

Henry Lamb Columns in 2000

Contents

Is there a double standard for eco-terrorists?.....	2
Repeal Antiquities Act!.....	4
Helms warns U.N. Security Council.....	6
Gloria doesn't get it: the tug-of-war for land	9
Get ready for global governance.....	13
America: a 'fascilist' country	16
Where's the outrage for Glenda?	18
Sovereignty no match for WTO.....	20
Greens arrested for arson.....	22
Helms acts to block U.N. court.....	24
What Bill should tell the U.N.	26
Why America is burning	29
Energy: A deepening dilemma	32
Coincidence or collusion?	36
Kyoto freezing in The Hague	40
What the world really needs... ..	42
Global governance erupts at The Hague	44
Shades of Kyoto at The Hague	46
Climate talks end in colossal collapse.....	48
Clinton on eco rampage.....	51
New U.N. treaty ratified quietly	53
Finally, finality.....	55
A new era of U.N.-U.S. relations?	57

Is there a double standard for eco-terrorists?

By Henry Lamb

Eco-terrorists are known to have launched at least 33 major acts of terrorism, with damage estimated to be in excess of \$28 million, in the last four years. Instead of launching a national offensive against these known terrorists, the FBI chose to denigrate Christians and opponents of global governance, in its infamous "Project Megiddo" report. Instead of profiling law-abiding citizens to label as "potential" terrorists, perhaps the FBI would better serve the country by profiling the idiots who get their kicks by blowing up other people's property.

The Earth Liberation Front proudly claimed responsibility for burning Boise Cascade's regional headquarters in Monmouth, Ore., on Christmas day. Their press release announced: "Early Christmas morning, elves left coal in Boise Cascade's stocking. Four buckets of diesel gas with kitchen timer delay destroyed their regional headquarters."

It's been more than a year since ELF claimed responsibility for destroying part of the Vail, Colo., ski resort, causing \$12 million in damage. No arrests!

The Animal Liberation Front has left a long trail of break-ins and destruction at animal testing labs across the country. Letters containing razor blades were sent to 83 scientists involved in animal research. Edward Walsh of the Boys Town National Research Hospital in Omaha, received a fax that said: "I'm coming to Omaha to see the three of you (wife & 5-year old son) very soon. We'll have so much fun together. I'm glad you like experiments. I have a few of my own to perform. And I hope that you die and your death will come soon."

Where is the FBI?

David Tubbs is a former national chief of counterterrorism for the FBI. He says, "Attempting to open a case against ALF is like trying to grab Jell-O."

What about profiling? The FBI was not at all reluctant to issue a report identifying the characteristics of so-called "potential" terrorists who believe in Christianity or national sovereignty. Why is there not a similar report identifying the characteristics of potential eco-terrorists?

Those characteristics are widely known. Begin with Edward Abbey's novel, "The Monkeywrench Gang," made more famous by Earth First! founder Dave Foreman's "Ecodefense: A Field Guide to Monkeywrenching." Dave Foreman, and colleague Reed F. Noss are the fathers of the prized "Wildlands Project," which Bill Clinton is implementing by presidential decree in his 40-million acre land lock-up. The FBI could hardly identify someone like that as a potential

terrorist, now could they? Reed Noss was employed by Clinton's Department of Interior. It could be quite embarrassing to identify the characteristics of potential eco-terrorists.

What are the characteristics of an eco-terrorist? We don't have to look too far. The Unabomber is a classic example. Is it reasonable to consider his philosophy, as expressed in his widely publicized "Manifesto," and compare his philosophy to statements made by others. Should others who share the Unabomber's philosophy be labeled as potential terrorists, as the FBI has labeled Christians and patriots?

If the same tactics employed by the FBI against Christians and advocates of national sovereignty are applied to potential eco-terrorists, then most of the Clinton administration would turn up on the list. Al Gore would probably be at the top of the list. Even a casual read of Gore's "Earth in the Balance" and the Unabomber's "Manifesto" reveal striking similarities of thought.

In his book, *Ecoterror: The Violent Agenda to Save Nature*, author Ron Arnold carefully compares Gore's statements with statements made by the Unabomber (pp. 57-59). The statements come from two people of the same mind.

No one wants to believe that eco-terrorism is rampant and on the rise because the Clinton/Gore administration is in agreement with their goals. But it is hard to justify how the FBI and the ATF can get so hot and bothered about the "potential" acts of the guy in Ruby Ridge, or the poor folks at Waco, while apparently ignoring the very real deeds of eco-terrorists.

Somehow, it just doesn't wash to hear the FBI excuse its ineffectiveness by saying the ALF is like Jell-O. FBI chief, Louis Freeh, told a Senate Committee last February that "the most recognizable single-issue terrorists at the present time are those involved in the violent animal-rights ... and environmental protection movements."

Why, then, did the FBI's November Megiddo report target Christians instead of eco-extremists who fit the eco-terrorist profile?

Every time there is a shooting somewhere, the president and most of Congress race to a television camera to call for stricter gun-control legislation. There was no press conference calling for stricter control of eco-terrorists after the Boise Cascade office was torched, or after any of the other acts of terror committed by those who share the Unabomber's worldview.

The only conclusion that can be reached is that there is, indeed, a double standard for eco-terrorists.

Repeal Antiquities Act!

By Henry Lamb

If there is any backbone at all in Congress, there should be a rush to repeal the Antiquities Act. President Clinton continues to use it to thumb his nose at Congress, and ignore the Constitution. Our founders had a reason for specifying that Congress -- not the president -- manage federal lands. That reason is to ensure that the consent of the governed empowers land management decisions.

The consent of the governed is of little concern to the president, and of even less concern to Bruce Babbitt, secretary of the Department of Interior. Clinton is concerned about his "legacy," and about appeasing the enviros who are deserting the Gore candidacy. Babbitt is concerned about making all the enviro-hay he can while the he still holds the power of his office.

