Constructing Meanings of a Green Economy:
Investigation of an Argument for Africa's Transition towards the Green Economy

A Research Paper presented by:

Tarcile Mballa-Ngamougou
(Cameroon)

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for obtaining the degree of
MASTER OF ARTS IN DEVELOPMENT STUDIES

Major:

Agrarian and Environmental Studies
(AES)

Specialization:

Environment and Sustainable Development

Members of the Examining Committee:

Dr Murat Arsel
Carol Hunsberger

The Hague, The Netherlands
December 2013

Disclaimer:

This document represents part of the author's study programme while at the Institute of Social Studies. The views stated therein are those of the author and not necessarily those of the Institute.

Inquiries:

Postal address:

Institute of Social Studies
P.O. Box 29776
2502 LT The Hague
The Netherlands

Location:

Kortenaerkade 12
2518 AX The Hague
The Netherlands

Telephone: +31 70 426 0460
Fax: +31 70 426 0799

Acknowledgments

The completion of this Master Thesis has been a challenging but worthwhile experience, one which was made ever more special by the abundance of knowledge and diversity of worldviews imparted to me by the ISS Community.

To my supervisor Murat Arsel, thank you for giving me ample space to explore my ideas, the encouragement and most importantly your patience throughout this journey. Thank you to Carol, my second reader; despite the fact that we only saw each other a few times, your constructive feedback and encouragement have been a great resource for this thesis.

To my AES family: thank you for making the last 15 months an incredible and absolutely unforgiveable and enriching experience.

Last but not least, to my family and friends who have been immovable foundations, a source of energy and support and laughter whenever it was desperately needed. I am incredibly grateful for all the brainstorming hour-long Skype calls regardless of time difference, the constant willingness to listen to my thoughts and help me navigate them and the calm confidence in me you have kept throughout – even when I changed my mind on a daily basis.

Contents

List of Figures

List of Appendices

List of Acronyms

AEC	African Economic Conference
AfDB	African Development Bank
AUC	African Union Commission
ECA	Economic Commission for Africa
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
GEC	Green Economy Coalition
GGND	Global Green New Deal
ICC	International Chamber of Commerce
ILO	International Labour Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LDCs	Less Developed Countries
NEPAD	New Partnership for Africa's Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
UN	United Nations
UNCSD	United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development
UNDESA	United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WWF	World Wildlife Fund

Abstract

The Green Economy, in the context of sustainable development and poverty reduction, is currently the most important item on the international environmental policy agenda. While conferences proceed and countries prepare for a transition to the Green Economy as advised by UNEP, the definition of the concept remains contested, yet still demanded. In parallel, countries have requested, and agreed on principle that they be given relative flexibility to dictate the implementation of their transitions. The result, like sustainable development before it is a multiple meanings which may position the Green Economy concept for failure in the long term as these meanings erode its practical relevance across contexts.

By means of argumentation analysis supported by framing theory, this study argues that the fulfilment of both requests is not necessarily compatible as countries define and redefine the concept of the Green Economy within different contexts. It also argues that ultimately Green Economy does indeed share weaknesses similar to those observed in sustainable development literature which may lead to its long term irrelevance and dim the likelihood of achieving its purpose. The object of analysis is a speech given at an African Economic Conference that is analysed to illustrate the already existing divergence of definitions and expose these weaknesses.

Relevance to Development Studies

The Environment and Sustainable Development (ESD) specialization is concerned with global environmental politics and the debates surrounding current concepts and frameworks for environmental policy. The Green Economy is such a topic, emerging as a proposed new paradigm for the achievement of sustainable development. As it stands the concept is not clearly defined, remains contested and therefore allows multiple perspectives for understanding and implementing it. This study explores but one such perspective, providing an insight into alternative constructions of multiple meanings and hence definitions of the Green Economy while reflecting on the power of deliberate language use in constructing these but also render them irrelevant in the prolonged absence of a consensus on the concept's meaning.

Keywords

Green Economy, Africa, Sustainable Development, Argumentation Analysis, Framing, Meles Zenawi

Chapter 1
Introduction

Just over 30 years ago "The Limits to Growth" report (Meadows et al. 1972) made the salient warning that humanity could not continue consuming physical resources and grow in population at a rate faster than that which nature could support, lest it find itself in a state of collapse , which could be of economic, ecological and social dimensions. Over the last decade or so, the world has fallen victim to a range of crises that happened in quick succession only to later converge into a multi-faceted crisis we face today. The climate, food and financial crises for instance, can be seen as signals that the planetary 'limits to growth' as warned by Meadows et al. (1972) are indeed being approached by our current global systems of development.

Meadows et al. (1972) went on to suggest that prompt, global decision making needed to be made in order to reduce these growth rates and avoid collapse, emphasizing that delays in this process would only increase the chances of the collapse becoming a reality midway through the 21st century if business continued "as usual". The latest proposition to emerge from such global decision making spaces in response to looming threats to growth is that a shift be made towards an economic system that results in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities (UNEP 2011) i.e. towards a Green Economy.

With such an appealing target and the similarly attractive idea that such balanced sustainability can be achieved without discontinuing economic growth, the Green Economy is gathering momentum as a "three birds, one stone" sustainable solution to the multiple crises (Barbier et al. 2013). The Green Economy has been a prominent feature of international environmental policy gatherings since 2008.

However, the idea of linking the economy, environment and society so as to proceed with development in an integrative manner and in the hope of countering signals that the planetary 'limits to growth' are approaching precedes this contemporary concept that is the Green Economy. The concept's precursor, sustainable development, sought to achieve these same objectives when it emerged in the late 1980s although it never proposed a pathway quite as detailed as the Green Economy's (Brockington 2012). The Green Economy in fact is considered *part of* and a strategy *for* sustainable development despite almost taking on an identity of its own in international policy circles (e.g. UN) over the last five years or so.

Despite attempts by organizations such as UNEP to produce a working definition for it, the Green Economy's definition remains unsettled in many stakeholders' minds and is therefore greatly contested. Nevertheless, the lack of a shared understanding has not stopped some countries from proceeding to strategize and implement steps towards a transition from currently 'brown' economies to green ones. As ambitious and optimistic a sign this is, attempting to implement a little understood and inadequately defined concept that holds the potential of significantly transforming societies in the long term carries certain implications. Some of these implications may ultimately undermine the original purpose of the concept (Fergus and Rowney 2005, Quental et al. 2011) – a trap the concept of sustainable development itself may have already fallen into.

Why Definition Matters

The concept of sustainable development found its way into the minds of global policy makers via the Brundtland report (Brundtland 1987) which defined it as "development which meets the needs of current generations without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs". It later solidified its position on multiple agendas at the UN's 1992 Rio Earth Summit (Jacobs 2012). The idea unified decision makers around the possibility of maintaining economic growth while ensuring the protection of environmental resources and improving human standards of living: a very attractive win-win solution (Sachs 1999).

The interpretation of this definition however is hotly contested to date (Ciegis et al. 2009). Such contestation resulted in different theories and worldviews being applied by different communities, be it 'big businesses', governments, social reformers or environmental activists (Giddings et al. 2002). Depending on each view or theory, key issues are shaped and prioritized differently, guiding the discussions about them in different directions and ultimately influencing actors, their roles and their actions (Ciegis et al. 2009, Giddings et al. 2002, Jabareen 2008).

For instance, comprehension of the social, environmental and economic sustainability components of sustainable development and of their intersection can result in different outcomes. The pillar approach (the one most often applied) understands the three components as separate but connected, allowing different groups to prioritize a particular component. Such compartmentalization of components of sustainable development allows policy proposals emanating from each stream to serve the interests of one objective at the cost of another. Take for example the economic stream's preference for technological solutions or market-based instruments for environmental management. The former may bypass the necessity for resources to be directed at environmental resources recovery while the latter obscures unequal socio-economic relationships, alternative knowledge for environmental management or the fundamental need for different societal production and consumption habits to change (Giddings et al. 2002).

Such approaches expose the contradictory objectives within each component (Redclift 2006), hence identifying a cohesive conceptualization is made difficult and further complicated by warnings that disregard of any component of sustainable development, jeopardizes the achievement of the ultimate objective of sustainability (Kahuthu 2006). Other ways of interpreting the connections between the three components include seeing them as nested within and therefore interdependent upon each other (Waas et al. 2011) or multi-faceted, where it is acknowledged that the three components are not homogenous and exist in multiple forms across the globe (Waas et al. 2011). While these alternative interpretations take into consideration diversity of views and societies or are take a more desirable integrated approach to sustainable development, these still fall short of providing consensus over what needs to be sustained (Jabareen 2008) or covering all three aspects in a balanced manner while providing a clear understanding of what sustainable development is (Ciegis et al. 2009).

A different part of literature on the definition of sustainable development claims there is a form of consensus around its meaning among scholars and practitioners, built over the last two decades but even authors such as Robinson (2004), du Pisani (2006) or Kuhlman (2010) agree that the multiple, unclear conceptualizations of the term lead to its overuse or misuse to serve particular interests. 'Green washing', the inaccurate claiming or reporting of corporate social and environmental compliance is an example of sustainable development's appeal being misused which also raises ethical concerns surrounding such misuse (Dahl 2010). In the end, the fear is that the practical global implementation of the concept is inhibited by this lack of clarity, vagueness and/or malleability (Ciegis et al. 2009, Waas et al. 2011) and presents the risk of essentially rendering the concept meaningless and powerless in effectively guiding policy action(Giddings et al. 2002, Waas et al. 2011, Zaccai 2012).

However, given the multiple interpretations of sustainable development, its evolution over the last two decades has revealed a trend of *co-existing* interpretations that inform governance towards sustainability (Zaccai 2012). The result is visible in the growing inclusion of actors outside of governments (e.g. public-private partnerships or community-based resource management) or a move away from market-based to more informational and voluntary instruments for instance (Zaccai 2012). Unfortunately such evolution, despite delivering pollutant reductions or the promotion of green products in the market, has insufficiently addressed major ecological impacts such climate change and biodiversity loss as the economic component still holds priority over the other two (Zaccai 2012). Waas (2011)offers these shortcomings of the sustainable development concept as a reasonable explanation for the perceived little progress made to date with regards to its fundamental purpose of sustainability.

The issues mentioned above all point towards another feature of sustainable development: it's truly complex and multidimensional nature (Waas et al. 2011) which, it can be argued, enables these fragmentations and inconsistencies in its interpretation. Dahle (1998) warned that such shortcomings – vagueness, malleability – may very well lead concepts similar to that of sustainable development towards the same fate. This warning is the root of this study's interest in the Green Economy's multiple meanings, interpretations and their constructions. Born of an unclear concept itself and given that its definition is essentially since in construction, *can multiple interpretations of the Green Economy concept create weaknesses similar to those of sustainable development that make it vulnerable to misuse and ultimately, failure?*

Organization and Argumentation

Based on these past observations on the concept of sustainable development, it is understandable that the task of identifying a single definition of the Green Economy – or at least what it should look like – is will be a necessary but complex one, as considerations beyond the economic dimension are made to include the social and environmental pillars of sustainable development in its conception to varying degrees and as various communities interpret it differently.

This paper argues that the Green Economy concept, given the absence of a universally accepted definition, is open to interpretation like sustainable development before it and as a result shares certain weaknesses that put it at risk of losing its ability and/or failing to guide international efforts to achieve sustainable development and by extension, poverty reduction.

To demonstrate these weaknesses, the speech given at the Sixth African Economic Conference by the late Prime Minister of the Federal Republic of Ethiopia, Mr Meles Zenawi. The speech, titled "Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa", attempts to build an argument in favour of Africa's transition towards a Green Economy is used as a sample exercise in the construction of meanings of a Green Economy. To reveal underlying assumptions, conclusions and ultimately meanings given to the Green Economy, the study borrows from the linguistic discipline to perform an argumentation analysis which will identify frames – lenses – through which the Green Economy can be understood in a manner different from the typical publications from international institutions.

The Chapters leading up to this analysis are set up to provide an overview of Green Economy, its most common definitions, critique and overview in an African institutional context (Chapter 2). Chapter 3 attends to the theories and methodology for argumentation and framing analyses, while Chapter 4 contains the bulk of the speech's analysis and accompanying discussion. Chapter 5 closes the exercise with some concluding remarks on the implications of the analyses findings in relation to the research question.

Scope and Limitations

One of the main limiting factors about this study is with related to the accessibility and content of the literature. Contemporary literature on the Green Economy seldom deals with its definition and instead focuses on its components and the links between them. Much of the 'general' literature on the subject is also published by closely related institutions and/or academics that have previously written for these institutions. This reduces the pool and diversity of sources for discussion of certain aspects of the concept.

On the methodological front, the object of analysis (the speech) is explored in its written form. This reduces the likelihood of the analysis identifying components of the speech – words, phrases or sentences – that the speaker might have uttered with particular emphasis, possibly guiding the audience to receive his message in a particular manner. Textual analysis of this nature also requires significant experience and practice from the researcher, given the risks of over- or under-analysis. In this case, such experience is limited to three months of training in discourse studies. This analysis therefore is not complete or considered advanced, nor does it compare multiple texts which could help identify a wider discourse. The unit of analysis, the speech, is used as a sample of what may be a widespread experience in constructing meanings for a Green Economy.

The intention of this paper however, is not to identify a particular strand of Green Economy discourse but rather but provide and an entry point in understand potential meanings for the main subject of interest, and how Green Economy's staying power can be affected in the face their multiplicity affect. This leaves space open for more in-depth exploration of the same speech or other related documentation using different methodology and theory.

Chapter 2
The Green Economy: Context, Definitions and Critique

Over the last decade or so, the world has fallen victim to a range of crises that happened in quick succession only to later converge into a multi-faceted crisis we face today. These crises have all had very tangible, negative impacts on human societies, be it in terms of environmental or socio-economic damage. Along with the manifestation of these crises, concepts such as green growth or the Green Economy have gained traction and now sit firmly at the top of international environmental policy making agendas. In this chapter we explore the main tenets of these concepts, giving particular attention to the most recent concept, the *Green Economy*.

Context for a Green Economy

The recent global financial crisis drastically reduced the activities of major economies (Edey 2009, Jessop 2012). As spending and production were curbed in reaction to its peak manifestation, a palpable contraction of global and national Gross Domestic Product (GDP) was witnessed by many countries, with only a handful being spared (e.g. the Asian Tigers) (Edey 2009). This crisis undoubtedly impacted abilities to curb other crises, all of which are complexly interlinked (Jessop 2012).

Elsewhere, the food crisis manifested itself with rising food prices, increasing instances of extreme weather critically low levels of global grain reserves threaten not only food security but are feared to have spill over effects of social unrest at multiple geopolitical scales (Headey 2013). Recovery from the 2012 is crisis is still in progress for consumers and producers worldwide.

In spite of many nations either turning or seriously considering the turn towards alternative energy sources, the dilemma that is the energy crisis persists as fossil fuels remain at the centre of many a national economy and access to them is increasingly proving to be problematic from financial, stock, environmental and socio-political dimensions (Bradshaw 2013).

Climate change on another end, despite being countered with numerous international and national efforts is yet to be stalled, let alone be reversed , although a minor denial lobby over the manifestation of its impacts the legitimation of the science supporting its state remains strong (Dunlap and McCright 2011, Oreskes and Conway 2010). Across policy making scales, climate-related threats remain one of the strongest motivators for the changes in growth patterns and environmental stewardship inspired by concepts such as sustainable development, green growth and the latest, Green Economy.

A basic recognition from all fronts is that the environmental aspects of the crises are not sufficiently countered by current patterns of economic growth (Jacobs 2012). However, the coupled atmospheres of disappointment with sustainable development efforts on one side (Zaccai 2012) and persistent sense of crisis on the other over the last decades have created an entry point for new paradigms of economic growth.

Such paradigms would not only need to look towards closing the gaps existing in efforts to achieve environmental sustainability but would also look to redress environmental degradation, as well as socio-political inequities that the past economic systems had established worldwide (Brand 2012). A general endorsement to the fact that national and international economic systems need cleansing or "greening" appears to have been given by world leaders.

Shaping Definitions of the Green Economy

It is at this juncture of acknowledged failure that disciplines such as that of green economics came into being. The departure point for action however was the same: there need not be a trade-off between environmental sustainability and economic progress. An addition to this conviction predicts the gradual independence of large economic activities on ecological resources, as innovation in green technology evolves through research and development (UNEP 2011).

Early ideas in green economics blamed past undervaluation of environmental resources and ecosystems in markets for the global environmental crisis which in turn hampered the prospects of enduring economic progress (Barbier et al. 2013, Jacobs 1993, Pearce et al. 1989). Such oversight needed to be corrected in a new economic model: urgent policy progress was to be made towards valuation and accounting of natural resources and the creation of incentives that would encourage their sustainable use by economic actors (Pearce et al. 1989).

Then and now (Barbier et al. 2013) , this advice remains relevant and has inspired the approach taken by the Global Green New Deal's (GGND) (Barbier 2009, UNDESA 2009) foundations for transitions to greener economies ; a 'building block' for the UNEP Report. At a time when the 2008 global financial crisis provided an opportunity for stimulus money to be redirected, the GGND's proposal was to invest intensively in efficient green technologies that placed little demand on natural resources and in their deployment (Barbier 2009, UNDESA 2009). The combination of the premises laid above led to the emergence of mostly market-related feats such as the creation of national environmental accounts, carbon markets, payments for ecosystem services schemes or investment in sustainable energy, agriculture and water technology. Such examples are the result of the growing imperative that better environmental management practices be adopted.

These premises also laid the foundation for a contemporary – and at this time most comprehensive – proposal for a Green Economy. In 2011 UNEP released its proposal for a Green Economy through a report, *Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication*. The report, centred on the belief that achieving the overarching goal of sustainable development rests entirely on "getting the economy right" (UNEP 2011). The report sealed UNEP's position as contemporary Green Economy 'champion', flanked by other institutions including the World Bank, OECD, WWF, IUCN, numerous other UN agencies or alliances such as the Green Economy Coalition (GEC).

A Green Economy, as defined by UNEP, is one that would "[result] in improved human well-being and social equity, while significantly reducing environmental risks and ecological scarcities" (UNEP 2010: 5), or in a simpler form, one that is "low-carbon, resource efficient and socially inclusive" (UNEP 2011a: 16). Given the similarities to sustainable development, there was early confusion about whether the concept was being replaced by the Green Economy. Clarification on the matter has since been enunciated and requirement to refer to "the Green Economy in the context of sustainable development *and* poverty eradication" (UNCSD 2012). It is in this context that the term is used throughout this paper.

UNEP's definition makes explicit the commitment to the social facet of sustainable development d as well as the commitment to fighting climate change with low carbon dependence, thereby integrating areas of focus outside the traditional economic sphere. Others contribute to this integration in varying degrees. For instance, the GEC states a Green Economy should "[generate] a better quality of life for all within the ecological limits of the planet" (Green Economy Coalition 2012). The ICC views it as a mutually reinforcing and responsible relationship between economic growth and environmental stewardship that supports social development (In-

ternational Chamber of Commerce 2011) while the Danish 92 Group defines it as a dynamic, evolving process of transformation which "cannot be Green without being Equitable" (The Danish 92 Group 2012).

Still, like sustainable development before it (Redclift 2006), Green Economy's definition is considered vague and incoherent due to its assumption that a trade-off between environmental health and economic growth in the current neoliberal economic model is not necessary (Brand 2012). Others utterly refute it and its foundations (Lander 2011, People's Summit 2012). Expectedly, the range of (dis)approval and interpretations makes is difficult to clearly identify a Green Economy and rally international, national or local stakeholders around one clear vision. Given its widespread use in international policy spaces such as the UN and related texts, this paper will follow suit and use UNEP's definition as a reference for discussion.

Foci of a Green Economy

Natural Capital

Following from scientific proof of ecological degradation and the logic that capital was previously misallocated in economies, Green Economy reasoning understands this misallocation to be the result of a failure by markets to recognize the true value of biodiversity ecosystem services (ten Brink et al. 2012). The solution for correcting this short-sightedness, as proposed by Green Economy orators, is for the recognition, efficient allocation and fair distribution cost and benefits of the caretaking or damaging of natural benefits (ten Brink et al. 2012). Essentially, what is needed is a structural transformation of the economy. For this, efforts to financially account for and price nature must be made, allowing a better integration into the market structure and mainstreaming it in the financial sector – recognizing the value of "natural capital" (Pearce et al. 1989, ten Brink et al. 2012, UNEP 2011).

Hence, nature in many Green Economy texts is discussed in terms of exchangeable, public ecosystem services and goods. Attempts to put a price to the range of provisioning, regulating, cultural and supporting services (e.g. freshwater, pollination, recreation and nutrient cycling respectively) abound (ten Brink et al. 2012). Nature therefore is mainly viewed as the base of the Green Economy - a provider and supplier that must be maintained, built up and invested into as it not only sustains human well-being but is also a source of employment in the long run. For the Green Economy, forestry, agriculture, freshwater and fisheries are the most important natural capital sectors to undergo 'greening' so as to ensure its successful achievement, particularly for rural areas in developing countries with high poverty indices. Thus, embarking on path of reforestation, sustainable agriculture, temporary reduced fishing effort and efficient water management are among the main recommendations made (UNEP 2011).

Low Carbon Development

The climate change debate has garnered globally institutionalized structures to address its perceived threats (Eastin et al. 2011), making it the priority ecological crisis for the Green Economy. It is typically assumed that a consensus on the fact that global temperatures are rising and that anthropogenic activity is a major contributor to these changes exists (Bray 2010, Doran and Zimmerman 2009, Oreskes 2004). This legitimation of climate chance science through the IPCC (Oreskes 2004) however, has increasingly been contested over the last five years; two other perspectives on the work of the IPCC seem to be emerging, with scientists external to the panel

claiming its findings are overestimated while the scepticism of past contributors points towards an overestimation (Bray 2010).

Relying on the still strong scientific consensus, a Green Economy pays particular attention to the energy sector. Maintaining the belief that both economic and environmental goals are achievable in quasi-simultaneity through adaptation and technological advancement, it approaches the climate crisis as an opportunity rather than a threat – an approach advocated by the likes of (Sudhakara Reddy and Assenza 2009). Energy is a key component of the Green Economy plot. This sector, an inescapable economic pillar, is both a source of crisis and opportunity as mentioned earlier. Still largely fossil fuel based, current economies and their carbon (equivalent) emissions have made major contributions to the climate crisis and adjusting for it has proven to be very costly to economies across scales (Bradshaw 2013, Bray 2010, Sudhakara Reddy and Assenza 2009). Compounding this crisis, the volatile rising prices of fossil fuels brew an atmosphere of instability that not only has economic but also social impacts; energy is a security issue of multiple dimensions (Bradshaw 2013).

In a Green Economy, an investment driven switch to renewable energy provides an exit from the entanglement of crises brought on by fossil fuels. The switch would gradually reduce dependency on fossil fuels and their environmentally damaging extraction processes while ensuring a buffer against short term energy shocks from both climate change and energy market volatility (UNEP 2011). Coupled with green production practices and development of green technologies, a significant increase in efficiency would contribute to significantly lower production and consumption costs, and carbon emissions for all in the future – these are particularly important for the housing and transport sectors in light of high urbanization trends observed globally (UNEP 2011). The low cost trend would also increase accessibility to electricity by low income communities, especially rural areas and high-density housing areas in urban centres.

Poverty Reduction, Employment and Equity

Poverty, understood in the Green Economy as insufficient access to education, healthcare, property rights, income and financial credit, is considered the largest sign of social inequity (UNEP 2011). It is also portrayed as an element of risk and insecurity, particularly with regard to natural disasters and economic shocks. Poverty is also linked to energy in this context: energy poverty equates to inaccessibility to electricity or to less costly, efficient and hazardous sources such as kerosene-based lighting (UNEP 2011).

Poverty reduction thus takes multifaceted approaches in a Green Economy. LDCs, with a significant percentage of poor populations are consequently marked for green sustainable agriculture especially at the small holder scale; sustainable practices would increase productivity, simultaneously ensure food security, counter carbon emissions and stimulate developed access to green product markets (e.g. organic foods) thereby increasing opportunities for income (UNEP 2011).

Investment in natural resources such as water and forests that low-income communities rely heavily upon, for their replenishment and sustainable use would also contribute to tightening their safety nets in case of shocks mentioned above (UNEP 2011). Investment in increasingly green and growing sectors such as local tourism, sustainable high-productivity agriculture, small scale renewable energy technology savoir-faire, waste management and recycling would provide multiple opportunities for employment of current low-income earners in the short, medium and long term (UNEP 2010, UNEP 2011, UNEP and ILO 2011). Increased employment rates in low-income areas would ultimately lead to an economic boost for a country.

The availability of strong safety nets, economically, in terms of access to resources (natural, education and healthcare) and employment, makes for relatively improved and more sustainable livelihoods. The message again seems to be to invest, only this time in people and in increasing their economic opportunities through employment, education and training, access to energy and access to vital natural resources.

Institutional strengthening and infrastructure development

The Green Economy's targets discussed above, mostly according to the UN, require countries to implement policy changes that will facilitate their achievement and acquire the infrastructure to support its complementary activities. Policy will have to be adjusted to encourage good green practices and deter from past inefficient, environmentally harmful or inequitable practices.

To support greening agriculture for example, subsidies facilitating the use and access to harmful chemical fertilizers will have to be removed. Similar action may be needed to eliminate fuel or mining subsidies that encourage human and natural resource overexploitation. Systems and legislation to steer the country towards better fisheries, forestry or water management will be just as necessary.

In terms of public spending, state institutions may need to adopt green procurement practices, stimulating supply of green, environmentally friendly products and services as well as encouraging their demand. Restructuring financial systems in a manner that attracts investments and encourages the private sector to support state initiatives towards a Green Economy is another adjustment countries are advised by institutions such as the UN and the World Bank.

Aiming public spending and institutional support at acquiring and increasing quality of and access to key infrastructure is also an important move required. Such infrastructure is relevant not only for the key 'greening' sectors targeted in UNEP's report for example but also other sectors such as education or health.

Such adjustments are particularly relevant for less developed countries, many of whom find they lack in different aspects of the necessary institutional structures and infrastructure for a transition towards a Green Economy.

Disagreeing with the Green Economy

Admittedly, the Green Economy proposal makes important contribution to the search for alternative, less devastating dominant visions and practices for development (Brockington 2012, Lander 2011).

However, some consider this vision to be awash with gaps in its logic, at times dismissive of other, comparatively minor visions and conceptions of the thematic areas covered above, (Jenkins and Simms 2012, Lander 2011). Some critics consider the definition to be a vague oxymoron, like that of sustainable development before it (Redclift 2006), as it attempts to package ideologies that at times contradict each other (Brand 2012). Different countries and stakeholder groups in the multiple United Nations conferences share similar reactions, while civil society stakeholders' reactions (think tanks, social movement organization, etc.) are divided along a spectrum ranging from full support to rebuff of the concept (Lander 2011, Verzola Jr. and Quintos 2012, Verzola 2013).

Most concerns actually take the debate on the definitions and understanding of the Green Economy beyond semantics. In some academic, sociological circles in especially, there is a con-

cern that the changes called for in a Green Economy are in fact not fundamental as claimed but relatively superficial; by relying on the market and financial sectors once more for the release of green economic benefits, the actors and knowledge base that informed the current multiple-crisis state are essentially left in control (Jenkins and Simms 2012, Lander 2011).

This is further reflected by the essential measurement and comprehension of growth and equity in mostly economic terms accompanied by an approach to making green investments attractive to businesses with the promise of bigger profits; an approach not necessarily encouraging the pursuit of profit, the driver of past and present environmentally and socially damaging capitalistic practices (Lander 2011, People's Summit 2012).

Many along this line of critique are left with the impression that the causes of the crisis are either not fully understood or acknowledged. For example, while a call for greener production and stimulation for green products are welcome, the issue of overproduction and overconsumption by society is not addressed at all. For the limits to growth debate (Meadows et al. 2004) hardly any publications give the option of a non-growth pathway any serious consideration (Bär et al. 2012).

Another debate arises from the identification of nature as ecosystem services and good i.e. natural capital. The commercialization of nature is thought to obscure decision making and power dynamics among local natural resource users especially and to lead to the exclusion of vulnerable members of low income communities, along with their cultural values and knowledge (Kosoy and Corbera 2010, Norgaard 2010, People's Summit 2012). The assumption that commodification of natural resources would automatically lead to social equity and justice (in a non-economic sense), has been contested for a long time (Sachs 1999).

Still on the matter of the role of nature, the relationship to nature remains extractive at the core and is one in which, especially with an emphasis on technology to counter ecological scarcities, the motivation is to dominate and exploit nature. No consideration is really given to other perspectives like those that consider nature – Mother Earth – to have rights of its own that need to be protected and that human activity must be incorporated within the Planet's system and not the other way around, as a Green Economy would have it (Morrow 2012, People's Summit 2012).

Significant criticism from development practitioners frequently criticised the Green Economy's seemingly one-dimensional environmental orientation that does not adequately deal with the equity and development facets of the current sustainable development framework (Ocampo et al. 2011). Accompanying this observation is call for better balancing of these three dimensions (Cook and Smith 2012), especially regarding equity which is not given the same policy attention but is rather addressed as a secondary goal of sustainable development (Bär et al. 2012, Cook and Smith 2012).

A debate surrounding the principles guiding the Green Economy also ensued, especially with LDCs highlighting the fact that some of the principles agreed upon for sustainable development at the 1992 Rio Earth Summit were being overlooked (Bär et al. 2012). The principle pertaining to common but differentiated responsibilities and capabilities of countries was of special concern, as UNEP's Green Economy report proposed an agenda with little to no such differentiation between the more and LDCs – an approach supported by some of the more developed economies (Bär et al. 2012).

