

Henry Lamb Columns in 1998

Contents

International Criminal Court: Who needs it?	2
What about national sovereignty?.....	4
The court's jurisdiction	6
The final step	8
Choosing the future: is it too late?	10
Choosing the future: turn right!	12
Choosing the future: people or bugs?.....	14
Choosing the future: a better alternative	16
Freedom at risk	18
Freedom at risk: shifting powers	20
Freedom at risk: the ICC	22
Freedom at risk -- everywhere	24
Global Governance is here!	26
Global Governance Everywhere!.....	28
Global Governance by Treaty.....	30
Global Governance by default	32
Behind the United Nations: the IUCN	34
Behind the United Nations: the WWF	36
Behind the United Nations: the WRI	39
Behind the United Nations: NGOs	41
Will Kyoto solve the problem?.....	43
It's poverty, not the climate	45
Is nature really in trouble?.....	47
Science or advocacy?	49

International Criminal Court: Who needs it?

By Henry Lamb

On June 17, appointed delegates from around the world will assemble in Rome, Italy. For five weeks, they will live the good life in luxury hotels while they put the finishing touches on the final draft of an international “statute” that will create the International Criminal Court. The President of the United States has already announced that he supports the idea as a way to prosecute war criminals. The statute, indeed, provides the mechanism for prosecuting war criminals, and anyone else who violates what is called “international norms.”

The problem is that international norms are whatever the United Nations defines them to be.

The International Criminal Court is justified by the need to prosecute war criminals, and those found guilty of genocide. But it is clearly intended to be the global enforcer of all international law.

America is founded upon the bedrock principle that government is empowered by the consent of the people who are governed. That consent is expressed through the officials elected by those who are governed. There has been no county commission, no state legislature, or no Congressional action to adopt a resolution calling for the creation of an International Criminal Court. Why then, has the President announced that he favors the creation of such a court?

The initiative to create the court comes from the United Nations, and has been underway for several years, led by the International Law Commission. In *Our Global Neighborhood*, the report of the UN Commission on Global Governance, published in 1995, the International Criminal Court is recommended because “The very essence of global governance is the capacity of the international community to ensure compliance with the rules of society (p.326).” Maurice Strong, a member of the Commission on Global Governance, and now the Executive Co-ordinator for UN Reform, scheduled the June meeting in Rome more than a year ago. The Preparatory Committee for the court has met twice since the first of the year to finalize the document in time to be adopted in Rome.

The Rome meeting is likely to be what Strong visualized way back in 1995, when he said in *Our Global Neighborhood*, “Our recommendation is that the General Assembly should agree to hold a World Conference on Governance in 1998, with its decisions to be ratified and put into effect by 2000 (p.351).” The International Criminal Court would give the UN the authority to enforce global governance. It is on schedule to be ratified by 2000.

It has not been decided whether the court will be created by treaty or by statute, even though the final draft refers to the statute. It has not been decided whether the new court will be accountable to the UN General Assembly, the UN Security Council, or a new Conference of the Parties consisting of delegates appointed specifically to oversee the court. What has been decided is that a new International Criminal Court will come into existence by virtue of the document to be adopted in Rome.

The new court is substantially different from the old International Court of Justice, housed at the Hague. The old court had no power. It dealt only with disputes between nations and then only when the disputing nations voluntarily submitted their dispute to the court's jurisdiction. No nation is bound by the old court's decision. Not so with the new court.

The International Criminal Court can arrest, try, convict, and jail individuals (natural persons), and arrest, try, convict, and dissolve corporations and organizations (legal persons), and confiscate their assets. The new court can issue an arrest warrant before an indictment has been returned. Trial by a jury of peers? Forget about it. A panel of prosecutors is free to roam the world investigating "complaints" filed by NGOs (environmental organizations), for infractions of international law, including environmental treaties and "international norms" such as those established in documents like the Declaration of the Rights of the Child.

There is much wrong in the world today. No doubt, those who are pushing this new International Criminal Court think it will help either right the wrongs or punish the culprits. The fact is that the court itself presents a greater threat to social advancement than any threat it hopes to eliminate. Next: What about the sovereignty issue?

What about national sovereignty?

By Henry Lamb

“One thing is absolutely clear; any establishment of the International Criminal Court will require cession of some aspect of sovereignty. We can’t have a court without states giving up part of their sovereignty. After 50 years, we are ready to give up sovereignty in Europe. Now is the time for the world to do a small thing in the same direction.” So says Gianfranco Dell’Alab, from Italy, a member of the European Union’s delegation to the Preparatory Committee meeting of the new International Criminal Court meeting in Geneva in April.

Mr. Dell’Alab, America is not ready to give up its sovereignty! President Bill Clinton may be, since he has announced that he supports the court’s creation, but the rest of America has no intention of letting an international court ignore the U.S. Constitution and prosecute American citizens for violations of “international norms.” Under the terms of the final draft of the document which will create the new court in June, prosecutors, appointed by the court, would be free to investigate inside the sovereign borders of participating nations without interference from national, state, or local governments. On the other hand, national governments would be compelled to cooperate with the UN prosecutors if requested. To enforce this provision, the document says simply that should a nation refuse to cooperate, the matter would be referred to the UN Security Council for whatever action might be necessary to “enable the court to exercise its jurisdiction.”

One of the more alarming features of the new court is the explicit authority of the prosecutors to investigate “complaints” submitted by NGOs (non-governmental organizations). This feature is in keeping with the trend to use NGOs as an early warning system. Throughout the literature flowing from environmental treaties, NGOs are identified as inexpensive and willing “partners” in the enforcement of international law by using them to spot infractions of law. The new court provides the mechanism for a quick and effective response. The U.S. government issued a grant to the Illinois Chapter of the Sierra Club to finance their SwampWatch Committee, whose job it was to ride up and down the back roads looking for bulldozers in what might be wetlands. A U.S. version of the NGO early warning system. The UN uses the same system on a global scale. The new court will increase the size of the hammer available to the government to squash pesky individuals who violate international norms.

The U.S. Senate is our Constitutional firewall against the erosion of national sovereignty by international treaties. Occasionally, the Senate defends our sovereignty by rejecting treaties, as in the case of the League of Nations, and the Convention on Biological Diversity. But then, too often, the Senate also sacrifices a measure of national sovereignty each time it ratifies a treaty such as the World Trade Organization, and the Climate Change Treaty. The new International Criminal Court is so important to the international community, that the Preparatory Committee is discussing several ways to bring the court into existence without requiring ratification by the Senate.

The document that creates the court is referred to as a “statute.” A statute is a law enacted by a governing body. On the one hand, the UN claims that global governance is not the same as world government, but if it is not a government, how can it create law? One of the measures proposed by the delegates emulates the “negative sale” method used by some shifty mail-order houses. Everyone has received books, or other merchandise in the mail with a note that says if you don’t want this junk, return it within 10 days. Otherwise, pays us \$\$\$\$.

The adoption procedure most favored by the delegates would make the International Criminal Court statute binding on all nations who do not exercise an “opt out” provision within a specified period of time.

Should the “opt out” method be selected by the delegates at the Rome Conference in June, the United States could be bound by the new court without the Senate ever having an opportunity to vote on it. The Congress would have to initiate legislation to opt out. Administration supporters in Congress could easily delay action to well beyond the time period allowed to opt out. Senator Jesse Helms, Chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, has said that there would not be an International Criminal Court as long as he is alive. But Jesse Helms is 76, and sickly. His likely successor, Senator Richard Lugar, has a completely different attitude about the UN. And the Administration is in favor of the new court. Next: The court’s jurisdiction.

The court's jurisdiction

By Henry Lamb

What the final shape of the International Criminal Court will be must wait until the finishing touches are added in Rome at the final conference June 17 to July 20. The major question under consideration is jurisdiction. Some delegates recognize that broad initial jurisdiction will frighten some nations away, and therefore, support limiting the court's initial jurisdiction to "enumerated" war crimes and genocide. Other delegates believe the world is ready to accept a global court to enforce all international law, particularly social and environmental law.

Mary Robinson, UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, told a meeting of the delegates in Geneva in April"

"Some governments feel threatened by international scrutiny of their actions, and don't want a court that could investigate and even indict top national leaders. The recognition continues, however, that the world needs a powerful and independent international court. NGOs are able to push the more progressive and responsible aspects of the court: these progressive matters include the authority of the prosecutor to investigate and prosecute indictments, the definitions of crimes against humanity, and the scope of the court's jurisdiction. Gender sensitivity, prosecution and redress must be incorporated into the new court."

Professor Lucius Caflisch, legal advisor to the Swiss Minister of Foreign Affairs, and head of the Swiss Delegation, "...why shouldn't all crimes based on international custom be within the jurisdiction of the ICC. This, of course, will require states to divest themselves of some of their sovereignty by treaty or by custom."

Ms. Mona Rishmawi, International Commission of Jurists and UN Independent Expert on Human Rights in Somalia, urged the delegates to "focus primarily on gender concerns. We must be clear that the court has inherent jurisdiction; there should not be too many loopholes for nations to opt out." An unidentified panelist responded to a question from the floor about who would enforce the verdicts of the new court. "No court," he replied, "can enforce its own judgments, so there will have to be some mechanism created. Possibly the Security Council. Enforcement is the job of the Executive Power and that will be the United Nations, or some bureau of the UN system."

It is clear that the intent of those who are creating the court, that the court should eventually have jurisdiction over all violations of whatever the United Nations defines to be "international norms." It is also clear that "international norms" refer to social behavior and environmental protection. As a practical matter, however, the delegates realize that it would be better to get the International Criminal Court accepted with limited jurisdiction now and expand that jurisdiction later, than to risk losing the opportunity to create the court by pushing for too much initially.

The strategy that is unfolding is becoming clear. The butchers of the Bosnian war have been known for years. Questions have been raised in the press asking why the culprits have not been captured. A few Washington watchers suggest that the failure to capture the known war criminals may be deliberate. Once the International Criminal Court statute has been adopted, there will need to be broad public approval for its acceptance. What better way to draw public attention to the need for an International Criminal Court than to make a media event out of the chase and capture of the Bosnian war culprits, and the awkwardness of trying to convict them of some crime when there is no existing international mechanism to do so.

The International Criminal Court statute will be adopted in Rome during the June-July meeting. The Bosnian war criminals had then better watch out. The statute creates a Preparatory Commission responsible for setting up the new court. During the months that the court is being created, a major public relations campaign to win public approval will be launched. The Bosnian war criminals are likely to be used to make the campaign very real, focusing all the public attention on the war crimes responsibility of the new court, and diverting attention away from all the other authorities that can be built into the new court system. Next: The final step.