Two questions arise that must be addressed: Should the land identified in the president's new "monument" designations be set aside as wilderness? If so, should the set-aside be accomplished by presidential decree?

Setting land aside as "federal" land goes to the very heart of what America is all about. Are we a land of the free, or are we a land where people must get permission from their government to tread on the land? Until 1964, the federal government was content to designate National Parks as places where citizens could go enjoy the great outdoors. The Wilderness Society, after a 30-year campaign to nationalize all forests, finally succeeded in getting Congress to pass The Wilderness Act of 1964, which set aside 9 million acres as wilderness.

At the time, Hubert Humphrey said that the designation was to show posterity what their forefathers had to conquer to create the nation. Since 1964, more than 100-million acres have been designated as wilderness. Clinton's "Land Legacy" initiative proposes to set aside at least 40 million more acres as wilderness by closing existing roads on federal lands. With the stroke of a pen, he set aside 1.8 million acres in Utah and is now setting aside more than a million acres in Arizona and California.

Don't be fooled by the goody-two-shoes claim that he is "protecting" the land for future generations. He is locking up the land to ensure that future generations can have no benefit from it. Wilderness designation not only prevents logging and mining; it prevents family outings, hunting, and even walking freely through the so-called "public" land.

To even look at the "public" land, people (the owners) must first get permission from the government. If permission is granted, the procedure for looking at the land is stipulated by the government, and enforced by gun-toting Babbitt-operatives. To see the Grand Canyon, the owners will have to see it the way Bruce and Bill think you ought to see it: park miles away and

ride their enviro-friendly rail car on a guided tour. Woe be unto an owner who accidentally drops a chewing-gum wrapper. Most of the locked-up land will simply no longer be available to the owners.

Land, and the resources it contains, is the prosperity future generations will require. Land lock-ups deny future generations their birthright, and force all of us into further submission to the will of self-appointed protectors of the planet.

If land is to be taken out of productive use, it should be for good reason, agreed to by the elected representatives of the people. Both the practice and the procedure of this administration is an abomination to freedom-loving Americans. Land, and its resources, are the property of individual citizens, and should not be taken by the government by decree. The land owned by government is owned for the benefit of all the people, not just for the benefit of owls, bears, and wolves. Neither Bruce nor Bill has the right to deny us, or future generations, the benefit of our land. They have the power, however.

Congress needs to remove that power. Clinton ordered the Department of Agriculture to promulgate rules for closing forest roads in order to effectively deny the owners access to their property. Congress must not allow appointed bureaucrats, even at the direction of the president, to usurp their Constitutional responsibility to manage federal lands.

Congress needs to repeal the Antiquities Act, which is Clinton's favorite target for presidential abuse. Babbitt has admitted that the lands targeted for the Arizona and California lock-up are not threatened, but he has recommended them for lock-up anyway, to ensure that they will not be threatened in the future. With such a criteria, is any land in America safe from the greedy clutches of this radically green bunch of bureaucrats?

This last year of Clinton's reign will see more sweeping exercise of dictatorial power, especially as Gore's poll-numbers continue to falter. Unless Congress exercises its power to stop the Clinton-Babbitt land grab, we'll see this scenario repeated time and time again.

Our land does not need to be protected from the people, its rightful owners; it needs to be protected from the government.

Congress, where is your backbone?

Helms warns U.N. Security Council

By Henry Lamb

Senator Jesse Helms told the U.N. Security Council exactly what it needed to hear: 1) the United States "will not countenance" the U.N.'s "global governance" aspirations; 2) "the U.N. serves nation-states, not the other way around;" 3) "no treaty or law can ever supersede the Constitution of the United States of America;" and 4) Americans reject and resent the suggestion that we are a "deadbeat" nation when we provided \$10.179 billion dollars to the U.N. in 1999.

He told them a lot more.

The ambassadors on the Security Council listened intently, as did the audience of ambassadors from more than 100 other nations.

With all the diplomacy of a Southern gentleman, Helms apologized for not being conversant with the "elegant and rarefied language of the diplomatic trade," and expressed his hope that the translators could speak "Southern" in order to translate words like "y'all" and "I do declare."

He asked forgiveness in advance "if I come across as a bit more blunt" than the ambassadors were accustomed to hearing. "I am an elected official with something of a reputation for saying what I mean and meaning what I say," he explained.

Blunt he was. Don't believe the polls commissioned by U.N. supporters, he admonished, which claim that the U.N. enjoys the support of the American public. "I have never won a poll," he said, "or lost an election." He told the ambassadors he had received "literally thousands of letters" expressing deep frustration with the U.N.

Helms explained that he had been instrumental in working out the arrangement to pay \$926 million in U.N. dues in exchange for agreements to certain reforms in the institution. He said he recognized that some members do not like having reforms dictated by the United States, but "I ask you to consider the alternative" which he said "would have been a breach in U.S.-U.N. relations that would have served the interests of no one."

Helms praised the U.N. for the occasions when it met its "core tasks" well. He listed those "core tasks" as: 1) helping sovereign states coordinate collective action by coalitions of the willing; 2) providing a forum where diplomats can meet and keep open channels of communication in times of crisis; and 3) providing to the peoples of the world important services such as peacekeeping, weapons inspections and humanitarian relief.

"But if the U.N. seeks to move beyond these core tasks, if it seeks to impose the U.N.'s power and authority over nation-states, I guarantee that the United Nations will meet stiff resistance from the American people," said Helms.

"Americans sense that the U.N. has greater ambitions" than simply meeting its core tasks. "They see the U.N. aspiring to establish itself as the central authority of a new international order of global laws and global governance. This is an international order the American people will not countenance. I guarantee you!"

With all the skill of a Southern politician, Helms took Kofi Annan's recent declaration that the peoples of the world have "rights beyond borders" and explained "we in America call (them) inalienable rights, endowed not by kings or despots, but by our Creator." He explained that nations derive their sovereignty from the consent of the governed, and quickly pointed out that nations that rule without the consent of the governed lose both their legitimacy and their right to claim national sovereignty.