The debates above reflect some – not all – of the main lines of critique the Green Economy messengers face. As divergent as they may appear, they do ultimately seem to share an either explicit or underlying theme of power dynamics, from the local to international political scales and also reflect the abstract struggle of ideologies or discourses along specific class lines in at the Rio+20 summit (Goodman and Salleh 2013).

Despite all the critique, an economic alternative with as detailed if not more details mechanisms and options for action incorporating some of this critique is yet to emerge. The ideas emerging from the UN gatherings, therefore, remain the best currently available option for a new economic paradigm as alternative movements face important limitations despite their potential (Bullard and Müller 2012).

Africa and the Green Economy

Since UNEP's Green Economy report, the call by various organizations, institutions and even international NGOs for countries to begin the transition towards a Green Economy has grown louder. LDCs in particular have been the most targeted and African countries have not been spared, recently receiving demands for an imminent up scaling of their efforts to embark on this transition (Steiner 2011).

Multiple efforts to convince African countries to heed the call have mostly consisted of supporters of the Green Economy as concept laying out its relevance and potential contributions to their national or regional development goals and challenges. Many speeches have been delivered and reports have been published including some from African regional institutions such as the AUC, AfDB or ECA of the UN. UNEP and the OECD too have designed reports aimed convince policymakers from LDCs. Widely distributed and referenced, these reports have significant influence over national and regional decision making regarding the adoption of the Green Economy as a strategy for sustainable development. Since they share an aim, some reports tend to share similar foci of discussion and approaches at problematizing the need for transition in the African context.

Many reports for example, embed their discussions within the climate change issue, taking the relatively high vulnerability of the African region to its threats and impacts as a point of departure and also as a factor exacerbating other challenges that are characteristic of the region. These challenges include food insecurity, still-high poverty, high unemployment and high population growth rates. Population growth carries almost as much importance as climate change as a leading threatening economic growth prospects for African countries.

The majority of the African population's heavy reliance on abundant but dwindling natural resources to support their livelihoods and contribute to their food security is also emphasized. The result, perhaps not surprisingly, is that the solutions proposed for Africa and other lower development regions focus heavily on natural capital being employed in a more efficient manner to achieve economic development.

The AfDB (AfDB 2013) and ECA (ECA 2012) also bring out Africa as host to some of the fastest growing economies on the globe. In 2010, six out of the top ten fastest growing economies in the world were African, with more expected to break through in the near future. Such feats however, have not necessarily been accompanied by the diminution of the challenges mentioned above.

Africa's minimal contribution to global greenhouse gas emissions along with characteristics listed above makes it a contender for leading the world into an era of sustainable green development (UNEP et al. 2011, ECA 2012). For the AfDB (2013), an opportunity for African countries to empower themselves also presents itself and the Green Economy provides a vehicle for achieving both. The Green Economy would make such development more resilient without affecting its accelerating trajectory (AfDB 2013, ECA 2012). Significant attention is usually given to the agricultural sector, access to energy, access to technology, employment and finance mobilization for the transition.

The agricultural sector is a mass provider of employment on the continent, supporter of (mostly rural) livelihoods and source of food security and holds an important place in the discussion of the Green Economy's potential for Africa. Despite the versatile benefits of agriculture to development, UNEP (2011) identifies a certain fragility of the sector in most LDCs as a structural constraint for a transition. Sustainable farming practices that can simultaneously ensure the protection of natural capital and food security while increasing productivity i.e. crop yields are therefore marketed as the most adequate. The promotion of small scale organic farming as an important contributor to the latter aim is also common and is another reason the region holds the position to lead in organic product markets as this practice is already present various areas.

Questions however have been raised about sustainable agriculture's ability to deliver on such expectations, when alternate purposes for agriculture such as biomass production are spreading as countries seek more efficient energy production (Muller 2009) or when technological choices lean towards mechanizing agriculture on larger scales, trading in labour intensity for higher productivity (Woodhouse 2010). Admittedly, more research remains to be done to establish the direct benefits of sustainable agriculture (ECA 2012). Similar concern, this time about the direct incomes available through forest conservation, are also raised since forest products make diverse contributions to rural livelihoods (AfDB 2013). The nature of this concern brings viability to suggestions for alternative income streams through payment schemes for conservation.

Another notable constraint is limited access to energy, especially in rural communities, that persists in many LDCs; a constraint all too real for African ones (AfDB 2013).

While the majority of African households still relying on wood as a source of energy, the expansion of national energy grids and further exploitation of fossil fuel reserves are shown to be environmentally and economically high-cost and unattractive options (AfDB 2013, OECD 2012, UNEP et al. 2011). Low carbon, preferably renewable alternatives are advised instead, for being more environmentally and economically sound choices in the long run. The accessibility of some of the green energy technology for small rural communities is also used to make this point, as is the need for greener, more efficient housing and transport planning for the continent's rapidly urbanizing population. For this shift to be achieved, significant investment into the access to, deployment and development of green technologies; for many LDCs in Africa, the cost is very high, as is acknowledged by the OECD (2012).

Institutional reform however, can contribute to lightening some of the load by setting up more attractive investment environments and promotion of domestic innovation, research and development (AfDB 2013). Supporting the latter may not necessarily be an easy feat, as local innovation may not be very competitive on the international market (OECD 2012) especially if informed by indigenous knowledge which is not attributed the same value as conventional science (People's Summit 2012, OECD 2012). Increasingly stringent and detail oriented intellectual property rights laws -not only for energy production but also in agriculture- also pose an obstacle in relation to technology transfer and ownership (Barton and Osborne 2010, OECD 2012). This could lead to a market divide in terms of technology producer-countries and consumer-countries, rendering one group dependent on the other in the long run –an arrangement which is neither resilient nor sustainable.

Following the 'conventional' Green Economy logic, it is expected that shifts in the management of agricultural, energy and other natural-resource-dependent and labour-intensive sectors (e.g. Tourism) will generate employment opportunities that will outbalance the current unemployment rates. This is considered even more feasible if an accompanying strategy in national education is tailored to the skill needs of such sectors (ECA 2012).

Last but not least, as already hinted in different parts of this section, the transition towards the Green Economy requires a large financial input. Investment and other forms of financing

need to be harnessed to facilitate the implementation of the shifts advised -another challenge characteristic of African countries.

The AfDB (2013), while it acknowledges the importance of external sources of financing as other institutions do (ECA 2012, OECD 2012, UNEP et al. 2011) places particular emphasis on the need for regional and sub-regional funding mechanisms. These, with African States at the helm, would support the creation of market incentives for the demand and supply of local and/or regional green products, savings and investments. Such initiatives would undoubtedly require high-level political commitment from African leadership (AfDB 2013) – this is where regional gatherings such as the African Economic Conferences can and do play a part, as they are space in which this commitment can either be strengthened or eroded; a keynote speaker's speech at such a gathering can in turn influence the proceedings towards either outcomes, as this study contends.

In the international policy arena (e.g. the UN), African countries have individually and collectively voiced concerns about the recommendations made by institutions such as those referenced above. Two major concerns pertain to the dangers of African countries finding themselves in less than favourable positions international trade (if different green policies were to result in trade protectionism) or in international cooperation negotiations (if new green conditionalities were to be placed on existing and future aid agreements (Bär et al. 2012, ECA et al. 2011, Doran et al. 2012, Ocampo et al. 2011).

Another concern is in light of the region's relatively minimal contribution to global carbon emissions which led to an agreement on principle of common but differentiated responsibilities for countries in their efforts to fight climate change (Doran et al. 2012, ECA et al. 2011). Green Economy negotiations included some of the more developed countries arguing for common responsibility in ensuring a transition for all countries (Bär et al. 2012), opening (wilfully or not) the door for some of these countries to renege on past commitments to support LDCs' efforts.

In addition, the recognition that the Green Economy does not carry "one-size fits all" policy prescription as countries have different context needed to be made explicit in negotiations, as did every state's sovereign to determine the manner in which their resources are exploited (Doran et al. 2012, ECA et al. 2011). These two requests bring certain flexibility to the concept, allowing countries to take 'ownership' of it to match their individual context. Such openness to the ownership of the concept, this study proposes, may further reduce the likelihood that the debate surrounding its definition be settled in the short term, as each country interprets it within different contexts and developmental schools of thought.

All these concerns have since been integrated as principle clauses in the African consensus (ECA et al. 2011) and outcome documents of the Rio +20 conference (UNCSD 2012) requiring all countries to steer away from such practices. An apparent agreement on these principles can be considered an early step, although small, towards the building of consensus around what the Green Economy should not result in.

The Green Economy, ultimately, is marketed as an opportunity for the African region to meet a multitude of its feature challenges in the face of climate change threats and high population growth rates in the long term. It would allow many countries to leap frog previous as well as current economic stages of development that have had damaging impacts on the environment and on people's livelihoods. Examples of African initiatives are already being exhibited as models for all countries to follow. Kenya, for example has been applauded for putting in place successful feed-in tariffs to ensure a market for renewable energy production, as has Uganda's national holistic agriculture policy which promotes the use of organic farming systems (UNEP 2010).

Chapter 3
Argumentation and Framing: Theory and Methodology

Argumentation and Framing

In a sense, what the previous section presents is a large, general argument for Africa's transition towards a Green Economy. These arguments are made by international and regional institutions and are not just designed for an African audience, but for an international one too. This study looks at how, in a space where the audience is for the majority African, one of their peers constructs an argument on the same matter – a look at the argument from 'within' the community, while paying particular attention to language use.

Argumentation is an example of language-in-use, that is, the specific application of language to justify and build support for a particular viewpoint or set of viewpoint (Van Dijk 2011). Speech, the object of analysis here, is typical location of such language use. Language use is not simply a static interpretative event but rather one that can have impacts beyond the boundaries of speech and text – it can shape attitudes, thoughts and ultimately actions (Blommaert 2005, Van Dijk 2009, Wodak 2013).

Closer attention to the way language is used, given the apparent complexity of its interpretation, is therefore justified and argumentation analysis is one way of exploring this as it can reveal a lot of relevant information beyond the generalized identification of a message in text or speech. Through such analysis, systems of identification, assumptions, categorizations or attribution of meanings that are the building blocks of particular beliefs can be brought to light whereas a surface 'reading' would miss these (Emmel et al. 1996).

The combination of these systems provides access to the logic, informal or formal, that supports the conclusions made in a speech for instance (Emmel et al. 1996)

The meanings –conclusions – carried throughout an argument for or against a message are in fact constructed in relation to contrasting viewpoints and identities. Identities, e.g. "us" versus "them", are reflections of understandings of what constitutes the 'self' and the 'other' (Hansen 2013). Meanings also house systems of valuation, when certain components or aspects of an issue are emphasized or chosen over others (Hansen 2013). Through the establishment of identities and values therefore, links can be drawn between meanings to create an overarching view on that particular issue.

If an individual's utterances can construct identities, values and categories in the manner outlined above, it is safe to assume that such construction also occurs and is reinforced at a larger social scale as individuals and groups interact with each other and strive to have their viewpoints accepted (Wodak and Meyer 2009). It is in this construction process that the interest of this study lies: in the construction of a meaning of the Green Economy within and for the African context. The hope is to reveal aspects of this meaning and by extension of the debate around the concept's definition that are not always obvious or explicit, 'subtleties' that bring further nuance to it.

With a goal to persuade, argumentation requires a strategy; rhetoric. The strategy can include appeals to emotions, moral bases, and draw from authority in knowledge and/or social status – all to attract attention, gain trust and acceptance from an audience (McCloskey 1994). Numerous ways of using language to achieve this exist and the use of tropes is but one of them. Tropes are instances when words are used in a sense other than their literal one to illustrate a point. Metaphors and similes are examples of tropes.

Metaphors – when an object or phenomena is described in terms of another – are commonly used and powerful tropes. They can be used to summon emotion or project images in a manner that resonates with an audience and facilitates their understanding of an idea (Kovecses 2002, Steger 2007). Through metaphors, the speaker's perspectives on an object or phenomena can be discovered (Alexander 2008). Any relevant references to relations, changes, states or causes are also demonstrated. These illustrations via metaphors, therefore, contribute to the construction of a lens of reasoning – a frame – that has the capability of guiding the thoughts and actions of an audience.

The notion of frames, or framing, has its roots in both the disciplines of linguistics and psychology. The notions linguistic foundation stems from a group of scholars' belief that language is not simply have static effects in its utterance but can have impacts beyond the boundaries of speech or text. Its effects include shaping attitudes and ultimately societal structures and relationships (Fairclough 2001, Wodak 2013) thereby shaping individual and collective psychological stances on particular subjects. Thus, people's thoughts and attitudes are the result of such effects which often merge, overlap or clash to produce their actions and reactions – people think and act through multiple frames (Goffman 1974, Ryan and Gamson 2006).

Frames spread their orators' preferred norms and conventions through particular language choices, patterns and use, which their adherents eventually and unconsciously adopt (Gasper et al. 2012). Entman (1993) defines framing as a deliberate act of selection and emphasis of certain aspects of reality, with an aim of promoting specific problem definitions, causal interpretation and recommendations for subsequent action. Thus frames, like arguments, manufacture meanings of various phenomena or objects through their ability to delineate "what exists, what happens and what matters" (Gitlin 1980) - they are "underlying structures of belief, perception and appreciation" (Schön and Rein 1995).

In policy circles therefore, policy framing – a deliberate construction of meanings around policy issues - can and is used by policy makers as a tool for setting the political agenda on particular policy issues, orienting it towards their desired recommendations (Gasper et al. 2012, Rein and Schön 1996).Outlining a problem by emphasizing certain aspects while downplaying or excluding others generate a distinctive manner of understanding it. The resulting problem definition in turn serves to validate links made for the causal links, blame and responsibilities drawn. Recommended actions and the moral basis upon which they are made therefore solidify this logic.

When the problem, causality and actions are then framed in way that resonates with a target audience on a personal level (Gamson et al. 1992), carries empirical credibility (d'Anjou 1996) or achieves both, this audience may consider it viable enough to influence, if not guide their thoughts and actions vis-à-vis the object or phenomena of interest. Here, it is understood that framing not only creates lenses through which problems can be perceived and understood but also offer options for solving these so as to serve particular individual or collective interests, much like the employment of rhetoric for the delivery of arguments in the hope that these bring about desired support and action.

Frames do not exist in isolation and are not spontaneously generated. In constructing their frames, orators often draw from a range of already existing frames either with intent to amplify and maintain these or to identify and exploit ideological linkages between them. On the matter of this frame 'co-dependence', Benford and Snow (2000) contribute that frames do not simply emerge as aggregations of individual perceptions but are rather the result of negotiated shared meanings among orators of similar perspectives. All the same, an argument pulls together multiple such frames, through different assignment of meanings, identities and categories. As illustrated, multiple links can be drawn between framing and argumentation as co-dependent exercises.

