Climate-change Mitigation & Green Economy: About Myths, the Basic Arithmetic of Growth and Inconvenient Developmental Truths



2011 Freiburg Forum on Environmental Governance 25 February 2011 Presentation by Ulrich HOFFMANN UNCTAD secretariat





Climate Change: Understanding the Challenge

- Limiting global warming to 2°C: requires absolute GHG emission cuts of 50% (in DgCs) to 85% (in DdCs)
 - Kyoto Protocol committed 37 DdOs to 5.2% GHG emission reductions by 2012 relative to 1990; yet, global emissions increased by 40%
- Should be achieved by fundamental shift towards GE
- Three key thrusts:
 - Material/energy/resource efficiency revolution
 - Fundamental shift in energy mix towards renewable energy
 - All too often forgotten: Fundamental transformation of agriculture
 - In essence, what is required is a Decoupling of economic growth from material/energy/resource use, but in absolute, not only relative terms
 - Those who promote decoupling need to take a closer look at the historical evidence, the basic antihine to grown, and development

Key Arguments on Climate Change and Green Economy

- Green Economy (GE) is without alternative; can effectively address a number of acute environmental problems; can create new "green" growth areas; and might slow down GHG emission growth. But achieving a significant absolute (permanent and global) decline of GHG emissions is a different ballgame.
- Current hype about GE may give false hope about real CC mitigation requirements; might underplay the seriousness of the situation; and might lead to excuses for doing nothing really fundamental.
- As Tim Jackson put it in his book *Prosperity without Growth*: "The climate may just turn out to be the Mother of all Limits" raises some key systemic issues of our growth model.
 - Time constraint is an increasingly important factor.
 - Understanding the seriousness of the challenge, its magnitude, complexity and that there are no easy (techno) fixes.
 - As yet there is no vision of an economy that allows continual UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT consumption growth based on absolute decoupling.

Conceptual Underpinnings of De-coupling



What makes the Green Economy myth questionable?

GE has potential for a relative decoupling, the creation of new "less GHGintensive" growth poles, but may well fall (far) short of effectively delivering on absolute decoupling:

Main reasons:

- Technical feasibility limits
- Governance and market constraints
- Systemic limits

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT



Technical Feasibility Limits

- Colossal scale of required GHG emission cuts in a historically very short
 period of time (see chart)
- Efficiency gains and ample availability of cheap renewable energy-willencourage "rebound effect"
- Extremely challenging to completely replace fossil fuel
- Peak oil may push into the coal trap
- Agricultural transformation is a major challenge





Governance and Market Structure Limits

- International climate governance regime is wanting.
- Unprecedented absolute, permanent and global GHG emission reductions require clear vision, a sound strategy and consistent implementation of mitigation measures – yet, in practice we are far from that.
- Not even the recent financial and economic crisis was seized as "turning point" (even during the crisis global material/energy/resource use increased, mainly driven by growth in rapidly industrializing countries).
- To set different incentives, a modification of the measurement of economic performance and resulting prosperity would be required.
- Externalization of environmental costs and perverse subsidies fundamental part of capitalist market economy.
- Market concentration a major complicating factor for effective deployment of new technology (e.g. biased approaches to renewable energy and in agriculture). NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

C

Systemic Limits

- Inherent conflict: Shift from dominating growth paradigm to "the limits-ofgrowth paradigm" (once marginal growth becomes uneconomic, it makes us poorer, not richer).
- Capitalist system cannot operate without "profit" growth (or in a contracting economy), which drags along physical growth.
- Expand or perish: competition for reducing costs; launching new products all lead to more, not less physical production/consumption.
- To assure social stability, growth should outperform labour productivity increase of 1.5% annually (on top, global population increase of 50%).

Can development be really largely based on "dematerialized and labourintensive" activities? (not without drastically changing relative costs of labour and materials)

Am I too pessimistic, underestimating the innovation, adaptive and flexibility capacity of capitalism?

Some Inconvenient Developmental Truths

- What "development space" for economically and socially catching up with developed countries does climate change still leave? (impossible to follow the Kuznets curve)
- Those who have contributed least to CC will be hit first and foremost.
- Particularly dramatic will be the impact on agriculture, food security and access to cropland and water.
- Huge migration movements.
- Large chunks of trade infrastructure are in coastal zones.
- Mounting scarcity of a number of strategically
 - important commodities.
 - The ecological U-turn will increasingly become an issue of global justice and international security.

UNITED NATIONS CONFERENCE ON TI



THANK YOU Electronic Versions can be downloaded from: 009/2010 NVIRONMENT REVIEW Promoting poles of clean growth to foster the transition to a more www.unctad.org/Templates/Page. asp?intItemID=1717&lang=1 For further info, please contact: ulrich.hoffmann@unctad.org Agriculture at the Crossroads: aranteeing Food Security in a Changing Global Climate BRI (\underline{a}) ON TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT