

# WHAT ARE THE PARTIES' POSITIONS ON SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT ?

## AN ANALYSIS OF THE ELECTORAL PROGRAMMES FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE ECOLOGICAL MOVEMENT

In the past election periods, the Mouvement Ecologique had sent questionnaires to the political parties asking them to indicate which suggestions / instruments proposed by the Mouvement Ecologique they supported and which they did not.

This year, the Mouvement Ecologique decided to go a different way. A synthetic summary of the electoral programmes in 5 key areas of sustainable development.



The suggestions of the Mouvement Ecologique for the 2023 national elections were already available in February, with the title “Eng Roadmap fir d’Legislaturperiode 2023 -2028” (available at [www.meco.lu](http://www.meco.lu)). **It is therefore interesting to see which elements are reflected in the election programmes of the parties or not.** These proposals of the Mouvement Ecologique are thus the basis of the analysis carried out. The analysis also looks at the extent to which parties hold opposing views on key sustainable development issues. In the opinion of the Mouvement Ecologique, this approach provides a more comprehensive picture than prefabricated questions.

The level of detail in the various party programmes and the weighting given to the different thematic areas vary greatly. While individual parties basically set out the orientation of the various measures in more detail, others opt for more general formulations. **These differences understanda-**

**ably complicate the analysis and are also reflected in it.** If a party lists instruments in detail on several pages, only exemplary proposals can be considered or commented on in the brief analysis. If only quite general statements are made, it is not always recognisable in which sense these are to be interpreted.

**In the following, the Mouvement Ecologique endeavours to outline the general orientation of the party programmes as best as possible from its perspective and to highlight the instruments that exemplify the spirit of the respective programme. The analysis has been carried out to the best of our knowledge and in all party-political neutrality.**

This will be limited to 5 thematic areas that are in the area of engagement of the Mouvement Ecologique and were also dealt with in detail in the above-mentioned “Roadmap”: Economy, Climate and Energy Policy, Regional Planning and Mobility, Nature Conservation and Agriculture and Democracy.

A review of all thematic areas of the party programmes with a greater depth of detail - would have gone beyond the scope and human resources in the limited time available, regrettable as this is... The 5 thematic areas mentioned are symbolic of the orientation of the programmes in the field of sustainable development and are likely to reflect the general attitude of the various parties to sustainable development issues.

The aim of the analysis is to help interested citizens and support them in forming their opinions. This is because the analysis - despite its brevity - wants to contribute to making different political perspectives and solutions clearer in order to tackle the social and economic transition.

**Proposals for which there is generally a largely cross-party consensus will no longer be commented on or particularly highlighted in the following.**

For example, all parties advocate the promotion of the circular economy, the expansion of solar energy, the reform of property tax, the expansion of public transport, the promotion of soft mobility, the promotion of new forms of housing, etc. (although there are gradations in the level of detail and also in the concrete proposals).

Since the primary aim of the following analysis is rather to present specific demands of the parties, these aspects - despite their importance - are not particularly emphasised in the analysis. However, the Mouvement Ecologique will remind the parties concerned of these promises when drawing up the coalition agreement.

*Individual parties not currently represented in the Chamber of Deputies have not been included in this analysis, given the limited capacities of the Mouvement Ecologique. This is because they either do not contest in all constituencies or their party programme was published quite recently.*

# GENERAL ASSESSMENT OF THE VARIOUS ELECTION PROGRAMMES



In the LSAP programme, there are quite detailed introductory texts in various thematic areas, in which it is stated that the current economic and social model is not sustainable and that a socially acceptable transition is necessary. Unfortunately, there is a certain discrepancy between this analysis, which is actually correct from a sustainability perspective, and the concrete programme of measures. Many of the action points mentioned in the general text are not reflected in the detailed programme of measures and the concrete proposals for implementation. This makes the assessment of the programme quite difficult. In addition, measures are often presented rather superficially and not in detail.

In the area of climate and biodiversity, one thus finds almost exclusively common statements, such as the expansion of renewable energies, which then also frequently represent a cross-party consensus.



*The programme contains fundamentally welcome statements, which, however, are not sufficiently reflected in the catalogue of measures, which is very general and rather limited.*



In its introductory text to the programme, the DP highlights its priorities, but does not mention the protection of the natural environment and the climate. In the corresponding chapters, however, the DP's programme is quite detailed and extensive. It names very concrete instruments and measures that tend to be positive and can make a real contribution in the sense of a transition.

The emphasis is on a policy of voluntary measures and incentives. At the same time, the state also needs to take responsibility by means of appropriate legal and regulatory frameworks in order to ensure the necessary transformation processes. The prioritisation of the DP in various areas, e.g. at the level of mobility policy or in the growth issue, remains unclear in some cases. One gets the impression that the DP, in a liberal sense, generally advocates that citizens and industry should be free to make their own decisions, while the state and municipalities should provide incentives.

*The DP's programme features a whole range of goal-oriented measures. However, in view of a certain orientation towards rather voluntaristic elements, the prioritisation is not necessarily recognisable.*





In the programme of “Déi Gréng”, the issue of sustainable development and ecological transition is presented very comprehensively and in detail with concrete measures in the various thematic areas. In the respective introductory texts of the party programme, it is clearly stated how great the need for action is and that climate and biodiversity protection must be the reference for political action. The party also addresses issues that are less or not reflected in other programmes, such as the importance of a transversal energy and climate protection policy, the establishment of a national heating company, and the need to analyse environmentally harmful subsidies.

