Annals of the Academy of Romanian Scientists
Series on Philosophy, Psychology and Theology
ISSN 2067-113X Volume **2**, Number **1**/**2010**

GLOBAL WARMING AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY

Constantin VLAD[1]

Abstract. *There is a direct connection among underdevelopment, international security and belligerence. The statistics show that measures aimed to fight the global warming contribute to maintain the underdevelopment, which represents a favorable ground for belligerence. In the same time, the above mentioned measures could impede the change of international configuration of power relations and the access of some big developing countries, like China, India and Brazil to a more visible role in the world affairs.*

Keywords: global warming, underdevelopment, gaps, international security, belligerency, asymmetries, fault lines.

1. Spring 2010. The international mass media makes headlines: an islet from the Indian Ocean had disappeared because of increase of the Planetary Ocean and of erosion. As a result, a territorial dispute between India and Bangladesh become without subject. Thus, global warming appeared as a factor of eliminating of some sources of disagreements and tensions among states, as well as of strengthening of international security. Nothing is more superficial and false. In my opinion, the truth is to the opposite. There are numerous, very numerous data which sustain such an opinion.

2. A first category of this kind of data puts into relation *underdevelopment, international security and global warming.*

2.1. *Underdevelopment.* The World Bank statistics depict a clear picture of the gaps concerning of economic developments of different categories of countries. Thus, according to *World Development Report 2010*,[1], in 2008 the least developed countries, in which 14.7% of the World population live, counted for 0.8% of the Gross National Income (GNI). In the same year, the developed countries, inhabited by 16.6% of the World population, disposed of 73.2% from GNI. Even we have in mind the least developed countries and middle developed ones together, picture of the gaps existing in the World does not modify. In concrete terms, those two categories of countries had 85.1% from the World population, but they possessed only 26.8% from GNI, the main share of that indicator belonging to 16.6% of population, namely to the inhabitants of developed countries.

[1]Prof., Ph.D., Founding and full member of Academy of Romanian Scientists

Some recent studies, [2], disclose new aspects of the gaps. I am referring to the deep difference among people concerning the access to computers and virtual media. That access or lack of it is becoming a strong source of the enlargement of those gaps.

These should be said about *dimensions* of the gaps in the field of development. But another fact, no less upsetting, is the following: the above mentioned gaps *continue to deepen*, in spite of the advance of some ”emergent economies”.

Thus, the statistics of the World Bank show that in 1980 the least developed plus middle developed countries together represented 28.3% of GNI, as the developed countries 71.7%. As we have seen, in 2008 those percentages changed significantly: the share of the first two categories of countries diminished at 26.8%, as the share of developed countries increased to73.3% from GNI. In the same sense, Joseph S. Nye Jr., shows, [3]: the income of the 20% of the World population, living in the richest countries, as against of a 20% from the poorest ones, increased from 30:1 in 1960 to 74:1 in 1997. Comparatively, between 1870 and 1913 that difference advanced from 7:1 to 1:1. So, if the gaps between different categories of peoples and countries are seen in an historical perspective, they have tendency to deepen.

2.2. *Underdevelopment and belligerency.* A lot of data offered by the scientific research indicate a close link between underdevelopment and belligerency, simultaneously with a move of conflicting affairs from interstate relations to the domestic conditions of the countries. As a matter of fact, after ceasing of the Cold War in 74 zones of the World 111 armed conflicts took place. From them, 7 were conflicts between states, and 104 conflicts inside of states. All latter were conflicts occurred in the underdeveloped or developing parts of the World, [4]. Of course, such an “appetence” of underdevelopment for belligerency has a diverse and complex determination: the discretionary manner in which former colonial powers drew frontiers in the case of many former colonies, undemocratic regimes, tribal structures, etc. Despite of that, the underdevelopment has no doubt its part in this determination.

2.3. *Global warming–underdevelopment–belligerency* .The concept of global warming continues to be controversial. But, because of quite clear evidence and taking into consideration many solid studies the International Community had considered very seriously the reality of gradual but constant warming of the atmosphere of Terra.