He cited Slobodan Milosevic, Fidel Castro, and Saddam Hussein as examples of dictators who rule without the consent of the governed, and therefore cannot legitimately hide behind "phony claims of sovereignty."

He warned: "the American people will never accept the claims of the United Nations to be the sole source of legitimacy on the use of force in the world." He said it is a "fanciful notion," and pointed out that "the United Nations has no power to grant or decline legitimacy" to the foreign policy decisions of the United States. He said that the U.S. ratification of the U.N. Charter in 1945 "did not cede one syllable of American sovereignty to the United Nations."

As if twisting the blade plunged into wounded prey, Helms referred to "international law" as a "make-believe justification for hindering the march of freedom." He cited the U.N. General Assembly's condemnation as a violation of "international law," the U.S. "liberation of Grenada from the hands of a communist dictatorship."

Helms said the United States would never accept the International Criminal Court, which he described as "a system in which independent prosecutors and judges, answerable to no state or institution, have unfettered power to sit in judgment of the foreign policy decisions of Western democracies."

"No U.N. institution ... is competent to judge the foreign policy and national security decisions of the United States," he said emphatically.

Helms paused, took a drink of water, and concluded his remarks:

"If the United Nations respects the sovereign rights of the American people, and serves them as an effective tool of diplomacy, it will earn and deserve their respect and support. But a United Nations that seeks to impose its presumed authority on the American people without their consent begs for confrontation and, I want to be candid, eventual U.S. withdrawal."

Ambassadors raced to sign-up to speak. The ambassador from Cuba was furious. His requests were rejected because he is not on the Security Council. He found a television camera and railed against the senator's "slandorous remarks" about Cuba.

The ambassadors who did speak revealed the wide chasm between what Helms said and what they heard. With much more diplomatic skill than Helms used, the ambassadors protested the failure of the United States to pay its full assessment without conditions. None acknowledged that the United States had paid much more than its assessment through its peacekeeping support.

Helms was told that his withholding of U.N. payments was a detriment to reform, and the wrong way to go about strengthening U.S.-U.N. relations. Canada's ambassador, Robert Fowler, said "we need a U.N. for 2000, not 1945," suggesting that Helms' assessment of the U.N. purpose is obsolete.

Agam Hasmy, ambassador from Malaysia went even further, saying that the Security Council had to be expanded, and that the veto question had to be dealt with. The Commission on Global Governance recommended in 1995, that the veto be eliminated and the council be expanded to 23 members. This "reform" would essentially take the Security Council out from under the control of the five permanent members and give the institution free reign to operate independently. The only remaining control from member nations would be the purse strings.

The same Commission on Global Governance, as well as the U.N. Association and virtually all of the U.N. supporting non-government organizations are pushing for U.N. taxing authority which would give the U.N. complete independence and create the circumstance in which the member states would serve the U.N., rather than the other way around.

Helms' vision of what the U.N. is supposed to be is held by a diminishing minority in government, and in the country. Even Hillary Clinton has endorsed the concept of world government under the authority of the United Nations, when she introduced Walter Cronkite at the meeting of the World Federalist Association.

In a mini-history lesson, Helms told the Security Council that the reason the U.S. Senate did not ratify Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations was Wilson's refusal to allow 14 conditions that would guarantee the continuation of America's absolute sovereignty. He said that little has changed since then. America expects the U.N. to serve the United States, and its other member nations; not the other way around.

The United Nations has scheduled a chain of events in the year 2000 leading to a Millennium Summit at which documents, which are already prepared, will be considered to give the United Nations global sovereignty, forcing member nations to serve its will, a situation Helms says America will not accept. We'll see.

Gloria doesn't get it: the tug-of-war for land

By Henry Lamb

Gloria Flora resigned her job as supervisor of the largest national forest in the lower 48, because what she calls an "anti-government" sentiment had reached a "fevered pitch." Something had to give. "Rather than waiting for a bomb, or for someone to get hurt, I decided to step down."

That fever pitch of "anti-government" sentiment is what others call defending their freedom from a government they believe has overstepped its constitutional authority.

The immediate issue that led to Flora's resignation stems from a small stretch of [South Canyon Road in Elko County, Nevada](#), which was washed away by floods. The county wanted to rebuild the road; Gloria's Forest Service said no.

The South Canyon Road situation is but one of thousands of similar cases confronting property owners and land users all across the country. An examination of the attitudes and issues reveals why America is in a winner-take-all tug-of-war for the land and its resources.

Gloria spoke to about 100 supporters on Jan. 26 in Kalispell, Montana, at a gathering sponsored by the Montana Human Rights Network and Public Employees for Environmental Responsibility. Across town, more than 600 people attended a rally sponsored by Montanans for Multiple Use. These people brought shovels to send to Elko in a show of support for the county's determination to rebuild South Canyon Road.

"The road isn't even the issue," Gloria told a reporter. "The issue here is a serious anger toward the federal government in general."

Gloria doesn't have a clue about why the people are angry. "While a bit of protest is a good thing in any democracy," she said, "you can have too much of a good thing. I'm coming (to Kalispell) to talk about civility in our public discussion."

The absence of civility in public discussions is a major reason for the frustration Americans have with federal agencies. In America, discussions about public policy are supposed to be open and honest. If they are heated, so much the better. All opinions should be welcome. Differing opinions about public policy are supposed to be resolved, finally, by elected officials, in a public vote.

To Gloria, civility in public discussion means that the public should listen to her agency's presentation, make suggestions -- if invited to do so -- about how to implement the object of the presentation, and be thankful for the opportunity to speak. Dissent from the object of an agency's presentation is considered to be anti-government, by Gloria and many of her colleagues.

