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A GIFT FROM THE CORPORATE WORLD!

SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT

Johannesburg World Summit 2002
A timetable to reduce emissions?!

...not until there's more evidence of global climate change!
HOPES FOR THE WORLD SUMMIT

.. TO SAVE THE ENVIRONMENT!

.. TO UPLIFT THE POOR!

.. TO KEEP EXPLOITING THE ENVIRONMENT AND THE POOR WHILE THEY FIGHT IT OUT!

Johannesburg 2002

ENVIRONMENT-ALISTS

POVERTY ACTIVISTS

BUSINESS
In this presentation:

- **Context** for climate debt amidst market failures, commodity crashes, financial crises and African ecology
  2. **Definitions**, components, and accounting implications of climate debt
  3. **Financing** climate debt repayment
  4. Taking the debtor to court
  5. Support the **movement**!
Ugandan Marxist Dani Nabudere’s thesis vindicated

The Crash of International Finance Capital and The Rise and Fall of Money Capital
Longer term stagnation in per capita GDP growth
Urgent to correct GDP bias (global) for pollution, resource extraction, etc

A "genuine progress indicator corrects the bias in GDP"  
Source: redefiningprogress.org
Accompanied by ‘hollowing corporations’ in the US
(source: John Bellamy Foster and Fred Magdoff, 2009)
Extreme economic crisis: Recent production crash in historical terms

As bad as 1929

Source: Eichengreen and O’Rourke
Trade crash in historical terms

Worse than 1929

Source: Eichengreen and O’Rourke
Stock market crash in historical terms

Worse than 1929

Source: Eichengreen and O’Rourke
### Sub-Saharan African GDP, exports/imports, savings/investment, state spending, 2005-09

Source: IMF, Regional Economic Outlook, October 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real GDP</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GDP</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Percent change)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exports of goods and services</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Imports of goods and services</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross domestic saving</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross domestic investment</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal balance (including grants)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Commodity prices crash, exports shrink

Sources: IMF, Commodity Prices, and UN Comtrade.

1 Composite of cocoa, coffee, sugar, tea, and wood, weighted by sub-Saharan African exports.

Source: IMF, Regional Economic Outlook, October 2009
Initial post-crisis IMF reaction across Africa: re-impose the Washington Consensus!
17 contractionary orders, 5 expansionary

IMF-Supported Macroeconomic Policies and the World Recession: A Look at Forty-One Borrowing Countries
Mark Weisbrot, Rebecca Ray, Jake Johnston, Jose Antonio Cordero and Juan Antonio Montecino

October 2009
“I found a flaw in the model that I perceived is the critical functioning structure that defines how the world works... [and am] in a state of shocked disbelief.” — Alan Greenspan

23 October 2008
OOPS... NEVER MIND!

FALSE PROFIT...

I. Deregulation
II. Deregulation
III. Deregulation
IV. Deregulation
V. Deregulation
VI. Deregulation
VII. Deregulation
VIII. Deregulation
IX. Deregulation
X. Deregulation
To the rescue! Obama’s economic team: Larry Summers, Tim Geithner, Paul Volcker
The ‘impeccable’
neocolonial logic of
the waste trade

DATE: December 12, 1991
TO: Distribution
FR: Lawrence H. Summers

... I think the economic logic behind
dumping a load of toxic waste in the
lowest wage country is impeccable
and we should face up to that... I've
always thought that under-
populated countries in Africa are vastly UNDER-polluted.

(full memo at www.whirledbank.org)
'Underpolluted?'
Rise in Southern African temperatures over historic norms

Source: Mark Jury
Lake Chad dries — 1973-2001

Kilimjinjaro melts — 1970-2000
Climate and African food

“It is projected that there could be a possible reduction in yields in agriculture of: 50% by 2020 in some African countries... In Africa, crop net revenues could fall by as much as 90% by 2100, with small-scale farmers being the most affected.”

