

News from Buenos Aires COP IV

U.S. Representatives' Press Conference Nov 10, 1998

The fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP IV) of the Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) is meeting in Buenos Aires, Argentina November 2 - 13 1998. Delegates from 171 member nations are trying to define the ambiguous terms of the **Kyoto Protocol** adopted at COP III last year in Kyoto, Japan.

Although the U.S. Senate adopted a resolution, by a vote of 95 - 0, setting forth the conditions necessary for Senate ratification, President Clinton is expected to sign the Protocol during, or shortly after the Buenos Aires meeting -- despite the Protocol's failure to meet the Senate's conditions.

November 13, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - COP4, scheduled to adjourn at 5 pm (local time) is still in progress at midnight. UN staff have been advised that adjournment may not come before Saturday afternoon? Why the last-minute log-jam?

Almost no progress has been made during the entire conference, toward consensus on many of the thorny issues left unsettled in Kyoto. The U.S. held firm to its requirement that developing nations agree to "meaningful participation" and

developing nations said they would do nothing until the U.S. stepped up to the plate. The EU and the U.S. have been at odds over trading limits and the like, while the oil producing nations held firm to the requirement for compensation for lost oil revenues. No one would budge. The meeting was expected to fizzle out today with the most important decision being the location of COP5.

Then the U.S. signed the Kyoto Protocol.



Suddenly, everyone was interested in cutting a deal. America had stepped up to the plate. With the U.S. on board, deals which were negotiated on the basis of "what if the U.S...." suddenly had to be confirmed, renegotiated, or canceled. Despite the absence of delegates who had to leave to make flight reservations, the weary who remain plod on.

The final result will not be know until Sunday or Monday. A few observations, however, are in order.

The extended meeting time is ample evidence that the participants consider America's signing the Protocol to be a commitment, despite the President's public insistence that the signing is only "symbolic" and carries no obligations for the U.S. The UN's Chief Executive Officer, responsible for implementing the Protocol, said that the signing committed the United States to take no action contrary to the Protocol before it is ratified. If it is never ratified, according to the Executive Secretary, international law obligates the U.S. to shape its emissions policies consistent with the Protocol. That may not be ratification, but it is not far away. The difference may be similar to what "is" means.

What has happened, then? Hours of discussion and speeches have murdered a massive forest to find a home on hundreds of thousands of pages that, in the end, outline the differences of opinion about the what the Kyoto Protocol means. Delegates hope that the differences have been narrowed enough so that agreement can be reached during the coming year.

Two major issues in America have been completely closed by the delegates in Buenos Aires: the controversial science, and the U.S. Senate. Both have been ignored; now both are forgotten.

Overheard in the halls, an environmental NGO observer to an unidentified delegate: "Why don't they just get-the-hell out of here, they're not delegates." A few yards away, Senator Chuck Hagel was making a statement in front of several TV cameras and a group of reporters.

Mercifully, this is the last update from Buenos Aires. There will be an extensive report of the Buenos Aires conference in the next issue of ecologic. Please see our [Bookstore](#) for more information.

November 12, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - The Kyoto Protocol was officially signed today by Peter Burleigh, acting UN Ambassador. The event, widely anticipated at COP4, signaled a

commitment by the United States to the conference participants, even though the White House has characterized the signing as "symbolic," with "no obligation to implement" the treaty.

Michael Cutijar, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, says that signing the treaty indicates that a nation "intends to become legally bound by it, and is committed not to act against the treaty's objectives before being so bound."

The U.S. press office said flatly that President Clinton "will not submit the Protocol to the Senate until there is meaningful participation by key developing countries." The term "meaningful participation" has not been defined or quantified. To date, 59 of the 171 nation Parties to the Convention have signed the Kyoto Protocol; two nations have ratified it: Fiji, and Antigua.

Confirmation of the signing came early this morning. Immediately, there was a noticeable relaxation of tension among the delegates and NGO observers. Delegates who are unfamiliar with America's Senate ratification process assume that the United States is now on board. Those who know how the U.S. government works, realize that once again, the White House has out- maneuvered the Congress.

By signing the treaty, the White House has clearly accepted "international obligations." By refusing to submit the treaty to the Senate for an up-or-down vote, the President is free to implement administratively whatever programs he wishes without fear of rejection by Congress. It is not likely a coincidence that Executive Order 13083, scheduled to take effect this month, lists "international obligations" as one of many justifications for triggering federal supremacy over state and local governments.

Signing the treaty draws a new battle line between the White House and Congress. The act is seen by many Congressmen to be a slap-in-the-face of the U.S. Senate, which, last year passed by a vote of 95 to 0, a Resolution saying it would not ratify a treaty which did not include requirements for all nations, nor one which imposed significant economic costs. The Kyoto Protocol requires nothing of 137 developing nations, while imposing substantial costs on the American economy.

Last year, after passage of the Senate resolution, the President appeared on national television and said firmly that he would not accept any treaty that did not conform to the requirements of the Senate resolution. Today, by signing the Protocol, the President did what he said he would not do. The press announcement also said that "new findings have reinforced the strong scientific consensus that human activities are affecting the climate." The most recent statement from the scientific community says.

"There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing (or will in the foreseeable future cause) catastrophic heating of the Earth's atmosphere and disruption of the Earth's climate." This statement has been signed by more than 18,000 American scientists. (See "Petition Project" on our [Climate Change](#) page.)

Americans have now become accustomed to seeing their President declare a statement to be true on national television, which, subsequently is proved to be false. Americans are familiar with the White House spin machine that launders language with a process guaranteed to distort black or white to a shade of gray that makes the White House dingy.

November 11, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - Congressman Jim Sensenbrenner (R-WI) told a press conference here today that "The members and I assembled here today believe signing the treaty at this time is a mistake for a number of reasons." The Congressman spoke as Chairman of a bi-partisan delegation of six members of the U.S. House of Representatives. He confirmed rumors that have been circulating in the conference halls all week, that Vice President Al Gore intended to sign the Kyoto Protocol during the Buenos Aires conference. He said Undersecretary Stuart Eizenstat, head of the U.S. delegation told him the decision to sign the treaty was "under active consideration."

Congressman John Dingel, the senior Democratic member of the House, and Ranking member of the Commerce Committee refused to travel to Buenos Aires to protest the rumored "signing" of the Protocol. Senator Richard Byrd, senior Democratic Senator, and co-author of the Byrd-Hagel Resolution that set forth the conditions necessary for Senate ratification, sent a letter to the President urging him not to sign the Protocol.

