

La réaction du **Professeur José Goldemberg*** à l'article de Laurence Tubiana et Nicholas Stern (« New deal pour le climat », *Le Monde*, 21 septembre 2007)

*Professeur à l'Universidad Sao Paulo & Membre du Conseil scientifique de l'Iddri

“Dear Laurence

Your article with Nick Stern published in “Le Monde” is very good and you make many good points such as:

“personne ne croit sérieusement que ces approches volontaires, suffiront à réduire de façon suffisamment efficace les émissions de gaz à effet serre”.

The proposals that a reduction in energy intensity could offset the increase in emissions proved to be futile to avoid the increase of emissions both in the US and China.

You argue too that

“Kyoto a largement été compris et négocié comme la définition d'un niveau de droits d'émissions de gaz à effet de serre. Dès lors, la question de la justice dans l'allocation des droits et dans la répartition des efforts à consentir est devenue central, et les pays émergents ont refusé de s'engager dans cette voie, considérant à juste titre que leur développement implique une augmentation de leurs émissions”.

To bring the idea of “juste titre” here seems displaced to me. Countries are moved by self-interest and to exempt developing countries from real efforts in reducing their efforts has been used as an excuse for inaction by many, including Brazil.

The “culprits” for poisoning the atmosphere with GHG have changed appreciably since 1993. Without the real engagement of China, India and Brazil (and a few other developing countries) it will not be possible to achieve the GHG reductions needed.

The only way this will happen, in my view, is that the developing countries realize that it is also in their self-interest to reduce emissions. They don't have to give up growth and development for that and you point out correctly that

“font chaque jour des choix d'investissement qui modèlent leur mode de développement à venir et prennent également conscience qu'avec un baril de pétrole à 80\$, l'inefficacité énergétique devient un obstacle majeur pour leur croissance et leur indépendance. D'ores et déjà, la croissance « sale » mine leur développement”.

The way I read it is that developing countries should not repeat the ruinous trajectories (from the climate change perspective) followed in the past by industrialized countries. What they should do is to “leapfrog” incorporating early in their process of development “cleaner” and more efficient technologies.

Sometimes they are more expensive but not always and three examples are:

- i. Cellular telephones that are replacing fixed telephony in most developing countries and
- ii. Renewables particularly bioethanol from sugarcane which is an excellent replacement for gasoline.
- iii. Many energy efficient devices as demonstrated in California.

When they are more expensive, such as efficient thermoelectric electricity plants as compared to the old ones* your recipe is the correct one

“L’Europe doit proposer un « deal » global que intègre différents volets: partage du surcoût désinvestissements, incitations économiques locales et mondiales efficaces, règles commerciales, droits de propriété intellectuelle”.

However there are no mechanisms for that and to propose the transfer of modern technologies on concessional terms - as is usually done in international conferences - is not more than a dream. Technology is not in the hands of governments but is the propriety of enterprises, which are not, by nature, philanthropic entities.

Therefore only enlightened governments in development countries could do it to avoid that *“croissance sale”*.

I don't think China and India are doing it in a significant scale with some exceptions such as the bioethanol program in Brazil.

Sincerely yours,

José Goldemberg”

* the present average efficiency of thermal power plants in China is lower than 30% to be compared with more than 50% in Japan.