



FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

www.fpa.org

Conference on the European Union, Human Rights and the UN Millennium Development Goals Remarks May 12, 2009

Featuring:

Sir Emyr Jones Parry

MR. WOLFGANG SCHMIDT: Good evening. Few diplomats and even fewer theoretical physicists can probably look back at their long and distinguished careers and come up with close to 30 years of serving their country in a multilateral setting such as has done Sir Emyr Jones Parry in his 35 year career working for the diplomatic service of the United Kingdom. His ambassadorial career, as we all know, culminated in him being the representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations. After his retirement in 2007, he became President of the University of Aberystwyth in Wales, and he also became chair of the All Wales Convention, which is supposed to come up with suggestions, a report later this year as to the powers of the Welsh National Assembly.

For close to two decades, serving at the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London, Sir Emyr Jones Parry was involved in European affairs. He served in various high ranking positions, both in Brussels and in London, and dealt with European Union issues, but also other issues such as the crisis in the Balkans in the 1990s. At the FCO, the Foreign and Commonwealth Office in London, he held the post of political director before he was sent back to Brussels to serve as the UK representative to the North Atlantic Council. And in 2003, he came here to New York to serve as the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the United Nations.

He, in the subsequent four years, became sort of the public face of the UK's progressive UN policies and its leadership role, particularly in the field of UN reform development and human rights. I remember myself from watching Sir Emyr

Jones Parry how much I could personally sense a personal commitment on his part to the realization of the Millennium Development Goals, to the protection of persecuted and vulnerable people in various parts of the world that were exposed to atrocities such as in places such as Darfur. And so there was much more than just the sort of diplomatic side, there was a real human side and human face to it whenever he spoke up in public.

And for those of you in the audience who did not reside in the United States between 2003 and 2007, I would like to add that during those years Sir Emyr Jones Parry also did a yeoman's job of explaining the complexity of the United Nations to a sometimes reluctant and hesitant American public. So please join me in extending a warm welcome to a great Welshman, Britain, European and citizen of the world. [Applause]

SIR EMYR JONES PARRY: Let me start, Noel, by thanking you for the invitation. It's always a great pleasure to be back in New York, but especially in the FPA. And Wolfgang, to you, thank you for that very generous introduction. I'll share with you all the fact that one of the things I'm doing in Wales, this All Wales Convention, I work very closely with the Archbishop of Wales, oddly enough. He takes time off from his day job to get heavily involved in the politics of Wales.

But he came on a recent visit to New York, he'd not been before, was met at the airport, and to his surprise, had to do an impromptu press conference. Did the press conference, but halfway through, a wizened reporter from Brooklyn said, "Say, Archbishop, are you going to visit any of our famous strip clubs in New York?" [Laughter] So the Archbishop, slightly nonplussed, but very tactfully said, "Are there any strip clubs in New York?" And passed on. And that morning, when he woke up, he was still quite pleased with himself the way he'd handled the question until he saw the morning newspaper under his door whose headline said, "Limey Archbishop, First Question: Are there any Strip Clubs in New York?" [Laughter] So this capacity to be misunderstood evident.

It's 30 years almost to the day that I started work on the European Community, as it then was, three days after Margaret Thatcher actually came to power. And that sparked in me a conversion to multilateral diplomacy, a long stint, as you heard, in the European Union, then NATO, and finally the United Nations. What you've got in front of you is an unapologetic advocate for multilateralism, and I particularly welcome, therefore, the subject of our discussions today.

My theme is going to be straightforward and hardly novel. The challenges we now confront are global, they're interrelated, as you've been hearing. They demand multilateral approaches to tackle them. Most multilateral organizations, as well as countries, need to contribute to finding solutions, and the solutions are more likely to be found if you have a multilateral coordinated response to the challenge. I want to seek to illustrate how that applies in terms of the work of the European Union, to human rights, and to the achievement of the MDGs.

Now, as you heard, the European Union and the United Nations, they share many common values and objectives. Each is committed to the maintenance of peace, the promotion of international security, and crucially, to the principles of justice and international law. Both are wedded to economic, social and humanitarian cooperation, to respect for human rights, and to individual freedoms.

Member states of the EU are resolved to reinforce their European identity in order to promote peace, security and progress worldwide. That's the commitment for fundamental principles which underpin the external policies of the EU. And I don't think they're just external. They have to apply internally, too. Because as someone said in a famous judgment in the Supreme Court of the United States not so long ago, if you go out there and espouse principles and values, you really ought to make sure that you practice the same values domestically, and that has to apply to all of us. Because none of us, as we look at human rights, none of us is above reproach, remember that.

The EU and the UN were in many ways complementary. The principles of the Charter actually informed much of the philosophy of the founding Treaty of Rome. More recently that cooperation put into sharp focus why the deployment of an EU military force to Eastern Chad to provide protection to all those internally displaced people and refugees. That deployment, covered by a Security Council resolution, was intended as the precursor to UN peacekeeping presence on the ground. In the same way, the European Union, some years ago, deployed to Eastern Congo for just the same reason: rapid deployment with the support, the authority of the Security Council, but for UN goals. Now those, for me, are simple examples of the EU and the UN working in the closest partnership for the best of reasons. I could add that NATO, for me, shares many of those same principles and objectives.