The final step

By Henry Lamb

The term “international community” refers to the people who are associated with the more than 130 UN organizations, commissions, and agencies, as well as delegates from all the nations who participate in the activities of the various UN organizations, and the hundreds of thousands of individuals who are members of the thousands of NGOs that promote the various UN agendas. These are the people who are steeped in the goals, procedures, and methods of the UN. Few of them have much, if any, experience in the real world where people have to earn a living from something other than tax revenues. The rest of the world is so occupied with working to pay the taxes that feeds the UN crowd, they have little time to learn, or desire to know about what the UN crowd is doing. The UN crowd counts on that fact. The UN-NGO machine has become incredibly effective in reshaping public policy to achieve their objectives without letting the ordinary people know what the real objectives are. The formula is simple: create a major public fear of impending harm, then present the perfect policy solution. The solution typically costs the individual nothing, at the beginning, and promises safe harbor from the impending harm. Each policy solution tightens the grip of the UN on both nations and individuals, and then is tightened even further at the whim of the UN. Recent examples of this formula at work include the 1985 Ozone Treaty which, originally, agreed only to monitor so-called ozone depletion. A protocol was added that raised the price of air-conditioning four-fold. Never mind that there never was any danger from ozone depletion. The more recent Climate Change Treaty is another good example. It began in 1992 as a voluntary treaty to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. The Kyoto Protocol now gives a UN body authority to dictate the extent the U.S. will be compelled to reduce its emissions. Never mind that more than 15,000 scientists have now signed a petition which says there is no scientific justification for the Kyoto Protocol.

The real purpose for these treaties, Agenda 21, and literally dozens of other policy documents, has far less to do with protecting individuals from impending environmental disaster than with building the framework of global governance. The International Criminal Court is the most blatant, potentially the most powerful instrument of global governance to date. In 1994, the World Trade Organization gave the UN the power to impose trade sanctions upon nations and upon individual industries within nations. The Convention on the Law of the Sea gave the UN power to impose taxes and user fees for the first time. The International Criminal Court will give the UN the power to send people to jail for life, and to dissolve corporations and confiscate their assets. That’s a lot of power. It is too much power to place in the hands of professional bureaucrats who reject the notions that government is empowered by the consent of those who are governed. The UN crowd operates on the principle that government is empowered by whatever it can get away with. Sadly, it is.

The UN crowd has gotten away with far too much in recent years, while ordinary Americans were working their tails off to supply the money the UN crowd needs to build its system of global governance. This statute to create a new International Criminal Court could be the final

step necessary to achieve global governance by the year 2000, as is the goal of the UN Commission on Global Governance. But it could also be a fatal flaw in the strategy of the UN crowd. It could be the hurdle Americans are unwilling to cross. It could be the trumpet call that rouses the American spirit. It could be the final straw that crushes the indifference that has allowed the UN to march unchallenged toward global governance.

America, and America alone, can still stop the imprisonment of humanity by the elite international community. The current Administration will not stop the UN. In fact, the Clinton/Gore team is providing fuel and encouragement to the UN's march to global governance. Congress will not stop the UN, unless ordinary Americans exercise their right and responsibility to empower, or eliminate the power of government, through the ballot box. All the litmus tests that all the groups apply to their candidates pale in importance to the candidate's attitude toward the UN. Should the UN crowd succeed in its quest for global governance, it won't matter how anyone feels about abortion, or school prayer, or private property, or anything else. Individual won't matter. The only individuals who may be permitted to speak on the issues are those who are members of NGOs that are accredited by the UN. Others will not be allowed to participate in the process of governance. There is no more important issue facing America today than the rise of global governance.

Choosing the future: is it too late?

By Henry Lamb

Until the Berlin wall fell, the United States and the Soviet Union were the pace cars competing to lead the world's race to the future. When the wall fell and the Soviet machine sputtered to a halt, the United States failed to take the lead, choosing instead to allow the United Nations to emerge as the leader. As the road to the future widened and traffic accelerated, clearly marked road signs warned of a split in the highway ahead. To the left for global governance; to the right for national sovereignty. For a few years it was not certain which road would be taken: national sovereignty, individual freedom, and private property rights; or global governance, sustainable communities in a global village. There is no longer any doubt. National sovereignty is the road not taken.

Global governance is not a sinister plot to rule the lives of every person on earth; it is simply the inevitable consequence. The proponents of global governance believe that the world will be a better place, and that all people will be happier and healthier living in a society that is regulated through the system of global governance they have devised. They believe that the welfare of all is far more important than the freedom of any. In fact, freedom, in the global community, is defined as "whatever government allows one to do." Had the world taken the road to the right, freedom would be defined as "whatever one wishes to do, restrained only by government authority empowered by the consent of the governed."

Global governance is empowered by a belief system that does not include the concept of individual sovereignty, and certainly not national sovereignty, or the notion of private property. To those who cling to these antiquated concepts, the belief system on which global governance is constructed is incomprehensible. For example, the earth is a living organism, the source of all life, called *gaia*. People are nothing more than individual "cells" in this organism, who exist only to perform some specific function for the benefit of the organism. Dr. Robert Muller, former Assistant Secretary-General of the United Nations, Chancellor of the UN University, and author of the World Core Curriculum (the basis for Outcome Based Education), says that the emergence of the UN is the manifestation of the evolution of *gaia's* brain. Global governance proponents see the UN as the "brain" that controls all activity on earth. *Gaia* allowed people to be free until they developed technology capable of destroying the planet by "stripping away her skin" with farm fields and factories. The UN is emerging to control people's use of technology, farm fields, and factories, as well as their education, reproduction, and movement

For billions of the world's people, the UN's global governance would be an improvement over the present living conditions. Most of the world has never known individual freedom. They are bound by daily rituals of survival, and cannot afford the luxury of even thinking about government -- except, perhaps, to avoid the current dictator's wrath. The leaders of these nations view the UN as a source of wealth. They are frequently paid to attend UN Conferences where decisions of global governance are made. They are rewarded for their allegiance by the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the UN

Population Fund, and a host of other UN treasure chests dutifully replenished by the American taxpayer.

The road to the future has been chosen by a handful of people who share a common belief that protecting the environment should be the central organizing principle of society. Al Gore's 1992 book, *Earth in the Balance* explains clearly why the United States chose not to take the lead in the race to the future when the Berlin wall collapsed. It also explains why the United States is not simply following the UN, but actually using its power, influence, and money, to accelerate the UN's leadership. A series of public policy decisions in recent years, particularly the creation of the World Trade Organization, the Kyoto Protocol to the Climate Change Treaty, and the emergence of the International Criminal Court, have put the world on the road to global governance. Still visible to the right, however, is the road to national sovereignty. It is not too late to reverse the decisions that have been made for us. But it will be soon.

Choosing the future: turn right!

By Henry Lamb

Will the people of the world be happier and healthier living under a system of global governance, or in a system where national sovereignty is the collective sovereignty of its individual citizens, restrained only by their own consent?

The proponents of global governance clearly believe their solutions promises the best future for the world. The case for individual freedom and national sovereignty has not been made. Americans take for granted the individual freedom they enjoy and when those freedoms are eroded, they assume it is because the officials they elected have deemed it necessary. Few Americans ever think about the freedom they enjoy, or about the possibility of losing it. Individual freedom is being eroded into oblivion by the expansion of global governance; Americans are the last hope of convincing the world to turn right.

National sovereignty is not an adequate term to describe a better alternative for the world than global governance. After all, national sovereignty exercised by a dictator is likely to be far worse than the oppression of global governance. What the world needs to understand is the power of the principle of government empowered by the consent of the governed. In America, we call that government a Constitutional Republic. But even in America, the fundamental principle of self-governance, on which our Constitution is built, has become obscured by layers of bureaucracy, distorted definitions, and political spin-doctors.

The very core of America's greatness is the idea that no government may exercise any power that has not been specifically granted to it by the people who are governed. The mechanism by which this idea is translated into political reality is the election process. The individuals who are elected by those who are governed are thereby empowered to create laws that restrain the freedom of those who are governed. Should those laws restrain too much, or too little, officials can be removed and replaced through the election process. The two key elements of this process are: electing officials who represent the views of those who are governed; and allowing no laws to be imposed by non-elected officials. When these two elements of the fundamental principle of self-governance are religiously observed, the best possible world is the inevitable outcome.

When society is organized around this principle of self-governance, individuals are free to do whatever they wish. What people want to do is whatever it takes to be happy and healthy. When people are free, they discover what it takes to be happy and healthy. The process is painful and not always successful for every person. It may appear to be unfair, chaotic, disorganized, inefficient, and undirected. It is all these things. In retrospect, it is this confusion of individuals' pursuit of happiness and health that created the internal combustion engine, the light bulb, refrigeration, space ships, television, and all the "things" so envied by the rest of the world. Global governance will establish a global political power to take the "things" from those who have them, to give to those who do not. What a better world it would be, if instead, we gave to

those who have not, the freedom to pursue their own happiness and health and thereby create their own prosperity.

All the ingredients of American prosperity have been available to every generation and every culture since the beginning of time. Each generation in every culture nudged history forward. With few exceptions, technological innovation was sponsored by, or allowed, by government. Individuals were subject to their sovereign and obliged to first be concerned about doing the sovereign's bidding. Individuals were free to do only what was approved by the sovereign. Not until America's founders enshrined the principle of government limited by the consent of the governed in its Constitution, were individuals really free to pursue their own happiness and health. In the next 200 years, free people, in their undirected chaos, created an explosion of prosperity unparalleled in history. Imagine what could be accomplished if the power of individual freedom were unleashed around the world!

The proponents of global governance claim that this prosperity is destroying the planet, and if it is not controlled, the planet will suffer a biological catastrophe that could destroy the human species. Really!

Choosing the future: people or bugs?

By Henry Lamb

Is the planet really on the brink of biological collapse as proclaimed by the United Nations? Because the scientific community doesn't share the UN's view, the UN created what it calls the Precautionary Principle: "where there are threats of serious or irreversible damage, lack of full scientific certainty shall not be used as a reason for postponing cost-effective action...." What constitutes a threat? Whatever the UN says is a threat. There need not be "scientific certainty" that a threat exists to launch any action that the UN deems to be "cost-effective." The UN says that its own scientific panel has determined that the "evidence *suggests* human influence on global climate." Nearly 200 climatologists and 17,000 other scientists have publicly stated that the science does not justify actions prescribed by the Kyoto Protocol. The UN has a deaf ear; it is moving forward with its command-and-control program as if the scientific community outside the hallowed halls of the UN did not even exist.