Doing Analysis: Approach, Warnings and Methodology

This study will attempt to identify such a lens, for understanding the relevance of the Green Economy for Africa. Through the framing analysis of a speech given by late Ethiopian Prime Minister Meles Zenawi on Green Economy and Structural Transformation, the theme for the 6th Annual African Economic Conference hosted in Addis Ababa on October 2011, the study seeks to identify an alternate way of thinking about the Green Economy *for* Africa in contrast and comparison to some of the selling points discussed by various international institutions (see previous section).

Following from the theory discussed above, it is very likely that through his speech, Prime Minister Zenawi provides an insight into an alternative reading of the relevance of and attitude towards the Green Economy in an African context. The combination of argumentation and framing analyses allows one to explore this. As debates rage on about identifying a specific definition of the concept, and as many countries especially African ones argue for flexibility and 'ownership' of the concept to some extent, the emergence of differentiated understanding of and motivation for transitions to the Green Economy will have some effects on these debates. The diversity of meaning for this transition countries and their governments carry may reduce the chances of a single definition ever being agreed upon, and where the motives are not necessarily those called upon by the likes of UNEP or the OECD, curbing a certain crisis such as climate change, might no longer be one of the lead motivators for the transition but may very well be demoted to being a secondary priority or a simple by-product of Green Economy strategy. Through the practice argumentation and framing therefore, meanings of objects, events, and concepts can be manipulated to serve a desired purpose.

Argumentation and aspects of framing analyses look for patterns of language use that result in meaning making with an aim to promote specific attitudes and actions towards an issue. Multiple approaches to doing so have been proposed.

For framing, analysts like Heumann (2013), for example, take a micro-analytic approach by looking at the emotive and cognitive resonance of language use and their ability to create individual and collective identities. Others, like Hansen (2013) explore persistent underlying 'macro' frames or ideas that hold a massive influential potential. Such exploration echoes Dombos et al's (2009) description of metaframes, "overarching frames of a higher level of generality that "can be operationalized as the normative aspects of issue frames" (Dombos et al. 2009): 7). Researchers like Wooffitt (2005) find the latter approaches to be too generalized and riskily simplistic as they do not consider the fluidity of the language used in their construction, missing more subtle aspects of its messages.

Antaki et al. (Antaki et al. 2003) warn about this risk of overgeneralization that comes with analysis of this nature, as it relies on claims that the text reflects such mega-frames or discourses e.g. 'neo-liberal' or 'Marxist' framing. This research does not seek to identify and label frames but rather looks to the constructed meanings that come together to create a particular lens that supports proposed attitudes to take towards the issue being discussed, and its relevance for a particular political community. Antaki et al. (Antaki et al. 2003) also warn about the dangers of over-selectiveness and over-interpretation within a text or speech e.g. through over-quotation or reading into the meanings beyond their relevant context, that could lead to an under-analysis. Adding to concerns with such methodological enterprise, Wodak (2013) and Van Dijk (2011) both warn about the risk of misinterpretation when the analysis is performed without due contextualization of the text, speech or other communicative media and call for a combination of both micro and macro approaches with sound contextual analysis and relevant theoretical backing.

This study will take heed of these warnings, by beginning with setting the context for the conference within the greater international discussion on the transition towards a Green Econ-

omy and the realms of transformation necessary for its implementation. For systematic micro-analysis which responds to the concerns of Antaki et al. (Antaki et al. 2003) above, the research draws inspiration from Scriven's (1976) seven steps for analysis to look at Prime Minister Zenawi's argument.

FIGURE 1: SCRIVEN'S SEVEN STEP MODEL FOR ARGUMENT ANALYSIS

1. Clarification of Meaning *Clarifying the meanings of terms, phrases, sentences, suggestions and arguments. Attention is paid to ambiguity, (un)stated assumptions as well as the identification of components of the text.*	**2. Identification of Conclusions** *Locate (un)stated conclusions. Indicators such as the use of "therefore", "because" or "so" or placement of cues at the end of paragraphs, taking into account the possibility of one the existence of multiple conclusions in an argument. Identify any main and/or secondary conclusions.*
3. Portrayal of Structure *Establish links between conclusions and premises in the various arguments, paying attention to assertions made in support of conclusions, instructions, rhetoric, or intentional repetition.*	**4. Formulation of Assumptions** *Identifying the arguer's explicit assumptions and differentiating these from the minimal, basic assumptions necessary to link premises to the arguer's conclusions and lastly stronger, optimal assumptions that are logically and independently well-supported e.g. through scientific study.*
5. Criticism of Inferences Premises *Assessing the reliability of claims made in support of conclusions and of the logic used to link them. This can be done through counter-exampling e.g. by looking for instances where, in similar context, the inference or premises do not hold.*	**6. Other Relevant Arguments** *Consider the existence of arguments that share a similar view and of those that reach different conclusions.*
7. Evaluate the whole argument (in light of findings from steps 1 through 6)	

Adapted from Scriven (1976) and Gasper (2000)

Scriven's (1976) approach is a flexible and exploratory one that allows the identification of both structure and content in an argument and assess these, complementing other approaches that prescribe their templates as universally valid, limiting the nature of arguments that can be investigated (Gasper 2000). In isolation, the steps above reveal little but when used in combination and in relation to their context contribute to clarify underlying beliefs and comprehension behind key messages in the speech. The first four steps contribute mostly to empirical part of the analysis, while the last three build towards synthesis and discussion.

Lastly, possible implications of Prime Minister Zenawi's speech for both the definition and implementation of the Green Economy, especially in comparison to concerns arising from the sustainable development concept, will be discussed to conclude the study.

Focusing on one speech may not necessarily lead one to identify a dominant (or less so) framing of the Green concept, let alone help identify a comprehensive stream of discourse on the matter. The analysis of multiple speeches, in varying environments would be best suited for such objectives. The speech however, provides as a *sample* of what could be a wider, global expe-

rience in constructing meanings of one or more concepts to fit specific contexts, audiences or to suit particular interests – a door opened in the absence of a universally accepted and applicable definition and interpretation of a concept. The analysis of the sample can shed light on the challenges, weaknesses and strengths of various definitions and interpretations of a concept encountered through this construction exercise and as such serves the purpose of this study's scope and intentions. Given that the unit of analysis is a sample the conclusions extrapolated from the speech are not treated as 'tried and tested' but rather discussed in terms of their potential implications.

Chapter 4
Arguing for Africa's Transition towards a Green Economy

Context for Prime Minister Zenawi's speech

The Sixth African Economic Conference (AEC) was jointly organized by the ECA, the AfDB and UNEP in Addis Ababa, Ethiopia and took place from October 25th to 28th in 2011. Launched in 2006 by the AfDB, the conference was to be a platform for sharing and strategizing to alter the status of a large number of sub-Saharan countries that had entered the 21st century as some of the poorest countries in the world. At the time the region's economic performance as a whole, was on the decline.

Subsequent conferences stayed close to the original theme, which was succinctly formulated as "Africa's Economic Recovery and Long Term Growth" in the fourth and fifth conferences. The context for the sixth conference however was different. UNEP had released its Green Economy report a few months before, as had multiple preparatory meetings for the 2012 United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20) and the United Nations Climate Change Conference in Durban, South Africa was around the corner. The combination of these and multiple international and regional organization pushing for countries to begin the transition to the Green Economy had renewed heated debates on sustainable development and climate change in Africa and worldwide.

The region was considered to be at an important stage of its development path, as many African countries had been registering record economic growth rates yet were still failing to counter climate change threats to agricultural productivity, food and water security, disease control, biodiversity and land degradation. Solutions to address these challenges and ensure long term development had to be found and following AEC tradition academics, research institutions, think-tanks, development practitioners and African policy makers gathered with this goal in mind; to strategize and debate adequate ways forward. Today the AEC is considered the premier and highly influential forum where policy decisions on Africa's development trajectory are made.

The political context for the Green Economy in Africa had already been set however, with multiple ministerial and regional recognitions and commitments being made. The 2009 Bamako Declaration for example, recognized that "the opportunities provided by a growth and development trajectory that embraces the Green Economy model" needed to be taken advantage of. Almost two years later, a Ministerial Statement from African Ministers of Economy and Finance recorded their commitment "to plat [their] part to spearhead the transition to a Green Economy in Africa."

The Head of State of the host country at the time, the respected – and at times feared- Prime Minister Meles Zenawi gave the official opening speech for the event, setting the tone for the discussions that ensued. Prime Minister Zenawi was a vocal supporter of the Green Economy both for Africa as a region and for his home country and helped steer Ethiopia as one of the first African countries to design its developmental plan with the Green Economy as a basis. This speech was given almost a year before his death and has been considered one of the most frank speeches on the Green Economy by an African leader.

Step-wise Analysis of Prime Minister Zenawi's speech:

The 5.5-page speech has two clearly identifiable sections, with the first one focusing on establishing the need for and usefulness of a transition to the Green Economy for African countries. The second section deals with the mobilization of resources for the implementation of the transition and offers some ideas to consider on the way forward. To facilitate analyses, these sections were further broken down into smaller blocks, each carrying a particular main theme. An analysis table allows is used to organized this block and systematically work through Scriven's first four steps (see Appendix II). For better orientation regarding quotes, line numbers and bold font have been assigned to the annexed copy of the speech (Appendix I) and are indicated at the end of the quote in the following format : **[line number]**. For example, **"pleased" [2]** refers to line number 2 beginning "how pleased I am…"

In exploring the argument for and the potential framing of the Green Economy in this speech, the analysis looks to highlight the nature of the problem, the potential solutions and the enabling conditions required for the transition as expressed by the Prime Minister. Of particular interest are the importance given to climate change, the environment-development linkages made, the role of technology in the transition, the dynamics of financial resource mobilization and any space for reshaping the umbrella concept created through the selective conceptualization of these themes.

On Climate Change

The first point addressed for the illustration of the problems Africa faces that allow a discussion on the Green Economy to be necessary is the climate crisis.

However, the importance of the climate crisis, which is repeatedly referred to as "global warming" [16, 20, 26, 107] throughout the speech, is portrayed as something foreign in relation to African countries. The crisis is assumed to be something that did not previously exist, often spoken of as a problem that was "created". The responsibility, blame for it and perhaps by extension the level of concern for "the problem" lies with a relatively undefined, non-African 'other'. This perspective is expressed when he says "[Africans] did not create global warming…" [9-10], "problems created by others" [23-24] or repeatedly refers to "those who created the problem" [14-15, 105].

The Prime Minister consequently does not consider Africa's contribution to climate solutions to be impactful, concluding that "…nothing [Africans] do is going to affect its trajectory much" [10] and classifies such contribution to be non-obligatory, optional even when he describes it as "an enormous service" [105] done to "humanity as a whole" [104]. Africa's concern and intervention in the climate change is therefore likened to an optional act of kindness.

In further treatment of the topic, the consequences of the climate crisis are inflicted on Africa by others (it is no natural phenomena) and logic follows that reparation ensues – "It would therefore be natural and fair that we be compensated… for the damage to our economies caused by [it]." [106-107]

The climate crisis's importance for Africa is not a motivational factor for transformation – "[it] is not the main reason why we embark on such a path" [46-47] - but is relevant in giving Africa the right to compensation, being a victim of its consequences and given that there is an 'other' identifiable perpetrator. The conclusion made here, is that the climate crisis is not the logical point of departure for understanding Africa's need for transformation or the Green Economy.

However, if solved as a legal matter, the crisis can be a source of financial resources that can go towards structural transformation.

The prime minister's understanding of the importance of the climate crisis for African countries stands in contrast to the treatment of the same subject in publications (some of them from African regional institutions) discussed in chapter 2 where emphasis is placed on the vulnerability of the region with regards to climate change and the urgency of actions that need to be taken. Prime Minister Zenawi creates distance from such a perspective while calling on aspects of the climate justice's movement that treat the crisis as a legal matter.

This relative downplay of the climate crisis shows the speaker's use of selectivity in his argumentation strategy, which here may serve as a reinforcement of the request for the application of the common but differentiated responsibility principle argued for by many African and other developing countries (Ocampo et al. 2011). It may also draw attention to a particular the Prime Minister was known to be an advocate of, that is, the climate debt owed to African countries by the world's top carbon emitters. From such perspective, the Prime Minister's speech can be considered to indirectly provide a strategy for financing the implementation of African countries' transition towards the Green Economy by attempting to reinforce the delicate alliance between African countries and build further pressure against the world's top carbon emitters which at times also happen to be donor countries in international development cooperation – a process that he had previously led but during which he faced considerable criticism for inconsistency (Muchie and Baskaran 2013).

With regards to the view that Africa's efforts towards combatting climate change are minimal at best, there is a risk that, if such a message were to resonate with policy makers and be duplicated in their home countries, collective efforts to tackle climate change impacts may be reduced or slowed down over time. Overlooked here too is the established fact that African livelihoods are affected by and need to become resilient against such threats (AfDB 2013, UNEP et al. 2011) regardless of African countries' role in 'creating' the climate crisis. This reflects a failure to integrate the social aspect of the concept, which has been criticized by some scholars (Cook and Smith 2012) and even climate justice proponents from whom the speaker borrows perspective (Bond 2010).

On Natural Resources: Agriculture and Renewable Energy

The greater and primary importance is the general state of the continent's resource base which is described as weak, unprotected, diseased and currently unable to support the region's growth. Zenawi uses words like "plagued' [23], "vulnerability" [25] and "exposed" [27] and "threatened" [28] to convey this view.

His instruction of rehabilitation [33] of the resource base -the "hills and mountains" [33, 35] - is not defended, which can be understood given his draw upon scientific knowledge on the matter that has long been accepted by the various interpretive communities in his audience. The issues of land degradation and soil erosion have been recognized by the community he addresses.

Contrary to the climate crisis, the blame here is shared by others and the African community. In his use of "our own mismanagement" [24], lies an admission of guilt but also of knowledge gaps – the latter can also be read in his use of "strange" [27] when describing the flood and drought combinations experienced.

The recommendations on his part to "improve" [31] and "promote" [32] are not presented as options but rather imperatives. He builds a great sense of urgency and drastic action (which can also be felt in other parts of the speech) through combinations of "act quickly" [30] or "very seriously" [28] and "radically mitigate" [30] and repeated use of "we need to" [30] "we cannot…

without…" [22, 33-34] serve to emphasize his message. These also place a collective responsibility on the audience and beyond ("mobilizing the labour of our people" [43]), thereby not singling out any person, institution or community but rather attempting to unify and organize Africans around this cause.

The "vital" [38] and central [41] role of the natural resource base is emphasized and its economic contributions in terms of livelihoods is mentioned almost as a secondary point, as is its additional ability to help with the climate crisis by creating carbon sinks - "icing on the cake" [45-47].

Recognizing concerns about the need for new technology and large injections of money that Africa does not have early in his speech [11-15], Prime Minister Zenawi attempts to respond to these in this section: "[it] does not require much additional money…[or] any new technology" [44]. The solution given is rather unassuming; "all it requires" [45] is social and political mobilization as already identified in the previous paragraph. Simplicity characterizes the solution to the challenge of agricultural transformation.

