

Chapter 1 : Privatising Medicare Archives - The Essential Report

MEP heads to Paris to warn of dangers of 'privatising the climate' 26 November 26 November by Media Green MEP and economist, Molly Scott Cato, is to warn a conference in Paris of the dangers of relying on private financiers to solve the issue of climate finance.

Published in the Guardian 31st July All successful conquests go through three stages. First the defeated are dispossessed. Then they adopt the habits and the outlook of the conquerors. Finally, they thank their new masters for their dispossession. Corporate power has entered the third stage of conquest. And everywhere we are told how grateful we should be. He asked them to support his campaign to save sub-post offices and village stores and to make the village pub the focus of community life. The prince offered no explanation for the disappearance of pubs, small shops and post offices other than foot and mouth disease and a few meanderings about rural decline. A more detailed analysis may have troubled his audience, for among the members of Business in the Community are the companies most responsible for destroying small business and undermining communities: He forgot to add that the shopkeepers must buy from his stores at the full retail price. Blessed are the cheesemakers, but not in Britain. Tesco arrived, built a huge store, trained local people to work there, and created new jobs. Now it will use this model to rescue another eleven depressed estates. One of the reasons why estates like Seacroft suffer so badly from unemployment is that for years the supermarkets have been drawing away the more prosperous shoppers those who own cars , undermining local business. While small businesses tend to spend their profits locally, Tesco removes them from the community. When Tesco secures a monopoly on trade within a poor estate, it reduces the inhabitants to the very dependency regeneration is supposed to address. A far better regeneration strategy for Seacroft would have been to shut the existing superstores, rather than opening a new one. But this pax tescona is slowly coming to dominate national life. Just before the G8 summit in Genoa, the marketing consultant Steve Hilton made a film for Channel 4 News showing how companies have begun to fill the gaps left by state provision. Nike has launched a campaign against bullying in schools. A McDonalds manager is organising community events. Mr Hilton argues that government has neither the resources nor the will to run projects like this, while corporations have the money, the creativity and the organisational skills communities lack. His argument is seductive until you remember that, like Tesco in Leeds, these companies are partly responsible for causing the problems they claim to be solving. Coke may be spreading the news about disease, but it is also spreading disease, bringing tooth decay to parts of the world in which it was almost unknown. McDonalds has damaged communities everywhere, wiping out its smaller rivals and homogenising high streets. The principal outcome of this literacy campaign, in other words, was to spread illiteracy. But these are the least of the problems associated with the corporate capture of the public good. As companies appear to fill the gaps they have helped to create, they can present themselves as indispensable vehicles for social provision, enabling them to argue for a further reduction in state services. Gradually, universal public provision gives way not, as Steve Hilton claims, to a new inclusive modernity, but to an old-fashioned philanthropy, in which the survival of the poor depends upon the whims of the rich. As the Business in the Community website reveals, the primary purpose of these new intrusions upon the public realm is not to make the world a better place, but to raise the profile of the brand. Cause related marketing is the psychological equivalent of the private finance initiative. It is a privatisation of our minds, a means of reaching those parts of our consciousness untouched by conventional advertising. Nike is working in schools not because its directors want to stop bullying, but because it wants children to recognise its brand as an immutable component of society, with which they will grow up and to which they will attach their identity. Programmes ostensibly designed to encourage self-reliance are instead contrived to foster dependency and control. The defeated participate in their conquest, and offer up their thanks to those who have dispossessed them. By privatising our minds, corporate power makes enemies of ourselves.

Chapter 2 : Privatising Climate Policy

Existing 'climate change' policy instruments should be withdrawn. Climate science cannot provide the knowledge that is needed to justify them. Anthropogenic global warming is a putative.

