

Foreword

Copenhagen summit has resulted in belied expectations. In view of the Kyoto Protocol running out in 2012 a new climate protocol was urgently needed. At the conference in Copenhagen 2009 the parties of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) were supposed to meet for the last time on government level to renew the climate agreement. Therefore the Climate Conference in Copenhagen was essential for the world's climate paving way for "Copenhagen Protocol" to prevent global warming and climate changes. But the result of the summit is a "deal" and not an "agreement" as expected by the participating countries and people across the globe. Moreover, India has apparently diluted its principled stand ceding considerable ground in an unreciprocated gesture. The unilateral emission cuts announced by India are now subject to international supervision ("consultation and analysis") without securing any guarantees of help with finances and technology. While most of the G-77 members are expressing their disappointments, the US seems fully satisfied having equipped itself with the ability to challenge India and China on their actions about emissions reduction.

Few may draw solace from the "Copenhagen Accord" on climate change but the responses so far are not very encouraging. South Africa, despite being one of the five draftees has described the accord as "not acceptable". The G-77 has criticized it as inadequately catering to only a few nations. Brazil, Maldives, ALBA (so called Alternativa Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América, this is, mainly Venezuela, Bolivia, Cuba), Sudan and Tuvalu have termed the accord as disappointing. The European Union too has labelled the conference and accord a "disaster". Promising to mobilize \$100 billion funding per annum for developing countries from 2020 onwards with a pledge of about \$30 billion by 2012 to meet the challenges of climate change the accord sets a target of limiting temperature increase to a maximum of two degrees Celsius. But it remains silent about the manner in which it proposes to mobilize funds and plans its distribution making the declaration all

the more doubtful and vague. The fact that the accord has not been adopted as a consensus document and the summit only taking "note" of it along with failure to legally specify the greenhouse gas emission cuts that nations need to commit themselves keeps one guessing about the final outcome.

"Copenhagen Accord" underlines the fact that the nations of the world have yet to agree upon a plan to address the impending environmental crisis due to ensuing complex climatic change. The Indian tradition presupposes that man is not separate from nature, that we are linked by spiritual, psychological and physical bonds with the elements around us. Knowing that the Divine is present everywhere and in all things, our civilizational ethos strive to do no harm in any form. Indian values hold a deep reverence for life and an awareness that the great forces of nature — the earth, the water, the fire, the air and space-as well as all the various orders of life, including plants and trees, forests and animals, are bound to each other within life's cosmic web. *Bhumi Suktam* states, "Earth, in which the seas, the rivers and many waters lie, from which arise foods and fields of grain, abode to all that breathes and moves, may She confer on us Her finest yield". (*Atharva Veda xii.1.3*). Unless world communities have such traditions, ethos and value system to back the efforts to meet the challenges of climate change, it remains a remote possibility that accords like the one struck in Copenhagen would really work.

This Booklet (in English and Hindi) has been published to bring the various facets of the Copenhagen Accord to the fore and also to highlight the points raised by senior BJP leaders inside and outside the parliament before and after the Copenhagen Summit. We hope that our readers will find the booklet interesting and insightful helping them to explore the realities and issues related to the ongoing debate and discussion over the outcome of the Summit.

Publisher
Bharatiya Janata Party
11, Ashok Road,
New Delhi-110001

January 2010

Copenhagen Accord

Key points

A US-led initiative called the Copenhagen Accord has formed the centre-piece of a deal at UN climate talks in Copenhagen, despite some countries' opposition. The following are the broad contours of the accord reached by the United States, China, India, Brazil, South Africa and several other countries at the U.N. climate talks:-

TEMPERATURE RISE

- ▶▶ The text recognizes the need to limit global temperatures rising no more than 2C (3.6F) above pre-industrial levels.
- ▶▶ The language in the text shows that 2C is not a formal target, just that the group "recognizes the scientific view that" the temperature increase should be held below this figure.
- ▶▶ However, the accord does not identify a year by which carbon emissions should peak, a position resisted by some richer developing nations.
- ▶▶ Countries are asked to spell out by 1 February next year their pledges for curbing carbon emissions by 2020. The deal does not spell out penalties for any country that fails to meet its promise.

EMISSIONS

- ▶▶ The deal does not commit any nation to emission cuts beyond a general acknowledgment that global temperatures should be held along the lines agreed to by leading nations in July. There are no overall emissions targets for rich countries.
- ▶▶ The already agreed-upon emission cuts fall far short of action needed to avoid potentially dangerous effects of climate change.

These cuts are to be made by 2020: U.S., a 17 per cent reduction from 2005 levels (or 3-4 per cent from 1990 levels); China, a cut of 40 to 45 per cent below "business as usual," that is, judged against 2005 figures for energy used versus economic output; India, 20 to 25 per cent cut from 2005 levels; European Union, 20 per cent cut from 1990, and possibly 30 per cent; and, Japan, 25 per cent cut from 1990.

EMISSIONS TRANSPARENCY

- ▶▶ The pledges of rich countries will come under "rigorous, robust and transparent" scrutiny under the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).
- ▶▶ In the accord, developing countries will submit national reports on their emissions pledges under a method "that will ensure that national sovereignty is respected."
- ▶▶ Pledges on climate mitigation measures seeking international support will be recorded in a registry.

FINANCIAL AID

- ▶▶ The deal promises to deliver \$30bn (£18.5bn) of aid for developing nations over the next three years. It outlines a goal of providing \$100bn a year by 2020 to help poor countries cope with the impacts of climate change.
- ▶▶ The accord says the rich countries will jointly mobilize the \$100bn, drawing on a variety of sources: "public and private, bilateral and multilateral, including alternative sources of finance."
- ▶▶ A green climate fund will also be established under the deal. It will support projects in developing countries related to mitigation, adaptation, "capacity building" and technology transfer.

LEGAL STATUS

- ▶▶ The Accord, reached between the US, China, India, Brazil and South Africa, contains no reference to a legally binding agreement, as some developing countries and climate activists wanted.
- ▶▶ Neither is there a deadline for transforming it into a binding deal, though UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon said it needed

to be turned into a legally binding treaty next year.

- ▶▶ The accord was merely "recognised" by the 193 nations at the Copenhagen summit, rather than approved, which would have required unanimous support. It is not clear whether it is a formal UN deal.

REVIEW OF PROGRESS

- ▶▶ The implementation of the Copenhagen Accord will be reviewed by 2015. This will take place about a year-and-a-half after the next scientific assessment of the global climate by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).
- ▶▶ However, if, in 2015, delegates wanted to adopt a new, lower target on global average temperature, such as 1.5C rather than 2C, it would be too late.

(With inputs from BBC and The Hindu)

■

Copenhagen Accord

Government not still out of Sharm-el-Sheikh syndrome

Speech delivered by Shri Arun Jaitley, Leader of Opposition (Rajya Sabha) on December 22, 2009 in Parliament on Copenhagen Accord

THE LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION (SHRI ARUN JAITLEY): Mr. Deputy Chairman, Sir, I have heard and gone through the elaborate statement made by the hon. Minister. I cannot, Sir, hide my disappointment under the present circumstances. Even when it became clear that at Copenhagen a multilateral accord or a statement was not going to be possible, what instead has happened is a plurilateral accord with a reasonable prospect of this plurilateral accord eventually slowly but surely being accepted by others and becoming the fresh basis for the furtherance of the negotiations.

In this detailed statement, Sir, the Minister has elaborately patted himself and the Government on the back for, what he calls, protecting the national interest. I do not know, Sir, whether the Government and the negotiators consciously agreed to the language, as has been framed, or they have been completely outwitted in the drafting of this language. Reports coming from across the world refer to this Accord as a global disappointment. It appears to be a complete betrayal of the poor and the weaker nations, the developing nations, and the more powerful nations have almost been left off the hook. And, after the Accord, what we find is a continuous campaign and spin-doctoring as a substitute for truth. We almost find that facts are being stated and represented, which are not even consistent with the very language of the Accord. Therefore, Sir, instead of referring to the statement while seeking clarifications, I

shall refer to the original document, the Accord itself and the language of the Accord. Sir, there are several questions which arise on the very language of the Accord. The first: If this plurilateral accord becomes a multilateral accord, which it is likely to, can it ever be reasonably argued that the Kyoto Protocol continues to subsist? The Kyoto Protocol had a specific, defined route and obligations. Annexure-I Parties, the developed countries, had to, within the first specified period, bring down their 1990 emission levels by five per cent. This was subsequently increased and the developed countries themselves felt that the reductions will have to be increased by 25 to 40 per cent. Sir, there is something called an 'implied abrogation'. Yes, this Document does not say that Kyoto stand is abrogated. But the moment a route alternative to Kyoto Protocol is discovered and then obliged, there is an implied abrogation as far as the Kyoto Protocol is concerned.

A very simple question

Sir, I am placing a very simple question today. If fresh set of obligations, less onerous obligations are to be cast under the Copenhagen Accord, you will continue giving lip-sympathy to the Kyoto Protocol which are the obligations which will be applicable in future. It is the onerous obligations under the Kyoto Protocol or it is the fresh set of obligations that have been cast under the Copenhagen Accord. The hon. Minister intervened and said 'read the Preamble'. Please read the Preamble. "Line four of the Preamble", you said. The words are used 'in pursuit of the ultimate objective of the Convention as stated in the Article'. Now, 'in pursuit of the objective', diluted from the Bali Action Plan language to achieve what is mentioned. So, 'achieve' is now read down to mean 'pursuit'. See the next line. Bali Action Plan said, 'for sustained implementation' that is now substituted by the words, 'being guided by'. Word by word, phrase by phrase the language of all other obligations stands diluted, and this is not only here.

Let us for a moment ignore the obligations in the Kyoto Protocol. My question to the hon. Minister is, please be specific on this: Are the Annexure-1 Parties today exempted and exonerated from the obligations of the Kyoto Protocol? If there is a repugnancy between the two Documents, which of the two is going to be made

applicable -- the less onerous one or the more onerous one? After all, you can't have two sets of conflicting obligations occupying the same space. One will have to choose which of the two responsibilities will be applicable. Now the Minister said that he has been very transparent and upfront. He told the Parliament that there will be no peaking here and he is not agreed to a peaking here and the Document, in effect, says so. Let us read the fourth line of paragraph 2 of the document. It says, "We should cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions as soon as possible, recognising that the timeframe for peaking will be longer for developing countries." Now what happens in the next round of negotiations? My difficulty is that the problem with this Government is the Sharm-el-Sheikh syndrome.

The agreed Document says one thing, but the Government always understands it to mean differently. So, paragraph 2 clearly says, "We will cooperate in achieving the peaking of global and national emissions." So, when the peaking of national emissions takes place, that peaking will be fixed. The only concession given is, the peaking will be more stringent for the developed countries, will be a little more liberal as far as the developing countries are concerned. So, in your next round of negotiations, you will be faced with the clear language which says, "You have agreed to the principle of peaking". All that happens is that if peaking for the developed world, for example, is 2020, the peaking for you will be 2025. The principle of peaking has been accepted; all that remains is the fixation of the specific year, as far as peaking is concerned. An assurance was given to this House that we would never agree to peaking. The principle of peaking is agreed. The peaking will be a little liberal as far as developing countries are concerned. The peaking year is yet to be fixed. That is what the Copenhagen Accord now says.

Natural consequence

So, I want the Minister to categorically tell us, and that is my specific query, will not the natural consequence of this in the next round of negotiations be that the two categories of peaking years for the developed and the developing countries will be fixed. My third difficulty with this document is again an assurance given to

this Parliament and to the country that unsupported domestic action will never agree for any international verification. I have the Minister's statement made in this House here: "All that will take place is only reporting. There can be a domestic accountability to the Parliament. But, as far as the international community is concerned, we will only tell them what we have to do." The first thing that this document does, Sir, it completely obliterates the distinction between supported and unsupported actions. There is no distinction between the two. It then specifically says, "as far as Annexure-I Parties are concerned, whatever they do will be subject to some element of international verification." It then comes to what happens to the non-Annexure-I countries. Now, if the document had said what the Minister assured this House, and what the Minister, in his statement, wants to again assure the House that it will be only reporting and nothing else, I would have nothing to say. But, again the Sharm el-Sheikh syndrome takes place; the document says something else. The document says, and I read paragraph 5, "Mitigation actions by non-Annexure-I Parties will be subject to their domestic measurement, reporting and verification, the results of which will be reported through their national communications every two years."

Sir, I stop here for a moment. This is precisely what the Minister told us. This paragraph should have stopped here. There will be domestic measurement; there will be domestic verification. And, every two years, we will tell the international community what we have measured and what we have done. They have no role in the matter. This is what this House was categorically told. But, then, there is a next sentence, "Non-Annexure parties will communicate information on implementation of their actions through national communications with a provision for international consultation and analysis under defined guidelines that will ensure that national sovereignty is respected." Now, it does not stop with reporting. Your responsibility does not get over with that. After you report, there will be an international consultation. That is the first thing that will happen. Then, there will be an international analysis of whether you have achieved that or not. Both these things will be done by a process -- and that is the whole art of outwitting in the process of negotiations -- under guidelines which are yet to be framed. So, the Secretariat will frame the guidelines. So, whatever we tell them, there will be consulta-

tion; there will be analysis. And, the guidelines will respect our national sovereignty. That is the sense of satisfaction we get. Now, what if the consultation and analysis report is that what we have achieved is only 20 per cent of what we had promised. Today, there is a statement made by the U.S. Administration saying, "We have now got India on hold and we will bind them by what is written therein, and we will make sure it is complied with."

Why pat ourselves

And, this is the process by which they will make sure that it is complied with. There will be guidelines framed, whatever we tell the world, there will be analysis, there will be consultations, and once they find that there is something lacking, then, the consequences will follow and you will enter into an era of conflict, an era where even trade sanctions can be imposed upon you. And yet we are being told that we must pat ourselves on the back because the language we have agreed is only reporting and nothing more. It is verification on those cases, it is now consultation and analysis under guidelines and the rest will follow. So, we again enter an era of ambiguity. We will say our understanding is different; their understanding is different. This is exactly what happened in the other document at Sharm el-Sheikh. After all, negotiation is a process by which you create value for your country; negotiation is a process by which every word has to be measured. In a document, words are not used without any reference. There is no tutelage as far as international agreements are concerned that you use words which have no meaning. Every word has to be given the meaning which is intended to be given therein.