So it is with virtually every other environmental catastrophe proclaimed by the UN: biological impoverishment, population explosion; desertification; species extinction; ocean pollution; and groundwater loss. When scientific evidence does not support the aims and conclusions of the UN, the evidence is ignored, or distorted. The truth doesn't matter to the UN. What matters is what people believe is true. Accordingly, the UN's most prolific operation is its propaganda production capability. Magazines, newsletters, videos, and other media flow out of the UN like a flooding river. Rich with color, graphics, and the newest communications techniques available, the propaganda is designed to convince readers that the world is going to hell-in-a-hand-basket and the only solution is to embrace the UN's vision of global governance.

The question has never been whether or not to protect the environment; the question is how best to do it. The UN believes the solution is to control the people who use the environment. The better solution is to let free people care for their own private property. The UN believes that the environment is a "global commons" to which all people have a right to share equally. Nature designed the environment to be shared by those who could claim it, tame it, and benefit from it. Had nature intended for the environment to be distributed equally by a central authority, birds would not have to rise with the sun to get the worm. Squirrels would not have to gather acorns for the winter. Mountain lions would not have to slaughter antelope to feed their young. Throughout nature, all species must claim, tame, and benefit from that portion of the environment they need. People were created to do the same.

The earth and its environmental bounty belong, not to the UN, nor to a king, nor to a dictator, but to all the species of the earth -- including people. Using their natural intelligence, people have developed a system of "ownership" that reduces the constant competition for the benefits of the environment within a specified portion of the earth. Using their natural intelligence, people quickly learned that to benefit from the environment within their portion of the earth, great stewardship was required. Those who despoil the environment are left without its benefits; those

who care for the environment benefit and profit from their stewardship. Those who are stewards of their own resources are necessarily better caretakers than an agency of global governance can ever be.

When individuals foul their own environmental nest, they must suffer the consequences. When individuals foul the nest of others, then that individual's actions should be restrained, not by UN policies, but by policies created by the consent of those whose nest has been fouled.

Governmental bodies elected at the local, state, and national levels, which reflect the consent of the governed, should establish all policies which restrain individual freedom.

The UN is convinced that people cannot be trusted to care for their own environment. The UN has manufactured exaggerated claims of environmental disaster to justify the need to take control of human activity. To the UN, the need for people to be free is less important than the need for a bug to be free from threat of people. Proponents of global governance have chosen to value bugs more than people are valued. There is a better alternative.

Choosing the future: a better alternative

By Henry Lamb

There was a time when the U.S. could withdraw from the UN and kick the UN out of the U.S. with the reasonable expectation that the UN would collapse, as did its predecessor, the League of Nations. That is probably no longer a reasonable assumption. The UN has extended its tentacles so deeply into the affairs of every nation, that should the U.S. withdraw, the UN could still consolidate its international financial mechanism to control the flow of money throughout the world. It is control of this international financial mechanism, being constructed so feverishly, that is necessary to implement the Tobin Tax. A tax of .05% on international currency exchange would yield \$1.5 trillion annually to the UN, 150 times more than its current budget. Such a situation would put the U.S. at odds with the rest of the world. The rest of the world, represented by the UN could control U.S. activity in the world by controlling the activity it allowed in its member countries. Flush with its independent income stream, the UN would become the 800 pound gorilla the United States has been for the last 50 years.

A better alternative might be to change the direction of the United Nations and make it become what most Americans thought it was supposed to be: a powerless forum for the discussion of disagreements among equal sovereign nations. The United States still exerts great influence at the UN; nothing happens at or through the UN that is not approved by America's Ambassador. That means, of course, that America has approved the decisions that have put the world on the road to global governance. Those decisions must be reversed. That means an Ambassador with a great deal of diplomacy and backbone must represent America. The President appoints the UN Ambassador, with the advice and consent of the Senate.

Should a President inhabit the White House who believes that society should be organized around the principle that government should be empowered by the consent of the people, rather than by one who believes that society must be organized around the principle of protecting the environment -- at any cost, then there is a chance that an Ambassador with both backbone and diplomacy might redirect UN policy.

The first policy America should insist upon is that the UN must never have independent funding sources; all UN income must be appropriated and freely given by member nations. The only way to keep the UN from becoming a world government is to deliberately deny it independent financing.

The next policy to be implemented should prohibit any policy proposal from originating within any UN agency or non-government organization. All policy proposals should be submitted to the General Assembly by member nations. In recent years, most of the policy declarations and treaty proposals have originated within the staff of the UN or within a non-government organization accredited by the UN. Clearly, the function of the UN has become the development of public policy to be accepted by, or imposed upon, its member nations. Discussion of disagreements

among nations has become discussions about policies initiated by the UN, not about differences among nations.

The UN must abandon its "consensus" process for making decisions. It is a process for which there is no accountability, begins with a predetermined outcome, and is essentially controlled by the presiding officer. Instead, there must be a system developed where votes may be counted and recorded. Because of the wide disparity of interests and capabilities, the voting system must be weighted to reflect the number of people represented by each vote, as well as the financial contribution made by the people represented by each vote. A third factor which should be built into the weighting formula, is the degree of individual freedom available to the people represented by each vote.

The UN constantly talks about increasing "transparency" and expanding democracy. What these words mean in practice is that the UN may release more of its staff-written documents, and any national government should allow its citizens to participate in government-sponsored events. If we had accountability through public, recorded votes within the UN, we would have transparency. If the term "democracy" were redefined to mean: government empowered by the consent of the governed, then the talk about expanding democracy would have meaning.

The best thing America can do for the world is to insist that the UN adopt a system of voting that rewards individual freedom. Not every nation can contribute dollars in the same volume as America, but every nation can help its citizens discover the individual freedom that arises from a government that is empowered by the consent of the governed. These policies are hardly a beginning to the redirection of the UN. They are possible, practical, and quite possibly the only steps that can prevent the world from plunging into a century or more of socialistic global control in the hands of the United Nations.

Freedom at risk

By Henry Lamb

America stands in the world like a brilliant magnet, attracting people from every continent and creating fantasies of flight for millions of others who can only dream about coming to America. What is it about America that draws so many people to her shores? The answer is simple: freedom. In America, citizens enjoy a brand of freedom that is unheard of in most of the world. Europeans certainly enjoy more freedom than is allowed in most of the world, but even in Europe, freedom is different from freedom in America. America was created out of the belief that just government arises from, and is empowered by, the consent of the governed. Americans are born free, and their freedoms are restricted only by laws agreed to, through their elected representatives, by the majority of citizens. This principle of self-governance began to emerge with the *Magna Charta*, and struggled through the centuries until America's founders resolved to shed the tyranny of government once and for all. The discovery of this simple principle of self-governance may well be mankind's most important discovery. The government America's founders constructed on that principle may well be mankind's greatest achievement.

The foundation of that achievement is being systematically eroded, and the government built upon it is in great jeopardy.

In most of the world, people are not born free. People are born into a system of governance in which citizens have no freedom except that which is granted by government. Government is empowered, not by the consent of the people, but by police power and military might. Throughout Europe, governance is more sophisticated, but still, it is the government that possesses ultimate power. Various shades of socialism, often combined with the popular term "democracy" permeate European governments. The hallmark of modern socialism is democratization to the extent that selected individuals may be allowed to "participate" in the process. Participation in the process of governance is a far cry from prohibiting government action, except those actions authorized by the consent of the governed, expressed through freely elected representatives.

. The process through which people give their consent to government action is the election process, available to every American citizen. The individuals elected by the majority of the electors are empowered by their election, to make public policy, or laws, that restrict the freedoms of the governed. Should the policies made by the elected representatives become oppressive, the electors may replace their representatives.

What happens to freedom if public policies which restrict freedom are made by people who are not elected by those who are governed? The electors have no way to replace the policy makers if the policy makers are not elected. The governed have no way to limit the power of policy makers if the policy makers can not be replaced by the electors. Since 1992, American domestic policy

has been made, less and less, by elected representatives and more and more by non-elected, carefully selected, appointed individuals. Why?

Responding to United Nations policies contained in Agenda 21, adopted by 179 nations in Rio de Janeiro in 1992, President Clinton issued Executive Order 12852, June 29, 1993, which created the President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD). The Council consisted of 28 non-elected, carefully selected individuals. The council met for three years, spent more than \$5 million, and declared: *"We need a new collaborative decision process that leads to better decisions; more rapid change; and more sensible use of human, natural, and financial resources in achieving our goals."* The new process is a "consensus" process, the same process used exclusively throughout the United Nations.

The Clinton Administration is rapidly changing the policy-making process in America from one in which public policy is made exclusively by elected representatives, to a process that deliberately by-passes elected representatives and gives the responsibility to non-elected, carefully selected individuals.

The subtle, unnoticed, but very rapid shift in the policy-making process is rapidly eroding the structure of governance America's founders fought and died to create. As the governed citizens lose their power to hold policy makers accountable, and to replace them when desirable, government power is no longer dependent upon the consent of the governed. Government power is then derived from the authority to appoint the policy makers. Only carefully selected individuals, who can be counted on to rubber stamp the wishes of government, are appointed to the policy making councils.

The process sounds remarkably like the process that ultimately led to the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Freedom at risk: shifting powers

By Henry Lamb

The Tenth Amendment makes it very clear: all powers not expressly granted to the federal government by the Constitution are retained by the states and by the people. Any time there is a question about governmental jurisdiction, the presumption of power must lie with the states and with the people. President Ronald Reagan knew this obvious truth. Because preceding Presidents pushed the envelope of power beyond those enumerated by the Constitution, Reagan issued Executive Order 12612 (EO). Federal agencies had no excuse to go beyond the bounds of Constitutional authority under the Reagan EO.

President Clinton revoked Reagan's EO, and replaced it with his own special interpretation of "Federalism," which Congressman Bob Barr (R-GA) says, will "stand the Constitution on its head." Clinton's Executive Order, signed in England on May 14, pays lip service to the federal government's "limited" scope of power, but declares federal jurisdiction to be "supreme" within that scope. Then he spells out just when his administrative agencies may invoke federal supremacy:

- in matters that involve multi-state, or interstate concerns;
- when there is a need for uniform national standards;
- when states have not adequately protected individual rights;
- when states are reluctant to impose necessary regulations;
- when state regulatory action would undermine regulatory goals;
- when matters relate to federally owned or managed property or natural resources, trust obligations, or international obligations.

Any one of these exceptions should cause a furor in Congress and across the land; the last exception may cause a revolt.