It described how self-interested subsistence farmers would destroy common land by over-stocking it with cattle. If you are struggling to feed your family then short-term self-interest is understandable, although there are numerous examples of how communities across the globe have worked collectively to sustain their local environments for hundreds or even thousands of years. Carbon trading is promoted, largely by wealthy countries, as the silver bullet to solve this age old problem. Is this a great idea or dangerous con? This note examines this question and concludes that the answer is the latter. The first question that should be asked in devising an international climate strategy, including setting up a global carbon trading scheme, is how much atmospheric carbon space is left? The next question is how should it be shared out? On the face of it, these appear to be simple questions, but, of course, in practice they are devilishly complex. Two uncertainties make the maths difficult: What impacts will result from different global average temperature increases and what impacts are acceptable. Scientific uncertainty on how sensitive the climate is to carbon pollution. But the greatest difficulty of all is how to share the remaining atmospheric carbon carrying capacity between countries. The recent Durban UNFCCC negotiations and the almost 20 years of negotiations before them have centred on this last difficulty, which is in essence a political and ethical choice and not a scientific one. Size of global carbon budget What is clear from most analyses of global carbon budgets is that there is not a great deal of atmospheric carbon space left. Rich countries through the G8 have said that to prevent dangerous climate change we need to keep global average temperature increases below 2 degrees compared to the pre-industrial level. By dangerous climate change they mean unacceptable impacts to people and economies as well as too high a risk of positive feedbacks. Positive feedbacks are where increased temperatures create changes on the planet that themselves create further warming, for example warming leading to the release of vast quantities of methane a powerful greenhouse gas due to the melting of Siberian permafrost. Uncertainties about climate sensitivity have been used to identify risk levels from different amounts of carbon pollution Meinshausen et al. If the G8 want a low risk of avoiding 2 degrees it gives a much smaller carbon budget than a high risk. For example a 50 per cent chance of avoiding 2 degrees gives a carbon budget of around GtCO₂e between and , whereas an 85 per cent chance of avoiding 2 degrees gives a carbon budget of GtCO₂e GtCO₂e has already been emitted between Through the work of setting self-imposed carbon budgets as a result of the Climate Change Act, the UK has been more explicit on this choice through setting in law a UK carbon budget that gives around a 50 per cent chance of avoiding 2 degrees if other countries make similar commitments. Many developing countries argue that a safer temperature target is to keep global average temperatures to less than 1. A recent update to the burning embers diagram certainly suggests that this target is more in line with the original thinking behind the setting of the 2 degree target diagram 1. Again these countries have not been explicit regarding the level of certainty they want to avoid this temperature target. The nature of the debate and the risks faced by their populations would suggest that they want as high a chance as possible of avoiding temperatures above 1. What this means on the size of the global carbon budget is that there is very little carbon budget left. Sharing out the global carbon budget As stated above, the bigger debate is around how to share out this global carbon budget. Given that even the G8 target implies very limited atmospheric carbon space, the debates have been fierce. NGOs and developing countries have argued that it would be wrong to ignore the carbon pollution released by rich countries since the industrial revolution. The US American Government argued at the Copenhagen talks that historic emissions may be interesting for authors of history books but are irrelevant to negotiations. In effect it is like they admit they have eaten half the cake but that this should have no bearing on how much of the remaining cake they should eat. NGOs and developing countries argue that historic emissions should be taken into account, with some advocating a historic base line of pre-industrial revolution, some and some Furthermore, the US American Government argued that emissions reductions should be set using a bottom-up process of countries setting their own voluntary reduction targets from which

carbon budgets can be roughly calculated assuming steady year on year reductions towards these targets. This was the approach of the Copenhagen Accord. The USA pledge amounted to 4 per cent less emissions than levels by This bottom-up approach led to the nonsensical position where the Copenhagen Accord on the one-hand sets an aspiration of keeping the temperature increase to less than 2 degrees but the reduction pledges made were in line with a temperature increase of around 4 degrees. Pew Center, NGOs and developing countries have argued for a top down mandatory approach based upon a fair share of the global carbon budget which is itself based on population sizes. Carbon trading Carbon trading is being pushed strongly by the USA, EU and others as the tool to enable an economically efficient transition to a low carbon economy without breaching any agreed temperature increase. Friends of the Earth, other NGOs and many developing countries have been very critical of this approach. There are four main reasons for this: The global carbon budget to avoid dangerous climate change is too small to allow trading. If a temperature target of 1. Under a tiny carbon budget it is almost certain that no country will have any spare emissions to sell. Rich countries would need to make significant cuts very quickly and developing countries would have to develop predominately through low carbon technologies. The focus on carbon trading is therefore a dangerous distraction from the real job at hand. The IPCC has suggested that rich countries identified in Annex 1 of the Kyoto Protocol should reduce emissions by between per cent from a baseline and developing countries should reduce emissions by per cent from their Business-as-Usual trajectories. In the UNFCCC negotiations the UK, EU, USA and others were suggesting that they could use carbon trading to buy carbon from developing countries to meet these targets and in doing so help developing countries meet their reduction targets. This neat arrangement conveniently ignores the fact that the IPCC figures require emissions reductions in both places, not one or the other. In addition to this, rich countries are suggesting that the money transfers resulting from this trade should count towards the finances pledged to developing countries. Whereas developing countries are rightfully arguing that these finances should be additional as they have to pay for the adaption required as a result of climate impacts associated with past rich country emissions. They also argue that additional money is needed as compensation for the reduced carbon space left for developing countries due to over-consumption by rich countries. Through this carbon credits are sold by projects in developing countries for the additional emissions reductions or emissions avoided made through the injection of foreign cash. In practice many of these avoided emissions or emissions reductions would have been made anyhow. Carbon credits trading for constructing hydro-power dams that were already within development plans in China and almost completely built or even in the most extreme cases already built , the carbon savings here are said to be due to reduced need to produce electricity from fossil fuel power stations; Carbon credits for building coal-fired power stations in India using newer technologies rather than older technologies even though the newer technologies have been used in the same country without the money from selling carbon credits; and Carbon credits for destroying HFCs from refrigeration factories which would otherwise be released into the atmosphere. This sounds acceptable, but because HFC is such a strong greenhouse gas and attracts so much money through selling carbon credits it has been suggested that some factories have been built specifically to create the pollution to make money from then curbing it. The obsession with carbon trading reduces the appetite for using other policy instruments, such as regulation and taxation. In the UK the previous Labour Government was not keen to regulate or increase taxes to curb the growth of international aviation. They used the excuse that carbon trading through the Emissions Trading Scheme ETS would result in carbon reductions being made elsewhere, ignoring the excess of carbon credits handed out to EU industries under the ETS or the ability of firms to buy credits from dodgy CDM schemes. In the EU, Commission officials argued that there should be no mandatory target on energy efficiency due to possible impacts on the carbon price. In addition to these reasons, NGOs and others have also argued against carbon trading as the time required to set up a global system is too long and distracts from the use of faster policy responses, from opposition to the commoditisation of the atmosphere, from finance siphoned away from carbon reduction to make carbon traders rich, and from the risks of private speculators creating a carbon sub-prime market similar to the housing sub-prime market. State of play Negotiations on temperature targets are far from being concluded with many developing countries refusing to accept a higher temperature target than 1. Reduction