It's not Gloria's fault; it's her training. Since the President's Council on Sustainable Development (PCSD) was created by executive order in 1993 (to conform to the recommendations of Agenda 21, a policy document adopted by the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development in 1992), the agencies of the federal government have been trained to substitute the "consensus" process for the old-fashioned hearing process in public discussions.

Public policy-making is not within the constitutional purview of the president, nor any of the federal agencies. Executive branch functions are limited to the implementation of the public policies enacted by Congress.

The PCSD, however, in compliance with the recommendations contained in Agenda 21, said, "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." Neither Congress, nor the Constitution has authorized any change in the "decision process," but Gloria's agency, at the direction of her White House boss, has changed the decision-making process. The new process is designed to limit -- or prevent -- public discussion of views that dissent from the government's objectives.

The president announced recently that he had instructed the Department of Agriculture to promulgate rules to close the roads on nearly 40 million acres of federal lands. This is a new public policy, which Congress has not authorized. Gloria doesn't understand why Americans are angered by this policy-making-by-decree.

Because the law requires public comment and input when the rules for implementing legislation are changed, The Department of Agriculture's Forest Service conducted what they called public hearings on the proposed road closure rule change.

The president made his "roadless" announcement in October. Within 30 days, the department announced that each of eight federal regions would hold a series of public meetings. More than 100 such meetings were held between November 17 and December 16. The comment period closed at the end of December. The agency could say it had complied with the law, and issue its new rules.

Did the agency comply with the intent of the law to provide Americans with ample opportunity to speak for or against the proposed rule change? Absolutely not!

The meetings were held only a few days after the schedule was announced, during the busy holiday season. Why the rush? When the people arrived at the meetings, they were confronted with a presentation on how wonderful the roadless plan would be. Those who wanted to speak were told to write their question -- not questions -- on a card, and time permitting, they might be allowed to ask it. Those who were chosen to speak were given a strict time limit, often no more than two minutes. Video taping of the meetings was not allowed in some cases.

Gloria, this decision-making process is not public discussion. The Forest Service knew what it was going to do before the public comment meetings were held. The meetings were held only because the law requires it. They were designed to screen out dissent. The people who are most

directly affected by the policy changes were muzzled. And Gloria doesn't understand why people are angry?

The tug-of-war between the federal government and the people who live on, and use, the land, is much deeper than process. It goes to the very principle of property rights in America. Gloria correctly says, "Many of the land-use decisions we are making today are almost irreversible." That's why it is imperative that the decisions reflect the will -- and the consent -- of the people who will be most affected by them. But Gloria says, "Half the people I represent are not even born yet." And President Clinton's mantra in the land lock-up scheme is to protect the land for future generations.

The reality of the land lock-up scheme is that the land will be protected *from* future generations as well as from the present generation that depends upon it. Once land is designated as wilderness, the wealth of resources it contains is no longer available to human beings. Neither this, nor future generations, can enjoy the benefits the land offers. As the roads are closed, people cannot even see the land, nor cultivate its resources.

Congress authorized nine million acres to be designated as wilderness in 1964, as the result of a five-year campaign by the Wilderness Society. Additional wilderness acreage has been authorized by Congress over the years, until now we have more than 100 million acres in wilderness. Without congressional authorization, the Clinton administration has expanded wilderness areas substantially by executive decree. His new initiative, if successful, will expand wilderness to nearly 200 million acres.

Why? How much wilderness do we need?

Since future generations cannot use the wilderness, it makes no sense to say that we are protecting it for them, although it makes for a nice sound bite on television.

The truth is that there are two conflicting views about who should own the land. America was founded on the belief that individuals should own the land. In fact, the Constitution says that the federal government should own only that land required for public buildings and facilities. That was a unique view in the 1700s. Throughout the rest of the world, land was the exclusive property of the king, or czar, or ruling government -- whatever it was called. The government granted individuals the right to use some portion of the land in exchange for a percentage of its yield. The American revolution was about getting out from under that kind of servitude to government. It was about gaining the freedom to possess land and use its bounty for personal gain. This principle of private ownership of land is the foundation of America's greatness.

Not all Americans, however, agree with this fundamental principle. Throughout the 1900s, the notion that government should own the land gained prominence, fanned by the strong socialist movement in America following the 1917 revolution in Russia. Federal land -- given to anyone who would homestead it in the 1800s -- was locked into federal ownership by the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976. Ironically, that same year, the American delegation to the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements signed a document in Vancouver, British Columbia, that says, in part:

“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 therefore contributes to social injustice. ... Public control of land use is therefore indispensable. ...”

In 1993, President Clinton signed the Convention on Biological Diversity, which requires every nation to establish a system of "protected areas," according to a plan identified as the Wildlands Project, published in the United States in 1992. The Wildlands Project says:

“... at least half of the land area of the 48 conterminous states should be encompassed in core reserves and inner corridor zones ... assuming that most of the other 50 percent is managed intelligently as buffer zone.”

The president's "Lands Legacy" program is the implementation of the un-ratified Convention on Biological Diversity, initiated by executive decree, without congressional authorization, and implemented by the agencies of the federal government. With the continuing wilderness lock-up of federal lands and the administration's efforts to establish a \$3 billion yearly slush fund to purchase private property, we are well on the way to converting "at least half" of the nation into wilderness and most of the other half to government-owned or controlled buffer zones.

And Gloria doesn't understand why Americans are angry?

To be fair to poor Gloria, she has probably never read the Convention on Biological Diversity, or the Global Biodiversity Assessment. She is mystified -- as are many of her colleagues -- by Americans who have read these documents, and who refer to the influence of the United Nations. She calls it "getting down and dirty" when dissenters "confuse the public" by making "villains where villains don't exist, or making heroes where only villains exist."

The tug-of-war is over much more than South Canyon Road in Elko, Nevada. Angry, frustrated Americans are sending thousands of shovels to Elko -- not bombs, Gloria -- to express their belief that the land and its resources should belong to the people, not to the government. Individual owners are far better, more responsible, managers of their own property than any agency of government. Gloria and the Clinton administration disagree.

