



Topic: High Income Countries and resources for the climate emergency

To face the challenges related to climate change, High Income Countries, responsible for a level of emissions 44 times higher compared to the one of Low and Middle Income Countries, need to take urgent measures to drastically cut CO₂ emissions into the atmosphere, while increasing the resources allocated to climate change adaptation of the most vulnerable communities. However, only one fifth of the \$52.5 billion allocated by High Income Countries in 2016-2017 for the climate emergency has gone to support adaptation programs. Governments in these countries often do not allocate aid efficiently, but rather deliver funds according to clientele targets.

Argument PRO: "High Income Countries should allocate resources for the climate emergency in order to support Middle and Low Income Countries".

Argument AGAINST: "High Income Countries should not allocate resources for the climate emergency in order to support Middle and Low Income Countries".

Current situation, scenario, and context.

Climate injustice is now being widely discussed, as data indicate that the wealthiest and most industrialized nations are the ones to cause the greatest greenhouse gas emissions, while tropical regions are most affected by global warming, i.e. geographical zones where Middle and Low Income Countries are located, with greater challenges of adaptation. Moreover, the future economic and industrial development of tropical countries could be hampered particularly by climate change.

Given the circumstances, greater support to climate adaptation would be necessary to prevent an increase in poverty among populations. The United Nations Sustainable Development Goals include the eradication of extreme poverty, the reduction of inequalities between nations and the fight against climate change. Coordinated international institutional action, well defined in terms of timing and instruments, is needed to clarify the role of the actors and their responsibilities, also concerning the strictly financial issue. Tackling the challenges of climate change is possible but has a cost and, therefore, it is necessary to define who should bear it and how.

Arguments pro:

- Economic support to Middle and Low Income Countries (by High Income Countries) should be an essential part of the fight against climate change, as well as of the commitment to achieve a more environmentally sustainable economic system.
- For countries suffering from the effects of climate change (droughts, cyclones, floods), economic resources would be crucial to support entire farming communities.

Arguments against:

- Aid should be provided only to those countries able to demonstrate that they have been pursuing correct policies in the past.
- In order to formulate strategies to counter the effects of climate change, the poor and small farmers must be placed at the center. Very often, resources only benefit the government's political clienteles, thus increasing corruption.

FURTHER INSIGHTS:

- Oxfam: [Climate Finance Shadow Report 2020](#)
- Impakter: [Despite the Climate Emergency, Developing Countries Still Deserve Help With Extractives](#)
- Foresight - the CMCC observatory on climate policies and futures: [Decrease in Global Inequality is Threatened by Climate Change](#)