targets for countries remain deadlocked with the USA refusing to accept a top down mandatory approach to target setting and the EU not prepared to increase its target to be in line with even a Agreement on whether to include historic emissions also remain deadlocked. And finances pledged at Copenhagen have, on the whole, failed to emerge or are simply rebadged Aid money. Carbon trading remains the number one policy objective of the USA, EU, other countries and a plethora of carbon trading vested interests, even though its weaknesses are increasingly recognised. The vast majority of developing countries will not accept a global carbon trading regime. They view the proposal as unjust because they see it allowing rich countries to pollute when they instead have to curb growth under proposals by the American Government trading would allow the USA to increase its emissions until Whilst some developing countries want to use the CDM mechanism and newer versions, such as sectoral trading, to bring much needed money into their country, many see this as unacceptable or a poor second best to much larger financial flows from other sources. Overcoming these differences looks like a Herculean task. Carbon trading is the vehicle by which rich countries are pursuing self-interest pretending that they are willing to work together for the common good. They are using carbon trading to get out of even the paltry reduction targets they are willing to accept. They are using carbon trading to avoid additional financial transfers to developing countries. They are using carbon trading to enable them to remain the global fat cats able to consume the vast majority of remaining atmospheric space. There are good reasons to oppose carbon trading because in effect it privatises the atmosphere. But perhaps more importantly carbon trading is a dangerous con, which promises to insert massive loopholes in any future international agreement and puts off the urgent task of countries like the UK making the transition to the low carbon economy. What is needed is global political acceptance of the urgency of the problem coupled with the use of policy measures that can be applied swiftly to reduce emissions fast “ regulations, tax and spend are policy measures that better fit the bill. He has worked at Friends of the Earth for over 20 years, working on issues ranging from factory pollution to water resources to climate change. He also worked for 4 years with an environmental consultancy specialising in the reclamation of contaminated land. He lives in York with his partner and two young daughters.

Chapter 3 : GRAIN – Trade agreements privatising biodiversity outside the WTO: update

Climate science cannot provide the knowledge that is needed to justify them. Anthropogenic global warming is a putative interpersonal conflict rather than market failure. Where property rights need protecting, tort litigation on the basis of strict liability is appropriate.

Climate science cannot provide the knowledge that is needed to justify them. Anthropogenic global warming is a putative interpersonal conflict rather than market failure. Where property rights need protecting, tort litigation on the basis of strict liability is appropriate. By providing a public arena for the competitive testing of scientific hypotheses, such litigation would also promote the advancement of climate science. Copyright © The Author. Journal compilation © Institute of Economic Affairs Published by Blackwell Publishing, Oxford. Suggested Citation Graham Dawson, Access to full text is restricted to subscribers. As the access to this document is restricted, you may want to search for a different version of it. More about this item Access and download statistics Corrections All material on this site has been provided by the respective publishers and authors. You can help correct errors and omissions. See general information about how to correct material in RePEc. For technical questions regarding this item, or to correct its authors, title, abstract, bibliographic or download information, contact: Wiley Content Delivery or Christopher F. General contact details of provider: If you have authored this item and are not yet registered with RePEc, we encourage you to do it here. This allows to link your profile to this item. It also allows you to accept potential citations to this item that we are uncertain about. We have no references for this item. You can help adding them by using this form. If you know of missing items citing this one, you can help us creating those links by adding the relevant references in the same way as above, for each referring item. If you are a registered author of this item, you may also want to check the "citations" tab in your RePEc Author Service profile, as there may be some citations waiting for confirmation. Please note that corrections may take a couple of weeks to filter through the various RePEc services. More services and features.

Existing 'climate change' policy instruments should be withdrawn. Climate science cannot provide the knowledge that is needed to justify them. Anthropogenic global warming is a putative interpersonal conflict rather than market failure. Where property rights need protecting, tort litigation on the.

