

Climate justice and the social-ecological transition

By [Éloi Laurent](#)

There is something deeply reassuring about seeing the growing scale of climate markets in numerous countries around the globe. A section of the youth are becoming aware of the injustice they will suffer as a result of choices over which they do not (yet) have a say. But the recognition of this *inter*-generational inequality is running up against the wall of *intra*-generational inequality: it will not be possible to implement a real ecological transition without dealing with the social question here and now, and in particular the imperative to reduce inequality. In other words, the ecological transition will be social-ecological – or it will not be. This is the case in France, where the national ecological strategy, currently 90% ineffective, needs to be thoroughly overhauled, as proposed in the new [OFCE Policy Brief \(no. 52, 21 February 2019\)](#).

This is also true in the United States, where a new generation of red-green politicians is taking part in one of the most decisive political struggles in the country's history against the ecological obscurantism of a President who is a natural disaster in his own right. In a [concise text](#), which is remarkable for its precision, analytical clarity and political lucidity, the Democrat Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez has just proposed a "Green New Deal" to her fellow citizens.

The title may seem ill-chosen: the "New Deal" carried out by Franklin Delano Roosevelt from 1933 was aimed at reviving an economy devastated by the Great Depression. But isn't the American economy flourishing today? If we rely on the economic indicators of the twentieth century (growth rate, finance, profit), there's no doubt. But if we go beyond appearances, we

can discern the recession in well-being that has been undermining the country for thirty years and which will only get worse with the ecological crisis (life expectancy is now structurally declining in the United States). Hence the first lever of the ecological transition: to break with growth and count on what really matters to improve people's well-being today and tomorrow.

The second lever: coordinating the approach to social realities and ecological challenges. The New Green Deal identifies as the root cause of America's malaise "systemic inequalities", both social and ecological. Accordingly, it intends to implement a "fair and equitable transition" that will benefit in priority "frontline and vulnerable communities", which one could call "ecological sentinels" (children, elderly people, the energy insecure). These are people who prefigure our common future if we allow the ecological crisis for which we bear responsibility to deteriorate further. It is this coordination between the social and ecological that lies at the heart of the proposal by several thousand economists to introduce "[carbon dividends](#)" (an idea [originally proposed by James Boyce](#), one of the world's leading specialists in the political economy of the environment).

Which brings us to the third lever: to gain citizens' interest instead of terrorizing them. In this respect, the [detailed report](#) published by the Data for Progress think tank deploys an extremely effective argumentative sequence: the new ecological deal is necessary to preserve humanity's well-being; it will create jobs, it is desired by the community of citizens, and it will reduce social inequalities; and the country has the financial means to implement it. It's concrete, coherent, convincing.

In 1933, Europe and France were half a century ahead of the United States in terms of the "new deal". It was in Europe and France that the institutions of social justice were invented,

developed and defended. It is in the United States that the social-ecological transition is being invented today. We should not wait too long to get hold of it.

The Preamble of the Treaty of Rome: 60 years later, what conclusions can be drawn?

By [Éloi Laurent](#)

The Treaty establishing the European Economic Community (the more emblematic of the two Treaties of Rome) gave life and body to the ideal of European integration that had been sketched in particular by Victor Hugo. Sixty years after its signature, here is a brief commentary, necessarily subjective, on the Preamble of this founding text (the past and present participles that open each paragraph of the text refer to the six heads of state and government who were signatories to the Treaty on 25 March 1957).

Determined to lay the foundations of an ever closer union among the peoples of Europe,

There are at least two possible readings of the objective referred to in the first paragraph of the EEC Treaty. The first sees in the “union” of “peoples” the union of their governments, and from this perspective it seems very difficult to dispute that since 1957 the European executive authorities have come together and now collaborate closely, with new elements of their sovereignty pooled. But the injunction of Jean Monnet, one of the principal architects of the Treaty, should not be forgotten: “our mission is not to unite states,

but to unite people". What, then, is to be said of the union of nations? A number of more or less anecdotal surveys seem to indicate that [stereotypes die hard in Europe](#) and that Europeans still do not know each other very well.