The lengthy press conference, featuring six U.S. Congressmen, in which some of the strongest language yet heard in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol was vented, drew only a photo with a two-line caption in the local press. While down the hall, Senators Leiberman and Kerry praised the Protocol to a host of TV cameras and reporters. (*The [full text of the press conference](#) is available at the [Sovereignty International web site](#)*)

Congressman Ron Klink (D-PA) said "by signing this, and not having full participation by the developing nations, we are taking the first major step toward the de-industrialization of our nation."

Congressman Knollenberg added: "Any treaty that exempts 134 of the 180 nations in the world from reductions of the growth rate of greenhouse gas emissions, will merely

result in changing the address of pollution, and the changing of jobs and wealth and income to places where the cost of manufacturing is lower because of lower energy costs."

In response to a caustic question from a reporter for the International Wildlife Magazine, Congressman Klink said, "Nothing, in my estimation, causes more degradation to the environment than poverty. How do you get out of poverty? You create wealth. You create jobs. You create industry."

Congressman Barton (R-TX) added: "I think we give our forefathers credit for developing a market-based system in the United States that's based on pluralistic democracy. We need to encourage them [developing nations] to continue to develop democratic models and also to use energy efficiency to create economic opportunity., Saddling the United States, which is 30% of the world's economy with a treaty that is a negative to our economy does not help the people in Mexico."

While debate is rampant in the halls, the delegates and ministers have spent hours discussing whether the next meeting (COP5) should be held in Jordan or Marakesh. They still have not decided.

November 9, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - Representative Jo Anne Emerson (R-MO) today witnessed first-hand the feeding frenzy surrounding the global warming debate among the delegates attending COP4. Two issues seem paramount among the majority of the delegates: how are we going to transfer technology (and wealth) from developed countries; and, no, developing countries will not submit to regulation by the UN. Against this backdrop, U.S. delegates are attempting to fashion an emissions trading scheme that will be acceptable to the European Union and to the developing nations. Lost in the shuffle, is the fact that emerging science confirms that whatever policies may be eventually agreed by the parties will have little or no impact on global climate.

There is, however, emerging evidence that confirms earlier speculation that Kyoto Protocol policies will have devastating economic impact, especially upon America. The U.S. Energy Information Administration (EIA) undertook an analysis of the impact of the Protocol at the request of the House Committee on Science. The result is a complete reversal of the White House's previous claim of "minor economic impact."

For example, the EIA says that the Protocol could cost as much as \$324 billion annually and that job loss in America would be in the range of 1.4 to 2.3 million. These findings are consistent with the studies performed by leading independent economists and the utility industry. Frank Moseley Manager of Strategic

Environmental Planning for Central and South West Services, Inc., which operates electric generating facilities throughout the southwest, said his company had determined that rate payers would experience rate increases amounting to 50% in order to meet the Protocol's first-phase requirements.

Steve Jenkins, Director of Environmental Policy for Tampa Electric Company, said 98% of his company's electricity is produced from coal. If coal is prohibited as a fuel, as is proposed by global warming advocates, the cost of conversion to natural gas would have to be paid by consumers, in addition to whatever taxes or other costs the Protocol may produce.

Speaking for the petroleum industry, William O'Keefe, Executive Vice President of the American Petroleum Institute, said it may cost more than the increased price at the pump. "Some can remember the rationing that was necessary during the Arab oil embargo of the 1970s," he said. Alan Lloyd, an analyst for a Hawaiian electric utility company, said his company has already notified its major companies that rate increases may not be enough to satisfy the requirements of the Kyoto Protocol; it may be necessary to ration energy on a rotating basis.

These issues of no concern to the global warming advocates assembled here. America is portrayed as the world's biggest polluter, which must be forced to reduce its wasteful consumption of energy and other natural resources. America's "luxury emissions" are repeatedly blamed for all the world's weather woes.

An article in the local press today featured Dr. Paul Epstein, of Harvard Medical School, calling for implementation of the Tobin Tax to provide the financial resources needed by the UN to implement the Kyoto Protocol. The Tobin Tax would tax international currency exchange at the rate of 0.05%, to produce an estimated \$150 billion annually for the UN - more than 100 times the UN's current budget.

November 8, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - At the half-way point of COP4, delegates and observers are not quite sure what has happened. Meetings have crawled toward midnight every day; environmental NGO observers have pursued delegates and reporters with evangelistic zeal; and all in attendance have earned a day of rest and recuperation. What has the first week accomplished?

- An estimated \$1 million has been spent by the UNFCCC to stage the event and pay expenses for delegates from approximately 120 developing nations. Many times that amount has been spent by the delegates and observers in Buenos Aires.

- The national media, particularly CNN International, has had a daily excuse to publicize the doom-and-gloom scenarios manufactured by global warming advocates.
- Delegates have mired deeper into disagreement over fundamental issues arising from the Kyoto Protocol.
- Normal people in America have heard more about Newt's resignation announcement than about events in Buenos Aires.

A major issue in dispute is centered around the emissions trading scheme incorporated into the Kyoto Protocol by the U.S. The U.S. contends that if American technology or capital is transferred to a developing nation for the purpose of reducing emissions in the developing nation, America should be credited with that emission reduction the same as if it had occurred in America. Environmental NGOs bitterly oppose this scheme, claiming that America will just "buy" its way out of reducing its own emissions.

A substantial number of developing nations favor allowing America some credit for such transfers, but also requiring real reductions in American emissions. Still other nations insist that America meet its reduction target of 7% below 1990 levels before any credit is granted for technology and capital transfers. The parties have no hope of resolving this crucial issue during this session. At least one, and probably two inter-sessional meetings are planned for Bonn, Germany next year in hopes of finding solutions before COP5, which will be held in late 1999. Gaping differences exist in other areas of the Protocol: monitoring, compliance, and enforcement, to name a few.

Lost among the delegates and observers is the growing body of scientific evidence that nothing decided by the Conference of the Parties will affect global warming or cooling. Increasingly, science is learning that it has only scratched the surface of understanding how nature has regulated the global thermostat over the millennia. Increasingly, normal people, especially Americans who read, are learning that the Conference of the Parties to the UNFCCC is an expensive, unnecessary exercise in futility that wastes millions of tax dollars manipulating minutia.

The final week begins Monday. The pace will quicken; the propaganda will take on an air of even greater urgency. Progress will be made toward consensus on some of the outstanding issues. Some of it may even be reported. But only enough to justify returning again and again to Bonn, then to other distant cities to continue the process.