Now, the second subject today, human rights. You heard a lot this afternoon about the UN declaration, which is a remarkable document. It sets out fundamental rights to which each person is entitled purely by virtue of their humanity, the rights necessary to secure basic human dignity, the wellbeing of each person. Now, as Uner outlined earlier on, the declaration is very clear that human rights are not just civil and political, but they're also economic, social, and cultural. Not just freedom from fear, but freedom from want. In short, human rights are interdependent, they're indivisible. You can't enjoy your economic and social rights if you are denied your full political and civil rights, or vice versa. Political economic rights must be advanced together, not just one as an alternative to the other.

Now, human rights, of course, don't exist in a vacuum. They're a commitment, a contract, between the state and its citizen to guarantee them not just freedom from oppression, but the freedom of opportunity. In short, a government, in ratifying international human rights instruments, makes a commitment to fulfill its obligation to provide a basic standard of living to all its citizens as well as to promote and protect their basic freedoms. That means, in part, having the

institutions, the infrastructure in place to share the gains of globalization among the population. In other words, the ability to respect and advance political and civil rights, to help reap the full benefits of the economic and social rights. Human development, for me, is a process of enhancing human capabilities so that people have more choices and opportunities, and each person can lead a life of respect and values.

And it should be fairly obvious that we'll never end poverty, attain the MDGs on any durable basis without certain guarantees. And for me these include some very simple ones – that states will not abuse power or act corruptly, that citizens will not be arbitrarily discriminated against when they go to a health center or go to school. An individual should have the right, ultimately, to choose how they are governed and by whom.

So human rights can't be advanced in a vacuum. They require sound economic and social foundations. A simple example. Trafficking in women and children, one of the most appalling abuses of basic human rights, will only be stopped, in my view, completely when the underlying socioeconomic causes, such as poverty, the lack of education, when they have been addressed, then we have some chance of at least stopping that problem.

Similarly, the effective and well judged implementation of labor standards with international assistance and cooperation, preferably, from business and unions. This can play an important part in the reduction of global poverty and in achieving the MDGs. The social argument rests on the importance of core labor standards, as basic rights in eliminating discrimination, reducing the risks of wasting skills and capabilities, and improving opportunities for the disadvantaged.

Labor rights, of course, can also contribute to social and political development. Freedom of association is a fundamental right, and labor organizations, certainly in Europe, have traditionally played a key role in the development of responsive democratic policies and politics. Overall, that approach doesn't actually hinder the competitiveness of industry, as is often alleged, but rather develops the economic case, in my view, for investment where you have social and economic stability becoming more likely because of the policies.

But what's inescapable is that the problems in the south – poverty, disease, lack of education and more – they present real challenges in the implementation of human rights, good governance and democracy. So the north can't concentrate just on the old priorities of civil and political rights. If, indeed, rights are indivisible, then we need the comprehensive strategy, and that strategy is in the Millennium Development Goals as set out in the Millennium Declaration, to tackle all aspects of human development.

Development brings poverty relief, increases the levels of education, improves housing, gives equitable access to resources. But it can also provide – and this is key – provide for the political structures, the democratic legitimacy necessary to sustain progress. There's a human rights aspect in all of the MDGs, and each of the

MDGs, in turn, is relevant to the promotion of different parts of human rights in their broadest sense. So for sustainable development, economic development and better civil and political rights go hand in hand.

Now, as some of you know, I don't normally use a prepared text, but I'm conscious of one of my ambassador colleagues who was notoriously unpopular with his staff, and did always use a text, and always read without having previously read it at all, the text that had been put before him. And on one famous occasion he came to the bottom of Page 3 and it said, "I have three proposals now to make to tackle this fundamental problem which I've outlined, and they are," and he turned over and it said, "You're on your own." [Laughter] But of course one of the things you notice about being an ex-ambassador is you no longer have anyone who's going to draft anything for you, so I can only blame myself for this. It's true also, of course, the way you identify an ex-ambassador, it's somebody who gets in the back seat of the car and sits there wondering why it doesn't start. [Laughter]

So what are our aims? And end to abject poverty and underdevelopment. Instead, economic prosperity spread as widely as possible. And stable, peaceful societies that respect human rights and the rule of law. But none of these – it's come up earlier this afternoon – none is attainable without the others. To achieve all these elements of human development simultaneously, we need to protect, promote all human rights at the same time. We also have a moral duty to speak up for them and to stand up against their flagrant abuse.

Human rights, therefore, have a preeminent importance, it seems to me. But human rights, the rule of law, democratic structures, they're crucial in states emerging from conflict. But so too are security, humanitarian relief and economic prospects. Each is a necessary and essential element of the transition to stability after conflict. Security, including policing, always an immediate challenge. But the lessons of Iraq, of Liberia, of Afghanistan, East Timor, they're clear.