Therefore, this analysis, this consultation, the guidelines and the consequences what the U.S. says will now emerge out of this. So, my query to the Minister is: What will be the consequences in his understanding of this consultation and analysis under the guidelines? Is it merely a case that we report and thereafter we don't look at them and they won't bother us? Or, have we travelled much beyond the commitment which we gave to Parliament?

Sir, we are now being told that this Accord was not adopted in the entire multilateral conference, but it is a clear pluralateral agreement between us, look at the language, and, therefore, no legally-

binding agreement arises. Sir, it is an argument which cuts both ways. If no legally-binding agreement arises, then, what will be the consequence if the developed countries by 31st of January don't make their submissions in the Schedule in which they are supposed to submit and say we are not bound by this outcome? Was what happened in Copenhagen, the meeting between the developed countries and the basic group, an exercise in futility? Admittedly, it was not. Admittedly, this document now promises to become the centrestage document as far as the climate negotiations are concerned. And, then the national Parliament to be told, "Well, this is not a binding document". Paragraph 5, which is our obligation, starts with non-Annexure 1 parties to the Convention 'will' implement mitigation actions. Not 'may' implement, not 'could' implement, we 'will' implement, and what is it that we 'will' implement? We 'will' implement what we make a declaration by 31st of January to the Secretariat that these are going to be what my emission cuts or energy intensity cuts are going to be.

It hardly lies with the Government after entering into an Accord which uses the word 'will' implement, then to come back and say, "Well, what I have signed is not binding; is not worth the paper it is written on. So, what is going to be, I want to ask the Minister, the consequence of this commitment that we 'will' implement. The Minister said, Sir, that the most important part of this agreement is the one relating to the funding. Sir, an impression has been created and I asked some of my colleagues that we conceded all this because we are all going to get a hundred billion dollars a year. If you see the statement of the Minister, the statement itself is in clear conflict with the language of the Accord. It says, "They have also undertaken a commitment to mobilise US hundred billion dollars by the year 2020 for such purpose". As though the developed countries are generous that hundred billion dollars will be taken out of the US Treasury and the EU Finances and will be placed on the table for the rest of the world.

Globe funding

Please read paragraph 8 which deals with global funding. It clearly says, 'Funding for adaptation will be prioritised for the most vulnerable developing countries such as the least developing coun-

tries, small island developing States and Africa.' So the 'others' get priority; 'we' are not on the 'priority list.' In the context of meaningful mitigation actions and transparency on implementation, the developed world commit to a goal -- now comes the most important world -- of 'mobilising' -- they are not going to take it out of their treasury and put it on the table -- jointly US 100 billion dollars a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries. This funding will come from a wide variety of sources, public and private, bilateral and multilateral, including alternative sources of finance. Now from the language it is clear that the 100 billion dollars does not come out of the US Treasury or the EU funding. This is public funding; this is private funding; this comes under various bilateral arrangements; and this will come under multilateral arrangements.

Is the whole gambit of carbon trade going to be covered under this funding? And a very large part of that trade itself, which you would have got even without the Copenhagen Accord, is going to be a part of this amount of 100 billion dollars. So, this figure of 100 billion dollars is dressed up to say that you are making this concession; you are letting them off the hook of the Kyoto obligations; and they are going to pay for it. What is going to happen is that this will be public funding, private funding, multilateral funding, bilateral funding, and carbon trade, everything included is going to be totally accounting to 100 billion dollars a year by 2020. Sir, when we look at all this, if you go through every word of this clause, and there are several other clauses, the language is completely altered. Now the hon. Minister in his statement said that our compliance will be according to articles 4.1 and 4.7 of the Convention. Why did they put 4.1 and 4.7? What did they miss out here? They missed out 4.3. Please read 4.3 of the Convention. Para 4.3 refers to funding for the purposes of technological development, which is one of the most important things. In paragraph 5, where they referred to what commitments we are going to make subject to the assurance of articles 4.1 and 4.7, what is missed out as a conscious omission is 4.3 -- Funding for the purposes of technological development. I recollect when my friend, Mr. Yechury, was debating this issue earlier and he took up the issue of IPRs on technological development. This document is a conscious omission. It is not a reference to what happens to the Intellectual Property Rights of the technol-

ogy which we are going to get.

Again, we will get into an era of ambiguity. You will say that as far as the IPRs are concerned, it will be covered under some other convention, WIPO or otherwise, and therefore, we need not look at this particular document for it. And the others will contend, 'No, we have to really look at this document alone, and there is no reference as far as IPRs are concerned.'

Sir, these are some legitimate questions in relation to the issues which have arisen and which have created doubts in our minds. Sir, I think that in the Minister's statements, both in Copenhagen and here, there was a lot of concern that we should not be considered the fall guys. And, therefore, we were either hiding behind somebody or we were out to please somebody. Sir, it is true that we should not be seen as the fall guys. But, at the same time, we should not allow our own interest to fall. And I am afraid in our entire attempt to please some and avoid being seen as the fall guys we have decided to let our own interests to fall as far as this Copenhagen Accord is concerned. Thank you, Sir.

■

Special Interview

The chance India lost in Copenhagen

India's food security is under serious threat. The government has bowed to US pressure

Former Union Minister and veteran BJP leader Dr Murli Manohar Joshi attended the United Nations Climate Change Conference organised at Copenhagen, the capital of Denmark, from December 7 to 18. He was member of a five-member delegation of Parliament. Organiser correspondent Pramod Kumar spoke to him in New Delhi to know the outcome of the Copenhagen conference and its impact on India. Excerpts:

»» **What is the outcome of Copenhagen Climate Change Conference?**

The Prime Minister may get appreciation from Obama in Copenhagen, but he failed to get any praise from the people of India. The Indian interest has not been fully safeguarded there. Rather to a great extent we accepted a draft or a note, though not a binding document, which will put a moral responsibility on us not to go back to it. The interpretation of it from the western countries now is that they can interfere in our internal programmes. That is not acceptable. We have demanded from the government that it must clarify and seek a clarification from America about their interpretation of the note.

»» **The government still claims that it has not shifted its stand on Kyoto Protocol. What is your view?**

The Kyoto Protocol is almost jettisoned now. It has been buried deep. They will now consider something in Mexico which is not based on Kyoto Protocol. It will be based on this note. This note forms the basis for further dialogues. Where is the men-

tion of Kyoto Protocol? I don't believe that the government interpretation in this regard is correct. The general apprehension is that the people have been let down

»» **What will be the impact of climate change for us and what are the indicators that India is getting affected by climate change and how it can damage India's developmental projects?**

The capping of two per cent of carbon emission may be good for the western countries, but it may prove disastrous for us. If the temperature rises even by 1o centigrade, millions of tonnes of wheat, paddy and vegetable will perish. One degree rise of sea temperature will have a serious consequence on our marine life. The availability of fish would be reduced. What to talk about 2o, just rise in 1o will prove highly disastrous for us.

If the temperature goes on rising, I am not talking about the rest of the world, what will happen to our Sunderbans, Lakshadweep and the entire western coast from Kutch to Kanyakumari? We know that one Mahabalipuram and Dwarika have already gone down under the ocean. So, there may be another holocaust on our coastal region. What will happen to Mumbai and Goa? The entire environment will be disturbed. If Sunderbans completely goes down in the sea, a large number of species will migrate from that place. People from that area and the other coastal areas will migrate. Serious problems of rehabilitation will arise. I ask why should we accept this cap. Just imagine what will happen to the monsoon which will be disturbed, causing double loss to the crops and India will be one of the worst victims. Our water system will also have very serious consequences.

»» **Do you think the developed countries are not worried on it?**

They have committed an offence, which I call civilisational offence. Why should we pay for it? They say that they would give us carbon credit. What does it mean? It means they will continue to produce carbon debts, and we should continue to absorb it. They say take money from us, grow more trees. If we continue to grow more and more of trees what will happen

to our food. They say they would grow food for us. Suppose if they refused exporting to us, what will happen then? The government must understand this foul game behind it.

»» **They also say that they will give us technology. Comment.**

Yes, but my question is the technology is a patented thing and they will not give us free. They will give us carbon credit by one hand and take away the royalty for technology by another hand. They will make a fool of us. Their objective is, let us develop and let you perish. For the benefit of a few, many are suffering and many will continue to suffer. This is the biggest objection from my side to all what is happening now and what was ignored in Copenhagen.

There is another factor. The global warming comes from the pumping of energy. What is our condition in energy? We are the poorest in consuming energy. America is emitting 20 times more than us. In the five lakh villages in our country, there are large numbers of hamlets which do not have even a single point of electricity or any other energy service. The human resource development gets a setback if we are not able to provide the basic minimum requirements of life to millions of our people. When the temperature rises, the new diseases and viruses are likely to crop up. The old diseases will die and the new will strike. Then a lot of multinational companies will come with fully patented medicines. It will be the third attack on us. We should put strong efforts and tell the west to change its model of development.

»» **Is it possible to change the model of development at this stage of globalisation?**

Basically it is the consequence of wrong model of development. I will explain it in a nutshell. When India was getting Independence, somebody asked Mahatma Gandhi that since India will now be free, how will you remove poverty? Since England has shown you the way and become prosperous, it is expected that you should also follow the same path. Gandhiji said England became prosperous by plundering half of the planet, as it was ruling over half of the planet, how many planets would

I have to plunder if India has to become rich on the same line? The present system of development is consumption and demand driven. The answer that he gave about 64 years ago is valid even today.

Secondly, I say the western consumerism is the main culprit. It is because of this consumerism that their economy collapsed. They have consumed more resources than they should have consumed. By doing it they created a carbon debt for the future. The tragedy is that you cannot replenish what you have spent here in natural resources and environment. That is gone. The recycling time may take billions of years. Then what to do? The basic principle is that one should not consume more than what the environmental conditions allow. And the planetary conditions say it is impossible to have infinite growth on finite planet. Again it leads to the growth model, which is flawed. Another objection is this model eats away the ethical and cultural values of the society. We have to strike a balance between the economic prices and the cultural values.

»» **Can we propose an alternative model of balanced growth to replace the exploitative international techno-economic order?**

Yes, we have the model. Gandhiji and Deendayalji explained it very clearly. Atharva Veda too says very clearly. Integral Humanism is the alternate model. Even the westerners are saying that it is impossible to have an infinite growth. They say there should be a balanced growth and there must be equity. It should not be a lopsided growth. Too few grow and too many suffer, too few become rich and too many become poor. The average may be growing but the growth at the particular level is very high and the poverty at the other level is much higher. The poorer are becoming destitute and rich are becoming richer.

»» **The metrological department or the scientists specialising in studying nature, are not able to predict correctly even on drought, flood, rainfall, earthquake or cyclone. How is it possible for these experts to predict nature, say 50 or 100 years from now?**

After having the data of the last 100 years or more, we know the trends. What was not observed earlier is being observed now thoroughly. We know what is happening. Now there are computers and super computers which can produce models of the future. Say, what will happen if 1o degree temperature rises? What will happen if 2o, 3o or 4o degree temperature rises? So, all these are extrapolations depending upon the present trend. Based on it, there is an average consensus by different scientists in different parts of the world.

»» **Do you agree with the widely held view that all UN projections on climate change are nothing but an intelligent guesswork?**

No, I don't say it as an intelligent guesswork only. No doubt there is an element of guess. There are estimates, no doubt, but it is not done by a group of bureaucrats. This is studied by scientists all over the world. It may be like this. Scientists are saying that it may be 5o, some group may come to the conclusion that it is not 5o, it is 4o or it is 5.5 or 6o. My understanding of the whole thing is that whatever the scientists say is little of the lower side. When they say it is 5o, it may be 6o.

»» **Recently Union Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh told the west to stop eating beef to stop carbon emissions. What do you say?**

Not only he, but many western scientists too say it. The reason is when you keep the animals for meat, they also produce greenhouse gasses. If the animal stock for producing meat rises, then of course the carbon emissions will increase. There are many scientists who say to go back to vegetarianism. Although vegetarianism also produces greenhouses gasses to some extent, but far less than produced by the animals.

Finally I feel the concept of sustainable development, the present paradigm, should be replaced with the concept of sustainable consumption. A reasonable level of nutrition should be provided not only to humanity but also to the animal world.

(Courtesy: Organiser)



Environment Minister got carried away by bandwagon effect : Jaitley

Statement issued by Shri Arun Jaitley, Leader of Opposition (Rajya Sabha) on December 04, 2009 on the unilateral decision of the Minister for Environment to reduce India's carbon emission intensity by 20 – 25 percent by 2020.

The Minister for Environment, Shri Jairam Ramesh, while replying to a debate in the Lok Sabha on 03.12.2009 on climate change has announced India's decision to unilaterally reduce its carbon emission intensity by 20 – 25 percent by 2020 as compared to the year 2005. The Bharatiya Janata Party has serious reservations about the approach of the Environment Minister. This is based amongst others on the following :-

- ▶▶ The Minister appears to be carried away by the bandwagon effect of some nations announcing unilateral cuts. The per capita pollution caused by China is far higher. The factual matrix of the two nations India and China is therefore not identical. It is bad strategy on the eve of any multilateral negotiations to announce unilateral stance without waiting for the approach of the developed countries. It is India's experience in various international negotiations including WTO that unilateral concessions announced before the multilateral dialogue become the starting point in India's negotiations. The announcement of unilateral cuts by Shri Jairam Ramesh has weakened India's negotiating position.
- ▶▶ The announcement by the Minister that "India would never accept a legally binding commitment to reduce its emissions" marks a serious departure from its earlier stated position that

we would not accept any "legally binding commitment to reduce overall emissions as also emission intensity". Is this omission deliberate to leave the doors open to the developed countries to bind India indirectly if not directly?