2. Definitions, components and accounting implications of climate debt
Accion Ecologica: ecological debt is the debt accumulated by Northern, industrial countries toward Third World countries on account of resource plundering, environmental damages, and the free occupation of environmental space to deposit wastes, such as greenhouse gases, from the industrial countries.
Multinational corporate profits as a percentage of firm equity

Extractive industries

Africa’s oil map

- Substantial oil reserves
- Oil and wars: Sudan, Angola, Chad, Congo
- US imports 16% from Africa
- In ten years will import 25%


.credit: Horace Campbell
“For too long official Washington has been gripped by the perception that the United States has no vital interests in Sub-Saharan Africa. Nothing could be further from the truth. As the political and security conditions of the Persian Gulf deteriorate the availability and appeal of reliable, alternative sources of oil for the American market grows. *African oil is emerging as a clear direction U.S. policy could take to provide a secure source of energy.*”

U.S. Assistant Secretary of State Walter Kansteiner III, 2003
Joan Martinez-Alier: “The notion of an Ecological Debt is not particularly radical. Think of the environmental liabilities incurred by firms (under the United States Superfund legislation), or of the engineering field called ‘restoration ecology’, or the proposals by the Swedish government in the early 1990s to calculate the country’s environmental debt.”
Martinez-Alier: “Ecologically unequal exchange is one of the reasons for the claim of the Ecological Debt. The second reason for this claim is the disproportionate use of Environmental Space by the rich countries.”
Types of ecological debt
(Joan Martinez-Alier):

- renewable resources that have been exported;
- future lack of availability of destroyed resources;
- damages produced by exports (smelter sulphur dioxide, mine tailings, water pollution by mining);
- profits from stolen genetic resources (‘biopiracy’);
- imports of solid or liquid toxic waste; and
- disproportionate use of ‘Environmental Space’, e.g. (unpaid) costs of free disposal of gas residues (carbon dioxide, CFCs, etc) assuming equal rights to sinks and reservoirs ($75 billion/year).
Examples of biopiracy in Africa

2005 study by Edmonds Institute, African Centre for Biosafety:

* **diabetes drug** produced by a Kenyan microbe;
* **antibiotics** from Gambian termite hill and West African snails;
* **antifungal** from Namibian giraffe and **nematocidal fungi** from Burkina Faso;
  * **infection-fighting amoeba** from Mauritius;
* **Congo (Brazzaville)** treatment for **impotence**;
  * **vaccines** from Egyptian microbes;
* **SA and Namibian indigenous appetite suppressant Hoodia**;
* **drug addiction treatments**, multipurpose kombo butter from Central, W.Africa;
  * **beauty, healing treatment** from Okoumé resin in Central Africa;
* **skin and hair care** from the argan tree in Morocco, etc etc
Monday, January 21, 2008 -- The environmental
damage caused to developing nations by the
world's richest countries amounts to **more than
the entire third world debt of $1.8 trillion**, according to the first systematic global analysis
of the ecological damage imposed by rich
countries. The study found that there are huge
disparities in the ecological footprint inflicted by
rich and poor countries on the rest of the world
because of differences in consumption.
Richard Norgaard, ecological economist at University of California, Berkeley: “At least to some extent, the rich nations have developed at the expense of the poor, and, in effect, there is a debt to the poor. That, perhaps, is one reason that they are poor. You don't see it until you do the kind of accounting that we do here.”
As human impacts to the environment accelerate, disparities in the distribution of damages between rich and poor nations mount. Globally, environmental change is dramatically affecting the flow of ecosystem services, but the distribution of ecological damages and their driving forces has not been estimated. Here, we conservatively estimate the environmental costs of human activities over 1961–2000 in six major categories (climate change, stratospheric ozone depletion, agricultural intensification and expansion, deforestation, overfishing, and mangrove conversion), quantitatively connecting costs borne by poor, middle-income, and rich nations to specific activities by each of these groups. Adjusting impact valuations for different standards of living across the groups as commonly practiced, we find striking imbalances. Climate change and ozone depletion impacts predicted for low-income nations have been overwhelmingly driven by emissions from the other two groups, a pattern also observed for overfishing damages indirectly driven by the consumption of fishery products. Indeed, through disproportionate emissions of greenhouse gases alone, the rich group may have imposed climate damages on the poor group greater than the latter’s current foreign debt. Our analysis provides prima facie evidence for an uneven distribution pattern of damages across income groups. Moreover, our estimates of each group’s share in various damaging activities are independent from controversies in environmental valuation methods. In a world increasingly connected ecologically and economically, our analysis is thus an early step toward reframing issues of environmental responsibility, development, and globalization in accordance with ecological costs.
Included: greenhouse gas emissions, ozone layer depletion, agriculture, deforestation, overfishing, and converting mangrove swamps into shrimp farms