More fundamentally, it is the confidence placed by Europeans in their union that seems to be a relevant indicator of how solid it is [1]. The Eurobarometer of autumn 2016 (published in December 2016) indicates that confidence in the EU has fallen to 36%, almost fifteen points below its 2004 level (according to Eurostat data, confidence in European institutions fell from 53% in 2000 to 42% in 2014). It is from 2011 that a majority of citizens began to turn away from the European Union, at a time, one might think, when the EU Member States were proving resolutely incapable of proposing a coordinated and effective strategy to get out of the crisis and when the bloc was once again plunging into recession. Confidence in the EU is lower in the euro area than in the non-euro countries, and it is particularly low in the major signatories of the EEC Treaty – Germany, France and Italy – where it fails to rise above 30%.

Resolved to ensure the economic and social progress of their countries by common action to eliminate the barriers which divide Europe,

The central tenet of Europe's strategy over the post-World War 2 years is set out here: by creating and consolidating the "four freedoms" of circulation (of goods, services, capital and persons) and steadily forming a European internal market, called a single market in the 1990s), the drafters intended to promote the prosperity of nations and to break down the mental barriers that have so deeply divided Europeans. The result, sixty years later, is an asymmetric integration: mobility, while high for goods and especially capital, remains low for people and services. Article 117 of the Treaty, which aims at "equalization in the progress" of living conditions, envisages that this will be achieved by the "functioning of the common

market, which will promote the harmonization of social systems". Europe's asymmetric integration has instead generated fierce tax and social competition. However, Europeans are strongly attached to their respective social models: according to the Eurobarometer, 82% of them believe that "the market economy should go hand in hand with a high level of social protection". Sixty years after the signing of the Treaty of Rome, if a European identity does indeed exist, it is centred on this belief.

But while for decades the free movement of people, structurally weak in the EU, has had only a marginal presence in European debates, it played a central role in the decision of the United Kingdom to leave the EU: whereas the British intended to propose a trade-off between the free movement of goods, capital and services, which they intended to keep, and the free movement of people, which they no longer want, the EU's institutions and Member States reaffirmed that the four freedoms form a bloc, to be taken or left together.

Affirming as the essential objective of their efforts the constant improvement of the living and working conditions of their peoples,

There is little doubt that Europeans' living conditions have improved since 1957, but their "constant improvement", affirmed as an "essential goal" by the Treaty of Rome, has come into question empirically in the recent period. According to the United Nations Human Development Index (HDI) [\[21\]](#), an imperfect measure that partly reflects people's living conditions, the situation in European countries, which can be assessed only since 1990 (the date when homogeneous data became available for the EU-28), indicates almost constant progress in the member countries up to 2000, the turning point after which the rate of HDI growth slows, falling to almost zero in 2014. "Employment conditions", which are approximated by the unemployment rate, have also deteriorated since 2000, with the unemployment rate recovering to its 2000 level only

in 2016.

But the essential point is undoubtedly the way that Europeans today perceive the possibility of their living conditions improving. The Eurobarometer says that 56% of Europeans now believe that their children will lead harder lives than they did. According to data from the Pew Research Center, [Europeans are now the most pessimistic in the world in terms of their economic future.](#)

Recognising that the removal of existing obstacles calls for concerted action in order to guarantee steady expansion, balanced trade and fair competition,

Anxious to strengthen the unity of their economies and to ensure their harmonious development by reducing the differences existing between the various regions and the backwardness of the less favoured regions,

These two paragraphs are aimed at averting two imbalances in Europe, which have in fact been reinforced in recent times: current account imbalances (going against “balanced trade”) and geographical imbalances (undermining the “harmonious development” of the territories of the European Union). On the first point, trade imbalances between EU Member States and in the euro area in particular are now well known and documented, as is the major destabilizing role being played by Germany. On the second point, the success of the single market inherited from the Treaty of Rome has been paradoxical: it brought countries closer together but led to divergence between the regions (and more generally the territories). It can for instance be shown that in the European Union [the gap in economic development between regions is stronger than the gap between countries \[3\]](#). This spatial fracture within Europe’s countries, which is found in other countries outside Europe but which the single market has undoubtedly accentuated by the powerful agglomeration effects it generates, is not without consequence for the geographical polarization observed in

recent polls, in the United Kingdom, [Austria](#) and France.