These elements cannot be treated sequentially. Each has to be tackled immediately to the extent possible. There won't be security without development, and there won't be any enduring prosperity without that security. And each is supported by that key third pillar: justice, rights, rule of law, democratic institutions. Sierra Leone also underlines another element, that the stability within a state is also dependent on combating contagious and harmful influences outside the state, and so we need also to take account of the regional dimension when addressing post conflict situations in a particular country.

Now let me now try and turn to some of the challenges that we confront, beginning with food security, and we heard a lot about that in the earlier panel. But it took humanity 10,000 years to expand global food production to five billion tons a year. But the sad news is that by 2050 the world will be consuming twice that amount, so we've got 40 years to do what previously took 10,000.

By 2050 it's estimated the world's cereal demand will be at least 60 percent higher. Why? Well, the drivers include the expected population increase, rising per capita

incomes, notwithstanding the present financial crisis, a growing demand for livestock products, increasing water and land scarcity, a growing demand for biofuels. I'll just quote you one-third of the United States maize crop goes in ethanol production, one-third of European Union rapeseed production this year will go for biodiesel. The impact of climate change – I'll come back to that. All those issues, and the lack of any substantial increase in productivity in food production, they're all major problems which explain why we have a huge challenge ahead.

Now, we heard earlier about the spike in food prices in 2007-2008 which threw 100 million extra people into extreme poverty. It added to 850 million chronically undernourished, 180 million children underweight, and 40 million women of childbearing age who are anemic. Despite the hike in prices, there's one stark factor. The developing country farmers did not respond to the increase in price. There was no extra production. Why is that? Partly because high cost of fertilizers, insufficient access to technology, lack of education as to what one should do, and crucially, lack of infrastructure and unreliable markets. Can add to it lack of water. But let me quote you one terrible statistic, that 50 percent of food produced in Africa does not get to market. Fifty percent gets wasted.

So access to water is a particularly difficult problem in the developing world. Agriculture consumes 85 percent of fresh water use in this world. Water borne disease and lack of sanitation a major cause of death at the same time. Now strikingly, people in this room, on average, consume two liters of water each per day. The food you consume daily takes two to three thousand liters of water to produce. Just think about that. You can drink two liters and the food you consume took up to 3,000 liters each to produce.

Yet in Africa there is minimal irrigation. Gordon Conway, well known in New York, has argued that water use productivity has to be more closely linked to land use productivity. But crucially, we need in Africa another green revolution, which we saw in Asia, but which Africa has not experienced. Again, an appalling figure. Over the last 50 years, crop yields in China went up by a factor of four. Crop yields in Africa over the same period stayed constant. The continent needs a sustainable, environmentally friendly transformation of its agriculture, and a transformation which must benefit the poor.

That will require a more skillful labor force. It will require access to technology, fertilizers, pesticides, crucially to water, and in particular, biotechnology which can produce seeds capable of countering pests and disease, showing increased drought intolerance, and also a capacity to withstand, at the same time, floods. I read something this morning with UNDP about grasses which can now stay submerged underwater for two weeks and yet recover. But quite crucial in terms of the weather that they will subsequently face.

So yields in Africa could be substantially increased, and those increased yields are actually needed, too, in Asia, simply because there's very little uncultivated land left on that continent, and where more than half the world's population live.

Ghana has demonstrated what is possible. Between 1993 and 2003 the number of malnourished was reduced by more than a half, meeting, actually, the first MDG. Maize yields increased by 36 percent, cassava by 50.

There's been a strong growth in smallholder production of cocoa and pineapples. Market liberalization and new ruler infrastructure have actually encouraged agricultural production. And if I go down to the Brazilian cerrado, 100 million hectares of former, what was formerly highly acidic, marginal land has been converted now into some of the richest productive farmlands in Latin America. How? Not rocket science. Thanks to lime, fertilizer, and effective weed control.

Now, there may be some in this audience, though I doubt it, who will remember when North American wheat production in 1950-54 was actually substantially affected by rust fungus. I'd not heard about rust fungus until recently, but what I do know now is that it's reemerging in Asia, and that it is only rice, among all the cereals, which actually can resist the fungus. So a challenge for the researcher is very simple: transfer the genetic immunity that exists in rice, get it quickly into your wheat, because otherwise you may face a repetition of 1950-54.

Agriculture needs to be able to use new technologies, but within, what seems to me, a better regulatory framework. Increased agricultural production therefore essential, but to achieve it, there needs to be a more substantial investment in global agriculture, in research and development, and of course in infrastructure and markets. It's a sad fact of life that official development assistance from most of the donors and from most of the agencies has actually neglected agriculture these last ten, 15 years, the need to come back to agriculture, to get all the donors to acknowledge that investment in food security actually is required, and very urgently so. Because crop production is increasingly targeted to helping achieve energy security, itself one of our key challenges.