November 6, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - Dr. Stephen Schnieder, Stanford University's outspoken global warming advocate, admitted today that no "reputable" scientist could say for certain

that climate change due to human activity has yet occurred. A few hours later, as conference president, Ms. Maria Julia Alsogaray (Argentina) convened the afternoon plenary session, she first asked for a moment of silence for the victims of hurricane Mitch in Central America. Then she said the tragedy is "Mother Nature reminding us that not much time remains for us to take action."

While even the most ardent global warming advocate scientists are forced to admit that there is no scientific evidence to link past climate or weather events to human-induced global warming, the policy makers and propagandists continue to make provocative public statements calculated to make headlines and the six-o'clock news.

Today's lead story in the Buenos Aires Herald is headed "Dengue at the doorstep." The story contends that dengue fever, and other tropical diseases now threaten Buenos Aires to the south, and as far north as Canada "as a result of global warming." The article quotes Dr. Paul Epstein, of the Harvard School of Medicine: "The extreme events we are seeing today in Nicaragua and Honduras (as a result of Mitch) are spawning outbreaks of cholera and dengue fever with new breeding sites for mosquitoes and increased water-borne diseases."

Epstein's statement contradicts Schneider's statement that no "reputable" scientist can say what Epstein said. To those who watch the global warming debate closely, it is clear that the proponents subscribe to Greenpeace founder, Paul Watson's philosophy, who told a reporter for Forbes magazine, that it doesn't matter what is true; what matters is what people believe is true.

Stephen Schneider is certainly a subscriber to Watson's philosophy. Discover magazine quoted Schneider telling a group of scientists that in the global warming debate, it would be necessary to offer up scary scenarios in order to get media attention. He told them that each of them would have to decide the proper balance "between being truthful and being effective."

We've seen scientists and NGO advocates alike come down on the side of being effective here at COP 4. Very scary scenarios are profusely blamed on America's failure to reduce its greenhouse gas emissions - without a shred of scientific evidence that America's use of energy has anything at all to do with catastrophic weather or climate events.

Speaking of catastrophic weather events, it rained all day in Buenos Aires. That was a catastrophe only for the U.S. delegation and the Global Climate Coalition, whose offices at the conference center are in the same area. Both offices were flooded. A river of water flowed through the offices most of the day, forcing ladies to hike up their skirts, and gentlemen to pretend not to notice. A member of one of the many

environmental NGOs in attendance was overheard describing the situation to someone on a cellphone. He said with obvious glee "isn't it great, it's running right through the oil industry's office."

November 5, 1998

BUENOS AIRES - While no spectacular announcement is expected to come from this meeting of 1530 delegates from 159 nations, here to flesh-out the Kyoto Protocol, rapid progress appears to be underway behind the scenes. The Clean Development Mechanism (CDM) is getting a lot of attention from the delegates and the various lobbyists. The CDM is the euphemism for "Command and Control Central." This is the mechanism that will ultimately have authority to "certify" almost everything associated with compliance with the Protocol. It is the CDM, for example, that will have to certify "national action plans." Should a nation's proposed efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions not satisfy the CDM, no certification will be issued. The nation would have to conform to the wishes of the CDM in order to comply with the "legally-binding" requirements of the Protocol.

What about national sovereignty? Acceptance of the Kyoto Protocol is the act of surrendering national sovereignty. Jessica Mathews, a former Gore/Clinton appointee, and now a member of the UN's Commission on Water for the 21st Century, said the Kyoto Protocol represents a "deeper penetration" of national sovereignty than any previous pact.

The CDM will have far-reaching powers to "certify" construction projects in developing nations that use funding from any UN source. Private investment will have to meet the "certification" requirements of the CDM. There is discussion underway that could result in the CDM having "certification" authority over land use changes. The shape, scope, and authority of this new UN bureaucracy is being decided this week in Buenos Aires, mostly in closed-door meetings without a thought about the emerging science that confirms the view that the Kyoto Protocol, even if fully implemented, would not significantly affect the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. Dr. Burt Bolin, former President of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has said publicly that the Protocol would reduce carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by no more than 1 to 1.5 ppm (from the current 360 ppm to 359 ppm).

Science here is a bastard stepchild. Propaganda is king. The environmental organizations pump out reams of doom-and-gloom urging immediate action. Dr. S. Fred Singer, the only scientist at the conference who challenges the global warming hypothesis, is not even allowed to ask questions. Skeptics are unwelcome. Opponents

of the process and the Protocol are considered to be "populist activists" at best, and uncaring slayers of the third-world's poor.

The newsletter published by the Climate Action Network (CAN) ran a lengthy article about all the natural disasters around the world, and implied that they were the result of global warming. Interestingly, the newsletter printed a "thank you" to: World Wildlife Fund; Greenpeace; Friends of the Earth; the Union of Concerned Scientists; and the David Suzuki Foundation for "financial assistance." The newsletter also lists 17 people on its staff. In a panel discussion yesterday, sponsored by environmental groups and the insurance industry, the recent devastation in Central America was actually blamed on America's greenhouse gas emissions.

So it goes in Buenos Aires.

Wednesday, November 4, 1998

It began with the request to adopt the agenda, which contained the fateful "item 6," which called for consideration of "voluntary commitments" by developing nations. The U.S. Senate has said it would not ratify the Kyoto Protocol unless it applied to all nations. President Clinton has said he would not even submit the Protocol to the Senate until it applied to developing nations. Yesterday, on the floor of the conference, it became abundantly clear that developing nations have no intention of accepting "voluntary commitments."

The Kyoto Protocol explicitly excludes developing nations from any restrictions. In Bonn, at the last climate change meetings, the developing nations said absolutely not. Yesterday, nation after nation said yet again, no, no, hell-no, we will never accept restrictions that will force us to reduce our use of fossil fuel.

China rose to ask, "How can a commitment be a commitment if it is voluntary?" China has consistently refused to even consider any scheme that would result in the UN having authority over its energy use.

It is apparently O.K., however, for the UN to restrict energy use in America to force a reduction in its "luxury-emissions." America is regularly described as the world's biggest polluter, the world's biggest consumer of manufactured goods, and the biggest waster of the world's natural resources.

America is constantly blamed for all the world's ills. There was talk in the conference yesterday blaming American consumption and emissions for causing Hurricane Mitch, and the resulting devastation in Central America.

Senator Chuck Hagel, an observer at the conference, and co-author of the the Senate resolution, saw the opposition to "voluntary commitments," and realized that there could be a full-blown east-west free-for-all.