Desiring to contribute, by means of a common commercial policy, to the progressive abolition of restrictions on international trade,

The drafters of the Treaty of Rome were right: the EEC and then the EU have contributed greatly to the liberalization of trade around the planet and therefore to contemporary globalization. While in 1960 the six EEC Treaty countries represented about a quarter of world trade, by 2015 the 28 EU countries accounted for about 34% of world trade. One-third of globalization has involved Europeanization.

Intending to confirm the solidarity which binds Europe and the overseas countries and desiring to ensure the development of their prosperity, in accordance with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

Resolved by thus pooling their resources to preserve and strengthen peace and liberty, and calling upon the other peoples of Europe who share their ideal to join in their efforts,

Have decided to create a European Economic Community...

This last section sets out the heart of the European promise: peace based on a market that relies on the law and calls forth enlargement. There is no denying that civil liberties and political rights have progressed on the continent, guaranteeing the Member States the longest period unbroken by war since the sixteenth century. In 1957, only 12 of the current 28 Member States were democracies – all are today. And democracies are far less prone to war than other political regimes. It is no exaggeration to say that Europe is today the most democratic continent in the world, with almost 90% of its countries considered free, compared with only 70% in the Americas, 40% in Asia, 20% in sub-Saharan Africa and only 1% in the Middle East and North Africa (according to data from

Freedom House). But the threat has changed in nature: it is no longer primarily international conflict that endangers Europe (although the new Russian imperialism cannot be taken lightly), but internal conflict.

Political instability, already evident in Greece, is rising in many countries, in Austria, the Netherlands, Finland, Italy and of course France. The European Union has contributed to the deep social resentment that is feeding the very secessionist parties that intend to dismantle it. The response to this risk of disintegration must be on a par with the Treaty of Rome, whose preamble affirms values $\square\square$ and sets out horizons. In this respect, the European Commission's tribute is contradictory: the [White Paper on the future of Europe](#), released on 1 March, considers the question of what Europeans want to do together and how they could do it, together or separately. But for the first time in sixty years, the Union is not expanding but shrinking. For the first time in sixty years, Europeans believe their children will have harder lives than they did. For the first time in sixty years, democracy is being threatened on the continent and, aggravating this situation, from within. The greatest danger for European construction is not the crisis: it is complacency about the crisis.

[\[1\]](#) The Eurobarometer, created in the spring of 1974, measures confidence in European institutions and the European Union, and is intended to reveal Europeans to one another through the expression of their respective public opinions.

[\[2\]](#) The HDI aggregates indicators on health, education and income on a parity basis.

[\[3\]](#) If the special case of Luxembourg is left out.

Measuring well-being and sustainability: A special issue of the Revue de l'OFCE

By [Eloi Laurent](#)

This issue of the [Revue de l'OFCE \(no. 145, February 2016\)](#) presents some of the best works that are being produced at a rapid clip on indicators of well-being and sustainability.

Why want to measure well-being? Because the idea that economic growth represents human development, in the sense that growth represents a good summary of its various dimensions, is simply false. GDP growth is not a prerequisite for human development; on the contrary, it is now often an impediment (as is illustrated by the exorbitant health costs of air pollution in India and China, two countries that concentrate one-third of the human population).

Achieving growth is not therefore sufficient in itself for human development; there is a need for specific policies that deal directly with education, health, environmental conditions and democratic quality. If the multiple dimensions of well-being are not taken into account, one dimension, typically the economic dimension, is imposed on and crushes the others, mutilating the human development of both individuals and groups (the example of health in the United States is particularly striking in this regard).