To Gloria and the Clinton administration, Americans who have the audacity to speak out against their policy-by-decree to lock the land away from individuals in this and future generations, are nothing more than anti-government villains. She says, "These anti-government groups have slogans like, 'Remember Waco,' 'God is on our side,' and 'God loves freedom-fighters.' These kinds of slogans can encourage a certain kind of person, and that can lead to a very dangerous situation."

Gloria just doesn't get it. But she is right about one thing. Continuation of the arrogant, dictatorial behavior of the administration and its agencies can lead to a very dangerous situation: it's called unemployment.

Get ready for global governance

By Henry Lamb

Rarely is the term "global governance" heard on the evening news. When it does appear, the term "conspiracy theory" is usually in the context. While America is watching the political circus, the international community is bringing together all the elements of global governance in preparation for the big event scheduled for September. A full [calendar of events](#) has been prepared.

Americans don't care what the United Nations is doing, in the belief that nothing the U.N. does can affect us anyway. This may have been true in the past, but no more. The magnitude of societal change that is underway is almost beyond comprehension. These changes are already affecting individual Americans, but rarely is the impact recognized as the result of United Nations influence.

We are already deeply into the era of global governance. It is a process that began many years ago. The events scheduled for this year, culminating in the September World Summit, will put in place all the international mechanisms necessary to insure that there is no turning back. It is important to realize that global governance will not be imposed suddenly, upon adjournment of the World Summit. After the summit, implementation of global governance will accelerate, but it will still take several years to fully transfer sovereignty from nation-states to a central global command.

International law will be the supreme law of the planet. Individual nations will be required to conform their laws to international norms. For those who say "never in America," wake up and smell the roses. The World Trade Organization already has the power to require conformance of national law to WTO policy. And it has the power to impose financial penalties upon those nations that fail to do so in a timely manner.

The U.N.'s Kyoto Protocol, though not fully negotiated, will have similar power to set strict, legally enforceable limits on the use of fossil fuel in America.

The Convention on Biological Diversity, even though it was not ratified by the U.S. Senate, is being implemented under the guise of the President's "Land Legacy" initiative. The published goal of the treaty is to return "at least 50 percent" of the total land area to wilderness and manage most of the rest of the land for conservation objectives.

We are seeing global governance at work when policies that originate with the U.N. are implemented in America, despite the absence of Senate ratification, Congressional authorization, or even the awareness of local elected officials. The rash of national monument designations and the "roadless" initiative, which closes access to public lands, has the effect of converting land to wilderness -- precisely as prescribed by the Convention on Biological Diversity. We are moving to a system of global governance in which national governments are transformed into

administrative units to implement U.N. policies. State governments are being transformed into administrative units to implement national policy, and local governments are being transformed into administrative units to implement state policies.

This transformation has accelerated dramatically under the Clinton/Gore administration, which is one of the strongest proponents of global governance in the international community. International policies that affect land use and energy are most visible. Less visible are the international policies that affect education, technology development, the flow of information, transportation, and security.

International policy already exists in all these areas and is in various stages of implementation around the world. The entire plan for global governance was published by the Commission on Global Governance in 1995. Many of the changes called for in their report have already been implemented. For example, the creation of the International Criminal Court, and the establishment of a new "Peoples' Assembly" that will hold its inaugural meeting May 22-26, 2000.

Other recommendations, such as the elimination of the veto and permanent member status in the Security Council; a standing world army; the authority to impose global taxation; and dozens of others, are being systematically implemented throughout the United Nations system. The consequences of this shift to global governance are incomprehensible to those who have not followed its progress. The society resulting from this transformation, though called "democratic," is socialist. Under the published vision of global governance, policy decisions are made by non-elected, carefully selected individuals. All sources and means of production are controlled by the central authority. The flow of information, too, is to be regulated by the central authority, as well as the educational curriculum. Enforcement of policy decisions will be at the hands of the International Criminal Court, and the U.N. standing army. And there will be no hope of rebellion.

Central to the objective of global governance is control by the U.N. of the manufacture, sale and distribution of all firearms. Possession of a firearm will be legal only when licensed by the United Nations. The recent call by the president to license all gun owners in America fits quite nicely into the United Nations' plan.

The painful reality is that many Americans see nothing wrong with global governance. The United Nations Association in America boasts hundreds of thousands of members who lobby their elected officials to allow international policies to be implemented.

Non-government organizations such as the Sierra Club and the Audubon Society claim millions of members who actively support this transformation. School children, even the Boy Scouts, have been taught that global governance is the answer to the world's problems. Those who challenge the globalist vision are immediately labeled as "right-wing extremists."

The treaties, agreements and other documents required to bring about global governance have all been prepared, and many are being implemented. When the World Summit convenes in

September, there is little doubt that the body will adopt the concept and usher in the era of global governance officially.

The only way to avoid this tidal wave of global socialism is the withdrawal of the United States from the United Nations. Should we fail to withdraw and continue to yield our sovereignty to this international body, it will, in relatively short order, drain our economic capacity to the point that we will no longer be able to chart our own course. The coming election may be the last opportunity we have to send people to Washington who value our sovereignty or our freedom.

America: a 'fascilist' country

By Henry Lamb

If land and its resources are, in fact, the source of production, America is in a heap of trouble.

The first, defining characteristic of a socialist country is government ownership of the sources of production. The first, defining characteristic of a fascist country is private ownership of the sources of production, under the control of centralized government.

More than 40 percent of the land in America is owned by governments, and the rest of it is controlled by the government. Does that make America a "fascilist" country?

It's not enough to own 40 percent of the land. The Clinton/Gore administration is pushing the George Miller-Don Young, bi-partisan Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA), which will set aside as much as \$3 billion per year so governments can buy more land.

