

## *eco•logic Special Report*

# International Influence on Domestic Policy

*by Henry Lamb*

**Environmental Conservation Organization**

Hollow Rock, Tennessee

December 22, 2005

**D**espite harboring the multi-billion dollar [oil for food scandal](#), on-going [sexual abuse scandals](#) within its peacekeeping forces, utter failure to prevent, or even slow the [genocide in Rwanda](#), or the [Darfur region of the Sudan](#), the United Nations continues to exert its influence and tighten its global governance grip on the world. For the most part, Americans are either unaware, or unconcerned, that the United States is becoming inextricably enmeshed in the global governance web.

Those who dismiss the idea of global governance, as the paranoia of the radical right, are simply uninformed, or are deliberately attempting to divert attention from a reality that grows daily. [Gustave Speth](#), former Director of the U.N. Development Program, told a 1997 U.N. gathering in Brazil, that:

"...global governance is a powerful and growing reality. Global governance is here, here to stay, and, driven by economic and environmental globalization, global governance will inevitably expand."<sup>(1)</sup>

Speth is quick to claim that global governance is not global government. But he then defines global governance to be:

"...a set of interacting guidance and control mechanisms that include both state and non-state actors, actors both public and private, both national and multilateral."

This, of course, is U.N.-speak for international treaties and agreements.

These treaties and agreements have proliferated over the past quarter-century, and now encompass virtually every facet of human life. They have gone unnoticed in the United States, largely because they have grown incrementally, and each affects only a portion of the population. Until the mid 1990s, the international community was very careful to conceal its global agenda. Throughout the 1970s and 1980s, the U.N. strategy was to take very small steps, and then build on each accomplishment.

A good example of how the U.N. operates is the [Universal Declaration on Human Rights](#), adopted in 1948. It is a carefully worded, non-binding document, with which few people could disagree. For example, Article 19 proclaims:

"Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion and expression; this right includes freedom to hold opinions without interference and to seek, receive and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers."<sup>(2)</sup>

Eighteen years later, however, the U.N. adopted a treaty to make the principles in the Declaration legally binding. Article 19 of the [International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights](#), says:

1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.
2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.
3. The exercise of the rights provided for in paragraph 2 of this article carries with it special duties and responsibilities. It may therefore be subject to certain restrictions, but these shall only be such as are provided by law and are necessary:
  - (a) For respect of the rights or reputations of others;
  - (b) For the protection of national security or of public order (ordre public), or of public health or morals.<sup>(3)</sup>

The legally-binding version is significantly different from the non-binding policy version. Paragraph 3 provides for the U.N. to determine what, when, and which "certain restrictions" are to be applied to the "right to freedom of expression." The U.S. ratified this treaty in 1992, with certain "reservations and understandings," a procedure that has not been allowed on most recent treaties.

Typically, the U.N. advances an initiative in the form of a policy document or a non-binding treaty, and then follows its adoption with a legally binding document. The [Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer](#) was originally a non-binding treaty adopted in 1985. Almost immediately, the U.N. went to work creating the [Montreal Protocol](#), adopted in 1987 and revised in 1990, 1992, 1995, 1997, and 1999, each with tighter and tighter, legally-binding provisions.

The same procedure was followed with the [U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change](#), adopted by the U.N. in 1992. This treaty was non-binding, but immediately, the U.N. set out to create the [Kyoto Protocol](#), which is legally-binding. The United States has ratified the non-binding treaty, but has not yet ratified the Kyoto Protocol.

Another method used by the U.N. to expand its programs incrementally can be seen in the U.S.