Toeing other's arguments

- ▶▶ By repeatedly referring to India's low per capita emission as "accident of history" or "due to India being unable to control its population" the Environment Minister has in fact repeated the arguments of developed countries against the "per capita principle". India was prevented from industrialization prior to Independence and also because of our faulty policy decisions since Independence. The Environment Minister is clearly wrong when he says that there is no difference between (i) India's per capita emissions will not exceed (that of developed countries) and (2) "be less than" the per capita emission of developed countries. Is India ever in a position to accept a legally binding limitation that our per capita emission will be categorically lower than that of the developed countries? Does the Environment Minister acknowledge that the historical responsibility of the developed countries for climate change ought to be taken into account while deciding their future per capita emission rights? Has the Environment Minister by announcing unilateral cuts without a corresponding commitment from the developed countries not negated the "equal per capita principle" which India has in the past been propagating?
- ▶▶ The Environment Minister has referred to flexibility in the context of extent of international observation of our unsupported domestic actions. Earlier in an interview to the 'Mint' he had favoured international consultations on the lines of WTO trade review policy. Will India accept any regime of international consultations or verifications with respect to climate change either unilaterally or in the context of international legal requirements?
- ▶▶ The Environment Minister has referred to most of India's deposits of coal, iron ore deposits being located in forest areas and mining would result in forest loss. Does he imply that India

cannot industrialize merely because valuable resources are located in forest area? Is he willing to overlook that the Central Government since 1980 has in special cases given permission even to private parties to mine in forest areas while keeping in view the concerns for co-existence of ecology and environment ?

- ▶▶ The Bharatiya Janata Party strongly criticizes the Environment Minister for rubbishing India's earlier approach as "do-nothing" approach. The argument that our earlier approach was "that we are not responsible for climate change and we have a right to emit as much as developed countries have done" makes a mockery of the programmes undertaken by successive Governments in the past with regard to environment protection. The Minister ought not to rubbish a consistent stand taken by various Governments in India. The Minister obviously overlooked the fact that it is this "do-nothing" approach which has led to reduction in emission intensity by 17.6% during 1990-2005 . How many developed countries who had undertaken legally binding obligations to do so, have actually taken the steps to reduce their emissions and have accomplished close to what India has achieved during this period?

Due diligence

- ▶▶ The Minister has referred to the due diligence by the Planning Commission as well as inputs from "other sources" before formulating the changed position of India. Is he willing to share with the country the entire material available for this due diligence and also disclose as to who 'other sources' are? Is he merely referring to reports prepared by international consultants who have an inherent interest in the economies of the developed countries?
- ▶▶ Is the Minister willing to clarify as to what would be the cost borne by the Government and citizens in implementing the specific measures cited by him which would lead to a reduction in our energy intensity. The Minister has referred to the "further measures by India beyond the announced targets in the context of equitable global agreement". What is the Government's view as to what would constitute "equitable global agreement".

Is India's interest on reduction of at least 25-40 % by 2020 from the 1990 levels by developed countries going to be part of such agreement? Is India going to resist any attempt to dilute/undermine/replace the Kyoto Protocol and insist on continuance of legally binding emission reduction by the developed countries under the Kyoto protocol ? Would mandatory transfer of finance & technology by the developed countries to the developing countries form a part of this proposition? Is the Minister going to ensure that there would be no constraints on the economic growth of developing countries on climate change considerations ? Would he resist any attempt to build in a permanent differential between the per capita emissions rights of developed and developing countries under any such "equitable global agreement".?

Matter of concern

- ▶▶ The recent media reports claiming that climate change data was manipulated by the scientific establishments in US is a matter of serious concern. It is all the more serious that these data formed the basis of all conclusions by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Has the Minister factored in possible misleading data creeping into the due diligence done by his team before making these premature unilateral commitments?



If Not An Agreement, At Least a Deal

By Nava Thakuria

The recently concluded global climate summit in Copenhagen created tremendous media hype around the world. But when the summit concluded with only a deal, and in no way resulted in a legally binding agreement, the same media started criticizing everyone. For the thousands of media from different parts of the globe who gathered at the Bella Center in the Danish capital in a freezing cold winter, it was like a festival.

Journalists worked overnight to spread their news, views and analysis. The outcome was a massive pileup of news stories that captured the space of the Google search engine for many days, which gave updates in an article every second during the last few days of the climate summit.

For the record, the UN global climate conference, the biggest in the history of mankind for the cause of the environment, witnessed the participation of over 130 heads of government and states from around the world. Everyone initially said the important summit that took place after two years of preparation must not fail.

But the series of negotiations and discussions proved that the division between the developed (Western) and developing (Eastern) countries remained intact. The diverse and arrogant opinions from America with some other European nations and the subsequent counter attacks by the representatives from China, India and other developing countries were in the media headlines for almost two weeks.

The rich countries, which are responsible for the greenhouse gas emission (and that way for the global warming and climate change) expressed their readiness to reduce their carbon use. But at the same time, they want to compel the developing countries like

India to reduce their use of carbon to a greater extent.

The repeated opposition and adjournment of the meetings delayed the acceptance of the resolutions. The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change summit, which was supposed to be concluded by December 18 night, continued until the next evening.

US President Barack Obama planned to return home soon after the agreement was signed in Copenhagen, but he had to stay for a longer period in the city to continue pursuing with different government heads. Even Prime Minister Dr Manmohan Singh was delayed because of the continued discussion during Friday midnight.

Finally Obama initiated a break though in the conference, where he convinced BASIC countries namely India, China, Brazil and South Africa to approve a kind of agreement.

An hour-long meeting with the US President, the Indian Prime Minister, Chinese Premier Wen Jiabao, Brazilian President Lula Da Silva and South African President Jacob Zuma resulted in a US-BASIC deal, where all parties agreed to take appropriate actions to prevent the global warming exceeding the level of 2 degree Celsius.

Moreover, all the government heads of BASIC and the US ensued for \$30 billion as aid to the poor and developing nations in the next three years. It has also agreed to support the US proposed global fund of \$100 billion a year by 2020.

Not everyone happy

But not everyone was happy with the deal. Opposing the initiative, various other developing nations argued that they could not 'accept a text originally agreed by the United States, China, India, Brazil and South Africa as the blueprint of a wider United Nations plan' to fight climate change.

It was primarily opposed by Cuba, Sudan, Nicaragua, Bolivia, Venezuela, Tuvalu, Costa Rica etc. Even the host country showed reservation to the deal. The Danish Prime Minister and also COP15 president Lars Løkke Rasmussen said that he was not in favour of the proposal.

However Japan, Norway, African nations with the European

Union nations came out in support of the proposal. The British Prime Minister Gordon Brown claimed the deal as a beginning was acceptable to him. He admitted that 'it was not an easy task' and asserted that the Copenhagen climate deal offers hope. German Chancellor Angela Merkel also agreed to the proposal but said she expected more.

The Indian Environment Minister Jairam Ramesh expressed happiness that a good deal for the entire developing world was resolved at the Copenhagen summit.

An important beginning

Somewhat happy notes were aired by the UN Secretary General Ban Ki-moon also when he termed the exercise "an important beginning." He admitted that it was not satisfactory to a number of delegates as the deal 'may not be everything everyone had hoped for'. But he firmly commented that finally, 'We have a deal in Copenhagen, which has an immediate operational effect'.

Amazingly for some moments, the summit that started on December 7 was on the verge of collapse by the second week. Amidst many factors, the continued loggerheads between the United States and China emerged as a major cause of concern. On the other hand, the imposing attitude of the host country to formulate a declaration ignoring the poor and developed nations also put the summit in the worst phase.

Jairam Ramesh, who was camping there for many days, strongly protested against the Danish Prime Minister Rasmussen for refusing to explain a draft political declaration that was to be discussed in the meeting of environment ministers. Ramesh made it clear that various procedures were made with less trust on the developing nations like India. However, he said, India wanted to make the summit a success.

Then came the important declaration from US Secretary of State Hillary Rodham Clinton, where she revealed that Washington would help to build a 100 billion dollar annual fund by 2020, to bail out the poor countries coping with the impacts of climate change. But she didn't forget to criticise China because of its rigid attempts to defy the verification of emission cuts by international agents.

Washington prefers Beijing to allow a verification mechanism of China's gas emissions. Hillary Clinton claimed that an agreement in the summit might be impossible if China, which is the second biggest greenhouse gas emitter in the world (after the US), doesn't show transparency.

Later, of course, the distance between America and China was narrowed down after Washington declared initiatives of raising 100 billion dollars a year in the coming days for the benefit of poor nations. The representatives from Beijing came forward to welcome the gesture of the US government.

At the same time, the poor countries like Bangladesh, Burma which are more vulnerable to the impacts of climate change are demanding some bailout packages from the developed countries.

Bangladesh came out with the campaign that the people displaced due to climate change should be recognised as refugees. Talking to media persons, Dhaka representatives argue that the world communities must think about the displaced people because of the adverse climate conditions.

"We are a densely populated country and a hundred thousand poor Bangladeshis still live on islands and coastal areas. They become innocent victims of climate change as they are no way linked to the phenomena," said Bangladesh's Environment and Forest Minister Hassan Mahmud.

The Bangladesh Prime Minister Sheikh Hasina made an appeal to the developed countries asking for 1.5 per cent of their annual growth for an adaptation corpus fund. Addressing the summit, Hasina stated that Bangladesh expects justice from the international communities.

"We are here with a dream to protect our mother earth and the human race," she reiterated.

Hasina even lobbied US President Obama as they talked over the phone before coming to Copenhagen. Obama had reportedly assured Hasina that Washington would stand beside Bangladesh in a time of crisis.

Obama disappointed

After his arrival in the Danish capital by an overnight flight

from Washington on December 18, President Obama met a number of influential world leaders before gracing the preliminary high level event. Lots of expectations were aired with Obama's arrival as a prime mover of the summit to finalize a concrete climate deal.

But contrary to expectations, Obama disappointed the world leaders. In fact, while Obama was speaking in the main auditorium of Bella Center, everyone was expecting some significant declarations from him.

Obama, while urging all the participating countries to compromise on key demands in order to seal an international accord in Copenhagen, didn't commit any further actions beyond Hillary Clinton's 100 billion dollar global fund. He only said, America had charted their course and they have made commitments. "We will do what we say," Obama asserted.

Soon after Obama, Manmohan Singh addressed the gathering, but serious differences were observed in their point of views. Unlike Obama, Dr Singh appealed to the developed countries to deliver with the guidelines of Kyoto Protocol. He insisted in continuing the protocol and argued that 'any new global accord announced at Copenhagen would go against international opinion if it dilutes the Kyoto Protocol'. He advocated for continued negotiations until 2010 for a globally acceptable climate agreement.

India's voluntary target

Dr Singh also disclosed that India would deliver on its voluntary target to reduce the emission intensity of GDP growth by around 20 per cent by 2020 as compared to 2005. Moreover, initiatives would be taken to curb the gas emission irrespective of a deal in Copenhagen, he said. The Prime Minister also informed world leaders that New Delhi had planned to generate 20,000 MW of solar power by 2022 and will also improve forest cover in the next few years.

The African nations also advocated for the extension of Kyoto Protocol, which is expiring in the next two years. Addressing the summit, the Burmese Foreign Minister Nyan Win also supported the continuation of the Kyoto Protocol. He claimed that Burma was one of the most climate affected countries in the globe. Cyclone

Nargis that hit southern Burma in May 2008 killed over 85,000 people and left nearly 54,000 people missing.

The high level segment of the conference, which was inaugurated on December 15, witnessed the participation of high profile personalities like the Prince of Wales. UN Secretary General Ban-ki-Moon addressed the gathering and appealed to all the country heads and representatives to go for a comprehensive, ambitious and effective international climate change deal.

The UN chief, while urging the environment ministers from different countries to compromise in the final days of discussions as various factors indicated a failed summit, concluded his remarks with the positive note, "Our future begins today here in Copenhagen."

Prince Charles of Britain, in his brief speech advocated for a safer planet to our next generation and hence emphasised an accepted and sustainable approach by all concerned. The Prince termed the summit as historic.

"I can only appeal to you to listen to the cries of those who are already suffering from the impact of climate change. The eyes of the world are upon you and it is no understatement to say that, with your signatures, you can write our future," Prince Charles added.

The distinguished gathering was also addressed by the host Prime Minister Rasmussen, who pointed out that the effect of climate change knows no boundaries and it doesn't discriminate one from another. "The magnitude of the challenge before us is to translate this political will into a strong political approach," he concluded.

Unending protests

In fact, the continued hectic discussion among the climate negotiators from different countries, never ending protest and demonstrations carried out by various activists and unbelievable busyness of the environment non-government organisation workers inside and outside the historic Bella Center, the main venue of the summit remained important media highlights for many days.

The Danish government expected around 15,000 delegates for the summit, but to their utter amazement, over 40,000 delegates including a huge number of journalists from both the print and visual

media (also web) gathered here. Though it was a difficult and painful task for the organisers to get them registered promptly, they however, provided thousands of laptops with high speed internet connections in the media centre.

Earlier a media training workshop and follow-up CoP 15 coverage was organized at Copenhagen by the World Water Forum of Journalists and the Asia-Pacific Forum of Environmental Journalists with the support from UNEP, ActionAid and Government of Denmark. It was facilitated by Alex Kirby, former environment editor of BBC and Quamrul Chowdhury, a lead negotiator of G 77 and LDCs. The participant journalists covered the press conferences of delegations like USA, EU, G 77 and LDCs during the CoP 15.

The conference as usual witnessed a series of protests outside the venue. Hundreds of protesters braved the cold weather to demonstrate in front of Bella Center demanding the responsible leaders to go for an accord in Copenhagen. The Danish police used batons to tear gas to disperse the protesters and maintained normalcy during the important summit.

Nava Thakuria is a Guwahati, Northeast India based independent journalist, who contributes to various media outlets throughout the world.

(Courtesy: NEWS BLAZE)

■

Can't afford it

By Madhu Purnima Kishwar

It makes sense to corner first world countries into investing in eco-friendly technologies to control carbon emissions, as was attempted at Copenhagen. But the stand of the Indian government that India cannot afford to enforce better environmental norms because as a country with a huge backlog of poverty, its first priority is "development" implies that India is obliged to commit all the mistakes that the West committed in its pursuit of economic growth. While for the first world countries, the harmful impact of carbon emissions and consequent global warming may represent a future threat, for us in India it is a now-and-here nightmare. The air that citizens of Europe or America breathe is nowhere as lethal as what we in urban India have to inhale. The quality of water available to citizens of first world countries is nowhere close to the filthy, disease ridden water we in villages and cities of India have to consume.