We, the taxpayers, are being forced to finance the transformation of America from a land in which the sources of production are owned by private individuals, to a country where the sources of production are owned by the government. Until the transition is complete, government is extending its regulatory tentacles across every square inch of land that remains in private hands.

The term "wetlands" emerged in our vocabulary, not from a land use policy enacted by elected representatives, but from a mangled distortion of agency rule-making, and consent decrees arising out of lawsuits filed by environmental extremists. For years, the policy was enforced under the authority of the 1972 Clean Water Act, a law which did not contain the word "wetlands."

The wetlands policy, conceived and implemented by bureaucrats, gave the federal government jurisdiction over an estimated 200 million acres of private property. This policy applied only to wetlands larger than three acres.

On March 3rd, the Corps of Engineers released a new 172-page proposed rule that reduces this exemption to one-half acre. Private property brought under federal jurisdiction by this new rule could easily double.

On Feb. 22, the U.S. Department of Agriculture released a new proposed rule on Watershed Resource Management. This bureaucratic expansion of the rules has the potential to plunder private property, although it is presented as a measure for public land.

Representative Helen Chenoweth is fighting efforts in the Senate to add an anti-property rights amendment to the Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Bill that would appropriate \$5.5 million for a new Habitat Conservation Plan in Idaho. This test run would let private property

owners "voluntarily" agree to restrict certain land use, in exchange for assurances that no future regulatory enforcement action would be imposed. In the fine print, however, we find the term "adaptive management," which means the government could change the rules anytime it wished, once the property is signed on, but the property owner would have no such option.

Bruce Babbitt is running from one end of the country to the other, looking for more land that the President can designate as national monuments, further blocking the public from public land.

Oblivious to the guarantees lodged in the history of legislation relating to RS2477 rights of way, the U.S. Forest service is busy closing public roads on federal land, assuring that the public can have no use of public property. Private land owners whose property is surrounded by federal lands, are harassed, and even jailed, for driving on an RS2477 road without a Forest Service permit. This harassment is called "grooming a willing seller."

There are literally dozens of regulations, initiatives, programs, decrees, executive orders, and inter-agency agreements that give the agencies of government the power to control the use of virtually any, and every square inch of land in America.

The regulatory activity has intensified dramatically in this last year of the Clinton/Gore reign. They want to get as much land under government control as possible, just in case Republicans storm the Bastille in November.

It will take a complete house cleaning and thorough fumigation at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue to reverse this march toward a fascist nation. No candidate should be elected to any office at any level of government, who has not first signed the *Freedom 21 Pledge* and has the backbone to live by it while in office.

Where's the outrage for Glenda?

By Henry Lamb

Glenda Ann Bradley is dead. She was minding her own business on a beautiful Sunday afternoon, waiting for her friend, Ralph, to try a few more casts into a different fishing spot. Had her killer been a drug-crazed teen with a gun, her death would have triggered another barrage of gun-control propaganda from the White House. Election-minded politicians would be parading to the podium to press for stronger gun laws, for registration of all guns -- to put an end to this senseless killing.

But it was not a drug-crazed teen that killed Glenda Ann.

Pat Taylor grew up with Glenda Ann. They went to church together as children. Glenda Ann went off to college and came back to teach at Jones Cove Elementary School in the mountains of East Tennessee. She was the kind of person everyone loved. Sometimes when Pat couldn't make it on time, Glenda Ann would take Pat's daughter home with her after school. Glenda Ann's death was a shock to Pat -- and a loss to the entire community.

Glenda Ann didn't need killing. She had wronged no one. She was minding her own business, enjoying a Sunday afternoon in the Smoky Mountains National Park, the most-visited National Park in the country. Ralph left Glenda Ann alone about 2:00 p.m. to try one more spot. He was gone about an hour. When he returned to the spot where he had left Glenda Ann, all he saw was her trail pack. He called to her. No answer. He looked in the woods beside the trail. About 40 yards away, near where the Little River and Goshen Prong trails come together, Ralph saw a black bear and a yearling cub, toying with what was left of Glenda Ann.

Ralph shouted and threw rocks at the bears, but they would not retreat. Another fisherman heard the commotion, saw what had happened and struck-out hiking to the Elkmont Campground to find a Park Ranger. Ralph's cries for help attracted about a dozen campers and hikers, all of whom tried to drive the bears away from Glenda Ann's body. The bears were not frightened -- nor were they about to leave their dinner.

For nearly three hours, Ralph and the group of hikers and campers watched in horror as the bears tore away the flesh from this sweet, 50-year-old school teacher's body.

The Park Rangers showed up at 6:05 and shot the two bears.

When a six-year-old boy from a broken and drug-infested home shot another six-year-old, the media and the White House went into overdrive, exploiting every opportunity to denounce guns and call for more gun control.

Where is the outrage for Glenda Ann's needless death? Where is the media? Where are Bill and Al? Where are the demands to outlaw bears in National Parks?

More likely, the fatal mauling of Glenda Ann will be used as an excuse to further restrict human use of National Parks. Michael Pelton, who led a black-bear research project for the University of Tennessee, said "It sounds like a predatory response on the part of the animal. I have to think the bear had an instinctive reaction when the person started running or somehow responding as prey."

Nancy Gray, a spokeswoman for the park, says "We normally tell visitors to be dominant and wave things and yell when they encounter a black bear, because the bear usually will run off." The bear, which had been tagged in 1998, did not run off. Another bear mauling occurred in 1989 in the park, but that victim didn't die. Nor did any of the other 17 victims of bear incidents recorded that year.

According to Kim DeLozier, park wildlife biologist, there have been 37 recorded black-bear fatalities in the United States. One of them occurred in Yellowstone National Park.

The Great Smoky Mountains National Park is one of the first national parks to be designated as a U.N. Biosphere Reserve in 1976. Since that designation, management of the park -- and all of the other 47 U.N. Biosphere Reserves -- including Yellowstone National Park, has undergone a transition of purpose. No longer are the parks managed for the benefit and enjoyment of people but for "conservation objectives."