But both are going to be challenged by one of the biggest threats that we face, climate change. Now thankfully, in the short time that I've been away, there's now greater, or perhaps near total acceptance that we face a manmade crisis, and not some cyclical change in the weather pattern. But the challenge is immense. If we stopped all emissions tomorrow, we'd still need to cope with the consequences of centuries of human behavior. And of course limiting and reducing today's emissions is a daunting task. The short-term priority, a global agreement at Copenhagen in December which reduces emissions, thus mitigating further damage, but which also encourages adaptation.

Now, I asked somebody in UNDP this morning, what do you mean by adaptation? It's always seemed to me a term that is used in different contexts. But the answer I got was adaptation means actually growing things in a way that takes account of the climate which results from climate change. Well, I think that's only part of it. The other bits of adaptation are if you've got new emission limits, how do you adapt so that you actually conform to the obligations you take on? And crucially, the third bit of adaptation is how do you adapt to new technology? How do you find new technologies and apply them?

Crucially, in all that, of course, to stop deforestation. And the thing about deforestation is it doesn't just contribute some 16 percent of the emissions that go up, but it's a double whammy because then there are fewer trees around to actually photosynthesize the carbon dioxide that is emitted. A major requirement there.

Because if climate change threatens us all, it threatens developing countries in particular. They face higher temperatures, greater, more intense rainfall, and at the same time, paradoxically, more drought. Riverbank erosion, more intense cyclones, and saltwater incursions, as we saw last year in Myanmar. And as the Deputy Foreign Minister of the Maldives told the Security Council in April 2007, and people argued was this a threat to security. Well, he said my state faces the prospect of disappearing under the rising sea if the temperature goes up by 1.5 degrees Centigrade. I can think, he said, of no greater threat to the security of my state than that it should not exist. And that's the answer to those who say that climate change is not a problem.

Poor people will bear a disproportionate share of the negative impacts of climate change. They'll be concentrated in areas where the effect will be early, severe, and yet where there are limited economic and institutional capacities to cope. It's not an exaggeration to say that climate change threatens poverty reduction, economic development, and even the destruction of traditional lifestyles. Just think, the same increase in water level would mean 30 million people in Bangladesh would have to go live somewhere else. Not an easy choice.

Oxfam produced a comprehensive report on what I'll call the climatic changes, the weather occurring today in Uganda. More erratic rainfall in March-June is reducing crop yields. The end of year rain now falls much more intensely. It causes floods, landslides, soil erosion. Rangeland related conflicts are more prevalent. There's an increase in disease among both humans and animals. Fish stock are declining and food security is worsening. Water is scarcer, bringing itself local conflict. Ninety-nine percent of rural Ugandans use wood or charcoal for fuel, increasing emissions, and at the same time, erosion.

Now, I'm not going to claim, because Oxfam didn't claim, that those effects are directly attributable to climate change. But they are, I think, precursors of what climate change will do, and what they demonstrate only too clearly is the vulnerability of ordinary people to the consequences of what happens to the weather. I'm using the word weather so as not to prejudice the argument, but if it's weather or sustainable climate change, the effect on the ground is the same: it's very, very bad news. And the prognosis for 2090 for Africa is quite simple, that the north and the south are going to become much more prone to drought and the central belt will be wetter and less prone to drought.

So development policy has to take account of the consequences of climate change and the measures needed to encourage adaptation in developing countries, not as part of existing assistance, it seems to me, but as an additional effort. Stearns [phonetic] did us all, I think, a very great favor by pointing out it will cost the world

much less to take action than it will actually to sit back and take the consequences of climate change. Amelioration of the consequences is what we should now be doing.

Now, as an example, let me simply quote that last week the Asian Development Bank warned that the Philippines, Thailand, Indonesia and Vietnam faced a loss of some 6.7 percent of GDP by 2100 if carbon emissions are maintained at their present levels. And another simple example, the drought in 2006-07 cost Australia one percent of its GNP. That's the scale of the impact that the weather is having.

I should also tell you I haven't delivered this speech before, but when I was last in this city one of my colleagues used to go off regularly, once a week, at least, delivering a speech entitled "Is the United Nations' Future Behind It?" And he came out one night, jumped into the car, and the driver said, "Where are we going?" And forgive me, Noel, he said, "I'm going to Yale." And he said, "What are you speaking on?" He said, "Is the United Nations' Future..." And he said, "Oh, not again," said the driver. And the driver said, "You know, I bet you I could deliver that speech. I could deliver it word perfect because I've heard it so many times."

So the ambassador said, "Well, they don't know me up there. I'll take the bet. You deliver the speech." So he did. The ambassador sat in the audience pretending to be the driver and the driver delivered the speech perfectly. The first question was an absolute sod, of course, dissected the main principle of the speech, and put forward a counter proposition. And the driver looked at the question and said, "You know, that is such a dumb, stupid question, I'm going to ask my driver to answer it." [Laughter]

Can I come back to the theme of linkages? Cows are a major source of methane emissions. Research has shown, very simply, that bovine emissions are reduced when cows are fed grasses with less sugar content. If you can actually produce grasses which are resistant to drought, have that quality, you'll be actually meeting many objectives at the same time. Was it something I said that everybody's leaving at this stage?