MAB ([Man and the Biosphere](#)) program. In the late 1970s, the U.S. State Department entered into a Memorandum of Agreement with the United Nations Education, Scientific, and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), to create special wilderness "research" sites called Biosphere Reserves. Over time, mission creep expanded the purpose, number and size of these sites to include not only wilderness research areas, but buffer zones, and zones of cooperation to serve as laboratories for sustainable development.<sup>(4)</sup>

The ultimate goal is the same as the [Wildlands project](#): to convert at least half the land area of the United States into wilderness areas, off limits to humans, and to manage most of the rest of the land for conservation objectives, forcing humans to lives in islands of human habitat, surrounded by wilderness,<sup>(5)</sup> euphemistically called, [sustainable communities](#).<sup>(6)</sup> The program is currently voluntary, but would become legally binding if the Convention on Biological Diversity, adopted by the U.N. in 1992, were ratified by the U.S. Senate.<sup>(7)</sup>

The "set of interacting guidance and control mechanisms," about which Gustave Speth spoke, is the United Nations system, which actually is more than 130 international organizations, agencies and commissions, and nearly a thousand officially [recognized non-government organizations](#).<sup>(8)</sup> One way or another, each of these U.N. components is working to bring the entire world into the web of global governance.

Of the U.N.'s 191 member nations,<sup>(9)</sup> most are considered to be "developing" nations. A few are considered to be nations with economies "in transition." Only about 35 nations are classified as "developed" nations. Each nation is assessed a dues amount based on the nation's economic output.<sup>(10)</sup>

Nine developed nations pay more than 75% of the total cost, with the U.S. paying 22% of the total budget - the largest single funding source.<sup>(11)</sup> Each nation gets one vote - regardless of population, or the dues amount paid.

The minimum annual dues amount paid by developing nations in 2005, was \$17,795. As of November 9, 61 nations had paid no dues at all, and 28 nations paid the minimum amount.<sup>(12)</sup> The U.N. pays the expenses of the delegates from these poor nations who attend endless U.N. meetings. Frequently, this expense exceeds the total amount of dues paid by the nation.<sup>(13)</sup> This policy insures that the U.N. will have all the votes it needs to advance any initiative on its agenda.

This same basic funding scheme applies to all the various U.N. organizations. The U.S. and a handful of other developed nations pay most of the expenses, and most of the delegates have their expenses paid by the U.N. There is never a shortage of votes for the U.N.'s global governance initiatives.

Non-government organizations that support the U.N. agenda also feed at the U.N. treasure trough. According to the 1996 First Quarter Report of the U.N.'s Global Environment Facility (GEF), a total of \$2.3 billion had been spent on global warming projects, with most going to accredited NGOs around the world. The report identified 39 such projects which were coordinated by either the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the World

Wildlife Fund (WWF), or the World Resources Institute (WRI), worth a total of \$350 million. <sup>(14)</sup>

In its June, 1998 report, the Global Environment Facility (GEF) listed \$748,142,000 in global warming projects, \$767,019,000 in biodiversity projects, and \$63,672,000 in "multiple focal areas" projects. A detailed analysis of the projects revealed that these same NGOs were named repeatedly as executing agency or collaborating agency, on 42 projects totaling \$792,705,000 in value. The NGOs named in these projects include: The Nature Conservancy (TNC); the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN); Greenpeace; World Resources Institute (WRI); and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF). <sup>(15)</sup>

It's little wonder that NGOs attend these U.N. meetings to urge the delegates to continue the various projects that produce so much funding.

This massive "set of interacting guidance and control mechanisms," has grown unabated in recent years, extracting its sustenance from nations "according to their ability," and redistributing a portion of the wealth to nations "according to their need." The undistributed portion feeds the "guidance and control mechanisms."

There can no longer be any question about the U.N.'s quest to establish global governance, nor can there be any question about the nature of the governance that is being imposed. Global governance is grounded in socialist philosophy: government is omnipotent, and is responsible for meeting the needs of people on an equitable basis; all resources are owned collectively by the people, and government is responsible for assuring that the earth's resources are shared efficiently, and equitably, by the current, and subsequent generations. This philosophy is the essence of "sustainable development." <sup>(16)</sup>

Most of the world eagerly accepts this philosophy, and is impatient for the U.N. to fully implement comprehensive global governance. The United States is the major obstacle.

The United States arose from a completely different political philosophy. In the United States, government is not omnipotent, but is limited, empowered only by the consent of the governed. This philosophy has been eroded rather substantially in recent years, not only to meet international obligations, but also because the U.N.'s influence over education has produced a growing percentage of the population who prefer the U.N.'s goals and methods over the values of limited government and national sovereignty.

