

Chris Layton: The title of our gathering includes the words global strategy. And while I heartily agree that any solution to climate change must mean a change in our own consciousness and also behaviour, all the local things that people have been talking about, I would like to focus on what, for me, is a key question. Can we, a gathering of committed people, gather behind some common global strategy so that we can put more effective pressure on a system, which is so far failing to meet the demands of this crisis of the planet and of life on Earth? To bridge this grotesque gap between the mounting realisation of the awesome prospect of "business as usual" and chain reactions of climate change and frankly the pitiful inadequacy of global action, whatever individuals and whatever particular countries may have done.

Everybody here, I am sure, fully accepts the necessities and the realities of climate change and most of you have been busy talking, writing, lobbying and pressing for global action. I feel that this might be vastly more effective if we could find common ground for pressing governments for the kind of radical action that is needed across the world. So I am just going to ask a few questions and see what happens in the discussion and what support we have for a few key points. We put in front of you the Chanctonbury Initiative, which was an attempt to bring together a kind of strategy. We would like any comments on that. But let me just pick up a few key points and ask for reactions.

First of all, there will probably be few who dissent from the need for a cap and reduction of emissions to a safe level. After all, isn't that the Rio treaty? I don't think any of you here will want to tear that up. So, can we say that there is agreement that we need a global system of cap and trade? When I say "cap and trade", I mean a cap that will reduce emissions down to the necessary level, which perhaps is 450 parts per million (ppm), perhaps even less, but to a scientifically agreed, at a global level, target. Why combine that with trade? And this now becomes a matter of opinion. In my view, because only an immensely powerful market driver can bring the transformation, not only in individual lives, but in the behaviour of the hundreds of

thousands of scientists, technologists and businesses, which drive the market system. At the moment the drive is towards economic growth and maximising the profit. Supposing the market signals were driving the innovative skills of humanity and this huge technological capacity towards a post carbon age. Just supposing that, the transformation is fabulous. And one can see that from the small changes made in individual companies in different parts of the world when different policies have been adopted, market things drives little local systems of trade. So, cap and trade is the agreement behind that. As a principle and as a goal that a concentration target that fits the scientific necessities over a period of time. Would this be building block one for a global strategy that is necessary? Aubrey was talking about what he felt were to be necessities. I'd like to test that out, that's the first point.

Second point, is it accepted that the second principle in Rio- equity - has to be answered? The first attempt to answer was Kyoto, simply cut by a number of advanced countries and now we are looking to the system beyond that, to the long-term strategy. And I say a 'long term strategy' because I personally can't accept this dichotomy between "should we do it for the next four years? Oh, long term strategy, that's too far away to think." The reality is that power stations are being planned in different parts of Europe that will last fifty years. People's investment now in new technology will decide the future over, not five year or one year, but ten, twenty, thirty, forty. So we need both.

My question is, "Is convergence to equal per capita, a negotiated convergence with equal per capita allowances on a certain date, the appropriate way of sharing out these cuts of emissions that we all have to make; that all world citizens have to be involved in?" Is it appropriate to make that a second building block of the treaty, or whatever we seek to agree for the next phase, post Kyoto?

I haven't heard any objections, actually, to the substance of Contraction and Convergence. All I have heard is, "Oh it is not possible. We can't persuade people, or they won't do it". This has been

my perpetual experience. And it's partly because of this experience that we in Action for a Global Climate Community have been making it our business to explore what people think. When we took this to people in the British government, their first reaction was that it was a good idea and an interesting idea but developing countries won't have it. So we made it our business to talk with developing countries. Certainly African states, many of them would like to have it and they express it in the Africa Group. We heard about India this morning, being so difficult to talk with, and yes it is true. They are developing and so the ambitions of consumption and material are there as well. But in India, they are suffering terribly already from climate change and as a prospect, even under the serious predictions of today, over carting food production, over a quarter by, perhaps, the second half of the century through climate change. And when we speak to Indians, and we have got a growing and strong group of our network in India; when we speak to people, -I'm talking about politicians, officials, scientists and NGOs in India -, on the basis of Contraction and Convergence and on the basis of moving towards equity, the dialogue changes completely. Actually it has, of course, been Indian policy to stand up for the concept of equal per-capita emission entitlements; I'll call it, for many years. And I believe that if the North, or if Europe took the lead in that, we'd get a very positive response from India. So that is the second question, how much is Contraction and Convergence the principal way forward?

Third question is this idea of 'a community of a willing' moving ahead. Well I am going to be, in a brief time, making a caricature, but not really. More a look at the situation as I feel it is. You have in the United States a country, which considers itself still to be the greatest power in the world, and it is in many material ways. It is the most powerful. And it is refusing to act. Its government is refusing to act despite the groundswell of support for action in the country.

Tony Blair has sought to persuade the Americans, to coax them all sort of better behaviour by being the top courtier in town. He has not succeeded for obvious reasons. The Americans are not confronted by anything powerful, they are not confronted by anything except a global opinion, which, yes it's true, persuaded George Bush to agree that climate change is a reality, but in Montreal, when questioned the American delegate and said, "what a victory, you've agreed to stay in the talks". "Yes, but we are not committing ourselves to any joint action".

Very strong statement. In other words, they are committing themselves to the inner talks, which they will try to obstruct. And that is the painful reality. Now I don't regard that that as something to go and cry about. But a reality that we need to address and we believe at AGCC, that the reality has to be addressed by willing states getting together and acting. The EU must take the lead. It needs its powers and take up the concept of Contraction and Convergence as a possible approach. Key developing countries such as India - perhaps the most key country as the largest democracy in the world and one who has great interest in this concept - has adopted it to mobilise our community or coalition of the willing to act.

When Peter Luff asked John McCain, Senator McCain, who has been a friend to AGCC, "would it help you if we moved ahead without you? Would it help your Everest to persuade America?" His answer was "Yes, of course. If you move ahead and act, that will be a hugely powerful stimulus and catalyst for us to persuade our government to change". So maybe we have to have some of the courage of our convictions and work for a global group that will move forward. Who could the leaders be? Well, I believe that the EU and India are key. Within the EU, yes, we have Italy and Poland and difficult countries. We need to have UK, France and Germany as core leaders of this concept. German Government Advisory Body on Climate Change, like our own environmental pollution commission, have advised their government to adopt a strategy of Contraction and Convergence, based on leadership by other community of the willing. Chirac himself has spoken at the Hague Conference at equity and form of equal per capita as being the appropriate long-term goal. So I believe that the potential is there, we need to persuade our own politicians in the UK to take the lead and be a partner in this venture.

