

Climate Change and the Rising Importance of the Indigo Economy¹

Dipankar Dey²

The ‘indigo economy’ represents economic activities which primarily use dirty and polluting production process. The climate change issue has divided the global economy into two broad categories- namely ‘green’ and ‘indigo’ economies. The developed economies of the North, which are increasingly using cleaner technology to minimize pollution and are relocating dirty industries to less developed countries, would become ‘green’ at the expense of the developing economies of the South, which would gradually turn ‘indigo’ by absorbing increasing amount of industrial pollutants (including nuclear radiation). According to Hindu mythology, to save mankind, lord Siva, the creator of the Universe, had absorbed all poison of the Earth at his neck and became ‘Nilkantha’ –‘indigo-necked’. Like lord Siva, the inhabitants of these developing economies would also turn ‘indigo’ by absorbing all poison of the Earth. In India the ‘indigo economy’ has a colonial root which dates back to 18th century when indigo plantation was started in Bengal in 1777 by the British planters as demand for indigo, as a dye, was rising very fast in Europe. This paper tries to analyze the rising importance of the ‘indigo economy’ in the context of present climate change debate.

Introduction:

The ‘indigo economy³’ represents economic activities which primarily use dirty and polluting production process. The climate change issue has divided the global economy into two broad categories- namely ‘green’ and ‘indigo’ economies. The developed economies of the North, which are increasingly using cleaner technology to minimize pollution and are relocating dirty industries to less developed countries, would become ‘green’ at the expense of the developing economies of the South, which would gradually turn ‘indigo’ by absorbing increasing amount of industrial pollutants (including nuclear radiation). According to Hindu mythology, to save mankind, lord Siva, the creator of the Universe, had absorbed all poison of the Earth at his neck and became ‘Nilkantha’ –‘indigo-necked’. Like lord Siva, the inhabitants of these developing economies would also turn ‘indigo’ by absorbing all poison of the Earth.

This paper tries to analyze the rising importance of the ‘indigo economy’ in the context of present climate change debate.

¹ Originally published as **Climate Change and the Rising Importance of the Blue Economy** in the Annual BIE Bulletin, 2009. <http://www.bie-paris.org/site/en/articles/general-news/283-2009-bie-bulletin-published.html>. This is an extended and updated version of a previous study done in 2007. See Dey. D (2007) SMEs: Rising Opportunities in the Emerging Blue Economy, published (October, 2007) in ‘ie2’ (International edition) – the monthly magazine of EEPC (Engineering Export Promotion Council), Ministry of Commerce, Government of India. Also available at: http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1021236

² Dipankar Dey, PhD, Associate Dean (Research), IBS, Kolkata, WDC Building, Block GP, Plot J-3, Sector V, Salt Lake City, Kolkata 700091, India, email: dip_dey@hotmail.com, ddey@ibsindia.org; Tel: 91-33-66163641, 919433887819, February 6,2010. The views are personal.

³ The author is grateful to Helene CONNOR, Hazel Henderson, Fulai SHENG, Pauli, Gunter for their comments and suggestions.

An UN study⁴ indicates that the shares of gross domestic product (GDP) of the developed economies are likely to fall in next two decades and the share of GDP of the developing economies would rise.

Table 1: Current and projected investment by region

Regions	Current (2000)			Reference Scenario (2030)		
	Percentage of world investment	Percentage of world GDP	Percentage of world population	Percentage of world investment	Percentage of world GDP	Percentage of world population
AI Parties#	77.60	79.34	20.36	56.65	64.30	20.13
NAI Parties	21.34	19.68	79.07	39.96	32.55	75.14
World Total - in billion units	US\$7,750	US\$35,440	6.0(100)	US\$22,270	US\$79,558	8(100)

Source: UNFCCC, 2007, # including USA and Australia, Figs in the bracket represents % of the world total

As the GDP of the developing ‘indigo’ economy is expected to rise, this economic parameter commonly used to distinguish between the developed and under developed regions/countries would become increasingly irrelevant. Instead, ‘rate of growth of green house gas (GHG)/pollution level’ of a region/country would be a better parameter to measure ‘development’ in true sense. Countries with negative GHG rate would be termed as ‘green economies’ and the countries with positive GHG rate – mostly the developing countries would represent the ‘indigo’ economies.

