

North vs South in the Climate Change Debate

Antto Vihma

Finland Futures Research Centre

Landmarks

- 1972 Stockholm [UNCHE]
- 1992 Rio de Janeiro [UNCED]
- 2002 Johannesburg [WSSD]

“We do not wish to impoverish the environment any further and yet we cannot for a moment forget the grim poverty of large numbers of people. Are not poverty and need the greatest polluters?”

- PM Indira Gandhi, Stockholm 1972

1972 - 2009

- South: from contestation to participation to engagement?
- Demise of the North vs South frame?
- Sustainable Development?

- 1992 Framework Convention on Climate Change [UNFCCC]
- 1995 Berlin Mandate
- 1997 Kyoto Protocol [KP]
- 2007 Bali Action Plan [BAP]
- 2009 Copenhagen? "A greed outcome"?

The South: Common elements

- Framing: development vs. the environment
 - Indira Gandhi 1972 in Stockholm
 - Development is the first and overriding priority of developing country parties (Article 4.7 of the UNFCCC)
- Developed countries must take the lead and recognise their responsibility
 - Reduce 20-40% of 1990 emissions before 2020
- New and additional financing
 - CDM, public funds, technology transfer

Argumentation

- **Historic responsibility of the North**
 - 1992 UNFCCC: historic emissions in the preamble
 - Case India: 5,5 % of global GHG emissions, ~2% historically
- **Per Capita emissions**
 - US 23,5; OECD 14,1; China 5,5; India 1,7 tCO₂e (WRI 2005)
- **Common but Differentiated Responsibilities**
 - 1990-1992: "Common responsibility" vs "Major responsibility"
 - 1992 UNFCCC: semantic compromise

The G77 perspective

- Major developing countries annoyed over being labelled "Major Emitters"
 - Cumulative emissions
 - Per Capita emissions
- Developed countries have not "taken the lead"
 - US emissions are far from 1990, returning maybe by 2016?
 - Transition economies excluded, developed world has increased its emissions 11% between 1990-2005
 - Technology transfer?
- The unfinished development agenda is not sufficiently understood
 - "China and India", "Chindia", "Emerging economies"...

Southern (elite) perspectives

- **Hard liners – it is our turn now!**
 - Climate governance is a geopolitical threat from the North
 - We must slow down and stonewall all Southern action
- **Realists – developing countries should act nationally**
 - Developing countries face no international requirements, but national interest is to favor development with climate co-benefits
- **Internationalists – cease the moment!**
 - Not only CBDR, but CBDR + effectiveness
 - Domestic actions and international process are connected
 - South should show leadership (South Africa)

Southern (elite) perspectives

- Increased public deliberation – f.e. a healthy internal debate in India
- CDM has influenced the views of business actors – language of opportunities is also present
- Governance of international funds is important
 - Deep mistrust towards GEF and WB
- Sectoral cooperation? Linking unilateral action to international process?
 - BAP 1 (b) ii; the MRV of the NAMAs

Copenhagen: the post-2012

- Quantified emission reduction commitments by the North
- Nationally appropriate mitigation action by the South
- New and additional finance from the North
- Governance of the new and additional funding

Thank you

`antto.vihma@tse.fi`