Well, question to you. Do you agree with that strategic approach? It is very important that we agree behind such a concept and mobilise our efforts to that end. There are other subsidiary points in the Chanctonbury Initiative that I won't go into but I guess I must mention the word "institution's rule of law" because of course no initiative is going to be successful if there are no sanctions, commitments or implementation that really binds people to act. But there is a crucial area of commitment there, even in the European Union, we have seen that where there is a much more supra-national, international application of environmental law, we'd need to up the stakes and make sure the next

period, as Tom [Spencer] has explained, of commitments, really fulfil the Kyoto commitments. So we have to go for that as well.

Those few principles seem to me, to be a core for a possible strategy. In it, as our friend from TERI was telling us, the EU has to take a lead. India is a classic example. They are saying, "Well, you know, we don't really trust you. Are you really prepared for equity, or not?" And talking with Elliot Morley, after his talk, which gave a very, sort of, dubious view of India, but then also said, "Yes, well maybe they are doing a lot of good things". Our experience has been that if you are up front about equity with India, you get, at once, into a constructive dialogue and we are hoping to have a Euro-Indian conference to see whether we can take this forward.

So those are my questions. Do you support some of these ideas? And can we carry them forward together?

Participant 1: This paper we have got in front of us is titled "Towards a community for global climate protection". Now I think the word 'community' is quite interesting. How can we become a global community? I'm conscious that, in the UK, when you start having discussions about climate change, fairly soon people raise the issue that China is such a populist country and is developing, and whatever we do, that is going to become a problem for us in the future. We are hearing today, if you talk to people in India, they say, "well, when the West have done something, we can think about it." So I am interested in what sort of common messages might speak to our whole community.

Tom Spencer: Climate is very important, in which you need to build other things round it. A good starting place is a rule of law, preferably a democracy. In my view it made sense to start with the European Union where you have those institutions and their shared value system. The next obvious step is to, given that we virtually cannot have coherent climate action without India and China. When I ran Global Legislators Organisation for a Balanced Environment [GLOBE], I used to keep the Chinese out on the grounds that it wasn't a democracy, and the People's Assembly is still a joke. But I accept that, following my own indications earlier, that we need all the wedges and that we cannot afford to wait until China is a democracy before we deal with China, so to create additional institutions with which to relate.

Now the advantage of the relationship with India and

that's where the sense of community came from, but we were using "community" in a sense rather like the original European Economic Community. But this would be something that didn't just share goals; it had agreed mechanisms for control for compliance enforcement. It had a system that could be verified, checked by judges etc. So we were using 'community' in a specific, general federalist sense, rather than in the broad sense of 'let's all share our humanity together'. Because, while I think that's important, it's only a first step; and what we are looking at is institutional cooperation. To put a framework on what the Canadians did with landmines with the coalition of the willing, which is that "we can't use the formal global institutions, but we can make major progress in institutional matters, if necessary, without the Americans, given the nature of American 'exceptionalism'".

Ashok Sinha: With regard to the specific question of how we can build a global community. I think we do so by (and I'm coming at it from the perspective of someone who is trying to work out how do we develop the kind of public pressure that is needed behind any intellectual resolution of the discussions that we are having, as to the best policy proposals that we should put forward. Public pressure. How do we build up a global community? I think we have to start with the global communities that already exist, actually. You come from the Methodist church; that is already a global community. Trade Unions are a global community. There are activists who've been working globally on issues for a long time now, whether it is Apartheid, whether it is third-world debt, whether it is trade justice. There is a global community that exists through those who simply pick up information about the world and decide they want to do something about it through the Internet. So, a challenge for us, within Stop Climate Chaos, and anybody else who is involved in popular campaigning, is not to reinvent the wheel, but to maximise the opportunities that exist amongst existing communities for action. But, and this is the critical issue, the unity of message. We have to have a unity of voice, in all of this. We have to be clear about what we stand for and why we stand for it. And I think in relation to the specific question posed on Contraction and Convergence, as a coalition, Stop Climate Chaos is clear. We do not officially support Contraction and Convergence. Individual members of the organisation do, officially. Individual members of the coalition do not, officially. In practise, though, I think we pretty much do. Do we say that we should contract global emissions? Of course. It would be preposterous to say that global emissions, of greenhouse gases, shouldn't contract.

Do we say that the global peak in emissions should occur about 2015? I think that is entirely consonant with the curves that Aubrey was presenting to us earlier. So it is a major plank of our policy position, which is based, just to be technical for a second, around the idea that the danger threshold to global warming is 2°C and if there is to be a better than evens chance of not exceeding 2°C, then we have to stabilise the atmospheric greenhouse gas concentrations at 450 ppmv or less, preferably a lot less, hence we get to the peak of decline in 2015 in global emissions when you take into account where we are starting from.

So, that's not so very different from Contraction. And do we say we believe in Convergence? Well absolutely. At some point down the line there is no logical reason why somebody in Burkina Faso should have any less of an entitlement to carbon emissions than somebody in Stockholm. So I think there is actually a convergence of message here. I think there is a convergence of, certainly in terms of the policies that we stand for. But I think in terms of public communication, the thing that really works much more than anything else, anything more than Contraction and Convergence, or 2°C or 450 ppmv, or any of these technical terms or rhetorical concepts, is the sense of -and we have got to find the right words for this- justice. And it came out in the Christian Aid report this week: 182 million Africans will die, at least, as a result of climate change, this century. And I think that is what we have to get across. And we have also got to get across the fact that we, in the industrialised nations, have to take the historical responsibility for this and we have to act now. Which is why we, in the UK, are working with partners around the world, certainly in industrialised countries, and talking to them about the unilateral action that the UK, and others - the G8 specifically-, must take, from now on, in order to bring down our greenhouse gas emissions. So that the world has got a chance of staying within the curves that Aubrey showed.