⁴ UNFCCC (2007), Analysis of existing and planned investment and financial flows relevant to the development of effective and appropriate international response to climate change, Background Paper, August,

Table 2: Projected industrial sector fuel consumption and emission in 2030 by different economies

Country/Region	Total Fuel consumption in 2000 (Mtoe)	Total Fuel consumption in 2030 under reference scenario (Mtoe)	Total Fuel consumption in 2030 under mitigation scenario (Mtoe)	Total Emission in 2000 Mt CO2 eq	Total Emission in 2030 under reference scenario (Mt CO2 eq)	Total Emission in 2030 under mitigation scenario (Mt CO2 eq)
World	1757 (100)	3932 (100)	3377 (100)	7638 (100)	14637 (100)	10663 (100)
OECD	883 (50.26)	1393 (35.43)	1225 (36.27)	3296 (43.15)	4777 (32.64)	3651 (34.24)
Transition Economics	149 (8.48)	337 (8.57)	284 (8.41)	951 (12.45)	1369 (9.35)	961 (9.01)
Developing Countries	725 (41.26)	2202 (56.00)	1868 (55.32)	3391 (44.40)	8491 (58.01)	6052 (56.76)
<i>Developing Asia</i>	462 (26.29)	1551 (39.45)	1304 (38.61)	2355 (30.83)	5868 (40.09)	3966 (37.19)

Source: UNFCCC 2007, also see Annexure I. Figs in the bracket represents % of the world total

Emergence of an Indigo Economy

In India the ‘indigo economy’ has a colonial root which dates back to 18th century when indigo plantation was started in Bengal in 1777 by the British planters as demand for indigo, as a dye, was rising very fast in Europe. The indigo planters left no stones unturned to make money and mercilessly pursued the peasants to plant indigo instead of food crops. They provided loans, called ‘dadon’ at a very high interest. Once a farmer took such loans he remained in debt for whole of his life before passing it to his successors. The price paid by the planters was

insignificant and the farmers could make no profit by growing indigo. They were totally unprotected from the brutal indigo planters, who resorted to mortgage or destruction of their property if they were unwilling to obey them. Government rules also favoured the planters. By an act in 1833, the planters were granted a free hand in oppression. Even the native land lords, money lenders and other influential persons sided with the planters. Then in mid 19th century, the farmers resorted to revolt against the British indigo planters.⁵

In the late sixties and early seventies of the last century, the idea of relocating/‘off shoring’ of manufacturing activities to other countries became popular. Management gurus like Raymond Vernon (1966) attempted to explain patterns of international trade by observing a circular phenomenon in the composition of trade between countries in the world market. Developed countries which had the ability and competence to innovate, became initial exporters of goods. Then they transferred the technology, initially to the developing countries and subsequently to the less developed countries, and eventually became importers of these goods. Thus by exploiting the cheaper factors of production- namely labour and raw materials of the developing countries of Asia, Africa and South America, multinational corporations (MNCs) of Western Europe, Japan and USA earned super normal profits. It may be recalled that in the decades of 1960s and 1970s, ‘transfer of obsolete technology to developing countries’, was the main allegation against multinational companies. That was the period when standardized cheap products of multinational corporations, produced in the developing countries, diffused into the local markets replacing many indigenous products. Standardized spare parts and low end products, produced at the subsidiaries of multinational firms in the export processing zones (EPZs), were also ‘exported’ to the parent firms. In addition to cutting production cost through this process of transferring obsolete low grade technology to developing countries where labour and natural resources were cheaper, the MNCs of the developed countries could also reduce the level of pollution, in the developed home countries.⁶

Since 1980s, when consciousness about environment had entered in the political and economic discourse of the developed countries, pollution became a major driving force for relocation of various manufacturing activities to off-shore destinations. Strict environmental regulations in developed countries compelled multinationals to relocate many polluting industries to underdeveloped countries. It was alleged that in 1991, Larry Summers, the Chief Economist of the World Bank (and later President of Harvard University), in a private conversation had justified the dumping of toxic wastes to the developing countries.⁷ He extended the economic logic of exporting first world waste to developing countries by arguing that⁸

