

Manipulation of the Masses

By Cathie Adams
December 12, 2004

Public transportation has traditionally been a matter for governments at federal, state and local levels, but the global economy created by the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has made it an international issue for all Americans and especially for those living in border states.

Major cities in Texas, for example, are building taxpayer-financed mass transit bus and rail systems, regardless the widespread opposition of the people. Supporters of the boondoggles have even hired professional ad agencies in order to pass propositions that create huge bureaucracies to run the money-losing systems. The 2003 Texas Legislature passed a massive transportation bill that has since been condemned by the 2004 Texas Republican Platform partly because of its major abuses of individual property rights. (It is also noteworthy that the 2000 Republican National Platform called for a nationwide rail system.) Regardless the controversy between taxpayers and mass transit supporters, the push for mass transit thunders on.

A "side event" at the ongoing United Nations (U.N.) meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina, may give another reason why public transportation and especially railways have become hot topics in spite of the opposition.

Devoid of concern for national sovereignty, the International Union of Railways (IUC) [sic] is in Buenos Aires to advocate "a switch from private to public transport" as a means of reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions claiming it causes global warming, a theory that man's activities, especially burning fossil fuels, causes catastrophic weather changes. Never mind that it is impossible to forecast next week's weather, the U.N. arrogantly believes it cannot only predict the weather into the next century, but that it can also control weather changes by limiting GHG emissions!

The IUC claims that rail transport has a lower average external cost than its competitors for passengers and freight, and stresses the need to facilitate the shift toward rail through substantial investment in rail infrastructure and political leadership to catalyze a shift toward rail. Jealous of Americans' freedoms and standard of living, the Union of European Railway Industries insists, "The railway should be the backbone of public transport."

Although the science is inconclusive about global warming, American policies concerning GHG emissions go beyond public transportation. According to Dr. Harlan L. Watson, Senior Climate Negotiator and Special Representative and Alternate Head

of the US Delegation at this U.N. conference, President Bush has set a goal to reduce greenhouse gas intensity by 18% over the next 10 years, which is equivalent to taking 70 million cars off the road. And the US is funding climate change science with \$2 billion annually and a total expenditure of more than \$23 billion since 1990. Americans are also spending nearly \$3 billion this year to accelerate the development of key technologies, such as renewables, energy efficiency, advanced fossil and nuclear, hydrogen, and carbon capture and storage, that have the potential to achieve substantial GHG emissions reductions.

Even so, the U.S. earned the first "fossil of the day" award at this conference, an award that highlights the hostility of the radical greens and the Third World nations against us. They claim that the American delegation wants to block all possible recognition of problems associated with climate change for attempting to replace the words "climate change" with "climate vulnerability."

Americans are doing more and spending more than any other country to study and reduce GHG intensity. Regardless, neither the radical greens, the international elite nor the Third World will be appeased because their aim is to cripple our economy by moving our GHG-producing industries around the globe, thus redistributing our wealth. Instead, they should be modeling our freedoms and

It's the Economy, Stupid!

By Cathie Adams
December 13, 2004

Do you think that the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) are victims of pollution and that your tax dollars should help finance diversification of their economies? I am certain that you do not, but that is the mischief OPEC is up to at the United Nations (U.N.) meeting being held in Buenos Aires, Argentina, 6-17 December.

The U.N. has concluded its first week of discussions on the Kyoto Protocol, which calls for reductions in greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions. The premise of the Protocol is that elevated levels of GHGs will cause catastrophic weather changes. GHGs are produced when people breathe out or drive cars that burn fossil fuels or when industries use fossil fuels to manufacture goods.

The good news is that the U.N. nor OPEC has fooled the American delegation in Buenos Aires. Alternate head of the U.S. delegation Dr. Harlan L. Watson frankly told the press this week that, "The Kyoto Protocol was a political agreement. It was not

based on science." Indeed, the Protocol has nothing to do with the environment and everything to do with the economy. Let me explain.

Harald Diaz-Bone, a spokesman for the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change, boasted that "the successful decoupling of economic growth from increasing carbon dioxide emissions in Finland" is a result of that nation's economy shifting to high-tech industries. He stopped short of the obvious fact that Finland's manufactured goods must now be imported from other countries.

Americans have lots of experience with this game. The "made in China" label has replaced the "made in the USA" on too many of our manufactured goods. Likewise, the industrial jobs in Finland simply moved elsewhere.

What effect does this have on GHG emissions? NONE! It does not reduce them; it merely moves the industries and thus the GHG emissions from one of the 30 developed nations bound by the Kyoto Protocol to one of the more than 150 undeveloped nations, like China, which is not bound by the treaty.

Even worse than not affecting GHG emissions, this ruse allows multinational corporations to prop up the Communist Chinese government while looking the other way as their citizens are abused as slave laborers. And it provides more than enough funding to enable them to build a military force that one day will have to be reckoned with, maybe from as close as the Panama Canal.

Over the last decade, U.N. bureaucrats have developed this global wealth redistribution system, and they have had lots of help not only from dictatorships in the Third World who want American taxpayers' jobs and money, but also from a myriad of non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

The newsletter *Hotspot* is published by Climate Action Network (CAN) Europe, a "global coalition of 365 environmental NGOs," 90 in Europe, including most European member states. In their November 2004 edition, they questioned, "Whither Adaptation Funding?" After blaming floods in Bangladesh, China and Mozambique, heat waves in Europe, droughts in Africa and hurricanes in the Caribbean on global warming, they hassled industrialized countries to give money to a new Adaptation Fund created at a global warming Conference of the Parties (COP) meeting in Morocco in 2001. The purpose of the fund is to assist Least Developed Countries (LDCs in U.N.-speak), like OPEC members, to diversify their economies!

CAN also calls for "much more rigorous emission reductions" than called for in the Kyoto Protocol, which neither former President Clinton nor President Bush submitted to the U.S. Senate for ratification because the treaty would devastate the U.S.

economy. While the 1997 Protocol calls for a five percent reduction of GHGs below 1990 levels, Clinton/Gore agreed to reduce U.S. levels by seven percent below 1990 levels. Accumulatively this would amount to about a 40% GHG emissions reduction below 1990 levels.

As the U.N. and their NGOs talk about saving the world from catastrophic weather changes by reducing GHGs, in reality they are sponsoring a global Communist dream to redistribute wealth. This scheme has nothing to do with the environment and everything to do with the economy.