Peter Luff: Let me add, if I can, a few more things to what Chris has been saying and Ashok has been saying, from my experience. I have been working now for a couple of years for Action for a Global Climate Community. It began, as you've heard, with a conference at Wilton Park, which was attended by people from 19 countries. Out of it was forged, this Chanctonbury Initiative, which tried to answer some of the questions that Chris has posed. The next stage was to see whether this had any resonance anywhere. So I began, and I confess to using up carbon more than I wish to have done, I began by

taking this idea to various places. To East Africa, to begin with, to the East African Legislative Assembly, which, as you probably know, is an assembly brought together by Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania, as an attempt to create a new kind of European model in Africa.

I spoke to the Environment Committee at the East African Legislative Assembly. There was, unquestionably, a profound agreement with the principles of Contraction and Convergence. They argued powerfully that this was something that Africa needed and would back. Other Kenyan scientists addressed the same point when the Kenyan Environment Minister hosted a lunch for fourteen or fifteen other African Environment Ministers to which I spoke. The same principle was upheld. Again, in West Africa, in Cameroon, a conference that Chris attended, the same message coming through. In Brazil, where Aubrey and I attended, actually, the first public debate, on the whole issue, where the Brazilian historical proposals were put up and Aubrey argued his point. It was fascinating, that debate, and one of the key people, who had been one of the architects of the Brazilian proposals, at the end said, "actually, it is Contraction and Convergence that makes better sense; the logic holds better". In India, where I have been going there regularly, for two years, we have built a large network of scientists, administrators, legislators and others, who say "well of course, we have been arguing the equity case, justice case, over many years. But we are not going to keep arguing it, if we are hitting deaf ears in the North". You go back to the North and the North say, the South aren't interested. But the South is interested. I actually confronted Dr Prodipto Ghosh, the key negotiator for the Indians at a meeting of UNEP, and said to him, "look, if Europe was prepared to negotiate on the basis of equity, would you?". And he said, "Yes, we would be prepared".

So it is absolute nonsense when they are saying in the North, this isn't the case. It is a reality in the South that there is an interest in this. So what we are trying to do now is to say, how can we get leadership in this? And it strikes us that the leadership, as Ritu was saying this morning, and I thought her speech was of extreme importance, we need Europe to take leadership on this. OK, and we are in UK, we are in Britain, and we need the British government to play its part. I mean there is a very good argument to say that Britain wants to get back into the heart of Europe. Let us forget, for the moment, about the constitution. Let's even forget, for the moment about whether we join the Euro. The

issue is that we could lead and take leadership on the issue on the environment and get some sort of united approach, looking towards the South. But before we can even do that, I think we need to get some sort of unity, and some sort of collective purpose, among the non-governmental agencies and those working in this field. And that is one of the purposes, to see if we can forge, not necessarily exactly what we are saying, but some form of common agreement that can act as a political imperative.

Now, we've heard, over and over again, about this thing that individuals must take action, and individuals must take action. And it is absolutely right that the big issue must be brought before the British people, for two reasons. First, because their actions will change things, both individually and collectively. And secondly, because they need to understand why there have got to be big political initiatives. But unless we can agree on big political initiatives pretty quickly, time is going to go too fast, which is one of the reasons that we would like this to debate to open up; so that what you are giving us is your views, on what kind of political initiatives. Whether you agree with some of the things being put forward or whether you have got additions or changes or amendments. So that is the kind of the field that we would like, this afternoon, to move forward onto.

Participant 2: I agree with everything that has been proposed. All I want to do is to suggest that we also need to recognise that it is not just political change that we will want. I think that Lord Redesdale was right. There does need to be a change of ideology as well. Because, although climate change is the biggest issue to hit us, in fact, we are also reaching a crisis in civilisation, where the kind of values or priorities, which is behind climate change, is also behind the starvation, is about the exploitation and so on. Our whole Western value system isn't working. So, although I think it is absolutely fine to concentrate on a political agenda, don't forget that in fact there also needs to be a change in the community in the wider sense. This is because, until people change what matters to them most, (and I go into this in terms of the way we look at 'enlightened self-interest', particularly in you take the Eastern point of view, that in fact, the self includes everybody else so that there is only one self and so that there is no need to compete) the whole Western model of competition is a Western idea. And you can draw upon the fact that there is the whole constituency of people involved in new consciousness and that's why I mention Gaia and

Schumacher and so on. The other people knew humanity movements. They are not connected with this campaigning and the climate change thing but they are working in parallel. And there are plenty of people realising that there needs to be a jump change of our whole priority system throughout the western world, and throughout the world itself. It would be generally global and not international. Don't forget that as well. We need to work in parallel with people changing underlying values. Not just going with political change alone.

Aubrey Meyer: I just want to underline how much I value and respect the work of Peter, Christopher, Tom and John Pinder. And to link that right here and now, today, to what you have in your hands. There is the statement from the Africa Group, which is being read out by the Kenyan government at their meeting tomorrow [19 May 2006], in their climate negotiations in Bonn. And the sense opportunity that I see and that I think we can use, is only yesterday, in the Independent newspaper, it said we must have an international climate agreement. "Africa's voice must be heard". I went last night to David Miliband, who had a public meeting, and said, "Minister, their voice has been heard since Kyoto, for C & C [Contraction and Convergence]". The Africa group took up this challenge in 1997. Their problem is that they sense that they've been heard, but they haven't been listened to. They've been arguing for this for years. And our sense of opportunity is to say to Tony Blair and all of them, "If you are saying that their voice must be heard, presumably that means that you want to know what they say. If they are talking something, which is, by my standards, common sense that solves the problem, it turns the problem into a solution. Take a chance on love. Or take a chance on logic. Take a chance on actually listening to what they are saying and see if you can find something better, rather than another decade of evading it. The agenda that reconciles this truth is, in principle, C & C and it's constitutional. And the opportunity to build on this community work is enormous. And the hunger for it, as Peter describes, is absolutely vintage and authentic. I have also tramped the globe periodically, air miles for twenty years. The fact that it isn't more alive here is the source of amazement to me, not the fact that it isn't there.