2.3.1. In June 1992, the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, informally known as the Earth Summit, held in Rio de Janeiro, adopted the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The objective of the Convention “*is to stabilize greenhouse gas concentrations in*

the atmosphere at the level that would prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system",[5]. The Convention entered into force in March 21, 1994. As of December 2009, it had 192 parties. The Convention in itself no mandatory limits on greenhouse emissions for individual countries and contains no enforcement mechanisms. In that sense, the Convention is considered legally non-binding. In spite of that, the Convention and actions undertook in order to implement its provisions have contributed significantly to create an acute sense of conscience on the risks implied by global warming and on necessity of fighting it. More than that, a number of states member agreed upon so called protocols, the best known from those being the Kyoto Protocol, adopted in December 24, 1997. It entered into force on February 16, 2005. As of November 2009, 187 states have signed and ratified it. The Kyoto Protocol is a legally binding treaty, which sets mandatory emission limits. The objective of Kyoto Protocol is to reduce the emissions of greenhouse gas by 5.2% until 2012 from the 1990 level. The Annex I of Kyoto Protocol includes 40 developed countries, which commit themselves to certain compulsory reductions of the emissions, with exception of the United States, which signed, but not ratified that treaty. According to Kyoto Protocol, the developing countries, as well as the economies in transition have no firm obligations on reduction of polluting emissions, but they assume some concrete commitments, as an expression of their will to contribute to the general effort in the field.

It is estimated that the objective fixed by Kyoto Protocol for 2012 could be fulfilled. Such a result would be due mainly because of low level of emissions of polluting gas in the Third World, as well as of drastic reduction of such emissions in the former European countries, under process of large destruction of industry which took place over the transition to market economy. In concrete terms, according to Kyoto Protocol, the joint commitment of the countries in transition is a reduction of emissions with 2,0% in 2012 from the level of 1990. In fact, in 2005, these emissions in the above mentioned countries were reduced by 35% from the 1990 level. By the contrary, the same emissions in developed countries in the same interval increased by 5% (the commitment of those countries in Kyoto Protocol is to reduce the polluting gas by 6%). In the case of the United States, over the same interval, the increase was of 18%, [6].

Thus, under Kyoto Protocol's regime, the measures aimed to fight the global warming do not diminish, but tend to amplify the gaps between the developed and developing countries; under the same regime, the underdeveloped continues to be a kind of favorite zone of belligerency.

2.3.2. What kind of perspectives has the post-Kyoto World? An idea in that respect could be suggested by the results of the Copenhagen Conference on Climate Change, held in December 2009. The event offered a chance of gathering of an impressive number of heads of states and governments as well as of other

high dignitaries. There, in that place, in the vicinity of Castle where Hamlet gave voice to dilemma "To be or not to be", some fearful warnings and bold ideas have been expressed and generous promises of assistance were made to developing countries in the common goal to arrest global warming. But, eventually, faced with a resounding failure, the Conference concluded only with a general agreement, formulated by delegations of the United States, China, India, South Africa and Brazil, agreement on which the participating states "took note". As a matter of fact, the agreement represents rather a statement of good intentions, associated with the commitment to search over 2010 year for a consensus on a document aimed to succeed to Kyoto Protocol. During the proceedings, some countries presented concrete proposals concerning reductions of pollutant emissions which they intend to put in practice. For example, over the interval 2005-2020, Norway pledged to diminish such emissions by 30-40%, Japan by 25%, the European Union as a unit by 20-30%, Russia by 20-25%, South Africa by 10-20%, the United States by 17%. For the same interval, China has intention to reduce the intensity of CO2 emissions by 40-45% and India by 20-25%, [7].

According to the Final Agreement, the developed countries commit to a goal of mobilizing jointly 100 billion USD a year by 2020 to address the needs of developing countries, [8]. It remains to be seen how many of these intentions will be materialized and to which extent.

Of course, at present can be emitted only some presumptions concerning the effects of the measures aimed to fight the global warming will have in the future on gaps between developed and developing countries, as well as on phenomena characterized as belligerent. These presumptions are not pure speculations because a certainty exists: namely, the period of Kyoto Protocol established a kind of pattern of the relations between global warming-underdevelopment-belligerency. According the that pattern, the actions dedicated to combat the global warming neither reduce the gaps among developed and developing countries nor diminish the belligerency in the underdeveloped zones. As concern the sources of belligerency, some *asymmetries* of the contemporary world must be added to the general conditions of underdevelopment.