- The countries with the lowest wages would lose the least productivity from “increased morbidity and mortality” since the cost to be recouped would be minimal;

⁵ http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indigo_revolt, visited on April 20, 2010

⁶ Dipankar Dey, 2004, Anxieties over Off shoring: State Vs New Economy, Economic and Political Weekly, June 12, 2004

⁷ Smith, K. (2006), “The obscenity of carbon trading”, *Biopact*, Saturday, November, 11.

⁸ Rolf Widmer, Heidi Oswald-Krapf, Deepali Sinha-Khetriwal, Max Schnellmann, Heinz Boni (2005), Global Perspectives on e-waste, Environmental Impact Assessment Review 25 (2005) 436-458, ELSEVIER

- The least developed countries , specifically those in Africa, were seriously under-polluted and thus could stand to benefit from pollution trading schemes as they had air and water to spare ; and that
- Environmental protection for “health and aesthetic reasons” is essentially a luxury of the rich, as mortality is such a great problem in these developing countries that the relatively minimal effects of increased pollution would pale in comparison to the problems these areas already face.

Thus countries like India and China have become the dump yards of developed countries’ waste, including electronic waste. Toxic wastes are recycled in these countries, mostly in the informal sector, in a hazardous condition⁹. Heavy metals pollution has turned the hamlets of southern China into cancer villages. "China has many 'cancer villages' and it is very likely that these increased cases of cancer are due to water pollution," said Edward Chan, an official with Greenpeace in southern China. World Bank study (2007)¹⁰ revealed that due to environmental pollution, around 4, 60,000 people had died in China.

Then in 1997, the Kyoto Protocol (KP)¹¹ has made an elaborate attempt to institutionalize the process that was theorized by Larry Summers. The clean development mechanism (CDM) under KP has allowed the industrialized nations to offset emission at home by buying carbon credits from developing world.¹² Inter-governmental Panel for Climate Change (IPCC) – the authoritative scientific voice on climate change once examined the potential for emissions leakage from the industrialized to developing countries. Within the specific context of the Kyoto Protocol, the IPCC concluded that “the possible relocation of some carbon intensive industries to Non-Annex 1 (developing) countries and wider impacts on trade flows in response to changing prices may lead to leakage in the order of 5-20 percent”.¹³ As the first commitment period has started only in 2008, it is too early to judge the effectiveness of the CDM and other mechanisms under KP in addressing the climate change related issues. However, initial findings indicate that compared to 1990, emission of the Annex I Parties was 5.5 percent lower in 2006. But between 1990 and 2004, the GHG emission worldwide has increased by around 24 percent implying that during this period, there was a strong possibility that emission got transferred to Non Annex I

⁹ Dey, Dipankar, 2009, Managing E-Waste in India: Challenges, Initiatives and Concerns, December, <http://unpan1.un.org/intradoc/groups/public/documents/apcity/unpan037141.pdf>

¹⁰ Reuters, 2009, China's 'Cancer Villages' Bear Witness To Economic Boom, September 18, Hong Kong.

¹¹ Kyoto Protocol has created a new market through ‘emission trading’ (trading ‘emission allowances’ among developed nations), ‘joint implementation (JI)’ (transferring ‘emission allowances’ between developed nations, linked to specific emission reduction projects) and the ‘clean development mechanism’ (CDM). Through CDM, developed nations are allowed to achieve part of their reduction obligations through projects in developing countries that reduce emission or ‘fix’ or sequester CO₂ from the atmosphere.