Chris Layton: I'd like to just respond also to the question about how you build a community and to the question about values as well. Of course I fully agree with the fundamental thing about values. I think the realisation that growth and materials do not achieve satisfaction and happiness is very

fundamental in the fact that it has actually been acknowledged now by numbers, and it is extremely important in a debate. But the idea of a global climate community does, in a sense, incorporate something about values. That's why I use the word "community" and not coalition, actually. It starts off from recognition of our global citizenship in shared destiny. And it means that, in practical terms for a country like India, if a lot of countries in the North (and eventually all), and a lot of countries in the South sign up to a new protocol or treaty, or whatever, which could be within the context of the UNFCCC, would any rate lead the way and draw everybody in. That will be a larger political and social concept than a purely calculus of emissions. The Indian government, for example, is wrestling with the issue of how to improve rural development and what to do about electric power. Actually, they have this gigantic potential of solar energy in every village. Staggering. It doesn't need them all to be on the grid, which is what they were doing. "Oh, you've got to get them on the grid so that the rich farm in the village can have a television set, taking power from that big dam system, several hundred or a thousand miles away." Well actually, the agenda of a sustainable, post carbon economy is extremely possible for India. And its industry is beginning to recognise that. But that has to confront the excited wish to emulate the West. So, if Europe, for example, were to reach out and say "Now look, let's create our countries' global climate community which has, not endless goal of cutting emissions, but where you will get important resources which can be put into sustainable development and help you with adaptation and all other related issues", it would be politically much more real, as we've found out from dialogue with our Indian friends, and much more responding to the real needs of the Indian community. It must address their total needs. And that's why we've put in - what I've always felt that Global Climate Community also needs - some kind of parliamentary body, just in the same way that one pushes for a UN Assembly. Because we do not want it to be only the meetings of extremely obscure discussions amongst technocrats, which have been the meetings of the COP so far. Somehow or other, we have to connect this global thing with a real political and social life of the different countries involved. So that is why we use the word 'community'. In practical terms, yes, it is perfectly legally possible to do it in the framework of the UN convention. The key thing would then to expand it to all the other countries. My pet concept is that we try to find a number of key countries, and I will mention who they are. Preferably the whole EU, if not the UK, France and Germany; India... Can we persuade

Brazil and other key developing countries? Enough to form a critical mass of countries they would get together and, what I would like to see is what I call a 'fast-track' negotiation. What happens now is that we negotiate every year on this urgent problem. Once a year you will have a meeting and you will have people chatting away in between. And you will give yourself another five years to work out what to do in post Kyoto, and then, oh dear, it is getting rather urgent and we only have five years left! Well, actually what we need is a fast-track negotiation, rather like the one that did the International Criminal Court or the Rome Treaty. Where representatives of these key governments get together and they are authorised, like representative College of Cardinals, by the government, to negotiate this crucial thing. They are stuck together in a room until they come up with a strategic agreement. They can then come forward and say to the rest of the members of the UNFCCC, "Would you like to join us?" This is the way forward and this is the logical way.

Participant 3: It seems to me that you have offered us three questions and you have asked for responses from NGOs and you are not hearing any reaction, and I'm not sure quite why that is and I am perplexed by the proposition you are putting to us and why you are not getting the reaction that obviously you want. For me, it may be something around this 'community of the willing'. You described it in your earlier paper as "a bubble of countries", which seems to me to be, self evidently, a good thing to do at one level. But we've heard several points of view during the day. We've heard from the lady from India, who was saying how she looked at the Indian Government and she was speaking about Europe's leadership We have heard quite derogatory remarks about the Italian government and how they really don't get it at all. I spent a bit of my time working in Ireland and for those of you who don't know, they are continuing on a huge burst of economic growth, which they have had for ten years now. Their emissions are totally out of control. They are increasing by about 13 per cent growth per annum now. We've heard about 'silver bullets' and one silver bullet that was offered to us was the notion that it is really very convenient to go and lecture other countries to engage in international diplomacy while doing very little at home. I'm really worried about that because we have had a couple of our speakers saying that actually we should get our own stores in order first before we then go and lecture anyone else. And it seems to me that one of the problems I'm having in this discussion is that many NGOs in Britain are committed to many of the notions that we've heard about contraction and

convergence, but actually they're focusing their campaigning on doing something about what's happening in this country now, today, about our emissions. Which will arguably, and I think they are probably right, put us in a better place to be influential internationally if we could control our own emissions. So, what you are suggesting, by a 'community of the willing', at one level is fine. But it doesn't actually require getting your own house in order at all, it just requires to commit to global contraction. That's what it says. Now, I think you need to go further than that and I think you need good champions. And I don't think the Irish or the Italians, or possibly even Europeans actually - in my experience - will be that good. I think we've got to make the leadership good and relevant. That is my disconnection with this debate so far and why I am a bit perplexed by exactly where the discussion may be going.

Chris Layton: Well of course it is both. Of course we can't do it whilst whizzing off with 'business as usual'. The commitment to Contraction and Convergence means a commitment to our own emissions curve. And the better we demonstrate it, the better off we are at speaking with others. And indeed, as - not surprising politically - John Gummer said, if the government has been high on rhetoric and short on implementation, it is weaker when it goes abroad. So, of course it's crucial that Europe achieves its Kyoto targets. What's happened in the emissions market place, in Europe, over the last few days, is fascinating. On the one hand, it demonstrated that the market works. On the other hand, it has signalled is that there is a surplus of emissions. In other words, that the blighters in Europe are not cutting enough and that there is a risk of too much hot air. So the EU has jolly well got to get its act together if it wants to be a leader. Of course, that is fundamental to the whole thing.

But, it's not enough. We have a global thing. So, I fully agree with Peter, that if Europe is to be 'a serious something' at all, it doesn't have to have a constitution, it is about getting our act together on this, the greatest challenge which faces humanity, and taking a lead on it globally. It is only because we have, hesitantly, half-effectively, done better nonetheless than USA and taken some kind of a lead at Kyoto and have got an opinion which we are still kind of working on it, that we are looked to as the one possible light in the darkness by India. So, of course, we don't go around being half dark, we've got to get on with it and do it properly. But that is part of the necessary, global strategy that we have to have.