Raising another aspect of the resource base the argument broaches a second reason for Africa's transition to the Green Economy; renewable energy resources. Considered a gift and a valuable one at that, the size of Africa's endowment [61] in renewable energy resources is repeatedly described as "enormous" [62, 65] or "huge" [63], also reflecting the limitless availability of the resources.

There is an aspect of uncertainty or experimentalism about the venture into renewable energy, as it is "untapped" and will reach full potential "as and when" the necessary technology becomes economically viable. The stress of the resources' "potential" [64-65] however, does much to convey a sense of hope and faith, be it scientifically or emotionally, as does the certainty with which the Prime Minister speaks of renewable energy as the only viable option [70-74] in the long term. The advice here therefore is to proactively [67] embark on the venture that is renewable energy production.

Presenting agriculture as more than farming activity but also forest and water resources, Prime minister makes natural resources the undisputable priority area of intervention and transformation and the doorway to other forms of development: "We cannot even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without transforming our agriculture. [22-23]" In addition, action to launch agricultural transformation does not require monetary and technological means beyond those that Africa already has.

Both in terms of agriculture and energy, the Prime Ministers speech contains a certain emotional resonance, as it builds from a desolate picture to one of hope and ends with quasi-excitement on the matter of renewable energy. Speaking on renewable energy, its viability is first and foremost a matter of availability and relative cost and almost indirectly a contribution to reduced carbon emissions. Renewable energy is also the theme through which technological advancement (previously deemed sufficient for agricultural transformation) is considered a pivotal component of the Green Economy.

Contrary to the proposal that environmental stewardship be fostered through the valuation of natural resources as most dominant publications mentioned in previous chapters do, the Prime Minister appeals to emotion and a sense of urgency, also hinting at the close dependence of the African population on and responsibility to their natural surroundings. Adding to the discussion on stewardship is an explicit reference to sustainable management and harvesting from the resource base, forests specifically; a balanced consideration that implies both protection but continued cautious use of resources. This statement echoes parts of the debate around access to natural resources for those most dependent on them, especially in the rural areas, for the sake of protecting a resource (Fairhead et al. 2012, People's Summit 2012). The problem therefore does not lie in market failure but is rather an almost ethical one of mismanagement.

This view would resonate to a certain extent with proponents of alternative values of nature as expressed in the People's Summit (2012), especially in ecological and sociological circles. This approach in the speech however, is limited to agriculture and unfortunately perpetuates a human-nature relationship where the latter must be looked after in order to remain in service to the other. Here, one component (environmental) of sustainability is conceptualized to serves the objectives of another (social). This can also be seen in the mention of people's (social component's) economic value in the green economy nexus as labour, meeting the needs of its economic component. Such relationships, where one component takes precedence over the other is another risk of the compartmentalization of a concept's components , with failure to adequately and equally address the all spheres of the final objective of sustainability (Ciegis et al. 2009).

When speaking of renewable energy resources, there is a constant referral to how limitless the resources are – a sense of limitlessness that could be extended to growth, production and even consumption. Coupled with the oversimplification of the solutions to transform the agricultural sector, the speech carries an attitude of non-consideration of the no-growth option but also of manageable and negotiable limits to growth (Jabareen 2008) – an attitude deemed to have resulted in the multiple crises faced today (Brand 2012), stemming from the neoliberal ideologies the Prime Minister later criticizes. The appraisal of the viability of renewable energy in cost-benefit terms also borrows from this ideology.

Another point of contradiction is also revealed through the link made between renewable energy generation and the reduction of carbon emissions; the climate crisis is deemed relevant in this context, as is the potential contribution of African countries in the fight against climate change. The Prime Minister, consciously or not, uses different perspectives of the crisis in an 'African context' to serve dual but contrasting purposes and interests.

On Technology

The Prime Minister establishes a clear link between technology and the Green Economy and treats this link as permanent and one that cannot be circumvented.

He also treats the eroding popularity of carbon based technology as a given, as a fact that "most people know" [85]. Carbon based technologies is relegated it to old technology [95] and strongly dissuasive phrases like "prohibitively expensive" [86] and "make our planet unliveable" [87] build a destructive and costly contrast to green technologies, especially for cost-sensitive policymakers or for development practitioners in the audience.

Green technologies are described with inspirational optimism repeatedly in a short space of text. From "technologies of the future" [88], to "(if) the future is in green technologies"[91] to the all-encompassing "the future of the world is green"[93] the speech not only attempts to build a new fact (through repetition) but also draws up a time dimension other than urgency to the discussion. Green technology is displayed as a plane of competition, of racing, as African countries have to "catch-up" [90, 92-93] to "advanced" [91] countries. "Foresight" [84] or proactivity is advised here too as a necessary strategy for technological transformation. Following this exposé-like tactic, the Prime Minister relies on and trusts his audience's ability to identify investment in green technology as the logical choice against old technology -"[it] makes a lot of sense" [87]. Overtly mentioning financial resources as part of his proposed strategy for the first time in this section, the Prime Minister proceeds to amplify their importance and international dynamics of their acquisition by African countries in the second part of the speech.

The keen interest in technology, again, perpetuates the perception that planetary (environmental) boundaries are negotiable rather than inarguably limiting. The focus on technology is also of an economic nature as the reference to competitiveness echoes the typical economic understanding of development as progress measured in terms of economic growth. This is further supported by the separation of 'advanced' and other countries along this line.

It is also within this space that Ethiopia's other detached role, as a competitor of and potential leader of other African countries emerges, as the Prime Minister draws on it as an example repeatedly. Given the high possibility that representatives of the private sector and other emerging economies are present, it would not be far-fetched to suspect that the Prime Minister's intention is also to market his own country as a viable target for external investment to support its renewable energy ambitions (Martinot et al. 2002) through this speech, somewhat undermining the 'African' alliance he tries to encourage in other parts of the speech.

Regarding the future of green technology, the optimism in the speech is palpable and perhaps with reason as there are identifiable trends showing that fossil fuels are depleting and that more prohibitive measures are being taken against it (Green 2010). However, the rate of depletion is predicted to be slow enough for them to be available for another century and they remain the current best choice, based on the same cost-benefit approach the Prime Minister (Shafiee and Topal 2009). The time factor of green technology development and economic viability is therefore not properly considered and neither is the role of intellectual property rights in both limiting and facilitating access to certain technologies which carry both political and social implications (Hall and Helmers 2013). The unstated assumption that all technological advancement is geared towards being a considerably harmless 'green' is also an unsubstantiated generalization. A tendency for generalization is also visible in the next part of the speech.

On Implementation: Financial Resources Mobilization

Prime Minister Zenawi treats the complexity and difficulty of financial resource mobilization as an almost natural occurrence, given a history of what he at times refers to as a "struggle" [111] or a "forcefully" [110] argued or earned "right" [115].

His speech also approaches the acquisition of financial resources from some external sources by Africans as a legal matter, especially in terms of international climate change negotiations but advises, again, that other solutions exist outside of this setting. Reiterating that the themes discussed at the conference are "too urgent and too important" [113], points concludes that African countries are in a better position to cater to their best interests, something that others' ironic, "tender mercies" [113] cannot be relied on to attain. The use of ironic language and references to conflict-laden events reiterates the controversial, "provocative" [4] nature of the themes under discussion.

A call is made for the ownership of the conditions for acquisition of the necessary and consequently of their structural transformation and Green Economy must be taken by African countries as a collective. The accompanying strategy proposed is the underexploited one of self-reliance and independence "without intermediation" [160] as African capabilities have been underestimated – "we have sold ourselves short" [121] - and left largely untapped. Africa as a collective and Africans themselves are resources for implementation [117-119].

In this section, the Prime Minister also expresses his belief about a certain 'order' that should exist between the labelled advanced and "emerging" [128, 135, 164-165] countries, assuming that financial resources should flow from the rich former to the less rich latter and calling out the unnatural occurrence of the opposite as an unbeneficial "anomaly" [134]. In usual pro-and-con fashion, the alternative, investment in African opportunities is painted as hugely profitable yet untargeted, perhaps subtly questioning the reasoning of the emerging countries.

Despite the call for ownership of the process, there is a strong emphasis on partnerships and that of collective versus individual bargaining by African countries which are considered to have been limitedly successful in the past. However, referral to the failure of past initiatives and their stalemate is mentioned as a caution. The speech's treatment of the matter identifies the (minimized [147]) "African State" [144] as an ideological opposite to an (economically impairing

[150]) "neo-liberal onslaught" [143] – another indication of polarization surrounding structural transformation.

This discussion also explicitly supports the call for transformation to occur in structural form but also in ideological form, noting that "[Africans] cannot solve the gap in infrastructural investment by limiting [themselves] to the neo-liberal thinking that created the problem in the first instance. [154-156]" There is an accompanying need for new ideologies to be employed.

Prime Minister Zenawi ends his speech by expressing his faith in the audience's ability to provide (better) solutions for the implementation of both structural transformation and Green Economy.

Here again, the idea of the climate debt is brought up and advocated for on behalf of African countries as a collective – a role the Prime Minister was used to taking on as former lead negotiator on climate matters for NEPAD, the AUC and the African Group at UN Climate Negotiations.

In this section too, more explicitly than in previous ones, distinctions between different economies and their groupings are made, as are calls for particular types of alliances. Along the lines of economic growth, the advanced and emerging economies are grouped separately. There are however repeated attempts to separate African countries from the former, not just as a category but also in terms of reliance and prior 'dependence'. This independence from the advanced countries is not only financial but indirectly ideological, as the neoliberal ideology is pitched against the "African state". Such separation can also encourage the emergence of alternative interpretations not only of Green Economy, but in future, of other terms that are likely to emerge from international negotiations.

The Prime Minister's use of an ideology whose application he claims is flawed, to convince his audience of the viability of renewable energy earlier in his speech is contradictory at the very least. This weakens part of the underlying premises of his argument in its entirety but also reflects the influential and staying power of neoliberal thinking; across environmental policy (Arsel and Büscher 2012) and with regards to the Green Economy particularly (Brockington 2012).

The grouping of African countries around financial needs and expectations in the speech may appear as a unifying point when in fact, the conflicting demands and views within the group of African countries, for example in the negotiation of the climate debt (where the attainment of political solidarity remains a challenge) (Bond 2010), is overlooked.

Another unstated argument from the speech however, is that the typical pivotal placement of the climate debate in international development and environmental policy may at times serve as an obstacle to the implementation of a transition towards a Green Economy. This can be visible with regards to climate change negotiations surrounding the climate debt and the unhonoured but unfortunately non-binding commitments made some of the advanced countries that fail to successfully transfer resources to LDCs, African ones especially. It also reflects how the objectives of various concepts, when treated as separate, can clash and ultimately impede the implementation of this concept, as seen with sustainable development (Giddings et al. 2002).

The mention, yet again, of the climate crisis though, re-establishes the crisis' relevance and importance despite its near-dismissive treatment in the opening parts of the speech. From this we can infer that the crisis, regardless of the perspective employed to conceptualize it, remains a central objective or concern of the Green Economy concept.

Extracting Meanings of the Green Economy

The opening lines of the speech's block on technology contain the clearest phrase stating the Prime Minister's opinion on Africa's Green Economy: "…we have to create a Green Economy…"

The speech doesn't directly provide a definition of the Green Economy, especially given that it interchangeably referred to it as "green development" or the "green path"; its aim was to establish the relationship between it and Africa and consequently establish its relevance for the continent. However, the language used in the speech and the manner in which it was used reveals more than these relationships and perhaps more that this explicit aim as previously discussed theory predicted (Emmel et al. 1996, Scriven 1976).

For example, the Prime Minister use of "we cannot…without…" hints at the 'composition' of the Green Economy by highlighting what cannot be excluded from it. Agricultural transformation, resource base rehabilitation and increased electricity generation for instance, may be considered components of a Green Economy. Through these components, specific goals are marked i.e. resilience to floods and drought or zero carbon emission energy generation. These usually more detailed goals paint a developmental vision for each sector, making are the Green Economy a little more than 'just a concept' to be defined. Clear goal setting helps with the identification of a concept but also with facilitates the building of models for its implementation (Ciegis et al. 2009).

The relationship established between are the Green Economy and structural transformation is a very close one and by the end of the speech, an almost undeniable one. The nature of the connection is explicitly made but a co-dependence is established reflecting the use of structural as a necessary action for the transition to the Green Economy, which is discussed as resource allocation through investment in leading publications (UNEP 2011, OECD 2011). However, the Green Economy is also portrayed as almost automatically leading to structural transformation – in fact Prime Minister Zenawi identifies it as "the only way" to achieve structural transformation on two occasions. The Green Economy therefore, can also be a toolkit (of policies for instance) and many authors treat it as such (Allen and Clouth 2012).

The Green Economy in this speech, in service of structural transformation is a different type of opportunity; one for the region to collectively take more control over some of its developmental choices e.g. in the nature of partnerships for resource mobilization and also to transform ideologically. This message is reinforced through the creation of various country identity groups and polarizations (Hansen 2013, Heumann 2013) throughout the speech. We are given a hint that the Green Economy is not only a discursive space (seen in the Prime Minister's early acknowledgement of the scepticism surrounding the issue or his reference to a neoliberal attack) but also a space in which power and control are competed for (Goodman and Salleh 2013). This also indirectly redefines structural transformation as not only a transfer of resources from one economic sector to the other, but also between countries and -perhaps most important for African countries- of control and power.

Noticeably absent from the speech, problems and solutions especially, are the objectives of the social facet of structural transformation and the Green Economy, ones that look beyond their direct income benefits to the population. A speech of this nature propagates an oversight that has been and still is being criticized (Boström 2012, Cook and Smith 2012). The same can be said of the absence of talk about a correction of habits and practices by the individual African, especially given the admitted mismanagement of natural resources (People's Summit 2012).

The several of key components of the concept, along with the multiplicity of their interpretations and linkages reveal the complexity and multidimensional qualities of the Green Economy concept. Within the speech, these are understood in different ways and applied selectively to

serve specific purposes. This observation supports the proposal that the adoption of the Green Economy concept, especially as countries are given flexibility on its implementation, may very well be fragmented and consequently makes a general or uniform identification of a Green Economy a difficult task in the long term.

Chapter 5
Concluding Remarks

The analysis of Prime Minister Zenawi's speech, through an in-depth look at language-in-use has provided a multi-perspective mental map of how a Green Economy can be interpreted, frequently straying from the 'leading' Green Economy definitions provided by organizations such as UNEP, the OECD or even the AfDB. This study has not only helped expose strengths and weaknesses in an influential and authoritative figure's speech but has also gone beyond and provided insight into understanding the speech's ability to produce meanings for a Green Economy.

Apart from the malleable nature that the Green Economy concept as a whole appears to have inherited through contestation of its meaning, another layer of malleability can be seen through the manipulation of the climate crisis to serve different interests within the same speech. One can therefore witness through this sample that the components or other concepts within the Green Economy, may themselves be open to reinterpretation in the absence of a universal definition for their over-arching or 'umbrella' concept. This may be the case for Green Economy in the context of sustainable development.