In fact, it is far easier for India to undertake course correction since most of our people are not addicted to pollution-friendly life styles. However, our government seems to be doing the very opposite by aggressively attacking and destroying inexpensive eco-friendly technologies and promoting pollution-friendly technologies. While our cities are choking with carbon emissions, government actively encourages mindless increase in motorised vehicles. Our banks chase customers for car loans at low rates. The poor pay a 30 per cent rate of interest on micro credit but car-loans are offered at 8 per cent to 10 per cent per annum with government officials paying no more than 5 per cent. Not surprisingly, Delhi, the seat of Central government, has 60 lakh motorised vehicles - more than all four metros put together. Each day, 1000 new vehicles descend on Delhi roads.

Hostility towards non-motorised vehicles (NMV): As per a 2005 study, 40 per cent of households in India own cycles, with Punjab at a high of 70 per cent. The use of bicycles in most towns and cities of India ranges from 25 per cent to over 50 per cent. But there is not a single inter-village road which has provided separate bullock cart or cycle tracks. On highways 20-40 per cent of the fatalities involve pedestrians and bicyclists.

An IIT Delhi study of 2007 found that cycling accounts for 50 per cent to 70 per cent of the commuter trips of those who work in the informal sector. The average daily wage of people in the informal sector ranges from Rs 120 to Rs 250 per day. Today, transport costs for those who come to the city from far flung areas for earning their livelihood comes close to Rs 80 per day. Therefore, many have to use bicycles. In the absence of separate tracks, cyclists and pedestrians account for nearly 70 per cent of road accident deaths in Delhi.

War against cycle rickshaws: Though private vehicles account for 93 per cent of total motor vehicles in Delhi, 85 per cent have to rely on public transport of which cycle rickshaws are a very crucial part. Rickshaws are an inexpensive mode of short distance commuters as well as feeder service for Metro and public buses. They do not consume any fuel and do not cause air or noise pollution. But government has imposed bizarre regulations and laws with the stated purpose of "eliminating" this vehicle on the ground that cycle rickshaws are out of place in a fast "modernising" India.

Several thousand rickshaws are arbitrarily confiscated and destroyed every year for operating without licenses, which are so tightly controlled that virtually every rickshaw in Delhi ends up being illegal and therefore subject to confiscation. Rickshaws are banned on all arterial and most sub-arterial roads including the inner-walled city areas where cycle rickshaws have been the most popular form of transport. However, due to active public demand for their service, they operate on all these roads illegally. Municipal officials and traffic police look the other way if suitably bribed. Thousands are confiscated every month for going into no entry zones, which have been declared so arbitrarily that it makes their existence illegal almost everywhere. Many more are released after paying heavy penalties.

All this totals to a loss of at least 360 crores a year to the rickshaw trade.

Today, Delhi has 600,000 to 700,000 cycle rickshaws and their number is growing daily. This clearly demonstrates that citizens are voting for cycle rickshaw through active demand for their services. Each rickshaw covers a distance of 20-25 kms per day amounting to a total of 120-150 lakh kms for the city's 600,000 rickshaws. If rickshaws are removed from Delhi, it would involve additional petrol expense of nearly 500,000 litres per day.

In 1997, a White Paper on Pollution in Delhi by the Ministry of Environment stated that "Vehicular pollution contributes 67 per cent of the total air pollution load in Delhi." The 2005 RITES study predicts that between 2001 and 2021, Delhi's vehicular trips per day will grow from 10.7 million to 24.7 million. To relieve congestion levels, the report advocated provision of bicycle tracks and other non-motorised vehicles. The Delhi Master Plan expressly mandates promotion of cycle rickshaws, as a measure of pollution control, and as a means of generating employment for self employed poor. And yet, the government agencies argue they have no space for NMVs.

The traffic police is fanatic in its opposition to the creation of separate tracks for non-motorised vehicles on the ground that rickshaws and cycles slow down motor vehicles! That does not mean rickshaws have disappeared. All it means is pullers have to bribe the traffic police to ply on banned roads.

One can provide innumerable cases of similar callous mismanagement in virtually every area of life. Reversing these trends does not require billions of aid money from America or Europe. All it requires is a dose of self respect, a bit of good sense and willingness on the part of our government to learn the basic art and tools of citizen friendly governance which will inevitably lead to eco-friendly policies.

The writer is professor, Centre for the Study of Developing Societies and founder editor 'Manushi'

(Courtesy: The Indian Express)



After Copenhagen: patchworks won't do

By Virendra Parekh

A truly global climate change agreement with some 200 countries signing a single document is always difficult. In that sense, the recent conference on climate change at Copenhagen was destined for failure, and even the successor conference in Mexico City in December 2010 may only yield incremental gains.

The agreement which the world has been waiting for is not going to come any time soon. The reason is clear: The trade-off between long-term benefit (better climate) and short-term costs (lower consumption levels) is as yet unclear. Therefore, no country wants to make a sacrifice, however defined, without knowing what the others are going to do. This is especially true of the big emitters.

The crux of the problem is that the industrialised world needs to cut emissions drastically, and this is neither easy nor cheap. So, it is looking for easy answers and for ways to shift the burden onto developing countries. Therefore, China and India become favourite targets. The fact is that these countries will emit more in the future. There is no way around it. They have growing populations and poor people. They need to provide for development for all.

This is another challenge of climate change: developing countries have the right to pollute. But there is not enough space left in the atmosphere for their emissions. Industrialised countries have disproportionately used up the space.

What an agreement brokered by US President Barack Obama with the BASIC group of China, India, Brazil and South Africa has done is to commit countries to keep negotiating to reach an agreement. This agreement was 'recognised' rather than adopted by the delegates at Copenhagen. Unless all 193 members of the

UN agree to this, it will have no legal sanctity.

The agreement accords a special place to limiting global temperature rise to two degrees Celsius and commits each country to cutting emissions in keeping with domestic protocols and processes, without punitive liability and specific targets. The developed countries have agreed to provide financial resources, technology and capacity-building to support the implementation of adaptation action in developing countries. The agreement offers short-term funding of \$30 billion for projects in developing countries, and aspires to a long-term system that would, in principle, provide \$100 billion a year for mitigation and adaptation from 2020 onwards. And, outside the world of climate politics, it moves forward the plan for reducing deforestation.

No targets

For many environmentalists, the accord's great deficiency is that it sets no targets for emissions. Indeed, it is feared that the Kyoto Protocol, which committed developed countries to measurable emission cuts by 2012, has been substantially diluted and may be junked at the next global conference.

However, the fact remains that the Kyoto Protocol imposes obligations only on the developed countries that have ratified it. It requires nothing from developing nations, even China, the world's largest emitter of carbon dioxide. And it requires nothing of America, which has not ratified it. More importantly, the Kyoto Protocol has not made developed countries cut their emissions as promised. In the absence of effective mechanisms for imposing penalties or resolving disputes, international obligations are hard to enforce. Government commitments to their own national expectations will have far more force.

In comparison, the Copenhagen Accord brings both into purview, both the US and China - the world's leading greenhouse gas emitters. Both developing and developed countries have moved from entrenched positions. India and China have been persuaded to set and achieve peaking emissions, albeit on principles of historical equity.

For India, the conference will be remembered for diluting its principled stand and ceding considerable ground without getting

anything in return. In the run-up to the Copenhagen summit, India took on what it called unilateral emission cuts. It has now agreed to international supervision ("consultation and analysis") of these cuts without securing any guarantees of help with finances and technology. This has left many G-77 members deeply unhappy, although it has obviously pleased the US, whose spokesman declared that the US will now be able to challenge India and China on their actions about emissions reduction.

Flexibility or surrender?

Environment minister Jairam Ramesh admits there has been a shift in India's position and justifies it in the name of flexibility. The tone and tenor of his speech in the Parliament and outside suggests that further 'flexibility' in Indian position cannot be ruled out. For instance, India could formally de-link its mitigation action from financial and technical support from developed countries. And, it would still have to fight in 2010 to defend itself against intrusive scrutiny of its domestic actions. If this is flexibility, what is surrender?

It is true the Chinese also have made grand commitments to fight climate change. However, they insist on remaining stereotypically inscrutable on vital questions of how and how much, while India as a parliamentary democracy will keep such information transparently in the public domain. India's international competitiveness would suffer should the Chinese choose to fudge their figures.

India has indeed divorced itself from the G-77 when it matters. It is now much more a G-20 country and is recognised as such. This reflects the emerging reality. However, G-20 is not a homogenous group. India is much less a sinner than China when it comes to global emissions — in absolute terms, in per capita terms, and in relation to GDP. India could and should have separated itself from China at Copenhagen, and adopted the more strategic argument that it will focus on emissions per unit of GDP - which no one can question in principle, and on which India comes up trumps. It can still do so, if it gives up the pretence that the two countries' interests are aligned.

Whether one approves of this development or not depends fundamentally on whether one thinks any better outcome was possible or whether complete failure at Copenhagen was preferable to the temporary fudge. It is difficult to arrive at a definitive answer, but it is beyond dispute that India has yielded more ground than the US.

Consider the generous sums of money promised by the developed countries for helping the import of clean technologies by developing countries. The UN convention requires that the industrialised countries provide funds and technologies to poor nations and route it through the convention as public funds transfer. But the Copenhagen accord allows rich countries to count private investments, development aid as well as other bilateral funds as part of their obligations under climate change convention.

And as Nobel laureate Thomas Schelling pointed out, the real problem is going to be the formula for sharing the money. This will keep the developing countries fighting with one another just as they did for textile quotas from 1964 to 2005. And more the money, the harder they will fight, which will leave the developed countries to carry on as usual at a very low cost. China has opted out of this fight, which makes it hard for India to remain in it.

What next? Signatory nations have to commit themselves to emissions targets for 2020 by February 1, 2010. Further off, there is the Mexico meet scheduled for December. In terms of actual reduction in emissions, nothing much will happen in the short run. Climate change will retreat to somewhere near the bottom of national agendas because, in governance, the urgent will always take precedence over the important.

All attempts to find small answers to the big problem have been found inadequate. We thought planting bio-fuels was the magic bullet till we learnt that these involved a trade-off when food prices skyrocketed. Increase in fuel-efficiency of vehicles could not help because even as cars became more efficient, people bought more cars and drove more. We pin our faith on technology till we are forced to realise that every liberating advance in technology creates a corresponding dependence.

Sufficiency of sentiment

What the world needs is not so much efficiency of machines as sufficiency of the sentiment. The Industrial Revolution fundamentally altered the relation between Nature and Man. While all other living beings survive by adapting themselves to nature, human beings no longer do so. Western civilization is rooted in the belief - implicit in Genesis, explicit in the works of Aristotle, St Augustine and others - that Nature exists to serve humans and the latter can do anything they like with it.

Harmony with nature

Global warming is a natural consequence of everything that followed from that belief. The world needs to rediscover its old harmony with Nature and switch from a consumption-oriented to a nature-oriented mode of living. It needs to evolve societies whose technologies and social institutions do not clash with Nature's ability to sustain Life. We need a cultural change before we could finally tackle climate change.

The author is Executive Editor, Corporate India, and lives in Mumbai

(Courtesy: <http://www.vijayvaani.com/FrmPublicDisplayArticle.aspx?id=1018>)

■

Why did Copenhagen fail to deliver a climate deal?

By Richard Black

After Copenhagen, there is no "developing world" - there are several.

About 45,000 travelled to the U.N. climate summit in Copenhagen - the vast majority convinced of the need for a new global agreement on climate change.

So why did the summit end without one?

Key governments do not want a global deal: Until the end of this summit, it appeared that all governments wanted to keep the keys to combating climate change within the U.N. climate convention. Implicit in the convention, though, is the idea that governments take account of each others' positions and actually negotiate. That happened at the Kyoto summit. Developed nations arrived arguing for a wide range of desired outcomes; during negotiations, positions converged, and a negotiated deal was done.

In Copenhagen, everyone talked; but no-one really listened. The end of the meeting saw leaders of the U.S. and the BASIC group of countries (Brazil, South Africa, India and China) hammering out a last-minute deal in a back room as though the nine months of talks leading up to this summit, and the Bali Action Plan to which they had all committed two years previously, did not exist. Over the last few years, statements on climate change have been made in other bodies such as the G8, Major Economies Forum (MEF) and Asia-Pacific Economic Co-operation forum (APEC), which do not have formal negotiations, and where outcomes are not legally binding.

It appears now that this is the arrangement preferred by the big countries (meaning the U.S. and the BASIC group). Language in

the "Copenhagen Accord" could have been taken from - indeed, some passages were reportedly taken from, via the mechanism of copying and pasting - G8 and MEF declarations.

The logical conclusion is that this is the arrangement that the big players now prefer - an informal setting, where each country says what it is prepared to do - where nothing is negotiated and nothing is legally binding.

The U.S. political system: Just about every other country involved in the U.N. talks has a single chain of command; when the president or prime minister speaks, he or she is able to make commitments for the entire government. Not so the U.S.. It effectively has two governments, each with power of veto over the other. It makes the U.S. a nation apart in these processes, often unable to state what its position is.

Bad timing: Although the Bali Action Plan was drawn up two years ago, it is only one year since Barack Obama entered the White House and initiated attempts to curb U.S. carbon emissions. He is also attempting major healthcare reforms; and both measures are proving highly difficult.

If the Copenhagen summit had come a year later, perhaps Mr Obama would have been able to speak from firmer ground, and perhaps offer some indication of further action down the line.

The host government: In many ways, Denmark was an excellent summit host. Copenhagen was a friendly and capable city, transport links worked, Bella Centre food outlets remained open through the long negotiating nights.

But the government of Lars Lokke Rasmussen got things badly, badly wrong. Even before the summit began, his office put forward a draft political declaration to a select group of "important countries" - thereby annoying every country not on the list, including most of the ones that feel seriously threatened by climate impacts.