By claiming that "international obligations" empower federal agencies to assume supremacy over the Constitutional powers reserved for the "states, and for the people," Clinton is assuming the power to impose virtually anything he wishes, any where he wishes, on any state, local government, or person that he wishes. An example of "international obligation" where no treaty exists is the UNESCO Biosphere Reserve Program. The United States has agreed, as a condition of the UN's designation, to manage its 47 UNESCO Biosphere Reserves according to the dictates of UNESCO. Executive Order 13083 declares that the President has the power to enforce federal agency rules by virtue of that "international obligation." UN Biosphere Reserve management procedures require management of buffer zones that includes private property. The Kyoto Protocol, which Clinton has said he would sign, may constitute an "international obligation," by virtue of his signing it. That would give him all the justification he needs to implement the Protocol's requirements despite the fact that the Senate has not ratified the Protocol.

Then comes that array of other "soft law" documents signed by the UN. Does the act of signing a policy document such as Agenda 21 constitute an "international obligation" sufficient to justify administrative enforcement of an international obligation even in the absence of legislative authorization? What about international treaties that are in force, but which have not been ratified by the U.S. Senate. Such treaties create what is known in legal jargon as "international norms." Does the President feel an obligation to uphold such international norms? While the answer to such questions may lie with the Supreme Court in some distant legal challenge, it is clear the President is preparing to use the Executive Order as justification for his anticipated actions.

The United States has signed many "soft law" documents that plunder the U.S. Constitution. In 1976, the U.S. signed the "soft law" policies of the UN Conference on Human Settlements which declares that private property is the source of accumulation of wealth and "contributes to social injustice...therefore, public control of land use is indispensable." The U.S. has signed the UN Covenant on Human and Civil rights, which declares that free speech is a privilege that carries responsibilities and liabilities, and may be subject to "penalties" which may be prescribed by law. Does President Clinton plan to enforce these "international obligations?"

Section 2(g) of the EO appears to give NGOs and "private associations" the same weight as state and local government in determining federal policy implementation at the local level. This is in keeping with the President's Council on Sustainable Development recommendation to create a "new decision process," one which bypasses elected officials, and utilizes carefully selected representatives of NGOs, and state agency bureaucrats to serve on "stakeholder councils" that craft local policies.

This unprecedented power grab by the President can, and must be stopped by Congress. Congressman Barr has said he would introduce legislation to spell out clearly what the Tenth Amendment means so no future power-hungry, would-be-American-King can reinterpret the fundamental limitations placed on the federal government by the people who created it.

Freedom at risk: the ICC

By Henry Lamb

While America slept through the night of July 17, 1998, the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court created the final essential mechanism to establish global governance. By a vote of 120 to 7 (with 21 nations abstaining), the Conference adopted a new, international Statute which creates, for the first time in history, an international criminal court that has the power to enforce international law.

The new international Statute creates an Assembly of States Parties (ASP) consisting of one representative from each nation that ratifies the Statute. The Statute goes into effect 60 days after it is ratified by the 60th nation. The ASP will elect 18 judges who will serve 9-year terms. The judges will be divided into three Chambers: (1) a Pre-trial Chamber, consisting of "not less than six judges;" (2) a Trial Chamber, of not less than six judges; and (3) an Appeals Chamber, consisting of four judges and the Presidency. The Presidency consists of a President and two vice presidents elected by the judges. The function of the Pre-trial Chamber may be carried out by a panel of three judges assigned to a particular case, or by any one of the three. Pre-trial functions include ruling on jurisdictional matters, issuing warrants or subpoenas, and the like. The Trial judges hear, and decide the cases brought before them -- without assistance from a jury.

The new Statute also creates an Office of the Prosecutor who is elected by the ASP for a 9-year term. The Prosecutor, a Deputy and their staff, are responsible for investigating and bringing to "justice" any person accused of an international crime: "the crime of genocide; crimes against humanity; war crimes; and the crime of aggression."

Crimes against humanity are defined to include: murder; extermination; enslavement; deportation or forcible transfer of populations "without grounds permitted under international law;" torture; rape; enforced prostitution; sexual slavery; forced pregnancy; enforced sterilization; persecution against any identifiable group; apartheid; and "other inhumane acts of a similar character."

Interestingly, genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes are each defined in a separate article of the Statute. Aggression, however, is not mentioned again, nor is it defined.

State Parties that ratify the Statute are compelled to cooperate with the Prosecutor; to conform national laws to meet the requirements of the International Criminal Court; to use national police powers and facilities to capture individuals, and confiscate property when directed to do so by the Prosecutor. Non-participating nations may enter into an *ad hoc* agreement to participate on a case-by-case basis. Non-cooperative states will be referred to the ASP and/or to the UN Security Council.

The United States insisted that the Prosecutor be limited by requiring the specific approval of any state in which an investigation would occur. The rest of the world scoffed at the suggestion. Then the U.S. proposed that the UN Security Council approve all investigations, a procedure that would allow the U.S. to use its veto power to block prosecution of American citizens. Again, the world scoffed. A compromise allows the UN Security Council to request a 12-month delay of any investigation. Accordingly, the U.S. could not block an investigation of an American citizen. Its veto power could only block a request for a delay.

The new court is to be financed through assessment of participating nations on the same basis of their assessment to the United Nations. The court has the power to confiscate property and assets of the accused, and to convert those assets to its own resources upon conviction. The court expressly accepts gifts and contributions from any nation, organization, corporation, or individual - a practice that is strictly forbidden by the UN Charter.

As a practical matter, the court will be operated by an 18-member "Bureau" chosen from among the ASP. The court will develop its own rules which must be approved by the ASP. The Statute may be amended only after seven years, by a two-thirds majority of the ASP.

Although no report of a recorded vote has been made public as of this writing, it is reported in the halls in Rome that the United States, Israel, and China were among the seven nations that voted against the Statute.

It is much too early to speculate about what impact this court will have in the world or on America. From the reports received from observers in Rome, it is clear that many of the nations who voted for the court expect to use the court's power to prosecute America, and Americans for a wide range of "crimes against humanity." The official newspaper for the Conference, *TerraViva*, accused former President Bush of committing "the single worst blood bath of war [against Iraq]." The NGO Coalition that formed to lobby for the court held a demonstration on the 4th of July in Rome that accused President Clinton of "genocide" because of the economic embargo against Iraq. The International Criminal Court now gives the world the legal instrument it needs to attack the United States for the crime of prosperity..

Freedom at risk -- everywhere

Henry Lamb

In Rome, NGO advocates for the International Criminal Court were overheard discussing the "obscene" salaries paid to American sports figures, which, in their estimation, was an "economic crime against humanity," that should be prosecuted by the new International Criminal Court. In this first document, "forced pregnancy" is illegal. By definition, "forced pregnancy" refers to variations of rape, and explicitly does not refer to anti-abortion laws of individual nations. This definition can be changed at the whim of the Assembly of the States Parties by simply removing the language referring to national laws, thereby making it a "crime against humanity" for a nation to outlaw abortion.

Marching behind the banner of "justice for perpetrators of war crimes," the United Nations has succeeded in creating a mechanism for enforcing all international law. NGO advocates for the court hail the new institution as a major step toward global governance. Indeed, the new court is the last of three new UN institutions that collectively, give the UN the power to rule the world. The World Trade Organization, created in 1994, gives the UN the power to impose trade sanctions on nations and/or upon individual industries within sovereign nations. The WTO has already imposed decisions that adversely impact U.S. industries, most recently, Eastman Kodak.

The Kyoto Protocol gives the UN the authority to dictate energy use in America, and thirty-four developed nations, while leaving the rest of the world to use as much energy as they wish. And now, the new International Criminal Court empowers the UN to imprison people, and to confiscate assets from individuals and corporations that are convicted of "crimes against humanity."

There is virtually no "check-and-balance" on the new court. It is to be overseen by an Assembly of the States Parties, consisting of one official representative from each nation that ratifies the Statute. From those representatives, 18 individuals will be selected to serve as the "Bureau." The court itself, creates its own rules of procedure and evidence, may amend the statute to redefine jurisdiction, and no nation is beyond its reach, whether or not it has ratified the Statute.

As recommended by the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance, in its 1995 report, *Our Global Neighborhood*, the UN has created the documents and institutions necessary to achieve global governance by the year 2000. The newly created UN power will not be fully implemented by the year 2000, but it is in place. The UN has already proclaimed that its millennium celebration in the year 2000 will declare the next millennium to be the millennium of sustainability. The only freedom that can exist under the regime of sustainability, is freedom that is granted by government. The concept that people are endowed by their creator with "certain inalienable rights" among which are life, liberty, and the freedom to pursue happiness, is rejected by the United Nations.

The United Nations, as well as the proponents of global governance, believe that people are born into subjugation to a government that may grant, or deny, freedom at the discretion of the government. The UN contends that governments have abused their power and all will be well when the UN has the power to grant, or deny, freedom to global subjects.

The United Nations bureaucracy will not entertain even the possibility that free people can create free markets to provide for their own prosperity, and create and empower governments to provide for the protection of their inalienable rights. According to the UN view, and the view of many other national leaders, America's success and prosperity is not the result of free people exercising their energy and ingenuity; it is the result of brutal enslavement of the disadvantaged, and greedy imperialism that squanders the world's natural resources. Sadly, the proponents of global governance are now reaping the rewards of years of careful planning, persistent propaganda, and ingenious organization. Far too many Americans have been educated through the schools and through the media who now accept the notion that America is the bad guy in the world, and must now change its ways to join the shrinking world in what will inevitably become a "global neighborhood," under the rule of the United Nations.

There is dwindling opportunity to prevent global governance as envisioned by the United Nations. While the American people still have the power to send their representatives to Congress, they must send representatives who have sufficient backbone to stand up to the globalists in the administration and say in a loud, clear voice: No More! No more rolling-over to ridiculous freedom-eroding regulations; no more power-grabbing Executive Orders; no more self-serving technology swaps to the enemies of America; no more tribute-money through the IMF and the World Bank, and no more funding the UN's take-over of the world. The time is short; the alternative is global governance.

Global Governance is here!

By Henry Lamb

For decades, people have speculated about various conspiracy theories that may or may not be afoot which would eventually lead to world government under the authority of the United Nations. Finally, all the conspiracy theories have been laid to rest. It is now official, the United Nations has announced its intention to achieve world government by the year 2000. The UN, however, calls the object of their determination "Global Governance," instead of world government. The difference is much the same as the difference between date-rape and rape. One begins with seduction; both end in violence.