As capitalism runs out of convenient colonies to parasitise, it has begun to work on societies within its traditional hosts in the developed world through austerity. Could air be privatised? Follow GrahamJBarnes We should perhaps envy Marx for his somewhat detached historical perspective on the development of capitalism. All things must pass. The problem, perhaps felt more acutely if you have children and grandchildren, is that by the time capitalism has eaten itself there will be nothing left for our descendants to sustain themselves with. If you had asked a member of one of the native American nations before who owned the land they would not have understood the question [1]. Very little land is now held in common, and the only current activist initiative pissing into the prevailing wind is that of Land Value Taxation – a proposition which, while welcome, does appear to accept that land has been irreversibly enclosed, and restricts itself to demanding a land rental back to the exchequer in the form of a tax. Elsewhere, in Flint, Michigan, following a series of commercial disputes over water supply, a state of emergency was declared as the extent of lead pollution became clear. In neither of these cases are we in an area of water shortage or stress. And the parts that are bad are fouling the world. Markets have no inbuilt ethics. And we have yet to demonstrate any governance capability that can detoxify them. As a thought experiment, and since we are in reductio ad absurdum territory consider the potential privatisation of the air that we breathe. That air is a basic necessity of life is of itself no protection. There is no apparent ethical barrier – other necessities such as land, shelter, energy and water have been enclosed by elites and rented back to citizens. The difficulties are practical. For example there is rather too much clean air to make for the globalised opportunity which would be ideal. However this does not need to be a major barrier provided we sculpt the narrative properly. Creative occasionally mendacious advertising plus mainstream media focussing on any convenient tap water scare stories have done the trick. The prime difficulty is in the physical enclosure of a separated-air-space and supply. A controlled-quality-air environment can be envisioned at the personal, dwelling, community, municipality or planet level. So there are product development opportunities for personal breathing devices, masks and filters, passive house variations with recirculated air and domes. As pollution increases, helpful stories about diesel particulates or Beijing air quality will progressively sensitise consumers to the need for interventions. Our inability to leave fossil fuels in the ground will help this narrative get established – an interesting variation on the theme that every market failure provides an opportunity for a new market. At the community level we should see a natural extension of the gated community service proposition to include guaranteed air quality inside large scale geodesic domes. Some municipalities – particularly scenic locations – may banish sources of pollution, buoyed by extra-high local rates acceptable to wealthy residents. Depending on local micro-climates such Canute-propositions may persist for a few years until higher pollution levels waft in from neighbouring areas. At a planetary level geoengineering solutions will develop to pump pollution back into less prosperous sink areas. Technology plus entrepreneurship can enable the enclosure of any public good. Absent effective sustainability-minded governance that is. The Great Spirit gave it to his children to live upon. So long as they occupy and cultivate it, they have a right to the soil. The Unheard Voices [http: Bottled Water is a Scam: Earth, Air, Fire and Water: Evolving Global Commoning Disclaimer: Feasta](http://Bottled Water is a Scam: Earth, Air, Fire and Water: Evolving Global Commoning Disclaimer: Feasta) is a forum for exchanging ideas. By posting on its site Feasta agrees that the ideas expressed by authors are worthy of consideration. The views of the article do not necessarily represent the views of all Feasta members. His current projects include the design and delivery of currencies to be sponsored by a local authority; by a social entrepreneur to complement and enhance a well established sustainability methodology; and by a restaurant chain.

Mike Childs is Head of Policy, Research and Science at Friends of the Earth. He has worked at Friends of the Earth for over 20 years, working on issues ranging from factory pollution to water resources to climate change.

Grant Stern is a professional mortgage broker, radio broadcaster and columnist based in Miami, Florida. The Republican party successfully conducted an entire primary and general election without addressing a single key policy issue on the campaign trail, with seventeen GOP candidates who mainly looked foolish, pandered to racism or religious zealotry or hurled insults. The Trump private roads and transportation plan was unveiled on Oct. When the Republican candidate claims at rallies to want a trillion dollars in infrastructure spending, naturally voters assume that the assets would be publicly owned and free to use. But nobody is awake at the switch, outside of Slate. Governments can borrow for much, much less than your typical private company. That gives them a big, built-in cost advantage when it comes to infrastructure. If a corporation wants to compete, it has to be hyper-efficient about construction. And some might be! But between the higher interest rates they pay on their debt and the need to turn a profit, chances are a lot of private developers would end up just charging a boatload in tolls and fees—more, over time, than the government would have to levy in taxes. The main beneficiaries, in all likelihood, are the Wall Street investors who would love to skim some cash off your ride to work. Roads are a classic example of something that government does better than private entities, like the Interstate Highway System. But in an e-mail, the campaign press office said that the figure combined an estimate of what the Obama administration had spent on climate-related programs, the amount of U. Trump and his elected Republican supporters have spent this entire election practicing the art of political distraction by choosing a reality TV clown for President. During the primary season, networks suspended all fact checking to sell infotainment about the offensive Trump campaign. It was so much easier to ignore any actual policy discussions. While a third-party might promise the moon and the stars, letting Republicans take over the Oval Office with Trump guarantees that climate change efforts will be defunded, quickly. The first beneficiary of that kind of environmental know nothing-ism would be the Koch Brothers, oil companies and the wealthiest of the wealthy who will get the savings on their tax bills when Trump slashes every form of taxation on the rich to benefit himself and the top 1 percent of earners. And anyone who drives would feel the pinch of the only new roads being expensive toll lanes which connect wealthy areas to one another - potentially bypassing the poorer areas. Do you have information you want to share with HuffPost?