Tom Spencer: I don't think we've answered enough properly your dichotomy between whether it is enough to get our own house in order and how do we operate in a British context, and the impact on Europe and global issues.

Charles King (TUC): If you're an electrician, you know about some of the energy saving things, and Learning Skills Council, it's in their remit. When Charles Clarke was in charge of education he put it in their remit, they have actually got a policy to introduce that in 2010. Now we in the TUC were saying "What's wrong with 2005, 2006?" So we're trying to progress some things along with that. We also looked at other things like off shoring, outsourcing, because they're important to jobs in the UK, they're also important to the places that you do offshore them, and as well as in terms of international labour organisations and standards in the countries where you offshore them. Those ought to be part of the contracts, so we press for those sorts of things. We looked at ethical investment, and ethical investment by us as trade unions. We invest several million pounds on the stock exchange, so we ought to actually have a say in how we do that. But also, we looked at our own procurement policies, about fair trade, whether we bought from companies who actually do deliver international labour organisation standards.

We're involved in a number of groups namely DEFRA, DTI, and Manufacturing Forum. And one of our concerns is that we want to change things like micro-generation, and we think that wind, wave power and all the rest of it are good. But we usually go along to the DTI and after about a year of convincing them they give you about £5m to go and do some research. But then when you go along and say "Can we build a plant in the UK so that we can employ UK workers and we can manufacture it in the UK?", they turn around and say "Well, it's a commercial environment, if it was any good, somebody would buy it and do it, wouldn't they?". And that's one of the biggest problems that we have. And I think you've got to link all these things about manufacturing and jobs, employment and communities, and the way we work, the way we deal with ourselves and with our colleagues abroad. We are also working together with our European and international affiliates, to try and improve working and living standards everywhere. But we can't do it at the expense of living standards here. It's OK to offshore something to Mumbai, fine. But if you were in Peebles and it was the only job in Peebles then it's not exactly a winner. It won't exactly do me any favours and I won't get any

members out of it, so you've got to put a balance on all these things, and that's what we're trying to do.

I think, probably in this league, we're a bit of a Neanderthal about some of the things you want to do, but when I go back to Wimbledon tomorrow, I'll be seen as a bit progressive and idealistic. So, you know, you've got to put a balance on some of these things. But we are trying by putting pressure, in our own way, and I think we've been quite successful in a number of ways and we should keep at it. Thank you.

Robert Whitfield: Robert Whitfield, from One World Trust and speaking personally as well. I think that on the contraction and convergence, both as general concepts, I'm sure in the room generally there is very wide acceptance. I mean one can argue about rates, but for the basic concepts I think there is wide support. The question mark of your three questions, the one which is least clear I think is 'the community of the willing', and what I'd like to understand is how, with the proposals on the table, that relates to the current activity for addressing the second phase of Kyoto post-2012. Is the proposal suggesting two parallel levels of international activity, first the post Kyoto dialogue that is currently running from Montreal, and then second there is your activity. So would governments be involved or negotiating two different things in parallel? Or as an alternative, is the idea that actually this would develop rapidly and sufficiently enough so that it evolves into the post-2012 solution and the other negotiation sort of fades away?

Chris Layton: The idea is to get movement and if everybody joins very quickly and accepts these principals then it becomes the final solution in the UNFCCC. But if you look at the positions of the US, Saudi Arabia and a certain number of countries, if global agreement waits on a consensus with them, we're not going to get a very good one for quite a long time. The whole idea is to take people who want to move ahead and who see the necessity of this, and then start a group within the UNFCCC, keep in touch with them. You can call it a 'framework of people' if you are bureaucratically inclined, but the analogy to be honest is the analogy I had in my mind for the early days of the European Union. In the early days of the Union, Britain was in the same kind of position as the United States today; it was all for European unity as long as they controlled the pace i.e. very slow. So a very slow process began with the Council of Europe and the OEC and people were co-operating together inter-governmentally and doing certain things, but it wasn't moving forward.

So six countries got together and said, "Look, we're going to meet outside this gathering and decide how to go ahead faster." And the European Economic Community was born and today, we're all in it. It's important to look at the time scale. The time scale on climate change will have to be quicker. What I would like to see is a group of this kind formed in time to implement contraction and convergence for a maximum number of countries, by the time of moving ahead and the second stage of Kyoto. It would indeed implement that sort of commitment and it's perfectly possible legally as Raul Estrada reassures me, the chair of the last COP meeting in Argentina, to move ahead even within the framework of the UN convention. Let's hope that the United States and others will all be in on the same terms by, say, 2020, though that's a bit late because we might have had not some small climate catastrophes by then, but some gigantic ones. So I actually feel that the speed with which people join will be also conditioned by the speed of accelerating climate catastrophe. It's a mixture between that and the pace with which we, the willing, move ahead and create a dynamic process and attract the others to join.

Tom Spencer: Can I answer that question as well and then that might give us a few steps forward. The model in my mind is of things like the Schengen Agreement, the Passport Agreement, inside the European Union, which shared the institutions of the European Union, but wasn't signed by the British and Irish suite. So you could have the group that goes faster. So at one level we've been trying to prepare the intellectual ground for a group that would go faster. Our preferred early relationship, for reasons, which I'll come to in a moment, is with India, but you can see how one would do it with other groups.

So you can have that at the theoretical level, that's the classic piece of federalist / functionalist building of international institutions; not in conflict with the post Kyoto discussions, but a reminder that you don't have to be totally dependant on that sequence of debates, as Chris has just said. It is possible for parties to the contention to go ahead, to go further, to go faster, to go together. Let me go down in scope for a moment, it has seemed to me, despite the turmoil in the Emissions Trading Scheme in the last few days, that one practical way of showing how this might manifest itself, short of treaties setting up new inter-institutional relationships between Europe and India etc., is to look at expanding the Emissions Trading Scheme, admitting more countries and linking it to other systems worldwide. And that again

is, if you like at the level just of emissions trading, a reflection of the idea of moving towards a single carbon price and a single community.