Why want to measure sustainability? Because today's global growth rate of 5% is of little importance if the climate, the ecosystems, the water and air that underpin our well-being have irrevocably deteriorated in two or three decades due to

the means deployed to achieve that growth. Or to put it in the words of the Chinese Minister of the Environment, Zhou Shengxian, in 2011: "If our land is ravaged and our health destroyed, what benefit does our growth bring?" We need to update our understanding of well-being so that it is not a mirage. Our economic and political systems exist only because they are underpinned by a set of resources that make up the biosphere, whose vitality is the condition for the perpetuation of these systems. To put it bluntly, if ecological crises are not measured and controlled, they will eventually do away with human welfare.

Indicators of well-being and sustainability must therefore enter a new, performative age: after measuring in order to understand, we now need to measure in order to make change – to evaluate in order to evolve. Because the change called for by these new visions of the global economy is considerable. This time of action invariably involves choices and trade-offs that are far from simple. This underscores the dual purpose of this issue of the *Revue de l'OFCE*: to show that indicators of well-being and sustainability have reached maturity and that they now can change not only our vision of the economic world but also the economic world itself; they can make clear the types of choices available to public and private decision-makers so as to carry out the change needed. In this respect the two sections of this special issue clearly highlight the issue of the relevant scale for measuring well-being and sustainability.

The first part of this issue is devoted to the relatively new topic of measuring regional well-being in France. Measuring well-being where it is actually lived presupposes moving down the scale to the local level: the need to measure and improve human well-being as close as possible to people's lived reality, along with the scale of spatial inequalities in contemporary France, demands a territorial perspective. There are at least two good reasons why territories (regions,

cities, *départements*, towns), more than nation-states, are the vectors of choice for the transition towards well-being and sustainability. The first is that they have grown in importance due to the impact of globalization and urbanization. The second is their capacity for social innovation. Following on from the late Elinor Ostrom, we talk about a “polycentric transition” to mean that each level of government can seize on the well-being and sustainability transition without waiting for a push from the top.

Monica Brezzi Luiz de Mello and Eloi Laurent (“Beyond GDP, beneath GDP: Measuring regional well-being in the OECD” – *all OFCE Revue articles in French*) gives the initial results of the theoretical and empirical work currently underway in the OECD framework (interactive access on the site <http://www.oecdregionalwellbeing.org/>) that measures certain dimensions of well-being at the regional level and applies these new indicators to the French case in order to draw useful lessons for public policy.

Robert Reynard (“Quality of life in the French regions”) provides an overview of recent findings by the INSEE using regional quality-of-life indicators. These can be used to develop a new typology of French spaces, highlighting eight major types of territories, which are distinguished both by the living conditions of their inhabitants (employment, income, health, education, etc.) and the amenities that these areas provide for their people (living environment, access to services, transport, etc.). The new representation of France that emerges constitutes a valuable decision-making tool for those in charge of policies aimed at promoting equality between the regions.

Kim Antunez, Louise Haran and Vivien Roussez (“Diagnoses of quality of life: Taking into account people’s preferences”) looks back at the approach developed by France’s regional monitoring body (*Observatoire des territoires*) and highlights indicators, offered at appropriate geographical scales, that

can be used to account for the multidimensional character of quality of life in France. Here too, regional typologies explore the link between the diverse amenities in people's environments and the diverse aspirations of the people who live in them, so as to highlight the imbalances that exist and the public policy levers that can be used to reduce these.

Finally, Florence Jany-Catrice ("Measuring regional well-being: Working *on* or *with* the regions?") discusses a fundamental aspect of the debate about measuring well-being in the French regions: the participation of citizens in defining their own well-being. She shows in particular that the impact of the indicators depends on whether those who develop them work on the regions or with them – it is only in the latter case that the region and its inhabitants become active players in the development of a common vision.

But, in contrast to these localized approaches, the measurement of sustainability requires moving up the geographical scale to the national or even global level. This is the subject of the articles in the second part of this issue, which deal with a subject whose importance has been emphasized by the recent law on the energy transition: the circular economy. Here there is a crucial difference to be made between a seemingly circular economy, which concerns a product or business, and genuine economic circularity, which can be understood only by enlarging the loop to develop a systemic vision.

