

Kyoto

Contents

Kyoto Report..... 3



Kyoto Report

By Henry Lamb



Japan appeared abruptly as we broke through the clouds at about 10,000 feet above Kansai International Airport. The mountains, very similar to the southern Appalachians, provide a natural barrier to the sea and shield an expansive nest of housing structures that crowd the valleys and surround the harbor. The 75-minute train ride from the airport to Kyoto was a picture of "sustainable living." There are no single-family structures visible anywhere. People live in housing structures, only some of which can be defined as apartment buildings. There are,

of course, many grand apartment buildings throughout the Kansai area of Japan, in which two-bedroom apartments rent for 770,000 Yen per month (\$5,968). Three-bedroom apartments go for 1.2 million Yen per month. People who live near the rail tracks, however, live in multi-family structures that rise three to four floors, separated only by breathing space. Every square inch of open land between the airport and Kyoto was a garden with cabbage, rice, and other vegetables. Most were the size of a typical bedroom, 12 x 16 feet. Occasionally, we passed a communal garden, larger in size, where several families tended small portions of a larger field.

The largest communal garden was about the size of a football field.

The Japanese people are truly the world leaders in courtesy and politeness. All the stories are true: Japanese people do bow at almost every encounter with another person, whether Japanese or not. The people strive to be friendly, courteous, and helpful. Every hotel maid offers "*ohayo gozaimasu*" (which we think means good morning) to every passerby. Every transaction is concluded with "*arigato*," thank you, or "*domo arigato*" which adds "very much." New York and Boston cabbies should take a lesson from the fleet of taxis in Kyoto. The cabs are spotless. Drivers wear crisp uniforms, hats and white gloves. Between fares, they polish their cars with long feather dusters. Many of the people speak English, to some degree, and are eager to help in any situation.

The Kyoto International Conference Hall is thirty-minutes from downtown Kyoto by subway -- 260 Yen, 2800 Yen by taxi . Ten thousand people from around the world converged in Kyoto to attend the Third meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Framework Convention on Climate Change.

In the jargon of the UN, that's COP III of the FCCC. COP III is the conference at which the Berlin Mandate (BM) is supposed to be fulfilled. The BM, adopted at COP I, called for legally binding QELROs (quantified emissions limitation reduction objectives) to be imposed on 34 developed nations -- but not on 131 developing nations -- before the end of 1997. Timothy Wirth, then Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs, actually supported the BM in 1995. It is little wonder that Wirth chose to leave Clinton's employment two weeks before Kyoto when Clinton reversed his previous position and said he would accept no agreement in Kyoto which did not include the "participation" of developing nations.

"Bill Clinton is dishonest," according to the Right Honorable John Gummer, former Minister of the Environment for the

United Kingdom (UK), now a Member of Parliament (MP) and a lead delegate to COP III representing the European Union (EU). "The BBC ran video tape of Mr. Clinton standing on the White House lawn in 1992 after his victory and he promised to do what President Bush was unwilling to do -- honor the Climate Change Treaty by returning greenhouse gas emissions to 1990 levels by 2000. I was there in 1995 when Tim Wirth stood with me in support of the Berlin Mandate. To come around now and require participation by the developing countries is sheer dishonesty."

Gummer's attitude reflects the mood of the majority of the delegates who began this conference with wide-ranging disagreements on the most substantive issues. Besides the issue of whether or not the developing nations would be required to participate, the issue of targets and timetables spanned what appeared to be an uncrossable chasm. The U.S. position on opening day was to commit to simply returning emissions to 1990 levels by 2008 - 2012, with the "legally binding" mechanism to be triggered at that time (after Al Gore is safely out of office). The U.S. position would require a reduction of some 34%, according to most studies. Japan offered a target of 5% below 1990 levels; the EU proposed a target of 15% by 2010, and the Alliance of Small Island States wanted a target of 20% below 1990 levels by 2005.

These vastly different positions were staunchly held by the Parties as the conference convened on Monday, December 1. Posturing had already begun. Meanwhile, in Bonn, Germany, behind the scenes negotiations were underway which opened the possibility that the U.S. would modify its position on "differentiation" if the EU would modify its position on the "EU Bubble." Clinton then announced that Al Gore would attend the conference for only one day, and that he had been instructed to "walk away" from a bad deal. On the second day of negotiations, a trial balloon was launched, suggesting that the U.S. would accept a target of 3-1/2% reduction below 1990 levels if China and the G-77 countries would accept some form

of "participation." When China robustly refused, the U.S. delegation vehemently denied making any offer to change its position. Such is the stuff of international negotiations.

The negotiating sessions ground on behind closed doors late into the night each day through Friday. Just before the dinner hour on Friday, New Zealand offered a proposal in hopes of breaking the deadlock caused by Clinton's demand for developing nation "participation." The proposal called for "evolutionary commitments" by developing nations. The proposal would allow developing nations to sign an agreement which would require them to be bound by the targets agreed to by the delegates at some unspecified time in the future (but not before 2014), at the point when their economies "evolved" to a certain (unspecified) emissions threshold. Such is the language of UN diplomatic doublespeak. Speaker after speaker lined up to support or oppose the new proposal. The Chinese delegate was furious. When he was recognized, he said: "No, no, no! It is a waste of time...out of the context of the Berlin Mandate."

Never far beneath the surface, the issue of the underlying science hovers. Sovereignty International published two editions of its newsletter for the delegates. The second edition's headlines read: "The Scientific Case Against The Climate Treaty." Dr. S. Fred Singer, author of *Hot Talk, Cold Science*, was present as one of Sovereignty International's eleven-member delegation. Although several press people interviewed Singer, and a press conference was arranged by the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI) and the Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow (CFACT), the only news reports that appeared in the local press had to do with statements issued by Robert Watson, newly elected President of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC).

Watson was asked in a press briefing about the growing number of climate scientists who challenge the conclusions of the UN that man-induced global warming is real and promises

cataclysmic consequences. Watson responded by denigrating all dissenting scientists as pawns of the fossil fuel industry. "The science is settled" he said, and "we're not going to reopen it here." With that, the issue of science was omitted from any discussion at the proceedings. The science, however, is drawing ever more serious challenges by a widening range of climate scientists. More than 110 of the world's leading climatologists and atmospheric scientists have now signed the "Leipzig Declaration" which says, essentially, that the uncertainties that abound in climate science do not justify policy actions proposed by the COP III.

Most of the major media, however, has conspired to ignore dissenting scientists. The Media Research Center conducted an analysis of major media news coverage of the global warming issue between January 1993 and October 1997. They found that of the 48 stories during the period, 39 simply assumed that the science supporting global warming claims was true. Only seven stories acknowledged that some scientists were skeptical, and in only two stories, were the arguments of dissenting scientists actually discussed. Both ABC and CBS were identified as advocates of the global warming science with statements such as Peter Jennings' October 22, 1997 declaration that "...the overwhelming majority of scientist now agree [climate change] is being caused by man."

The media refuse to report statements such as that of Benjamin D. Santer, lead author of the IPCC Chapter on science. *Science* magazine quotes Santer as saying (May 16, 1997), "It's unfortunate that people read the media hype before they read the report. We say quite clearly that few scientists would say the attribution [of global warming to human causes] issue was a done deal." At least six independent polls have now been conducted by reputable firms such as the Gallup organization, and others, in America and in Europe. Depending on how the questions are framed, as few as three percent of American climate scientists agree with the IPCC conclusions, according to a survey conducted by

the *Meteorologisches Institut der Universität Hamburg*, as published in the UN's own *Climate Change Bulletin* (Issue 14, Second Quarter, 1997). The most generous estimate of agreement registered by any of the polls was 19%. That means that at least 81% of the scientists involved with climate reject the IPCC conclusion that "the balance of evidencesuggests a human influence on global climate."

The media and the UN have conspired to orchestrate the most comprehensive propaganda campaign since Joseph Goebbels tried to prepare the world for Hitler's brand of global governance. In Japan, as was the case in Bonn and in Geneva throughout the year, CNN has become a 24-hour per day propaganda mill for the UN, using unconscionable scare-tactics in support of the Climate Change Treaty. Throughout the day and night, promotional spots for their "global warming" special fills the air waves, featuring hurricanes, floods, drought, storms, and all manner of other calamities.

Kyoto is especially well prepared to promote the party line on global warming. Posters line the streets everywhere praising COP III as the solution to the global warming problem. A youth orchestra consisting of students from around the world has been funded by the FCCC to hold concerts around the world in support of protecting the earth by reversing global warming. Students for COP III (SCOP) were all over town with various celebrations and demonstrations. The front page of *The Daily Yomiuri*, the local newspaper, featured a three-column color photo of Tomoko Nose, of Japan's Greenpeace, celebrating a ceremonial "tea," with water warmed by solar panels. The ceremony was attended by officials from Kyoto Green Action, Greenpeace Spain, and Environmental Right Action (ERA) of Nigeria.

Of the estimated 10,000 people attending COP III, about half are NGO representatives, about one-third are media types, and the rest are delegates. The Climate Action Network (CAN) consisting of a worldwide coalition of organizations such as the

Sierra Club, The Nature Conservancy, and Friends of the Earth, have 117 lobbyists registered. Greenpeace has 44 lobbyists in attendance, while Global Environmental Action fielded 114 lobbyists. ICLEA (International

*Sovereignty International
broadcast 37 radio programs
from Kyoto through a
massive network of
more than 3,000
local U.S. radio stations
and via shortwave to
80 foreign nations —
23 hours of live broadcasts!*

Council for Local Environmental Action) has 112 lobbyists listed. These are only a few of the nearly 200 green NGOs attending COP III. By contrast, Sovereignty International had 11 people, two of whom are from C-FACT, and four are from Eagle Forum. The Competitive Enterprise Institute had two people on the job in Kyoto. Despite being severely outnumbered, our efforts received significant recognition. In addition to the news bulletin published by Sovereignty International, David Rothbard, of CFACT, and Henry Lamb broadcast 37 programs totaling 23 hours of air time through a massive network of approximately 3000 radio stations. Several of the programs were also broadcast via shortwave to as many as 80 nations.

During the grinding boredom of waiting for the delegates to say something different, Friends of the Earth International conducted a vote among the green NGOs to identify the world's "Dirty Dozen," industries and organizations most responsible for destroying the earth. The top vote-getter received their "Scorched Earth Award." The Global Climate Coalition was chosen as the dirtiest of the dozen (with Exxon a close second) because of the \$13-million ad campaign waged weeks before COP III. The award consisted of a half globe, filled with dirt, and a sign proclaiming "Scorched Earth Award."

In the spirit of environmental responsibility (and not to be outdone), the CFACT group secured the award and decided that it should be recycled into the "Scorched Economy Award." With a little ingenuity, the half globe had its sign changed and the dirt was covered with 1-Yen coins (129 Yen = 1 U.S. dollar). Press releases were issued, a large banner prepared, and the Sovereignty International delegation joined CFACT and CEI in a parade to the center of the press area where the award was presented to Friends of the Earth International. TV cameras rolled and flash bulbs flashed. Brief exchanges of friendly insults resulted in a challenge to a formal debate on the science of global warming, scheduled the day before the conference adjourns.

The first edition of our newsletter carried an invitation to delegates to share their views with America by visiting the Sovereignty International exhibit to record an interview to be played over the radio network. Both delegates and NGO representatives responded and produced a collection of interviews that will enlighten America to the attitudes that prevail at these conferences and around the world. John Gummer, quoted above, chastised America while a Member of Australia's Parliament expressed growing concerns about the intrusion of the UN into national sovereignty. A Russian member of the International Commission on Human Rights, representing the World Council of Churches, shared her views about the new "Earth Ethic." These interviews will provide useful understanding of how the rest of the world feels about the U.S. and about the UN.

Enter Prince Albert

A flock of helicopters rattled the windows of the Miyako Hotel until the Vice President's chopper landed on the hotel's heliport and deposited the most important person to attend the negotiations. Environmental NGOs proclaimed that Al Gore would deliver the dynamite necessary to break up the log-jams that plagued the proceedings. Gore's contribution to the celebration was hardly a firecracker. His speech to the

delegates contained the usual rhetoric to which he appended "I am instructing our delegation right now to show *increased negotiating flexibility* if a comprehensive plan can be put in place."