FEMALE VOICE: All the drivers are leaving.

SIR JONES PARRY: Yes, well... [Laughter] Everybody did leave me once, actually. I was left with one person who came up to me, and I said, well, thank you very much for staying to the end. And the person said, I'm the caretaker, I have to lock up after you. [Laughter] Drought or excess water will reduce crop yields unless, crucially, we produce new resistant plant varieties. Not just produce, but actually teach farmers and give them the means to actually plant them and then actually grow them and harvest and send them to market. If we don't, it's not just effect on crop production.

Climate change will exacerbate the potential triggers of conflict, it will increase the use of biofuels, it will lessen food security, and we'll end up that we're worse off in all directions. And yet if you can enhance energy security sensibly, through

biofuels, at the same time you would then reduce Western dependency on hydrocarbons from geopolitically less stable areas. Those things go together really rather neatly if you can make it work.

Now, I haven't got this far without a need to mention the immediate challenge, the worst financial crisis since 1945. It has its roots in many places and several causes, and there can be no doubting its impact, New York noticeably quieter today. But, more importantly, what it's doing to the developing world. If G8 economies are in recession, world trade will shrink this year by...well, at least for the first time in 25 years it's going to decrease. Developing countries who, after all, didn't cause this crisis, are the ones who are going to suffer disproportionately.

Private capital flows to the developing countries this year are likely to be about \$200 billion compared with one trillion two years ago. And in case people get confused, I should have said 200 billion, and I did mean one trillion, so it's a factor of one-fifth of what they were. That's the scale of the reduction. Remittances, crucial to the developing world, which tended to average about \$280 billion are falling rapidly. And as recently as January 2008 the World Bank projected the developing countries would grow by seven percent this year.

The current projection, and declining rapidly, is two percent. In India industrial production is slowing from double to low single figure growth. In Latin America, 40 percent of financial wealth has been wiped out in the first 11 months of last year. In Zambia, 27 percent of mining jobs lost. In Cambodia, 15 percent of jobs in the garment industry, and so on. And if world demand is a major driver of prosperity for us, it's a bigger driver for the prosperity of the developing countries. The IMF used to say if you had one percent of GDP growth in OECD, then that would generate half a percent of growth in Sub-Saharan Africa. So what happens now?

That interrelationship is why the G20 meeting in London in April very sensibly addressed a number of issues, and I'll briefly say to restore growth and jobs, to strengthen the financial system through better surveillance and regulation, to fund and reform the IFI, to combat protectionism, including, very crucially, imports from low income countries and put in place a transparent monitoring system. And ultimately to build a green, sustainable recovery – and what they said, and I hope they believed – meet the MDGs and honor aid pledges.

The need to meet in April was obvious, as was the requirement for coordinated, decisive action to stimulate economies and global growth. The outcomes, in principle, they were good, provided now, crucially, that the commitments taken on are actually honored. And disturbingly, some countries and in Europe are already failing to meet their aid promises, and protectionist steps are being taken in a number of countries. A big boost all around, and we've been saying this for years, would be a successful conclusion of the Doha round, but that still seems elusive.

But at least for some it recognized the need to insure social protection for the hardest hit through a rapid response social fund, because budgets for basic health, education and nutritional needs have to be protected. Bob Zelnick [phonetic]

pointed out that that was not done in the Asian crisis, and with all the painful consequences of that. But the need now for, as Zelnick emphasized, for agriculture and infrastructure investment in the developing world, that has to be safeguarded, because unless we safeguard it now, in the years to come the many problems will be even worse than they promise to be.

So it only serves to underline, however difficult it may be in terms of public expenditure, in all the countries of the north and, of course, elsewhere, commitments should be honored if, indeed, development is to move forward, and crucially, if the MDGs aren't going to be further set back. I used to say that some of the MDGs were running slowly, and it wasn't 2015 – it was two and a half years ago – headed to be 2050 for some. Well, the risk is we didn't bring it forward and that 2050 was an underestimate, and that actually the delay will be even longer.

But joys of G20 as a platform was significant, recognizing that the balance of economic power has been shifting, that middle income and developing countries need a voice and an equity in the proceedings. And for the longer term, again, the undertakings to complete new quote shares for both the IMF and the World Bank, they're a step to a much needed direction if the IFIs are to be credible. Because if I'm an advocate of multilateralism, I have to recognize two tests for the legitimacy of a multilateral institution. The first one of structure, that its membership, its values, processes, and decision taking structures should be broadly acceptable. And second that the decisions, the results of its endeavors should be widely appreciated and accepted. Best of all, that both tests should be met, that the organization has credibility and you like what it's doing.

For me the European Union is capable of doing both. It has a credible record in promoting peace and security, particularly on the European continent. And I highlight there what it's done from taking a community of six up to today's 27 member states. Those of us who can go back simply to remember what it was like in 1988 will realize that ten countries then under totalitarian regimes are now part of the EU and that six of them didn't actually exist as states in that form 21 years ago. That's the reality.