Newcomers to the UN procedures will see endless, boring speeches that continue well into the night. What they do not see are dozens, perhaps hundreds of unscheduled, private meetings going on all over the facility. It is in these meetings that deals are struck and decisions are made.

On the final day of the conference, dignitaries are likely to declare that the meeting is a work in progress that will be continued in Bonn, Germany later next year in preparation for COP V. No major announcements are expected from this meeting, except, perhaps, an announcement that President Clinton has signed the Kyoto Protocol.

Why do these meetings go on and on, over and over again if nothing is getting accomplished? Much is getting accomplished, it just doesn't show yet. Deals are being struck on issues such as how the Protocol can be monitored and enforced -- and funded. An announcement yesterday by Dr. Bob Dixon, also provides some explanation. He informed the group that some \$70 million had been made available to developing countries to pay for the development of their national reports. An additional \$193 million was tucked into the "budget compromise" agreed hours before Congress adjourned. This, of course, is in addition to America's 25-33% share of all UN funding as well as the extra funding of all peacekeeping operations. As long as America continues to hand out American tax dollars, nations from around the world will be happy to meet in exotic cities around the world to accept it.

Monday, November 2, 1998

By noon Monday, more than 4,000 delegates, observers, and reporters had converged on the UNFCCC Conference site in Buenos Aires, Argentina. The number is expected to swell to nearly 8,000 by the end of the event, November 13.

American delegates began early, pleading for "developing" nations to voluntarily submit to the Kyoto Protocol. The terms of the Protocol, adopted a year ago in Kyoto, Japan, explicitly exclude 137 "developing" nations from any requirement to reduce greenhouse emissions. Nations such as China, North Korea, Brazil, and Mexico, are exempt from all Protocol requirements. Only 34 developed nations, most particularly, America, are required to reduce the use of fossil fuels in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions.

Greeting the delegates, was an editorial in the local press, sharply criticizing America -- the world's biggest polluter -- for its failure to ratify the Protocol. The editorial did not say that in the year since Kyoto, only one nation has ratified the document -- Fiji, which is not bound by the Protocol. One-hundred-seventy of the 171 members of the COP, have not ratified the Protocol.

Rumors abound in the "corridor-intelligence" network. Some say that Vice President Al Gore will make another dramatic appearance, as he did in Kyoto, to announce that President Bill Clinton will sign the Protocol, despite the U.S. Senate's resolution setting forth minimum ratification requirements which have not been met.

Robert Watson, a former Clinton White House appointee, now head of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) made an extensive presentation, color slides and all, declaring again that the world is going to global-warming-hell-in-a-handbasket. This is the same person who, in Kyoto, was asked to defend the UN's position in the light of growing opposition from the world's scientists. His response: "the science is settled." Since Kyoto, more than 18,000 American scientists have publicly stated that "There is no convincing scientific evidence" that human release of carbon dioxide is causing, or will cause catastrophic global warming.

There are 51 exhibits at the conference, mostly environmental NGOs and UN organizations. Sovereignty International has had an exhibit at each of these meetings for the last two years, where live radio programs are broadcast to thousands of local radio stations in America. Although the request for exhibit space was made officially the day the forms were received from the UN (September 5), there was no space available for Sovereignty International. Nevertheless, Sovereignty International is broadcasting more than 25 hours of radio programs during the conference, and will publish its *World Concerns* newsletter for the delegates.

Copyright © 1998, [Sovereignty International](#)

TEXAS EAGLE FORUM's Report from Buenos Aires

By Cathie Adams, president Catalinas Suites Apart Hotel, Buenos Aires, Argentina,

November 13, 1998

The head of the American delegation Stuart Eizenstat said last night that we have a "long night ahead with no assured results." That's been the continuing saga at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

Despite of the snail's pace negotiations in Buenos Aires, Eizenstat smugly spoke about the progress being made back home citing the diminished business opposition to the Kyoto Protocol. He claims that now dozens of companies want to make it work mentioning utilities as an example. He said about the progress, "This is a sea change" and that an aggressive program of domestic outreach will "increase that significantly."

At the UN conference, Eizenstat said he wants the G77/China (132 developing countries) to agree to "meaningful participation." He explained that that would mean categorizing the nations by per capita wealth, then setting "abatement targets" for greenhouse gas emissions that would provide for "a growth target lower than business as usual."

Imagine the international bureaucracy necessary to assess, implement and oversee the different targets and the loss of national sovereignty because of penalties for non-compliance. Regardless, the Clinton Administration wants to impose the devilish Treaty.

The Kyoto Protocol was signed in New York yesterday in order to signal to the world that America is serious about climate change, but there is NOTHING to gain by impressing the UN. Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee Jesse Helms has already taken away any wind that the signing may have put in its sails. He notified Secretary of State Madeleine K. Albright that she should "recommend to the President that he quickly submit the treaty for Senate advice and consent so that the Senate may reject the treaty and scrap the Kyoto Protocol process altogether."

The President isn't letting Senator Helms' promise slow his radical environmental agenda. Senator Joseph Lieberman is in Buenos Aires to introduce a bill being proposed in the U.S. Congress (S. 2617) that intends to be an "early credit bill that will bring in small businesses." It's as if Lieberman wants to make amends to the President for publicly rebuking him on the Senate floor for his sexual perversion.

Just as Clinton lied about committing adultery, he is lying when he tells the American people that the Kyoto Treaty would be inexpensive to implement. Clinton's own Department of Energy has produced a new study that says gas prices could raise by \$.66 per gallon, electricity prices by 86% and coal prices could more than double by 2010.

The Treaty would force American industries to be gutted and/or moved to one of the 132 nations that don't have to adhere to the Treaty unless they "voluntarily" establish their own greenhouse gas emission standards. Countless American jobs would be lost and our standard of living would be drastically reduced.

Americans need to ask our Congressmen to support Senator Helms' call to "reject the Treaty and scrap the Kyoto Protocol process altogether." Furthermore, Congress must reject Senator Lieberman's bill (S. 2617) because it intends to impose the Kyoto Treaty using the legislative process.

The mainstream media claims that Americans only care about "the economy stupid." If that is true, then we'd better be concerned that the European Union labels our wealth and standard of living "immoral" to the developing world.

Americans wake up! Recognize that it is NOT IMMORAL to have freedom or ingenuity or free markets. If the rest of the world wants a higher standard of living, then let them learn from our Constitution that has granted the U.S. national sovereignty and its people the freedoms necessary to EARN our standard of living. And let's not forget that we owe the UN nothing, even though regrettably it owes the U.S. its very existence. Now is the time to dismantle the UN's global government before it is used to dismantle the U.S.