Disappointment descended upon the delegates; environmental NGOs were outraged. A report published by the Climate Action Network was headlined "Gore's Climate Fraud," CNN ran clips of Gore campaigning in 1992, criticizing President Bush's inaction on climate change, contrasted by Gore's statement made to the Kyoto delegates. A spokesman for Friends of the Earth (FOE) stood before TV cameras reading from Gore's 1992 book *Earth in the Balance*, in front of huge banners with the words "Gore in the Balance." Gore's presence did create a minor ripple in the negotiations. Although Gore refused to define "increased flexibility," it took only minutes to learn (through our corridor intelligence systems) that Gore had authorized the American delegation to increase the U.S. negotiating position from reductions to 1990 levels to a target 3-1/2% below 1990 levels *provided* that China would accept some kind of language that could be interpreted as an agreement to accept some kind of commitment at some point in the future. The corridors were abuzz for nearly two hours until word was passed that China was holding firm, flatly refusing to accept any language that could be construed as accepting commitments to reduce emissions.

We can only imagine the frustration that must have accompanied Gore's report to Clinton, who, in recent weeks, gave the Communist Chinese government a 21-gun salute, a red-carpet White House reception, a port at Long Beach California -- and nuclear technology. The Chinese government reciprocated with a resounding no to Clinton's demand for "meaningful participation" by developing nations.

In the palatial Presidential Suite, (one floor above our humble bedroom-press room-broadcast center) Gore convened one of those unofficial non-meetings that never occurred, attended by

the ministers from Japan, the EU (Luxembourg, UK, and Netherlands), to ponder the next step in the negotiations after the Chinese rebuff. The meeting concluded at 2:am after our corridor scouts were asleep. Chairman Estrada (Argentina) announced that a new revision of the negotiating text would be issued at 3:pm Tuesday, less than 24-hours before the scheduled adjournment.

At 8:pm the announcement came. The Chairman's new revised text included differentiated targets that would grant Australia permission to *increase* emission by 5% above 1990 levels while requiring the U.S. to reduce emission by 5% below 1990 levels by 2010. Japan's target was set at 4-1/2% below 1990, and the European Union's target set at 8% below 1990 levels. Still no movement by China on the all-important compliance by developing nations. Again, the delegates retreated behind closed doors, not to be heard from again until Wednesday morning -- a scant few hours before the delegates would be climbing onto airplanes heading home.

Wednesday, December 10, was scheduled to be the day the agreement would be adopted. The day's program announced a plenary session at 3:pm, followed by scheduled news briefings from the Secretariat and from most of the major delegations. A reception was scheduled at 8:pm at the Kyoto Concert Hall -- to celebrate. Three o'clock came and went. On the schedule board, all the times changed to "TBA." Five o'clock, seven o'clock, still no word from behind the closed doors of several working-group negotiating session. A flurry of speculation circulated through the corridors; "it may be about to blow-up." Finally, a little past eight, Chairman Estrada emerged, obviously weary, to announce that the working groups had all reported, and that he would take the reports and produce still another "final" draft of the agreement which would be ready at 11:pm. Delegates would then reconvene to consider the changes.

Relieved, but exhausted, the delegates, observers, and reporters found places to nap, places to eat, and some returned to their hotels for a shower and change of clothes in preparation for another night-long vigil. We had radio programs scheduled every two hours throughout the night. We expected to be able to report the final outcome of the conference, but the negotiations were still going on. At 7:35 am, on Thursday, December 11, -- just hours before our flight departed -- a friend who had spent the night at the conference hall slipped the final, final, amended agreement under our hotel room door. The delegates had finally agreed on the language of the document, although they still had to clear several other agenda items before the actual formal adoption. It was finally done. At nearly noon, after a marathon all-night negotiating session, the deal was finally complete. The position so confidently presented by the President and Vice President of the United States had been overwhelmed by China's tenacity. The President said that any target beyond returning to 1990 levels would be "unrealistic." In the end, he accepted 7% below 1990 levels as a target -- a reduction in excess of 40% from current levels of emission. The President said he would not accept an agreement that did not require "meaningful participation" by developing countries. In the end, he accepted an agreement that requires nothing from developing countries. The only reference to developing countries in the agreement specifies "no new commitments." The White House caved in, crumbled, and turned America's energy policy over to the United Nations.

Kyoto Protocol

to the United Nations

Framework Convention on Climate Change

(Summary analysis)

Preamble

Sets forth the authority for the protocol, citing Articles 2 and 3 of the FCCC (objectives and principles) and the Berlin Mandate (decision 1/CP.1).

Article 1:

Defines relevant terms: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change; Montreal Protocol; Annex I Parties as those listed in Annex I of the Convention, etc.

Article 2:

Requires Annex I Parties, "in order to promote sustainable development," to implement policies and measures such as:

- Enhancement of energy efficiency;
- Protection and enhancement of "sinks and reservoirs" and "promotion of sustainable forest management practices;"
- Promotion of sustainable forms of agriculture;
- Increased use of new and renewable forms of energy;
- Phasing out of "market imperfections," (fiscal incentive, tax exemption and subsidies);
- Reforms in relevant sectors which limit or reduce emissions of greenhouse gases;

- Limit and/or reduce emissions in the transport sector;
- Limit and/or reduce methane through waste management;
- Limit and/or reduce emissions from aviation and marine bunker fuels.

Instructs Parties to "minimize" adverse impacts of climate change on "international trade, and social, environmental and economic impacts" on developing countries. Calls on Parties to "cooperate," and requires Conference of the Parties (COP) to "consider ways and means to elaborate coordination of such policies and measures."

Article 3:

Annex I Parties shall, "individually or jointly" reduce carbon dioxide equivalent emissions listed in Annex A (list of six greenhouse gases) not to exceed amounts assigned in Annex B (list of specific targets for each Annex Party i.e. U.S. = 7%; EU = 8%; Japan = 6%) below 1990 levels "in the first commitment period 2008 to 2012.

By 2005, Annex I Parties "shall have made demonstrable progress in achieving its commitments."

Net changes in emissions resulting from direct human-induced land use changes in afforestation, reforestation, and deforestation "shall be used" to meet commitments of the protocol. Modalities, rules, and guidelines for measurements are to be adopted at the first session of the Parties after the protocol enters into force. The 12 Annex I Parties identified as "in transition to market economies" are to be granted "a certain degree of flexibility" in meeting commitments of the protocol.

Commitments for "subsequent periods shall be established in amendments to Annex B" (targets). Consideration of targets for subsequent periods shall be initiated "at least seven years

before the end of the first commitment period" (2006). Excess emissions reductions during a commitment period may be "banked" for use during a subsequent period. Parties to the Protocol shall "consider what actions are necessary to minimize the adverse effects" of implementation upon developing countries, including "the establishment of funding, insurance and transfer of technology."

Article 4:

Annex I Parties may "jointly fulfil their commitments," however, each Party is responsible for meeting its own target if the aggregate reductions fail to meet the combined reduction target. Parties may work jointly with "regional economic integration organizations."

Article 5:

One year prior to the start of the first commitment period, each Party shall have in place "a national system for the estimation of anthropogenic emissions" using methodologies accepted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Methodologies for calculating "global warming potentials" shall be accepted by the IPCC and reviewed by the relevant subsidiary body of the COP.

Article 6:

Annex I Parties may "transfer or acquire...emission reduction units" providing that such emissions trading agreements results in reductions that are "additional to any that would otherwise occur. "Guidelines for the implementation of this Article, including verification and reporting," are to be further elaborated at the first session of the Parties after the protocol enters into force.

Article 7:

Annex I Parties shall modify their reporting procedures required by the FCCC, to reflect compliance with the commitments required by this protocol. The first session of the Parties after the protocol enters into force, "shall adopt

guidelines for the preparation of the information required under this Article...and decide upon modalities for the accounting of assigned amounts."

Article 8:

Information submitted under Article 7 "shall be reviewed by expert review teams" created by the COP. Expert review teams "shall be coordinated by the secretariat" and shall be "selected from those nominated by the Parties...and appropriate intergovernmental organizations." Guidelines for review "shall be adopted" later. "Parties to this Protocol shall take decision on any matter required for the implementation of this Protocol."

Article 9:

Requires a periodic review of the protocol "in the light of the best available scientific information." (Defined by COP II to be the report of the IPCC).

Article 10:

Reiterates no "new commitments for Parties not included in Annex I." Requires, "in order to achieve sustainable development," the formulation of "programmes...for periodic updating of national inventories of anthropogenic emissions." Such programs would:

- "Concern the energy, transport and industry sectors as well as agriculture, forestry and waste management. Furthermore, adaptation technologies and methods for improving spatial planning would improve adaptation to climate change."
- Cooperate in "effective modalities for the development application and diffusion of..., facilitate and finance...the transfer of, or access to, environmentally sound technologies, know-

how, practices and processes...that are publicly owned or in the public domain, and the creation of an enabling environment for the private sector...to transfer technologies."

- Develop "observation systems" to reduce uncertainties related to the climate system and the adverse impacts of climate change and the economic and social consequences of various response strategies.
- Promote "at the international level...the strengthening of national capacity building, human and institutional capacities...personnel to train experts in the field, and facilitate at the national level public awareness and public access to information on climate change."

Article 11:

Developed country Parties shall:

- "Provide new and additional financial resources to meet the agreed full costs incurred by developing country Parties in advancing the implementation of existing commitments;
- Also provide such financial resources, including for the transfer of technology, needed by the developing country Parties to meet the agreed full incremental costs of advancing the implementation of existing commitments."

The Parties "shall take into account the need for adequacy and predictability in the flow of funds."

Article 12:

"A clean development mechanism is hereby defined."

The purpose of the clean development mechanism is to "assist Parties not included in Annex I in achieving sustainable development." Annex I Parties "may use the certified emission reductions accruing from such project activities to contribute to compliance with part of their commitments" as determined by the COP.

The clean development mechanism "shall be subject to the authority" of the COP and shall be "supervised by an executive board of the clean development mechanism." (No provision is specified as to how the executive board is to be formulated). Emission reductions from such project activity "shall be certified by operational entities to be designated by the COP."

The clean development mechanism shall "assist in arranging funding of certified project activity," and provide "independent auditing and verification of project activities."

The COP "shall ensure that a share of the proceeds from certified project activities is used to cover administrative expenses as well as to assist developing country Parties...to meet the costs of adaptation." Participation in project activities "may involve private and/or public entities" subject to whatever "guidance may be provided by the executive board of the clean development mechanism."

Article 13:

"The Conference of the Parties, the supreme body of the Convention, shall serve as the meeting of the Parties to this Protocol." The parties to the Protocol may or may not be the same as the Parties to the Convention. Therefore, decisions relating to the Protocol shall be taken only by Parties to the Protocol which is the same as the COP sitting as a Meeting of the Protocol (MOP), however, those Parties of the Convention that are not Parties to the Protocol participate as "observers" and may not participate in the decisions of the MOP. The subsidiary bodies of the Convention, serve *mutatis*

mutandis to the MOP. Rules of procedure and amendment procedures for the MOP are the same as those for the COP.

Article 14:

The Secretariat of the Convention shall serve as the Secretariat of the Protocol.

Article 15:

The subsidiary bodies of the Convention and the Bureau (executive officers) of the Convention shall serve *mutatis mutandis* to the Protocol, with provisions for non-Parties to the Protocol to be replaced by Parties to the Protocol for "decisions taken under this Protocol."

Article 16:

Parties to the Protocol "shall modify the multilateral consultative process referred to in Article 13 of the Convention." (Resolution of questions relating to implementation). Requires the COP to "define the relevant principles, modalities, rules and guidelines...for reporting and accountability for emissions trading."

Article 17:

The MOP shall, at its first meeting, "approve appropriate and effective procedures and mechanisms to determine and to address cases of non-compliance with the provisions of the Protocol, including...an indicative list of consequences, taking into account the cause, type, degree and frequency of non-compliance. Any procedures and mechanisms under this Article entailing binding consequences shall be adopted by means of an amendment to this Protocol."

Article 18:

"The provisions of Article 14 of the Convention on settlement of disputes shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to this Protocol."

(International Court of Justice, or an arbitration panel under the auspices of the COP).

Article 19:

The Protocol may be amended by consensus, if possible, or by "a three-fourths majority of the Parties present and voting." Amendments enter into force "for those Parties having accepted it" on the 90th day after instrument of acceptance is received by the Depository from at least three fourths of the Parties to the Protocol.

Article 20:

Annexes, or amendments to the Annexes of the Protocol, "other than Annex A or B" (list of gases and list of Annex I Parties) enter into force six months after adoption except for those Parties that have "notified the Depository in writing within that period of their non-acceptance."

Article 21:

Each Party shall have one vote. Regional economic integration organizations may vote as a bloc unless a single member wishes to vote separately, in which case all members must vote separately.

Article 22:

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall be the Depository of this Protocol.

Article 23:

The Protocol "shall be open for signature at United Nations headquarters in New York from 16 March 1998 to 15 March 1999," and shall be open for accession from the day after the period closes.

Article 24:

The Protocol shall enter into force on the 90th day after 55 Parties to the Convention, "incorporating Parties included in Annex I which accounted in total for at least 55 percent of the

total carbon dioxide emissions for 1990 of the Parties included in Annex I," have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

Article 25:

"No reservations may be made to this Protocol."

