the poverty and environmental degradation, despite most scholars agreed that poverty is one of the consequences and the poor are the victims of environmental degradation. However, there are wide differences among varied schools on whether environment degradation was caused by poverty or not. The first school attributed the environmental degradation to poverty or the poor. On the contrary, the second school attributed environmental degradation to the relatively wealthy country, region or the rich. The third school seems to integrate the former two schools and argued that poverty and environmental degradation were affected by varied factors and the conventional linear relationship is too simple and arbitrary. Based on it, it is concluded that there are four characteristics and trends about the research, i.e., putting the poverty and environment into one analytical framework on the whole, focusing on the poor and emphasizing their livelihoods at the micro level, exploring the impact of climate change on poverty and its adaptation at the macro level, and promoting the interdisciplinary and multi-scale fusion from various perspective. This study aims to help to disclose the intrinsic mechanism of the relationship between poverty and environment. At the same time, there are important policy implications to China and other developing countries. Firstly, when the policy of poverty alleviation and environmental protection, the livelihoods of the poor must be treated as important as the environment so as avoid two extreme, i.e., developing at the expense of the environment or damaging the poor's interests in the name of environmental protection is designed. Secondly, the benefits of different stakeholders such as the government, the public, the enterprise and the NGOs must be carefully respected and protected. Thirdly, the policy applicability of different scales must be comprehensively understood basing on the specific regional context. Fourthly, some hotspot areas, such as the ecologically fragile zones and the contiguous poverty-stricken areas in China must be recognized and given more assistance.

Key words: poverty; environment; sustainable development; climate change