¹² EurActiv.com (2007) - Economics of climate change, EU-European Information on Climate Change, Wednesday, 14 February

¹³ IPCC 2001, as quoted in Earth Trends: Featured Topic (2002) see Baumert, K.A. and Kete, N. (2002), “Will the Kyoto Protocol Drive Industry to Developing Countries?”, Earth Trends: Featured Topic

developing countries. Thus the Annex I countries became 'green' at the expense of 'Non Annex I' countries which turned to 'blue' by absorbing the pollution of the developed "North".¹⁴

A study on the 'balance of emissions embodied in trade' (BEET) for a number of countries substantiates the above apprehensions. It has concluded that China's BEET (embodied emissions in exports less embodied emissions in imports) was 585.5 MtCO₂, compared to the UK's BEET of (-)102.7 MtCO₂. The corresponding figures for Germany, Japan, USA and India are (-) 102.7, (-) 139.9, (-) 197.0. (-) 438.9 and (+) 70.9 MtCO₂ respectively. This indicates, by importing goods (net) manufactured in other countries, UK could transfer 102.7 MtCO₂ of carbon emission to the exporting countries.¹⁵

Shift of Capital to Indigo Economy

In these emerging 'blue economies', where substantial amount of investment is expected to flow in next few years (refer to Table A, in Annexure I), huge opportunities awaits small and medium enterprises (SMEs). The UNFCCC¹⁶ report (August 2007)¹⁷ has made an analysis of the projected future investments¹⁸ and financial¹⁹ flows for the year 2030 taking into account both the reference scenario²⁰ and mitigation scenarios²¹. The report has predicted a decline in the proportion of investment in primary sectors like agriculture, forestry, fishing and mining. Compared to these, significant increase in the proportion of investment have been projected for few specific sectors namely transportation, storage and communications, financial intermediation, real estate, renting and business activities.

Among the Non-Annex I economies, the developing Asia would attract substantial investment. During 2002 and 2030, the projected investment flows in industrial sector indicate a sharp rise in the share of investment in the developing Asia. In this period, it would rise from 21.77 % to 44.23%. Compared to this, the projected share of investment in the OECD member countries would decline to 46.24% from 62.78%. The projected investment flows (see Table B, Annexure I) in residential and commercial sector would follow the same trend.

The projected figures on 'transport related investment' (refer to Table C, Annexure I) indicate that the global investment in motor vehicles would increase from US\$ 69 billion in 2002 to US\$ 209 billion in 2030. During the same period, the gross investment in 'transport and trade' (that

¹⁴ WTO-UNEP, 2009, Trade and Climate Change

¹⁵ Kejun J, Cosbey A, Murphy D, 2008, Embedded Carbon in traded Goods, IISD, Canada

¹⁶ The UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) was adopted in 1992 and entered into force in 1994. It provides the overall policy framework for addressing the climate change issues.

¹⁷ Op.cit...

¹⁸ An investment flow has been defined as the initial (capital) spending for a physical asset

¹⁹ A financial flow has been defined as an ongoing expenditure related to climate change mitigation or adaptation that does not involve investment in physical assets.

²⁰The reference scenario estimates the annual investment flows taking into consideration of energy supply and demand and the associated GHG emissions and investments. In 'a business as usual' situation, it assumed that no new international agreement would be enacted, till 2030, to address climate change.

²¹ The mitigation analysis uses a scenario that would return emission in 2030 to its 2004 level.

includes infrastructure investments as well as all other transport equipment not considered road vehicles) is expected to grow from US\$ 1.1 trillion to US\$ 4 trillion. China and India are expected to attract maximum investment.

Market for Clean Technology in the Indigo Economy

Economists have differed widely on the amount of funds (cost of emission reduction) that would be required to meet the challenge of global warming and mitigate green house gases (GHG) in future. Compared to two other major studies on this, one by Enkvist et al (2007)²² on behalf of McKinsey Quarterly and the other by Sir Nicholas's Stern (2006)²³ commissioned by the British government, the UNFCCC (2007) estimates look very conservative. Sir Stern's report predicted that, in a "business as usual" situation, the cost of climate change would be equivalent to losing at least 5 to 20 percent of global GDP each year. However, according to him, the cost of mitigation would be 'as low as one percent' of global GDP each year.²⁴

To restrict GHG emission to a level (450 pert-per million) there by not allowing the average global temperature to rise more that 2 degree C in 2030, the required investment in green technologies, as per Enkvist et al, would range between 500 billion Euros and 1,100 billion Euros. These figures translate to 0.6 -1.4% of the global GDP in that year.²⁵

The transnational corporations of the developed economies of the North, with strong support from their home states, have used the climate change issue as a strategic tool to retain their economic supremacy. They have successfully converted this challenge into an opportunity and elaborate business plans have been prepared to take advantage of the same.