The U.S. Constitution provides no authority for the federal government to regulate the use of private property. However, when the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species was ratified, an "international obligation" was created. In order to comply with the requirements of the treaty, the U.S. Congress adopted the Endangered Species Act, which authorizes the federal government to regulate the use of private property deemed - by the government - to be "critical habitat." Without the treaty, this law would clearly be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court has allowed it to stand, because Article VI of the Constitution includes treaties as the supreme law of the land.

## Education

The erosion of traditional American values is also the result of a carefully orchestrated program by the United Nations to influence the education of children, beginning at the earliest possible age. The first major project of UNESCO in 1949 was a series of training sessions called "[Toward World Understanding](#)," designed to teach teachers how, and what to teach. The text for training session V, instructs teachers thusly:

"...it is sufficient to note that it is most frequently in the family that the children are infected with nationalism...this may be more ridiculous than dangerous, but it must, none the less, be regarded as the complete negation of world-mindedness. We shall presently recognize, in nationalism, the major obstacle to the development of world-mindedness."

"As long as the child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only rather precarious results."<sup>(17)</sup>

The National Education Association, and the U.S. Department of Education were very active partners with UNESCO during these early years. A vivid, very detailed, and well documented account of the involvement and cooperation of the NEA, and several other key U.S. organizations, is available in Robert P. Hillmann's excellent book, [Reinventing Government: Fast Bullets and Culture Changes](#).<sup>(18)</sup>

The cooperation between U.S. education institutions and the United Nations has continued. The curriculum for social studies, math, and environmental education - at every level - is replete with the principles advanced by the United Nations. Alan Quist's [FedEd: The New Federal Curriculum and How it is Enforced](#),<sup>(19)</sup> provides outstanding examples of how textbooks have been changed to diminish traditional American values and extol the U.N.'s values of the new "global citizen." Familiar programs such as "Outcome Based Education," "Goals 2000," "School to Work," and "No Child Left Behind," are all constructed on the U.N.'s principles of developing "world mindedness" - at the expense of accurate American history, the supremacy of national sovereignty, and the benefits and responsibilities of individual freedom.

This education campaign has been so effective over the years, that a World Federation of United Nations Associations has emerged, representing millions of members of U.N. supporters around the world. The United Nations Association of the United States boasts hundreds of thousands of members, who regularly lobby Congress to support U.N. initiatives. In fact, many of these U.N. supporters are members of Congress, who work to advance the U.N. agenda despite its erosion of national sovereignty.

## Sovereignty and the oceans

[The Convention on the Law of the Sea](#) is an excellent example. Article II(3) states:

"The sovereignty over the territorial sea is exercised subject to this Convention and to other rules of international law."<sup>(20)</sup>

This provision clearly subjects sovereignty over territorial seas to the authority of "*this Convention and to other rules of international law.*" This treaty has been approved by the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and is supported by many people in the administration. These people have no problem accepting the erosion of national sovereignty, while further empowering the United Nations system.

This treaty also creates the International Seabed Authority which has the power to issue permits to private, or government organizations, that wish to explore the seabed for resources. Besides charging a permit fee in the \$250,000 range, the ISA can also require payment of a royalty on anything that is extracted from the seabed. This treaty empowers a U.N. agency to levy its own taxes, even though proponents claim that permit fees and royalties are not taxes.

An independent source of income has long been the dream of the United Nations. As long as the U.N. is dependent upon voluntary dues payments by the member nations, it can be controlled by its members. The fear of losing the revenue provided by the United States is the only reason the U.N. has not moved more aggressively toward global governance. Ultimately, the U.N. wants to have the authority to tax. Dozens of proposals have been advanced, but the U.S. has been able to block them. Should the U.N. ever acquire the authority to levy taxes, it would be able to maintain its own enforcement regime, and all nations would be subject to its power.

### **Land use**

The aspirations of global governance reach across every facet of human existence. Land use policies affect not only Biosphere Reserves, but all land. The U.N. first published its land use policy in 1976. The preamble to the report of the U.N. Conference on Human Settlements says:

"Land...cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and therefore contributes to social injustice; if unchecked, it may become a major obstacle in the planning and implementation of development schemes. The provision of decent dwellings and healthy conditions for the people can only be achieved if land is used in the interests of society as a whole. Public control of land use is therefore indispensable...."<sup>(21)</sup>

Many of the specific policy recommendations<sup>(22)</sup> in this document have been incorporated into the model legislation developed by the American Planning Association with grants from the federal government. As states continue to enact comprehensive planning legislation, these policy recommendations become law in the United States.