(Note: This provision has been included in all treaties since 1992. The Chemical Weapons Ban Treaty was ratified by the Senate only after extensive "reservations" were included in the ratification legislation. Since the Treaty itself precludes reservations, the language of the Treaty would likely prevail in the event of dispute. However, the United Nations has not had enforcement capability in the past. The expanding "sanction" power of the World Trade Organization, and the creation of a new International Criminal Court, as well as the enforcement mechanism being developed under this Protocol, will put teeth into the "no reservation" clause in the near future.)

Article 26:

Any Party may withdraw from this Protocol after three years by giving written notification to the Depositary. Withdrawal takes effect one year from date of receipt of notification. Withdrawal from the Convention constitutes automatic withdrawal from the Protocol.

Article 27:

This Protocol shall be considered equally authentic when the text is deposited in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian, and Spanish, with the Depositary.

Done at Kyoto this tenth day of December, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-seven.

The Leipzig Declaration

As independent scientists researching atmospheric and climate problems, we -- along with many of our fellow citizens -- are apprehensive about the Climate Treaty conference scheduled for Kyoto, Japan, in December 1997. This gathering of politicians from some 160 signatory nations aims to impose -- on citizens of the industrialized nations, but not on others -- a system of global environmental regulations that include quotas and punitive taxes on energy fuels.

Fossil fuels provide today's principal energy source, and energy is essential for all economic growth. Stabilizing atmospheric carbon dioxide -- the announced goal of the Climate Treaty -- would require that fuel use be cut by as much as 60 to 80 percent -- worldwide!

In a world in which poverty is the greatest social pollutant, any restriction on energy use that inhibits economic growth should be viewed with caution. We understand the motivation to eliminate what are perceived to be the driving forces behind a potential climate change; but we believe the emerging Kyoto protocol -- to curtail carbon dioxide emissions from only part of the world community -- is dangerously simplistic, quite ineffective, and economically destructive jobs and standards-of-living.

More to the point, we consider the scientific basis of the 1992 Global Climate Treaty to be flawed and its goal to be unrealistic. The policies to implement the Treaty are, as of now, based solely on unproven scientific theories, imperfect computer models -- and unsupported assumptions that catastrophic global warming follows from the burning of fossil fuels and requires immediate action. **We do not agree.** We believe that the dire predictions of a future warming have not been validated by the existing climate record. These

predictions are based on nothing more than theoretical models and cannot be relied on.

As the debate unfolds, it has become increasingly clear that -- contrary to the conventional wisdom -- ***there does not exist today a general scientific consensus about the importance of greenhouse warming*** from rising levels of carbon dioxide. In fact, many climate specialists now agree that actual observations from weather satellites show no global warming whatsoever -- in direct contradiction to computer model results.

Historically, climate has always been a factor in human affairs -- with warmer periods, such as the medieval "climate optimum," playing an important role in economic expansion and in the welfare of nations that depend primarily on agriculture. Colder periods have caused crop failures, and led to famines, disease, and other documented human misery. We must, therefore, remain sensitive to any and all human activities that could affect future climate.

However, based on all the evidence available to us, we cannot subscribe to the politically inspired world view that envisages climate catastrophes and calls for hasty actions. For this reason, we consider the drastic emission control policies likely to be endorsed by the Kyoto conference -- lacking credible support from the underlying science -- to be ill-advised and premature.

This statement is based on the International Symposium on the Greenhouse Controversy, held in Leipzig, Germany on November 9-10, 1995, under the sponsorship of the Prime Minister of the State of Saxony. For further information, contact the Europaeische Akademie fuer Umweltfragen (fax: 011-49-7071-72939) or The Science & Environmental Policy Project in Fairfax, Virginia (fax: (703) 352-7535).

Signers:

Abrams, Elliot - Penn State University
Apel, John - John Hopkins University
Aubrey, David - Woods Hole Ocean. Inst.
Badura, Leslaw - Univ. Kattowitz, Poland
Balling, Robert - Arizona State University
Barrett, Jack - Kingston-upon-Thames, U.K.
Bauer, Ernst-Waldemar - Esslingen, Germany
Berg, Hermann - Sachsisch Akad., Jena, Germany
Berning, Warren - New Mexico State University
Boe, Bruce A. - Atm. Resource Brd. ND
Bottcher, C.J. Frits, The Hague
Bourne, Arthur - University of London
Bruce, Larry
Brown, Norman M.D., University of Ulster
Bye, Matthew - Meteorologist, San Francisco
Cain, Joseph - Florida State University
Clube, S.V.M. - University of Oxford
Courtney, Richard - Epsom, U.K.
Csanady, G.T - Old Dominion University
Cunningham, Robert M. - Meteorologist, Lincoln, MA
Decker, Fred - Meteorologist, Corvallis, OR
de Freitas, Chris, University of Auckland
Del Re, Giuseppe Rom.
Dietze, Peter - Nurnberg, Germany
Dyer, Rosemary - Phillips Lab
Eddington, Lee W., Naval Air Warfare Center
Ellsaesser, Hugh - Livermore National Laboratory
Emsley, John, Imperial Collage
Frank, Neil - Fmr. Dir. Hurricane Center
Franzle, Otto - Univ. Kiel, Germany
Gaynor, John E. - Envir. Tech. Lab., Boulder, CO
Gerholm, Tor Ragnar - Univ of Stockholm
Gleeson, Thomas A. - Aeronomist, Florida State Univ.
Gold, Thomas - Cornell University
Goodell, H.G. - University of Virginia
Goodridge, James D. - Climatologist, Mendocino, CA

Groeber, Richard F. - Weather Service, Springfield, OH
Guttman, Nathaniel B. - Climate Center, Asheville, NC
Hales, J. Vern - Meteorologist, Las Vegas, NV
Handler, Paul, University of Illinois
Harnapp, Vern, University of Akron
Hayden, Howard C. - Univ. of Connecticut
Heyke, H.H. - Lichtenwalde, Germany
Higastberger, Michael J. - University of Vienna
Hogan, A.W. - Jour. of Aerosols, Atm. Chem.
Hubbard, William, University of Arizona
Jaworski, Zbigniew, University of Warsaw
Kloke, Adolf - University of Berlin
Kohler, Max A. - Meteorologist, Silver Spring, MD
Kolstad, George A. - Geophys., Laytonsville, MD
Korber, Erich - Univ. Tübingen, Germany
Kovach, Robert L. - Stanford University
Landscheidt, Theodor, Nova Scotia
Leep, Roy - Meteorologist, Tampa, FL
Legates, David R. - University of Oklahoma
Lettau, Heinz H. - University of Wisconsin
Linden, Henry R. - Illinois Inst. of Technology
Lindzen, Richard, Mass. Inst. of Technology
Lischka, Gerd - Univ. Tübingen, Germany
Lodge, J.P. - Atmos. Chemist, Boulder, CO
Lunardini, Virgil, CRREL, Hanover, NH
Lunsford, R. Dwayne, Germantown, MD
Marquardt, Karl - Dornstadt-Auhausen, Germany
McVehil, George E. - Air Quality, Englewood, CO
Mellner, Dusan - Univ of Brno, Czech Republic
Metzner, Helmut - Tübingen, Germany
Michaels, Patrick - University of Virginia
Mitchell, William, Oxford University
Moene, Asmund, Oslo, Norway
Mohry, Herbert - Leipzig, Germany
Neumann, Eberhard - Univ. Bielefeld, Germany
Nierenberg, William A. - Scripps Inst., LaJolla
Nolte, Dieter - Stadt, Krankenhaus, Reichenhall, Germany
Oberhammer, Heinz - Univ, Tübingen, Germany
Porch, William - Colorado State University

Priem, Harry, University Of Utrecht
Reifsnnyder, W.E. - Yale University
Robertson, Alexander, Univ. Of Newfoundland
Schmidlin, Thomas, Kent State University
Schuh, William, ND State Water Comm.
Seitz, Frederick - Rockefeller University
Sestak, Zdenek - Univ of Prague
Sharp, Gary D., Ctr for Climate/Ocean Resource Study
Singer, Fred - Science & Environmental Policy Project
Stange, Karl - Ludwigshafen, Germany
Starheim, Fred, Kent State University
Starr, Chauncey - Electrical Power Research Inst., Palo Alto
Steinmetz, E. - Essen, Germany
Stevenson, Robert E., IFARNS/IAPSO
Stout, Glenn E. - University of Illinois
Stroke, George - Max Planck Inst., Munich
Sundermann, Heinz - University of Vienna
Sussman, Brian - Meteorologist, San Francisco, CA
Sutton, George H. - Prof. Emeeritus, Univ of Hawaii
Svidersky, Vladimir - Sechonoc Institute, Moscow
Talwani, M. - Rice University
Torrance, Thomas F. - Jena, Germany
Van Sumere, Christaan - Univ of Gent, Belgium
Vonnegut, Bernard - SUNY, Albany
Wentworth, Robert C., Geophys. Oakland, CA
Worzel, J. Larmar - Meteorologist, Wilmington, NC
Wyrteki, Klaus, University of Hawaii
Zwiener, Ulrich - Univ. Jena, Germany

Meteorologists

Apuzzo, Richard, WXIX-TV
Bernier, Andre, WJW-TV
Bernier, Sally, WJW-TV
Breckm, Robert, WVUE-TV
Colby, A.J., WICU-TV
Frank, Neil, KHOU-TV
Gantz, Dick, Weather Forecasting Service
Goddard, Dick, WJW-TV

Hollett, Shane, WJW-TV
Johnson, Mark, WEWS-TV
Koontz, Mark, WJW-TV
Leep, Roy, WTVT-TV
Loufman, Jon, WKYC-TV
Maly, Dan, WOIO-TV
McPike, Ryan, WICU-TV
Moore, James T., KSWO-TV
Sussman, Brian, KGO-TV
Sussman, Brad, WEWS-TV
Watts, Anthony, HSL-TV
Webster, Don, WEWS-TV
Westfall, Brian, Weather Forecasting Service
Williams, Jerry A., Meteorologist Consultant

What you never hear about greenhouse warming

By Hugh W.
Ellsaesser, Ph.D

We have observational data providing an estimate of the global mean surface air temperature since about 1870. While these data indicate a global warming of 0.3 to 0.6°C this is significantly less than

climate models predict should have occurred by no due to man's additions of greenhouse gases to the atmosphere. In addition most of the observed warming occurred before World War II, before the bulk of the greenhouse gases had been emitted. To argue that the model-predicted warming has been obscured by a natural cooling cycle, requires a natural cooling of more than 1 degree C over the past few decades -- a cooling larger than any observed before in the documented climate history of Europe, which extends at some stations into the 17th century.

Climate models predict that greenhouse warming should increase with latitude and be greatest in polar latitudes in winter. Since 1957, when regular observations began in Antarctica, neither pole has shown significantly more warming than the tropics.

Since the time of the dinosaurs, the Earth has cooled by about 10 degrees C. About 3 million years ago we entered the present ice age, marked by a series of glacial/interglacial cycles with a mean global temperature range estimated by 5 to 7 degrees C.

*“The least
controversial explanation
for the warming shown by our
surface temperature
observations is that it
represents a return to normal
from the Little Ice Age
and possibly, entry
into the next warm
period of the Holocene”*

The last seven of these cycles exhibited a glacial period of 90,000 years of staged cooling followed by rapid warming back to an interglacial lasting 10,000 to 12,000 years.. We are currently in an interglacial, called the Holocene, estimated to have begun 10,700 years ago. Thus, we are due to enter another 90,000-year period of glacial cooling at any time. Since this is our current state of knowledge, why do we not hear the argument that adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere to delay, and thereby hopefully to prevent, the next glacial is just what man should be doing?

During the Holocene, temperature fluctuations of plus and minus 1 - 2 degrees C have been inferred from various types of data. The warmest period, the Climatic Optimum, occurred about 6,000 years ago. Around 900 AD the sea ice in the North Atlantic melted back and the Norsemen were able to colonize Iceland and Greenland. About 1350 AD the ice returned, the Greenland colony perished and the glaciers advanced over rent-paying farms and villages in Switzerland and Scandinavia. Thus we have both historical and paleoclimatological data for the "Medieval Climatic Optimum" warm period circa 900-1350 AD and the following "Little Ice Age" cold period circa 1350-1850 AD.

The least controversial explanation for the warming shown by our surface temperature observations is that it represents a return to normal from the Little Ice Age and possibly, entry into the next warm period of the Holocene. If this is what is occurring, we are now at the inflection point, or point of most rapid rise, of the temperature curve and we can look forward to a further warming of about another degree C over the next couple of centuries, regardless of what man does. Note also that the warm periods of the past have been termed "climatic optima," and so they must have appeared to the remnants of the Greenland colony circa 1350 AD.

The latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change claim that "*The balance of evidence suggests as*

anthropogenic influence on global climate" elicited much controversy. Its invalidity is now indicated by the Richard Kerr and Klaus Hasselmann articles in the May 16, 1997 issue of *Science*. These contain statements like the following:

"...many climate experts caution that it is not at all clear yet that human activities have begun to warm the planet -- or how bad greenhouse warming will be when it arrives." (Richard Kerr, Research News & Comment Writer for *Science*.)

"We say quite clearly that few scientists would say the attribution issue was a done deal." (Benjamin D. Santer, Lead Author of Section 8 of IPCC95.)

"The inherent statistical uncertainties in the detection of anthropogenic climate change can be expected to subside only gradually in the next few years while the predicted signal is still slowly emerging from the natural climate variability noise. It would be unfortunate if the current debate over this ultimately transitory issue should distract from the far more serious problem of the long-term evolution of global warming once the signal has been unequivocally detected above the background noise." (Klaus Hasselmann, Max-Planck Institute for Meteorology.)

From these acknowledgments by its supporters, it seems quite clear that the IPCC95 statement, "*The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate,*" was studiously crafted. The purpose of the wording appears to have been to induce the media to broadcast to the public and policymakers of the world a message which few, if any, of the researchers, on whose work it was based, are yet willing to defend before the scientific community.

Global climate policy may reach a crescendo in Kyoto in December, but it will not be because of compelling scientific case has been made that requires action be taken to ward off environmental calamity. The theory of human-induced global warming is far from being an open-and-shut case.

While the concept of greenhouse warming is well established, its actuality on planet earth currently rests only the predictions of climate models. That the models still lack the desired precision is evident by their broad disagreement with each other and with observational data, such as their less than specific "forecast" of temperature history.

Models of global warming are especially oversimplified for the tropics due to their inability to cope with the very low humidities in the downwelling portions of the Hadley circulation. Any surface warming in the tropics will lead to acceleration of downdrafts of convectively dried air, opening deeper and enlarged subtropical windows" for infrared radiation to escape. As a result, model predictions of global warming in the tropics seem exaggerated by a factor of two to three times.

Efforts to construct a "fingerprint" of man-made global warming have also done little to enhance the credibility of gloom and doom global warming forecasts. Even the IPCC was forced to conclude: (1) "It is not possible at this time to attribute all, or even a large part, of the observed global mean warming to enhanced greenhouse effects on the basis of observational data currently available." And (2) "We do not yet know what the detailed signal [fingerprint] looks like because we have limited confidence in our predictions of climate change patterns."

Moreover, there is a consistent bias against good news. Very reputable scientists are engaged in global climate research. But their careful statements are either suppressed or ignored when they do not support dire scenarios. The United Nations, of

course, has tremendous incentives to promote widespread dissemination of bad news. Global doom scenarios enhance its position as a transfer agent for massive flows of wealth from developed to developing nations.

Until global climate change models improve significantly, we do not know whether we have a serious threat to our planet, no threat, or even a beneficial outcome due to manmade greenhouse gas emissions. In short, despite pronouncements by political leaders in the United States, Europe, and elsewhere, policymakers are not being compelled to act on the basis of global warming science. Indeed, global warming science is still evolving.

(The complete scientific report from which this summary was prepared is available from Dr. Ellsaesser at 4293 Stanford Way, Livermore, CA 94550. Phone, (510) 447-3834; fax (510) 447-3003)

How others see America

One of the questions most often asked is "Why are our European allies supporting the climate change treaty?" This interview with the Right Honorable John Gummer, answers that question. Unfortunately, there is no way to capture in print the animosity and contempt conveyed in his voice. Gummer was the Minister of the Environment in Britain's conservative government. Since the May elections, he has served as a member of the British Parliament, and is a delegate to the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, representing the European Union. Portions of this interview were aired over thousands of American radio stations during the Kyoto conference.

1. What are your impressions of the events that are unfolding here in Kyoto?

Well, it has taken a long time to get underway because, unfortunately, this is the least well prepared conference of a serious kind that I've ever been to in 17 years of international negotiations. And that is largely because the United States and Canada have been so slow in coming forward with any propositions. This is a situation of the world vs the United States to be truthful, because the European Union, the largest trading unit in the world plus the G-77, the developing nations are very concerned to see that the world's biggest waster of energy and emitter, the United States, followed closely by Canada, of course, should meet their global obligations. So there is a pretty tough battle here and it has taken a long time to get underway.

2. Do you think we will get an agreement by the end of the conference?

Well I've always been more optimistic than many over the past two years. I've had some very tough negotiations myself when I was the Minister for the Environment in the United Kingdom until the May elections, and therefore did a lot of negotiations with the United States. I think the thing that has changed is that the United States has recognized that it is a quite impossible position to uphold that having grown rich on pollution, having created the situation in which we are, that the rich nations should then turn to the poor nations who after all have not gotten much out of pollution as a matter of fact, and tell them "you've got to put it right first before we do anything. Now that really is ridiculous. It's also immoral. And I'm not sure which of those is the more telling comment but it is certainly true that I would find it quite intolerable that we should say to these very poor countries, "look here, we have all this wealth, and we have created this wealth because of the use of industrialized processes. We're now going to ask you to forego those processes and we're not going to do anything about our own situation. That would be quite intolerable.

3. I take it that you were not pleased by President Clinton's requirement that developing nations be included under this treaty.

No, because it was dishonest. First of all, President Clinton, in his battle against President Bush five years ago, attacked Mr. Bush for not signing up to the Rio agreement. That was a part of his campaign. On the BBC's television program last Monday, they did a rerun, a clip, -- in these days of television we can see what people did say -- and there he was on the White House lawn, having won, on Earth Day, telling journalists that he was going to meet the Rio requirements which was to bring the U.S. emissions back to 1990 levels by the year 2000. So to come forward now and to say we're not going to do that now until 2010 or 2012, and also, we're not even going to do that

unless the developing countries come on board, is just sheer dishonesty. But more important than that, it was worse, because in Berlin in the run-up conference to this one, we all agreed to a Berlin Mandate. I was there when the American representative, who happened to be Tim Wirth at the time, put his hand up to vote for it. I was there because I put my hand up to vote for it on behalf of the United Kingdom. It's no good coming around now and saying that having voted in Berlin for the principle that the rich nations would deliver first, and would not expect the poor nations to join in until they had delivered, then come to the Kyoto conference, which is the conference which is controlled by that Berlin Mandate, and turn around and say "we're not going to do it." I mean that is a double-dishonesty. So you cannot stand by that. That's not something which anybody else in the world takes seriously.

4. How do you respond to the charge that industry will flow from the nations that are controlled by the treaty to those which are not?

Well it's just a great story by the Global Climate Coalition. They invented it. And it doesn't stand up. The truth is that the member companies of the Global Climate Coalition, which is this business based organization opposed to any action on climate change, the member companies of that coalition are already exporting vast numbers of jobs to the developing countries. That's what they are doing constantly. That is how they operate. And it is not going to be accelerated by any decision of this sort. People don't choose to go to India because of the pollution control. They go to India because of a whole range of other reasons. Largely, the question of having a trained work force with wage demands significantly lower than those in the western world. That isn't the reason they move; it doesn't stand up in argument. What does stand up in argument is the one 'round the other way. If the United States doesn't sign up to something of this sort, the European Union businesses will be meeting much higher emission controls than those in the United States. And we will clean up in the world

because nobody will buy United States technology if it is behind the lead technology. If you are one of the developing countries, if you are one of the "tiger" economies -- when they become tigers again, after this temporary blip -- they are not going to buy second-rate technology. They will want to have leading-edge technology. And the leading-edge technology will come from the countries that have accepted the demands of global warming, determined to change their systems so they can, in fact, not emit in the way they have in the past. The United States will fall behind. It will be exactly the same as the United States steel industry in the 1980s. You remember they went 'round the world saying it was outrageous, it was all unfair. They really couldn't compete. Someone had to protect them. They did all this and what happened? They went bust. There isn't a United States steel industry in the same sort of way it was then. They killed themselves. It's exactly the same here. The people who will suffer from this is the Exxon corporation because Shell and BP will win. Exxon is now reactionary in these circumstances. Shell and BP are out there changing their policies and their programs to meet the demands of global warming. I know where I'd put my money and where I would be a stockholder. I'd be a stockholder at BP. No wonder their stocks have gone up very sharply since they've become a green petrol company.

5. What is your answer to those who point out that unless developing nations are bound by the treaty, it will really do nothing to reduce emissions since, China will surpass the U.S. in total emissions early in the next century?

Well there are two things at fault with that. One thing is that we are talking about a different time scale. We're talking at this conference about what we are going to do now, between now and the year 2010. In those circumstances we are, by far, the largest emitter, the rich countries. Also in those circumstances, we are the countries that have made their wealth on those

emissions. Therefore we are responsible for paying the costs. The second thing is that when we come to the point at which China will become the world's largest emitter, first of all it will be at sometime in the future, sometime after 2010, probably. We're also talking about a shift in the statistics. People talk now about the largest per-capita emitter which is the United States. It is also the largest overall emitter too. Of course China will be the largest overall emitter, but it is vastly larger than the United States. It has 1.4 billion people now. It adds to its population the same number that the Australians have every year. So of course when you come to the year 2010 it will be the largest emitter. It is the largest country, vastly bigger than anywhere else. But it will still be true in 2010 that the United States will be the largest per-capita emitter. And it will still be the largest waster.

You see the United States is not only a big emitter, it is a terrible waster of energy. If you want to see the figures they are fascinating. If you want to compare people properly, you have to say how many men's work does it cost for the energy requirement of each citizen. In other words, instead of using electricity and gas and the like, you had physical people doing it, how many would you need? You would need 120 for every American You'd need 60 for every European. You'd need 8 for every Chinaman. And you would need one for every Bangladeshi.

Now that is hugely, hugely revealing. What it says is simply this. It says that America uses twice as much energy but it doesn't have twice the standard of living. It has a higher standard of living than Europe, but not all that much. It therefore uses twice as much energy to produce nothing like twice as much result. So what we in Europe say is if we can cut our energy requirement so we will cut our emissions by 15% overall, what the blazes is the United States doing when it wastes so much, complaining that it can't manage it.

Of course you can manage it. In the United States, you are so wasteful, you can manage it without blinking your eye. You won't notice it. All you have to do is terribly simple things. You know, in every corner of almost every room in America, there's a little red un-winking eye on the television set or video or whatever else it is. That's a stand-by button. When you've got your machine on stand-by, it uses half the energy it uses when it's on. So for 24-hours a day you're using half energy. That's equal to the output of several electricity generating plants that you could close down. Just change the technology. So when you buy a new television you didn't have the stand-by system. Why is it that in every office, some secretary has stuck a notice on the photocopier "don't turn this off." It's because it takes some time for the photocopier to warm up. If you buy a Cannon photocopier nowadays, it doesn't have to warm up. That can happen to any photocopier. You can change the technology. That will mean the United States can waste less, be more efficient, sell better, and win in world markets.

Or you can do the opposite and disregard all this, not do what you need to do, and we'll beat you. And we'll beat you up hill and down dale because we will be more efficient. We'll be using less power, our goods will be cheaper, and people will want to buy them because we will be at the leading edge of technologies. If you want to export American jobs to other countries, the easiest way to do it is not to do anything about global warming. Let the Europeans do it and your jobs will go to Europe. So I'm really shooting myself in the foot asking you to behave properly.

6. What is your take on the U.S. Senators' concerns that legally binding commitments are an infringement upon national sovereignty?

Oh I've got no take, it's just rubbish! I have got my national sovereignty constantly being attacked by the United States. Your pollution is changing my climate. I'm not having you telling me that I've got no say in what you do. You are changing

my climate. My constituency will be underwater because of your pollution. Don't talk to me about national sovereignty. The United States has got to realize that it lives in the world. It is not the United States' world. It's our world: the world of poor people and rich people alike. The United States Sovereignty is of no account in a world that is being destroyed by the United States' pollution. So those two senators ought to go back and understand this. If you want a World Trade Organization, if you want the United States to be able to sell in the world, then the United States has got to realize that it must stop destroying the climate of the rest of the world.

A Two-headed monster:

Links between the Climate Change Treaty and the Biodiversity Treaty

By Tom McFeely

To those unschooled in the euphemistic language and hidden goals of the UN and its allies among radical non-governmental organizations (NGOs), the title of a seminar held this weekend in a conference room on the sixth floor of an office building in downtown Kyoto probably seemed innocuous enough.

Participants and observers attending the negotiations to amend the Framework Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) were cordially invited to "Forging the Link: Climate Change and Biodiversity," a seven-hour gabfest staged to "discuss linking these two top global environmental concerns." But for those with a better acquaintance with the cynical drive by UN-related agencies and green NGOs to dictate human affairs, the Saturday get-together provided a revealing glimpse of the sinister interconnectedness of the two groups -- and of how they intend to further hijack the UN process to pursue their shadowy goals.

At the core of the UN-NGO alliance is Maurice Strong, a multimillionaire Canadian-born businessman who has devoted much of the last 30 years to orchestrating the alliance's "global

"At the core of the UN-NGO alliance is Maurice Strong, a multimillionaire Canadian-born businessman who has devoted much of the last 30 years to orchestrating the alliance's 'global governance' campaign."

governance" campaign. Strong, who currently serves as the UN's Under Secretary for Reform, as chairman of the Earth Council, and as special advisor to the World Bank, was not at the seminar himself. (However, he arrived in Kyoto on Monday to personally deliver UN Secretary General Kofi Annan's appeal that national delegates sign on to coercive targets for reductions of emissions of so-called "greenhouse gases" like carbon dioxide.) But even in his absence, Strong's influence was evident everywhere at the downtown gathering; for one thing, three of the 12 sponsoring groups -- the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), and the World Bank -- are international agencies over which he exerts a direct and powerful influence.

The other co-sponsors encompassed some of the heaviest hitters among the environmental NGO establishment, including the World Conservation Union (also known by the acronym IUCN), the World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) and the World Resources Institute (WRI). All are also intimately intertwined with the Strong empire through such things as the Earth Council participation, regular infusions of funds from Strong-dominated UN agencies, and their leaders' close personal ties to Strong.

However, media accounts routinely portray groups like the WRI, IUCN, and the World Wide Fund as private, unaffiliated organizations. In reality, all three are classic examples of what critics have dubbed "private government organizations," or PGOs. Every year, each of the three "NGOs" receives millions and tens of millions more from supportive UN agencies. "Joint projects among these PGOs and the United Nations Environment Programme include: *World Conservation Strategy*; *Global Biodiversity Strategy*, and for all practical purposes, Agenda 21 [the official platform of the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, which was chaired by Maurice Strong]; the Convention on Biological Diversity; the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*; and the Framework Convention on Climate Change," reports *World Concerns*, a newsletter published in Kyoto by Sovereignty International.

In the April 1996 report of the Global Environment Facility, *World Concerns* reports the three environmental groups were listed as "Executing Agency" or "Collaborating Organization" for no less than 29 different grants. The total amount thereby funneled through the so-called "NGOs": a staggering \$350 million.

This incestuous relationship between international agencies and pseudo-NGOs -- and the pro-environmentalist, anti-life Clinton Administration

-- was painfully clear among the panelists at the Kyoto "Forging the Link" conference. After an introductory address by Japanese parliamentarian Akiko Domoto, an IUCN Councillor for East Asia, the first panelist to speak was Robert Watson. Watson was recently named as the new chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the agency set up in 1988 by UNEP and another UN agency, the World Meteorological Organization, to lay the propaganda groundwork for the entire global-warming campaign. Watson is also currently serving as director for environment at the World Bank, a position he assumed after leaving his job as the associate director for environment in Bill Clinton's executive office.

"Scientific" Linkage

Watson outlined the "scientific" rationale for linking a new FCCC protocol on binding reductions of emissions to the existing UN Convention on Biological Diversity. The biodiversity strategy mandates the creation of huge interconnected "protected areas," within which human activities are to be sharply curtailed or banned altogether to preserve allegedly threatened "ecosystems." The FCCC, meanwhile, aims to steeply reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases produced by industrial activity, on the scientifically unproven grounds that such gases are responsible for dangerously heating the earth. Watson treated his audience to a slick slide presentation that purported to demonstrate how the warmest areas of the world, which are the most prolific regions in terms of total species of life, would be injured by man-induced global heating. At the same time, he claimed, it was essential to advance the protected areas campaign so that they can serve as reservoirs to repopulate ecosystems that will

supposedly be blighted by continued global warming and other environmental degradation.

The rampant illogic at the heart of this argument was at no time addressed by Watson, or by any of the subsequent speakers arguing for the linkage of the climate-change and biological-diversity conventions. That is, given the irrefutable fact that it is warm areas that are the most fecund in terms of species, a warming of the Earth should serve to advance the cause of species diversity, not injure it. After all, glaciers and other cold-climate features are hardly conducive environments for terrestrial life.

Characteristically undismayed by the weakness of his arguments, Watson concluded by stating the UN-NGO case for gaining sweeping domination over the globe's governments and economies. After lamenting such things as the "market failure to recognize the value of biodiversity," the "institutional failure to properly regulate use of natural resources," and the "fragmentation" of valuable ecosystems, Watson finished with a bold proclamation. "We have to correct market failures," he declared. "We have to correct the way people think about the environment."

Next up was Jeff McNeely, who holds the title of "chief scientist" of the IUCN, an organization where Maurice Strong formerly served as a director. McNeely opened by applauding Watson's status at the World Bank. "I'm glad someone like Bob is at the World Bank, getting people to think carefully about the issues we care about."

Ominously, McNeely started his own presentation by displaying some charts that compared increases in population with increasing energy use and food consumption. The implication was clear: the earth's root ecological problem is a surplus of human beings. Global warming -- "particularly when coupled with population growth" -- will lead to a loss of

biodiversity, McNeely warned. "This is basically the problem we're dealing with all the time."

Like Watson, McNeely cited the protected-areas initiative as the key to preserving "genetic reservoirs" that could mitigate this gloomy prediction of species disappearance. Neither man, however, chose to make explicit the anti-humanity premises underlying leading protected-areas offshoots like the Wildlands Project proposal formulated in 1992 by eco-terrorist Dave Foreman and his collaborator Reed Noss, a University of Idaho environmental scientist. Noss has admitted that he would ideally like to see 95% of North America placed within environmental set-asides, while Foreman has advocated that the world's population be reduced by 98%, pruning it to just 100 million from its current total of roughly six billion.

During a brief question-and-answer session after Watson and McNeely's presentations, an audience member asked why there has been so little discussion of population-control measures in the FCCC negotiations, if population was indeed so central to climate change and biodiversity loss. "Your point that we should be looking at population is absolutely well taken," IPCC head Watson replied, "but it's such a thorny issue politically it is never undertaken in these discussions."

In large measure, the "thorniness" Watson was referring to is the widespread hostility the UN faces from Catholic and Moslem nations who vigorously resist the UN's efforts to impose abortion and contraceptive-based population-control programs on their nations. But Watson assured his audience that UN agencies have already secured the opening they need to implement population-control programs, courtesy of the 1994 International Conference on Population and Development in Cairo. "I believe we already have the right basis of looking at the population."

Population and the environment

After Watson finished explaining how the UN intended to forge ahead with population control as a means of protecting the environment, UNDP policy director Anders Wijkman stood up in the audience. After praising Watson and McNeely's presentations, Wijkman delivered a homily about the need for "institution-building" in order to successfully implement the UN's various agendas. The UNDP policy advisor is another prominent example of the UN-NGO linkage that has been so carefully cultivated by Maurice Strong; a stint as director general of the Swedish Nature Conservation Society figures prominently on Wijkman's resume.

In his current position, Wijkman reports to UNDP executive director Gus Speth, who in turn has been charged with serving as Strong's lead bureaucrat in the promotion of the UN's "global governance" initiative. Before being named UNDP executive director, Speth was a member of Bill Clinton's transition team in late 1992 and early 1993. Ten years earlier, he became the first head of the newly created World Resources Institute, a position he held until his brief stint working for the Clinton Administration, which was responsible for his landing the UNDP job (by unwritten UN tradition, the U.S. controls the selection of the chief bureaucrats of both the UNDP and UNICEF, while Russia controls the appointment of chief of military operations).

Early this year, Speth delivered a speech on "global governance" to a Rio+5 review conference convened in Brazil by Strong's Earth Council. In it, UNDP's senior administrator talked about the rationale behind the UN's continuing drive to secure global power. "Global challenges and global needs -- whether economic, environmental or otherwise -- require global solutions and global action," Speth insisted. "Economic and environmental integration lead to political integration. That is global governance."

Later in the speech, Speth highlighted the crucial importance he and Strong attach to strengthening the FCCC. "Perhaps the most far-reaching, powerful development in the area of global governance is the emergence of the World Trade Organization, though it may be that, over time, the global climate convention will actually become even more influential."

NGO pawns of the UN

For his part, Wijkman has been delegated to make the rounds of virtually every UN-NGO get-together, whether at international conferences like Kyoto or at sessions like last month's World Bank briefing at UN headquarters in New York, to bang the drum for the advancement of the global governance structure. Hence his "institution-building" appeal to the Kyoto seminar, an appeal he repeated less than two hours later during a press conference at the FCCC site.

At the press conference, held to unveil a new UNDP "energising Development" initiative to promote investment in climate-change-related technology, Wijkman elaborated on UN efforts to build greater institutional and human "capacity." A leading means of accomplishing this, the UNDP official said, was through direct funding of selected NGOs. In fact, Wijkman continued, the UNDP now uses its pet NGOs as "implementing agents" for UN-sponsored objectives. This is more UN-style obfuscation; the process Wijkman alluded to is a common ruse whereby international agencies can make end runs around apathetic or hostile national or local governments. By working indirectly through its puppet NGOs, the UN can ensure implementation of programs like abortion and contraceptive-based sex education even where a target government refuses to co-operate in funding such programs or in granting permission to the UN to operate them.

While explaining the UNDP-NGO liaison, Wijkman disingenuously remarked that his agency hadn't "foreseen" this "explosive" expansion of the role of NGOs. That he would make such a comment is scarcely credible; Strong and his

surrounding circle of activists have in fact worked tirelessly for three decades to nurture exactly this sort of activist participation. Indeed, the recent "explosion" of NGO activity has taken place specifically because of the massive piping of World Bank and UN funds to green and radical-feminist groups as their sympathizers have tightened their grip on the international agencies.

For example, at last June's Habitat II Conference in Istanbul, World Bank representative Michael Cohen appeared on a panel at the UN Conference's NGO forum along with Bella Abzug, co-chairman of the Women's Environment and Development Organization (WEDO) and several other prominent international feminists. Citing the World Bank's planned \$15-billion investment in local communities over the next five years, Mr. Cohen promised "qualitative" changes in which "voices" and "realities" received that funding.

Appearing on the same panel, UNDP executive director Speth (who proudly told the Habitat II audience that "I spent my life as an NGO before I got lost in the UN bureaucracy") stressed that it was "extremely important" that feminist NGOs cajole national governments to adopt their radical agenda, while promising to donate \$25 million to help in the feminists' efforts to do exactly that.

Generally, senior UN officials are only that forthright about the extent of their symbiotic interaction with radical NGOs when they feel they are safely among like-minded listeners. Back at the NGO get-together in downtown Kyoto less than two hours later, Wijkman felt similarly comfortable about fully expressing his own allegiances. Appearing on the last panel of the day (chaired by WRI president Jonathan Lash), the UNDP policy director grumbled that he was "astonished" that the ongoing FCCC negotiations had gotten bogged down in a "political discussion" over the scope and nature of individual countries' contributions to emissions reductions. The UNDP, Wijkman intimated, wanted to move beyond that sort of

distasteful bartering by unenlightened national representatives, and speed ahead with its plans to "merge or integrate" the UN's environmental and social agendas.

After the panelists were done, IUCN "chief scientist" Jeff McNeely returned to the stage for some concluding remarks. After promising that the key elements of the day's discussions would be fed into the FCCC deliberations through a sympathetic national delegation at a timely moment, McNeely commented that he hoped that "Bob Watson makes sure biodiversity is a focus of the IPCC."

Given the tenor of the IPCC chairman's remarks earlier in the day, McNeely's hopes look certain to be realized. And it's every bit as likely that the FCCC's permanent secretariat will be equally committed to following the NGO order to link climate change and biodiversity, no matter what national delegates decide to do in Kyoto. That's because FCCC executive secretary Michael Zammit Cutajar is yet another member of Strong's seemingly bottomless stable of UN and NGO loyalists. Early in his three-decade-long association with the UN bureaucracy, a young Zammit Cutajar worked in 1971 and 1972 as a staff member in Strong's office while Strong served as Secretary General of the 1972 UN Conference on the Human Environment. In the cozy world of the UN and its activist cohorts, it appears that the more things change, the more they stay the same.

(Tom McFeely is an independent journalist from Canada who covered the Kyoto conference for Human Life International.)

U.S. Senate not swayed by media hype

Volume I, No. 5-October 28, 1997

ecologic Bonn

Published by Sovereignty International, Inc.