If I may speak personally for a moment, there's another logic to a EU – India link. If you look at the really big emissions on Aubrey's chart 20 years out, at the end of the day we can't do much about this without a US and China agreement. Eventually they have to come to some terms. But they're both locked in a vision of their own exceptionalism. There's a long term struggle going on there and I don't think it's wise for the rest of humanity to wait while Beijing and Washington work out exactly the parameters of their own agreement on carbon. If you look at the other great emitters, the EU, especially in its enlarged and enlarging form, and with its peripheral links to the African, Caribbean and Pacific countries, makes one moderately coherent group with India. And so what we've done was taking an idea and looking for ways of expressing that idea in the politics and the negotiating habits of the climate change discussions. But to do that successfully and to win the big prize of an agreement with India, you have to take the Indians at their face value, understand that they really do want to exercise this kind of "great power" role and not just to continue to bask in a kind of comfortable Gandhian leadership of the developing world role. Now, they've shown in some areas they're prepared to do that. I'm not going to get into the question of nuclear power and nuclear weapons and all the rest of it, but there is definitely a sense of India stirring as seeing itself as one of the great powers of the planet. With that, certain responsibilities go along. And one of those responsibilities is to actually start doing deals about real matters rather than about rhetoric. So, I think what we've been doing so far in the first phase is tactics, checking out whether this picture has any reality in the rest of the world; checking out whether people are prepared to talk; checking out what the next steps might be. Now, if I'm absolutely honest, occasionally I fall asleep and dream that the Bush administration changes its mind or the next administration doesn't have the problems with the senate and elsewhere, but actually I don't believe it. I think we may have anything up to 15 years before America is a full and willing partner of a global structure. So this is a second best; it's a lifebelt; it's a way of exploring new intellectual ideas and new models. But I think we'd be the last to say, "Yes, we have a game plan which says St. Lucia joins on September the 12th and the island of Borneo - which incidentally, in some bad years, emits one-eighth of all man-made carbon. If you have forest

fires of that scale, it is really of global significance - joins. (). And then in 2012 India would sign this agreement". I don't think we have that game plan. What we think that we have is some good ideas and we have been, mainly through the work of Peter [Luff] and Chris [Layton], chasing those ideas, trying to hone them.

Participant 4: Before I came along today, I had a look through the text of your Chanctonbury Initiative, and there were a number of things I could say I would use a different word, or the emphasis should be different. I would like to ask whether you have put this before people like David Attenborough or Lord Oxborough to find out about their opinion or how they would feel about singing up to it.

Tom Spencer: No, we've not gone out on a big signature campaign

Peter Luff: I just want to say a couple of things. We haven't actually tried yet to make this a popular campaign in quite that way. We've put it forward for a number of people. So, to give you an example, our patrons around the world include Sir Crispin Tickell, Professor John Schellnhuber, who was the director of the Tyndall Institute and now of the Potsdam Institute, Ambassador Raul Estrada, one of the architects of Kyoto, Ambassador Chandrasekhar Das Gupta, who was the chief Indian negotiator previously, Professor Margaret Kamal, who is Vice-Chancellor of the University of Nairobi and was President of the East-African Legislative Assembly and so on. I could go on with a number of names. Now, we've done that because we are trying to build up our own particular campaign. The one at this point has been a fairly close run campaign. Just trying to talk to those people we can do with the limited resources we have. This is one of the moves outward, to try and get others involved in the non-governmental and the civil society worlds. If we can then move forward, we may well look to get a wider audience still. So the answer is, to specifically David Attenborough and Lord Oxborough, no. David Attenborough, particularly, I actually think is not particularly involved in the whole political sphere of campaigning and he is interested in climate change broadly, but he tends not to sign up to individual initiatives. Lord Oxborough, I have a standing engagement to go and see, which I shall do at some point and I think Aubrey has something to say on that one. Is that helpful?

Participant 4: Well, I was going to say that the important thing is to progress a certain number of principles. One would be either based on

Contraction and Convergence or a variation of it, which would be to say “we should adopt something very similar to Contraction and Convergence”. Another way would be to say that there should be strong use of fiscal instruments which leaves it open, whether people who sign up to that are themselves supporters of personal carbon rations, carbon tax or a hybrid approach. For me, the most important principle, which people have eluded towards during the day, which I don’t see here, is the importance of education. When people ask Elliot Morley “how much success are you going to have in persuading your colleagues to take it as seriously as you do?”, the reaction we had from him - and I can’t remember what John Gummer said - seemed to be along the lines of “it’s a gradual process of diffusion”. The important thing with climate change and sustainability is that these aren’t issues in which you can say, “make enough noise about it and that will be it”. Compared with issues like military threats, hospital waiting lists or quality of education, most issues are linear issues, where people can figure out in their minds how much importance they attach to them based on what they’ve heard about it and what they’ve read about it. With climate change and sustainability, I’d say, in my own personal case, I am someone whose hobby, for a very long has been, reading about science and following scientific news, and it only took me until recently, within the last two years, to really get why climate change was so important. And part of that has been reporting on the consolidation on the scientific theory and findings. But, if that’s how it is for me then I suspect for a lot of other people, to get the matter into their heads, you need to sit them down and take them through the logical steps, which aren’t linear, and needs explaining and needs visual aids like Aubrey Meyer has given today. I advocate that this should be within all the major political parties, a campaign to see all sitting politicians and candidates undergo a two-day educational seminar on the principles of climate change and sustainability, and a campaign on something not dissimilar for every member of the public to be summonsed to have to attend. I think that there is no ‘silver bullet’, but I think that is a crucial missing piece to the puzzle.

Ashok Sinha: I’m not entirely sure I agree. I’m looking at a situation where we are going to take decisions, nationally and globally, in the next three or four years, which are going to be ‘make or break’. I don’t think getting it into the national curriculum, for example, is going to deal with that particular issue. Now, if we are talking about public communications, I don’t think it is also, necessarily the case, that by trying to educate people through a linear process of,

“we’ll start with the problem, then we will develop an understanding of that problem, then we will develop an understanding of the solutions and then maybe people will be convinced by the action that needs to take place”. I don’t think that is necessarily going to work and certainly not in the time that is available. My gut reaction is that people will see and support the need for action when they see what’s in it for them. And what could be in it for them might be that they are social activists who don’t want 180 million people in Africa to die. What’s in it for them might be that they want to be able to walk to school, or that they want to be able to be happy that their grandmother is not going to die of fuel-poverty, or that, in fact, their children won’t be going to fight wars for oil in the future. Whatever it is, but I think that over the timescale that we’re talking about, we’ve got to - and I use the word advisedly -, sell climate change as a communications issue, on the basis of what is going to press their button that makes them think, “Aha, I see it. I can see the benefits” from whatever frame and whatever position they are starting from. And I don’t see that as necessarily a linear part of education approach. I see it as being a means of trying to figure out, across a broad swathe of society, what are the general categories of people, what a general response is that they will find attractive and persuade them to take action and press those buttons because we have only got about three or four years and maybe one general election - maybe two, but I would hazard to suggest just one general election - in which to make this the biggest issue of all time.

