

PREVIOUS YEAR QUESTION

UPSC 2018 · 15 marks

Would you agree that the on-going debates on international environmental politics continue to be marred by a new North-South ideological divide over historical responsibility and developmental model? Illustrate your answer with suitable examples.

FLOW SNAPSHOT — how the answer moves

Intro routes

R1 agree → environmental politics = a new arena of the old North-South conflict → **Dauvergne's** two goals (improve environment vs reform an unfair system)

R2 since Stockholm 1972 the blocs diverge → G-8 vs G-77 → the divide is ideological, not technical

Body flow

historical responsibility (North's 150 yrs of emissions vs South's equity) → CBDR + Kyoto Annex I / non-Annex I → **Guha** (deep ecology vs empty-stomach environmentalism; victim without representation) → developmental model (right to develop vs shared restraint) → **Indira Gandhi** (poverty as polluter) → EU "good cop" / US "bad cop" + US quits Paris → Paris (2015) dilution + Katowice finance unclear

Counter-view

C. Raja Mohan (South "suboptimal," "defensive," reactive) → the divide is sustained by both sides

Conclusion routes

R1 the proposition holds → the divide still mars the debate

R2 eases only via redistributive justice → **Prebisch's** 1% GNP transfer

Environmental politics has become the newest arena for the old North-South conflict. Since the Stockholm Conference of 1972, the industrialised G-8 and the developing G-77 have sought different ends from the same negotiations.

Dauvergne argues that the North defines the goal as improving the global environment, while the South sees the real problem as an unfair global system. The divide is ideological and not technical.

The North produced the bulk of emissions across more than 150 years of industrialisation and the South demands equity.

Ramachandra Guha sharpens it, setting the West's "deep ecology" against the South's "empty stomach environmentalism" and calling the South a "victim of emissions without representation".

The South's right to develop against the North's demand for shared restraint. Indira Gandhi called poverty the primary polluter. Within the North, the EU plays 'good cop' while the US, quitting the Paris Agreement, plays 'bad cop.' At Paris historical responsibility was diluted & the Katowice Rulebook left climate finance unclear.

C. Raja Mohan finds the South's posture "suboptimal" and "defensive", reactive rather than proactive, so both sides sustain the divide.

Therefore, the debate remains mired by this new divide, and it eases only through redistributive justice. Raul Prebisch's call for the North to transfer 1% of its GNP to the South.