Greenpeace co-founder, Paul Watson, told a *Forbes* reporter: "It doesn't matter what is true; what matters is what people *believe* is true" (*Forbes* Magazine, Nov. 11, 1991 p. 174). What people *believe* is true is shaped by what they are told by the media. According to the World Wide Fund for Nature, some 72 percent of the American people *believe* that human activity is causing global warming. The people whose beliefs are shaped by primary research, rather than by media hype, have come to a different conclusion.

Benjamin Santer, lead author of the IPCC chapter on the detection of greenhouse warming, says: "It's unfortunate that many people read the media hype before they read the IPCC chapter.... We say quite clearly that few scientists would say the attribution issue was a done deal."

"In Kyoto, he [the President] should be prepared to walk away from a bad deal that risks America's prosperity and leaves much of the world off the hook. If he does not, let me assure him now, the Senate will."

Neither truth, nor facts, have slowed the media hype generated by those who insist that "the

overwhelming majority," and "the consensus" of scientists agree that anthropogenic global warming is already occurring, while ignoring the growing evidence that climate scientists have reached a different conclusion. In a survey of climate scientists conducted by the *Meteorologisches Institut Universität Hamburg and GKS*

Forchungszentrum, 67 percent of Canadian climate scientists rejected the notion that anthropogenic global warming is already occurring. In Germany, the number was 87 percent. And in America, the number was 97 percent. A separate survey of the official climatologists employed by the individual states in America revealed that 58 percent rejected the notion that anthropogenic global warming is occurring.

But, as Paul Watson says, it doesn't matter what is true; what matters is what people *believe* is true.

In America, a rapidly growing number of people are separating truth and fact from media hype. Among them is Senator Trent Lott, Majority Leader of the U.S. Senate. He says that the President's Plan -- so roundly criticized in Bonn -- fails to meet the basic requirements of the Hagel-Byrd Resolution passed unanimously by the Senate. Even if COP III should adopt the President's plan in Kyoto, it would "face a very cool reception in the Senate," Lott says.

Trent Lott is one of many Senators who have separated truth and fact from media hype: "The political agenda developed by activists is not supported by evidence developed by scientists. It is important that emotions not lead governments into chasing non-existent solutions to highly exaggerated problems."

Lott says the Senate will judge the Kyoto agreement on five basic principles:

- First, there must be no erosion of American sovereignty. The Senate will not ratify a treaty that

creates yet another unaccountable UN bureaucracy with the power to regulate American economic well-being.

- Second, there must be no hidden taxes or wealth-transfer schemes. The President's plan would have the net result of transferring American resources to other countries and increasing costs to our producers and consumers.
- Third, there must be no loss of American jobs. Mr. Gore and others may be willing to sacrifice American workers for their dubious environmental theories, but the Senate is not.
- Fourth, American business cannot be placed at a disadvantage overseas. The Senate will not support a treaty which jeopardizes our ability to compete in the global marketplace.
- Finally, there must be no special advantages to major polluters in the Third World. It makes neither environmental nor economic sense to sign a "global " treaty in Kyoto that places no legally-binding limits on emission from China, India, Mexico, Brazil and other developing countries.

Lott says: "In Kyoto, he [the President] should be prepared to walk away from a bad deal that risks America's prosperity and leaves much of the world off the hook. If he does not, let me assure him now, the Senate will."

Averting tragedy in Kyoto

With great optimism, AOSIS proposed 20% below 1990 levels by 2005 as the target and timetable for greenhouse gas emissions reductions. Finally, after months of stalling and delay, America announced its target and timetable: 1990 levels by 2008-2012. Do these two, widely divergent positions mean that the Kyoto protocol will reflect "middle ground" somewhere between these extremes? If it does, it will likely die in Kyoto. Real-world reality forced the President to advance a target and timetable that he knew would be unsatisfactory to

the rest of the world in order to have any hope of winning the support of the U.S. Senate and the American people. And there is no assurance that either the Senate or the American people will support the President's proposal; there is almost no chance that a more stringent proposal could win approval. What, then, are the delegates to do in Kyoto?

It should be obvious that the nations of the world are nowhere near ready to agree on targets, timetables, monitoring and compliance mechanisms, or an enforcement regime. Nor will they be ready in Kyoto. Delegates may be well advised to recognize that reality and devise a strategy to salvage the process rather than risk losing the entire treaty.

Should the delegates insist on going forward with unrealistic targets and timetables, without acceptable compliance and enforcement mechanisms -- in order to meet the Kyoto deadline -- the entire process, and perhaps the treaty itself, could be seriously jeopardized. There is a large and growing number of Americans who simply do not believe that even the President's modest proposal is justified by the science. Three powerful U.S. Senators have already advised the U.S. Secretary of State of the circumstances that will trigger reconsideration of the entire treaty by the U.S. Senate.

There is a strategy discussed among the more radical proponents of global warming which would have the delegates adopt the most stringent targets and timetable possible by the widest possible margin, in order to isolate the United States as a target for global ridicule -- to shame the U.S. into compliance. That is a dangerous strategy. Far more than just the climate change treaty could be at risk.

On the other hand, delegates could recognize the political reality in the world and choose to use Kyoto to restore the mission of the Conference of the Parties to its original purpose -- to implement a **voluntary** effort by the members to prevent "dangerous anthropogenic interference with the

climate system." The entire process becomes highly suspect when the delegates appear to be more interested in limiting energy use in developed nations and transferring technology to developing nations, than about determining at what levels of concentration anthropogenic greenhouse gas emissions become dangerous. While many proponents of global warming may "*believe*" existing levels are dangerous, their beliefs have not been substantiated with scientific evidence. Public policy should not be dictated by the "beliefs" of global warming proponents.

Proposed rule change

Three of America's most powerful Senators -- Jesse Helms, Chair of the Committee on Foreign Relations, Rod Grams, Chair of the Subcommittee on International Operations, and Chuck Hagel, Chair of the Subcommittee on International Economic Policy -- sent a letter to Secretary of State, Madeleine Albright, advising her that a proposed "rule change" would not exclude the Senate from the treaty process.

The proposed rule change, offered by the European Union (EU) "would permit parties to the FCCC to adopt protocols by a three-quarter majority," according to the Senators' letter. The Senators told the Secretary that "If adopted, the EU proposal would cause an even more dramatic shift in these critical negotiations away from the interests of the United States." In America, the U.S. Senate must approve any treaty signed by the President.

The Senate is on record as having rejected legally binding targets and timetables as an acceptable provision of the FCCC. "We believe any effort to amend the FCCC in this regard...would require the Administration to resubmit the entire amended FCCC to the Senate for its advice and consent." By a vote of 95-0, the U.S. Senate has adopted a resolution which says any agreement on global warming must meet two specific conditions: (1) no adverse economic impact on America; and (2) all nations must be equally bound.

The EU rule-change proposal is being interpreted by some as a "back-door" attempt to by-pass the U.S. Senate. Should the Senators' fears be validated by the decision of the delegates, any agreement reached in Kyoto will be instantly jeopardized. There is little patience in the Senate for such finagling -- and even less for the protocol proposals now on the table.

U.S. Proposal: an attempt to destroy the world...? Now, really!

More hyperbole and hype surround the climate change negotiations. The assertion that the U.S. proposal is "*an attempt to destroy the world in pursuit of U.S. economic interests,*" is an example of the fundamental problem that underlies the entire negotiations -- hyperbole and hype. The vast majority of the delegates, no doubt, are sincerely seeking realistic solutions to the possibility that human activity may affect global climate. Hyperbolic media hype distorts reality and reasonableness. For example, it is not reasonable for the IPCC to admit, on the one hand, that it cannot calculate the efficiency of carbon sinks, while on the other hand, it proclaims that "billions of people could be impacted" by all manner of calamity -- including sea-level rise, measured to the centimeter.

As Ambassador Hamblin clearly stated, the U.S. position advances what the U.S. Administration considers to be a "realistic" set of goals. The U.S. Senate, and the American people -- growing weary of hyperbole and hype -- may well consider the President's measured proposal too much to stomach.

The age-old accusation that "*the U.S. with less than 5% of the world's population, enjoying more than 22% of the world's wealth and emitting more than 25% of the world's greenhouse gases...*" will gain little sympathy from Americans. The American people, 5% of

the world's population, had to *earn* the wealth which pays the lion's share of the cost of these negotiating sessions, create the lion's share of the technology that is expected to be transferred, and fund the lion's share of the "Clean Development Fund," and the "Compensation Fund." If given the choice between the goods and services, military defense, humanitarian relief and financial aid provided by America -- and zero greenhouse gas emissions from America, there would be no contest among reasonable people. It is those who persist in producing hyperbole and hype that endanger the world by pursuing political power to "not allow" America to continue producing the economic wealth, technological innovations, and free market opportunities the world so desperately needs.

Support weak for climate agreement

Two separate public opinion polls show that the American public offers little support for the greenhouse gas emission reduction agreement now in final stages of negotiation. A poll released by the World Wildlife Federation reported that 72% of the American people *believed* global warming was occurring, and that 60 percent agreed that "stricter controls on carbon dioxide emissions are worth the cost and would protect health and create new jobs." But when they were asked if they would be willing to pay a 50-cent per gallon tax -- even when the tax is rebated through income tax deductions -- more than half of the respondents said "no."

The Small Business Survival Committee's poll found that 60 percent of Americans oppose a climate treaty that would destroy American jobs. Eighty-six percent believe that developing countries

***"73 percent
oppose locking
the United States
into long-term,
costly programs
before we know
how best to respond."***

should be treated exactly as developed countries in any agreement, and 67 percent do not want America to provide free technology to other countries. And 73 percent oppose "locking the United States into long-term, costly programs before we know how best to respond."

One of the most impressive polls appeared in the *Washington Post* in the form of a three-page advertisement. More than eleven-hundred organizations representing all 50 American states urged the President not to sign a premature, legally-binding agreement in Kyoto. By even the most conservative estimates, the combined membership of the eleven-hundred organizations represents as many as 15-million Americans.strong>

Commentary:

Last Chance

The success of the climate change negotiating process may well be measured by what did **not** occur, rather than by what did occur at the 8th AGBM negotiating session. If the delegates march forward toward the production of a legally binding protocol -- to meet the Kyoto deadline -- which is then ultimately rejected by America and other Annex I countries, Kyoto and the process will be an historic failure. If, on the other hand, the delegates recognize that there is nothing sacred about the Kyoto deadline, and that the protocol is nowhere near ready for presentation to the world, both the protocol and the process may be salvageable.

Early this century, another group of international delegates negotiated a different treaty. They assumed that because President Woodrow Wilson supported idea, that the League of Nations would become the seat of global governance.

In America, neither the President, nor the delegates to any UN Conference, can bind the nation to any treaty without the

approval of the U.S. Senate and the support of the American people.

The protocol now being rushed to completion may well be destined to the same fate as the League of Nations. Neither the U.S. Senate, nor the American people are convinced that there is a legitimate, science-based need for the draconian reductions of greenhouse gas emissions now being discussed. Moreover, the inequitable implementation measures being discussed reveal the protocol to be more focused on the redistribution of wealth than on the reduction of global greenhouse emissions.

There is no need for the delegates to risk rejection of their efforts. There is no need to rush into unnecessary action. Even if science eventually establishes a direct link between human activity and climate change -- a link which has not yet been established -- there will be time for appropriate action. There will be time to continue to benefit from the **voluntary** actions called for by the treaty. In three short years, voluntary action reduced emission of Annex 1 countries by nearly 5%, while private industries **voluntarily** invested more than \$500 billion in countries dependent upon the World Bank.

There will be time to develop new, affordable, alternative technology. There will be time for developing nations to realize their economic potential. There will be time to refine the protocol to make it an agreement that all nations and all people can support.

Should the delegates insist on producing a document at Kyoto that is ultimately rejected, Kyoto will go down in history as the place where the Convention on Climate Change unraveled. Kyoto can be remembered as the place where the negotiating process gained credibility because the delegates were unwilling to compromise the integrity of an important process -- just to meet an arbitrary deadline.

There is much work yet to be done; delegates should not jeopardize the work already done just to produce an inadequate document at Kyoto -- that is likely to be rejected.

World Concerns

**December 2, 1997 Published by Sovereignty
International, Inc Volume 1, No. 2**

Formerly ...ecologic Bonn

During the last three negotiating sessions, Sovereignty International has published for the delegates to the FCCC, a unique newsletter called ***ecologic Bonn***. The ideas and information presented in our newsletter offer a sharp contrast to the business-as-usual advocacy presented by the environmental lobby. The name "***ecologic***" is a great name. It was chosen by one of our founding organizations as the name of its publication and has been used continuously since 1992. The name was especially appropriate for our newsletter for the FCCC delegates, because it so perfectly illustrates the difference between the views we present from those presented by the other well-established newsletter published at these meetings.

