

Dangerous concessions granted to anti-science globalists in Kyoto

by Marsha Freeman

After a ten-day process of wearing down the delegates from the United States (the last 48 hours, without sleep), who were told by Vice President Al Gore on Dec. 8 that they should be more “flexible” in their negotiations with the hard-line Europeans, an agreement was forged in the wee morning hours of Dec. 11 at the global conference on climate change in Kyoto, Japan. The agreement is one that developing nations refused to be part of, that the U.S. Senate will not ratify, and that, were it to be implemented, would wreck the economy of the United States.

Nothing of substance was accomplished at Kyoto, in that while the United States, Japan, and the European Union agreed, in principle, to mandated limits of emissions on so-called greenhouse gases, there is little chance this agreement will go into effect. Were it to do so, there is no formal enforcement regime to punish countries that do not live up to their commitments. Yet.

But, the danger of what has been agreed to in the “Kyoto Protocol” is the capitulation by nearly 160 nations to policies that are based, not on science, but on propaganda, and potentially to a regime of enforcement that submits sovereign nations to an international mechanism that has the power to dictate the future economic development of their peoples. In fact, it furthers the process which would give the United Nations system control over the economic activity of sovereign nations.

The Kyoto Protocol, which is an amendment to the 1992 treaty on climate change signed by 150 nations at the Earth Summit in Brazil, is being hailed by the environmentalists, including Vice President Gore, as a crucial “first step” in the process of controlling so-called global climate change. The intent of the British, the most active promoters of strict controls on emissions of so-called “greenhouse gasses” for the U.S. economy, because of an alleged but *nonexistent* danger of “global warming,” was to have the United States reduce emissions on a scale that would replay the way the Russians have “reduced emissions” since the fall of the Soviet Union: by shutting down industrial capacity.

President Bill Clinton, by failing to challenge the fallacious assumptions and rigged data of the global warming hoaxsters, was reduced to promoting a series of gimmicks to try to show that the United States would limit emissions.

Going into the Kyoto conference, representatives of U.S. industry, elected officials who went as observers, and delegates from developing nations knew, and would say privately, and often in public, that there is no such thing as global warming. Scientists who have studied the process of climate change (as opposed to weather forecasting), explain that astronomical cycles of thousands of years create periodic ice ages on the Earth, with inter-glacial periods of warmer climate in between. We are now in a time when a new age of glaciation is approaching.

The idea that there is “global warming,” which is based on short timescales, and in many cases “massaged” data that have been challenged using different measuring techniques, is a hoax. The purpose of those promoting it is to move the industrial world into a “post-industrial” society. The developing nations are to remain in a state of poverty and underdevelopment, lest they emit more gasses.

What the U.S. agreed to

Were it to become law, the Kyoto Protocol would mandate that the United States cut its emissions of so-called greenhouse gases, largely carbon dioxide, to 7% below the level of emissions in 1990. This translates to a reduction of about 30% from the level emissions would be otherwise, by the year 2012.

Such a drastic cut, in such a short period of time, would affect every American, because it would require reductions in energy consumption, which most likely would be effected through price increases. Carbon dioxide is produced as a by-product of the incomplete combustion of fossil fuels in the automobiles we drive, the coal-fired power plants that provide our electricity, the tractors that harvest our food, and the factories that produce the goods that give us our standard of living.

President Clinton has tried to soften the blow such cutbacks would deliver to the already shrunken U.S. physical economy, by introducing proposals that were at least partially accepted by the European Union, in Kyoto.

These would allow the United States to band together with other industrial non-EU nations, such as Russia, Australia, and Canada, under an “umbrella” within which greenhouse gas emissions could be “traded.” This is similar to the EU

gimmick of clumping all the western European nations together under an atmospheric “bubble,” whereby the cutbacks made by collapsing eastern German industry, or the emissions cuts in France resulting from increasing use of nuclear power, obviate the need to cut emissions in countries in Europe that might still be growing economically.

The United States has proposed that under this “umbrella,” it should be able, for example, to improve pollution standards in Russian factories or power plants, and take “credit” to apply against increased emissions from U.S. facilities. This, President Clinton claims, will be good for the U.S. economy, because industry can sell Russia energy-efficient technology, and can avoid making cutbacks at home. (Never mind that Russia is near financial collapse.)

