



AN INSUFFICIENT AGREEMENT, WHEN WE NEED EXISTENTIAL DECISIONS¹

Héctor Casanueva²

The COP 26 Summit was followed by speeches with good intentions from world leaders, along with urgent calls from the scientific and academic community, NGOs, world public opinion, and especially from young people to concrete action. The results, however, have been limited, insufficient, they go in a divergent line of intentions and calls. The evaluations of the agreement reached in extremis are unanimously critical, since the commitments are only halfway to what all the scientists point out as essential for us to limit the increase in temperature to 1.5° Celsius. The same regarding fossil fuels, which are not mentioned, and coal, which, instead of committing to eliminate it from the matrix, only agrees to reduce it.

It cannot be ignored that there has been an advance, but it has been so forced, that there are serious doubts that deep down the signatories, some of them, are willing to comply. We know that these agreements are mandatory, but not enforceable, because there are no coercive mechanisms to do so. And that countries that are large emitters of greenhouse gases, such as China or India, have great difficulties in changing this energy matrix in the necessary timeframes. Like many of the least developed countries (in the terminology of the UN), they need large investments for this and that the aid pledged by the rich countries is not enough.

If the Glasgow agreements are fulfilled, we would be stopping the increase in temperature, but they place it at double (2.9° Celsius) of the 1.5° of the Paris agreements, which, in any case, many scientists consider to be of all insufficient modes.

For Barak Obama in his evaluation of COP26, "Paris showed the world that progress is possible ... but the bad news is that we are nowhere near where we need to be."

Perhaps the summary of everything can be seen in the intervention of the UN Secretary General, who has clearly and firmly made present, at the beginning and at the end of the meeting, that humanity is in existential risk, which many seem not to want to see. Because, precisely, the Glasgow agreements "reflect the interests, the contradictions and the state of political will in today's world."

¹ Part of this article was published on November 12, 2021, by Chile's *Diario Estrategia*.

² Former Ambassador, Professor-Researcher at IELAT, University of Alcalá, Spain. Member of the Planning Committee of the Millennium Project Global Futures Studies & Research. Visiting professor at the Miguel de Cervantes University, Chile, and at the Romanian University of Political Studies. Vice-president of the Chilean Council for Prospective and Strategy.

He had already pointed this out before, at the 76th General Assembly, when presenting his report "Our Common Agenda": "Due to continuous technological advances, the acceleration of climate change and the increase in zoonoses, it is likely that the risk of global catastrophe or even extinction is extreme".

There is the point, marked by Guterres, and which makes the lack of a definitive commitment to stopping global warming and its consequences more incomprehensible: we are at extreme risk of a global catastrophe that will lead to the extinction of humanity. "Let's stop digging our own grave," he said bluntly, in tune with Sir David Attenborough's eloquent intervention.

COP 26 has once again made it clear that the long term, the strategic vision, the future consequences of actions in the present, have disappeared with the pandemic, which is in itself a paradox, since this is not the first nor will it ever be. the last global health crisis, and that finally most of the strategic and existential threats to humanity derive from unleashed global warming, to which are added those derived from General Artificial Intelligence.

All this refers to the political responsibility of governments, parliaments and civil society, on a local and global scale, to generate an adequate management of the present and the future. To take a turn towards responsibility, one must take into account what both Jerome Glenn, director of the Millennium Project, and Paul Werbos, former director of the National Science Foundation, warn, regarding the information gap that exists between what the The scientific world knows and what decision makers (that is, political leaders) really know.

That is why the Millennium Project, the World Futures Studies Federation, the Association of Professional Futurists and the Ibero-American Prospective Network, collecting a proposal from more than 200 world personalities, among them the Nobel Prize winner Oscar Arias, and the ideas of more than a thousand futurists. from all over the world, are promoting the creation in the UN of an office of strategic and existential threats that centralizes information, studies of futures and guides the international system in anticipating these risks with the necessary information for decision-making.