



“Respect Europe” Conference, Goteborg, 14 June 2001

Rémi Parmentier,  
Political Director, Greenpeace International  
[remi.parmentier@diala.greenpeace.org](mailto:remi.parmentier@diala.greenpeace.org)

I would like to express my gratitude for the opportunity provided to me to speak to you today. Since the Rio *Earth Summit* of 1992, a lot has been said about the need for environmental NGOs and responsible business leaders to work better together, with an action-oriented agenda. There has been progress in this direction, but certainly not enough. My presence here today on behalf of Greenpeace International shows however that more solid action-oriented bridges between NGOs and responsible business are possible. The fact that this is taking place at the same time and place as the US/EU Summit is good, because this is a message your US colleagues need to hear urgently.

There is no doubt that we are already in the climate crisis. The melting of Arctic sea ice, mountain glaciers and Antarctic ice-shelves, the increased rates of extreme weather patterns, increased forest fires, floods and increased insurance liability are almost a daily reality. This reality, and its human-induced nature, have been confirmed again recently by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). One of Australia's biggest insurers has withdrawn coverage of properties in northern Australia because of fears over projected climate changes.

It is also clear that people are beginning to wake up to the issue as a real and present danger. You have witnessed the global public outcry over George W Bush's decision to dump the Kyoto Agreement. With his blindness, GW has managed to increase the feelings on this issue even in the United States by several orders of magnitude. So far, obviously, he has shot himself in the foot, but we cannot wait for the US government and Congress to wake up.

The scale of changes that are needed to the way we power the modern world have not yet been fully grasped—not by politicians, and not by the public. Clearly, the sooner we start along this track, the better.

The solutions do exist. Renewable energy sources such as solar, wind and wave are already here. Together with energy efficiency, Renewable energy can provide a safe future. But production and installation need to be scaled up dramatically in order to see the shift that is required. Some countries are already starting to scale up. Denmark, for example, has an ambitious goal of producing 50% of its electricity from wind sources by 2030 (and in fact Denmark is on track to be producing 30% of its electricity from Renewables by 2005). This is encouraging.

But meanwhile, 2 billion people (and this number is increasing as population growth is outstripping development) do not have access to any of the modern forms of energy that we in Europe take for granted. This is a global environmental issue, as well as an issue of social justice. An issue of social justice because this is another way in which these people are kept in poverty and ill-health, and in which the inequity of the world is increased:

- **Ill-health**: some of the highest concentrations of air pollutants occur indoors in rural areas because of inefficient cooking and heating stoves. Women and children are most exposed to this pollution;
- **Poverty**: the world's poorest people often pay more for energy than the richest. Light from kerosene can cost the equivalent of US\$ 20 per kilowatt/hour compared to the US10 cents (EUR 12 cents) we typically pay in Europe;
- **Inequity**: if we are serious about a world striving for more equity, the rich North must question its current consumption patterns, and we must help the South with effective sustainable and safe clean alternatives;
- And it is an issue for the **global environment** because development for these people could go one of two ways. It could take the traditional route—implying massive development of fossil fuel and nuclear energy sources; or it could take a new route, drawing the lessons from the grave mistakes we have committed in the North. Do we want to offer a sustainable, or an unsustainable future to the developing countries, and therefore to the whole world? This is the real question.

So, back to GW. One of the key allegations that Bush uses for rejecting the Kyoto Protocol is that it does not include emission reduction targets for developing countries. His arguments are flawed: the Kyoto Protocol contemplates contiguous commitment periods well into the future, and reduction, stabilization or limitation targets will be set for developing countries in future as part of the second and subsequent commitment periods after 2012 and beyond. It is just that the first round of emissions cuts follows the principle that the wealthy nations--those that have caused the problem to date and benefited from the largest share of greenhouse gas emissions--are required to take action to reduce emissions first.

It is also true that humankind and the environment cannot afford for developing countries to follow the same fossil-intensive development path as did the rich northern countries. However, so far little has been done (especially by those in the US that talk the loudest) to actually encourage and help these countries to change their development patterns. At the same time as Bush is demanding that developing countries take action, his government continues to bankroll the export of fossil fuel technologies to those very countries. And he fails to acknowledge that one of his prime targets, China, has actually reduced emissions by 17% since 1996 and that US emissions have increased more than China in the period since 1990.

There is a different model, however. One that would be good for the environment, good for the wellbeing of people in the developing world--and good for generating the massive upscaling in Renewables technologies that we in the wealthy north also need.

A study that we shall be releasing soon show that it would take 200 to 250 billion dollars worth of investment in the next ten years. That sounds like a lot of money. But according to the International Energy Agency of the OECD during that same period 425 billion dollars of fossil fuel investment will be needed to maintain *business-as-usual* trends.<sup>1</sup> Even more shocking, according to the same source during that same period, 240 billion dollars will be spent in developing countries in kerosene, wood, candles and other outdated and unsustainable energy sources. Clearly our target will take a change in the way institutions like the *World Bank* and other multilateral development banks as well as export credit agencies select and fund energy projects.

The Rio+10 opportunity:

The time will never be more appropriate than now for such an initiative. Next year sees the World Summit on Sustainable Development, which is being held to mark the tenth anniversary since the Rio *Earth Summit*, where the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change was signed. The WSSD will take place in Johannesburg, South Africa at the beginning of September 2002. It will be preceded by another UN conference called Finance for Development (FFD), in Mexico in March 2002.

Between now and then, there will be a lot of criticism from the NGO community about what hasn't been done since Rio. There will also be increased skepticism from the wider public about the ability of the international community, including business, governments, and even the NGOs, to take their environment stewardship responsibilities seriously. The public is fed up with rhetoric. And the developing countries will not take sustainable development seriously if we do not support them beyond rhetoric.

It is evident that the state of the planet has deteriorated considerably in the last ten years, and while Rio produced a lot of nice words, the actual actions that have been taken by governments have been disappointing to say the least. The US attack on the Kyoto Protocol is but the tip of the iceberg of inaction, indifference and hostility towards protection of the global environment. The Kyoto Protocol is child of the *Rio process* – its death would be a blow not just to the climate regime but to the entire Rio agenda. If Kyoto goes down, so might all the Rio agreements, and the current *Rio+10* process to Johannesburg.

In the end, if these global problems are to be resolved, it will need governments to meet together and agree action plans jointly. So we must work towards solid outcomes at the World Summit in Johannesburg. Solid outcomes are most likely when enough concerned citizens demand change. Now is the right time to generate a real movement to push for clean and safe renewable energy.

[www.greenpeace.org](http://www.greenpeace.org)

---

<sup>1</sup> *World Energy Outlook 2000*, IEA, Paris, 2000.