Participant 5: I’ll just add a positive comment. I think the EU’s leadership is very important. For example, we know that the EU have started to implement its ETS this year. In parallel, Japan and in other Asian countries start to clean up their IT industry. So my point is that global relations and trading will be very important in tackling climate change. EU will probably have a major impact at global level, particularly in US and China. If the EU pass a very strong law then, because they want to sell their products to Europe, they will take action. Probably we would get rid of deadlock in the EU about how we get the US or China on board.

Participant 6 I am working for the Sustainable Development Commission, but I have just been working for DEFRA on the Climate Change Programme Review and Energy Review. We went through the transition from Margaret Beckett to David Miliband only one or two weeks ago and I was very interested in this idea he has of ‘an

environmental contract'. And I wondered, from the panel, whether or not this idea has an ideology behind it, which would be useful for engaging members of the public, which aren't currently engaged, and whether, in addition to that, it will have a kind of campaigning merit to it as well? And associated again is whether or not the issues that are being espoused here chimes in again with the idea of 'an environmental contract'? So I guess, is there any merit behind an environmental contract? Is there something that we can campaign on?

Peter Luff: I'll just come in on this one because actually, Ashok, I was at the theatre the other evening, and just before the performance started, somebody stood up and offered one of the Stop Climate Chaos leaflets, which was an environmental contract. And I thought it was excellent. And actually it was very persuasive to the audience. I think that that's very much at the heart of it with what I was talking about the different levels. To actually get people to realise that they must do something and also persuade their government to take those actions, I think is actually a very good way forward. May I just make it clear about, so that people understand what AGCC is trying to do? We're not trying to build some huge international campaign. We're rather focused on particular negotiations we are trying to get going between people we believe can begin to move things forward at a pace that they need to be moved forward. That doesn't alter any other activities, which are going that are excellent, like an environmental contract. I was just amused to be in the theatre having this lecture before the play started.

Ashok Sinha: I'm not sure I fully understand how the environmental contract will manifest itself in practice, but this is a good start in the way that David Miliband is talking about it and just taking words out of my mouth in a sense that, what we're calling the pledge, at least for now, in Stop Climate Chaos. It is a simple action that you take where you declare what you are personally going to do to reduce your climate change impact. But you also state to governments, to the Prime Minister, what you expect of him, what you expect of the government. And, in a situation where we know that no one sector can deliver everything, it's not just the state, it's not just the government and it's not just the individual or community action. We do need to have some form of, if you like, trust and commitment, shared commitment across individuals and the government which says that "it is worth my while, and actually, I'm going to go the extra mile because I know government will". Government will

go the extra mile because it knows it's not going to get destroyed by the ballot box. So to that extent, I think that an environmental / social contract on the issue of climate change could potentially be very productive. And that's why we have effectively got the embryonic social contract in the form of this personal pledge that I just described.

Aubrey Meyer: For the first point to Charlie; there is a scheme which Elliot himself has openly backed and is widely supported, where there is a national equivalent of Contraction and Convergence (C&C) called "Domestic Tradable Quota". In effect it is C and C within a country. So, the point I feel that is of relevance to what you were saying is, by definition, you've got to compress and resolve the wildly asymmetric conditions that exist within this country, never mind within globally as well.

The second point is that somebody mentioned Lord Oxborough. On the back page of this leaflet is an article, which appears today, I believe, in the building industry magazine called "Building". It is a report on a meeting where the "Edge group", led by myself and Lord Oxborough and the Edge itself, had a pretty intense discussion about C and C at the end of it, where the chairman, Peter Guthrie, came to the point of actually taking a vote from the whole community about whether C and C was their consensus position. The way they recorded it to themselves was that they took a unanimous vote of consent for this and Lord Oxborough was given clear opportunity to just say "no, count me out"... literally eyeballing him and he didn't take that opportunity. So whoever was asking for Lord Oxborough, he was in.

There were two more points. The first is that what got raised in the morning and didn't get followed up on here is the extent of all-party consensus building around not just that we have a climate problem, but also that we can come to a consensus on a climate solution. Crudely, five of the seven political parties in the UK have got C and C in their manifestos. Whether that means anything or not, I don't know but it's there. The two who don't are the Labour Party and the Conservative Party so we read something into that. Half the parliamentary Labour Party are personally signed on the record, whether it means anything, to C and C. They've signed EDMs [Early Day Motions] and pledges and all sorts of things like that. And particular Tory members have signed up for it too. And the inquiry that is seeking this consensus right now is on the way taking evidence to try and assimilate it all. I suggest you watch that space very closely. I don't think they are

taking evidence any more but the keenly felt question is, as you rather heard this morning, that having a meaningless consensus on the solution is a great danger. It is preferable to have a less than total consensus on something that is robust, to that extent the consensus is already, as I see it, for C and C.