We discovered, however, that another NGO also used the name Ecologic. The organization, officially listed as "Center For International and European Environmental Research (Ecologic)," asked us to change the name of our publication. Sebastian Oberthur, speaking for the Berlin-based organization, explained that although his organization was not registered until 1995, the word "Ecologic" was a part of the official name of his organization and it would be much more difficult to change than would be a name change for our publication. Moreover, according to Oberthur, donors to the Berlin organization were confused, thinking that the positions we advanced in our newsletter were the positions of the Berlin organization.

It is not our purpose to "monkeywrench" the Berlin organization. Our purpose is to challenge flawed assumptions, examine questionable data, monitor procedures, and to present alternative ideas, new information, and to advance values that much of the world has not yet realized.

Consequently, in a meeting facilitated by the Secretariat, we recognized that since the FCCC meetings are likely to be held in Germany, our continued use of the name **ecologic** would continue to confuse German donors to the Berlin organization, and continue to be a sore spot that would distract from far more important issues. Therefore, in the spirit of international cooperation -- and with an agreement from the Berlin organization that they would not use the name "Ecologic" in America -- we agreed to change the name of our publication at the FCCC meetings. Henceforth, our publication at the FCCC meetings will be called **World Concerns**.

*“Many people believe
that the era of nation-states
is over....
Sovereignty International
does not share that view.”*

Meet Sovereignty International

Sovereignty
International, Inc.,
exists because of our
growing world

concerns. We are concerned about infringement of inalienable rights with which all people are endowed. We are concerned about the economic well-being of all people. We are concerned about the global environment. And we are concerned about self governance. These concerns are shared by all responsible people. How best to protect and enhance individual rights, economic well-being, the global environment, and self governance -- is a process of discovery. There is no single formula, nor is there a single sovereign authority that can meet the needs of all people. The

process of discovery is an on-going adventure that needs the ideas and suggestions of all nations and every constituency. Sovereignty International intends to contribute to the discovery process.

Few would disagree that individual freedom is among the highest of human values. Individual freedom includes the freedom of self governance. The ultimate expression of self governance is national sovereignty. Individual freedom is enhanced as personal relationships are built upon voluntary, mutually beneficial agreements. Relationships that are imposed by one person upon another diminish individual freedom and create a situation of involuntary servitude. Such relationships become festering sores that erupt in revolt, often violently. Lasting relations among nations are also built upon voluntary, mutually beneficial relationships. Relationships that are imposed by one nation upon another become the seeds of war, as history has so painfully documented. This fundamental principle of *voluntary* relationships cannot be minimized, overlooked, or ignored as the nations of the world seek to find solutions to perceived environmental problems. Lasting solutions will come only from *voluntary*, mutually beneficial agreements.

Self governance, by definition, is governance empowered by the consent of the people who are governed. Sadly, much of the world has not yet realized self governance. When the rules of government are crafted and imposed by a handful of unelected people -- there is no consent by the people who are governed, nor is there individual freedom. When the rules of global governance are crafted and imposed by a handful of unelected people -- there is no voluntary, mutually beneficial agreement, nor can there be lasting solutions.

The United Nations was conceived to be a forum where sovereign nations could assemble, and through the process of discussion, debate, and deliberation, discover areas of mutually beneficial agreement that might be entered into

voluntarily. The world has been spared much violence and pestilence as the result of decades of such agreements. In recent years, however, the function of the United Nations has begun to change, from an agency that facilitates deliberation, to an agency that crafts and imposes rules of government.

Many people believe that the era of nation-states is over, that the time has come when national sovereignty must yield to global governance. Sovereignty International does not share that view. Despite disclaimers to the contrary, global governance becomes world government at the point the United Nations expands its function from facilitator of deliberations to instigator of regulations. The Berlin Mandate -- which calls for "legally binding" commitments -- is a prime example of UN authority expanding beyond the facilitation of deliberations into the arena of global governance.

Sovereignty International believes that there should be no political power greater than the sovereign nation. Nations should settle their disputes -- and discover mutual benefits -- through voluntary agreements. Even when acquired incrementally, the power to craft and impose rules of governance upon sovereign nations is, by whatever name it may be called, world government. National sovereignty cannot survive the accumulation of such power by the United Nations. Without national sovereignty, there is no self governance. Without self governance, there is no freedom.

Pawns, Puppets, or Policy-Makers?

**Source: United States Internal Revenue Service,
Exempt Organization Database**

Organization	Income	Assets	Year Reported
Natural Resources Defense Council	\$25,911,824	\$38,192,947	1995
The Nature Conservancy	\$882,040,841	\$1,120,094,965	1995
World Wide Fund For Nature (USA)	\$132,874,116	\$62,558,896	1995
Greenpeace	\$8,910,589	\$15,119,776	1994
Totals	\$1,049,737,370	\$1,235,966,584	

The driving force behind global climate policy cannot be traced to compelling science. What, then, keeps the notion of global warming -- replete with the attendant prophecies of planetary pestilence -- in the international media, and keeps thousands of people parading to venues around the world in pursuit of policies to prevent problems that are not yet apparent?

Writing in *Foreign Affairs* (January/February, 1997), Jessica T. Mathews says the driving force behind the global climate policy is NGOs. According to Mathews, Vanuatu "turned its delegation over to an NGO" based in London and funded by an American foundation. It was NGO involvement that produced the original treaty in "the blink of a diplomat's

eye -- 16 months -- over the opposition of the United States, Russia, and Saudi Arabia."

The same NGOs that dominated the working groups during the work-up to the 1992 Earth Summit, which produced the FCCC, dominated COPI that produced the Berlin Mandate,

have dominated the negotiating sessions leading to Kyoto, and are continuing to dominate the propaganda surrounding the proposed Kyoto protocol. NGOs have an enormous stake in environmental policy, particularly in climate policy. And they are well prepared to protect their interest.

The combined annual income and/or assets of the environmental NGOs accredited to the FCCC could solve most of the real environmental problems of the developing world, were they so disposed to use it for that purpose. Consider the numbers reported by only four of those organizations that are required to report in the U.S.

A search of the IRS Exempt Database revealed 154 environmental NGOs that have either assets or annual income in excess of \$5 million. The total annual income for those organizations is \$4,042,294,445, and their assets total \$8,666,050,901. These are only those NGOs that are required to report in the United States. According to Jessica Mathews, the Association for Progressive Communications (APC), transmits FCCC information and propaganda to 50,000 NGOs in 133 countries. The total budget for the FCCC for 1996 was \$7.3 million. What drives the global climate Policy?

NGOs or PGOs:

front groups for governments?

The FCCC recognizes three NGO constituencies: environmental NGOs, industry NGOs, and local government authority NGOs. Who do these NGOs actually represent? It is

clear that industry NGOs represent their respective industries and the hundreds of thousands of workers who depend upon those industries to provide jobs. The other two groups of NGOs continually criticize industry NGOs for seeking profits, while they represent themselves to be spokesmen for vast grassroots constituencies of voiceless people. Not quite.

Many environmental NGOs are better described as PGOs -- private governmental organizations. Elaine Dewar, author of *Cloak of Green*, describes such NGOs as organized as a private not-for-

Many environmental NGOs are better described as PGOs — private governmental organizations.

profit organization, but funded by a government. Dewar's extensive research reveals how many NGOs are simply front groups for government interest. The practice was perfected in the work-up to the 1992 Earth Summit that produced the FCCC. Elizabeth May, for example, was appointed to the Canadian delegation to the preparatory meetings for the 1992 Rio Summit. Although she represented Cultural Survival Canada, Sierra Club of Canada, and the Canadian Environmental Network, her expenses were not paid by her constituency, but by the Canadian Industrial Development Agency (CIDA). Moreover, the Canadian government "put aside \$1 million to spend over the next three years on NGO activities related to the Rio Summit," according to Dewar. The Center for Our Common Future received \$250,000 directly from the Canadian government between 1990 and 1992.

The International Institute for Sustainable Development, publishers of the familiar *Earth Negotiations Bulletin*, is

actually a PGO, according to Dewar, not an NGO. It was created March 15, 1990 and funded by the Canadian government to the tune of "\$23,250,000 taxpayers' dollars," Dewar says. The U.S. government (USAID) also supplies funds to the Institute.

Three other NGOs that are recognized as representing the environmental constituency should also be renamed PGOs: the International Union for the Conservation of Nature; the World Wide Fund for Nature; and the World Resources Institute. In addition to the millions of dollars these PGOs receive in grants from national governments, they are, in fact, an integral part of the United Nations system. Joint projects among these PGOs and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) include: *World Conservation Strategy; Caring for the Earth; Global Biodiversity Strategy*, and for all practical purposes, Agenda 21; the Convention on Biological Diversity; the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*; and the Framework Convention on Climate Change. In the April, 1996 report of the Global Environment Facility (GEF), these three PGOs were listed as "Executing Agency," or "Collaborating Organization" for 29 grants totaling \$350 million. It's difficult to imagine that these organizations are recognized as representative of the grassroots environmental community.

*"...these three PGOs
were listed as
executing agency...
for 29 grants totaling
\$350 million."*

The organization that claims to represent local government authorities also appears to be a PGO rather than an NGO. The International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI) was created in 1990 at the behest of the United Nations Environmental Program, according to Jeb Brugmann

in an interview with journalist Joan Veon, at the March, 1997 Rio + Five Conference in Rio de Janeiro. With "generous" funding from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the fledgling organization has secured emissions reductions "agreements" with only 178 cities and counties around the world and now claims to speak at UN meetings for "local government authorities." In the United States, where there are more than 3000 county governments and three-times as many cities, ICLEI has secured 43 agreements, according to their 1997 report. Still, the organization, funded essentially by governments, with a very weak link to a minute segment of local governments, is recognized as the NGO voice of local government authorities.

Sovereignty International, Inc., by contrast, is not a front-group for anyone. Sovereignty International is funded neither by government nor industry. In its first year of existence, its largest single contribution was \$3000. Its work is supported by small gifts from individuals, businesses, and organizations that also pay the taxes which governments so eagerly give to PGOs and United Nations organizations. Sadly, the United Nations has not yet recognized the constituency represented by Sovereignty International. It is a very real and growing constituency -- whether it is recognized or not.

World Concerns

December 4, 1997 *Published by Sovereignty International, Inc* Volume 1, No. 3

The Scientific Case Against the

Global Climate Treaty

Perhaps the most cogent and persuasive analysis of the science underlying the FCCC has been prepared by Dr. S. Fred Singer, professor (emeritus) of environmental sciences at the University of

Dr. S. Fred Singer

will be available

for press interviews

which may be scheduled at the Sovereignty International exhibit

on the 4th floor,

near the snack bar.

Virginia, founder and president of The Science & Environmental Policy Project, author or editor of 15 books and numerous scientific articles, and an atmospheric physicist who has served the U.S. government as Assistant Administrator for Policy, Environmental Protection Agency; and chief scientist for the Department of Transportation. He created and

developed earth satellite systems and pioneered remote sensing techniques to measure atmospheric parameters from satellites. His latest book, *Hot Talk, Cold Science*, explains precisely where and how the current climate change policy departs from sound science. Here is an excerpt from the overview.

The Global Climate Treaty rests on three propositions that are either questionable or demonstrably false:

1: The Climate Treaty supposes that a human influence has been detected in the climate record of the last hundred years, thereby validating the computer-generated predictions of a major future warming. But the climate has not warmed significantly over the last half-century, and not at all over the last 20 years, in contrast to theoretical predictions.

2: It further supposes that any future warming would produce catastrophic consequences, including droughts, floods, hurricanes, rapid and significant sea level rise, the collapse of agriculture, and the spread of tropical disease. But the recorded climate record of the past 3,000 years appears to dispel that. Historically, warmer temperatures have been, on the whole, beneficial for human welfare and the development of civilization.

3: It presumes -- with no scientific definition -- to know which atmospheric levels of greenhouse gases are "dangerous" and which are not. To stabilize CO₂ concentration at present levels, 30 percent above pre-industrial values, would require a drastic reduction of emissions and energy use -- more than 60 percent worldwide. But again, the historical record indicates that higher levels of CO₂ -- and they have been much higher in the past -- may in fact provide benefits. Some scientists, including the late Roger Revelle, known as the father of greenhouse warming, have

speculated that some of these benefits have already turned up in improved agricultural yields.

Let's take a broader look at these points. The main conclusion of the UN-sponsored science advisory group, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), is that "*the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate.*" This artful but essentially meaningless phrase has been misread by policymakers as proof that computer models predicting a warming of 1 to 3.5 degrees celsius by the year 2100 have been validated. Such confusion is understandable. The IPCC Policy-makers Summary juxtaposes that phrase with the results of climate model calculations of future warming, ***even though such a connection is specifically denied in the body of the 1996 IPCC report (p.434).*** (Emphasis added.)