The chief Danish negotiator Thomas Becker was sacked just weeks before the summit amid tales of a huge rift between Mr. Rasmussen's office and the climate department of minister Connie Hedegaard. This destroyed the atmosphere of trust that developing country negotiators had established with Mr Becker.

Procedurally, the summit was a farce, with the Danes trying to hurry things along so that a conclusion could be reached, bringing

protest after protest from some of the developing countries that had presumed everything on the table would be properly negotiated. Suspensions of sessions became routine.

Despite the roasting they had received over the first "Danish text," repeatedly the hosts said they were preparing new documents - which should have been the job of the independent chairs of the various negotiating strands.

China's chief negotiator was barred by security for the first three days of the meeting - a serious issue that should have been sorted out after day one.

The weather: Although "climate sceptical" issues made hardly a stir in the plenary sessions, any delegate wavering as to the scientific credibility of the "climate threat" would hardly have been convinced by the freezing weather and - on the last few days - the snow that blanketed routes from city centre to Bella Centre.

Reporting that the "noughties" had been the warmest decade since instrumental records began, the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) noted "except in parts of North America."

If the U.S. public had experienced the searing heat and prolonged droughts and seriously perturbed rainfall patterns seen in other corners of the globe, would they have pressed their senators harder on climate action over the past few years?

24-hour news culture: The way this deal was concocted and announced was perhaps the logical conclusion of a news culture wherein it is more important to beam a speaking president live into peoples' homes from the other side of the world than it is to evaluate what has happened and give a balanced account. The Obama White House mounted a surgical strike of astounding effectiveness (and astounding cynicism) that saw the president announcing a deal live on TV before anyone - even most of the governments involved in the talks - knew a deal had been done.

The news went first to the White House lobby journalists travelling with the president. With due respect, they are not as well equipped to ask critical questions as the environment specialists who had spent the previous two weeks at the Bella Centre. After the event, of course, journalists pored over the details. But the agenda had already been set; by the time those articles emerged, anyone who was not particularly interested in the issue would have come

to believe that a deal on climate change had been done, with the U.S. providing leadership to the global community.

The 24-hour live news culture did not make the Copenhagen Accord. But its existence offered the White House a way to keep the accord's chief architect away from all meaningful scrutiny while telling the world of his triumph.

EU politics: For about two hours on Friday night, the EU held the fate of the Obama-BASIC "accord" in its hands, as leaders who had been sideswiped by the afternoon's diplomatic coup d'etat struggled to make sense of what had happened and decide the appropriate response.

If the EU had declined to endorse the deal at that point, a substantial number of developing countries would have followed suit, and the accord would now be simply an informal agreement between a handful of countries - symbolising the failure of the summit to agree anything close to the EU's minimum requirements, and putting some beef behind Europe's insistence that something significant must be achieved next time around.

So why did the EU endorse such an emasculated document, given that several leaders beforehand had declared that no deal would be better than a weak deal? The answer probably lies in a mixture - in proportions that can only be guessed at - of three factors:

- + Politics as usual - never go against the U.S., particularly the Obama U.S., and always emerge with something to claim as a success.

- + EU expansion, which has increased the proportion of governments in the bloc that are unconvinced of the arguments for constraining emissions.

- + The fact that important EU nations, in particular France and the U.K., had invested significant political capital in preparing the ground for a deal - tying up a pact on finance with Ethiopia's President Meles Zenawi, and mounting a major diplomatic push on Thursday when it appeared things might unravel.

Having prepared the bed for U.S. and Chinese leaders and having hoped to share it with them as equal partners, acquiescing to an outcome that it did not want announced in a manner that gave it no respect arguably leaves the EU cast in a role rather less digni-

fied that it might have imagined.

Campaigners got their strategies wrong: An incredible amount of messaging and consultation went on behind the scenes in the run-up to this meeting, as vast numbers of campaign groups from all over the planet strived to coordinate their "messaging" in order to maximise the chances of achieving their desired outcome.

The messaging had been - in its broadest terms - to praise China, India, Brazil and the other major developing countries that pledged to constrain the growth in their emissions; to go easy on Barack Obama; and to lambast the countries (Canada, Russia, the EU) that campaigners felt could and should do more.

Now, post-mortems are being held, and all those positions are up for review. U.S. groups are still giving Mr. Obama more brickbats than bouquets, for fear of wrecking Congressional legislation - but a change of stance is possible.

Having seen the deal emerge that the real leaders of China, India and the other large developing countries evidently wanted, how will those countries now be treated?

How do you campaign in China - or in Saudi Arabia, another influential country that emerged with a favourable outcome?

The situation is especially demanding for those organisations that have traditionally supported the developing world on a range of issues against what they see as the west's damaging dominance.

After Copenhagen, there is no "developing world" - there are several. Responding to this new world order is a challenge for campaign groups, as it will be for politicians in the old centres of world power.

(Courtesy: BBC News/Distributed by the New York Times Syndicate.)



More to the Point

By Beth Day Romulo

UN Secretary-general Ban Ki-Moon diplomatically called it an "essential beginning." Environmental activists called it a "disaster." By the time the 100 heads of State joined the ten day Copenhagen conference on Climate Change, their 192 delegates were supposed to have completed a draft agreement on Climate Change, to replace the Kyoto Protocol, which expires in 2012.

What they got were delegates from developed, developing and poor nations at loggerheads about what the agreement should include. And the draft, such as it was, did little to help the majority of countries. True, there was a Climate Change Fund for poorer countries. And de-forestation got a break with a provision to pay poor countries to save their forests.

Otherwise it was a non-binding agreement, which set no target for curbing emissions or verification of progress. In short, it was simply one step forward toward an eventual agreement.

And even this came with a high price. When president Obama arrived, the countries were still wrangling over the terms, and he closeted himself with leaders from China, South Africa, India and Brazil, extending the conference another 18 hours until they could at least produce something, on the way toward the agreement the world needs, instead of simply giving up, and dooming the conference to 'failure. President Arroyo spoke for the vulnerable south-east Asian nations and was accompanied by her adviser on global warming, environmentalist Heherson Alvarez. The Philippines is on the list of nations most at risk and she described the impact of this year's devastating storms and the need for binding commitments to cut carbon emissions.

It is an irony that countries such as Africa which produce the lowest greenhouse gas emissions, suffer the worst from climate change - storms, flooding, drought.

Different countries are adversely affected in different ways. Rising sea levels, as glaciers melt, threaten to submerge low-lying island states. A group of 15 Caribbean states are affected by both rising sea levels and deforestation and need funds from the developed world to help save what's left of their rain forests. France reported that climate change has already affected their wine production because seasons now vary from the norm: heat waves in the Spring storms in the summer, droughts in the south. Vintners are already getting lower yields.

The Philippines, which has taken a regional leadership role in tackling climate change, received \$380 million in financial aid pledges primarily provided by the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank, which will be used for renewable energy projects and energy efficiency. The Copenhagen Accord set an average global temperature rise at a maximum of 2 degrees Celsius.

Financing was pledged for developing countries, in new funding of \$30 billion, with a total of \$100 billion a year by 2020, to help them develop alternate sources of energy and deal with effects of global warming.

Save rainforest

A winner in this interim agreement was the effort to save the rainforests -- a pet project of Britain's Prince Charles who addressed the conference. Rich countries will pay poor countries to save the world's rainforests. Deforestation already accounts for 1/5 of global carbon emissions--more than all the world's cars, buses and airplanes put together.

A stumbling block in creating a viable agreement was China's initial resistance to verification, although Premier Wen Jiabao promised to cut emissions and issue a report on their progress.

As delegates left Copenhagen, they might have taken a look at what Denmark has been doing. They reduced their dependence on imported oil from 90 to 40 percent. The government has subsidized wind energy which is expected to produce half of their electricity needs by 2020, and employs 26,000 workers. They raised taxes on new cars and motor fuel to encourage citizens to use bicycles, which a third of commuters now do, on a network of safe bike lanes.■

(The writer is a well known journalist)

विकास का पश्चिमी मॉडल ही विनाश की जड़

— डॉ. मुरली मनोहर जोशी

सभापति महोदय, मैं जलवायु में परिवर्तन के प्रभाव के बारे में बोलने के लिए खड़ा हुआ हूँ। वैसे तो सारे विश्व में ही पर्यावरण गर्म हो रहा है। उसका असर आज यहां सदन में भी दिखाई दिया। यह बहुत खतरे की बात है, जैसे कि दुनिया का पर्यावरण गर्म होने पर काफी संकट है। अगर सदन में भी इसी तरह से गर्मी बढ़ती रहेगी तो जनतंत्र के लिए संकट खड़ा हो जाएगा। मेरा अनुरोध है कि इस पर्यावरण के मामले पर बहुत गंभीरता से विचार करें। पर्यावरण के संबंध में कुछ तो शॉर्ट-टर्म सवाल हैं और कुछ लॉग-टर्म सवाल हैं। पर्यावरण के कुछ शॉर्ट-ड्यूरेशन इफैक्ट्स हैं और कुछ लॉग-ड्यूरेशन इफैक्ट्स हैं। लॉग-ड्यूरेशन इफैक्ट्स शॉर्ट-ड्यूरेशन इफैक्ट्स से कहीं ज्यादा गंभीर हैं। उनकी चर्चा मैं बाद में करूंगा। पहली बात तो इस ह्यूमन डवलपमेंट रिपोर्ट 2007-08 की शुरुआत में ही कहा गया है कि दुनिया गर्म हो रही है। यह संदेह किया जा रहा है कि जिस रफ्तार से विश्व का तापमान बढ़ रहा है, यदि उसको नियंत्रित नहीं किया गया तो यह भी संभावना है कि 2100 के अंत तक अर्थात् इस शताब्दी के अंत तक 5 डिग्री से भी ज्यादा तापमान आगे बढ़ सकता है। कुछ वैज्ञानिकों का कहना है कि शायद 9 डिग्री तक भी तापमान चला जाए। 5 डिग्री तक तापमान के जाने की संभावनाएं तो बहुत लोग करते हैं लेकिन कुछ वैज्ञानिकों ने अभी जो नये एमआईटी के रिसर्चर आए हैं, उन्होंने बताया है कि शायद यह 9 डिग्री तक चला जाए और यह केवल 21 वीं शताब्दी का ही सवाल नहीं है, 22वीं और 23वीं शताब्दी में भी इसके असर होंगे। उसका एक कारण यह है कि आज जो कुछ हो रहा है, आज से डेढ़ सौ या दो सौ साल पहले जो कुछ हुआ था, यह उसका

असर है। जब पहला स्टीम इंजन बना और जब पहला थर्मल पॉवर प्लांट बना, उससे जो आसमान में कार्बनडाइऑक्साइड के कण गये, उनका असर आज भी पाया जा रहा है। इसका अर्थ है कि जो आज हम कर रहे हैं, उसका असर डेढ़ सौ या दो सौ वर्ष तक रहेगा और जो कल करेंगे, उसका असर और भी ज्यादा रहेगा। इसलिए बहुत विचारणीय बात है कि यह जो हम इस पर्यावरण के संबंध में अपने निष्कर्ष निकालेंगे, वह इस बात को ध्यान में रखकर अभी बताया जा रहा है कि अगर औसत तापमान 2 से 3 डिग्री तक बढ़ गया तो उसके बहुत ज्यादा खतरनाक परिणाम होंगे। सबसे बड़ी बात तो यह है कि कैटेस्ट्रोफीक इम्पैक्ट्स होने लगेंगे। किसी को पता ही नहीं लगेगा। अभी तो कुछ चीजें ज्ञात हैं लेकिन पर्यावरण के मामले में तब अज्ञात होने लग जाएंगी, पता ही नहीं चलेगा। उसका कारण यह है कि मॉडलिंग के जितने हमारे तरीके हैं, वे तरीके आज की विशेष परिस्थिति को सामने रखकर बनाये गये हैं। लेकिन अगर उसमें कुछ और अधिक अज्ञात तत्व आ गये तो फिर उसका निदान करना और भी कठिन होगा। इसलिए यह कहा जाता है कि यह जो तीन आईपीसीसी की रिपोर्ट थीं और इसमें जो तीन सिनेरियो बताये गये हैं, उसमें यह कहा गया है कि शायद 5 डिग्री से अधिक तापमान के जाने के चांसेज 50 प्रतिशत से भी अधिक हैं। यह उम्मीद की जा सकती है कि 5 डिग्री से अधिक तापमान जा सकता है। यह बहुत खतरनाक बात है क्योंकि आपको पता ही नहीं है कि तापमान 3 डिग्री जाएगा या 5 डिग्री जाएगा। जैसा मैंने आपको बताया कि अभी जो इमीशंस हैं जिनके बारे में चिंता की जा रही है, किसी एक स्तर पर हमें उनको कायम करना है कि इसको कहीं रोका जाए और कैसे रोका जाए और कौन चीजें हैं जो इस तापमान को बढ़ा रही हैं। इस तापमान को बढ़ाने की सबसे बड़ी एजेंसी एनर्जी है, ऊर्जा है। तापमान को बढ़ाने में एनर्जी का 25 परसेंट, लैंड यूज और फॉरेस्ट्री के अंदर अदल-बदल करें तो आठ परसेंट, एग्रीकल्चर का छः परसेंट, इंडस्ट्रियल प्रॉसेस का डेढ़ या दो परसेंट और वेस्ट का डेढ़ परसेंट कन्ट्रीब्यूशन है। आप इंडस्ट्रियल एनर्जी को डेढ़ समझ रहे हैं लेकिन इसमें ऊर्जा का ज्यादातर हिस्सा इंडस्ट्री के साथ है। ऊर्जा में कौन सबसे ज्यादा कन्ट्रीब्यूट कर रहा है? इसमें पुरानी इंडस्ट्रियलाइज्ड कंट्रीज, जिनका 200 साल से औद्योगिकीकरण हो चुका है, वे इसमें सबसे अधिक कन्ट्रीब्यूशन कर रही हैं। मैं आपको एक उदाहरण देता हूँ, यूनाइटेड किंगडम की जनसंख्या केवल छः करोड़ है, यह इजिप्ट, नाइजीरिया, पाकिस्तान और वियतनाम,

