

Earth Summit a success . . . for the enemies of mankind

by Kathleen Klenetsky

The U.N. Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the Earth Summit, which met in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil during the first two weeks of June, must be counted a rousing success for the enemies of the human race. Despite complaints from the global environmentalist movement that the conference failed to achieve its more radical goals, the Earth Summit succeeded in winning virtual worldwide acceptance for the principal elements of the neo-malthusian agenda, and in setting the stage for an aggressive assault in the immediate future against mankind's very existence.

Two treaties were adopted at the conference: one governing climate change, and another on "biological diversity," which only the United States refused to sign, and that primarily due to political reasons connected to the November presidential election.

In addition, the conference adopted Agenda 21, a lengthy compilation of non-binding recommendations which is supposed to guide the policies of signatory nations on a broad spectrum of issues, ranging from population to "sustainable development," and it also issued a Declaration of Principles.

Moreover, a number of industrialized countries, led by Japan but also including western European nations and the United States, pledged billions of dollars to the Third World, not for desperately needed nuclear power plants or water projects, but for assorted environmental schemes.

'Hidden teeth'

No wonder, then, that the environmentalists have dubbed UNCED a victory. Aside from continued criticism of the Bush administration, particularly for its refusal to sign the biodiversity convention, the most influential leaders of the environmentalist movement have now agreed that UNCED on the whole made a dramatic contribution to their cause.

Richard Benedick, a former U.S. State Department official who negotiated the Montreal Protocol on chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and who served as an adviser to UNCED Secretary General Maurice Strong, advised the June 14 *New York Times* that the conference "should not be judged by the immediate results, but by the process it sets in motion." Don't worry about the blandness of the final treaties, the *Times* added in its analysis of the conference, because they "have

hidden teeth that will develop in the right circumstances."

Sen. Albert Gore (D-Tenn.), head of the U.S. congressional delegation to Rio and a prominent advocate of environmentalist lunacies, gave a glowing report on the conference to his Senate colleagues on June 16. "This meeting was a tremendous success for the world community," he declared, "in that a very powerful learning process took place for people of all nations around the world and their leaders. I believe deeply that substantive policy and program changes necessary to protect the Earth's environment will come more easily after the Earth Summit."

Gore expressed particular enthusiasm that the 100-odd world leaders who participated in UNCED, had agreed to create a "sustainable development commission within the United Nations." The commission, which will function as a subsidiary of the Economic and Social Council (Ecosoc), will be "empowered to have hearings, to have public proceedings, and receive evidence about the behavior and policies of countries around the world in order to assess whether and to what extent they are consistent with the agreements reached" at Rio, Gore explained.

A 'fundamental transformation'

Gore and Benedick are not alone in giving the Earth Summit high marks. Most private environmental groups share their view. According to Gareth Porter of the Environmental and Energy Study Institute, "the majority of environmental groups believe that the Rio meeting was by and large a success."

In an analysis entitled "What Happened in Rio?" Porter writes: "The agreements reached at the Earth Summit . . . fall short of what is needed to ensure that the world will be put on a sustainable path of economic development. . . . *But viewed in the context of multilateral diplomacy, they represent a remarkable achievement.*

"Even if the agreements adopted by the Earth Summit fall short of what is needed," Porter adds, "they do provide institutional mechanisms and benchmarks for holding governments accountable for progress in integrating environment and development and in forging more effective North-South cooperation. *Moreover, the Earth Summit itself represents a fundamental transformation of world politics.* The

conference raised the issue of sustainable development and environmental protection to the top of the global political-diplomatic agenda, both for governments and for people of the world. Political leaders, news media, and other powerful institutions must be deeply impressed by the fact that history's first truly global summit meeting of heads of government was devoted to environment" (emphasis added).

Rearguard action

The environmentalists are gloating, and for good reason. They succeeded at Rio in pulling off a virtual revolution against the foundation of Western civilization: the concept that man is the pinnacle of God's creation, and that by using his creative powers, he can and should exercise dominion over the rest of creation. And they also managed to limit and contain any significant opposition.