But the EU has always stood for human rights globally. Its member states are among the strongest defenders of and the largest contributors to the United Nations system. There's a huge scope for cooperation between the two organizations in development, in the application of European security and defense policies, in the continued voice for rights and the rule of law, with a range of policies that the EU has, both internally and crucially externally in order to help that they be delivered. They are the policies and the instruments through which the European Union and its member states deliver their development assistance and contribute to the achievement of the MDGs.

The latest figure I've got is that in 2006 members of the EU provided 32 billion pounds of aid, which is more than half the total global development assistance for that year. So it's not a bad achievement. I claim that in terms of what was said earlier this afternoon that the acceptance of the 0.7 percent target for 2015, what

it's saying about gaseous emissions and binding limits on those, the EU is trying to take on a leadership role. But, like all of us, it has to do much better. Because I don't want to sound complacent.

The European Union has to be on its mettle to deliver what it has pledged and what its member states have said they will do. And it has to do more, realistically, given the scale of the present crisis and the challenges that we all confront. That will require enormous political will to deliver on promises made and improve the efficiency of what is already being done, and to do that at a time when the pressure internally for public expenditure constraint is enormous. It's not a good time to be in government in any country, but especially, it seems to me, in OECD countries.

What we need is a recognition, too, that the EU has a wider interest. It's not just promoting the prosperity of its own people, but that wider interest is justice and a fairer global distribution of economic benefit for the whole world. And nowhere is that more evident than in the case of international trade policy, where completing Doha would be a wonderful boost for the developing countries, but where there is, I think, a particular obligation on the EU, like the United States; they both need to do better.

Whatever their difficulties, of course, developing countries have matching obligations. Not much is said about it, but let me be quite clear. I think each developing country, if these resources are to be made available, if these changes happen, then they have an obligation to put programs in place nationally to implement the Millennium Development Goals. Secondly, have linked, of course, to insure that their citizens enjoy both political and economic rights in their broadest sense. In short, that their governments, too, deliver on what they have signed up to do. The United Nations is full of norms and values, objectives, things that people have said they will do. Where we are all not good is on the implementation, and that's where, of course, much more has to happen.

Hiding behind the argument about thou shalt not interfere in the sovereignty of another state is just not a good enough argument. Being prepared to actually identify those cases of abuse of human rights, to stand up for values and what needs to be done, that's an obligation on the developing as well as on the developed. And developing countries rightly claim that they have little responsibility for climate change. Of course they need to grow economically. But what we've got to do is work with them to find ways to transfer technology to permit the growth, but without exacerbating climate change or repeating the mistakes of the 20th century which OECD countries did, partly because they didn't know any better. We do now know much better, and we have to do better.

So can I finish where I started, in addressing the European Union, rights, the Millennium Development Goals. I hope I've brought out some of the complexities which have been part of the discussion all afternoon. The fact that there is no independent variable in a mathematical sense in all of this, but there are so many cross linkages and interrelations; they're everywhere. The challenge to respond,

put simply, demands a multilateral approach, where the positive contributions of any state or organization has to be harnessed in a coordinated action.

The challenges, they are truly immense. I don't want to say historic, because that's an abused adjective, but they are immense. But it seems to me that the multilateral approach, the efforts of the UN and other organizations offers the best prospect of trying to pull through to meet these concerns, and in particular, to develop a better tomorrow for the developing countries.

Let me finish with what the Millennium Declaration said, and I think it put it very well. Only through broad and sustainable efforts to create a shared future based on our common humanity in all its diversity can globalization be made fully inclusive and equitable. Thank you very much. [Applause]

MALE VOICE: We'll give those people who want to leave an opportunity to do so, but Ambassador Jones Parry has very graciously agreed to take some questions.

SIR JONES PARRY: Anybody want to put me on the spot? Please.

MALE VOICE: Yes, I have a question. You talk about multilateral cooperation in terms of governments. I was looking at some figures lately -- crisis, and I saw that the -- financial system, the derivatives market and the equities markets and securities, etc., -- if I got it right. So I'm just wondering whether, you know, in combating the financial crisis -- future, whether it's the governments, the governments -- multilateral organizations are sufficiently combating them, or there should be something more that has to be done -- .

FEMALE VOICE: Can you please repeat the question?

SIR JONES PARRY: I think the question was is there any more that should be done over and above what is currently in train to try and encourage financial cooperation to tackle these problems.

MALE VOICE: Yes, -- to repeat that. I said that the global financial -- the -- of the global financial, the markets are much bigger than the GDP, the combined GDP of the various countries around the world. That's my understanding. And I just wanted to see whether, you know, just talking about what the countries and governments can do in combating the financial crisis is sufficient. Like very recently, I just saw today that, for example, the oil just started to rise. We had, like, a small, like, improvement in the stock market.

