Thoughts and Considerations

CLIMATE CHANGE AS THE DEFINING CRISIS FOR THE 21st CENTURY

Viriato Soromenho Marques
viriatosmarques@netcabo.pt

Viriato Soromenho-Marques (1957) teaches Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Nature, and European Ideas in the Departments of Philosophy and European Studies of the University of Lisbon, where he is Full Professor. Since 1978 he has been engaged in the civic environmental movement in Portugal and Europe. He was Chairman of Quercus (1992-1995). He is member of the National Council on Environment and Sustainable Development. He was Vice-Chair of the European Environmental and Sustainable Development Advisory Councils network (2001-2006). He was the scientific coordinator of the Gulbenkian Environment Program (2007-2011). He was one of the twelve members of the High Level Group on Energy and Climate Change by invitation of the President of the European Commission (2007-2010). In the spring of 2008 he was elected member of the Lisbon Academy of Sciences, Class of Humanities (Letras). He was the representative of public opinion in the Press Council (1985-1987). He is a regular contributor to some Portuguese mass media, particularly, the Jornal de Letras, Rádio Renascença, the public television network (RTP), Diário de Notícias, Visão, and the Portuguese and Brazilian Sections of the BBC. He wrote over three hundred works on Philosophy, Environment and International Relations matters. He was speaker in over one thousand conferences in Portugal and twenty three other countries.

By the end of the current year the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) will expire, with no international regime to follow its fragile achievements. In the current landscape of economic and finance crisis and political incompetence, the international community is about to enter in a no man’s land regarding the most important ontological challenge human civilization will face during this century.

In his first inaugural speech, read on the 4th March 1933, President Franklin Delano Roosevelt depicted the somber landscape of his country ravaged by poverty, unemployment, and despair. However, he saw that amidst the overwhelming bitterness there was a glimpse of hope: "Nature still offers her bounty.

Three years ago, in a Conference hosted by TERI, the institute led by Dr. Rajendra K. Pachauri, in New Delhi, I listened to the strong moving words of Mr. Anote Tong, President of the Republic of Kiribati, an island country stretching over millions of square kilometers in the central Pacific Ocean, severely endangered by the rising level of the sea. He presented himself to a silent assembly: "I am the President of a country that is going to disappear under water..."
In 2012, like in 1933, the world is under the shadow of a major finance and economic meltdown. In the case of Europe, the situation is even worst. Very quickly the so called “sovereign debt crisis” is changing its nature. More and more, it’s becoming a terrific political crisis that can throw over 60 years of European integration into the abyss. Awakening in the process long sleeping devils of an European history marked by turmoil and bloodshed. Besides that, in 2012, however, we can no more share the hope of President F.D. Roosevelt. Now, Nature isn’t offering us her blessings but rather her angry feelings, after many decades and centuries of aggression and ill management by human greed and folly. In a crowded planet, not with 2 billion like in Roosevelt years, but over 7 billion people, the major crisis that is growing between us and a sustainable future it isn’t at the heart of economic nature, but rather a global environmental crisis. A crisis that becomes more visible to the world through the numerous extreme events of climate change.

§1. We need to build a common narrative on the seriousness of climate change

Climate change is the most important indicator of the exceptional nature of our time.

More than a century ago some pioneers had already alerted towards the risk of a collision course between our way of life, driven by a still young, immature and primitive technological and scientific structure, and the complex realm of dimensions of what was called during millennia by the word “Nature”, and it’s named now as “Environment”.

Climate change emerged in the last twenty five years as the clear evidence of that collision course, which is not a mere suspicion, but a matter of factual truth, repeatedly confirmed by the numerous collecting-data networks that cover the Earth system, from artificial satellites to monitoring devices installed under the oceans waters or inside the ice of glaciers and in the permafrost cover, both on Siberia or Western Antarctica.

The current generations living on Earth have a unique and overwhelming responsibility, with no match in any historical situation ever.