Déi Gréng advocate a mixture of binding framework conditions as well as incentives, including subsidies, with special support for financially weak households. The importance of the CO<sub>2</sub> tax is outlined, but they are content with a modest progression from a scientific point of view. Regrettably, however, the party does not directly address the central issue of the growth constraint. Knowing that this question is also of fundamental importance for the World Biodiversity Council and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, this is a major shortcoming. Instead, it is conveyed that a good organisation of growth would solve the problems, although concrete proposals are made in this regard.



*The programme contains very concrete and detailed suggestions in the various sectors; however, the fact that the growth issue is not directly addressed is a clear shortcoming.*

In the CSV programme, one finds a few, mostly very general commitments to the importance of climate and biodiversity protection. As far as implementation is concerned, the programme remains mostly (also) very general. The constructive elements are in themselves rather underdeveloped, whereas aspects that the CSV currently sees as hampering the country’s development are often dealt with in more detail. There is talk of “pragmatic climate protection”, “pragmatic nature conservation”, a “climate policy without crowbars”, and so on.

Several times in the programme, the priority of economic development over climate and biodiversity protection is mentioned. It is explicitly stated that growth is a prerequisite for sufficient funds to be made available for the transition. The CSV relies primarily on a policy of incentives (including subsidies, fiscal instruments) and voluntary measures by actors in the climate and biodiversity sector. The general promotion of hydrogen (not only “green”), the considerable construction of more roads, the reduction of the competences of the Ministry of Environment, etc. are also highly problematic from the perspective of a consistent policy of sustainable development.

*From a sustainability perspective, the CSV’s election programme is extremely sobering and quite problematic in parts. Constructive proposals for the concrete implementation of sustainable policies are rather underdeveloped.*



Déi Lénk repeatedly emphasise the importance of ecological transition and give the issue quite a lot of space in their programme. The recognition of ecological boundaries is emphasised. In particular, the link between ecology and the social is established.

Déi Lénk make a whole series of proposals, especially of a structural nature, many of which are presented in great detail. The importance of the state in regulating economic activities, among other things, is explicitly emphasised several times. Déi Lénk advocate a mix of instruments, with rules, incentives and subsidies. An analysis of environmentally harmful subsidies should be carried out. The social justice of ecological measures is emphasised. The instruments mentioned by the party are certainly important for the necessary transition.

The question of growth is not explicitly addressed.

*Déi Lénk have concrete and coherent ideas with regard to a sustainable social and economic transformation, even if aspects such as the question of growth are not addressed.*





The ADR sees itself as a party that has an ecological orientation by addressing the issue of growth. Unfortunately, this is not the case. The way in which the ADR addresses the growth issue is strongly characterised by nationalist-identitarian statements, which the Mouvement Ecologique rejects. Moreover, there are contradictions in the programme in this area as well. In addition, it is difficult to see which concepts the ADR wants to use to solve the growth issue.

Moreover, the ADR, like no other of the parties analysed, opposes important instruments from the perspective of sustainable development. This applies to climate and energy policy, nature conservation and mobility, regional planning and much more. Those who advocate the general retention of nuclear power, fossil fuels, the internal combustion engine, substantial road construction projects, etc., and who question the protection of biodiversity, hardly give priority to ecological transition. In its programme, the party also sows doubt about the fact that climate change is primarily man-made. The list of what the Mouvement Ecologique considers to be counterproductive measures is very long, and the concrete suggestions (in a positive sense) are limited. This is not changed by the fact that the ADR often states in general that it stands up for nature and environmental protection or climate protection. ADR also focuses almost exclusively on measures - regulations are apparently hardly accepted.

*A programme in which extremely many statements are diametrically opposed to national and international sustainable development goals and in which the constructive elements in these areas are very limited in proportion.*



A general evaluation of the Pirates' programme from a sustainability point of view is quite difficult to carry out, as the statements in the programme are quite general in nature and also (with a few exceptions) contain measures that are accepted across party lines. The level of detail is rather limited.

Individual topics, especially the chapter on biodiversity, are only dealt with superficially and unfortunately do not reflect expert knowledge. In addition, the programme contains numerous problematic statements that contradict sustainable development, such as the expansion of the road network, certain statements in the field of nature conservation, etc. This does not change the fact that some topics are dealt with only superficially, especially in the chapter on biodiversity. This is not changed by the fact that in the chapter "Protect environment, climate & nature!" there is a general commitment to the importance of the issue. The "Pirates" also seem to focus less on ecological limits and a corresponding political framework, but rather on "citizenship".



*The programme of the "Pirates" contains some constructive suggestions, but is rather general in the areas mentioned and in part very underdeveloped.*



The Fokus programme is underdeveloped from a sustainability perspective. It lacks really concrete proposals on how a necessary transition can succeed. This is not changed by the fact that Fokus explicitly states that its guiding concept "justice" also means "Gerechtigkeet heescht Nohaltegkeet". Fokus addresses the issue of growth in the sense that activities should increasingly take place in the border region. There is an important difference in this context: Fokus does not only advocate cross-border cooperation or the creation of cross-border activity zones. Rather, it suggests that joint zones should also be designated exclusively on the territory of neighbouring countries. This is probably intended to solve the issue of limited territory, while probably creating new dependencies and also not addressing the fundamental issue of dependency on growth constraints (including social systems).

A concrete implementation of the sustainability paradigm does not take place in the various thematic areas of the party programme. On the contrary, "Focus", for example, opts for nuclear power and wants to hold on to fossil fuels, among other examples.



*Overall, a programme that does not do justice to the ecological challenges and also contains numerous problematic statements from a sustainability perspective.*