### **Gun control**

Gun control is another item on the global governance agenda. In its 1996 report, [\*Our Global Neighborhood\*](#), the Commission on Global Governance said:

"The production and trade in arms should be controlled by the international community. We strongly endorse community initiatives to protect individual life, to encourage the

disarming of civilians...."<sup>(23)</sup>

The United Nations called together representatives of 33 non-government organizations in 1998 to create the [International Action Network on Small Arms](#).<sup>(24)</sup> There are now more than 500 local groups working in 100 countries to promote international law to ban small arms, and to promote gun ban legislation at the local level. These groups are funded by government agencies and by private foundations, many of which are in the United States.

## **Commerce**

Actually, the United Nations wants all trade and commerce controlled by the international community. The General Agreements on Tariffs and Trade (GATT) evolved into the World Trade Organization in 1994. This U.N. organization has the power to invoke sanctions against any nation, including the United States, that does not comply with its regulations. At the recent WTO meeting in Hong Kong, the proposal for the WTO to control the movement of "guest workers" gained substantial ground. "Mode 4, - movement of natural persons" as the proposal is known, would allow the WTO, rather than sovereign nations, to determine the number of migrant workers, and the circumstances under which they may enter a sovereign nation to work.

The International Standards Organization (ISO) also imposes rules on industry that affects commerce. ISO-9000 is a series of international management standards, and ISO-14000 is a series of standards relating to environmental management. Industries that fail to comply with these international rules can be prohibited from international commerce. The process of acquiring ISO certification has spawned a specialized consulting business that results in costs that must be passed on to the consumer, while it ensures that U.N. management and environmental policies are implemented.

Similar certification arrangements are required by various forest treaties and agreements. The International Tropical Timber Organization (ITTO), another U.N. organization, has developed an extensive certification program using selected NGOs as the certifying agencies. These NGOs extract a certification fee from the producer. Producers cannot ship timber products without this certification. Horror stories abound about the abuse and extortion these certificate-wielding NGOs have imposed upon the U.S. timber industry.<sup>(25)</sup>

## **Internet**

Since the emergence of the Internet, the U.N. has lusted after its control, not only to control the flow of information, but also to exploit its revenue-producing potential. The Council of Europe began developing a treaty in 1997, <sup>(26)</sup> known as the "International Convention on Cybercrime."<sup>(27)</sup>

The United Nations, however, wants much more control.

The U.N. convened a "World Summit on the Information Society" in Geneva, Switzerland in December 2003. This meeting attracted delegates from 175 nations who agreed to create a U.N.-sanctioned "Working Group on Internet Governance." The WGIG met four times officially in

preparation for the second World Summit on the Information Society, held in Tunis, in 2005. Their first goal was to define Internet governance:

"Internet governance is the development and application by Governments, the private sector and civil society, in their respective roles, of shared principles, norms, rules, decision-making procedures, and programmes that shape the evolution and use of the Internet."<sup>(28)</sup>

It is instructive to note that from the very first meeting, delegates never considered the proprietary interests of the people who created the Internet. Neither the U.S. Government, the academic institutions, nor the private investors who built the Internet were even acknowledged. From the outset, the existence of the Internet was viewed as an existing resource, and therefore, it should be controlled by the international community and provided to all people on an equitable basis.

The WGIG went into the Tunis meeting of the World Summit on the Information Society with a full report which recommended the creation of a (1) U.N.-sanctioned "Forum," which would provide "space" for all stakeholders to provide input for Internet governance; (2) "Global Public Policy Oversight," which stipulated that "no single government" should control the Internet, and provides four models for global Internet governance; (3) "Institutional Coordination" among intergovernmental organizations; and (4) "Regional and National Coordination" led by multi-stakeholder organizations.