Chapter 6 : Corporate Sponsors at Yosemite? The Case against Privatizing National Parks - Scientific Ame

Climate justice demands that industrialized countries, who are the biggest culprits in causing climate change, must take the greatest responsibility to protect the world's forests by Susan Austin Green Left Weekly, September 20 Reduction of Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) is the name of a World Bank sponsored carbon offset program.

The unfulfilled promise of a turnaround in their fortunes for the last couple of years have completely eroded their credibility. The stock markets have therefore lost confidence in their ability to give a decent return to shareholders and have beaten down their shares. And now, like the proverbial last straw, come the scams that some officials of PNB have been involved in. The amounts talked about are no doubt sizeable and seem destined to keep the bank in the red for a long time – barring a miracle. It is in this context that there have been a series of calls from industry associations and commentators that the Government should get out of banking – by reducing its share and privatising these banks. It would appear that the current mood of shrill and polemical arguments has infected these bodies and experts too, and they have taken leave of calm reasoning and yielded to the cry of the mob. Forgotten fact Most of them seem to have forgotten that India is still a poor country. What will happen if private banks run the entire show? The Jan Dhan scheme, for instance, which gave access to banking services for millions, was a public sector show all the way – the private sector put in only a token presence. Do we want to go back to an era of exclusion once more? The answer to the problem of fraud in the system is not to do away with the system itself but to tighten controls and do the basics well. In the PNB case, there has no doubt been a failure at multiple levels. Internal controls have failed. Counterparties 30 of them have failed. Management has been incompetent. Auditors and regulators and their inspections have been lax. But getting rid of PSBs because frauds happen there is like throwing the baby out with the bathwater. By that bizarre yardstick we must throw away governments because some politicians are frauds or criminals. And that begs the question: What will you replace it with? Is there an alternative? Private banks may seem better in comparison, but frauds happen there too. They too have bad loans and have hidden them very well. Will the Government or the RBI be able to wash their hands off this on the grounds that it is a private bank and it is the responsibility of their shareholders? If it is any consolation, that has been the experience even in the US, the citadel of capitalism. After the crisis, the US government had to bail out all the blue chip private banks with taxpayer money. A case of responsibility So, however appealing the argument for privatisation of PSBs may be, there is no escaping the responsibility that the Government or the RBI has in the event of a bank crisis. They might as well take the criticism they face now on the chin and see how matters can be improved in the banks they control rather than sell them and face the same problem later on. PSBs serve a valuable purpose and the hiccups that occur in their operations must not detract from their usefulness in a poor country. A fraud must not be allowed to create an existential crisis.

Chapter 7 : Privatising Air | Feasta

The article offers information on privatisation of carbon budgets under the Climate Change Act. It states that in a meeting on carbon emissions non-profit organisations (NGOs) and developing countries have argued that carbon budgets should be based on industrial revolution which is better in.