To enhance the expanding market of clean technology and to offset possible asymmetries in competitiveness of the domestic firms of the developed countries, arising out of 'carbon leakage' to the developing countries, two types of entry barriers are being considered to be imposed on goods with high quantities of 'embedded carbon'.

(a) Border tax; In order to offset the 'hidden' subsidy' these goods receive, it is proposed to impose countervailing duty (against 'de facto subsidies') or an anti-dumping duty (against 'environmental dumping') on these imported goods produced in countries that do not impose climate change related regulations.²⁶

(b) Non –tariff barriers like denial of market access for non compliance of certain set rules/standards: A provision in the America's Climate Security Bill (2008), proposed by Senators Leiberman and Warner, aiming at penalizing other nations by imposing restrictions on their exports to USA, if they fail to reduce GHG emissions, is one such move. As per the provision, if two years after the enactment of the U.S. program, it is found that a major emitting nations has not taken comparable action, the legislation would require importers of GHG-intensive

²² Enkvist, Per-A., Naucler, T. and Rosander, J. (2007), "A cost curve for greenhouse gas reduction", *The McKinsey Quarterly*, No.1.

²³ H.M Treasury, 'Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change', http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/independent_reviews/stern_reviews_economics_climate_ch... (visited on 29th August,2007)

²⁴ Reisman, G. (2006), "Britain's Stern Review on Global Warming: It Could be Environmentalism's Swan Song", *Stern Review on the Economics of Climate Change*, August, 08: www.mises.org/story/2372

²⁵ Enkvist et al (2007)

²⁶ WTO-UNEP, 2009, Trade and Climate Change

manufactured products from that nation to purchase U.S. 'offsets'. The number of 'offsets' to be purchased would be calculated based on the embedded carbon in the good in question. Though the onus is put on the importers, in actual practice, this provision will force the exporters of 'carbon embedded goods' to switch to cleaner production process by replacing the existing technology with greener ones. Legislations like the Carbon Labeling Act of 2008, as proposed by the state of California would also act as a non –tariff barrier to carbon embedded goods from the developing countries²⁷. These measures will substantially increase the market for green technology.

Copenhagen conference

The Copenhagen conference (December 2009), has marked the beginning of a new way forward by involving USA and emerging economies of the developing South in tackling the climate change issue. Both the developed and developing countries have agreed to an international role in monitoring any emission cuts they commit themselves to. While the Kyoto Protocol addressed about 30% of global carbon emission (major polluter like USA did not ratify the Protocol), the framework accord hammered out in Copenhagen may encompass the majority of world emissions. With the active participation of USA in the expanding global carbon market, 'Green imperialism'²⁸ is likely to become more aggressive in near future.

Differences in EU and USA approach

It may be noted that the European Union (EU) and USA have taken two distinct approaches in tackling the climate issue and seize the advantages of the new business opportunities it has created. The EU has taken the 'mitigation strategy' and is trying to address the main cause (emission of green house gases) of global warming by promoting clean technology and alternative fuel. The British Prime Minister Gordon Brown's statement (March 2009) on this is a case in point. According to him, investment in "green" projects will create hundreds of thousands of jobs and could help put the world's ailing economy on the path to recovery. Spending money on environmentally friendly infrastructure and new technology will create 400,000 new jobs in Britain alone over the next eight years. The investment will form part of a global "Green New Deal" that aims to restore growth while dealing with climate change and energy security. "(It is) an opportunity to tackle our over-dependence on oil and to meet our three interlinked objectives - energy security, climate change and job creation -- together", he said.²⁹ It may be recalled that in the 1930s, U.S. President Franklin Roosevelt's "New Deal" helped to lift the United States out of the Great Depression

²⁷ Kejun J, opt cit....

