

## **"The consumption of the realm is the biggest problem"**

In addition to the morally dubious messages in the debate article "Environmental reasons speak for more limited immigration," the reasoning resides on a number of very problematic assumptions and premises.

Firstly, the whole article builds on an assumption of average immigration of 100,000 people per year up to 2100. This figure is based on the article authors on a report from the National Board of Housing, Building and Planning. Upon a closer examination of this report, it turns out that their forecast spans six years ahead, by 2024, and lands on a total population of approximately 11 million. Forecasts are considered fresh and often have major inherent uncertainties, not least in terms of immigration and emigration. If we were to look 80 years back in time, we see that Sweden has had an average net immigration of around 24,000 people a year, but also that it has varied considerably over time. Without further explanation, the figure of 100,000 and extrapolating the 80th anniversary of the time appears in this context as a power search

The article writers also choose to paint an unnecessarily gloomy picture of what this immigration could lead to. One might ask why. The fact that housing construction today is often through densification and on possible farmland is no natural law, but the result of political decisions. It is possible to make other decisions, for example, to pursue an active rural policy. This also applies to the issue of income gaps and contributions. In relation to socioeconomic security, it is surprising that the authors choose not to mention the problem of aging populations, which immigration actually helps to alleviate. The fact that emissions of climate gases increase with population are no news. If there was a universal causality between population and emission levels, which were independent of other factors, it would be possible to assess a country's emissions based on its population.

However, this is not the case. Many factors have a bearing on the size of the emissions. IPAT is a well-used equation used to calculate human impact on the environment (Impact) by multiplying population (Population) with the prosperity of the population (Affluence) and using a resource utilization coefficient (Technology). To argue that population size is the most important part of this equation is a Malthusian survival that, in Sweden, turns one on absurd suboptimization. Sweden is one of the population of both small and heavily populated countries.

The problem today is that a small part of the world's population stands for an unsustainable consumption in all respects, and that the technological potential to streamline production and consumption is not realized to a sufficient extent. If the entire population of the world consumed as the average Swedish, the world's greenhouse gas emissions would double. Perhaps this is what this article authors take on; The climate can not afford more people to enjoy the same standard of living as people in Sweden?

If that is the case, it's the Swedes' consumption they should debate. Here are interesting aspects to discuss in relation to the topic of the article, such as the distribution of emissions in

the population. For example, there is a strong correlation between income levels and emissions. If you want to save the planet, it is therefore important to review how the middle and upper classes consume, rather than keeping poor people outside the borders of the country.

Alternatively, the authors say that the problem is not that emissions occur, but that immigration causes a larger proportion of the emissions to become "Swedish" and that this risk eroding Sweden's good reputation as a precursor to environmental and climate issues. Such a problem formulation is based on a nationalist logic that has no place in today's globalized economies and ecologies. The climate does not care in which country the emissions are taking place. On the other hand, climate change tends to hit hardest against poor populations in low-income countries, which themselves have a very small part in causing them. Changed climatic conditions already force people on flight. To argue that a country such as Sweden - which represents a relatively large climate impression - should shut out these people rather than offering help, is deeply unsolidaristic and testifies to a lack of understanding of the political complexity of climate issues.

Josefin Wangel Researcher, City and Country, Swedish University of Agricultural Sciences

Göran Finnveden Professor, Sustainable Development, Environmental Science and Technology, Royal Institute of Technology

Pernilla Hagbert researchers, urban and regional studies, Royal Institute of Technology

Anna Kaijser Researcher, Theme Environment Change, Linköping University