Fortunately, delegates from the United States were not eager to turn the Internet over to this new proposed international Internet governance institution. The only portion of the wish list that remained at the end of the Tunis meeting was the first recommendation - the creation of a "Forum." This small victory, however, is enough to keep the Internet in jeopardy. The U.N. will not relinquish its quest simply because the current U.S. administration opposes U.N. control.

This new Forum will continue to meet and plan new strategies to wrest control of the Internet from the U.S. and get some form of international control. Should another administration come to the White House who, like the Clinton-Gore administration, is eager to support global governance, control of the Internet will likely be transferred to the international community.

### **Enforcement**

This is only a cursory glimpse of the scope of governance the international community hopes to control through the United Nations structure. The two essential elements for success are adequate funding, and the ability to enforce its policies. Through treaties such as the Convention on the Law of the Sea, with its International Seabed Authority, the U.N. has established the precedent of levying taxes in specific areas. Negotiations surrounding the Kyoto Protocol discussed similar options relating to an international emissions trading program. Other agencies, such as the U.N.'s High Level Panel of Funding Development, are still trying to impose more direct tax levies, particularly on the international exchange of currency. Other income-producing ideas are continually advanced.

The [Oil-For-Food program](#) is an example of both the U.N.'s creative financing, and why the U.N. should never be allowed to acquire independent financing. The OFF program generated nearly a hundred billion dollars of revenue that flowed through the United Nations. The program provided a two percent administrative fee directly for the U.N. This is an amount roughly equal to the amount of the U.S. annual contributions to all U.N. activities. Until the U.S. invaded Iraq, the world assumed that the OFF was functioning properly, and that the U.N. was administering the program efficiently.

Not until U.S. forces secured documents from the internal operations of the Iraqi government, did the world begin to realize just how corrupt the program was, and the extent of U.N. complicity. Had the U.S. not invaded Iraq, the U.N. would still be abusing the program and lining the pockets of its officers and friends. The story of corruption unfolded throughout 2004, <sup>(29)</sup> and revealed that Saddam Hussein had bribed hundreds of individuals and companies, including U.N. diplomats.

These revelations spotlighted not only the propensity for corruption within the U.N. system, but also the absence of accountability as well. The U.N. is a closed system, unaccountable to any higher authority. In this regard, the U.N. system is similar to any other dictatorial system, where the powers that be may do virtually whatever they wish, without fear of retribution. Only the discovery of Iraq's internal documents made possible the discovery of the U.N.'s corruption. Who knows what other U.N. programs may be just as corrupt.

Even more important, the OFF scandal revealed another fatal flaw in the U.N.'s system of global governance: people, as well as nations, will put self-interests ahead of international concerns.

The U.N. Security Council has the responsibility and the authority to sanction the use of force against a nation. Although the Security Council had issued more than a dozen resolutions against Iraq, which were blatantly ignored, the Security Council refused to authorize the use of force. France, Germany, and Russia blocked every attempt to force Iraq to comply with the resolutions.

The OFF documents revealed why. Saddam Hussein had targeted companies, officials, and diplomats from these countries for contracts and bribes, to ensure that they would block any efforts by the U.S. to disturb his lucrative activities.

The U.N. Security Council is the primary enforcement authority for U.N. policies and resolutions. Were it not for the veto power granted to the five permanent members, the U.N. would be able to do whatever it wishes. That's why global governance proponents want so desperately to remove both the veto and permanent member status from the U.N. Charter. The Commission on Global Governance recommended a two-step plan to achieve this goal. First, expand the Security Council to 23 rotating members, and remove the permanent member status. This would weaken the council substantially, and reduce the number of members with veto power who may be on the Council at any given time. And finally, to remove the veto power altogether.

The demand for U.N. reform, after the OFF scandal, includes a part of this recommendation: the expansion of the Security Council membership. Reformers knew, however, that neither removal

of the permanent member status, nor the veto, was possible in the current environment. But expansion of the Security Council is still a step toward the eventual goal.