Park officials began monitoring black bears nearly 30 years ago, at which time they estimated the bear population to be 300 to 500 animals. Today, there are about 1,800 bears in the park. New studies reveal that grizzly bears, too, are experiencing a population explosion in and around Yellowstone National Park. Estimates in 1985 put the number of bears in the Yellowstone area at 44. This is the estimate that landed the critter on the endangered species list -- which the Sierra Club still says requires the impoundment of 14 million acres around the park as a buffer zone for bear recovery. Actual DNA analyses of bear hair has now confirmed the number of grizzly bears in the area to be more than ten times the reported estimates.

Philip Francis, acting superintendent of the Smoky Mountains National Park, said that Glenda Ann's death won't affect the park's bear management policy. Where is the outrage?

Had the gun-control laws allowed Glenda Ann to pack a 357, she would probably be in jail today, for killing the bear. But she would be alive.

Sovereignty no match for WTO

By Henry Lamb

The debate surrounding the proposal by Congressman Ron Paul, R-Texas, to withdraw from the World Trade Organization, revealed a wide chasm between the fundamental beliefs of the people who represent us in Congress. Paul says that our participation in the WTO results in an erosion of national sovereignty. Congressman Doug Bereuter, D-Neb., says that it does not. Moreover, Bereuter says that "no significant scholars" suggest that American participation in the WTO results in a loss of national sovereignty.

Both can't be right.

Bereuter obviously has not met Lewellyn H. Rockwell, Jr., world renowned economic scholar and president of the Von Mises Institute, who says, "We should toss the WTO into the dustbin of history ..." because "What appears to be a step in the right direction -- towards greater liberty in trade across borders - turns out to be a leap into world statism." The WTO agreement requires participating nations to conform their laws to comply with WTO rulings. This language clearly defines the ruling of the WTO to be superior to laws passed by Congress. How can this situation not be a loss of national sovereignty?

Congressman Phil Crane, R-Ill., has the answer. He says that the United States is not compelled to change its laws, even though we have agreed to do so by accepting the WTO agreement. Should the U.S. fail to conform its laws to WTO rulings, the agreement authorizes the WTO to impose fines of its choosing as long as the U.S. remains in noncompliance.

When any foreign government has the authority to order the United States to change its laws, and enforce that order by imposing fines, it doesn't take too much of a scholar to recognize that WTO sovereignty is more sovereign than U.S. sovereignty. Crane says this is not a loss of sovereignty it's just the price we have to pay for not playing by the rules. Fines imposed by the WTO are not the slap-on-the-wrist variety. The U.S. said no to British Petroleum's wish to ship gasoline with the additive MTBE into the United States. The WTO said that is a violation of their rules and slapped the U.S. with a \$360 million fine, according to Congressman Bart Stupak, D-Mich. "When the WTO kicks in, sovereignty is kicked out," Stupak says.

Congressman Jack Metcalf, R-Wash., pointed out that the U.S. Constitution clearly places the responsibility for regulating foreign trade upon the Congress. The WTO usurps that responsibility. Phil Crane sees it differently. He says Congress has no problem delegating responsibility for regulating trade to the Commerce Committee, and various subcommittees. To Crane, delegating the responsibility for regulating trade to the WTO follows the same reasoning. The major difference, of course, is that no American has the chance to vote for or against, any member of the WTO which has the final say on trade regulations.

Nearly every speaker who stood to oppose the Paul proposal, began their presentation with a litany of WTO problems that need to be corrected. Most of the opposition speakers took the position that the WTO should be reformed, but that the U.S. should remain a member while working for reform. The WTO is accountable to no other political power and can be reformed only by an extraordinary majority of the 135 WTO member nations. The U.S. has one vote, and no veto power. Congressmen have no power at all to influence the WTO. Rep. Helen Chenoweth-Hage said that congressmen were not even allowed access to the recent WTO meeting in Seattle.

The issues of national sovereignty and constitutional authority were systematically ignored by the speakers who opposed the Paul resolution. Tom Reynolds, R-N.Y., touted the WTO and pointed to an increase in exports of \$235 billion since the WTO came into existence. Peter Visclosky, D-Ind., quickly countered that during the same period, our overall trade deficit had grown by \$300 billion, a fact conveniently ignored by WTO supporters.

WTO supporters tried to cast opponents as "isolationists," and conjured up images of the Depression and world wars that would follow withdrawal from the WTO. During the period between 1947 and 1995, foreign trade was conducted under the GATT (General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade), a period that saw the greatest global economic expansion in the history of the world. GATT had no authority to impose fines or require conformity to its rules.

Supporters of the WTO -- opponents of the Paul proposal -- displayed an alarming willingness to look the other way when confronted with the fundamental principles of national sovereignty and constitutional authority. Even Larry Combest, R-Texas, chairman of the Agriculture Committee expressed more concern about maintaining world markets through the WTO than about constitutional principles. He used the 1980 grain embargo, which would not be allowed by the WTO, as an example of what could be avoided through the WTO.

Whether or not Combest agreed with the decision in 1980, it was made through the constitutional process. Congress could have reversed the president's decision. If the people of America disagreed with the policy, the people could remove the policy makers. In fact, they did just that. But Americans have no such recourse when the WTO makes policy decisions with which they disagree. The WTO consists of appointed bureaucrats elected by no one, accountable to no one, who operate in secret, doing whatever they wish, subject to whatever influence offers the greatest prize.

Ron Paul is right. The WTO offers nothing to the people of America that cannot be achieved without the loss of sovereignty and the erosion of constitutional authority. The global economic engine that is America can play a major leadership role in the world without yielding one ounce of sovereignty to an international body. Congress should reclaim its constitutional responsibility to regulate foreign trade and answer Congressman Jack Metcalf's question: "If Congress doesn't protect national sovereignty, who will?"