In 1995, the UN Commission on Global Governance published the result of its three-year study in a publication called *Our Global Neighborhood*. The 410-page report set forth, in frightening detail, what changes needed to be made in public policy and in international law to give the United Nations the power and authority it requires to enforce its vision of world government. Among the changes needed are the creation of an international criminal court; the consolidation of international monetary mechanisms, the creation of a standing army under the control of the UN Secretary-General, and the control of land use and natural resources. Virtually all of these necessary changes are currently underway.

Maurice Strong, a member of the UN Commission on Global Governance, was appointed Executive Coordinator of UN Reform, immediately after Kofi Annan was selected as UN Secretary-General. Strong has been busy restructuring the UN, under the banner of "reform," to reflect the changes his Commission on Global Governance said are necessary. In his first report, Strong said that he was consolidating the far-flung 130 UN organizations into five administrative units under the direct authority of the Secretary-General. One of the more important "reforms" is the consolidation of monetary mechanisms, which has to be done before the UN can impose what is called the "Tobin Tax." This is a proposal by the UN Development Program, to apply a .05% tax to international currency exchange. Such a tax would produce an estimated \$1.5 trillion annual revenue stream to the UN, more than 150 times its current budget. The new administrative unit designed to control all international monetary exchange would also house the UN Development Program and the World Trade Organization. Virtually all trade and international exchange will be under the ultimate control of the UN when this phase of the "reform" is fully implemented.

The UN standing army is equally important to the UN, but less urgent. "Reform" is underway in this arena as well. The recent Chemical Weapons Treaty was an important step. The UN Commission on Disarmament has now stepped up its work to consolidate three separate initiatives into a single effort to control the manufacture, sale, and distribution of all munitions, including hand guns and hunting rifles. The recent intervention by the Secretary-General in the dispute between the U.S. and Iraq demonstrates the UN's intention to become the mediator in international disputes. The UN's role is changing. Originally, the UN was conceived to be a

forum where disputing parties could discuss and debate their differences in a neutral setting. Now, the UN wants to become the authority which dictates how disputes must be resolved -- and have the power to enforce its resolution. The UN has not achieved that power yet, but is clearly working to gain that position. The ultimate objective, set forth decades ago, remains to create a world in which the UN controls the military might. All nations are expected to surrender military capability to the UN, and retain only enough police power to control the domestic populace. Domestic police power too, will be controlled by the UN.

The International Criminal Court, created by the UN in July, 1998 at a special conference in Rome, gives the UN the authority to enforce its laws around the world, whether or not a nation has ratified the document. This new UN entity is the realization of another important change recommended by the UN Commission on Global Governance. Until now, the UN has existed to serve its member nations in hopes of promoting security among the member nations. With the creation of the International Criminal Court, the UN is pledging to provide security for the people, thereby superceding the authority of sovereign nations, to impose the UN's version of "security" regardless of what the sovereign nation may think.

The International Criminal Court was just authorized by the UN and it will take a few years for it to get organized and fully operational. The United States supported the creation of this court until the last day of the conference when the U.S. cast one of only seven votes against it. The U.S. veto power works only in the UN Security Council. In all other UN organizations, including the General Assembly, the US is only one of 185 votes. Most of the rest of the world is eager for the UN to achieve global governance, and is eager to overrule the United States. No where is the desire for the UN to rule the world more visible than in the UN's plans to control land use and natural resources. We'll examine those plans in the next installment.

Global Governance Everywhere!

By Henry Lamb

If you think the little plot of land you own is yours, think again. It is now the published objective of the United Nations to take control of every square inch of land, and every living species. In the report of the UN Commission on Global Governance, *Our Global Neighborhood*, the Commission proposes the restructuring of the UN Trusteeship Council to have "trusteeship" over the global commons. The Commission defines the global commons to be "outer space, the atmosphere, non-territorial seas, and the related environment that supports human life." The Trusteeship Council is to be restructured to include no more than 23 members of "civil society." Civil society is defined to be those NGOs (non-government organizations) that are accredited by the UN. In other words, the Trusteeship Council will be representatives from organizations such as the Sierra Club, the Temple of Understanding, the World Resources Institute, the Worldwide fund for Nature, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature.

That may sound like an unattainable goal, even for the UN. It's not. Maurice Strong has already announced that the UN Trusteeship is being restructured. All UN environmental treaties and organizations are being consolidated into one of five new UN administrative units. There are already more than 300 environmental treaties and executive agreements in place -- and more in the making -- all of which will ultimately come under the authority of the newly restructured UN Trusteeship Council. Two of the most recent treaties are particularly egregious.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, introduced to the world in 1992, seeks to dictate how all land is to be used, eventually returning "at least 50% of the land area to wilderness" and managing "most of the rest of the land area" for conservation objectives. While the U.S. Senate has not ratified this treaty, many of its provisions are being implemented administratively through Executive Orders and Executive Agreements with UN organizations. This desire to control land use is not new with the UN. As early as 1976, the UN published its land use policy in the final report of the UN Conference on Human Settlements (HABITAT I). That document says:

"Land cannot be treated as an ordinary asset, controlled by individuals and subject to the pressures and inefficiencies of the market. Private land ownership is also a principal instrument of accumulation and concentration of wealth and thereby contributes to social injustice.... Public control of land use is therefore indispensable...."

The Convention on Biological Diversity is one of several international laws that set forth the basis on which land use may be controlled by the United Nations. Moreover, the Convention on Biological Diversity endows natural resources with "legal rights" for the purpose of making sure humans may not use natural resources "with impunity." The *Global Biodiversity Assessment* (which is an 1140-page instruction book for implementing the 18-page Convention) says plainly that humans should be required to "justify" any use of natural resources. The justification, of

course, must be made to the United Nations through its growing maze of regulatory enforcement machinery.

Your plot of ground, its trees, flowers, and garden spot, are a part of the "related environment that supports human life" which the UN has determined to be a part of the global commons, subject to the "trusteeship" of the UN Trusteeship Council. The tightening regulatory noose landowners have felt in recent years reflects the willingness of the federal government to implement the provisions of UN treaties and executive agreements with or without Senate approval.

The U.S. Senate has ratified the UN's Framework Convention on Climate Change. Originally, this Convention required 34 developed nations to adopt *voluntary* efforts to reduce carbon dioxide emission to 1990 levels by the year 2000. In 1995, the UN bureaucrats decided that the developed nations would not meet the objective and began working on a Protocol, or "amendment" to make the reductions legally binding, and to set new targets. The Protocol was agreed to in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997. The U.S. agreed to the Protocol which has yet to be considered by the U.S. Senate. The Environmental Protection Agency, and the rest of the federal bureaucracy, is not waiting for Senate ratification. A massive campaign is underway to implement the provisions of the Kyoto Protocol without Senate ratification.

This international law is especially important to the UN. The Kyoto Protocol will essentially give the UN the authority to dictate how much fossil fuel can be used by the 34 developed nations. The Protocol currently requires the United States to reduce its carbon dioxide emission to a point 7% below 1990 levels by 2012. To reach this target, energy use in America will have to be reduced at least 31%, and some estimates range as high as 43% over the next decade. The developing nations, 134 of them, have no such restrictions. China, Korea, Brazil, and the other developing nations are free to use as much fossil fuel as they wish. The 7% target is just the first step. It is the stated goal to increase the target. The UN delegates can increase the target whenever they wish, to whatever levels they wish. For all practical purposes, the Kyoto Protocol gives the UN control over the fossil fuel energy that may be used in America. The Kyoto Protocol also claims control over land use. That's a topic for another day.

Global Governance by Treaty

By Henry Lamb

Article 2 of the Kyoto Protocol was added during the waning hours of the two-week meeting in Kyoto, Japan last December. Article 2(ii) requires "Protection and enhancement of sinks and reservoirs...taking into account relevant international environmental agreements; promotion of sustainable forest management practices...." Article 2(iii) requires "Promotion of sustainable forms of agriculture in light of climate change considerations." Almost no one has paid attention to these two clauses because almost no one knows what "sinks" are, and even fewer know what the UN means by "sustainable agriculture."

Sinks and reservoirs are large areas of vegetation, especially forests, which absorb carbon dioxide. Among the "international environmental agreements" referred to in the Protocol is UNESCO's Biosphere Reserve Program which has already designated more than 300 such biosphere reserves around the world, 47 of which are in the United States. The entire global network of biosphere reserves was offered to the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity by the Chair of the International Biosphere Reserve Council, Mr. Peter Bridgewater, as the starting point for implementation of the Convention.

The United States, however, has not ratified that Convention so the UN has no direct treaty authority over the management of biosphere reserves in the U.S. The Executive Agreement that binds the U. S. to UNESCO is voluntary and unenforceable by the UN. The Convention, on the other hand, is international law, subject to enforcement by the World Trade Organization, and eventually by the International Criminal Court. America's refusal to ratify the Convention of Biological Diversity may have been a major factor in the inclusion of "sinks and reservoirs" in the Climate Change Treaty. Once ratified, the Kyoto Protocol would give the UN direct, enforceable authority over land use, especially that land designated as "sinks and reservoirs."

Sustainable agriculture is a politically correct term that describes primitive, agrarian life styles. More importantly, it describes a system of central planning and central authority. When confronted, federal and state officials deny that sustainable agriculture is anything more than "conservation techniques necessary to protect the environment." Many field officers of these agencies actually believe this line of propaganda because most of them have never even heard of the *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, or *Agenda 21*, which spell out in graphic detail exactly what the UN means when it says "sustainable agriculture."

The ultimate objective of "sustainable agriculture," according the UN-published *Global Biodiversity Assessment*, is to return to farming techniques that require no fossil fuel, no man-made fertilizers, no man-made herbicides or pesticides, and no man-made "alien species" such as hybrid seed, or hybrid livestock. Only plants and animals native to a region are to be cultivated for human use.

These policies are embedded in international treaties. As the UN gains the power to enforce its version of global governance, these policies will be implemented through the existing governments of each nation, province, or state. It is a policy of central planning and central enforcement. For generations, Americans called this form of government socialism, and communism, and worse; now we call it "sustainable agriculture," "sustainable development," and "global governance."

It is, indeed, the objective of the global governance planners, to create a world in which people travel by foot, bicycle, or other non-fossil-fuel-burning vehicle. Working mostly to raise their own food, and other work that is determined to be necessary, within walking distance of eco-efficient dwellings in sustainable communities. Only the elite -- those necessary to the implementation and enforcement of global governance -- are to enjoy rights and privileges that are granted by government to those the government determines to be worthy. Freedom, as it has been known in America, is rapidly becoming too environmentally destructive to be allowed. Even freedom of speech -- that opposes the party line -- is already being branded as "hate" speech, in preparation for the implementation of the UN's idea that the exchange of ideas is an important responsibility that must be subject to law.