In addition to agreeing to cutbacks of emissions 7% below 1990 levels, when the U.S. proposal had been to stabilize emissions at 1990 levels, the United States, most dangerously, has given credibility to the process of negotiating international agreements based on the worst pragmatic considerations, rather than consideration of principle.

The ghost of Thomas Hobbes

That such an horrendous proposal for gutting U.S. economic activity could be taken seriously, much less agreed to in writing, is a testament to the cowardice of the opponents to the agreement, in industry, the U.S. Congress, and the developing nations, who refused to marshal the science to refute the hoax of global warming, and instead played a “blame game” to try to limit the damage that emissions cut-backs will have on *their* country, *their* industry, *their* jobs. In the spirit of Thomas Hobbes, the Kyoto negotiations became a war of each against all.

Going into the Kyoto conference, even the media in the United States, which had kept out of print any articles challenging the fallacious assumptions and doctored data of the global warming hoaxsters, admitted that while there was a “consensus” on global warming, there was also significant opposition.

This should have buttressed the forces in the opposition. But, once the delegates started to gather at Kyoto on Dec. 1, the opposition threw principle overboard, and fell back on the same pragmatic approach as President Clinton.

U.S. industry lobbyists, snidely referred to as the “fossil-fuel lobby” by the environmentalists, but in fact representing the nation’s electric utilities, automobile manufacturers, mining companies, and other heavy industry, made the object of their attack not the hoked-up “science,” but the developing nations.

The Global Climate Coalition, representing industry, aimed to block an agreement, because, it said, the science did not exist to support it. However, the GCC cynically promoted a resolution that passed the Senate by a vote of 95-0 on July 25, which said that developing countries must agree to mandatory

emission controls on the same timescale as the industrial nations, if the Senate were to ratify any agreement coming out of Kyoto. This played upon senators’ concerns that if developing countries did not have to raise their costs to cut back emissions, this would create “unfair competition” for U.S. companies. That approach begged the question: Would the quack science be vindicated, if China and other developing nations would sign onto it?

The developing nations did little better, in failing to fight for a principle rather than pragmatic concerns.

As the largest, fastest growing developing nation, with the most, therefore, to lose from any climate agreement, China took the point in opposing the imposition of emissions controls on developing countries. The Chinese delegation, which threatened to walk out of the negotiations if a proposal for mandatory limits on emissions for developing nations were voted on, rightly argued that slapping controls on how much carbon dioxide and other emissions these countries could release, would destroy their future economic growth.

But, the Group of 77, representing about 130 of the 160 nations in Kyoto, did not argue, correctly, that the entire issue was bogus because there is no global warming. Instead, the G-77 insisted that big polluters, and the United States in particular, show good faith and cut back their emissions *first*, before the developing nations are asked to join in.

Republican U.S. Congressional leaders who were in Kyoto as observers, did no better in their efforts to block the signing of an agreement. Sen. Chuck Hagel (R-Neb.) has repeatedly made the argument that there is no scientific proof of global warming, and House Science Committee Chairman James Sensenbrenner (R-Wisc.) has held hearings to make that case.

But, in Kyoto, their opposition was based on the “political reality,” that this bill of goods will never be sold to the Senate, or to the American people. What they fail to realize, is that if they continue to cede the scientific questions to the environmentalists, it may well be possible to brainwash the American people into accepting the need for an internationally enforced austerity regime, to “save” them from floods, rampant disease, and every other ridiculous “threat” the media tell them is just around the corner.

Then, there are the environmentalists themselves. The most dishonest action by these modern-day Malthusians in Kyoto, was their attacks on the Chinese for planning to destroy the planet, because they intend to improve the standard of living for their 1.2 billion people. While representatives from environmental groups suggested that the Chinese government impose standards for energy-efficient refrigerators, the government of China is planning its economic growth based on the only two non-greenhouse-gas-emitting electrical generating systems economically available: hydroelectric and nuclear power. Both are opposed by the environmentalists.