SIR JONES PARRY: I don't want to dodge the question, but great minds have been trying to address in the past 18 months, a lot of them are totally confused, if not surprised. People who have been 40 years in the banking industry say, well, I no longer have the slightest idea what's happening. And that's because the whole thing got out of control. And seeing a -- over coffee, what intrigues me is they're all making these losses; where did it go? Because, you know, if you...if we all go gambling tonight, and if there are four of us gambling, and two of us lose, you assume the other two have won.

But it looks, at the moment, as if everybody's losing. And the sums are...I mean, they're out of sight. The British obligation that we've taken on to fund our banks are many times GDP. The amazing thing is the banks and the debts they took on were actually so much greater than GDP. The whole thing was disproportionately out of kilter. My assumption is that in the different things that the G20 came up with against the political and practical constraints, they did just about everything that was possible, because frankly, they threw the kitchen sink at it. Any more I'm not at all sure what it is.

And I was chastened. Talking to a number of school kids about a month ago and at one stage they get onto the financial crisis, and I tried to do a little bit of an explanation. And one of them just looked at me and said, so you mean our generation is, for the rest of our lives, going to have to pay for the consequences of the mismanagement by the few who are now drawing all these pensions? And I didn't, as I'm demonstrating to you, I haven't got an answer to that question either. The answer is yes, I think. Please.

FEMALE VOICE: Yes, I was wondering what you thought about the new push in China to have clean coal firing plants.

FEMALE VOICE: What was the question?

SIR JONES PARRY: What I think of the push in China to have clean coal firing plants. Well, the fact is they're opening how many new plants per week, and it's a major contribution, of course, to the emissions. But the challenge for the rest of us is can we deny China economic development, an economic development which is actually helping to pull the rest of us along quite nicely as well. It's a major contribution to global growth.

And the lesson has to be that somebody out there, given...you need an energy policy which actually makes sense, which tackles one, the use of, secondly, has different sources to produce energy, and maximizes what you can do on renewables. But in Britain they demonstrated quite easily the other day that if we wanted to meet all our electrical requirements from renewables, the whole of my nation in Wales would have to be covered by wind turbines entirely, just in order to produce what Britain needs. There's a limit to what is possible renewable.

So a sensible basis for nuclear has to be found, which means coping with reprocessing, with getting rid of waste and so on. But I don't see how you can do without it. And crucially, if we're going to have more coal fired, and the United States have made clear that coal is part of its long-term energy future, somebody has to do something with capturing the carbon. And it's not enough to say, well, as the British government has been saying, we're going to open new coal fired power stations and we're going to develop technology and we're going to be a world leader. The assertion doesn't deliver, because there is no British technology to actually sequester carbon dioxide.

And what you've got to do, very simply, is put something at the top of a stack and take it all around and either compress it, liquefy it or somehow absorb it in something so carbon dioxide doesn't go out. And it's a massive problem. It sounds very simple, but nobody yet has an answer to it. But they better damn well find it soon. Please.

FEMALE VOICE: Good evening. My name is Arnesia Watson [phonetic] and I'm an international student here - - at Brooklyn College. And my question is the European Union seems to be a success story to me, at least, over the past, you know, it's grown in the past 20 or so years. And I'm curious to know if the European Union and the UN, working with nations in developing regions like Africa and the Caribbean to promote greater state interrelation, to promote development, because, you know, I think the European Union especially, not so long ago, it wasn't as...there were critics saying that sovereignty nations will not be able to work together on a common goal to unite or to improve their region, and I think if the European Union stands now as somewhat of a success story in its effort, then it should be working with regions like the Caribbean and African nations to perhaps set some kind of development and strategies for internal development for those regions, rather than just pouring in external assistance.

SIR JONES PARRY: Well, the short answer, I agree with you 100 percent. Of course I come from a nation which hasn't quite reconciled itself to sharing sovereignty with the European Union, so we have this permanent tussle, are we prepared to? But the theory is very simple, that in areas where there is sensible benefit to cooperate at the supra national level, you do so, environment now being a classic, because as a nation-state, you can't actually do it alone. And the lesson of climate change is it's even above the European Union. It's got to be global if it's going to work.

But I've got to pay tribute to the EU in terms of its trade policies, the concessions it has been giving for the last 30 years to the developing world, the European Development Fund and the sums it disburses, and the whole what used to be Yaunde Lomen [phonetic], is now the Conacre Treaty, taking in, what, 77 developing countries and their relations with the EU. It does a lot. It should do more.

But where you're absolutely right is the EU as an exemplar, best demonstrated on the European continent where, for the Balkans, the simple message to the Balkans is if you can, one, as individual countries adopt the norms and values that the EU claims, two, in your relationship between each other you can have the sort of relations that Germany and France developed post 1945, and thirdly, meet both those conditions and we'll bring you closer to Brussels and to eventual membership in the EU. And that, as a foreign policy instrument, has been very powerful on the European continent.

The exemplar model for ECOWAS in West Africa, for the Caribbean, it's there. And it needn't be political, giving up sovereignty, but economic, practical cooperation, there's a huge amount that can be done and should be done. And you can take that also to the Pacific islands where it's always seemed to me that as nation-

states, the bigger states in the EU pull out and no longer have representation, there's a vacuum for the EU to go in and represent us all and not just, as you say, distribute aid, but actually look to try and encourage structures which actually offer stability and the prospect of progress in all directions.