The final point I want to make is, in relation to the issue about global vs. local, and the dilemma of being seen to be green or actually being green and all the rest of it. But the test is the numbers. If the general acceptance is that there is a sort of reasonable logical proposition, which is one way or another, by accident or design, c and c (with small cs) is what this is about, and the issue is then how do you organise it? You get into this kind of vicious circle where it is absolutely true, many people in developing countries have made the point that “Unless we see the industrial countries really getting their act together and cleaning up, we’re not going to take any lessons from you guys and clean up our act”. So the European Union have heroically struggled to establish the Kyoto protocol. They’ve had two major problems with this. The first is that the United States has just perennially said, “Sorry, no deal. You can talk about it until you are blue in the face, but we’re not part of it”. So the only rescue there is that you can try to build it up through the States to the federal level. It is kind of beginning to happen, but it is a slow build and Tom’s [Spencer] pessimism about dates, 2020, is probably not inaccurate on a conventional analysis of that curve. The second point is that partly because of both of those things, the European resolve has actually considerably weakened and the actual structural process around the propositions itself has weakened too. So, for example, the original European commitment under Kyoto was fifteen per cent off by 2010. It was immediately halved, courtesy of the Americans and Al Gore, to seven and a half. Since then it is about net zero and it has gone from that bad to the worst we’ve now seen where there’s a circle of permits and the price fell out of the market. The optimists say it’s a blip, the cynics say that it proves that you just can’t do it. But the key thing is that it does have the weakness that C and C and the Stop Climate Chaos movement are trying to address, which is ultimately, how can you be practically seen to be engaged in delivering results but also being numerate, if you like, within the survival equity equation, globally?

And this is where I would really like Sam and Ashok to take a challenge here. The momentum of this campaign is so far primarily national. That’s fine,

absolutely fine. It is absolutely, miraculously organised by the proposition, as I understand it and correct me if I am wrong, that the faux big ask of three per cent off per annum is the numerate part of the strategy, that is separate from all the selling strategies and so on. Now, the difficult bit is this. They could well fall into the slip stream of what I am going to call ‘the underachieving Kyoto process’, where one particularly perverse feature emerges, which is never discussed and I think we should be discussing it, or at least thinking about how to discuss this downstream from here. The key test is here. We have to solve this problem faster than we created it. Otherwise you know, what’s the point? That’s the first thing.

The second thing is that if that means, with the amplification of feedbacks making the problem worse and faster rather than slower, and the available, sustainable, carbon output in the future is less than what we thought, the issue of how you globally share that is very important in respect of the kind of numbers that are generated under Kyoto and even under Stop Climate Chaos, where the rhetoric has all been “This is pro-South, this is demonstrating that we really mean it, hoping you will follow our example”. The weathering on the numbers process tends to generate precisely the opposite result when you count it out. That, in fact, the lion’s share, which is theoretically reserved for the south, actually turns out to be quite the opposite. The lion’s share, which is not a big lion’s share, but it is the lion’s share of what is available, actually defaults to the north under things like the European Trading Scheme and the problems they’ve just run into. And there are real messaging problems attached to this, if you come back to the Africa point. From the point of view of an African, who has probably heard about this by now, after having probably experienced by now some of the impacts, and he’s getting the message through the media that he’s one of the 12 million this year of the 182 million over the century, who are going to die. They are the, kind of, discard in all of this. It’s not just a kind of collateral cost; it’s cheaper to let them go than keep them in the game. The psychology of that is pretty horrific. But that is only the beginning of the problem. If we adjust ourselves to a tolerance of that, so that it becomes a part of our psychology that they are the discards, while we fight out this issue of who gets the lion’s share of a very small budget that is actually available. I think this is going to destroy the possibility of any rational discourse whatsoever. So, the challenge is really acute and the challenge to Stop Climate Chaos is, can you please present some kind of arithmetic that

demonstrates a mechanism, as I believe C and C does, which makes it possible, in respect to this historic debt, or as Andrew [Simms] calls it, the “ecological debt”, that addresses this in terms of what’s left and the majority of what’s left defaulting in favour of the South rather than sort of ‘business as usual’ with odds on, being grabbed by the North? That’s the difficulty. Can we solve that one? Or can we address it?

Ashok Sinha: It’s the right challenge, Aubrey. Absolutely it is the right challenge. I’m sitting here thinking if we can get the United Kingdom and the rest of the G8 countries to reduce by 3 per cent per annum, from now on, and that is what I want us to be able to achieve, there should be a lion’s share available. But actually, it might get eaten up by, not the G8 - even if we are successful in this regard -, but by India, China, Indonesia, Brazil and others. So we do need an answer to that. Because what we are trying to work out here is what is the sufficient condition that is necessary for global emissions to have peaked by 2015. One condition for this, an inescapable condition for this, is for industrialised nations to be driving down their emissions by three per cent per annum. But we do have to deal with what’s left; how we manage the rest of the cake. And you are right to challenge us on that, and we are absolutely trying to work hard on getting an answer for it. And as you know already, some members of our coalition believe in Contraction and Convergence and some are still working on the answer. So that’s where we are.

Peter Luff: Just finally a last word, if I may, please. I have tried to explain what we are about. I do believe it is important to build up some sort of coalition in this country around these themes. Ashok has quite rightly explained that the Stop Climate Chaos campaign has got its own objectives and this isn’t integrally its policy. But it would be good to begin to build up a coalition, and as I said, I use the International Criminal Court as being one of those. I would love to hear from anybody here who is interested in and that they are supportive, and then we can begin to build some sort of coalition on this. I think it is the way forward and I think we have limited amount of time, so any support would be welcome. Please don’t expect a huge amount of response other than acknowledgment, but as we build up, hopefully we might be able to get a broader mandate to take this work forward. Thank you.

Tom Spencer: I have a three-sentence conclusion, which are my conclusions from the day. One, the centrality of Europe, for one of the reasons that a participant mentioned, that Europe is effectively the first place you go to set global standards and it is not just in directly climate change issues that Europe can show a lead. Secondly, I don’t think that we have got sufficient support from respectable economists. I don’t see why I should have to choose between ‘gingerbread men’ and the Washington consensus. We need a lot more working out of what someone called the ‘economics of climate change’. Thirdly, everything really is connected to everything else and I think we should remember that in the work of our individual organisations. I’m writing a paper for some colleagues in the European Parliament, on bio-fuels. I have realised that, in order to make that paper make sense, I have to cover agriculture and land-use and climate change and trade and energy and sustainable development. And without any one of those bits, it’s an inadequate paper.

Many of you represent NGOs and civil society, spread across different subjects, but I think you should regard that as a strength and not a weakness and if people feel that this has been helpful, without committing the organisation, I think we would like to come back and do it on a regular basis, if we can report back to you what we are doing and you can give us ideas and report on what you are doing. So with my thanks to the organisers and to you for attending, travel safely, God bless, bye-bye.