This is timely and appropriate, as the NPS faces serious challenges that affect the preservation of these precious lands. We both study the history of conservation efforts in the United States, and have also worked as rangers at national park sites in Utah, Arizona and California. Based on our experience with the park system, its stewards and its visitors, we caution against many major changes to the overall institutional structure of national park management. These proposals are neither persuasive nor popular, and they could cause unforeseen damage and loss of support for the system. Risky reforms Some observers have suggested significantly restructuring or even replacing NPS by privatizing the parks or transferring them to state control. Any such proposals involving national park lands should be cause for concern. The empirical record regarding state parks is illustrative. State parks thus have added hotels, lodges, golf courses, ski resorts and various forms of commercial sponsorship. That figure represents what Americans would pay to preserve the parks intact, not an actual flow of dollars to the U. Nonetheless, we can only wish that Americans thought all government expenditures were so worthwhile. Reasonable reforms We are not suggesting that the NPS is doing everything right. But many reforms are possible without privatizing parks or transferring them to state control. First, NPS could pay greater heed to lessons learned by state parks. The agency has often been somewhat insular and unreceptive to different ideas. State park managers, consistent with the tradition of innovation in a federal system, have tried various approaches to problems that could be useful at the national level. Second, the current national park fee system is generous to a fault. Large fees increases are controversial and unlikely to pass Congress, however. In some ways the National Park Service is a captive of its own popularity and success. Today that system is the envy of the world, and cause for a different kind of national pride. It still celebrates those awe-inspiring landscapes, but it also tells the world a more complex story, from precolonial times to ongoing struggles for equality today. Read the original article.

Chapter 8 : Carbon trading – privatising the world's forests | Green Left Weekly

Climate change has brought droughts in some places and floods in others, making freshwater supplies more difficult to manage. Heatwaves have forced some cities to drill deeper for groundwater or desalinate sea water.

Water can seem endless: As water scarcity grows, local campaigns across the globe are rolling back corporate ownership and challenging water privatisation, in a bid to regain control over our most vital resource. Sources are often difficult to access; hidden in remote glaciers or deep underground. Climate change has brought droughts in some places and floods in others, making freshwater supplies more difficult to manage. Heatwaves have forced some cities to drill deeper for groundwater or desalinate sea water. In flooded regions, freshwater has increased, but heavier rainfall has made it more difficult to store. As weather extremes bring new challenges for water management, industry and urbanisation are aggravating demand. The United Nations estimates that during the last century water use exceeded the rate of population growth. With more people migrating to cities, existing infrastructure is creaking. These global trends create regional problems. The number of people living in water stressed areas, where freshwater is limited during part or all of the year, is set to rise. Water inequalities often map onto existing social fractures, with poor infrastructure leaving urban peripheries disconnected, and scarcity kindling water-related conflicts. In these uncertain conditions, the question of who is best placed to manage water is crucial. The promise of privatisation At the same time, scarcity has created opportunities for profit. Water and sanitation has become a thriving industry dominated by multinationals like Veolia and Suez. Most major banks now have investment funds specifically targeted at the water industry, writes activist Maude Barlow. England was the first country to sell off its water system in , but privatisation remains politically controversial. The process typically involves municipal authorities leasing water provision to private companies in a public-private partnership. As Eduardo Araral, a professor of water policy at the Lee Kuan Yew School of Public Policy in Singapore writes , privatisation advocates argue this is worthwhile for two reasons. First, the private sector delivers services more efficiently. In England, politicians expected market competition to hasten improvements to services and bring down costs. The second argument is fiscal. In the developing world, states struggle to raise finance for infrastructure projects, but ceding water provision to the private sector attracts inward investment. From the s onwards, the World Bank founded policies on this wisdom. In conjunction with the International Monetary Fund, it gave loans to developing countries on condition that they privatised utilities. In countries such as Bolivia, the idea was that water privatisation would plug gaps left by the state. Clear costs, few benefits But evidence shows governments have been overly optimistic about the benefits of selling up. And in the majority of privatisation cases, companies still rely on public funds. A study by the Public Services International Research Unit found companies received nearly million euros from the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development from When asked to finance a new mega sewer in , the company claimed it was too burdened by debt to afford it, despite paying millions of pounds in dividends to shareholders and executives. Instead, consumers will pay for the new sewer through higher water bills, with the state acting as guarantor in case the project has financial difficulties. Infrastructure investment has a murkier record in the developing world. Despite assurances that companies would bring much-needed investment, most have only been willing to invest in middle income countries where risks are lower. Back to public management Public opinion about privatisation is shifting. The Transnational Institute, a campaigning organisation in the Netherlands, found that cities with public water supplies tend to enjoy increased quality and lower bills. It estimates that cities globally have remunicipalised water systems. Remunicipalisation differs from nationalisation. The latter is orchestrated by a centralised state, while the former is typically undertaken by regions or cities, with water and sanitation falling under municipal jurisdiction. Where nationalisation has a whiff of overweening state bureaucracy, remunicipalisation devolves ownership to democratically elected regional authorities. This participation in municipal ownership can also lead to wider political involvement. In Paris, where Suez and Veolia transferred water services to the publicly owned Eau de Paris in , trade unions, environmentalists and tenants associations are all represented at board level, and meetings are open to the general public. Other municipalities are next. Lagos State has long planned