जिनकी संख्या 47 करोड़ है, से ज्यादा कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड दे रहा है, ये अकेला देश दे रहा है। नीदरलैण्ड तो बोलिविया, कोलम्बिया, पेरू, उरुग्वे और सेंट्रल अमरीका के साथ छोटे देशों की तुलना में अकेला ही सबसे ज्यादा कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड दे रहा है। टेक्सास, अमरीका की एक स्टेट है, इसकी पापुलेशन दो करोड़ है, यह 700 मिलियन टन कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड पैदा कर रही है। इस तरह से ये अकेली एक स्टेट सारे यूएसए का 12 परसेंट कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड दे रही है। यह अफ्रीका और सब-सहारन रीज़न, जिनकी जनसंख्या 72 करोड़ है, से ज्यादा है। न्यूयार्क में 19 मिलियन आदमी रहते हैं और 50 लीस्ट डेवलपमेंट कंट्रीज, जिनकी जनसंख्या 74 करोड़ है। एक अकेला न्यूयार्क शहर उनसे ज्यादा कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड दे रहा है। अब आप समझ लीजिए कि सबसे ज्यादा तापमान बढ़ाने या पर्यावरण में परिवर्तन लाने का काम इन धनी देशों का है। आप देखें कि आज स्थिति यह हो गई है कि 1.6 बिलियन यानी 160 करोड़ लोग ऐसे हैं जिनमें 70 करोड़ लोग साउथ एशिया और सब-सहारन रीज़न में रहते हैं उनके पास एनर्जी नहीं है, बिजली नहीं है। ईस्ट एशिया में 22 करोड़ लोग रहते हैं। सब-सहारन अफ्रीका में 54 करोड़ बिना ऊर्जा के लोग रहते हैं। यह स्थिति ऊर्जा डिस्ट्रीब्यूशन की है। अब आप देखें कि कि कितने लोगों के पास बिजली का अभाव है, बिजली नहीं है। The number of people in India Living without access to electricity is around 500 million. हमें यहां हमेशा रूरल इलैक्ट्रिफिकेशन के आंकड़े मिलते हैं कि इतने गांवों में बिजली पहुंच गई। आप बिजली का मतलब यह समझते हैं कि तार लग गए और खंभे लग गए, तब तो जरूर मिल गई। लेकिन बिजली मिलती नहीं है। Electricity is not available: energy is not available. आप बार-बार कहते हैं कि ऊर्जा नहीं है तो विकास नहीं होगा। दुनिया में 1.4 बिलियन लोग हैं जिनके पास किसी भी प्रकार की आधुनिक ऊर्जा सेवाएं नहीं हैं। यह दयनीय स्थिति है कि इनमें से छः मिलियन यानी एक चौथाई लोगों के पास बिल्कुल भी ऊर्जा स्रोत नहीं है। लेकिन यह ऊर्जा गई कहा? ये सब उन धनी लोगों ने ले ली है। दुनिया के आठ-दस बड़े देश हैं और कुल मिलाकर करीब बीस बड़े और छोटे विकसित देश हैं, जिनके पास सारी ऊर्जा है, सारे स्रोत हैं। इन्होंने प्राकृतिक स्रोतों पर कब्जा किया हुआ है इसलिए बाकी देशों में ऊर्जा का अभाव है।

महोदय, अब यह कहा जा रहा है कि ठीक है, ऊर्जा में तो गड़बड़ हो गई, पर्यावरण में विकृति आ गई लेकिन अब इसे ठीक करेंगे। अब ऐसा करते

हैं कि आप अपने यहां पेड़ उगाइए, ज्यादा कार्बन पैदा कीजिए ताकि कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड एब्जॉर्ब हो जाए और हमें कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड बनाने दीजिए। हम आपको पैसा दे देते हैं, आप और पेड़ लगाइए। आप कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड एब्जॉर्ब कीजिए, आप सिंक बन जाइए और हम कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड पैदा करते हैं। आजकल विकसित देश, कोपनहेगन और इससे पहले के सम्मेलनों में, संस्थाओं के सामने हमारी चिंताओं और समस्याओं को केवल इसी बात पर मूलतः आधारित करते हैं कि हमें ऊर्जा उत्पादन करने दीजिए। हमें अपना उत्पादन करने दीजिए, आप बाजार बने रहिये, हम बिजली पैदा करते रहें, आप उसे खरीदते रहिये। हम कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड देते रहें, आप अपने यहां फॉरेस्टेशन करते रहिये। आपको विकास करने की जरूरत नहीं है, वह तो हम कर ही रहे हैं। हमारा विकास और आपका विनाश, ये दोनों साथ-साथ चलते रहेंगे। ये जो आज एक विशेष बात इस पर्यावरण के कारण आकर खड़ी हो गई है, इसे हमें समझने की जरूरत है। यह बहुत खतरनाक चीज है। मैं आपको यह भी कहता हूँ कि अगर यह बात सच भी मान ली जाए कि हम अपने यहां ज्यादा फॉरेस्टेशन करके ज्यादा कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड एब्जॉर्ब करें तो विज्ञान का विद्यार्थी होने के नाते मैं कह सकता हूँ कि कुछ दिनों के बाद जब एक सीमा से अधिक हमारे यहां कार्बन एब्जॉर्प्शन हो जायेगा तो फिर उसके बाद लॉ ऑफ डिमिनिशिंग रिटर्न्स होगा। फिर उसकी एब्जॉर्प्शन कैपेसिटी कम हो जाती है। फिर वह एब्जॉर्प्शन नहीं करेगा। यानी कुछ दिनों तक हमें पैसा दे देंगे, कुछ दिनों तक हमारे यहां कार्बन डाइऑक्साइड का एब्जॉर्प्शन होता रहेगा और उसके बाद हम फिर वही फटेहाल के फटेहाल बने रहेंगे, क्योंकि हमारे पास कोई रास्ता नहीं बचेगा। दरअसल पश्चिम का यह जो डैवलपमेंटल मॉडल है, यह उसका बहुत बड़ा दुष्परिणाम है।

मुझे याद आता है जब देश आजाद हुआ था, तब महात्मा गांधी से किसी ने यह पूछा था कि अब आप आजाद हो गये हैं तो अंग्रेजों ने जिस तरह से अपना विकास किया है, क्या आप उसी तरह से अपना विकास करेंगे? तब महात्मा गांधी ने बहुत अच्छी बात कही थी, उन्होंने कहा कि आधी दुनिया को लूटकर इंग्लैंड धनी बना है, कितनी दुनियाओं को लूटकर हिंदुस्तान धनी बनेगा। How Many Planets? आधी दुनिया को लूटकर अगर इंग्लैंड धनी बन सकता है तो इंग्लैंड के मुकाबले उस समय हमारी सात गुनी जनसंख्या थी तो कम से कम हमें साढ़े तीन दुनिया तो लूटनी पड़ेगी। आज जो स्थिति

है, वह यह है कि अगर हर आदमी उसी तरह से विकास करना चाहे, यानी वैसा ही कार्बन फुट प्रिंट देना चाहे, जैसा कि डैवलपड कंट्रीज दे रहे हैं तो उसके लिए छः दुनिया लूटनी पड़ेंगी। कितनी लूट मचाई जाए, कितने लोगों को गरीब बनाया जाए, कितने सारे प्राकृतिक साधनों को लूटा जाए, कितना इमिशन दुनिया में दिया जाए। छः प्लेनेट्स कहां से लायेंगे, एक दुनिया तो बचानी मुश्किल है। विश्व के अलावा और रिसोर्सेज कहां हैं, उसी की खोज चल रही है। आज चंद्रमा में देखो, क्या मिल रहा है, मंगल में देखो क्या मिल रहा है। अब यह बताया जा रहा है कि और दूसरी दुनिया में जाकर रहिये, वे बहुत अच्छी हैं। वहां बहुत साधन मिलेंगे। जब मिलेंगे, तब मिलेंगे। हम अपनी दुनिया की बात कर रहे हैं। हमें इस दुनिया की बात करनी है, यहां क्या होगा? आने वाले सौ, दो सौ, तीन सौ सालों में क्या होगा, हमारी अगली पीढ़ी के लिए क्या होगा? यह सब कहना बहुत हास्यास्पद है कि आप उसी डैवलपमेंटल मॉडल से विकास कर सकते हैं।

सभापति जी, मैं मंत्री महोदय और उनके माध्यम से सरकार को चेतावनी देना चाहता हूँ कि जब तक आपका विकास का यह मॉडल रहेगा, जब तक आप पश्चिमी तरीके से दुनिया का विकास करने के लिए चलेंगे, तब तक पर्यावरण की समस्या हल नहीं होगी। मानव जाति के लिए उसके अस्तित्व की समस्या खड़ी हो जायेगी। आप देखिये सारी दुनिया में आजकल कैसा हाहाकार मचा हुआ है। उस वक्त एक विचित्र स्थिति पैदा होगी। दुनिया के 16 प्रतिशत लोग सारी दुनिया के 80 प्रतिशत संसाधनों पर, सारी दुनिया के उत्पादन पर और सारी दुनिया के उपभोग पर स्वामित्व रखते हैं। पानी के लिए हाहाकार मचा हुआ है। आधी दुनिया के पास पीने का पानी नहीं है। यदि ग्लोबल वार्मिंग हुआ तो उससे क्या-क्या चीजें होंगी। उससे हमारे देश और विश्व के अंदर कितनी समस्याएं पैदा होंगी, उसके बारे में मैं आपको संक्षेप में बताना चाहता हूँ। पहली बात यह होगी कि यदि तापमान इसी तरह से बढ़ता गया तो ध्रुवों पर जो आइस जमा है, वह पिघल जायेगी। उसके क्या परिणाम होंगे। अब यह कहा जा रहा है कि जितने असेसमेंट्स थे, उससे दोगुने, तिगुने सी लैवल का राइज होगा। हमारे मुम्बई का क्या होगा, चेन्नई का क्या होगा, गोवा का क्या होगा, अंडमान और निकोबार द्वीपसमूह का क्या होगा, मालदीव का क्या होगा, आइसलैंड का क्या होगा, हमारे पशुओं की प्रजातियों का क्या होगा, खेती का क्या होगा? आज भी कहा जा रहा है कि फूड प्रोडक्शन में कमी हो रही है। यह कमी अगले 10-20 सालों

में 8 से 10 प्रतिशत हो जायेगी। और 2020 तक जाते जाते यह और ज्यादा हो जायेगी। देश की 51 प्रतिशत भूमि इससे प्रभावित होगी। हमारे पास आंकड़े हैं, दृश्य हैं और सैटेलाइट से चित्र आते हैं कि दुनिया की क्या हालत है? दुनिया के कितने हिस्से में रेगिस्तान हो रहा है, कितनी जगहों से वैजिटेशन गायब होता जा रहा है, पशु-पक्षी गायब होते जा रहे हैं, नई नई बीमारियां पैदा हो रही हैं। स्वास्थ्य विभाग के लोगों का कहना है कि दुनिया में डेंगू और मलेरिया बहुत तेजी से फैलेगा, डेंगू, मलेरिया और कालाजार के रोगियों की संख्या और अधिक बढ़ जायेगी तो हमारे भारतवर्ष की क्या हालत होगी? आप दवाईयां नहीं दे सकते हैं, नई नई बीमारियों की दवाईयां इजाजत करना मुश्किल होगा। आप पेटेंट कानून बनाने जा रहे हैं और जहां बना हुआ है, वहां आप कुछ नहीं कर सकेंगे। फिर आपको कोलोनाइज करने की स्कीम चल रही है, उधर आपका कहां ध्यान है? अगर पर्यावरण के इस प्रभाव को नहीं रोका गया तो मुझे डर है कि विश्व के अंदर भयानक विभीषिका खड़ी हो जायेगी, दुनिया में संघर्ष खड़े होंगे, दुनिया के देशों के बीच में संघर्ष खड़े होंगे। एक विचित्र प्रकार की स्थिति विश्व में पैदा होगी। मुझे इस बात का भी खतरा लगता है कि अनाज, वनस्पति और जीव-जन्तुओं की स्पीसिज गायब हो जायेगी। हालांकि अन्य लोग भी इस पर बोलेंगे अतः मैं कुछ ज्यादा नहीं कहना चाहता। आंकड़े आ रहे हैं जिससे चिन्ता पैदा होती है कि पर्यावरण के कारण मृत्यु ज्यादा होगी, लोगों के सामने आवास की समस्या आ रही है, रिहैबिलिटेशन की समस्या आ रही है जो सारी दुनिया के सामने एक भयानक विभीषिका पैदा कर रहे हैं।

सभापति जी, माननीय मंत्री जी ने हम सब सांसदों को एक पत्र लिखा जिसमें कहा गया कि भारत को क्या करना है, भारत का क्या रुख है, उसका खुलासा किया गया है। मुझे खुशी है कि सांसदों को चिट्ठी लिखकर उनके विचार जाने गये। आपने कहा है "A shared vision for long term cooperative action including a long term global goal for emission reduction." कौन मान रहा है? लॉगटर्म कोआपरेशन को लोग नहीं मान रहे हैं, अमरीका मना करता है तो यह कौन सा लॉग टर्म ग्लोबल गोल मानने वाला है, यह विश्व की आर्थिक महाशक्ति बना हुआ है जिसके सामने हमने घुटने टेके हुये हैं। हम उससे क्या आशा कर सकते हैं कि लॉग टर्म गोल में हमारा साथ देगा, मुझे इसका यकीन नहीं? मुझे यकीन हो सकता था लेकिन मैंने एक विचित्र बात पिछले दिनों देखी। अमरीका में जब क्लाइमेट पर एक बिल

पास हो रहा था तो उस समय एक बड़े प्रसिद्ध व्यक्ति पॉल क्रुगमैन का एक लेख 'बिट्रेडिंग दी क्लाइमेट' पर आया। जब बिल रखा गया तो वह पास हो गया लेकिन जो विरोधी थे, उन्होंने आगे बात कही। उन्हें कितनी प्रशंसा मिली, मैं उस लेख को पूरा नहीं पढ़ूंगा लेकिन कुछ जरूर पढ़ना चाहूंगा। यह जून महीने की बात है।

"But if you watched the debate on Friday, you did not see people who have thought hard about a crucial issue, and are trying to do the right thing. What you saw, instead, were people who show no sign of being interested in the truth. They don't like the political and policy implications of climate change, so they have decided not to believe in it - and they'll grab any argument, no matter how disreputable, that feeds their denial."