If delegates at the conference come to "consensus" on a final document, then I plan to send a final report before departing Buenos Aires on Sunday.

---END---

November 12, 1998

The last two days of negotiations are extremely important for the American people because during these waning hours, the major players will confirm that this conference has nothing to do with climate change and everything to do with economic issues.

The stage is set for the final ceremony which will lead to the U.S. signing of the Kyoto Protocol even though the Buenos Aires meeting will not appease the U.S. Senate resolution passed by 95-0 before the Kyoto conference. It called for the President not to sign any treaty that placed legally binding obligations on the U.S. to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions "unless the protocol or agreement also mandates new specific scheduled commitments to limit or reduce greenhouse gas emissions for Developing Country Parties within the same compliance period." Regretfully, the U.S. Senate neglected to reference scientific evidence, thereby

leaving a loophole for the President to feign "meaningful participation" by the developing world and to sign the Treaty.

International courtesy and national sovereignty are foreign ideas to Mbareck Diop, President of the Senegal's National Climate Change Committee, present at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in Buenos Aires. He is making a "demand for equality" and the "clean development mechanism" (CDM) will padlock his demand.

The CDM would enable industrialized countries to finance emissions-avoiding projects in developing countries and receive greenhouse gas emission credits for doing so. This avenue would allow governments and private corporations to transfer and promote "clean technologies" and wealth.

Senegalese Diop prophesied, "We believe that the CDM will give us the opportunity to achieve the structural basis we need in order to attract investments?. We are attending COP4 [Conference of the Parties 4th meeting] with one idea in mind: equality. For years now, there has been only one pilot project in African territory?. We do not agree with this kind of geographic distribution?. Annex 1 countries [the U.S. included] are responsible for around 80% of the GHG [greenhouse gas] emissions?. We must find financial resources to foment such economic growth."

Diop condemns any opposition to his scheme. "Aligned behind the interests of certain governments [the U.S.] are private groupings [freedom-loving Americans]. That explains the lack of progress seen by some nations: sometimes their private sectors are not comfortable with certain positions?. This is why we consider this type of conference highly valuable," concluded Diop. He represents only one of the G77/China (132 developing) nations, but his insults toward the U.S. and expressions of class warfare are typical at UN conferences.

The G77/China group expects compliance with the Kyoto Protocol to procure world equity. In Buenos Aires, they're like bloodhounds looking for the scent and the Clinton-Gore team has granted the scent by promising to sign the Treaty before the one-year deadline of March 1999 (possibly even today). Diop has powerful help from Senators Joe Lieberman, D-Connecticut and J. Robert Kerry, D-Massachusetts who are in Buenos Aires calling on President Clinton to sign the Kyoto Climate Change Treaty Senator Lieberman says, "The Kyoto agreement is only a beginning, not a complete agreement. Kyoto set the goals and described the means of addressing climate change, and in Buenos Aires, the parties are seeking to fill in the details so we can bring the programs to life?. By signing the agreement, the Administration ensures that the U.S. will have the credibility to continue to take a leadership role in shaping and implementing these programs and in persuading the developing nations to become

a part of the solution." Mr. Lieberman's "leadership role" means to rape, pillage and plunder American businesses and their associated jobs, lower our standard of living and dismantle national sovereignty granted by the U.S. Constitution.

Senator Kerry is a member of the official U.S. delegation in Buenos Aires and has met with the lead negotiators for Brazil, Argentina, Mexico and South Korea to discuss their positions on climate change and the Kyoto Protocol. He will deliver the undefined "meaningful participation" by developing nations to President Clinton.

With only two days remaining, the negotiating committees have reached no agreement on a number of issues that will now be forwarded to the COP Plenary: methodological issues on GHG inventories, technology transfers, the document preamble, the calendar of meetings, commitments, flexibility mechanisms and even whether some developing countries would make "voluntary commitments."

Yet, U.S. lead negotiator Stuart Eisenstat says that we have to meet the ambitious environmental targets set in Kyoto "with flexibility mechanisms and a compliance regime that will have us achieve these goals." He added that the final document "could very well include issues like technology transfer; the impacts of climate change on developing countries; financial mechanisms; the review of the adequacy of commitments by all parties; flexible mechanisms; compliance; and possible new pathways for developing countries to participate." Eisenstat concluded, "This is a marathon and not a sprint, and we have a long way to go."

Don't hold your breath until the Conference of the Parties produces a final document in Buenos Aires even though you'd be withholding greenhouse gases from the atmosphere. Instead, be a true American and shout from the mountaintops that global warming is a hoax intended to redistribute economic wealth around the globe.

---END---

November 11, 1998

Why is the myth of global warming taken seriously and who is driving the radical environmentalist agenda?

Money, mostly from American taxpayers, is the lifeblood of the environmentalist agenda. A 1997 article in Foreign Affairs by Jessica T. Mathews reports that the "total budget for the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) for 1996 was \$7.3 million," enough to feign legitimacy for the global warming hoax.

Well-funded non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are the driving force behind the global climate policies. The Internal Revenue Service, Exempt Organization Database reveals 154 environmental NGOs that have a total annual income of more than \$4 Billion and their assets are more than double that amount. Their wealth has enabled them to dominate the working groups during the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, the Climate Change negotiations in Kyoto in 1997 and now in Buenos Aires.

One of the NGOs' lobbying tools is to produce a proliferation of publications. The newsletter, Hotspot, is a publication of the European office of Climate Action Network, "a global coalition of 265 NGOs that promote action to limit human induced climate change to ecologically sustainable levels." Hotspot's cover of their latest issue printed a quote in red ink: "We oppose the theory of global warming and the Kyoto agreement, says the Republican Party of Texas."

Unfamiliar with the publication, I hoped that the article would present the bountiful scientific evidence against global warming since I put that statement in the Republican Party of Texas platform when I served as sub-committee chairman last summer! Instead, Hotspot used the quote to lambaste as "a serious obstacle to further progress the persistent demand from powerful sectors in those countries with the greatest greenhouse gas emissions that developing countries should also limit their emissions, as a precondition for ratifying the Kyoto Protocol."

In other words, the NGO's demand is for the U.S. and 37 other industrialized nations to submit to the greenhouse gas emissions limits without any participation by the developing nations. Solidifying their point they wrote, "Meaningful participation by developing countries should not be a means to oblige them to take on quantitative greenhouse gas emissions reductions or limitation commitments within the first target period, except where they exercise a sovereign right to do so voluntarily."