The United States has become so entangled with such a maze of UN treaties and executive agreements that it may be too late for extrication. Global Governance cannot become the reality that its proponents envision unless America relinquishes the freedom guaranteed by the U.S. Constitution. That freedom, however, carries with it the awesome responsibility of defending it.

Global Governance by default

By Henry Lamb

The United Nations seeks to control the production, sale, and distribution of all munitions. Through the International Criminal Court, it seeks to control prosecution and enforcement of all international law. The UN seeks to control the flow of international currency exchange and all trade through the World Trade Organization. It seeks to control energy use in America and 33 other developed nations. And it seeks to control land use and the use of natural resources. The plan is no longer a secret; it is published throughout official United Nations literature. The plan is no longer simply a dream in the minds of global socialists; it is now international law in the form of several international treaties and even more "soft-law" policy documents such as *Agenda 21*. Global governance is not an event that will occur on a day certain at some point in the future; it is a process that has been underway for a number of years. It is being imposed, not by military might, but by the default of those who are too busy to learn what is happening.

Americans expect their elected representatives to defend their citizens from attack from abroad. Indeed, were the United Nations, or any other external force, to mount a military take-over, every American citizen, including elected representatives, would jump to the defense of our nation. The attack, however, is not military; it is ideological. It is silent. And it is sinister. Only a handful of Americans even know what the UN is up to. Most Americans don't know, don't want to know, and are ready to believe that any concerns raised must come from "right-wing radicals" as characterized by those who implement the UN's agenda.

The take-over is very close to completion. Most of the essential mechanisms have been adopted, if not yet fully implemented. There is still time, however, to foil the plans of the global governance advocates. The United States still supplies the UN with as much as one-third of its money. Congress can stop the life-line to the UN any time it chooses to do so. Congress will not stop the money as long as it thinks the American people support the UN agenda. So far, the vast majority of Americans think the UN is an important institution which should be supported. The last vote in the House of Representatives to withdraw from the UN garnered only 54 affirmative votes from 435 Congressmen. Congress cannot be expected to take such a dramatic action without strong support from their electors. So far, the electors have been asleep.

Good arguments are raised on both sides of the question of whether or not the U.S. should withdraw from the UN. There should be no argument, however, on the question that the U.S. should never relinquish sovereignty to the UN. American sovereignty is being relinquished to the UN incrementally through the implementation of every UN treaty. Jessica Mathews, a former aide to Vice President Gore and an appointee to the State Department, said that the Kyoto Protocol is a "deeper penetration into national sovereignty" than any previous agreement. The American people should insist that not one more cent be spent on UN programs until those programs which threaten national sovereignty can be dismantled.

There is no scientific basis to justify the need for the Kyoto Protocol; it should be utterly rejected. There is no scientific basis to justify the Convention on Biological Diversity; it, too, should be utterly rejected. There is no political justification for the International Criminal Court; it must be rejected. There is no reason under God's blue sky to give the UN Trusteeship Council authority over the global commons, and especially the "related environment that supports" [American] human life." The United Nations must never be allowed to impose its own tax on anything. When that happens, it will become a self-sustaining government with virtually no checks and balances, answerable to no one, and free to impose its own brand of socialism on the entire world.

America is the only nation on earth strong enough to stop this march toward world government, known by the politically-correct term as "global governance. The current administration is among the globalists' most powerful advocates. Congress, so far, seems powerless to stop either the administration or the UN from implementing the global agenda. Only the American people can infuse sufficient Congressional back-bone to stand up to both the administration and the UN. If the American people stay submerged in their daily grind, too busy to look up and see the attack, the UN will succeed in ruling the world.

On the other hand, it only takes a handful of dedicated people to generate that critical mass required to prop up Congressional authority. It was a laughable minority of dedicated individuals that created the U.S. Constitution and the world power that it allowed. Once again, a small group of individuals can alter the course of history. A handful of dedicated people who are first, informed, then enraged, and then become active, can convince or elect a sufficient number of Congressmen to defend our great nation from the strangle-hold now being perpetrated upon the world. There is something you can do to help that is not now being done. Find it; and do it!

Behind the United Nations: the IUCN

By Henry Lamb

The “United Nations” is a maze of more than 130 international organizations that are being consolidated into a monolithic agency for the administration of global governance. Maurice Strong, Executive Coordinator for UN Reform, is the architect, and one of a handful of individuals who have advanced the concept of global governance to the threshold of reality. The United Nations, however, with its sprawling array of international organizations, is only the instrumentality through which philosophy is translated into international policy and international law. The UN is a tool used by a relatively small group of individuals to impose their values and behavior patterns on the entire world. The driving force behind the UN agenda is largely ignored, but widely supported by individuals, governments, and foundations that either do not see the connection, or don’t care.

The philosophical force that shapes and drives the UN agenda resides in three incestuously related NGOs (non-government organizations). The most important of which is the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), also known as the World Conservation Union, located in Gland, Switzerland. Its founder is the same Julian Huxley who founded UNESCO, and who was the vice president of Europe’s Eugenics Society.

To understand the role the IUCN plays in the shaping of UN policy, it is helpful to realize that both UNESCO and the IUCN were created expressly to advance the concept of global governance, an idea that can be traced directly to Cecil Rhodes, Woodrow Wilson, Edward Mandell House, and the League of Nations. When the League of Nations failed to win ratification by the U.S. Senate, its fate was sealed, and its proponents developed a new strategy.

Realizing that America was not yet ready to accept world government, the same handful of people who had created the League of Nations, created a network of new “educational” organizations to prepare the world for the next effort. In America, the organization was called the Council on Foreign Relations. In Europe, it was called the Royal Institute for International Affairs (RIIA). Similar Institutes were created in Asia, and elsewhere. Huxley was involved in the formation of the RIIA.

UNESCO (United Nations Education, Science, and Cultural Organization) swallowed up and expanded the Paris-based Institute for Intellectual Cooperation, a hold-over organization of the League of Nations. UNESCO’s purpose is set forth in its charter: “Since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defenses of peace must be constructed.” In other words, UNESCO’s purpose was to “educate” the world to accept a peaceful world — as envisioned by that handful of individuals who conceived the League of Nations, and its successor, the United Nations.

Huxley, as UNESCO’s first Director-General, quickly realized that he had to have a constituency to support the policies being promoted through UNESCO. Three years after

UNESCO was created, Huxley, and his friend from the Royal Institute of International Affairs, Max Nicholson, created the IUCN. The new organization took its leadership from the 50-year old British Fauna and Flora Preservation Society. The IUCN was organized into six commissions, each of which had responsibility for research, and policy development within their particular sphere. This basic organizational structure remains in place today. Its membership, however, is unique. IUCN membership consists of other NGOs, approximately 700, government agencies, including the U.S. State Department, and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and at least 68 sovereign nations. Its budget exceeds \$53 million per year, to which the U.S. State Department has contributed \$1.2 million every year, at least since the early 1990s. The IUCN enjoys diplomatic immunity by virtue of Executive Order 12986 issued by President Clinton, a status reserved normally for sovereign nations. Among other benefits provided by the immunity, is freedom from law suits in America. The IUCN has “consultative status” with every major UN organization, and is the official consultant on all World Heritage Sites and all UNESCO Biosphere Reserves.

Jay Hair resigned his \$230,000 per year post as head of the National Wildlife Federation to become President of the IUCN. He replaced Shridath Ramphal, who moved directly from his position at the IUCN to become co-chair, along with Ingvar Carlsson of the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance.

In the late 1950s, the IUCN realized that it needed more money than it was receiving. Its work was behind the scenes, and its revenue came only from enlightened agencies and foundations. A bold new initiative was undertaken: a new organization with a public face, one which could capture the imagination — and the pocketbooks — of the public. In 1961, the IUCN created the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), and recruited Prince Phillip to be its titular head. To this day, the world headquarters of the IUCN and the WWF occupy the same building in Gland, Switzerland.

Behind the United Nations: the WWF

By Henry Lamb

The World Wildlife Fund, recently renamed the World Wide Fund for Nature, retained its WWF acronym. It is a major force that shapes and drives the policies of the United Nations. It was created in 1961 by Julian Huxley, Max Nicholson, then Director of Britain's Nature Conservancy, and Sir Peter Scott, then President of the IUCN, primarily as a public source of funding for the work of the IUCN. It has now taken on its own distinctive role in the march toward global governance. The WWF now claims 4.7 million members in 100 countries. Since 1985, it has spent \$1.165 billion on 11,000 projects in 130 countries. The WWF serves as both an advisor to, and a contractor of, various United Nations organizations, particularly the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP).

In 1975, the WWF, the IUCN and UNEP set up the World Conservation Monitoring Center in Cambridge, UK. The same three organizations collaborated on, and jointly published the *World Conservation Strategy*, in 1980. It is from this document that the IUCN drew its 1981 proposal for a UN Convention on Biological Diversity. The same three organizations produced *Caring for the Earth*, in 1991, which laid the foundation for much of the agenda at the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro. These three organizations are inseparable.

The WWF is responsible for implementing UN policy through its various "projects" scattered around the world, funded not only by private foundations, but by government and UN grants as well. The WWF also is responsible for the development of various strategic initiatives.

Thomas E. Lovejoy III, Vice President for Science at the WWF is credited with conceiving and executing what has become known as "debt-for-nature" deals throughout the developing world. The arrangement allows wealthy environmental organizations, such as the WWF and others, to purchase "bad" debts from developing nations for as little as 15-cents on the dollar. The purchased notes are then given to sister organizations in the debtor nation to be redeemed at face value in either cash or land. Millions of acres of land and natural resources have been acquired by environmental organizations using this "debt-for-nature" technique.

More recently, the WWF has decided to rid the world of chlorine. WWF zoologist, Dr. Theo Colborn, appeared with Jessica Landman of the Natural Resources Defense Council, and Greenpeace activist Mark Flögel at a May 8, 1994 press conference in Washington, to promote then-Congressman Bill Richardson's "Chlorine Zero Discharge Act (HR2898). Colborn conducted a series of seminars to spread WWF's condemnation of chlorine. The most dramatic indictment of the chemical came from observations made by Louis M. Guillette, a University of Florida scientist, whose studies of chlorine-rich Lake Apopka revealed that alligator penises were one-third to one-half normal size. Guillette told a Congressional committee that "there is not a man here who is half the man his grandfather was."