Indeed, if there was a defining moment in Friday's debate in America, it was the declaration by Representative Paul Broun of Georgia that climate change is nothing but a 'hoax' that has been perpetrated out of the scientific community.

यह उनकी चिन्ता है और उनको बेहद प्रशंसा मिली। क्रुगमैन वह आगे कहते हैं -

"I would call this a crazy conspiracy theory, but doing so would actually be unfair to crazy conspiracy theorists. After all, to believe that global warming is a hoax you have to believe in a vast cabal consisting of thousands of scientists - a cabal so powerful that it has managed to create false records on everything from global temperatures to Arctic sea ice."

अगर यह उनका दृष्टिकोण है तो आगे उनसे क्या आशा करें कि वे किसी भी विकसित देश में और विकासशील देशों में जो पिछले 200 सालों से अपराध करते चले आ रहे हैं, वे उस अपराध की सजा से बचना चाहेंगे, उससे मुक्ति पाना चाहेंगे, प्रायश्चित्त करना चाहेंगे, उन पर बिल्कुल भरोसा नहीं किया जा सकता। आगे कहते हैं कि "Still, is it fair to call climate denial a form of treason? Isn't it politics as usual? Yes, it is - and that's why it is unforgivable. Do you remember the days when Bush Administration officials claimed that terrorism posed an "existential threat" to America, a threat in whose face normal rules no longer apply? That was hyperbole - but the "existential threat" from climate change is all too real." इसमें सारे रूल्स लगाने चाहिए। टैरिज्म का

श्रेट हो जाए तो सब रूल्स फेंक दो, क्लाइमेट चेंज की विभीषिका आये और सारा विश्व प्रभावित हो जाए, आपके अपराध से प्रभावित हो जाए और इसके लिए हमें दबाया जाए। इसके लिए हमसे कहा जाए कि आप इमिग्रेंस कम कीजिए, इसके लिए हमसे कहा जाए कि आप अपनी विकास की रफ्तार को कम कीजिए। ये गहरे सवाल हैं और इसके ऊपर आपको बहुत चिंता के साथ बात करनी होगी। मेरा अपना ख्याल है कि हमें कोपनहेगन में इस बारे में बहुत डटकर अपनी बातें कहनी होंगी। अगर हम वहां दबे, अगर हम वहां थोड़े से भी झुके तो हम अपनी आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियों का जीवन नष्ट करेंगे। हम अपनी आगे आने वाली पीढ़ियों के अपराधी होंगे, जैसे आज भी हैं। इन 60 सालों में भी हमने जो कुछ किया है, जिस रास्ते पर हम देश के विकास को ले गये हैं, भले ही हमारा इमिग्रेशन बहुत कम है, इसमें कोई शक नहीं है, लेकिन फिर भी हम अभी बचे हुए हैं। अगर आपने इस रास्ते को तेजी से पकड़ा तो जरा विचार कीजिए कि अगर इस देश का हर व्यक्ति उतना ही एमीशन करने लगे, जितना अमेरिकन प्रति व्यक्ति कर रहा है, वह हमसे 16-17 गुणा अधिक कर रहा है तो दुनिया की क्या हालत होगी, हमारी क्या हालत होगी? अगर अकेला बांग्लादेश ही उतना करने लग जाए तो क्या हालत होगी? क्या विकास का यह मॉडल सस्टेनिबल कंजप्शन दे सकता है, क्या यह सब लोगों को डिग्नीफाइड जीवन दे सकता है, क्या यह सब लोगों को रोटी, कपड़ा, मकान, पानी, दवाई आदि दे सकता है? अगर सिर्फ 16 परसेंट लोग आज सारी दुनिया के साधनों पर हावी हों, अगर दो बिलियन लोग दो डॉलर के ऊपर भी प्रतिदिन गुजारा नहीं कर पा रहे हों तो यह विकास का मॉडल हमें कहां ले जाएगा? मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूँ कि इसके बारे में आप बहुत गंभीरता से विचार करें। हमारे विज्ञान के कुछ लोगों की अभी कांफ्रेंसिज हुई थीं, उसमें विचार हुआ कि इसे आम जनता को कैसे समझाया जाए? उसने बहुत अच्छी बात कही। ये हैं मिस्टर जॉन रूकस्ट्रम, जो हमारे स्टॉकहोम एनवायरमेंटल इंस्टीट्यूट के अध्यक्ष हैं। वे कहते हैं, "The financial crisis happened because we allowed housing loans way beyond the stock levels that were available. Similarly, we are subsidizing our living standards to a level which the planet cannot afford." जितना आपके बैंक में पैसा नहीं था, उससे ज्यादा वहां आपने हाउसिंग के अंदर लोन दिये। नतीजा आपकी इकोनॉमी कॉलैप्स कर गयी। आप जितना पर्यावरण बर्दाश्त कर सकता है, उससे कहीं ज्यादा खर्च कर

रहे हैं तो आपका पर्यावरण कॉलैप्स कर जाएगा, आपका जीवन कॉलैप्स कर जाएगा। अगर आप गौर से देखें तो उसी डेवलपमेंटल मॉडल से वहां इकोनॉमिक क्राइसेस आये। उसी कंजंपशन की तरफ जाने से, उपभोक्तावाद के कारण वहां क्राइसिस आयी, अर्थव्यवस्था डूब गयी। उसी उपभोक्तावाद के कारण जलवायु का प्रदूषण शुरू हुआ, यह प्राकृतिक साधनों का निर्बाध शोषण शुरू हुआ। इसका नतीजा हुआ कि आज हमारे सामने पर्यावरण का संकट है, मानवता का संकट है, मानव के अस्तित्व का संकट है। पहली बात सोचने की यह है कि जिस अर्थव्यवस्था ने, जिस टैक्नोलॉजी ने, जिस उत्पादन की व्यवस्था ने, जिस मार्केट सिस्टम ने, मार्केट पर डिपेंडेंस ने आज दोनों तरफ, आर्थिक और क्लाइमेटिक यह हालत पैदा की है। उसके बारे में गहराई से वहां विचार होना चाहिए। The fundamentals of globalisation and Western guidelines to development are flawed. They are wrong. ये ठीक नहीं हैं और वे बदलने चाहिए। मैं आपको बता रहा हूँ कि इसके बारे में मैं बहुत पहले से बोलता चला आ रहा हूँ। पिछले दिनों मैंने कई स्थानों पर इसके लिए आगाह किया था और मुझे खुशी है कि अब उसे हमारे जो वर्ल्ड बैंक के तत्कालीन अध्यक्ष मिस्टर वोल्फॉसन ने स्वीकार किया है कि यह दुनिया इनबैलेंस हो गयी है। उन्होंने सितम्बर 2003 में वर्ल्ड बैंक के अपने गवर्नर्स की मीटिंग को संबोधित करते हुए एक बात कही:-

"Last week, in Paris, I met youth leaders who represented organisations with more than 120 million members worldwide."

(DISCUSSION RE: IMPACT OF CLIMATE CHANGE-Contd.)

श्रीमन् मैं बता रहा था कि श्री वोल्फॉसन ने यह सवाल उठाया था, जब उन्होंने 2003 में दुबई में वर्ल्ड बैंक के गवर्नर्स की कांफ्रेंस को सम्बोधित किया था। तब उन्होंने यह कहा था:

"Last week, in Paris, I met with youth leaders who represented organizations with more than 120 million members worldwide."

और तब उन्होंने कहा कि इन लोगों ने उनके सामने जो बात कही, वह बड़ी महत्वपूर्ण है।

"But, they also said, we do not want a future based only on economic considerations-there must be something more. They chal-

lenged us about values and beliefs....To respond to them, we must address the fundamental forces shaping our world. In many respects, they are forces that have caused imbalance.This world is out of balance."

यह विश्व असंतुलित विश्व है, यह वर्ल्ड बैंक का अध्यक्ष कह रहा है।

"In our world of six billion people, one billion own 80 percent of global gross domestic product (GDP), while another billion struggle to survive on less than a dollar a day. This is a world completely out of balance"- फिर आगे कहते हैं: "Mr. Chairman, it is time to take a cold, hard look at the future. Our planet is not balanced. Too few control too much, and too many have too little to hope for-too much turmoil, too many wars, too much suffering."

फिर आगे कहते हैं:

"We all share one planet. It is time to restore balance to the way we use it. Let us move forward to fight poverty, to establish equity, and to assure peace for the next generation."

लेकिन वे खुद कह रहे हैं कि 80 परसेंट जी.डी.पी. सारी दुनिया के सिर्फ 16 परसेंट लोग कर रहे हैं। Where is equity? Where is inclusive growth? आपके इस देश में इन्क्लूसिव ग्रोथ कहां है और क्लाइमेट चेंज तो इस इन्क्लूसिविटी को बिल्कुल नष्ट कर देगा, एक्सक्लूसिविटी बढ़ा देगा, अगर यहां सिर्फ 20 परसेंट लोग डैवलप्ड हैं और 80 परसेंट लोग अंडर डैवलप्ड हैं, अनडैवलप्ड हैं। आपकी रिपोर्ट्स ऑफ्टर रिपोर्ट्स कह रही हैं कि बिलो पावर्टी लोगों की संख्या बढ़ रही है, आपके रिसोर्सेज घट रहे हैं, आपकी प्रोडक्टिविटी घट रही है तो आप किस दुनिया की बात कर रहे हैं? कौन इक्विटी लाना चाहता है? क्या ये वेस्टर्न कंट्रीज इक्विटी लाना चाहते हैं? क्या ये दुनिया को बराबरी से देखना चाहते हैं? आज कहा जा रहा है कि प्लेनेट के ऊपर जो सारा एटमास्फियर है, वह दुनिया की संपत्ति है। उसे सबको शेयर करना चाहिए। आज तक इन दो सौ सालों में तो सिर्फ आपने शेयर किया है। आपने जो अपराध किए हैं, उसका खामियाजा नहीं भुगतना चाहते, दंडित नहीं होना चाहते। दंडित तो दूर की बात, प्रायश्चित भी नहीं करना चाहते, उल्टा हमें उपदेश देते हैं।

मंत्री जी, मैं आपसे स्पष्ट रूप से कहना चाहता हूँ कि यह जो आज सवाल है, सारी दुनिया के ऊपर सिर्फ जलवायु से संबंधित नहीं है, अपितु यह

व्यापक सवाल है। यह डेवलपमेंटल मॉडल का सवाल है, यह टेक्नॉलाजी का सवाल है, यह मार्केट को रिप्लेस करने का सवाल है। क्या मार्केट फोर्सज सारी दुनिया को चलायेंगे? क्या प्रोडक्शन की टेकनिक्स मार्केट ओरिएण्टेड होंगी? आपने अपनी चिट्ठी में लिखा है कि आप चाहते हैं enhanced action on technology development and transfer to support action on mitigation and adaptation. कौन टेक्नॉलाजी आपको देगा? हमारे विदेश मंत्री जी जो पढ़ रहे थे, इसमें उन्होंने कहा है कि जो प्रधानमंत्री जी की अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति महोदय से बातें हुयी हैं। उसमें वह कहते हैं कि Prime Minister and President Obama announced the launch of a Clean Energy and Climate Change Initiative. The Initiative includes cooperation in wind and solar energy, second generation bio-fuels, unconventional gas, energy efficiency and clean coal technologies including carbon capture and storage.

मैं आपसे पूछना चाहता हूँ where are the patent laws? ये टेक्नॉलाजी आपको मुफ्त में नहीं देंगे, उसकी कीमत वसूल करेंगे। पहले हमारे यहां पोल्यूशन करेंगे, फिर उस पोल्यूशन को दूर करने के लिए हमें टेक्नॉलाजी दिखायेंगे और उसकी कीमत वसूल करेंगे। इसलिए पहली बात यह है कि we must change the technology. आज की टेक्नॉलाजी हाई एनर्जी, हाई कैपिटल टेक्नॉलाजी है। एनर्जी इसके अंदर सबसे बड़ा दोषी है। इसलिए we must go to the low energy and low capital technologies. हमारे देश को इस मामले में अनुसंधान करना चाहिए। सोलर एनर्जी के संबंध में मुझे बहुत आशा है कि अगर उसको ठीक ढंग से काम कराया जाएगा, तो हमारे देश के लिए बहुत आत्मनिर्भर ऊर्जा देने वाली, क्लीन ऊर्जा देने वाली एक शक्ति है। दुनिया की सारी ऊर्जा सूर्य से आती है। सूर्य से सबसे अधिक ऊर्जा प्रति स्क्वायर किलोमीटर हमारे देश को मिलती है। सोलर इनर्जी हमारी सबसे ज्यादा है। आप उसका उपयोग करिए, लेकिन नहीं करेंगे। उसकी तरफ ध्यान नहीं देंगे। आप ध्यान किस तरफ देंगे, बाहर से क्रूएड ऑयल मंगाने के लिए, गैस बेस्ड, थर्मल बेस्ड, आप कहां से थर्मल चलाएंगे? जो आपके थर्मल बेस्ड प्लांट्स आज चल रहे हैं, उसके लिए आप कितने टन कोयला इंपोर्ट करेंगे? अगर वर्ष 2030 में देखेंगे, तो 14 सौ मिलियन टन आपको कोयला इंपोर्ट करना पड़ेगा। आप कहां से करेंगे?