In the year leading up to Rio, significant opposition emerged to the more egregious neo-malthusian features promoted by Maurice Strong and other UNCED architects. The Malaysian government and other members of the Third World Group of 77 repeatedly demanded that economic development not be subordinated to environmentalism.

At Rio, these forces were able to insert wording in the final statement of principles which declared, "human beings are at the center of concerns" for sustainable development. This caused tremors among the eco-nuts, such as the *New York Times*, which complained in a June 14 article: "Putting humans at the center of things, with the implied right to dominate and exploit the rest of nature, is what has caused the problem in the first place."

But in the context of the Earth Summit as a whole, this statement amounts to little more than a rhetorical bow in the right direction, especially since it embraces the genocidal notion of "sustainable development." To put man at the "center of things," requires jettisoning the whole package of neo-malthusian policies, emphatically including the fraud called sustainable development, and replacing them with an aggressive, global program for high-technology-vectored industrial and agricultural development—the very opposite of what came out of the Earth Summit.

Similarly on the population issue: Although the Vatican, together with several Third World delegations, put up a vigorous fight to prevent the conference from blaming all the world's ills on the growth of human population, they, too, in their formal statements, paid lip service to the idea that human population growth was problematic. As a result, the Earth Summit's organizers were able to maintain the lie that human population expansion in and of itself leads to environmental problems.

Sen. Timothy Wirth (D-Colo.), another key member of the U.S. congressional delegate to UNCED, noted in a public statement on June 16 that in Rio, "Even the Holy See . . . was talking about population as an issue. Everybody understands that this issue of population must be addressed." Wirth urged

that the foundation set by the Rio conference be used to "begin preparations for the 1994 U.N. Conference on Population and Development," and announced that he will reintroduce a "comprehensive population bill" calling for a major international campaign to bring down population growth rates.

Enter greenie Bush

Ironically, given the criticism he came under for allegedly obstructing the Earth Summit, George Bush has put himself in the vanguard of those who see Rio as setting the stage for "fundamental transformations." U.S. and European sources report that the Bush administration is spearheading a campaign to impose one of the most lunatic environmental schemes yet: a global tax on the use of all fossil fuels, from oil to coal, that would require creation of a supranational institution to implement the levy.

David Warsh reported in the June 14 *Boston Globe* that the Bush gang has been "quietly laying the basis for a concrete deal on global greenhouse gas emissions," and that if and when Bush wins reelection, he will mount a campaign that, "with a little luck, will lead within a year or two to serious international controls."

The "free market" case for a global carbon tax was laid out in the June 4 *Wall Street Journal* by Martin Feldstein, formerly Bush's top economic adviser. Feldstein's proposal would get around the mandatory nation-by-nation limits on carbon dioxide emissions favored by the European Community executive committee by imposing a global level, and allowing countries to "trade" their emission rights with one another.

The proposal would mean a draconian tax on industrial and agricultural production worldwide. For industrialized countries which consume large amounts of energy from fossil fuels, such as the United States, it would put yet another costly burden on production. Gen. Richard Lawson (ret.), president of the National Coal Association, told *EIR* earlier this year that "the imposition of a carbon tax or a fossil fuel tax would certainly have a dramatic impact upon the American economy," and could mean the "imposition of huge sums, as much as \$200 billion annually, upon the overall economic capability of the energy production facilities of the country."

For underdeveloped countries, the consequences would be murderous. To allow countries to "trade" their emission rights would mean, in practice, that impoverished Third World countries, struggling under a terrible debt burden, would be given an inducement to forgo economic development, which depends ultimately on energy throughput, by selling their emission "rights" to earn some much-needed foreign currency in the short term.

Yet, the administration has already begun pressing other nations to convene a meeting on implementing the climate treaty signed at Rio, where, reportedly, the Bush team will put its carbon tax proposal on the table.