Richardson's bills were not enacted, but that has not slowed WWF or Greenpeace in their efforts to ban chlorine. Nike has recently announced that it will no longer use vinyl in its products because vinyl is made from chlorine chemicals. Most of the world's scientists have debunked the chlorine scare. WWF and Greenpeace ignore the benefits of chlorine, including the fact that 98 percent of all municipal water supplies use chlorine as an inexpensive, effective disinfectant.

The WWF is one of the better financed NGOs. The International organization lists its 1997 income at more than \$60 million. On its most recent tax return, WWF-USA reported income of \$156,288,512, and a report for its *Fondo Mexicano*, with income of \$24,051,204. During one 18-month reporting period in 1993-94, the WWF received four grants from the Department of Interior totaling \$260,407. The first quarterly report of the UN's Global Environment Facility listed the WWF as "Collaborating Agency" on grant projects totaling \$184.92 million in 16 countries. The WWF is, indeed, well-funded — to a large extent, with tax dollars.

By the 1980s, the IUCN and the WWF leadership decided that still another NGO was needed, one which could produce the "scientific" documentation needed to justify the social policies reflected in their global agenda. Russell E. Train, then-President of the WWF-USA (formerly, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency), was instrumental in securing more than \$25 million in grants from the MacArthur Foundation, the Andrew K. Mellon Foundation, and the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, to launch the new NGO called the World Resources Institute (WRI). James Gustave Speth was chosen to head the new organization. WWF's Russell E. Train served on the board of directors.

Col 275 (November, 1998)

Behind the United Nations: the WRI

By Henry Lamb

James Gustave Speth proved to be an excellent choice to lead the new World Resources Institute (WRI), in 1982. A Rhodes Scholar, Yale graduate, Georgetown University law professor, co-founder of the Natural Resources Defense Council, and former chairman of the U.S. Council on Environmental Quality, Speth brought a proven track record to the job. Almost immediately, the influence of the WRI was felt throughout the international policy development community.

One of the tasks undertaken by the WRI was the coordination of NGO activity. A publication called the *NGO Networker* identified the various NGOs that were responsible for specific tasks. The publication provided updates and reports on the success of each NGO and listed the upcoming projects each would undertake.

The WRI is listed, along with the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP) as publishers of *Global Biodiversity Strategy*. The WRI is also listed as “Collaborating Agency” on the report of the UN’s Global Environment Facility to administer several projects worth millions of dollars. One of those projects is \$3.3 million for the coordination of the *Global Biodiversity Assessment* (GBA), an 1140-page instruction book for the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The entire project was coordinated by Robert Watson, who worked for the Clinton White House until accepting his current position as head of the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). The person Watson succeeded, Dr. Bert Bolin, now sits on the WRI board of directors, along with the board’s chairman, Maurice Strong. Kenton Miller, an employee of WRI, coordinated Section 13 of the GBA. It is Section 13 that sets forth the specific land use management practices that are considered to be sustainable, and identifies the *Wildlands Project* as central to the land management policies that each nation should follow.

It is impossible to understate the influence the WRI has on both international and domestic policy. Jonathan Lash, WRI’s current president, co-chairs the President’s Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD). David T. Buzzelli, of Dow Chemical Company, also is a member of the PCSD and is on the board of directors of WRI. James Gustave Speth served as WRI’s president from 1982 until the Clinton/Gore election in 1992. He then served a brief stint on the Clinton/Gore transition team, and then took a position as Director of the United Nations Development Program. He recently announced that he would accept a position at Yale University as Dean of the Department of Agriculture. Rafe Pomerance, Speth’s chief policy analyst at WRI, was tapped by Clinton to become Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for Environment, Health and Natural Resources.

Jessica Tuchman Mathews served as WRI’s president for a while before becoming an advisor to Al Gore. She served as Deputy Undersecretary of State for Global Affairs in the Clinton White House, is a regular contributor to the Council on Foreign Relations’ publication *Foreign Affairs*, is now on the staff at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, and was recently

appointed to serve on the UN's Commission on Water for the 21st Century. Al Gore heaped praise on Mathews in the credits to his 1992 book, *Earth in the Balance*.

The World Resources Institute, the World Wildlife Fund, and the International Union for the Conservation of Nature are so completely integrated into various United Nations organizations that for all practical purposes, they might as well be one and the same. Each organization, however, has its own funding connections and its own specific niche to fill in the implementation of the integrated agenda. While almost everyone recognizes the WWF panda, and views the NGO as a prestigious environmental organization dedicated to saving wildlife, almost no one recognizes the connection between the WWF and the IUCN, WRI, and the United Nations. Few people have ever heard of the WRI, and even fewer have heard of the IUCN. The relatively small handful of people who lead these NGOs are directly responsible for developing the agenda that is presented to the world through UN treaties and policy documents. These same

NGOs, through their affiliated national, state, and local chapters, are responsible for generating public pressure to accept the policies dictated by the international community, translated into regulations and laws at the national level, and implemented at the local level upon unsuspecting citizens

Behind the United Nations: NGOs

By Henry Lamb

One needs only to attend a meeting of the United Nations to see the tremendous influence exerted on the delegates by the NGOs. Hundreds of organizations send thousands of individuals to swarm around the delegates in the conference halls, their hotels, and even at restaurants. Delegates are literally under siege from the moment they arrive until the final gavel of the meeting. NGO activity is not hap-hazard; it is well planned, well coordinated, and well executed.

At meetings of the Conference of the Parties (COP) to the Convention on Climate Change, the Climate Action Network (CAN) is in charge of the NGO agenda. This is a coalition of NGOs that sends their climate change specialists to monitor the meetings and lobby the delegates. They publish a newsletter for the delegates in which they lambaste proposals they consider to be too lenient, and castigate proposals and individuals that differ from their agenda. They frequently have a staff of 17 people to produce their two-to-four page newsletter. Their efforts are funded by foundations and often by grants from sovereign nations.

Similar activity surrounds meetings of the COP of the Convention on Biological Diversity, except that coalition of NGOs is called BIONET. Many of the same organizations participate in both coalitions. Organizations such as the IUCN, WWF, and the WRI have such large staffs that they have individuals who specialize in each area of UN activity.

At the meeting of the International Criminal Court in Rome recently, a completely new coalition of NGOs assembled to lobby the delegates, publish a newsletter, and continue the pressure to advance the agenda developed by the three primary NGOs that drive the United Nations. All the NGO activity is conducted with the blessings of the UN. Most of the NGOs that attend these meetings are accredited by ECOSOC (the UN's Economic and Social Council). Some NGOs that attend do so by virtue of their affiliation with accredited NGOs. NGOs that are not willing to declare allegiance to the aims of the UN are not accredited by ECOSOC. Moreover, accredited NGOs must demonstrate at least two years of activity that supports the aims of the UN before they will be accredited.

In Kyoto, at COP III, three-fourths of the 10,000 people in attendance were NGO observers. In Rio de Janeiro, at Earth Summit II, credible estimates said that nearly 30,000 of the 40,000 people present were NGO observers. NGOs drive the UN agenda, and then agitate in local communities for the implementation of the agenda. Where does all the money come from?

The environmental NGO business has become one of the most lucrative enterprises in the world. Not only do wealthy foundations pour endless dollars into the NGO machine, but governments (including the U.S. government), and the United Nations funnel, untold millions of tax dollars into NGOs as well. The Nature Conservancy reported annual income and assets in excess of \$1

billion, more than many developing nations. Dozens of NGOs have annual income that exceeds \$100 million. Industry, too, pours millions of dollars into these NGOs.

In fairness, most of the people who support their local environmental organization, even the leadership of local branches of environmental organizations, have no idea where their marching orders come from. What started as a grassroots movement to reduce pollution 30 years ago, has been hijacked by sophisticated professionals at the highest levels who now use the environmental movement to advance a social agenda that had its origins in the imagination of Cecil Rhodes, and Alfred Milner in the last century. The same group of people who carried on the Rhodes dream through the League of Nations, the creation of the Council on Foreign Relations, and the United Nations are now calling the shots at the Foundations that fund NGOs, and at the NGOs that develop UN policy, and in the UN organizations and the agencies of federal government that have the power to implement that dream.

Never has there been such an effective “shadow government” formulating policy for official government agencies, with a world-wide constituency of NGOs to advocate implementation. Government in the U.S. and in many foreign countries is rapidly becoming administrative units for the United Nations. And the United Nations already is the instrument of world government through which the agenda of a handful of “enlightened elite” translate their philosophy into international law to be administered through the obedient units of national government. Such is the essence of global governance.

Will Kyoto solve the problem?

By Henry Lamb

Suppose that human use of fossil fuels really is causing global warming. Mind now, "there is no convincing scientific evidence," to support that supposition, according to 18,000 American scientists, but suppose the global warming hypothesis were true. Is the Kyoto Protocol the best solution to the alleged problem?

First, global warming in the range projected by the computer models, 1 to 2.5 degrees C over the next century, may not be a problem at all. Should the temperature reach the maximum projection by 2100, the planet will have returned to the temperature that prevailed during the period referred to by scientists as the Medieval Climate Optimum (1000 - 1400 A.D.).

A rather complete historic record of the period reveals no unusual, or increased "catastrophic" weather events such as those predicted as inevitable in current global warming scenarios. History does record, however, that Greenland was warm enough to attract settlers who developed colonies. Life was considerably more livable during the Medieval Climate Optimum than it was during the "Little Ice Age" that plunged temperatures about two degrees lower than current readings during the 17th century.

But what if it were true, that weather catastrophes -- floods, hurricanes, fires -- will intensify and spread havoc around the world such as that recently experienced in Central America, would the Kyoto Protocol prevent it? Not likely.

The Kyoto protocol is not designed to reduce global emissions; it is designed to change the address of the source. The Kyoto Protocol requires only 38 of the largest emitting nations to reduce emissions, while providing resources and technology to 137 developing nations expressly for the purpose of increasing their emissions. Bert Bolin, former President of the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has admitted that were the Protocol fully implemented, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would be reduced by no more than 1 ppm. -- from about 360 ppm to 359 ppm. Why bother?

On the other hand, there is strong, convincing evidence that the increasing carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is being absorbed, and utilized by vegetation. Dr. Keith Idso, at the Center for the Study of Carbon Dioxide and Climate Change, has reviewed every major, peer-reviewed study of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere published in the last ten years, and determined that only 2% of the world's plants suffer a negative impact from increased carbon dioxide. Some 5% show no effect, but a whopping 93% show a positive benefit from increased carbon. Agricultural productivity rises up to 35% for some crops, while leaf and trunk growth in trees shows a similar increase in productivity. Carbon dioxide is the natural fertilizer which stimulates plant growth. Efforts to reduce carbon dioxide in the atmosphere could result in an environmental catastrophe of global proportions.