to sell off water services, much to the anger of local NGOs. However, David Hall argues that tackling the underlying causes of public sector failure, such as corruption, is a better approach. Surveying the mixed legacy of water privatisation elsewhere, he may be right. Part one can be read here. Now more than everâ€ chinadialogue is at the heart of the battle for truth on climate change and its challenges at this critical time.

Chapter 9 : Trump Just Told The Truth, And It's More Terrifying Than His Racism And Lies | HuffPost

Climate justice demands that industrialised countries, who are the biggest culprits in causing climate change, must take the greatest responsibility to protect the world's forests – first by addressing their own deforestation problems and second by funding forest preservation projects in developing countries.

The idea is to pay owners of forests in the global South to stop deforestation as a way of reducing carbon emissions. The scheme generates "credits" for the carbon "saved" in the forests. The scheme has faced widespread criticism for, in effect, privatising forests and allowing rich nations to evade responsibility for cutting emissions themselves. Now, evidence has emerged that the REDD scheme is being manipulated by carbon speculators. Fake carbon certificates were given to landowners to persuade them to sign over the rights to their forests. The office of climate change has been accused of issuing at least 39 REDD "credits". Each credit amounts to 1 million tonnes of carbon in up to a dozen forests. One of the projects involved the controversial Kumula Doso concession in the Western Province – an area subject to a long-running ownership dispute. These "REDD readiness" projects are at various stages of development in more than 25 countries. This underlines that as Copenhagen approaches it is important that environmentalists are clear on what is at stake with this issue and what can be done about it. There is little question that poor countries in our region have a problem with large-scale logging and the burning of forests. The huge increase in demand from wealthy countries for products like palm oil has further fuelled the destruction. Big companies can make quick money from burning forests and establishing oil palm tree plantations for export. To be effective, forest protection needs to be coordinated across regions and the globe. She said a big problem with REDD is that it did not address the causes of deforestation. The REDD schemes have been accused of ignoring these rights. Without a definition of forests that distinguishes between forests and industrial tree plantations, REDD would spell disaster. It means a country can convert a natural forest to a plantation, but still claim it is climate-friendly. This is despite the fact that native forests win hands-down when it comes to carbon storage capacity and biodiversity. A scheme like REDD could conceivably play a positive role, but only provided the rights of developing countries, indigenous peoples and local communities are respected and the right safeguards and funding mechanisms are used. This means that big carbon trading corporations and carbon market speculators have control over REDD initiatives and the schemes are open to the potential for corruption, price crashes and loopholes. Many NGOs and indigenous groups support an alternative, fund-based mechanism. For example, Greenpeace has proposed a fund called "Forests for Climate", which could make funds available to protect tropical forests and allow industrialised countries to meet some of their overall emission-reduction targets by helping Third World countries protect forests. But the whole idea of offsetting emissions overseas is a dangerous distraction from the real task that industrialised countries like Australia need to face: Instead of being part of the lobby group for big timber, palm oil and dodgy carbon trading companies, the Australian government needs to lead by example at Copenhagen. Last year, the rich countries spent trillions of dollars bailing out the failed financial system, but they cried poor when it came to action on climate change. We have to save the planet and failure is not an option. Current issue Become a supporter.