मेरा सवाल यह है कि आप इस पर विचार करिए। पूरे डेवलपमेंटल मॉडल को बदलिए। सस्टेनेबल डेवलपमेंट के बजाय, सस्टेनेबल कंजप्शन

हो। आज ऐसा विकास का मॉडल चाहिए जो दुनिया के हर आदमी को एक रीजनेबल डिग्निफाइड लिविंग की अपार्युनिटी दे सके। उसको मकान, कपड़ा, दवाई, भोजन और आगे आने की सुविधायें सभी तरह से हों। जो मॉडल आज दुनिया में ऐसी विभिषिका पैदा कर रहा है, उसे नकार दीजिए। कोपेनहेगेन में डटकर कहिए कि आपके डेवलपमेंटल मॉडल से सारी दुनिया को नुकसान हुआ है, दुनिया में गरीबी बढ़ी है, बीमारी बढ़ी है, बेरोजगारी बढ़ी है, हाहाकार बढ़ा है, पानी और अनाज का संकट बढ़ा है। इसको बदलिए।

भारत को इस मामले में नेतृत्व करना चाहिए। भारत वह देश है जहां ऋग्वेद से लेकर आज तक पर्यावरण के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहा गया है। अथर्ववेद का पृथ्वी सूक्त पढ़कर उनको सुनाइए। हम आज से नहीं, हजारों साल से बोल रहे हैं – माता भूमि, पुत्रो पृथिव्या अहम। एम्स्टर्डम में पांच-छः साल पहले वैज्ञानिकों ने यही कहा है कि this earth is a living system; it is not a dead spaceship. यह स्पेसशिप नहीं है कि जिसमें हम चक्कर लगा रहे हैं। It is a living planet. इसके अंदर वही सब तत्व हैं, जो एक लिविंग आर्गेनिज्म में होते हैं। जैसा मेरा जीवन है, वैसा ही इस प्लैनेट का जीवन है। इसे बिल्कुल आप एक निर्जीव प्राणी समझकर, निर्जीव और इनर्ट समझकर इसके साथ व्यवहार मत कीजिए, इसे चैतन्यमयी मां मानकर इसके साथ व्यवहार कीजिए। अगर आप पृथ्वी को अपनी मां मानते हैं, जैसा कि हम भारतवासी मानते हैं, तो फिर कोई अपनी मां के साथ बलात्कार नहीं कर सकता। मां का दूध तो पिया जा सकता है, पर मां का खून नहीं पिया जा सकता है। इस पश्चिमी मॉडल ने पृथ्वी के पर्यावरण का खून पीने का एक शोषणकारी मॉडल दिया है। हम उसको नकारते हैं। हम दुनिया से कहना चाहते हैं कि अपनी लाइफ स्टाइल को बदलिए। हमारी आवाज होनी चाहिए कि पश्चिमी लोगों को अपना कंजप्शन कम करना चाहिए, बदलना चाहिए। जिन लोगों की उन्होंने लूट कर अपना सारा जीवनयापन किया है, उसका कम से कम ब्याज तो वापस कर देना चाहिए, अगर मूल वापस नहीं कर सकते हैं तो। उन्हें कहना चाहिए कि आपको पहले शर्मिंदा होना चाहिए कि आपने सारी दुनिया पर अत्याचार किया। अब यह अत्याचार ज्यादा दिनों तक नहीं चलेगा। दुनिया के साढ़े पांच बिलियन लोग डेढ़ मिलियन लोगों के खिलाफ खड़े हो रहे हैं। जलवायु के, पर्यावरण के सवाल ने आज मौका दिया है कि भारत उन तमाम बेसहारा लोगों का, उन तमाम हाहाकार मचाते लोगों का नेतृत्व करे। आपको अवसर मिला है। मुझे खुशी होगी यदि प्रधान मंत्री

जी वहां जाएं और दुनिया के सामने यह बताएं कि भारत बेसहारा लोगों का नेतृत्व करेगा। भारत सारी दुनिया में इक्विटी लाएगा, भारत सारी दुनिया के लोगों को एक रीजनेबल लैवल ऑफ डिगनिफाइड ऐंग्जिसटैंस के लिए रास्ते दिखाएगा। मुझे खुशी होगी, हम उसमें आपका साथ दें। लेकिन यदि आपने डैवलपमेंटल मॉडल का वही राग अलापा और आप उन्हीं के साथ चलते रहे और उसी में कुछ सुधार करते रहे, तो कुछ नहीं होगा।

मुझे आपसे एक और बात व्यक्तिगत कहनी है। मुझे यह बताया गया है कि आपने अमरीका में किसी भाषण में यह कहा था कि *Yankees go home but take us with you*. अगर यह सच है तो मुझे शर्म है, अगर यह गलत है तो मैं सुनना चाहूंगा। यांकी अपने देश जाएं, मुझे कोई आपत्ति नहीं है। वे दुनिया में कहीं भी जाएं, मगर आप उनके साथ मत जाइए। इस विभीषिका को लाने वालों के साथ आप अपने को मत जोड़िए, आप भारत के साथ रहिए, आप उनके साथ मत जाइए।

इतना कहकर मैं अपना वक्तव्य समाप्त करता हूँ।



कोपेनहेगन में घाटे का सौदा

— ब्रह्मा चेलानी

कोपेनहेगन में जलवायु परिवर्तन पर दुनिया भर के देशों की वार्ता कार्बन उत्सर्जन घटाने के लिए महत्वाकांक्षी और कानूनी रूप से बाध्यकारी कार्ययोजना तैयार नहीं कर पाई है, किंतु इससे कुछ महत्वपूर्ण हासिल हुआ है। इस वार्ता ने चीन, भारत, ब्राजील और दक्षिण अफ्रीका से जलवायु संकट का हल निकालने के एक अंग के रूप में राजनीतिक वचनबद्धता ले ली है और इस प्रकार उस जलवायु परिवर्तन व्यवस्था का कायापलट हो गया है, जिसके तहत कार्बन उत्सर्जन घटाने का भार पूरी तरह विकसित देशों पर था। भविष्य में अंतरराष्ट्रीय वार्ताएं इन राजनीतिक वचनबद्धताओं के आधार पर होंगी। वर्तमान व्यवस्था के दो स्तंभ 1997 क्योटो प्रोटोकाल और 1992 संयुक्त राष्ट्र जलवायु परिवर्तन सम्मेलन अब अधिक महत्वपूर्ण नहीं रह गए हैं।

कोपेनहेगन में अमेरिकी राष्ट्रपति बराक ओबामा की 13 घंटों की वार्ता अमेरिका के लिए दोहरी सफलता लाई है। सबसे पहली तो यह कि विश्व की मात्र 4.5 प्रतिशत आबादी वाला जो देश 22 प्रतिशत कार्बन उत्सर्जन के लिए जिम्मेदार है वह किसी भी प्रकार की बाध्यकारी वचनबद्धता से बच गया है। दूसरा यह कि ओबामा न केवल चीन, ब्राजील और दक्षिण अफ्रीका, बल्कि भारत जैसे काफी गरीब देश को भी वचनबद्धता के दायरे में खींच लाए हैं, जिसके कार्बन उत्सर्जन का स्तर किसी भी महत्वपूर्ण विकासशाली देश से भी बहुत कम है। नई व्यवस्था के तहत भारत को राष्ट्रीय उत्सर्जन कटौती पर अंतरराष्ट्रीय निगरानी तंत्र का हिस्सा बनना होगा। सरल शब्दों में कहा जाए तो कोपेनहेगन में नया अंतरराष्ट्रीय प्रोटोकाल निर्धारित नहीं हुआ, बल्कि इसके विपरीत विद्यमान जलवायु परिवर्तन व्यवस्था को पुनर्निर्धारित किया गया। कोपेनहेगन समझौते में नई शर्तें शामिल की गई हैं। विकसित देशों के लिए यह सफलता का प्रतीक है। कोपेनहेगन संधि में वातावरण में ग्रीनहाउस गैसों के बनने में बड़ा योगदान देने वाले देशों या प्रति व्यक्ति उत्सर्जन स्तर के निर्धारण में उद्देश्यपरक मानदंड निर्धारित करने का जरा भी

संदर्भ नहीं आया। भारत के लिए इस संधि का आशय मोलभाव की क्षमता की कूटनीतिक क्षति है। भारत जलवायु परिवर्तन के लिए आर्थिक बोझ उठाने के लिए तैयार हो गया है, जबकि करोड़ों भारतीय बेहद गरीबी में जी रहे हैं और इनके पास बुनियादी सुविधाएं तक नहीं हैं। धनी देशों ने अंतरिम समझौते के तहत वंचित देशों के साथ कार्बन कटौती का भार साझा करके जलवायु परिवर्तन के अन्यायपूर्ण युग के द्वार खोल दिए हैं। जिस प्रकार पांच परमाणु हथियार संपन्न देशों ने अपनी श्रेष्ठता कायम रखने के लिए 1970 में परमाणु अप्रसार संधि कर ली थी उसी प्रकार जो देश जल्दी अमीर बन गए हैं वे पर्यावरण क्षति और अधिक कार्बन उत्सर्जन की अपनी विरासत के बावजूद नए जलवायु युग में अपनी विशेष स्थिति को बनाए रखना चाहते हैं।

धनी देश 1992 में संयुक्त राष्ट्र जलवायु परिवर्तन रूपरेखा सम्मेलन और क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल द्वारा निर्धारित अपनी पृथक जिम्मेदारी से बचना चाहते हैं। इसके साथ ही वे मांटेरियल प्रोटोकॉल और मास्ट्रिख संधि जैसे कई अन्य समझौतों के माध्यम से अंतरराष्ट्रीय कानून में बदलाव करते रहते हैं। क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल का लक्ष्य है— कार्बन उत्सर्जन में 1990 के स्तर से मात्र सात प्रतिशत कटौती की करना। अपनी जिम्मेदारी से बचने के लिए धनी देशों ने बहाना ढूंढा हुआ है कि जब तक विकासशील देश भी उत्सर्जन कम करने पर राजी नहीं होंगे तब तक वैश्विक तापमान में कमी नहीं लाई जा सकती। यह महज टांग-खिंचाई का एक सुविधाजनक बहाना है। इसे पश्चिम में फैली इस धारणा से समझा जा सकता है कि जलवायु संकट का अधिक भार विकासशील देशों पर पड़ना चाहिए। कार्बन उत्सर्जन में कटौती के लिए धनी देशों को अपने आर्थिक विकास की गति कम नहीं करनी चाहिए, क्योंकि वे उभरती हुई अर्थव्यवस्थाओं से मिलने वाली गंभीर चुनौती का सामना कर रहे हैं।

कोपेनहेगन ने यह डर बढ़ा दिया है कि 1992 के समझौते और क्योटो प्रोटोकॉल में संशोधन कर धनी देश नई व्यवस्था के तहत लाभ की स्थिति को बनाए रखने में कामयाब हो जाएंगे। नई व्यवस्था संपन्न और वंचित देशों की खाई और चौड़ी कर देगी और जलवायु परिवर्तन पर अप्रसार संधि देखने को मिल सकती है। कोपेनहेगन संधि के मूल में नए किस्म का मोलभाव दिखाई दे रहा है। वास्तव में, अपने अगले प्रमुख अंतरराष्ट्रीय कदम के तौर पर ओबामा परमाणु अप्रसार संधि को मजबूत करने के लिए अप्रैल में एक सम्मेलन आयोजित करने जा रहे हैं।

तुलनात्मक शर्तों पर महत्वपूर्ण पहलू यह है कि शक्तिशाली खिलाड़ी कानूनी बाध्यताओं में हेरफेर करके परमाणु अप्रसार संधि थोपना चाहते हैं।

इसलिए प्रमुख सिद्धांत है—एनपीटी अवधारणा की सुरक्षा करो, इसका अनुमोदन करो और इसे मजबूत करो, किंतु जलवायु सिद्धांतों में नवीनीकरण करो, पुनर्निर्धारण करो और जलवायु परिवर्तन परिदृश्य में सुधार लाओ। दूसरे शब्दों में, एनपीटी सिद्धांत को अकाट्य घोषित किया जा रहा है, जिसमें किसी भी प्रकार का संशोधन और छेड़छाड़ नहीं की जा सकती, जबकि कोपेनहेगन संधि को जलवायु परिवर्तन सिद्धांतों के कायापलट की विकासपरक प्रक्रिया के रूप में दर्शाया जा रहा है। यह देखते हुए कि एनपीटी सिद्धांत जलवायु परिवर्तन सिद्धांत से एक-डेढ़ पीढ़ी पुराना है, यह कहा जा सकता है कि अगर नवीनीकरण की आवश्यकता है तो वह पुराने सिद्धांत के लिए ही है।

यह आश्चर्यजनक है कि नाभिकीय अप्रसार संधि के लिए भारी कीमत चुकाने के बाद भारत अब नए जलवायु परिवर्तन सिद्धांत की कीमत चुकाने के लिए भी तैयार हो गया है। इसके विपरीत एनपीटी की तरह ही जलवायु परिवर्तन में चीन ने अपनी ताकत को बढ़ाने के बाद समझौता किया है। आखिरकार, विश्व के सबसे बड़े प्रदूषक के तौर पर चीन भारत के बजाय अमेरिका के अधिक करीब है। वास्तव में भारत ने एक ऐसे देश के साथ समान लक्ष्य निर्धारित किया है, जिसका प्रति व्यक्ति उत्सर्जन भारत की तुलना में करीब पांच गुना अधिक है, इससे बीजिंग के गरीब देशों पर आश्रय के प्रयासों की ही पुष्टि होती है।

यद्यपि किसी भी तरह के जलवायु सिद्धांत से बाहर भी काफी कुछ किया जा सकता है, किंतु निराशाजनक है कि प्रदूषण फैलाने वाले सबसे बड़े देश अपनी तरफ से कुछ भी करने में हिचकते हैं। ऊर्जा खपत को ही लें, जिससे लाभ की एक-चौथाई स्थिति हाथ से निकल जाती है। जापान की तुलना में अमेरिका में प्रति व्यक्ति कार्बन उत्सर्जन लगभग दोगुना है, जबकि दोनों देशों की प्रति व्यक्ति आय लगभग बराबर है। अमेरिका के कैलिफोर्निया में प्रति व्यक्ति ऊर्जा खपत 1974 से स्थिर है, जबकि इस दौरान पूरे अमेरिका में प्रति व्यक्ति ऊर्जा खपत 50 प्रतिशत बढ़ गई है। कोपेनहेगन ने दिखा दिया है कि जलवायु परिवर्तन केवल विज्ञान का विषय ही नहीं है, इसके दायरे में भूराजनीति भी आती है और भूराजनीति में धनबल और बाहुबल वाले बेहतर प्रदर्शन कर पाते हैं।

(लेखक सामरिक मामलों के विशेषज्ञ हैं)