This is what Christian Arnsperger and Dominique Bourg aim to demonstrate ("Towards a truly circular economy: Reflections on the foundations of an indicator of circularity") by examining the main issues and questions that designers of an indicator of a truly circular economy would need to take into account, if it were ever to be developed formally and technically. They conclude in particular that without a systemic vision oriented towards the reduction, rationing and stationarity intrinsic to the permaculture approach, the notion of the circular economy

will forever remain vulnerable to misuse that, however well intentioned, is ultimately short-sighted.

Vincent Aurez and Laurent Georgeault (“Indicators of the circular economy in China”) attempt to assess the relevance and the actual scope of the assessment tools developed in recent years by China to flesh out an integrated circular economy policy that aims at ensuring the transition to a low-carbon model with a restrained use of resources. These instruments, which in many respects are unique, but still inadequate, are distinguished by their systemic and multidimensional character, and therefore constitute an original contribution to the field of sustainability indicators.

Finally, Stephan Kampelmann (“Measuring the circular economy at the regional level: A systemic analysis of the management of organic matter in Brussels”) draws on the theory of social-ecological systems to carry out a particularly innovative exercise. He uses a battery of indicators to compare the economic, social and environmental impact of two possible pathways for the municipal management of flows of organic matter in Brussels: a centralized treatment using anaerobic digestion, and a process based on decentralized composting.

Thus while well-being is best measured at the local level, to assess sustainability properly, including at the regional level, the impact felt beyond local and national borders has to be taken into account. The trade-offs between these dimensions, including the exploration and possible transformation into synergies at regional and national levels, then turn out to be the most promising projects opened up by the welfare and sustainability transition.

Climate justice – the “Open Sesame” of the COP 21 climate conference

By [Eloi Laurent](#)

Climate negotiations cannot be limited to technical discussions between experts about the reliability of scientific data: they need to take the form of an open political dialogue that is nourished by ethical reflection involving the citizens. What should be the focus of this dialogue? With COP 21 opening in two months in Paris, it is becoming increasingly clear that the key to a possible agreement is not economic efficiency, but social justice. The “green growth” that was a goal in the past century has little mobilizing power in a world plagued by injustice. It is much more important to highlight the potential that resolute action against climate change holds for equality at the national and global level.

Three issues indicate how social justice is at the heart of the climate negotiations. The first concerns the choice of the criteria for allocating the carbon budget between countries in order to mitigate climate change (the approximately 1200 billion tons of carbon that remains to be emitted over the next three to four decade so as to limit the rise of ground temperatures to around 2 degrees by the end of the 21st century). Various indicators can be used both to estimate the carbon budget and to distribute it equitably among countries; while these indicators need to be discussed, we cannot under any circumstances ignore this issue in Paris. It is demonstrable that [the application of hybrid but relatively simple criteria on climate justice](#) would lead to cutting global emissions almost in half over the next three decades, which would ensure meeting the goal of 2 degrees, and even

targeting the increased rise in temperatures to 1.5 degrees, thereby enhancing the fairness of this common rule with respect to the most vulnerable countries and social groups.

The second issue concerns adaptation to climate change, that is to say, the exposure and sensitivity to extreme weather events and rising global temperatures that is differentiated between countries and social groups. Here too it is important to select relevant indicators of climate vulnerability to fairly allocate the available funding (which should increase to \$100 billion per year by 2020). But it will be very difficult to mobilize the necessary sums without [shifting the climate negotiations from the current quantitative logic to a price logic](#).

Finally, combatting inequality seems to be the most effective way to involve citizens in the climate dialogue. The fight against climate change must be understood not as a social threat or an opportunity for profit-making but as a lever for achieving equality: a chance to reduce disparities in human development between countries and within countries.