The NGOs want industries to move from developed countries to developing countries, then after the wealth is redistributed, let developing countries decide whether they want to exercise their "sovereign right" to limit their greenhouse gas emissions voluntarily.

What's good for the goose is good for the gander! The U.S. should recognize and respect the sovereignty of the developing nations, and the developing nations should recognize and respect the sovereignty of the U.S. Neither the UN nor the NGOs have any "right" to demand that nations adopt "legally binding" emissions standards.

Maybe that's what Congressman Sensenbrenner from Wisconsin meant when he said at a press conference yesterday in Buenos Aires that the Clinton "Administration has backed itself into a corner and I don't know how we can get out of this corner."

The U.S. Congress can get us out of this corner by discontinuing funding to the UN, and investigating the tax exempt status of the NGOs that have lobbied the U.S. into that corner!

---END---

November 10, 1998

The Kyoto draft from last December's UN conference speaks to "committing the developed nations to financial aid to the others to help them inventory their emissions, utilize modern control technology, adapt to climate change, and, in general, to achieve sustainable development."

Sustainable development is repeated like a mantra at UN meetings and it prescribes how they plan to redistribute wealth. While the radical environmentalists and the G77/China group (132 developing nations) demand financial aid and the transfer of technology from the developed countries, they also contend that too many people are a stumbling block to sustainable development. Because people use the earth's resources which they believe are being depleted, environmentalists demand that man lower his standard of living and that the fewer people there are, the better it is for the earth.

Although the discussion of population control (abortion and birth control) has been kept to a whisper, it is an issue at this UN Framework Convention on Climate Change taking place in Buenos Aires.

"You're living [in] a world where fuel, food, jobs, housing and health care are at a premium, where natural resources are severely depleted and cities horribly polluted, uncomfortably crowded, and plagued by crime" writes Paul Ehrlich, honorary president of Zero Population Growth in a recent letter. "We're heading on a collision course towards a population crisis that could deepen this nightmare," he warns.

Americans are major targets because "even though Americans make up only 4.5% of world population, we consume 5 times the world's average per capita use of energy, 3 times the amount of steel, and more than 2 times the amount of grain." If we don't "take steps NOW to stabilize population growth and conserve world resources, future generations will have to wait in line for food and water. At no time have I been more concerned about the population crisis-in America and the rest of the world-then (sic) I am right now," continues Ehrlich.

The Population Action International is pushing the Ehrlich agenda in Buenos Aires. "The atmosphere is the common property of all human beings, and the impacts of

human-induced climate change will ignore national borders," says Director Robert Engelman. He is pushing for the 1994 UN Cairo Population Treaty to be integrated into the Climate Change Treaty negotiations despite the fact that the "average number of children born to each woman in the world is now less than three, compared to about five in 1957."

Radical environmentalists are demanding "population control" which really means control of the population since fewer people are easier to control, "flexibility mechanisms" which are schemes intended to redistribute wealth, "technology transfers" and "financial aid" from developed to developing nations. In order to force these demands on those who enjoy a higher standard of living (Americans mostly), the environmentalists want to control the population.

Our President is a willing partner in the population control agenda as demonstrated by his two vetoes of bills that would have outlawed partial birth abortions. That is the horrible procedure whereby a "doctor" delivers a baby feet first, uses scissors to make a hole in the baby's skull, then inserts a syringe to suck out the baby's brains. Such extremists believe that people--instead of God--are the givers and takers of "life."

Americans should tell their Congressmen to reject the radical environmentalists' agenda of financial and technological transfers and population control. And we should tell our children that they are "gifts from God" not curses to the earth.

---END---

November 9, 1998

Delegates representing 161 countries gathered in Buenos Aires for the UN Conference on Climate Change don't have much to show for their first week's efforts. Only one thing has been decided: there will be no formal negotiations about whether developing countries must accept voluntary standards for greenhouse gas emissions.

Negotiations are slow because certain nations are adept at abusing the process for their own gain. They're also slow because the UN system is complicated and their meetings are closed to most observers. Imagine the chaos if the U.S. Congress would meet behind closed doors once a year in order to accomplish all their work in only two weeks! Most Americans would probably profit if Congress met so seldom, but meeting in secret would be unacceptable!

Within the UN system, the COP-4 (conference of the parties, fourth session) is the supreme body of this ongoing convention in Buenos Aires. That body elected Argentinean Maria Julia Alsogaray as president on the opening day of the conference.

Her responsibility is primarily to preside over the Plenaries (group meetings where all formal decisions are made).

At last Friday's Plenary meeting, Ms. Alsogaray offered condolences to the Caribbean and Latin American countries that suffered losses due to hurricane Mitch, suggesting that "Mother Nature" was reminding delegates that urgent action was needed during this conference. Her comments, of course, assume global warming and its effects are proven scientifically, that mans' activities could cause global warming and that the UN system is the cure. She then called for a "moment of silence." In all, the purpose of the Plenary was simply to cajole those doing the negotiations.

Negotiations take place in the subsidiary bodies. There are two subsidiary bodies for this conference: the Subsidiary Body for Implementation and the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice. There are also contact groups that are open-ended meetings wherein Parties can negotiate before forwarding agreed text to the plenary for formal adoption.

Nations are divided into groups for the purpose of "harmonizing their negotiating positions." The G77/China group consists of 132 developing nations who are threatening to halt negotiations unless the conference addresses Kyoto's financial aid commitments for technology. The G77/China "urged developed country Parties to prioritize the implementation of the Convention over economic and political considerations."

In other words, give us the money and technology; don't let politics get in the way. That's the same jargon that President Clinton used so successfully to cover his sexual perversion by blaming the Congress for arguing about politics rather than focusing on the issues of the people! (Who learned from whom?)

If the Clinton-appointed delegates give in to G77/China, then the environmental issue will be used to transform the world's remaining superpower into a "paper tiger" under attack by nations that used to be "sleeping tigers." The last thing the U.S. should do is to provide more financial and technological aid to ravenous and greedy tigers.

---END---

November 6, 1998

"There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane or other greenhouse gases is causing (or will in the foreseeable future cause) catastrophic heating of the earth's atmosphere and disruption of the earth's climate. Moreover, there IS substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon

dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the earth," states a petition signed by nearly 17,000 U.S. scientists, half of whom are trained in the fields of physics, geophysics, climate science, meteorology, oceanography, chemistry, biology, or biochemistry. The statement abstract concludes that there is no basis for believing #1 that atmospheric CO₂ is causing a dangerous climb in global temperatures, #2 that greater concentrations of CO₂ would be harmful or #3 that human activity leads to global warming in the first place.