The final element for enforcement is the [International Criminal Court](#), also recommended by the Commission on Global Governance. This court was created in 1998, and signed by then-President Bill Clinton. Initially, this court would address only "genocide, war crimes, and crimes against humanity." Nothing in the court's founding documents precludes the court from expanding its jurisdiction at any time. Further, it is up to the court to determine just exactly what constitutes a "crime against humanity." Several nations, as well as the former U.N. Commissioner for Human Rights, have declared that the U.S. should be indicted for war crimes. And at virtually every climate change meeting, delegates have charged that the U.S.'s pollution and refusal to join the Kyoto Protocol constitutes a crime against humanity. The document that created the International Criminal Court specifies that all nations - whether they ratified the court or not - are subject to the court's jurisdiction.

President George Bush took the unusual step of withdrawing Bill Clinton's signature from the document, and immediately negotiated agreements with participating nations to exempt U.S. citizens from prosecution by this court in their country. These exemptions could vanish, in an instant, with another President in the White House.

### **Conclusion**

Very few Americans are aware of the real and potential consequences of global governance. Most people are indifferent. According to recent Gallup opinion polls, a full 60 percent of Americans still believe the U.N. should play a "major role" in international policy affairs. Far too many people are actively working to achieve global governance through the United Nations.

Some of these people hold key positions in the administration and in Congress.

John F. Turner is the Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs. He is responsible for bringing forward again, the Convention on the Law of the Sea. He has also declared that he would again advance the Convention on Biological Diversity. Turner also heads the U.S. delegations to all U.N. environmental conferences.

Senator Richard Lugar, Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, is also a strong supporter of the United Nations. He held hearings on the Convention on the Law of the Sea, but would not allow testimony from people who opposed the treaty. There are many others in Congress who believe the U.N. should be given more authority and resources, to expand its vision of global governance.

If the march toward global governance is to be reversed, it will be ordinary Americans who convince their elected officials that the U.N.'s agenda must be rejected. Until ordinary citizens get informed and involved in sufficient numbers to influence elected representatives, global governance will continue to advance. Ordinary citizens are getting informed and involved, by forming local organizations, and inviting their neighbors to meetings, and sharing literature, and by making presentations to local government. Local organizations are networking in statewide

coalitions to influence state legislatures, and to coordinate national campaigns to influence Congress.

As more and more ordinary citizens get informed, they are requiring the candidates for office to declare a position on these important issues, before deciding who gets their vote. This is the American way. In the end, whether the world is plagued by global governance, or saved from it, will be determined by ordinary Americans, and their willingness to do whatever it takes to preserve and advance the principles of freedom. Every previous generation of Americans has confronted similar threats; they responded, by giving whatever it took to insure freedom for this generation. This generation can do no less.

## Endnotes

1. "Global Governance for Sustainable Development," A speech by James Gustave Speth, Executive Director of the United Nations Development Program, delivered to the World Conference on Rio +5, Rio de Janeiro, March, 1997. <http://sovereignty.net/p/gov/ggspeth.htm>.
2. Universal Declaration of Human Rights, Article 19, adopted by the U.N. General Assembly Resolution 217 A (III) of 10 December 1948. [www.un.org/Overview/rights.html](http://www.un.org/Overview/rights.html)
3. International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, Article 19, adopted by U.N. General Assembly resolution 2200A (XXI) of 16 December 1966. [www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/a\\_ccpr.htm](http://www.unhcr.ch/html/menu3/b/a_ccpr.htm)
4. Tom McDonnell, "Analysis of the Evolving Nature of the United Nations Environmental, Scientific & Cultural Organizations's Man & Biosphere Reserve Program, and United States Compliance with its Statutory Framework," August 15, 2005. [sovereignty.net/p/land/mcdonnell.html](http://sovereignty.net/p/land/mcdonnell.html), Also published in *Eco-logic Powerhouse*, October, 2005.
5. Global Biodiversity Assessment, Section 13; (Cambridge University Press, 1995,) p. 993.
6. "Sustainable Development: Transforming America," Henry Lamb, *Eco-logic Powerhouse*, December, 2005.
7. How the Convention on Biodiversity was defeated, Sovereignty International, Inc., 1998, [sovereignty.net/p/land/biotreatystop.htm](http://sovereignty.net/p/land/biotreatystop.htm)
8. NGOs in Consultative Status with ECOSOC - [sovereignty.net/p/ngo/NGOstatusUN.htm](http://sovereignty.net/p/ngo/NGOstatusUN.htm)
9. Growth in United Nations Membership, 1945-2005, [www.un.org/Overview/growth.htm](http://www.un.org/Overview/growth.htm)
10. For a list of member assessments,

see: <http://globalpolicy.igc.org/finance/assessmt/dues2000.htm>

11. For a chart of relative payments, see: [www.globalpolicy.org/finance/tables/reg-budget/percentassess05.htm](http://www.globalpolicy.org/finance/tables/reg-budget/percentassess05.htm)