Not included (too difficult): excessive freshwater withdrawals, destruction of coral reefs, bio-diversity loss, invasive species, and war
World Bank estimates of tangible wealth: 
what price on subsoil, timber, not-timber forest resources, protected areas, cropland, pastureland, produced capital, urban land, intangible wealth? 
the cases of Rwanda, Senegal, Seychelles, Singapore and South Africa 
(per capita US$ measure – *Where is the Wealth of Nations*, WB, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>7,709,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1,849</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>2,068</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>3,055</td>
<td>5,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>9,530,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>1,272</td>
<td>975</td>
<td>7,920</td>
<td>10,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>81,131</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>28,836</td>
<td>96,653</td>
<td>125,572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>4,018,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>79,011</td>
<td>173,595</td>
<td>252,607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>44,000,000</td>
<td>1,118</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>3,400</td>
<td>7,270</td>
<td>48,959</td>
<td>59,029</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continued)
World Bank method for adjusting savings to account for a country’s tangible wealth and resource depletion: The case of Ghana, 2000 (per capita US$ measure)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangible wealth</th>
<th>Adjusted net saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsoil assets</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber resources</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFR</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected areas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastureland</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced capital</td>
<td>886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tangible wealth</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Education expenditure  | 7                   |
| Consumption fixed capital | 19               |
| Energy depletion       | 0                   |
| Mineral depletion      | 4                   |
| Net forest depletion   | 8                   |

Population growth 1.7% \(\Delta\) Wealth per capita -18

*Note: Data for 2000. NTFR: nontimber forest resources.*
Why World Bank estimates are conservative:

* minimalist definition based upon international pricing in 2000 (not potential future values when scarcity becomes a more crucial factor, especially in the oil industry);

* only partial calculation of damages to the local environment, to workers’ health/safety, and especially to women in communities around mines;

* Bank’s use of average – not marginal – cost resource rents also probably leads to underestimations of the depletion costs.
World Bank method for adjusting savings to account for a country’s tangible wealth and resource depletion: The case of Ghana, 2000 (per capita US$ measure) (Where is the Wealth of Nations?, 2006)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tangible wealth</th>
<th>Adjusted net saving</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subsoil assets</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber resources</td>
<td>280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTFR</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected areas</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cropland</td>
<td>855</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastureland</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Produced capital</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross National Saving</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education expenditure</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consumption fixed capital</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy depletion</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mineral depletion</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net forest depletion</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total tangible wealth</td>
<td>2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted net saving</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population growth</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ Wealth per capita</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Data for 2000. NTFR: nontimber forest resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>GNI per capita</th>
<th>Population growth rate (%)</th>
<th>Adjusted net saving per capita</th>
<th>Change in wealth per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Benin</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Botswana</td>
<td>2025</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1021</td>
<td>814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td>548</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Verde</td>
<td>1195</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>-81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chad</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>-8</td>
<td>-74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comoros</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>-17</td>
<td>-73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo, Rep. of</td>
<td>660</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-227</td>
<td>-727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d’Ivoire</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td>3370</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>-1183</td>
<td>-2241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gambia, The</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>343</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>-11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritania</td>
<td>382</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>-30</td>
<td>-147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>3697</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Namibia</td>
<td>1820</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>392</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-10</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>-97</td>
<td>-210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>-27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seychelles</td>
<td>7089</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1162</td>
<td>904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>2837</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swaziland</td>
<td>1375</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>-20</td>
<td>-88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>-13</td>
<td>-83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zimbabwe</td>
<td>550</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All dollars at nominal exchange rates.

Is reformed resource extraction the answer?