The case of China shows how constraints on cutting CO₂ emissions can turn into a tool for reducing inequality: the limitation on coal consumption simultaneously reduces the country's greenhouse gas emissions and the damage caused to the Chinese population's health by fine particles, which are distributed very unevenly around the territory and therefore within the population. The same applies to the much desired regulation of automobile traffic in France's urban areas, which represents both a gain for health and a reduction in emissions related to mobility. This dual climate-health dividend (reducing emissions to contain global warming has an indirect effect, i.e. improving health) must therefore be at the heart of the Paris negotiations. The fight against climate change offers a chance to reduce the inequalities that will be so devastating: by cross-checking the "social" map and the "climate" map, we can anticipate that the impact of heat waves

will be felt strongest in regions where both climatic exposure and the share of elderly people living alone are at high levels. The climate risk is a [socio-ecological risk](#). Inequality associated with this risk is [environmental inequality](#) [article in French]. The goal of COP 21 should not be to “save the planet” or even less to “save growth” but rather to “save our health” by protecting the most vulnerable from the worst of the climate crisis.

Let's negotiate a global carbon price signal – quickly!

By Stéphane Dion [\[1\]](#) and [Éloi Laurent](#)

Two decades after the Rio Conference, and just as a new climate conference is opening in Bonn on Monday 14 May 2012, we must admit to collective failure in combating human-induced climate change. We cannot escape serious climate disruption if we continue down this same path. We must change direction, and we must do it quickly.

The International Energy Agency forecasts warming of over 3.5°C by the end of the 21st century if all countries respect their commitments, and by more than 6°C if they content themselves with their present policies. At that level of warming, climate science warns us that our planet will become much less hospitable for humans and all other forms of life.

At the Durban Conference in December 2011, the countries

expressed their grave concern about the gap between their commitments and achieving the objective of a 2°C limit on increased global warming (relative to the pre-industrial era). They promised to re-double their efforts to bridge this gap. But they failed to make any commitment to achieve more stringent targets. We are thus facing an increasingly untenable gap between the urgent need for action and the inertia of international negotiations.

The developed countries are refusing to strengthen their climate policies so long as the other major emitters don't do the same. But the emerging economies, particularly China and India, with annual GDP growth rates of 8 to 10%, will not accept in the foreseeable future targets for the reduction of the volume of their greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. On the other hand, these countries might be more open to the idea of setting a price per ton of CO₂ that was standardized at the global level, from which they would derive revenue, and which their economic competitors would also be required to levy.

We believe that the best instrument for the international coordination needed to combat climate change is a global carbon price signal. This is why we are proposing that the forthcoming negotiations focus on this crucial goal.

Here is what we are proposing (for more detail, see, in French, <http://www.ofce.sciences-po.fr/pdf/dtravail/WP2012-15.pdf> and, in English): every country would make a commitment to introduce, in their respective jurisdictions, a carbon price aligned with a scientifically validated international standard, in order for the world to achieve or at least come as close as possible to the objective of keeping global warming below 2°C. Each country would decide whether to extract this levy through taxation or through a system of ceilings and trading in emissions permits (a "carbon market").

Governments would be free to invest, as they see fit, revenues

from the carbon emission levy and from the corresponding elimination of fossil fuel subsidies. They could, for example, invest in research and development in clean energy and public transportation, etc. They could also choose to address social inequalities with respect to access to energy.

Developed countries would be required to set aside part of their revenues to help developing countries introduce policies to mitigate emissions, to adapt facilities and to create carbon sinks (by means of reforestation, for example). The contributions of each country would be based on what their respective GHG emissions represent relative to the total emissions of all the developed countries.

Under this international agreement, countries would have the right to levy border taxes on products from countries that have not established a carbon price in accordance with the international standard. The message would be clear to all large emitters: if you do not levy a carbon tax on your products before you export them, the other countries will do so in your place, and it is they who will collect the revenues. Each country will understand that it is in its own commercial interests to comply with the international agreement, to tax its own emissions and to use the corresponding revenues as it sees fit.

In this way, the world would have available an instrument that is vital to its sustainable development. At last, carbon emitters would be required to pay the environmental price for their actions. Consumers and manufacturers would have an incentive to choose lower-carbon-content goods and services and to invest in new emission-reducing forms of technology.

We need to negotiate a global carbon price signal, and quickly. What better place to do this than at Rio, where the problem of climate change was first recognized by the international community 20 years ago?

[\[1\]](#) Stéphane Dion is a Member of the House of Commons of Canada; as Canada's then Minister of the Environment, he chaired the 11th Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in Montréal in 2005 (COP 11).