12. Payments to the Regular Budget of the United Nations as of November 9, 2005. [www.un.org/News/ossg/honroll.html](http://www.un.org/News/ossg/honroll.html)

13. It is nearly impossible to find actual documentation for the extent of this expense, since most budget documents simply list a "conference expense," without specific documentation. However, at more than two dozen U.N. meetings around the world, the author has personally witnessed the procedure for delegate reimbursement, and watched delegates - by the hundreds - line up to submit their expense vouchers.

14. "How NGOs are changing the world," *Eco-logic*, January, 1997. [eco.freedom.org/el-97/eljan97.htm](http://eco.freedom.org/el-97/eljan97.htm)

15. "NGOs Drive Global Climate Agenda," *Daily Reports*, Bonn Climate Change Meetings, May 31 - June 11, 1999. [sovereignty.net/p/clim/bonn699/updates.html](http://sovereignty.net/p/clim/bonn699/updates.html)

16. Agenda 21 is the non-binding policy document adopted in 1992 at the Rio U.N. Conference on Environment and Development. This document defines Sustainable Development, and sets forth policy recommendations for its implementation. <http://sovereignty.net/p/sd/a21/> .

17. Towards World Understanding - V, UNESCO Publication 356, Georges Lang, Paris; D.L 3 Trim. 1949 B2388 - [eco.freedom.org/reports/unesco356.htm#toward](http://eco.freedom.org/reports/unesco356.htm#toward))

18. *Reinventing Government: Fast Bullets and Culture Changes*; [sovereignty.net/p/gov/hillmann-book2.html](http://sovereignty.net/p/gov/hillmann-book2.html)

19. Steven Yates, "FedEd: Education for Global Government," LewRockwell.com <http://www.lewrockwell.com/yates/yates72.html>; also see: [http://www.edwatch.org/fed\\_ed.html](http://www.edwatch.org/fed_ed.html).

20. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Article 2. [http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention\\_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm](http://www.un.org/Depts/los/convention_agreements/texts/unclos/closindx.htm)

21. Information here cited is from "Report of Habitat: United Nations Conference on Human Settlements," Vancouver, 31 May - 11 June, 1976, (A/Conf.70/15), personally photocopied from the archives of the U.N. Library at Geneva, Switzerland, December 6, 1996. (On file)

22. Many of these recommendations are documented in "The U.N. and property rights," published by Sovereignty International, Inc. - <http://sovereignty.net/p/land/unproprts.htm>

23. *Our Global Neighborhood*, The Commission on Global Governance, Oxford Press, 1995;

pages 85, 131. <http://sovereignty.net/p/gov/ogn-front.html>

24. More detailed information on this organization is available here: "Next, our guns," by Henry Lamb, Eco-logic online, December 1, 1999 - [www.eco.freedom.org/el/19991201/guns.shtml](http://www.eco.freedom.org/el/19991201/guns.shtml)

25. More information about this timber certification program is available at: <http://www.eco.freedom.org/el/20031001/caruba.shtml> and, <http://www.itto.or.jp/live/PageDisplayHandler?pageId=101>

26. Henry Lamb, "New Internet Treaty Readied," published by Sovereignty International, Inc. - <http://sovereignty.net/center/treaty.html>

27. Full text and ratification information is available here: <http://conventions.coe.int/Treaty/EN/cadreprojets.htm>

28. Report of the Working Group on Internet Governance, June 2005, Title II(8) - <http://www.wgig.org/WGIG-Report.html>

29. "1,300 Oil Vouchers Begin to Tell Story;" *Washington Post* Staff Writers, Friday, October 8, 2004; Page A30 - [www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A16282-2004Oct7.html](http://www.washingtonpost.com/wp-dyn/articles/A16282-2004Oct7.html).