However, as illustrated through the Prime Minister's initial attempt to side-line climate change and repeated return to the concept in the latter parts of the speech, it is possible to identify components of the concept that are essentially difficult to circumvent and that form a point of reference for the concept's partial identification and interpretation. As such, not *all* aspects may be malleable. Perhaps, in efforts to secure characteristic features, cross-cutting principles for integrative comprehension and implementation of such a concept as attempted for sustainable development by Jabareen (2008) can be built around these 'core' components. These evaluative principles may reduce the chances of a fragmented adoption and implementation of the Green Economy concept. They could also help in building alternative criteria for its identification and guide the design of measurable indices to mark and compare progress between countries. Sustainable development's millennium goals were similar to these principles but were only applicable to individual pillars and not all three.

Like sustainable development before it (Redclift 2006), the Green Economy concept carries potential contradictions of its own, as Brand (2012) suggests. This is visible in the contradictory positions the speaker perhaps unconsciously finds himself in relation to the application of neoliberal ideology or of the different value of nature attributed for agricultural and the renewable energy purposes. Such contradictions fuel contestation of the concept, making the creation of consensus around one or even a handful of meanings for it ever more difficult.

The speech's revelation of the impracticality of applying certain views, needs and demands uniformly on what are essentially heterogeneous communities, e.g. African countries, makes a reasonable argument in favour of this multiplicity, as countries may have common but differentiated goals and potentially conflicting identities. While the multiple and at times co-existing interpretations of the Green Economy and its components may be desirable for country leaders with different financial means, natural resource base and social development priorities, there remains the risk that the concept's core objective of global sustainability will be undermined or missed, especially if a compartmentalized approach to it persists.

The interaction of the different perspectives from each country may also re-shape their identities and roles in relation to each other in the long term, encouraging alliances and groupings along criteria different from those currently applied in international arenas (Harvey 2009). Perhaps in the long term, it is from such newly formed blocks and their co-existing perspectives

or policies that fewer, more accepted but negotiable meanings of the Green Economy concept will emerge making its definition less amorphous over time.

It has been demonstrated with the guidance of argumentation and framing theory that the Green Economy concept carries within the debate of its definition, characteristics similar to those of sustainable development. The concept's currently contested definition exposes it to various risks of manipulation and misuse which could ultimately render it powerless regarding its ability achieve its equally contested concept of sustainable development, a necessity that is no longer arguable.

Although highly unlikely at the immediate future, consensus around a single or few closely related definitions is necessary if global sustainability is to be achieved and if this achievement is to be identifiable. Perhaps, the solution towards consensus building lies not in semantic construction of a definition but rather in other approaches such the identification of cross-cutting goals and principles within closely related interpretations of the concept.

References

AfDB (2013) 'African Development Report 2012: Towards Green Growth in Africa'. Tunis: AfDB.

Alexander, R. (2008) *Framing Discourse on the Environment: A Critical Discourse Approach*. NY: Routledge.

Allen, C. and S. Clouth (2012) 'A Guidebook to the Green Economy Issue 1: Green Economy, Green Growth, and Low-Carbon Development–History, Definitions and a Guide to Recent Publications'. UNDESA.

Antaki, C., M. Billig, D. Edwards and J. Potter (2003) 'Discourse Analysis Means Doing Analysis: A Critique of Six Analytic Shortcomings', *Loughborough University* Accessed 1 November 2013 <https://dspace.lboro.ac.uk/dspace-jspui/handle/2134/633>.

Arsel, M. and B. Büscher (2012) 'Nature Inc.: Changes and Continuities in Neoliberal Conservation and Market-Based Environmental Policy', *Development and Change* 43(1): 53-78.

Bär, H., K. Jacob and S. Werland (2012) 'Green Economy Discourses in the Run-Up to Rio 2012', FFU Report. *Freie Universiteit Berlin* Accessed 1 November 2013 <http://www.polsoz.fu-berlin.de/polwiss/forschung/systeme/ffu>

Barbier, E.B. (2009) A Global Green New Deal. Report prepared for the Economics and Trade Branch, Division of Technology, Industry and Environment. *UNEP*.

Barbier, E., A. Markandya and D.W. Pearce (2013) *A New Blueprint for a Green Economy*. Abingdon, Oxon; New York, NY: Routledge.

Barton, J.H. and G.E. Osborne (2010) 'Intellectual Property and Access to Clean Energy Technologies in Developing Countries'.

Benford, R.D. and D.A. Snow (2000) 'Framing Processes and Social Movements: An Overview and Assessment', *Annual Review Of Sociology* : 611-639.

Blommaert, J. (2005) *Discourse: A Critical Introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bond, P. (2010) 'Climate Debt Owed to Africa: What to Demand and how to Collect?' *LINKS International Journal of Socialist Renewal* Accessed 27 November 2013 <http://links.org.au/node/1675>.

Boström, M. (2012) 'A Missing Pillar? Challenges in Theorizing and Practicing Social Sustainability: Introduction to the Special Issue', *Sustainability: Science, Practice, & Policy* 8(1): 3-14.

Bradshaw, M. (2013) 'Introduction', in M. Bradshaw (ed.) *Global Energy Dilemmas: A Geographical Perspective*, pp. 1-22. Polity.

Brand, U. (2012) 'Green Economy the Next Oxymoron? No Lessons Learned from Failures of Implementing Sustainable Development', *GAIA-Ecological Perspectives for Science and Society* 21(1): 28-32.

Bray, D. (2010) 'The Scientific Consensus of Climate Change Revisited', *Environmental Science & Policy* 13(5): 340-350.

Brockington, D. (2012) 'A Radically Conservative Vision? The Challenge of UNEP's Towards a Green Economy', *Development and Change* 43(1): 409-422.

Brundtland, G.H. (1987) 'Brundtland Report: Our Common Future', Comissão Mundial.

Bullard, N. and T. Müller (2012) 'Beyond the 'Green Economy': System Change, Not Climate Change', *Development* 55(1): 54-62.

Ciegis, R., J. Ramanauskiene and B. Martinkus (2009) 'The Concept of Sustainable Development and its use for Sustainability Scenarios', *Inzinerine Ekonomika-Engineering Economics* 2(62): 28-37.

Cook, S. and K. Smith (2012) 'Introduction: Green Economy and Sustainable Development: Bringing Back the 'social'', *Development* 55(1): 5-9.

Dahl, R. (2010) 'Green Washing: Do You Know what You're Buying?', *Environmental Health Perspectives* 118(6): A246.

Dahle, K. (1998) 'Toward Governance for Future Generations: How do we Change Course?', *Futures* 30(4): 277-292.

d'Anjou, L. (1996) *Social Movements and Cultural Change: The First Abolition Campaign Revisited*. Brunswick N.J: Transaction Publishers.

Dombos, T., A. Krizsán, M. Verloo and V. Zentai (2009) 'Critical Frame Analysis: A Comparative Methodology for the QUING Project', *ECPR First European Conference on Politics and Gender*, pp21-23.

Doran, P., D. Paul, K. Ripley, N. Risse, J. Van Alstine and L. Wagner (2012) 'Summary of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development: 13–22 June 2012', *Earth Negotiations Bulletin (ENB)* 27(51): 1-24.

Doran, P.T. and M.K. Zimmerman (2009) 'Examining the Scientific Consensus on Climate Change', Eos, *Transactions American Geophysical Union* 90(3): 22.

Du Pisani, J.A. (2006) 'Sustainable Development–historical Roots of the Concept', *Environmental Sciences* 3(2): 83-96.

Dunlap, R.E. and A.M. McCright (2011) 'Organized Climate Change Denial', *The Oxford Handbook Of Climate Change and Society* : 144-160.

Eastin, J., R. Grundmann and A. Prakash (2011) 'The Two Limits Debates: "Limits to Growth" and Climate Change', *Futures* 43(1): 16-26.

ECA (2012) 'A Green Economy in the Context of Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication: What are Implications for Africa?'. Addis Ababa: ECA.

ECA, AfDB and AU (2011) 'Africa Consensus Statement to Rio+20'. Addis Ababa: ECA.

Edey, M. (2009) 'The Global Financial Crisis and its Effects*', *Economic Papers: A Journal of Applied Economics and Policy* 28(3): 186-195.

Emmel, B., P. Resch and D. Tenney (1996*) Argument Revisited, Argument Redefined: Negotiating Meaning in the Composition Classroom*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Entman, R.M. (1993) 'Framing: Toward Clarification of a Fractured Paradigm', *Journal of Communication* 43(4): 51-58.

Fairclough, N. (2001) *Language and Power*. London: Pearson Education.

Fairhead, J., M. Leach and I. Scoones (2012) 'Green Grabbing: A New Appropriation of Nature?', *The Journal of Peasant Studies* 39(2): 237-261.

Fergus, A.H. and J.I. Rowney (2005) 'Sustainable Development: Lost Meaning and Opportunity?', *Journal of Business Ethics* 60(1): 17-27.

Gamson, W.A., D. Croteau, W. Hoynes and T. Sasson (1992) 'Media Images and the Social Construction of Reality', *Annual Review of Sociology* : 373-393.

Gasper, D., A.V. Portocarrero and A.L. St Clair (2012) 'The Framing of Climate Change and Development: A Comparative Analysis of the Human Development Report 2007/8 and the World Development Report 2010', *Global Environmental Change* 23 (1): 28-39.

Gasper, D. (2000) 'Structures and Meanings: A Way to Introduce Argumentation Analysis in Policy Studies Education', ISS Working Paper Series/General Series 317: 1-30. The Hague: Institute of Social Studies.

Giddings, B., B. Hopwood and G. O'Brien (2002) 'Environment, Economy and Society: Fitting them Together into Sustainable Development', *Sustainable Development* 10(4): 187-196.

Gitlin, T. (1980) T*he Whole World is Watching: Mass Media in the Making & Unmaking of the New Left: With a New Preface*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Goffman, E. (1974) *Frame Analysis: An Essay on the Organization of Experience*. Harvard University Press.

Goodman, J. and A. Salleh (2013) 'The 'Green Economy': Class Hegemony and Counter-Hegemony', *Globalizations* 10(3): 411-424.

Green Economy Coalition (2012) 'The Green Economy Pocketbook: The Case for Action'. *GEC* Accessed 1 November 2013 <http://www.greeneconomycoalition.org/updates/green-economy-pocketbook-case-action>

Green, B. (2010) 'Fossil Fuel Subsidies are 10 Times those of Renewables, Figures Show', *The Guardian* 3.

Hall, B.H. and C. Helmers (2013) 'Innovation and Diffusion of Clean/Green Technology: Can Patent Commons Help?', *Journal of Environmental Economics and Management* 66(1: 33-51.

Hansen, L. (2013) *Security as Practice: Discourse Analysis and the Bosnian War*. NY: Routledge.

Harvey, D. (2009) 'Reshaping Economic Geography: The?World Development Report 2009', *Development and Change* 40(6): 1269-1277.

Headey, D.D. (2013) 'The Impact of the Global Food Crisis on Self-Assessed Food Security', *The World Bank Economic Review* 27(1): 1-27.

Heumann, S. (2013) *Sexual Politics and Regime Transition: Understanding the Struggle Around Gender and Sexulaity in Post-Revolutionary Nicaragua (Perspectives on Gender)*. NYRoutledge.

International Chamber of Commerce (2011) 'Ten Conditions for a Transition Towards a "Green Economy"' ICC.

Jabareen, Y. (2008) 'A New Conceptual Framework for Sustainable Development', *Environment, Development and Sustainability* 10(2): 179-192.

Jacobs, M. (2012) 'Green Growth: Economic Theory and Political Discourse', Grantham Research Institute on Climate Change and the Environment Working Paper 92. *London School of Economics*.

Jacobs, M. (1993) *The Green Economy : Environment, Sustainable Development and the Politics of the Future*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Jenkins, T. and A. Simms (2012) 'Challenge Paper: The Green Economy - Stakeholder Forum', pp. 1-9 , Stakeholder Forum.

Jessop, B. (2012) 'Economic and Ecological Crises: Green New Deals and no-Growth Economies', *Development* 55(1): 17-24.

Kahuthu, A. (2006) 'Economic Growth and Environmental Degradation in a Global Context', Environment, *Development and Sustainability* 8(1): 55-68.

Kosoy, N. and E. Corbera (2010) 'Payments for Ecosystem Services as Commodity Fetishism', *Ecological Economics* 69(6): 1228-1236.

Kovecses, Z. (2002) Metaphor: A Practical Introduction. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kuhlman, T. and J. Farrington (2010) 'What is Sustainability?', *Sustainability* 2(11): 3436-3448.

Lander, E. (2011) 'The Green Economy: The Wolf in Sheep's Clothing', *Amsterdam: Transnational Institute* : 6.

Martinot, E., A. Chaurey, D. Lew, J.R. Moreira and N. Wamukonya (2002) 'Renewable Energy Markets in Developing Countries*', *Annual Review of Energy and the Environment* 27(1): 309-348.

McCloskey, D. (1994) 'How to do a Rhetorical Analysis, and Why', *New Directions in Economic Methodology* : 319-342.

Meadows, D.H., D.H. Meadows, J. Randers and W.W. Behrens III (1972) *The Limits to Growth: A Report to the Club of Rome (1972)*. New York: Universe Books.

Meadows, D., J. Randers and D. Meadows (2004) *'A Synopsis, Limits to Growth: The 30 Year Update'*, Sustainability Institute: Chelsea Green Publishing Company .

Morrow, K. (2012) 'Rio 20, the Green Economy and Re-Orienting Sustainable Development 1', *Environmental Law Review* 14(4): 279-297.

Muchie, M. and A. Baskaran (2013) *Innovation for Sustainability: African and European Perspectives*. Oxford: African Books Collective.

Muller, A. (2009) 'Sustainable Agriculture and the Production of Biomass for Energy Use', *Climatic Change* 94(3-4): 319-331.

Norgaard, R.B. (2010) 'Ecosystem Services: From Eye-Opening Metaphor to Complexity Blinder', *Ecological Economics* 69(6): 1219-1227.

Ocampo, J.A., A. Cosbey and M. Khor (2011) 'The Transition to a Green Economy: benefits, challenges and risks from a sustainable development perspective', Report by a Panel of Experts to Second Preparatory Committee Meeting for United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development. Division for Sustainable Development, UNDESA, .

OECD (2012) *'Green Growth and Developing Countries – A Summary for Policy Makers'*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

OECD (2011) *'Towards Green Growth'*. Paris: OECD Publishing.

Oreskes, N. (2004) 'The Scientific Consensus on Climate Change', *Science* 306(5702): 1686-1686.

Oreskes, N. and E.M. Conway (2010) *Merchants of Doubt: How a Handful of Scientists Obscured the Truth on Issues from Tobacco Smoke to Global Warming*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.

Pearce, D.W., E. Barbier, A. Markandya, Great Britain and International Institute for Environment and Development (1989) *Blueprint for a Green Economy*. London: Earthscan Pubs.