The tragedies that occurred in Central America had nothing to do with the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. The tragedies were the result of poverty. Had those families who lost their homes and loved-ones, lived in a community that had storm sewers, flood control structures, homes constructed with modern materials and techniques, far less devastation would be measured. Does it not make more sense to focus the world's attention on solving the problems of poverty than to invest billions of dollars to reduce carbon dioxide by 1 ppm?

It's poverty, not the climate

By Henry Lamb

Why are some nations still so poor that they cannot build storm sewers, flood-control structures, and safe homes to protect their citizens? This question has generated a library of answers during the global warming negotiations over the years. Most of the answers blame America and other developed nations for a wide variety of perceived injustices inflicted upon the poor. To solve the problem, the United Nations community has developed a global agenda to equalize the world's wealth, and manage the affairs of nations and individuals to ensure that all people enjoy equitable, sustainable lives.

The global agenda (*Agenda 21*) rests upon the belief that governance consists of an omniscient authority responsible for the security and happiness of all people. To meet that responsibility, government authority must restrict and direct the behavior of some people in order to ensure that none of the people fall below a global standard of life quality. The belief system anticipates a continually rising tide of life quality on which all boats will be lifted. It differs from traditional socialism and communism only at the margins, in the techniques used to implement and enforce the belief system.

To be sure, some people would experience an improvement in life quality under such a system. The poorest nations would surely get safer homes and improved urban infrastructure. Any health care at all would be an improvement where there is none. Promises by the UN community to provide these basic "human rights" are compelling incentives to people who daily face the pain of grinding poverty.

Is it not just; is it not morally responsible for America to help the UN community to create this new system of governance so the poverty-bound people of the world might have better homes and infrastructure?

No, it is not just; it is unjust. Helping the UN community repeat on a global scale, a known and proven social tragedy would be both immoral and irresponsible.

America has a responsibility to the world. America has been blessed as no other nation in the history of the world. Its blessings come, not from limiting carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, nor from the UN community. America's blessings are the result of reasoned response to unacceptable circumstances. America's responsibility to the world is not simply to share its wealth with the poor, but to share the discoveries that empower people to create their own wealth, and earn their own blessings.

The most important discovery is that government should be empowered by the consent of the governed. Government power should be exercised only by officials elected by the governed.

Government power should be limited to those public policies enacted by elected officials, and people should be free to exercise their own ingenuity to solve their own problems and meet their own needs. And yes, to accumulate as much wealth as their efforts earn.

The law of supply and demand cannot be repealed. It can, however, be distorted, and its benefits delayed. A free market will produce inequities, which are self-correcting. A managed market will produce inequities, which are self-compounding. The global agenda anticipates managing all markets to one degree or another. By managing the use of fossil fuel energy, an essential ingredient of prosperity, the UN community expects to limit the prosperity of developed countries in the mistaken belief that the developing countries will automatically benefit. When government is empowered, by whatever authority, to take from one group to give to another group, both groups are damaged. Those from whom wealth is taken are penalized for their effort and ingenuity, thereby removing incentives for becoming more productive. Those to whom wealth is given are rewarded for their lack of ingenuity and effort, thereby providing incentive to remain non-productive.

It may well be compassion that drives the UN community to manipulate policies that promise to redistribute the wealth of developed nations to the homeless victims of natural disaster. It is a policy, nonetheless, that will condemn developing nations to generations of poverty, just as similar notions condemned generations of Americans to the poverty of welfare.

Is nature really in trouble?

By Henry Lamb

America is being victimized by the false notion that nature needs protection from greedy humans. A steady stream of propaganda in our schools, through television, and from government agencies dominated by former environmental organization executives, is convincing ordinary people that nature is in trouble and can be saved only by government regulations that prevent people from doing what they want to do. In the last 30 years, the government has moved from the position that private property is a sacred Constitutional concept, to a position that sees all land and natural resources as a "public" property to be managed and regulated by the government.

Originally, the Louisiana Purchase provided land that the government gave to private citizens who would settle there. Over time, Jefferson's idea that the government acquired the land only to transfer to private citizens was transformed to the idea that the land belonged to all citizens which the government should manage for multiple-use. In recent years, even the multiple-use principle has been transformed to the notion that the land must be managed by the government for "conservation objectives." So strong is that notion, that not only federal lands, but now, private property must be managed for conservation objectives as well.

Since America's wetlands policy was shaped in the 1970s and 1980s, based on an international treaty signed in Ramsar, Iran in 1971, the government's role in regulating private property has expanded tremendously. The Endangered Species Act, based on another international treaty, gives the government authority to regulate land use on private property that an endangered or threatened species may wish to use. The Scenic By-ways program, the Scenic Rivers and Streams Act, the American Heritage Rivers Initiative, the Watershed Initiative, and a series of American Heritage Sites Acts, all give the federal government authority to regulate the use of private property.

Moreover, both the federal government and various state governments are on a spending spree to purchase private property. Three different bills were introduced into the 105th Congress to provide up to \$1 billion annually to purchase "sensitive" private property, or development rights. Florida, by law, has spent \$300 million per year on similar purchases, and has recently amended its Constitution to provide an annual amount for the continued purchase of private property. Clearly, there is a major effort underway to transform America from a nation of private property owners, to a nation where the land is either owned or controlled by the government.

This trend flies in the face of free people and free markets. Without land, and the freedom to use its resources, all other freedoms ring hollow. When land is owned, or its use controlled by the government, private citizens are subject to activities prescribed by the government. Convinced that it is necessary to protect nature, and heavily influenced by a ton of tax-payer cash, land owners appear willing to sell their land to the government, or to a conservancy organization, to

"preserve" the natural habitat for the future. These transactions may, indeed, preserve bugs and beetles for future generations, but they deny future generations the freedom to prosper as have previous generations, and they forever condemn future generations to management by the government.

Every acre of land that is preserved, either by regulation, or sale to the government, is another breath denied to the very soul of freedom. Every policy adopted to promote sustainable development ensures that freedom will not be sustained for future generations. The more government is given authority to govern the activity of private citizens, the less responsible are private citizens for their own welfare. We have turned a very important corner in America, and are now headed directly toward a society in which government is no longer empowered by the consent of the governed, but by the awesome control of all resources. The road America is now traveling leads to the same destination from which our forefathers fled: tyranny, oppression, and poverty for all but the elite who happen to be in control. Whether the central authority is a king, a dictator, a politbureau, or a federal administration, the result is the same: individual freedom is denied, and central power is multiplied.

Science or advocacy?

By Henry Lamb

It takes very little thought to realize that nature needs no protection that humans may offer. The opposite is true: humans need protection from nature. The very best that humans have been able to accomplish, in terms of protection from nature, crumbles under the incalculable power of a volcanic eruption, an earthquake, a hurricane, a flood, a drought, a freeze, or virtually anything else nature decides to deliver. The very idea that global climate can be controlled by an international treaty that limits carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, is arrogance of the first order. The first order of business for the human species should be an ongoing effort to understand nature, and then to promote technology to protect humans from nature's indiscriminate torture.

Science is an effort to understand nature. Science is the process by which human understanding is validated -- or not. The scientific method consists of stating a hypothesis, testing the hypothesis by observation, and drawing conclusions based on the test results. Casual observations justified the pre-Copernican hypothesis that the sun revolved around the earth. Continual testing of the hypothesis eventually proved the hypothesis wrong, and in fact, just the opposite was proved to be true. Science cares not what the truth is, only that the truth be discovered. Advocacy-science, however, has a different objective: discover and publish only the evidence that supports the hypothesis.

A handful of advocacy-scientists hypothesized that continuing elevations of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would result in global warming. They constructed elaborate computer models to forecast how much the global temperature would rise as the concentration of carbon dioxide increased. As these scientists continue to test their hypotheses, their projections are consistently revised downward. Dr. James Hansen, the NASA scientist who developed one of the earliest computer models, has now renounced the entire notion that computer models are an adequate test of global warming or climate change hypotheses. Among scientists, the global warming hypothesis is being destroyed as was the pre-Copernican hypothesis about the sun.

The scientific truth about global warming is being met by governing authorities as the Copernican hypothesis was met by the governing authorities of his day, with scorn, and rejection. Copernicus was imprisoned for publishing scientific truth which differed from the policy of governing authorities. Nearly 4,000 scientists spoke out in general terms about the difference between global warming science and global warming policy in a document known as the Heidleberg Appeal. More than 100 climatologists spoke out directly about the difference between the science and the policy in what is called the Leipzig Declaration. Now, more than 18,000 American scientists have signed a petition saying flatly that "no scientific evidence exists" to support the global warming policy. Still, the governing authorities ignore, and reject the scientific truth and continue to pursue policies based on hypotheses that are continually discredited by further scientific investigation.

This head-in-the-sand approach by governing authorities is doing nothing to help the people of the world protect themselves from the ravages of nature. It is increasingly clear that the entire global warming initiative is nothing more than an excuse to create a global central power to control the flow of energy (fossil fuel). It is the expressed wish, and published plan of the global authority to force prosperous nations to reduce their energy use, while at the same time, forcing prosperous nations to transfer their technology and know-how to developing nations that remain free to use fossil fuel without limitation.

Developing nations need technology and wealth in order to provide adequate defenses against the extremes of nature. They do not need to be enslaved or subjugated to a global governing authority in the process. They need to learn, as America learned, that the best way to solve all problems is to let people solve their own problems with their own ingenuity and effort.

In many developing nations, government's first concern is staying in power; the needs of the people are much further down the priority list. In many developing nations, the land and all the resources are owned, or controlled by the government. The people have neither the resources, nor the lawful ability to exercise their ingenuity. Their effort is demanded, and directed by the government.

Developing nations can prosper only if central, dictatorial governance is replaced by a system of government which is empowered by the consent of the governed. People must be free to use the resources provided by nature, and the ingenuity provided by nature, and the effort provided by their own determination to construct protection against nature's extremes and to create wealth and prosperity of their own. Wealth cannot be given; it can only be taken away. When it is taken from one and given to another, what the recipient gets is welfare. Wealth and prosperity must be created. Nature has provided people with the instinct to create wealth and prosperity; it is central-command-and-control governance that thwarts that instinct by attempting to regulate activity that nature, ultimately, will not allow to be regulated.