Such misinterpretations to the contrary, the global temperature record of this century, which shows periods of both warming and cooling, can best be explained in terms of natural climate fluctuations, caused by the complex interaction between atmosphere and oceans, and perhaps stimulated by variations of solar radiation that drives the Earth's climate system.

(Dr. Singer's book, Hot Talk, Cold Science, may be ordered at the Sovereignty International exhibit.)

Playing statistical games

Dr. Bert Bolin has never denied, nor downplayed, the uncertainty that permeates the science of climate change. Others, however, have taken the mustard-seed of uncertainty that "suggests discernible human influence on global climate," and transformed it into a mountain of cataclysmic doom and gloom propaganda, designed to frighten unsuspecting environmentally sensitive citizens into supporting unnecessary and imprudent controls over energy use in developed nations. The mustard-seed, and all the subsequent mountain-building

is not derived from observations of scientific fact, nor from valid conclusions produced by the excruciating, time-consuming "scientific process." Virtually all of the speculation about rising seas and expanding deserts, drop-dead diseases and devastating weather events, is derived from statistical computer games marketed under the GCM label. The problem, according to *The Economist* (November 29, 1997), "the models keep misbehaving."

"There is not yet, for instance, a model that can 'predict' the past with precision -- most models estimate that the amount of warming should be about twice as large as has actually occurred. So assertions that the future projections of such models are correct need to be taken with a tablespoon or two of salt. Indeed, it is only in the past year that a model has been made that can accurately predict the present -- that is, it behaves, without the aid of fudging, like the current climate. This model, created at the National Centre for Atmospheric Research in Boulder, Colorado, suggests milder, more gradual, increases in temperature than the IPCC did, and its estimate of the human fingerprint on climate change is smaller."

That doesn't sound much like the work of "obstructionist industry toadies,"

Moreover, *The Economist* reports that "even the best of the world's supercomputers are not powerful enough to cope with all the variables that make up the climate." Max Suarez of NASA's Goddard Space Flight Center agrees. He says it's "iffy" whether anthropogenic greenhouse warming is even underway. "I wouldn't trust the models to that level of detail yet. Especially if you're trying to explain the very small [temperature] change we've seen...." The computers on which the GCM games are played are years away from having the horsepower to approximate the global climate. Klaus Hasselmann of the Max Planck Institute for Meteorology, says "The next 10 years will tell; we're going to have to wait that long to really see."

Another reason the computer models keep misbehaving is, "that there is still nothing like a consensus over the exact effects on the climate of sunlight, clouds, oceans, aerosols, and living things," according to *The Economist*. "When assumptions about these factors change, so do the results. The IPCC's own 'best estimate' of sea-level rise over the next century decreased by a quarter between 1990 and 1995, and that of the amount of warming fell by a third...." These are the same "misbehaving" computers that produce the warming predictions at various stabilization figures. Such exercises are, indeed, statistical gamesmanship. Delegates should look again to see who are the players.

More statistical gamesmanship

A popular PGO publication reports: "There are so many scientific uncertainties and unresolved issues surrounding the use of sinks for quantitative emissions targets that it is ecologically irresponsible to allow the use of the net approach at this stage."

What?

If computer analyses of data collected by real people, from real sinks, by the best technology available is so fraught with "scientific uncertainties and unresolved issues" as to render its use "ecologically irresponsible, how can we trust global warming predictions, generated by unreal simulations of unknown future climate events, analyzed by computers widely acknowledged to be inadequate?

And more statistical games...

The *Herald International Tribune* chose the opening day of COP III to announce "Americans Want Action on Climate" on the front page. The burning desire of 260 million Americans is represented by 953 scientifically (carefully) selected people. It may be only a coincidence, but all the polls conducted by PGOs, and many by the media reach similar conclusions.

Polls conducted by organizations that do not have a seat on the global-warming bandwagon conclude that Americans are skeptical about global warming claims, and want no action that will result in higher energy prices. These polls, however, are quickly attacked as "industry funded." What games PGOs play!

Celebrating human achievement

Essay By Henry Lamb

*This essay celebrating the U.S. Constitution and the American government it created is a new feature in **ecologic**. A part of the reason America seems to be drifting toward socialized global governance is that we, as a nation, have lost sight of the values that made America the greatest nation on earth. We invite all readers to submit essays that illustrate the values we celebrate as Americans. We hope this feature will be an inspiration to all who visit here.*

The U.S. Constitution may be humanity's greatest achievement toward the goal of self governance. It is a product, not so much of inspiration, but of observation and hope. The men who wrote it followed no pattern, but tried desperately to construct a system to prevent the wrongs inherent in other governments. They did not succeed. The American system of government is not free from wrongs. It is, however, the best system of self governance yet devised. The government created by the U.S. Constitution is a human achievement. It is a human achievement we celebrate.

But what, exactly, is it about the American system of government that makes it the best system yet devised? If it is, in fact, the best system yet devised, why do so many people -- especially Americans -- criticize it, and constantly try to change it. The answer is simple: because they can.

The bedrock on which our Constitution -- and our system of government -- is founded is the realization that people are born free. At birth, they are endowed by their creator with the right and the ability to choose individually what actions they will take. Each person is empowered to direct his own life. Each person is sovereign unto himself. Individual people, working in concert, voluntarily agree to impose upon themselves a measured limitation of their freedom. The U.S. Constitution articulates that agreement and measures the power sovereign individuals bestow upon the institution of government. Those people who wrote the Constitution, and those who subscribe to it, agree to be bound by the laws produced by the institution of government because it is they, the individual people, who are the government. Upon this bedrock realization, the people of America built a great nation because they were neither dependent upon government nor limited by it.

To avoid the most oppressive wrongs inherent in previous governments, the people who wrote the Constitution insisted that government could not restrict speech or the ideas conveyed by speech. Government could not restrict or promote any religion. Government could not take the private property of individuals without just compensation. Government, as designed by our Constitution, respects the sovereignty of individuals and acknowledges the limitations those individuals placed upon it.

To guard against the usurpation of individual sovereignty by the government, its power was carefully divided among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. To ensure that the new government was accountable to the people who empowered it, direct elections selected the individuals who would be entrusted with governmental authority. The two houses of the legislative branch ensure that ideas for laws would be forced to survive the most arduous debate before being imposed upon the people.

It is the genius of the legislative process that keeps the power of government in check. The Constitution requires that laws originate in the legislature. Any elected representative may introduce any proposed law that he wishes. Any American may support or oppose any legislative proposal by attempting to persuade elected officials. In the legislative chambers any representative may speak in support of opposition of any proposal. The fate of every legislative proposal is determined by a public, recorded vote of the representatives, which makes them directly accountable to their electors. Fortunately, most legislative proposals never make it through the process. Those which do survive, rarely become law in their original form. Legislative proposals are refined and polished in the process of debate. And even then, when a law is enacted and later recognized to be bad, it can be changed or repealed by the legislature.

The system of government is truly the best system yet devised, but it is not perfect. It can never be perfect until the people it represents are perfect. Government is a reflection of the people who created it. Government can be no better than the people who empower it. Government will be, at any given point in history, what the majority of people want it to be. That means that at any given point in history, about half the people are happy with government, and about half are not. The continual struggle between conflicting forces is what keeps the American government in balance. Students of history can readily see the influence of conflicting social forces reflected in the policies of government. Shifts in ideological direction are very slow in real time, but historically, the shifts are fairly predictable and consistent. The system of government, created by the writers of our Constitution, is flexible enough to accommodate ideological shifts and technological innovation. When government goes astray, it is not because of the system, it is because of the political forces that direct the government onto its wayward path. As the counterbalancing force arises throughout the people, those people who are happy with government become disenchanted and redouble their efforts to

redirect to government. The struggle is good, healthy, and what the founders envisioned.

Throughout the rest of the world, people long to come to America to partake of its bounty, but few people outside America understand how America works or why it has become the greatest nation on earth. Most people on earth cannot comprehend the bedrock realization on which American was built. The idea that people are born free is incomprehensible to most of the earth's population. Most people are not born free. They are born into a system of government that possesses sovereign power over the lives of its citizens. Freedom of any sort is a gift from government. Freedom to speak, worship, create, and even to work, is a privilege granted by government. Private property ownership is a privilege granted -- or denied -- by government according to the whims of government. Most people in the world are both dependent upon and limited by their governments. When those people describe freedom, they speak of privileges that have been granted by government; when Americans describe freedom, they speak of complete individual freedom, except for those limitations they have voluntarily agreed to impose upon themselves.

In those nations where government possesses sovereign power over the lives of individuals, those who control government are the ruling class. New blood enters the ruling class, not by election, but by selection. The ruling class chooses only those whose activities are consistent with their own agenda to bring into the ruling class. Kings control the ruling class by bloodline. Dictators control the ruling class by rewarding loyalty. Communist and socialist regimes control the ruling class by carefully selecting those individuals who demonstrate solidarity of belief and performance. Even parliamentary systems tend to reflect incestuous influence through the ruling parties. Only in America can the people "throw the bums out" without fear of personal reprisals, revolution and/or anarchy.

But the American system of government is changing. The U.S. Constitution -- even with its enumerated powers -- is being ignored. New forces, external forces, are exerting influences that challenge the bedrock realization of individual sovereignty, and are eroding the legislative process as the mechanism for the creation public policy.

The United Nations has evolved its own hierarchy of elite rulers from nations that cling to the notion that governments are sovereign over the freedoms of individuals. While the United Nations claims to promote the expansion of democracy, what it means is that it will *allow* individuals greater opportunity to participate in the process. The United Nations refuses to accept the premise that it is the people who have the power to control government -- even the United Nations. Most of the people of the world do not have the power to control the United Nations. Their governments speak at the UN without fear of contradiction by its citizens. American representatives to the UN may speak for the government, but with the certain knowledge that their voice will be subject to the ultimate approval of the American people.

The power of the American people over its government is an obstacle to the objectives and agenda of the United Nations. Therefore, a mechanism has been devised to diminish the power of the legislative branch of government at every level. Public policy is being made by carefully selected individuals, rather than by duly elected officials. Virtually every agency of the United Nations consists of selected individuals rather than elected officials. Selected individuals develop international policy and write international law. When an international treaty is ratified by the U.S. Senate (a very troublesome process for the UN), American laws must be created or amended to conform to the requirements of the treaty. Both the U.S. wetland policy and the Endangered Species Act are the result of compliance with international treaties. The President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD)

consists of *selected* individuals -- not elected officials.

Regional councils, consisting of *selected* individuals, operating under the auspices of the PCSD, are now regionalizing the policy-making process through stakeholder councils, consisting of *selected* individuals. The process is taking the policy-making process out of the hands of elected officials, where there is direct accountability to the electors, and placing it in the hands of individuals *selected* for their demonstrated compliance with the ideals of the elite ruling class.

The perpetrators of this mischief have devised this mechanism not simply to control people, but in the sincere belief that the American legislative process is an obstacle to progress that could redirect their agenda away from policies which the ruling elite believe is essential for the well being of society. Their view of society begins with the notion that government is sovereign over the people. And that freedoms should be granted by government to individuals who meet their responsibilities to the state. The philosophy of governance on which the United Nations system is building its global governance regime is diametrically opposed to the philosophy upon which the U.S. Constitution was constructed. A collision between those two philosophies is inevitable. Indeed, the collision is immanent. America is the only nation that can prevent the UN philosophy from emerging into full-blown global governance. Which philosophy will prevail in America is not yet clear.

The UN philosophy is not invading America with black helicopters and blue-helmeted soldiers. It is invading America through the Convention on Climate Change, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on Chemical Weapons, Agenda 21, the President's Council on Sustainable Development, Ecosystem Management, American Heritage Rivers Initiative, Goals 2000, and an endless stream of policy recommendations that are being implemented without the benefit of legislative debate and authorization.

The invasion of UN philosophy cannot be stopped by bullets or retreat to a survival community in the mountains. It will be stopped by individuals exercising their individual sovereign power to limit and control their government. It will be stopped by people who arm themselves with factual information and persuade their city councilmen, county commissioners, state legislators, and their Congressmen to not let their Constitutional authority be eroded by *selected* policy makers. It will be stopped by individuals who attend stakeholder visioning meetings and object to policies that diminish private property rights and individuals freedom. It will be stopped by individuals and corporations who find new ways to let free markets solve social and environmental problems. It will be stopped by free people exercising their inalienable right to be free. The American government is the only nation on earth strong enough to stop the march toward global governance. The American people are the only power on earth strong enough to direct, or redirect, the American government.