FEMALE VOICE: You mentioned the famous speech, the future, what was it, the future of the United Nations is behind us, or something like this. And I want to tie a rather serious question to this famous speech, which I'd like to hear one day. Isn't there a tendency now in world politics to find new fora of working together like the G20, and isn't, in certain areas aren't nations and aren't governments trying to bypass the United Nations?

SIR JONES PARRY: No, I don't think they're trying to bypass the UN. They are trying to say that the IFIs, the World Bank and the IMF, haven't given them sufficient representation and that the days when fundamental policy for the American, British, French, German governments was we have quota shares and we're going to hang onto those and we're not going to reduce anything, in the real world we live in, we do not dominate that much economically, and other people have to have their voices heard.

Where the UN comes in is that, A, it's global, and B, the Security Council and what it does, when it acts under Chapter 7 with the right language, that's binding on 192 nations, and there's nothing I know of that's at all a substitute for that. That's the binding capacity of the UN to act. And for those who believe that a union of democratic states or something could supplant, then that's for the birds.

MALE VOICE: My name is Richard Fields. Active in the American Bar Association. And on climate change and global warming, I want to take advantage of your scientific expertise. And I understand and agree with the scientific evidence. But in a way, as a devil's advocate, why isn't global warming a zero sum game in that, you know, unless you decide that everybody's temperature today around the world is the optimal, perfect temperature, some will gain and some will lose, and the Sahara will have water.

Why isn't it zero sum? What's the argument to counter that? Is it just that change is disruptive, whether it's global warming, global cooling or anything else, and doesn't that have implications for the free market, to say the market will change quickly, but it will come to an equilibrium? Does it have implications for the Internet? Fundamental disruption is just a byproduct. Isn't actually the fundamental disruption the essence of the issue here? And where it ends up is disruption?

SIR JONES PARRY: I don't think it is, and I tried to talk about the weather rather than climate change to respect the argument of those who say this is cyclical. And there is an argument that says there's an 11 year cycle of hot spots on the sun and that the classic example is somewhere between 1730 and 1750, say, Britain was very cold and the Thames froze, and it happened to coincide with a period where there

was no sun spot activity recorded. And since 1500 they'd been recorded sun spots. So people say, you know, it's the normal cycle.

Well, I don't think it is the normal cycle. The science, as you admit in the question, from all the experts, pretty well, some 95 percent of them believe that this is manmade and it's a permanent problem. Why I think it's not just disruptive change, it's dramatic change and it's final change. If you live in the Maldives, if you live in lower Bangladesh, there's nowhere to go. And of course there are bits of Canada and Russia which are going to be warmer, and they'll be better off. But that's more than compensated by all those countries who are going to be substantially worse off. And it's not just that they'll be a wee bit hotter, but what I tried to describe, as is now happening in Uganda, is that it's so erratic, but its impact is disastrous. And it is disastrous in terms of what it does for agricultural production and so on. So we've got to adapt to that.

And part of my simple argument is that that includes technology. In Europe we haven't, I think, grown up yet to accept GM sufficiently, but actually we've been fiddling with seeds for as long as mankind has actually done agriculture. What's different is we're doing a bit more with stem cells now at the molecular level. But in practice, if you can have a plant which will resist the flood, but can actually carry on growing and will produce a better yield, then we better go there, because if we don't, there will be sufficient disruption that actually agricultural production overall will drop really quite markedly, and against all of the demands that we have, there's going to be major poverty, and not enough food to go around. So it seems to me that's why we have to tackle it.

MALE VOICE: One last question.

FEMALE VOICE: When the dust settles, could you tell us what will development look like, the face of development? Will it follow the old neo-liberal paradigm or will we see the kinder, gentler capitalism which Bill Gates is suggesting at the moment?

SIR JONES PARRY: I don't know the answer, but there was an interesting article – it was in the *FT* last week – by the president of Rwanda, who was arguing that the days of ODA were coming to an end, they had to cut the dependency, and that actually countries had to sort it out for themselves. The long-term goal of development must be that, that you've got sustainable development indigenously done. So we get to that, and if we've got capitalism working, but especially markets liberalized, what I do think is at the heart of this is market liberalization and access to markets. And that includes access to European markets from the developing world, where we've done quite well, but there's scope for doing much better.

But of course the paradox there is when I go to the supermarket and say I really fancy these Kenyan green beans, and my wife says it's ridiculous, why on earth are they wasting all that energy, etc., the carbon footprint of exporting those to Britain? That's part of the argument. The other bit of the argument is unless the Kenyans export such products, there isn't much else that they're actually going to

be able to do. And again, it takes you directly into the consequences. One side is desirable, the other is an adverse reaction.

MALE VOICE: Emyr, I know the FPA, as we look back on this conference, we will remember this as one of the most important that we have held, and I want to thank you for making it so. [Applause]