

Climate treaty and international cooperation

Commentary to the world summit on Climate-change December 2009

By Asger Lorentsen d. 19.12.09

Many people, organizations and governments are disappointed by the vague and noncommitted agreement or joint statement that came out of the climate summit in Copenhagen. All people who have a commitment to a sustainable future and for global cooperation, rightly feel that years of work in numerous committees and meetings have borne very little fruit in the 2 weeks in Copenhagen, where decisions were taken. And poor countries rightly complain that the rich and industrialized countries have shown little willingness to compensate the poor countries, although the increased consumption of coal and oil is the main reason that up to one billion people's lives already are or within a few decades will be seriously affected by e.g. drought in Africa, coming drought in the Himalayan region and flooding in low lying countries.

Expectations and realism

The question is whether there have been unrealistic expectations about how quickly a binding international cooperation on climate change can happen. And the answer is really simple: *Yes, expectations were unrealistic* of the following reasons:

1. The United States has a population, the great majority of which traditionally is a great opponent of intervention that can restrict the freedom of individuals. This freedom includes driving big cars and to getting cheap fuel. And the overall population of the U.S. is not ready to take up the issue that the country has a karmic obligation to counterbalance the climate impact of non-industrialized countries.
2. China will be respected as not just a great economy, but also – due to its 1st ray soul – as the leading future power on Earth. And China wants no commitments, which in any way suggest that other countries can decide anything within its borders.
3. Most oil producing countries are not interested in a global transition to an oil-free society.
4. Many poor countries came to Copenhagen with the primary aim to take this opportunity to put pressure on the industrialized countries as part of ancient opposition to colonialism or neo-colonialism.
5. There is clearly still a widespread national egoism, which is not likely replaced so quickly. E.g. it was clear that most addresses from the big countries' leaders in the plenary were more directed at the domestic audience than to the plenary on the world scene. An earlier era of mutual mistrust between nations and fight for their own interests cannot so quickly become replaced by a broad international awareness.
6. The UN has always been and is clearly still too slow an organism for major changes, so long as it uses a model that will have all countries involved in the decision-making. Regarding decisions on pioneering changes the decisions of the UN are usually reflecting the lowest common denominator!
7. A shift to a drastic reduction of oil and coal in the short term is not economically feasible, as long as new technologies are not fully developed. Eg. solar panels to produce electricity 10 years from now probably have halved in price compared to now, and have the double performance. This means that an investment in 10 years probably can provide 4 times as much reduction of CO2 emissions as now.

Conclusion: *There is no one to blame for the vague agreement. We are on this planet only at the beginning of a major international collaboration towards a new world community. This cooperation must evolve in an organic process where the countries involved may be so realistic, that they can actually implement what is decided. If they have too ambitious targets, countries will not live up to them. That is what we have seen by the Koyote Agreement on diminishing Co2 emissions.*

Will the global warming then accelerate?

All the information / inspiration that we have from the spiritual worlds, suggesting that the global warming will not accelerate to such a degree that it spirals out of control. This is mainly due to 3 factors:

1. About half of the current global warming is not caused by humanity. It is due to cosmic conditions in which we have no direct influence. Among these factors the current intensification of the vibrations emanating from the Heart of the Sun plays the greatest role: Spiritual heat also creates physical heat. The increase in the flow from the Heart of the Sun follows laws and rhythms, which are under divine control and planning.
2. A very large number of technical innovators have incarnated from higher developed planets, who already are in the process of inventing the future of pollution- and CO2-free technologies and energies. The pace of phasing out oil and coal will therefore be quicker than most scientists and politicians right now imagine. It is predicted that already in the 2030ies new technologies have taken over in all major fields of energy-production.
3. Mankind is about to become a responsible world disciple who takes responsibility for his/her actions. If we are too late to take responsibility, then our suffering will increase, and this in turn will compel responsible actions.

Conclusion: *The situation with a weak start on a global commitment does not bring a disastrous development for either humanity or the Earth. But it gives the effect that we collectively will get more suffering than if we manage to take drastic steps already within the next few years. These sufferings will mature us into a closer cooperation and a stronger solidarity. This maturity is again a step in creating a foundation for humanity's brother-sisterhood.*

The organic process

This climate summit is not an all-or-nothing event, but the start of an increasingly intensive process. Maybe a vague starting is the best thing that could happen, for now the international cooperation must continue with more meetings, more cooperative, more dissolving of national obsessions and more light-lines of communication between idealistic people, movements and governments around the world. *It would be a less optimal outcome, if so much was achieved in Copenhagen that the process of international and global consciousness needed less stimulation.*

Since the interaction between decisions, maturity and inventions in any case will ensure a sustainable future, *the most important spiritual purpose in the coming decades of climate processes is what stimulates the global consciousness in the direction of a mature global cooperation.* In this perspective, the optimal scenario is an organic and ongoing process to meet the challenges of climate change. That brings a continuous involvement of expertise exchanges and decisions at the international level.

In an organism is both superior and subordinate bodies, and diverse expertise and functions of the organs. Therefore, it is most natural that some countries and regions taking the lead with initiatives, responsibilities, and actions. E.g. the European Union should not adapt to other regions of lower targets, but can find partners for a faster transition regarding both decisions and technology.

Conclusion: *There is every reason for optimism, but this optimism must be balanced with realism, and part of that realism is that a slow learning process leads to more suffering, which in turn gives more maturity and depth in the collective consciousness.*