The first task over our shoulders is the need to establish a solid and lasting consensus about the profoundly seriousness and novelty of the danger presented by the climate change process.

Climate change contains in itself the prospect of a row of possible future events that would merge in a global tragedy. Accordingly, there is an extreme urgency in the need of dissipating, on the grounds of factual and scientific evidence, those myths that tell us about “winners and losers” in the climate crisis. When the “Titanic” sank, the luxury of the cabins was completely indifferent regarding the sad sake of all those who died in the shipwreck. In the long run there are only climate change losers.

What is really at stake, in our present decisions, is the future of humankind. Thomas Jefferson, the third American President, wrote that we should avoid both budget deficit and public debt on the ground of the fairness principle between generations. Upon an
even more strong reason, we need to abide by the moral and political imperative of fighting against climate change if we want to be fair towards our children and grandchildren. **We have the moral obligation to avoid a kind of ontological debt, impossible to be solved.**

§2.

**Towards a new global environmental and climate regime**

The second task that should unite today humans everywhere is the enlightened refusal of old methods of thinking and doing, of “business as usual” habits.

We have to understand that the chief driving force that will allow us to find solutions with a similar scale and size of our current environmental and climate problems is the **ability to create new political procedures for decision making and new forms of governance.** That assertion is valid both for States and international relations and for small and large private organizations within civil society as well.

In spite of all its current limitations and stalemate, the European Union was certainly the best contemporary example of innovation at political level. The replacement of an endemic culture of hate and war by institutions that enhance peace and cooperation was certainly, until there years from now, an experience with strong universal power of inspiration.

The ambitious proposals advanced since the March 2007 European Council, regarding a new policy linking energy and climate change should be read not only as an internal challenge, directed to the 27 Member States, but also as a negotiation agenda offered by the EU to the rest of the world aiming the need to go further -- after the end of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), that will expire by the 31st December 2012 -- in a more effective path of mitigation and adaptation policies towards climate change, within the wide range open by the UNFCCC.

In spite of the truly global disappointment represented by the negative outcome of the COP 15, in Copenhagen, in December 2009, we should strive harder for a truly **Pact on Environment and Climate Protection** that should include every country and nation in the planet. Respecting however the **principle of common but differentiated responsibilities**, every country, either developed or developing, should contribute to the common goal. The reduction and stabilizations of GHG emissions should result from the flexible combination of targets and instruments, using both market mechanisms and regulation, striving for technological innovation but recurring also to a more efficient use of already existing hardware, creating national and sector caps, but also preserving forests and enhancing the positive role of agriculture in the carbon cycle.

§3.

**Two ways ahead of us**

If we allow ourselves to be conquered by the inertia of political egoism, by the narrow logic of the “balance of power” and “national interest”, we will lose the battle against climate change, entering immediately after the end of the current year into a hobbesian
climate and environmental “state of nature”. Instead of a global regime for reduction and stabilizing of the GHG emissions and concentration, we would be placed before a tremendous drain in human skills and financial resources, sacrificed in the altar of a new arms race serving the fight to accede to dwindling natural resources. Such somber situation could at the end of the road drive us to a new major war and a formidable collapse with no parallel in history. In that case, the “Tragedy of the Commons”, studied by Garrett Hardin in 1968, would take real shape before our hopeless eyes.

On the contrary, if we are able to design and implement the political institutions convenient to what I usually call “compulsory co-operation”, meaning the urgent need to work together for the common interest of mutual survival, in that case we would have tremendous chances of being able to merge together the best of human intelligence and ingenuity in the endeavor of accomplishing a new industrial revolution, probably the first step to a clever way of living together in the world, creating a new global economy, freeing itself gradually from fossil fuels, and prone to establish a symbiotic, non predatory connection with the Earth ecosystems.

This is the great challenge before of us. Not jut for today or tomorrow, but for the 21st century as a whole. This is also a challenge that should invite European not only to bind together within the framework of the European Union, but to improve its hardware in the direction of a truly federal polity.
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