I have in mind the fact that the above mentioned concentration of richness and power exists in the Northern Hemisphere - except Australia, and New Zeeland; that concentration of richness and power is a fact in the regions of the Planet inhabited by white man–except Japan, South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore: in those regions of the Planet where people share mainly some divisions of Christianity, namely Catholicism and Protestantism, as well as Judaism; no other great religions of the World: the Islamism, the Hinduism, the Buddhism, the Orthodoxy are spread in the zones enjoying of high level of economic development. The growth which take place in the last years in countries like China, India, Brazil do not change the fundamental aspects of the problem. And

such aspects which graft the gaps concerning development on the relations among civilizations potentiate the effects of those gaps on the field of international stability and security.

3. *The global warming and international security.* Another aspect under which the measures against global warming meet the subject of the international security concerns the evolution of the power relations in the World. The concept of power in the international life has a complex and diverse content. But in determination of that content the level of the economic development has a particular place and significance, [9]. In the last decade, the World Bank took the initiative to publish data on polluting emissions over long intervals, as well as yearly for recent times. These data allow to make a historical evaluation of pollution on countries and categories of countries and, in this way, to establish their responsibility–of course, a moral responsibility–for the present level of pollution. On the other hand, such data permit a realistic approach by different countries and by international community of the objective of fighting the global warming.

3.1. In concrete terms, over the period 1850-2005, the present low income countries produced 24 billions metric tons of carbon dioxide, the middle income countries–395.1 billions of metric tones and high income countries–750.1 billions of metric tones. For the same period, are interesting data about four countries–two developing: China and India, and two developed: Japan and the United States. Thus, in the above mentioned period, India contributed to the pollution of the earthly atmosphere with 28.1 billions of metric tones, China with 94.3 billions of metric tones, Japan with 46.1 billions of metric tons and the United States with 324.9 billions of metric tons, [10]. In spite of any approximation of these figures, they say something significant about contribution of different countries and categories of countries to global warming over one and a half century.

3.2. *Pollution and actuality.* In 2005, [11], India generated 1,149 millions metric tons emissions of CO2, which meant 1.1 metric tons per capita and a share of 4.33% of those emissions from the world level. In the same year, for China those figures were: 5,060 millions metric tons, 3.5 metric tons per capita and 19.05 5 from the total. For Japan–1,214 millions metric tons, 9.5 metric tons per capita and 4.57% from the total emissions. And for the United States–5,841 millions metric tons, 19.7 metric tons per capita and 22 5 of the emissions of the world level. The significance of these figures appears more comprehensible if they were put in connection with the GDI of the countries concerned because the degree of pollution is just a result of the creation of GDI; also, if those figures are related with the primary sources of energy used in the economy, responsible for the pollution. So, in the above mentioned year, India had a GNI of 793 billions of USD, China–2,263.8 billions of USD, Japan–4,988.2 billions of USD,

and the United States–12,969.6 billions of USD. In that year, the share of the sources of primary energy in India were the following: fossil fuels–69.0 %, from which the coal–considered the most pollutant fuel–counted for 39.4%; the renewable sources–31.0%, with nuclear energy representing 0.9%. In China, fossil fuels: 85.0%, coal representing 64.2%; renewable sources–15.0%, from which 0.8 % nuclear energy. As for Japan, fossil fuels: 81.6 %, with coal counting for 21.3%; renewable sources–18.4%, from which 15.0% nuclear energy. In the case of the United States: fossil fuels–85.7%, coal representing 23.7 %; renewable sources–14.2% from which 9.2% nuclear energy. I will present now the same categories of figures at a world level for 2008, [12]. Thus, the actual low income countries used the following primary sources of energy: fossil fuels: 44.2%, from which 17.3% coal; renewable sources–57.9%, nuclear energy counting for 0.1%. The middle income countries: fossil fuels–82.9%, from which 35.8% coal; renewable sources–17.5%, nuclear energy representing 2.0%. The high income countries: fossil fuels 84.5%, from which 13.9% coal; renewable sources–16.1%, with 11,0% contribution of nuclear energy.

Such data makes evident a *qualitative backwardness* of the low income and middle income countries concerning sources of primary energy, in comparison with the high income countries. The large share of the coal in the fossil fuels used transforms the developing world in a bigger pollutant then the developed world, under condition that the cumulative GDI of the developing countries is substantially smaller that of the developed ones. In this regard, the large share of the renewable sources of primary energy in the case of low income countries must not deceive. The most part of those sources comes from burning of vegetal residues which, as a pollutant, are similar to the coal.