Credibility of Kimberley Process on the Line, Say NGOs (IRIN, June 22, 2009)

The credibility of the Kimberley Process Certification Scheme (KPCS) - an initiative to prevent conflict diamonds from entering the multibillion dollar market - is being questioned by NGO activists ahead of a three day international meeting in Namibia on 23 June.

UK-based Global Witness, which led the campaign to set up the certification system, said in a statement on 19 June: "Despite having all tools in place, the scheme was failing effectively to address issues of non-compliance, smuggling, money laundering and human right's abuses in the world's alluvial diamond fields."
3. Financing the repayment of ecological debt
REPAYMENT VIA AID?
Declining commitments
Source: World Development Movement

[Graph showing ODA/GNI over time with key events and years marked on the x-axis.]
AID IN CONTEXT:
Far less than military spending - and 60% is ‘phantom aid’

Source: UNDP HDR 2005 and World Development Movement
ActionAid ask: How much is required for climate mitigation, 2020?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Amount required per year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adaptation&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>US$86 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean technology&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>US$65 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Combating deforestation&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>US$24 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural mitigation&lt;sup&gt;5&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>US$7 billion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>US$182 billion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

... how much is pledged?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fund</th>
<th>Amounts pledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Special Climate Change Fund</td>
<td>US$12 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Least Developed Countries Fund</td>
<td>US$182 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyoto Protocol Adaptation Fund</td>
<td>US$61 million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>US$255 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Who should pay what share?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>% of global total</th>
<th>Mitigation amount per year by 2020 (billions)</th>
<th>Adaptation amount per year by 2020 (billions)</th>
<th>TOTAL amount per year by 2020 (billions)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$US$</td>
<td>€</td>
<td>$US$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>US</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU17</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>27.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Korea</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Repayment responsibility?

Ecological debt results from the unsustainable production and consumption systems adopted by elites in the Northern countries, which are to some extent generalized across the Northern populations.
Hence even poor and working-class people in the North, *often through no fault of their own*, are tied into systems of auto-centric transport or conspicuous consumption, which mean that they consume far more of the Earth’s resources than do working-class people of the South.
Hence ‘Greenhouse Development Rights’ (per capita rights to pollute – and to trade pollution rights) are dubious.

Is justice measured merely in terms of formal ‘equality’?

Isn’t justice historical, political-economic, and grounded in social struggles of those adversely affected?

Shouldn’t justice aim for eco-social transformation?
Greenhouse Development Rights?
Larry Lohmann (Cornerhouse): critique of Baer/Athanasiou/Kartha’s “tacit endorsement of a long-discredited concept of ‘development’ that condescendingly sees ‘resilience’ as ‘far beyond the grasp of the billions of people that are still mired in poverty’ and singles out for special climate blame ‘subsistence farming, fuel wood harvesting, grazing, and timber extraction’ by ‘poor communities’ awaiting Northern tutelage in capital flows, social networking, carbon trading and methods for holding policymakers accountable.”
4. Taking the debtor to court?
JUSTICE IN THE (US) COURTS?

- In November 2008 a San Francisco court began considering a reparations lawsuit – under the Alien Tort Claims Act - filed by Larry Bowoto and the Ilaje people of the Niger Delta against Chevron for involvement in 1998 murders reminiscent of those that took the life of Ken Saro-Wiwa and eight other Ogoni leaders on November 10, 1995. The first judgements went against Bowoto et al but appeals are in process.

- On June 10 2009, Shell reparations payments of $15.5 million were accepted by the families of Saro-Wiwa and the Ogoni Nine. Though just four hours’ worth of Shell profits, it is considered a crucial step in establishing liability and disincentivising corporate exploitation of people and nature.
Reparations lawsuits now being heard in New York by victims of apartheid who are collectively requesting $400 billion in damages from three dozen US corporations who profited from South African operations during the same period. Supreme Court justices had so many investments in these companies that in 2008 they bounced the case back to a lower New York court to decide, effectively throwing out an earlier judgment against the plaintiffs: the Jubilee anti-debt movement, the Khulumani Support Group for apartheid victims, and 17 000 other black South Africans. When Judge Clara Scheindlin replaced the late John Sprizzo, the case suddenly was taken seriously and in March 2009 moved a step closer to trial when she rejected the corporations’ attempt to have it dismissed.
Dennis Brutus, a leading activist and honorary prof at UKZN Centre for Civil Society
1970s anti-apartheid sanctions leader -> 2009 reparations plaintiff
• Climate change lawsuit settled out of court in February 2009 by Friends of the Earth, Greenpeace and cities of Boulder, Colorado, Arcata, Santa Monica and Oakland in California.