Discounting science, the American delegation, after one week of talks in Buenos Aires at the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, reports that negotiations are "progressing." Head of Delegation (until Stuart Eizenstat arrives for "high-level" talks next week) Melinda Kimble says that the U.S.' compliance with the Kyoto Protocol is contingent upon the flexibility mechanisms. Those are "emissions trading," "joint implementation" between developed countries, and "clean development mechanisms" to encourage joint emissions reduction projects between developed and developing countries. Two more "mechanisms" being discussed are financial mechanisms (redistribution of wealth schemes) and compliance mechanisms (penalties for non-compliance to the Kyoto Treaty).

The international arena is not the only place where President Clinton is forging ahead with his radical environmental agenda in keeping with last December's agreement in Kyoto to reduce greenhouse gas emissions by 7% between 2008-2012 which translates into a 30-40% reduction in industrial output. In order to comply with Kyoto, he has proposed the Climate Change Technology Initiative, "a vigorous program of tax cuts and research and development". The package amounts to an additional \$6.3 billion over 5 years (\$3.6 billion in tax cuts and \$2.7 billion in new investment)-over and above what was planned already for climate change-related investments. The recently signed Fiscal Year 1999 appropriations bills include over \$1 billion for investments-a 26% increase over last year."

His plan also aims to build "sector-by-sector partnerships with key energy-intensive industries to encourage voluntary efforts to cut emissions." Dirk Forrister, Chairman of the White House Climate Change Task Force is in Buenos Aires. He describes his consultations with industry as a four-pronged approach: #1 measure the industry's emissions; #2 do a bottom-up review of them; #3 offer to remove government barriers and ask for commitments; and #4 make an action plan. After his consultations with corporate high level staffs, their CEOs are then sometimes invited to the White House to meet with the President in order to discuss "partnering" with the federal government.

The only difference between what history books call "fascism" and this "sector-by-sector partnership" with the federal government is that, thus far, the industrial commitments are voluntary. Once the largest industries are brought into the federal government's net, however, it would be profitable for them to support mandatory compliance in order to eliminate their small competitors.

Electricity restructuring is "another core element of the President's plan" which is supposed to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while cutting consumers' energy bills. State governments have already been told that they must either "restructure" their own electricity industry, or the federal government will do it for them. This issue should be watched closely in every state capitol.

The Clinton plan also calls for making substantial improvements in the federal government's own use and procurement of energy. However, U.S. Delegate Kimble said that the Department of Defense would be exempt from emissions reduction requirements.

The U.S. Congress should intercede in the President's initiatives to assure they are in accordance with the U.S. Constitution and that they do not harm America's free markets. Congress should demand that its law-making authorities are not usurped by the executive branch. Since the purpose of the Buenos Aires conference is to put teeth into the Kyoto Treaty, Congress should demand that the President recall his delegation.

---END---

November 5, 1998

"The task of this conference is to maintain the POLITICAL momentum generated by Kyoto. Climate change must remain high on national AGENDAS; ministers must remain committed to seeking agreement and achieving timely results," proclaimed Michael Jammit Cutajar, Executive Secretary of the Buenos Aires UN Framework Convention on Climate Change in his opening statement.

As of the end of September, 57 countries have signed the Kyoto Protocol. President Clinton has yet to submit it to the U.S. Senate, not because he is protecting American sovereignty, but because he wants developing countries to have "meaningful participation," whatever that means. Argentina proposed that developing countries adopt "voluntary commitments" to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, but the motion was withdrawn. Developing countries (G77/China as identified within the UN system) argued that "developed nations are the ones that should assume reduction commitments, and not the developing countries whose growth could be jeopardized."

Americans cannot expect such determination from the U.S. lead negotiator in both Kyoto and Buenos Aires, Stuart Eizenstat. The Under Secretary of State for Economic, Business and Agricultural Affairs, says this conference is "a significant milestone in efforts to consolidate our gains and to make concrete and operational our Kyoto achievements." In Kyoto, the U.S. agreed to reduce our "greenhouse gas" emissions by 7% by 2008-2012 even though science has yet to prove that the earth is warming or that man's activities could cause "global warming."

In Kyoto, Eizenstat agreed to the schemes: "emissions trading," "joint implementation" between developed countries, and a "clean development mechanism" to encourage joint emissions reduction projects between developed and developing countries. In Buenos Aires, how those schemes will be implemented and monitored is being discussed.

- How will the transfer of portions of assigned amounts of "greenhouse gases" be verified and monitored?
- What compliance mechanisms should be required at the national level?
- What types of consequences should Parties be considering, and should those consequences be automatic but appealable?
- If a Party has oversold "emissions credits" at the end of the budget period, who is responsible: the buyer, or the seller, or both?
- Should there be automatic consequences for those that have bought or sold "bad tons?"

President Clinton and his appointee Stuart Eizenstat have disregarded the standards of sound science and the U.S. Constitution when dealing with the UN. The U.S. Congress should intervene. They should protect our national sovereignty as granted by the U.S. Constitution. The U.S. has no business coming to "consensus" on any "legally binding" treaty that establishes "consequences." And Americans should use this international issue as a "litmus test" for future presidential candidates.

---END---

November 4, 1998

"I want to emphasize that we cannot wait until the [Kyoto] treaty is negotiated and ratified to act [on global warming]," said President Clinton before the UN met in Kyoto last December.

Textbook publishers have heeded Mr. Clinton's plea. The textbook entitled Reading, Book I of the Kim Marshall Series (Educators Publishing Service, Cambridge and

Toronto, copyrights 1998,1992, 1981) is supposed to teach reading comprehension. Instead, it teaches 9 and 10-year-olds about villagers in Japan dying or suffering horrible deformities because of mercury dumped in the ocean. The math textbooks, dubbed "Rain Forest Algebra," also teach scary environmental scenarios in lieu of math.

But scientific evidence does not support the extremist views promoted by politicians and textbook publishers. Scientists who promote such views utilize computer models that are so inept that the sun's impact on climate change cannot be factored in. They also admit that their models are in a "very rapid phase of evolution."

Evidence opposing the global warming dogma is bountiful. Climatologists report in the October 16, 1998 issue of Science magazine, that soil and vegetation in North America, about 20% of the world's vegetated land, absorbs annually as much carbon as is released into the atmosphere by North American sources. That is good news for the U.S., one of only 34 nations "legally bound" by the Treaty, if it should be ratified.