All those facts plead in favor of an adequate approach of different categories of countries concerning the measures aimed to combat the global warming, as well as in favor of a massive and effective assistance to the developing countries, in some cases even to the middle developed countries, in order to change the structure of the sources of primary energy, with the aim to diminish their pollutant potential.

3.3. As I already mentioned, the level of economic development represents an important feature in defining the concept of power and, by effect, of the relationship of power among states. The end of the Cold War two decades ago recorded the disappearance of the East as a center of power. The United States of America remained the unique superpower; in that sense, the World ceased to be bipolar and became unipolar. She continues to evaluate under the sign of unipolarity. On the other hand, countries like China, India are experiencing spectacular growths, both from the point of view of power, and of influence in the international arena. Russia, at its turn, regains a higher posture in the World

affairs. Under such conditions, the World accumulates gradually a state of an entity with a few centers of power.

3.3.1. This the context in which the global warming and measures against it intersect with some evolutions which tend to modify the power relationship in the international life. The tendency to put restrictions on pollutant emissions in the of developing countries, which ignore their necessities of economic progress, can hamper the developments towards certain changes of the power relations in the World. I have in mind changes which would permit to the Third World to say more in the global affairs, as well as the access to the management of those affairs of the new actors of high stature ad influence. So, according to some sources, [13], at Copenhagen the United States proposed for 2050 a reduction of the pollutant emissions by 50%, with a contribution of 80% of the developed countries. Such a proposal was vetoed by China because, in Chinese view, it would affect seriously the chances of economic growth of China on medium and long terms and would favor the maintaining of the actual positions of some great developed countries. The significance of this American-Chinese confrontation was surprised by the British official Ed. Miliband in the following formula: the Copenhagen conference was *"Bretton Woods plus Yalta multiplied by Reykjavik",* [14]. The symbolism of that formula is quite clear: at Bretton Woods the United States played the decisive role in establishing of the post-war World financial order, at Yalta the two superpowers, jointly with the Great Britain, have reached the consensus on division of the World spheres of influence, but at Reykjavik the same two superpowers failed to arrange a new configuration of a condominium at a planetary scale. In the Miliband's symbolism, the reference to Reykjavik has a special significance: the two great competitors in the race of programming the measures against global warming were not able to get an understanding. With the mention that the United States had gained a large support from the developed part of the Planet, as China enjoyed of approval and was backed by the developing and underdeveloped parts of the same Planet.

That's why, the disputes concerning the climate changes and ways of facing them could generate a new *fault line* among World's states and peoples with most serious negative effects on the capacity of the international community to react efficiently against the most formidable defiance to the address of human civilization.

In this way, the solutions which are under scrutiny against global warming have certain direct effects on the relations of force among different powers and, as a result, they can have not at all negligible consequences concerning the security of states, as well as the international security as a whole.

R E F E R E N C E S

[1] *World Development Report 2010;*

[2] Ion Iliescu, *România şi lumea la confluenţa secolelor XX şi XXI.* Editura Tehnică, 2009;

[3] Joseph S. Nye Jr., *Descifrarea conflictelor internaţionale. Teorie şi istorie.* ANTET, 2005, p.181;

[4] Joseph S. Nye, Jr., ibidem, p. 12;

[5] *United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.* Accessed April 2, 2010;

[6] *Kyoto Protocol,* Wikipedia. Accessed April 9, 2010;

[7] *2009 United Nations Climate Change Conference.* Wikipedia. Accessed March 30, 2010;

[8] *Copenhagen Accord*, Wikipedia. Accessed March 30, 2010*2009;*

[9] Constantin Vlad, *Relaţiile internaţionale politico-diplomatice contemporane*, Editura Fundaţiei *România de Mâine*, 2001, p.44-45;

[10] *World Development Report2010. Selected indicators: Table A I Energy-related emissions and carbon intensity, p. 361;*

[11] *World Development Report 2010,* Table 1. Key indicators of development, p. 232-233;

[12] Ibidem, Table A 3;

[13] *2009 United Nations Climate Changes Conference*, Wikipedia, p.21. Accessed March 3, 2010;

[14] Bill McKibben, *Copenhagen Climate Talks set to begin: what's likely to happen and what's at stake*, Yale Environment, December 5, 2009. Accessed March 3, 2010.