• Targets were US Export-Import Bank and Overseas Private Investment Corporation, which invested, loaned or insured $32 billion in fossil fuel projects from 1990–2003 with no regard to the US National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). At present, only US cities have formal standing to sue for damages from climate change under NEPA, in the wake of a 2005 federal ruling.

• Defendants will incorporate CO2 emissions into planning (http://www.foe.org/climatelawsuit)
Lawsuits point to climate change litigation threat
Oct 22, 2009 - Paula Dittrick, OGJ Senior Staff Writer

*HOUSTON, Oct. 22* -- A climate change litigation threat appears to be looming for the oil and gas industry in the wake of a US Supreme Court decision allowing the regulation of greenhouse gases as air pollutants.

Federal courts recently issued conflicting decisions in climate change litigation. One case involved Murphy Oil USA, and another case involved ExxonMobil Corp. and others. Power companies face the same issues.

The recent litigation all stems from an Apr. 2, 2007, decision in which the Supreme Court ruled that the Environmental Protection Agency has authority under the Clean Air Act to regulate greenhouse gases. That ruling came in a lawsuit filed by Massachusetts and several other states, US cities, and environmental groups.

On Sept. 21, the US Circuit Court of Appeals for the 2nd Circuit in San Francisco allowed a coalition of eight states, New York City, and environmental groups to sue coal-burning utilities over climate change. The San Francisco ruling later was cited in the Murphy Oil ruling...

On Oct. 16, a three-judge panel of the US Court of Appeals for the 5th Circuit in New Orleans said residents and land owners along the Gulf Coast in Mississippi could seek relief for Hurricane Katrina damages presumed to be related to global warming.
5. Support the movement!
Momentum for ecological debt work in Africa:

- following Bolivian and Ecuadoran governments’ lead, Meles Zanawi (Ethiopian dictator) demands reparations for CO2 emissions, 25/6/09

- movements against ecological debt need to be built within CJN!, given profile and cross-fertilised across the Global South
The climate debt of developed countries must be repaid, and this payment must begin with the outcomes to be agreed in Copenhagen. Developing countries are not seeking economic handouts to solve a problem we did not cause. What we call for is full payment of the debt owed to us by developed countries for threatening the integrity of the Earth’s climate system, for over-consuming a shared resource that belongs fairly and equally to all people, and for maintaining lifestyles that continue to threaten the lives and livelihoods of the poor majority of the planet’s population. This debt must be repaid by freeing up environmental space for developing countries and particular the poorest communities.
Crucial battle this week:
African leaders demand $67/bn year

Ethiopian PM Meles Zenawi on 3 September 2009 threatening Copenhagen Summit (reminiscent of Seattle WTO 1999, Cancun 2003):

‘If need be we are prepared to walk out of any negotiations that threatens to be another rape of our continent.’
Little/no progress with global governance:
Top-down failures in economics, politics, environment
Montreal Protocol on CFCs, 1996

but since then:
- Kyoto Protocol 1997 and aftermath
- World Bank, IMF Annual Meetings: trivial reforms
- Post-Washington Consensus: rhetoric since 1998
- UN MDG strategies, 2000
- WTO Doha Agenda 2001: failure
- Monterrey 2002 Financing for Development and G20 global financial reregulation 2008-09: failure
- renewed war in S.Asia, Middle East, 2001-?
- UN Security Council Reform 2005
- G8 promises on aid, NEPAD/APRM, Gleneagles: ?
As a result, from below, African eco-justice movement activists define terrains of future eco-debt struggles