²⁸ The Malaysia's Deputy Finance Minister used this term while arguing that developed countries were hypocritical because they complained about China's greenhouse gas emission while taking advantage of the country's cheap labor.(see TIME, July 9, 2007,p12)

²⁹ UK's Brown: "Green New Deal" will help fix economy, March 6,2009,
<http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/L5661912.htm>, visited on September 30, 2009

As a late entrant to this lucrative market, the USA has put its thrust on ‘adaptation strategy’ to reduce the adverse impact of climate change on food production. Being the driver of the 1st green revolution, USA continues with their strategy to remain focused on global food market, especially in the densely populated Asian and African regions, where the demand for food has been growing steadily. As before, the present push is on mass production through diffusion of new farming technology, including genetically modified seeds (GMS), across the globe.³⁰ Obama administration sees ‘chronic hunger’ as a key priority of their foreign policy and according to the US administration, ‘food security’ is not only about food, ‘it represents the convergence of complex issues: drought and floods caused by climate change, swings in the global economy that affect food prices and threaten the fate of vital infrastructure projects, and spikes in the price of oil that increase transportation cost’.³¹

GM- Food: the new threat

Apprehension of a ‘drought like situation’ due to climate change has given an opportunity to introduce genetically modified seeds and launch the second green revolution to feed the hungry mouths of Asia, Latin America and Africa. US biotech giants like Monsanto is trying to capitalize this opportunity by aggressively promoting its GM seeds as a solution to this emerging crisis. In Copenhagen climate conference (CoP15) Monsanto has been lobbying hard for carbon credits for their ‘Roundup Ready’ crops, which are being grown for agro fuel. ‘Roundup Ready’ soy doesn't need plowing because it can be heavily sprayed with herbicides. Not plowing the fields leaves more carbon dioxide in the ground, but the vast spread of soy monocultures in Latin America have caused deforestation, displacement of people, and massive amounts of toxic weed-killer being used instead. Monsanto also wants GM soy to be funded under the Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) which would allow polluting industry in the developed world to offset their emissions by buying credits from GM soy projects.³²

Monsanto, which had launched its genetically modified cotton in the Indian domestic market in 2002, also sells hybrid corn, fruit and vegetables, and several other agrochemical products in the country. Monsanto is focusing on the development and launch of new vegetable seed varieties (like Bt brinjal) in the Asian markets, especially in India and China. It has sought regulatory approval in India to sell its genetically modified (GM) corn that is tolerant to herbicides and provides protection from pests. The GM corn, currently undergoing field trials in the country, would be the second such product, after Bt cotton. The firm has received approval from India’s Genetic Engineering Approval Committee to conduct field trials to evaluate the bio-safety of the genetically modified product against target insects and weeds.

While the governments (including the mainstream agricultural experts) of developing countries like India have advocated for the application of agricultural biotechnology for tackling the climate change related issues, EU has a different view on this. Instead, they have been

³⁰ Dey, Dipankar, The Second Green Revolution in India: The Emerging Contradictions, Consequences and the Need for an Alternative Initiative (August 12, 2009). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1447795>

³¹ Hillary Rodham Clinton, 2009, US Secretary of State, World without hunger, The Times of India, October 16,

³² <http://www.angrymermaid.org/>, visited on December 17, 2009

encouraging traditional farming practices and consumption of organic food. In USA also, conscious attempts are being made at different forums to promote organic food.³³

Dual production and consumption practices: move towards a permanent indigo economy

It was expected that with the shift of capital and manufacturing activities to the developing countries, more jobs would be created and the economic condition of the hungry millions of the South would improve, though, at the cost of their health and environment. It was also assumed that with the improvement of economic condition, more funds would be diverted towards implementation of better production techniques to control/mitigate pollution. As the possibility of parceling pollution to other less developed regions does not exist (there is no south to south pole!), all the economies across the globe would turn 'green' in the long run. May be, the regulatory issues on 'global warming' would play the role of great equalizer, by default. But the real situation is different.