People's Summit (2012) 'Another Future is Possible: Texts Drafted on the Basis of Findings of the Thematic Groups of the Thematic Social Forum'. Rio de Janeiro: People's Summit.

Quental, N., J.M. Lourenço and F.N. da Silva (2011) 'Sustainable Development Policy: Goals, Targets and Political Cycles', *Sustainable Development* 19(1): 15-29.

Redclift, M.R. (2006) 'Sustainable Development (1987-2005): An Oxymoron Comes of Age', *Horizontes Antropológicos* 12(25): 65-84.

Rein, M. and D. Schön (1996) 'Frame-Critical Policy Analysis and Frame-Reflective Policy Practice', *Knowledge and Policy* 9(1): 85-104.

Robinson, J. (2004) 'Squaring the Circle? Some Thoughts on the Idea of Sustainable Development', *Ecological Economics* 48(4): 369-384.

Ryan, C. and W.A. Gamson (2006) 'The Art of Reframing Political Debates', *Contexts* 5(1): 13-18.

Sachs, W. (1999) 'Sustainable Development: On the Political Anatomy of an Oxymoron', 'Sustainable Development: On the Political Anatomy of an Oxymoron', Planet Dialectics: Explorations in Environment and Development, pp. 71-89. London: Zed.

Schön, D.A. and M. Rein (1995) *Frame Reflection: Toward the Resolution of Intractable Policy Controversies*. NY: Basic Books.

Scriven, M. (1976) *Reasoning*. NY: McGraw-Hill.

Shafiee, S. and E. Topal (2009) 'When Will Fossil Fuel Reserves be Diminished?', *Energy Policy* 37(1): 181-189.

Steger, T. (2007) 'The Stories Metaphors Tell: Metaphors as a Tool to Decipher Tacit Aspects in Narratives', *Field Methods* 19(1): 3-23.

Steiner, A. (2011) African Ministers of Finance, Planning and Economic Development. 'Speech Delivered at the 2011 Joint Annual Meetings of African Union Conference of Ministers of Economy and Finance and the Economics Commission for Africa Conference'. Addis Ababa: UNEP.

Sudhakara Reddy, B. and G.B. Assenza (2009) 'The Great Climate Debate', *Energy Policy* 37(8): 2997-3008.

ten Brink, P., L. Mazza, T. Badura, M. Kettunen and S. Withana (2012) 'Nature and its Role in the Transition to a Green Economy', A TEEB report. Accessed 1 November 2013 <www.teebweb.org > .

The Danish 92 Group (2012) 'Building an Equitable Green Economy.' The Danish 92 Group Forum for Sustainable Development.

UNCSD (2012) 'The Future we Want, Outcome of the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20)'.

UNDESA (2009) 'Technical Note: A Global Green New Deal for Climate, Energy, and Development, UNDESA.

UNEP (2011) 'Towards a Green Economy: Pathways to Sustainable Development and Poverty Eradication' UNEP.

UNEP (2010) 'Green Economy: Developing Countries Success Stories', UNEP.

UNEP and ILO (2011) 'Green Jobs: Towards Decent Work in a Sustainable, Low-Carbon World', UNEP.

UNEP, UNCTAD and UN-OHRLLS (2011) 'Why a Green Economy Matters for Least Developed Countries', UNEP.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2011) Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction. Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2011) 'Introduction: The Study of Discourse', in T. Van Dijk (ed.) *Discourse Studies: A Multidisciplinary Introduction*, pp. 1-9. London: Sage.

Van Dijk, T.A. (2009) *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Verzola Jr., P. and P. Quintos (2012) 'Green Economy: Gain Or Pain for the Earth's Poor?' IBON International.

Verzola, J. (2013) 'Économie Verte: Un Bien Ou Un Mal Pour Les Pauvres?', *Alternatives Sud* 20(1): 85-108.

Waas, T., J. Hugé, A. Verbruggen and T. Wright (2011) 'Sustainable Development: A Bird's Eye View', *Sustainability* 3(10): 1637-1661.

Wodak, R. (2013) 'Critical Discourse Analysis', in K. Hyland and B. Paltridge (eds) *Bloomsbury Companion to Discourse Analysis*, pp. 38-53. London: Bloomsbury.

Wodak, R. and M. Meyer (2009) 'Critical Discourse Analysis: History, Agenda, Theory and Methodology', Methods of critical discourse analysis 2: 1-33.

Woodhouse, P. (2010) 'Beyond Industrial Agriculture? some Questions about Farm Size, Productivity and Sustainability', *Journal of Agrarian Change* 10(3): 437-453.

Wooffitt, R. (2005) *Conversation Analysis and Discourse Analysis: A Comparative and Critical Introduction*. London: Sage.

Zaccai, E. (2012) 'Over Two Decades in Pursuit of Sustainable Development: Influence, Transformations, Limits', *Environmental Development* 1(1): 79-90.

Appendix I - Speech by Prime Minister Zenawi of Ethiopia

Keynote Address
by

H.E. Mr Meles Zenawi

Prime Minister of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia
on

"Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa"

October 25, 2011

Excellencies

Ladies and Gentlemen

I am honoured to welcome the participants of this august gathering to Addis and to express how pleased I am to join you today.

The topic of your discussion for this year's gathering Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa is an apt if not **provocative** one. Many people I am sure would agree with you that the fundamental issue for us Africans is that of structural transformation of our economics and not mere growth of our GDP. Green economy is however an altogether different thing.

I am sure many Africans will ask what green economy has got to do with us. **We did not create global warming** and **nothing we do is going to affect its future trajectory** much. We are unlikely to be the source of new technology green or otherwise. So what indeed has green economy got to do with us? Why should we think of **introducing green technologies** which could be **more expensive than the alternatives**? Why shouldn't we simply concentrate on growth and transformation and leave the green thing to **those who created the problem** in the first instance and **who can afford to embark** on a new and largely untried course?

I can think of three good reasons why green growth is and cannot but be an essential element of Africa's structural economic transformation and none of them have much to do with what we as Africans can or should do to mitigate **global warming**.

We cannot even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without transforming our agriculture. Our agricultural sector is **plagued by problems created by others** and by **our own mismanagement**. Much of our land has been cleared of tree cover resulting in massive land degradation, soil erosion and **vulnerability** to both flooding and drought. As a result of the **global warming** that has already happened we have become more **exposed** to **strange combinations** of drought and flooding. The resource base of our agriculture is **very seriously threatened**.

We need to **act quickly** to stop or at least **radically mitigate** soil erosion. **We need** to **improve** the moisture retention capability of our soil, recharge our underground water resources and increase the flow of our rivers. If we are to **promote** irrigated agriculture to adapt to the changes we have to **rehabilitate** our degraded **hills and mountains. We cannot hope** to mitigate the impact of droughts and floods **without** a massive re-afforestation of our **hills and mountains.**

But the impact of such a massive re-afforestation programme will not be limited to its effect on soil erosion and water management. The trees we plant would become **vital sources of new income** for our farmers if we can sustainable manage and harvest them.

Green development involving massive re-afforestation water management and soil conservation programmes is **thus centre to any hope of transforming agriculture** and improving the income of our farmers.
Much of such work can be done by **mobilizing the labour of our people** and **does not require much additional money**. **It certainly does not require any new technology**. **All it requires** is the political will and social mobilization. Such a programme would also create a massive **carbon sink** in the continent, but that is as it were the **icing on the cake** and **not the main reason why we embark on such a path**. The main reason why we have to embark on such a green path of agricultural development is **because that is the only way we can sustain a meaningful agricultural sector** in the current global environment and **because that is the only means we have to preserve the source base** of our agriculture so that we can then transform it. It also happens to be something that we can do with the resources and technology at our disposal.

Given the fact that agriculture is the main stay of our economies, embarking on a green path of agricultural development **will of necessity mean that green development becomes a pillar of our overall goal of economic transformation**. That is why **we in Ethiopia** have embarked on green development in agriculture including through the re-afforestation of up to 15 million hectares of degraded land.

The second reason why we can and should embark on green development as part of our structural economic transformation is because **we are richly endowed** with green and renewable sources of energy. We in Africa have **enormous untapped resources** to generate power from renewable sources. We have **huge** hydro power and wind power **potential**. We have significant **potential** in geothermal energy and with the greening of our agriculture we will have **enormous potential** for modern bio-energy development. **As and when** the technology develops and becomes competitive with other sources of energy our abundant solar power resources **will come in handy**. **There cannot be** any talk of structural economic transformation **without** massive increase in the electricity we generate. And if we are to embark on such a massive programme we have to generate the electricity from the resource that we have in abundance and whose **opportunity cost is close to zero**.

That can only be done if we generate most if not all of our electricity from renewable sources. If we generate most or all of our energy from renewable sources then **we will have by design or default embarked on a green path** of economic transformation. That is why we in Ethiopia have decided to increase the electricity we generate five-fold in five years and do so from renewable sources only. That is why we plan to promote bio energy including second and third generation bio-fuels so that by 2025 when we expect to be a middle income country we will have close to zero net emission of carbon in our economy.

The third reason why **we have to create a green economy** has to do with global technological trends. It is true that International **Negotiations on Climate Change have been stuck in a quagmire** and are unlikely to get out of it any time soon. **But this has not**

stopped those countries and companies that have the foresight and the resources from massive and concerted investment in green technologies**. Most people know that** carbon based energy resources are going to be **prohibitively expensive** even before they **make our planet unliveable**. It therefore **makes a lot of sense** for them **to invest in the technologies of the future which most certainly are going to be green**.

Structural economic transformation in Africa will require that we **catch up technologically** with the most **advanced nations**. If **the future is in green technologies our strategy for catch up** cannot be based on technologies that will be out of use by the time we catch up. **The future of the world is green** and when we plan for our future we must do so on the basis of green technologies. All the more so because we have not heavily invested in **old technologies** and we are as it were investing in a green field.

It seems to me that structural economic transformation and green development in Africa not only go together but are virtually inseparable. Our topic today is therefore very timely and appropriate.

As usual our problem is less in charting our course for the future and more in implementing our chosen course. More often than not the problem of implementation revolves around availability of resources for implementation.

As we embark on green development we will be doing **humanity as a whole** and in particular **those who created the problem** in an enormous service. **It would therefore be natural and fair that we be compensated** not only for the damage to our economies caused by **global warming** but also for the services we render in mitigating it.

We have **forcefully argued** our case in the past and I am sure we will do so in the future. But even as we embark on **the struggle to get every penny that we deserve** we should recognize the issue of green development and structure economic transformation in Africa are **too urgent and too important** to be left to the **tender mercies** of the good will of others. We have to find a more reliable source of funding even as we insist on payment by other that is **due to us by right**.

We should first and foremost look at options of **mobilizing our own resources.** As I said earlier much of what needs to be done to embark on green development of our agriculture can be done through **social mobilization and labour contributions of our people**. We should also do more to mobilize domestic resources for investment in electric power generation. I must say that **we have all sold ourselves short when it comes to domestic resource mobilization** for infrastructural investment. There is a lot of **untapped potential** there and **we should share experiences** on how to mobilize domestic resources for green infrastructure.

Contrary to views of some people, there is no shortage of investment funds in the world

today. Indeed the problem globally is that there is a glut of savings than cannot find suitably remunerative investment. As a result many **emerging countries** have been forced to lend their hard earned dollars at virtually zero interest rates to the most **advanced countries. The irony** is not only that the poor are lending to the rich, it is also that there are **huge profitable investment opportunities in Africa** and yet we have difficulty accessing the glut of savings in the system.

A number of mechanisms have been tried to address **this anomaly**. We have tried to access the resource at source and sought to borrow money from those emerging countries that have excess savings. **Some of us have been more successful than others** in doing so. We should try to do more of that but we have to realize that we will need additional mechanisms given the scale and scope of financing gap we face.

We have tried to work through the G20 to try to devise a mechanism that would mitigate the perceived risk of lending to Africa and to use the MDB's to mobilize additional resources for infrastructural investment in Africa. But **this approach appears to have reached a dead-end as a result of the ideologically driven neo-liberal onslaught on the African State.**

As you know the neo-liberal thinking that is dominant in these institutions believe the African state should limit itself to building schools, clinics and so called social infrastructure and leave the rest to the private sector. The only problem with that approach is we have done exactly that for 30 years and the result has been the massive gap in infrastructural investment that is **crippling the prospects of economic growth in our continent.**

Einstein is supposed to have said you cannot solve a problem by limiting yourself to the level of thinking that created the problem in the first instance. **We cannot solve the gap in infrastructural investment by limiting ourselves to the neo-liberal thinking that created the problem in the first instance**. And so while we cannot give up the fight to do more through these institutions we should at the same time seek other alternatives of accessing the global savings.

One such option would be to access the savings without intermediation by others but through multilateral rather than bilateral mechanisms. There are many alternatives of doing that. We have not in the past explored such a possibility as Africa's engagement with the major savers has been limited to bilateral contacts or Africa's engagement with one or the other **emerging** power. I believe the time has come for us to broaden our past engagements by approaching the **emerging** countries as a group to design mechanisms to enable us to directly access their savings for investment in green infrastructure. There are a few ideas to tackle the challenge but I am sure you the participants can come up with more and better alternatives.

I wish you success in your deliberations and thank you for your kind attention.