- activists fighting **Monsanto’s GM drive** from the US to South Africa to several African countries;
- **blood-diamonds** victims from Sierra Leone, Angola, Botswana and Zimbabwe continue to build pressure after failure of Kimberley Process;
- **victims of SA mining capital** - platinum in Limpopo and titanium on the Wild Coast - successfully protest extraction;
- **Lesotho peasants** objecting to displacement during construction of the continent’s largest dam system (solely to quench Johannesburg’s irrational and hedonistic thirst);
- Ugandans similarly threatened at the overly expensive, corruption-ridden **Bujagali** dam, Mozambicans fighting the **Mpande Nkua** dam on the Zambizi, and Ethiopians opposed to the **Gibe** dam;
- Ghanaian, South African and other activists opposing **water privatization**;
- a growing network questioning Liberia’s long exploitation by **Firestone**;
- **Chadian and Cameroonian** activists pressuring the World Bank not to continue funding their repression and environmental degradation; and
- **Oil Watch** linkages of Nigerian Delta activists such as those who signed the Ogoni Bill of Rights and many other Gulf of Guinea communities.
Ogoni Bill of Rights

We, the people of Ogoni (Babbe, Gokana, Ken Khana, Nyo Khan and Tai) numbering about 500,000, being a separate and distinct ethnic nationality within the Federal Republic of Nigeria, wish to draw the attention of the Government and people of Nigeria to the under mentioned facts:

… that oil was struck and produced in commercial quantities on our land in 1958…

that in over 30 years of oil mining, the Ogoni nationality have provided the Nigerian nation with a total revenue estimated at over 40 billion Naira (N40 billion) or 30 billion dollars.

that in return for the above contribution, the Ogoni people have received NOTHING…

that the search for oil has caused severe land and food shortages in Ogoni - one of the most densely populated areas of Africa (average: 1,500 per square mile; national average: 300 per square mile.)

that neglectful environmental pollution laws and sub-standard inspection techniques of the Federal authorities have led to the complete degradation of the Ogoni environment, turning our homeland into an ecological disaster.

that the Ogoni people lack education, health and other social facilities.

that it is intolerable that one of the richest areas of Nigeria should wallow in abject poverty and destitution…

Adopted by general acclaim of the Ogoni people on the 26th day of August, 1990, at Bori, Rivers State
Petro-mineral resources:
Leave the oil in the soil
Leave the coal in the hole
Leave the tar sand in the land

- Alaska wilderness and California offshore drilling campaigners
- Oil Watch
- women of the Niger Delta, ERA, MEND
- Australian *Rising Tide* v Newcastle coal exports
- British Climate Camp
- Attac, Norway
- Alberta, Canada tar sands green & indigenous activists
- South Durban Community Environmental Alliance against new pipeline that will double petrol flow to Johannesburg
- Ecuadoran indigenous activists, Accion Ecologia and Rafael Correa - agree that Ecuador’s main oil reserve (Ishpingo-Tiputini-Tambococha, in Yasuní National Park) should stay in the ground (August 2007), to be financed by Germany (June 2009)
Climate Justice Now!
Bali, December 2007

- Carbon Trade Watch (a project of the Transnational Institute);
- Center for Environmental Concerns;
- Focus on the Global South;
- Freedom from Debt Coalition, Philippines;
- Friends of the Earth International;
- Women for Climate Justice;
- Global Forest Coalition;
- Global Justice Ecology Project;
- International Forum on Globalization;
- Kalikasan-Peoples Network for the Environment;
- La Vía Campesina;
- Durban Group for Climate Justice;
- Oilwatch;
- Pacific Indigenous Peoples Environment Coalition;
- Sustainable Energy and Economy Network (Institute for Policy Studies);
- Indigenous Environmental Network;
- Third World Network;
- Indonesia Civil Society Organizations Forum on Climate Justice;
- World Rainforest Movement.
Climate Justice Now! Bali, December 2007
Movement demands:

• reduced consumption;
• huge financial transfers from North to South based on historical responsibility and ecological debt for adaptation and mitigation costs paid for by redirecting military budgets, innovative taxes and debt cancellation;
• leaving fossil fuels in the ground and investing in appropriate energy-efficiency and safe, clean and community-led renewable energy;
• rights-based resource conservation that enforces Indigenous land rights and promotes peoples’ sovereignty over energy, forests, land and water; and
• sustainable family farming and peoples’ food sovereignty.