During last two decades the export processing zones of the Non Annex I countries, like China and India, have become the manufacturing hubs of many transnational corporations of the North. Imposition of various tariff and non-tariff barriers on 'carbon embedded goods' will induce radical changes in the manufacturing sector of these developing countries. As an immediate consequence, a dual production process will be in vogue. 'Green goods', meant for the developed markets of the North, would be produced using better and cleaner production techniques to make those export items compatible with the new carbon standards set by developed countries. And 'indigo goods' destined for the domestic and other markets of the developing South, would be manufactured using the old production process. With the introduction of GM seeds, this trend is getting extended to agricultural practices and food consumption also³⁴.

Large scale application of agricultural biotechnology, to boost agricultural yields, will bring in sweeping changes in the cultivation and food consumption pattern of China, India and other developing countries. If GM seeds and other associated inputs actually increase the production of essential crops, these GM foods, discarded by the health and environment conscious consumers of many developed countries especially in Europe, will be sold at an affordable 'fair' price to the hungry billions. Total absence of any food safety regulation will make these unprivileged populations extremely vulnerable to various food related disorders. As this new agricultural technology is 'capable' of providing high yield even when applied in barren; arid and saline lands, fertile lands will be earmarked for the cultivation of local varieties using traditional farming practices and rain water. Those 'organic' products will be exported and sold at a 'premium price' at the high end retail stores across the world. And GM products will be cultivated with arsenic contaminated underground water.

³³ Washington based non profit organization EWG (Environmental Working Group) constantly campaigns to 'Go organic and eat fresh foods' by (i) buying organic or low-pesticide fruits and veggies; (ii) avoiding food containers that leach the chemicals into food;(iii) choosing more natural meat and dairy products.

³⁴ For detail, see, Dey, Dipankar, The Second Green Revolution in India: The Emerging Contradictions, Consequences and the Need for an Alternative Initiative (August 12, 2009). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1447795>

Though industrial pollution could be checked in future through the induction of green technology but introduction of GM seeds will destroy the age old agricultural practices permanently. Once the indigenous seeds and biodiversity are lost, these are lost for ever.

Conclusion

The widening of this domestic dualism in the production and consumption of goods and food items in the emerging economies of South is the outcome of a unique strategy the Northern countries have been following for the last few decades to make their economies 'green'. Initial tactics was to shift the polluting industries to the developing countries. Now is the turn for the agriculture. The developed economies are becoming 'green' at the expense of the developing economies which are turning 'indigo' by absorbing increasing amount of 'Franken foods' and industrial pollutants, including nuclear radiation.³⁵

Annexure I

Table A: Investment flows in the industrial sector by region and time period (billions of US\$)

Region	2002	2030
Africa	25 (1.97)	71 (2.23)
Developing Asia	276 (21.77)	1406 (44.23)
Latin America	88 (6.94)	79 (2.49)
Middle East	45 (3.55)	100 (3.15)
OECD	796 (62.78)	1470 (46.24)
Transition Economics	38 (3.00)	54 (1.70)
World	1268 (100)	3179 (100)

Source: UNFCCC, 2007, Figs in the bracket indicates % of the world total

³⁵ This piece is dedicated to my friend Kana who stays in a remote village of Bengal (India) and is fighting relentlessly, against this encircling gloom, to save her children, tradition and rich cultural heritage of a great civilization.

Table B: Investment flows in the residential and commercial sector by region and time period (billions of US\$)

Region	2005	2030
Africa	33 (0.75)	167 (1.49)
Developing Asia	432 (9.73)	2383 (21.29)
Latin America	88 (1.98)	306 (2.73)
Middle East	42 (0.94)	343 (3.07)
OECD	3806(85.75)	7796(69.66)
Transition Economies	38 (0.85)	197 (1.76)
World	4438	11191

Source: UNFCCC, 2007, Figs in the bracket indicates % of the world total

Table C: Projected transport related investments under the reference scenario, (billion of US\$)

	2002	2030
Motor vehicles	69	209
Petroleum and coal products	23	24
Trade and transport services#	1138	4034

Source: UNFCCC, 2007,

includes infrastructure investments as well as all other transport equipments not considered road vehicles.