Appendix II – General Analysis Table for the Speech

COMPONENTS	MEANINGS OF TERMS, PHRASES, ETC.	CONCLUSIONS	ASSUMPTIONS
PART I – PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS			
BLOCK 1 - INTRODUCTION			
The topic of your discussion for this year's gathering Green Economy and Structural Transformation in Africa is an **apt** if not **provocative** one. Many people I am sure would agree with you that the **fundamental** issue for us Africans is that of **structural transformation** of our economics and not **mere** growth of our GDP. Green economy is however **an altogether different thing**.	*Very appropriate, suited to the circumstance;* *Referral to excitement as well as anger, challenging or confrontational, inflammatory or encouraging* *crucial, primary;* *large scale transfer of resources to other sectors, changing the structure of resource allocation* *Mere – strictly, only* *contrasting, foreign, perhaps unrelated*	There is a need to discuss the conference theme. Theme brings together concepts foreign to each other	Differences of opinion and attitudes regarding the theme exist Some people do not agree that structural transformation is a fundamental need for growth.
I am sure many Africans will ask what green economy has got to do with us. We did not **create** global warming and nothing we do is going to affect its future **trajectory** much. We are **unlikely** to be the **source** of new technology green or otherwise. So what indeed has green economy got to do with us? Why should we think of **introducing**	*Appeal to self-authority and reliability of knowledge, shows awareness of contrasting views and anticipates them.* *Make, invent, probably in this case 'cause';* *Direction, path, course* *Improbable, doubtful, implausible;* *Origin, provider/supplier* *Indirect assignment of blame elsewhere. Africa not in a position to nor should it have to act* *Bring in the new, in-*	Scepticism, uncertainty and failure to identify a relation to/interest in green economy by many Africans. Africa did not contribute to the climate crisis.	

green technologies which could be more expensive than the alternatives? Why shouldn't we simply concentrate on growth and transformation and leave **the green thing** to those who created the **problem** in the first instance and who can **afford** to embark on a new and largely **untried course**?	*itiate, establish familiarize or advance* *Environmental aspect of development (?) Green economy not 'known' or 'describable' or 'vague';* *Difficulty, puzzle, obstacle;* *Having enough means to pay, give, allow;* *Unexperienced, unproven, experimental*		
I can think of three good reasons why green growth is and cannot but be an **essential element** of Africa's structural economic transformation… …and none of them have much to do with what we as Africans can or should do to **mitigate** global warming.	*(Redundancy?) fundamental, indispensable component* *Purpose of speech revealed; to dispel scepticism and establish other links between Africa and Green Economy besides climate change.* *Alleviate, lessen, diminish*	Links between Africa and green economy other than climate change mitigation can be made. Green economy and structural transformation are compatible.	Structural transformation is the ultimate goal Obvious link between Africa and Green Economy is climate change
BLOCK 2 – AGRICULTURE			
We cannot even think of structural economic transformation in Africa without transforming our agriculture. Our agricultural sector is **plagued** by problems created by others and by our own **mismanagement**. Much of our land has been cleared of tree cover resulting in massive land degradation, soil erosion and **vulnerability** to both	*Overwhelmed, troubled, afflicted; Misconduct, negligence, incompetence* *Plague Metaphor: likened to disease or infection*	Agriculture sector is *the* priority sector for transformation. Both the resource base and the people are vulnerable, and the blame is shared.	

flooding and drought. As a result of the global warming that has already happened we have become more **exposed** to **strange** combinations of drought and flooding. The resource base of our agriculture is **very seriously threatened**.	*unprotected, weak* *unprotected, subjected* *odd, inexplicable, unexpected* *endangered, vulnerable* *Constant reference to vulnerability* *Emphasis of urgency.*		
We need to **act quickly** to stop or at least **radically mitigate** soil erosion. We need to **improve** the moisture retention capability of our soil, recharge our underground water resources and increase the flow of our rivers. **If we are** to **promote** irrigated agriculture to adapt to the changes we have to **rehabilitate our degraded hills and mountains**. We cannot hope to **mitigate** the impact of droughts and floods without a massive **reafforestation of our hills and mountains**.	*Sense of urgency. Repetition of "We need" "We cannot…without" in connection with positive actions - giving instruction, action must be taken, responsibility is collective.* *Reference to choice*	Corrective action is imperative, not optional. 'Healthy' hills and mountains build resistant/resilient resource base and people.	These 'problems' are not unsolvable. Forests are currently not in a state conducive to resilience.
But the impact of such a massive reafforestation programme will **not be limited to its effect on**	*Immense task; acknowledges instructions are challenging*		

soil erosion and water management. The trees we plant would become **vital sources** of new income for our farmers **if** we can sustainably manage and harvest them. **Green development** involving massive re-afforestation water management and soil conservation programmes is **thus centre to any hope** of transforming agriculture and improving the income of our farmers. Much of such work **can be done** by **mobilizing** the labour of our people and **does not require much additional money**. It certainly **does not require any new technology**. **All it requires** is the political will and social **mobilization**. Such a programme would also create a massive carbon sink in the continent, but that is as it were the **icing on the cake** and **not the main reason why we embark on such a path**. The main reason why **we have to** embark on such a green path of agricultural development is **because that is the only way** we can sustain a meaning-	*Emphasis of importance of forests;* *Condition for success* *Previously used "green thing" when echoing sceptics, now assigning clear term.* *Response to counterviews regarding affordability and need for new technology* *Organization, recruitment* *Icing Metaphor; emphasis that carbon sink is a 'bonus' – related to climate change again, circles back to fact that climate change is not the perspective taken in this speech.* *Journey metaphor*	We (Africans) are currently unable to manage forests or harvest sustainably Green development will lead to improved agriculture sector. We (Africans) too can and have other means to take corrective action. Achieving green development/green economy is a socio-political matter. Green Economy improves the agriculture sector. Green Economy is the only viable option, especially given the resources available	Green development and green economy are similar and/or connected. Ways other than the Green Economy have been evaluated for the transformation of African agricultural sectors

ful agricultural sector in the current global environment… …**and because that is the only means** we have to preserve the source base of our agriculture so that we can then transform it. It also happens to be something that we can do with the resources and technology at our disposal.	*for green economy* *Imperative, instruction* *Conclusion* *Conclusion* *Additional benefit/reason*		
Given the fact that agriculture is the main stay of our economies, embarking on a green **path** of agricultural development will of necessity mean that **green development becomes a pillar of our overall goal of economic transformation.** That is why we in Ethiopia have embarked on green development in agriculture including through the reafforestation of up to 15 million hectares of degraded land.	*Undisputable fact.* *Journey metaphor* *Ethiopia (home country) as example.* *"We in Ethiopia" – standing out of the crowd*	Green economy is central to economic transformation.	*Undisputable, normalized fact.*
BLOCK 3 - ENERGY			
The second reason **why we can and should embark on green development** as part of our structural economic transfor-	*Reiterates capability and imperative for transition to green economy* *Journey metaphor*	Renewable energy is a means through which Africa can	

mation is because **we are richly endowed** with green and renewable sources of energy. We in Africa have enormous **untapped** resources to generate power from renewable sources. We have huge hydro power and wind power **potential**. We have **significant potential** in geothermal energy and **with the greening of our agriculture** we will have enormous **potential for modern bio-energy development**. **As and when** the technology develops and becomes competitive with other sources of energy our **abundant solar power** resources **will come in handy**. **There cannot be any talk** of structural economic transformation **without** massive increase in the electricity we generate. And **if we are to** embark on such a massive programme **we have to** generate the electricity from the resource that we have in abundance **and whose opportunity cost is close to zero.**	*Gifted, capable* *Reflected value of renewable sources of energy for Africa* *Unexploited, unused* *Repeated use of potential – either accidental or an indirect admission of the experimental aspect of bio-energy development in Africa or scientific application (physics) of the word in relation to energy.* *Uncertain outcome* *Related terms: richly, abundant – more than enough;* *Reference to uncertain future and preparedness* *Condition for success* *Defining structural transformation* *Reference to choice*	achieve both Green Economy and successful structural transformation. The renewable energy market is still in its early stages. Choice to exploit renewable energy exploitation must be made based on costs.	Access to renewable energy sources is limited in other regions of the world Successful exploitation of renewable resources depends on access to appropriate technology (*may contradicts earlier statement that [transition to] the green economy did not require new technology)* *"Opportunity cost" – alternatives for massive electricity production exist.*

	Condition for choice		
That can only be done if we generate most if not all of our electricity from renewable sources. If we generate most or all of our energy from renewable sources then we will have **by design or default** embarked on a green path of economic transformation. That is why we in Ethiopia have decided to increase the electricity we generate five-fold in five years and do so from renewable sources only. That is why we plan to promote bio energy including second and third generation bio-fuels so that by 2025 when we expect to be a middle income country **we will have close to zero net emission of carbon in our economy.**	*Condition for success* *"Intentionally or not" embarked on a green path…* *Defining the green path* *Ethiopia as example, Ethiopian choice* *Ethiopia as example, Ethiopian choice* *Reference to fight against climate change goals.*	Electricity generation through renewable resources is the best choice. Electricity generation through renewable resources helps counter climate change.	Electricity generation through renewable resources has an opportunity cost close to zero. Renewable energy produces close to zero net carbon emission in the long term No other type of energy source is or will be competing with renewable resources
BLOCK 4 - TECHNOLOGY			
The third reason why **we have to create a green economy** has to do with global technological trends. It is true that International Negotiations on Climate Change have been stuck in a **quagmire** and are **unlikely to get out of it any time soon.** But this has not	*Imperative, instruction* *First explicit use of 'green economy' since introductory section* *Recognizes potential reason for concern.* *Difficult, complicated situation* *Lack of faith in negotiations?*	Technology is part of Green Economy and cannot be ignored.	

stopped **those countries** and companies that have the **foresight** and the resources from massive and concerted investment in green technologies. Most people know that carbon based energy resources are going to be **prohibitively expensive** even before they make our planet unliveable. **It therefore makes a lot of sense** for **them** to invest in the technologies of the future which **most certainly** are going to be green.	*identifying 'others'* *Prudence, forethought, far-sightedness* *Well-known 'fact'* *Trust the knowledge of the audience* *Dissuasive* *Conclusion, logical decision, identifying 'others'* *Faith in green technology's potential*	Countries need to be proactive vis-à-vis technological trends.	No other type of energy source is or will be competing with renewable resources.
Structural economic transformation in Africa will require that we **catch up** technologically with the most **advanced** nations. **If the future is in green technologies** our strategy for catch up **cannot** be based on technologies that will be out of use by the time we catch up. **The future of the world is green** and when we plan for our future we must do so on the basis of green technologies. **All the more so because** we have not heavily invested in **old technologies** and we are as it were investing in a green field.	*Reference to racing, competing* *Illogical decision making* *Repetition of position/belief* *Conclusion, supporting fact*	Carbon based energy will eventually be phased out as an option. Green technology *is* the future.	Carbon based energy is already losing popularity.

PART II – FINANCIAL RESOURCES FOR IMPLEMENTATION			
It seems to me that structural economic transformation and green development in Africa not only go together but are virtually inseparable. Our topic today is therefore very timely and appropriate. **As usual** our problem is less in charting our course for the future and more in implementing our chosen course. More often than not the problem of implementation revolves around availability of resources for implementation.	*Repeating viewpoint, conclusion and relevance of the conference* *Normalized, recognized situation/reality*	Availability of resources for implementation is the main obstacle.	
BLOCK 5 – REWARDING THE TRANSITION			
As we embark on green development we will be doing **humanity as a whole** and in particular **those who created the problem** in an enormous **service**. It would therefore **be natural and fair** that we be compensated not only for the damage to our economies caused by global warming but also for **the services we render in mitigating it**.	*The entire human species* *'others', placing blame/responsibility* *Favour, act of kindness, non-obligatory* *Normal, right - Moral appeal* *African countries as victims of climate change* *African countries as providers*	Adopting green development is benefits others too. African countries' decision to adopt green development should be rewarded.	African countries should not be committing to mitigating climate change
We have **forcefully** argued our case in the past and **I am sure we will do so in the future.** **But** even as we embark on the struggle to get **every penny** that we deserve… …we should recognize the issue of green	*Convincingly, insistently* *Legal reference* *Faith in African countries' efforts and abilities.* *Previous action insufficient* *Thoroughness;*	External funding is insufficient so alternative funding is necessary.	

development and structure economic transformation in Africa are **too urgent and too important** to be left to the tender mercies of the good will of others. **We have to** find a more reliable source of funding even as we insist on payment by others that is **due to us by right**.	*Time sensitive, valuable;* *Imperative, instruction, need to own and control process* *Legal language*		External funding is unreliable. A form of law attributing such rights to African countries exists.
BLOCK 6 – LOCAL RESOURCING			
We should first and foremost look at options of **mobilizing our own resources.** As I said earlier much of what needs to be done to embark on green development of our agriculture can be done through social mobilization and labour contributions of our people. **We should** also do more to mobilize domestic resources for investment in electric power generation. I must say that we have **all sold ourselves short** when it comes to domestic resource mobilization for infrastructural investment. There is a lot of **untapped potential**	*Independence, self-sufficiency* *Local, multi-level commitment and organization* *Instruction* *Expression of disappointment; Underestimate, failure to recognize potential/capacity*	African countries have underestimated the availability of their own resources for investment. There are unidentified resources and African countries can learn	Domestic resources are available and accessible.

there and we should share experiences on how to mobilize domestic resources for green infrastructure.	*Unexplored, under-exploited*	from each other.	
BLOCK 7 – ROLE REVERSAL			
Contrary to views of some people, there is no shortage of investment funds in the world today. Indeed the problem globally is that there is a glut of savings than cannot find suitably remunerative investment. As a result many **emerging countries** have been **forced** to lend their **hard earned dollars** at **virtually zero interest** rates to the most advanced countries. **The irony** is not only that the poor are lending to the rich, it is also that there are huge profitable investment opportunities in Africa and yet we have difficulty accessing the glut of savings in the system.	*Singles out sceptics, pessimists* *"other" grouping* *Countries have no choice;* *Obtained through a lot of effort* *Not beneficial; 'wasted' (?)*	Investment in Africa is more beneficial and profitable than lending to advanced countries.	The rich should be lending to the poor.
A number of mechanisms have been tried to address this **anomaly**. We have tried to access the resource at source and sought to borrow money from **those emerging countries** that have excess savings. Some of us have been more successful	*Abnormal relationship* *Identifying 'others', dividing the group further.*		

that others in doing so. We should try to do more of that but we have to realize that we will need additional mechanisms given the scale and scope of financing gap we face.			
BLOCK 8 – PAST EFFORTS AND ALTERNATIVE RESOURCES			
We have tried to work through the G20 to try to devise a mechanism that would mitigate the perceived risk of lending to Africa and to use the MDB's to mobilize additional resources for infrastructural investment in Africa. But this approach appears to have reached a **dead-end** as a result of the **ideologically driven neo-liberal onslaugh**t on the African State.	*Stalemate, impasse* *Ideological attack, assault, ambush*		
As you know the neo-liberal thinking that is dominant in these institutions believe the **African state should limit itself to building schools, clinics and so called social infrastructure** and leave the rest to the private sector. The only problem with that approach is we have done exactly that for 30 years and the result has been the massive gap in infrastructural investment that is **crippling** the prospects of economic growth in our continent.	*Well known fact, audience awareness* *Impairment, consid-*	Role of the state has been reduced. Neoliberal ideology has failed African countries and can no longer be relied upon.	African states' activities should not be limited

	ered offensive term		
Einstein is supposed to have said you cannot solve a problem by limiting yourself to the level of thinking that created the problem in the first instance. We cannot solve the gap in infrastructural investment by limiting ourselves to the neo-liberal thinking that created the problem in the first instance. And so while we cannot give up the fight to do more through these institutions we should at the same time seek other alternatives of accessing the global savings.	*Appeals to widely recognized scientific authority, paraphrases thoughts to support and illustrate a point and logic.*	New way of thinking, new ideology is needed.	
One such option would be to access the savings **without intermediation** by others but through multilateral rather than bilateral mechanisms. There are many alternatives of doing that. We have not in the past explored such a possibility as Africa's engagement with the **major savers** has been limited to bilateral contacts or Africa's **engagement** with one or the other emerging power. I believe the time has come for us to broaden our past engagements by approaching the emerging countries as a group to design mechanisms to enable us to directly	*Without intermediaries;* *'Other' groups* *Commitment or battle;*	Intermediaries are not always necessary and bilateral agreements reduce options for and potential for mobilization of resources	Multilateral agreements are not limiting. Emerging countries are better partners than past collaborators e.g. G20

access their savings for investment in green infrastructure. There are a few ideas to tackle the challenge but I am sure you the participants can come up with more and better alternatives.		Collective exchange can/will generate adequate alternative solutions.	
END OF SPEECH			