American industries and automobiles emit carbon dioxide (CO₂) when they burn fossil fuels. It is the major "greenhouse gas" blamed for the supposed global warming. Natural sources that absorb the carbon, such as soil and vegetation, are called carbon "sinks." In the U.S., natural "sinks" are absorbing CO₂ emissions. The climatologists in the Science magazine attribute the existence of the North American carbon "sinks" to four factors:

1. regrowth of U.S. forests from previous logging and agriculture;
2. an increased amount of nitrogen in the atmosphere due to industry and agriculture that eventually winds up fertilizing plants, thereby stimulating their growth;
3. an increased rate of photosynthesis due to the higher concentration of CO₂; and
4. a longer growing season at higher latitudes, due to a slight warming.

During the ongoing UN meeting on the Kyoto Treaty in Buenos Aires, the U.S. should argue that their ability to absorb excess CO₂ in their natural "sinks" offset their emissions. Therefore, the Kyoto Treaty should be scrapped and the annual follow-up meetings should be discontinued.

--END--

November 3, 1998

I attended the "World Bank's Open House on Climate Change" today, but top Bank officials were not on hand to defend their global warming positions. They did, however, clarify their relationship with the International Monetary Fund. While they were both created at the same time and established offices adjacent to one another, their bank accounts are not commingled. The World Bank loans American taxpayers' money for projects around the globe, while the International Monetary Fund uses our money to bail out wealthy investors and failed government economies. The recent Clinton-Congress budget deal gave \$18 BILLION to the International Monetary Fund, not the World Bank.

Also attending the event was Dr. Fred Singer, a preeminent authority on the global warming hoax. The UN and its World Bank do not welcome his views because his views dispel the "crisis" that is being used to force nations to globally redistribute wealth. The UN should want all sides of the issue to have a fair hearing. Furthermore, it and the participating nations should insist upon scientific evidence of global warming. Without open debate of scientific "facts," the issue becomes a matter of "faith."

Vice President Al Gore's speech in Kyoto last December reflects his disregard of scientific "facts." He said, "Nine of the ten hottest years since the measurements began have come in the last ten years. The trend is clear. The human consequences- and the economic costs-of failing to act are unthinkable. More record floods and droughts. Diseases and pests spreading to new areas. Crop failures and famines. Melting glaciers, stronger storms, and rising seas. Our fundamental challenge now is to find out whether and how we can change the behaviors that are causing the problem."

The "facts" show that the earth has been cooling since 1979. Regardless, Gore wants Americans to lower our standard of living and allow our wealth to be redistributed around the globe. It is presumptuous and arrogant for radical environmentalists to claim that when humans and animals "breathe out" and when automobiles and industries burn fossil fuels, it will alter God's sovereign plan for the earth He created.

The conclusions of this conference will either be based on "faith" in non-science or on scientific "facts."

--END--

November 2, 1998

In Buenos Aires, Argentina, representatives from some 180 governments are meeting from 2 to 13 November to develop schemes for reducing greenhouse gas emissions as

required by the 1997 Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC).

The United Nations claims that greenhouse gases--mostly carbon dioxide, the gas humans and animals "breathe out" and is also produced when burning fossil fuels--are causing the earth to warm. It ignores much scientific evidence that the earth is cooling rather than warming and even disregards the possibility that sun activity could cause fluctuating earth temperatures!

America first became involved in the global warming debate when former President Bush agreed to "voluntary" standards intended to reduce greenhouse gases at the 1992 UN conference in Rio de Janeiro. Then last December in Kyoto, Japan, the Clinton-Gore administration agreed to "legally binding" emission standards set at 7% below 1990 levels that are to be accomplished between 2008-2012. Taking into account the normal growth of U.S. industries, the Treaty would require us to reduce our industrial output by one-third even though the Treaty has yet to be presented to the Senate for ratification. Two-thirds of that body must vote in favor of it in order for it to become law.

America is one of only 34 industrialized nations required to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Delegates at this UN meeting are to hammer out three schemes intended to reduce emissions levels. The first scheme is an "emissions trading" (redistribution of wealth) regime that would allow developed countries that reduce emissions beyond their agreed target to sell the excess emissions credits ("hot air") to others. Hotly debated will be whether to create a concrete ceiling on how many credits a country can buy or sell.

The second scheme called a "clean development mechanism" would enable industrialized countries to finance emissions-avoiding projects in developing countries and receive credit for doing so. This new avenue would allow governments and private corporations to transfer and promote "clean technologies" and wealth.

The third scheme to redistribute wealth is called "joint implementation" which will also provide credit for investments in projects, but only in other developed countries.

The Kyoto agreement is not legally binding until 55 countries, including developed countries accounting for at least 55% of developed country emissions, have ratified it. The U.S. should tell the UN that it should take its "hot air" treaty to the nearest dumpsite and add it to the landfill.

Let them eat cake, I plan to have "coffee, cookies and conversation" ("hot air") tomorrow (November 3rd) at the "World Bank Open House on Climate Change" here in Buenos Aires. Such a deal!

Why is the World Bank involved in the Climate Change negotiations? One big reason is because the \$18 BILLION gift American taxpayers just gave them in the new "budget" deal is probably burning a hole in their pockets. (I hope someone is watching out for the ozone layer!) The U.S. Congress and the Clinton Administration just gave the World Bank \$18 BILLION, so they can afford to buy lots of coffee and cookies as they expel "hot air" bragging about their newfound riches. Another is because the World Bank and the New World Order crowd are using the environmental issue to globally redistribute wealth.

The World Bank is less concerned about "hot air" than about controlling every nation's wealth. The UN defines "hot air" as "the concern that some governments will be able to meet their commitment targets with minimal effort and could then flood the market for emissions credits, reducing the incentive for other countries to cut their own domestic emissions." National sovereignty is anathema to the UN and its World Bank.

Those of you who received my messages from Kyoto, Japan last December probably remember the question I asked the American Congressmen there: "Is it true that this (Kyoto) conference has nothing to do with climate change and everything to do with economics?" Both Democrats and Republicans responded with a resounding "YES."

There is not adequate scientific evidence to prove that the globe is warming. And even if it was, it would be just what the environment needs. According to preeminent authority Sherwood Idso, our CO₂ levels (the major "greenhouse gas" that is supposed to cause global warming) could be 10 times higher than what they are today with no adverse effects on man or animals, and with excellent effects on plants and trees.

That brings us back to why the World Bank is sharing coffee, cookies and conversation ("hot air"). Like sucking piglets, many nations cannot afford to miss the coffee, cookies and conversation ("hot air") with the mother sow, the World Bank.

I don't want to miss the show! I'll let you know tomorrow how it goes.

--END--