Congress did not protect our national sovereignty. Ron Paul's resolution to withdraw from the WTO was rejected by a vote of 363 to 56.

Greens arrested for arson

By Henry Lamb

Paint a plastic milk jug black and fill it with gasoline. Then soak a sponge in gasoline and stuff it into the handle. Next, tape several wooden kitchen matches to an eight-inch stick of lighted incense and wedge the incense into the jug's handle beside the saturated sponge. Sound interesting? It gets better.

Now find a tractor-trailer truck and remove the cap from the fuel tank. Soak a towel in gasoline and stuff it into the truck's fuel tank. Now set the gallon jug on top of the truck's fuel tank beside the saturated towel. Be sure that a double-trailer full of high-grade gasoline is attached to the truck that contains the jug.

And run like hell!

This is precisely what someone did on the night of May 26 in Eugene, Ore. In fact, according to Deputy Chief Randall B. Groves of the Eugene Fire and Emergency Medical Services Department, "It appears that the plan was to use the devices to ultimately blow up at least two large fuel trucks."

Fortunately, the devices failed to ignite, sparing the residents of the Whiteaker community several blocks of devastation and fire. A double tanker load of gasoline has much more explosive power than the fertilizer bomb that destroyed the federal building in Oklahoma City.

What kind of deranged individual could conceive of, and actually execute such a plan? Plans for making this type of incendiary device appeared in the December-January 1999 [Earth First Journal](#), according to reports, but the website archives now return an error message saying this edition is no longer available.

Anarchist author John Zerzan, who happens to live in the community where the devices were found, told the Associated Press that his movement is getting more militant, but "Nobody I know would dream of doing something like that."

Eugene, Ore., is home for a nest of ecoterrorist anarchists. About 60 known anarchists, referred to as the "Black Bloc," do their thing using Eugene as a base.

On June 16, three pickup trucks on the Romania Chevrolet lot were burned, causing about \$40,000 in damages. The company had recently renovated property in the Whiteaker community.

Police arrested Jeffrey Michael Lurers, 21, and Craig Andrew Marshall, 27, the same day and secured a warrant to search a warehouse where Lurers was known to stay. The two are being

held on two counts of first-degree arson, criminal mischief, two-counts of unlawful manufacture and possession of a bomb, and two counts of attempted arson. The pair pled not guilty.

The "Black Bloc" marched from the University of Oregon through downtown Eugene, chanting support for Lurers and Marshall.

Lurers and Marshall have a long history of activism with Earth First!, according to Barry Clausen, of North American Research. In April 1998, Lurers and other radical environmentalists built platforms atop trees to prevent logging of the Willamette National Forest's Clark timber sale.

In a letter to Sens. Dianne Feinstein and Barbara Boxer, Clausen said the incendiary devices found in Eugene were of the same type used in the \$12 million arson at Vail, Colo., and the \$1.2 million arson at the Monmouth, Ore., offices of Boise Cascade.

Chief Deputy District Attorney, Kent Mortimre said, "When people build bombs, they are designed to destroy things and hurt people. That's not freedom of speech and First Amendment rights. That's terrorism, pure and simple, and we're going to treat it that way."

Helms acts to block U.N. court

By Henry Lamb

Once again, Sen. Jesse Helms has taken action to do what the Clinton administration is either unwilling, or unable to do -- protect U.S. citizens from the growing power of the United Nations.

This time, Helms tackled the International Criminal Court by introducing legislation that would prohibit U.S. cooperation with the court, and seriously restrict relations with other countries that support the court (S-2726). The court would be prohibited from conducting an investigation in "any territory subject to the jurisdiction of the United States."

The bill instructs the president to veto any U.N. Security Council resolution calling for the use of American troops, unless the resolution specifically provides permanent exemption for U.S. military personnel from prosecution by the U.N. court.

To ensure that the law is obeyed, the bill prohibits the participation of U.S. military in U.N. peacekeeping projects, until the president has certified to Congress that U.S. military personnel have been exempted from prosecution.

To sharpen the law's teeth, Helms specified that U.S. troops in a U.N. operation may not set foot on the soil of a nation that has ratified the U.N. court, unless the president certifies that the nation has entered into an agreement preventing the U.N. court from prosecuting U.S. personnel.

The bill also prohibits the transfer of "national security information" to the court, or to any nation that has ratified the court, unless the president provides a written agreement with the nation that the information will not be made available to the U.N. court.

The straw that is likely to break the court's back is the prohibition of military assistance to any nation that has ratified the U.N. court -- unless the president provides certification in the form of a written agreement with the nation, preventing the U.N. court from proceeding against an American citizen in that nation.

To put it mildly, the Clinton administration is annoyed by Helms's intervention in international diplomacy. After years of pushing for the court's creation, the Clinton administration was forced to vote against the final document -- one of only six negative votes -- in Rome in 1998, when 120 nations would not allow the United States to exempt its citizens from the court's jurisdiction.

Nonetheless, negotiators have continued working with the court's preparatory committee in an effort to find a way to exempt high officials in the U.S. government through ambiguous document language. U.S. efforts failed again when the preparatory committee refused to accept the language of U.S. Ambassador David Scheffer who proposed that the court prosecute citizens from only "irresponsible nations."

The document adopted in Rome provides authority for the court to prosecute citizens of any nation -- whether or not the nation has ratified the document. While the purpose of the court is said to be the prosecution of war criminals and international terrorists, there is nothing in the document limiting the court's jurisdiction. The court itself defines its jurisdiction, and many of the delegates in Rome openly anticipated the court's prosecution of violations of all international law, especially human rights and environmental law.

The court will go into force 60 days after the Rome document is ratified by 60 nations. Presently, 97 nations have signed the document, indicating the intention to ratify, and 12 nations have actually presented documents of ratification. France is among the most recent ratifying nations.

Introduction of the Helms bill will give pause to nations that have not yet ratified the document. Should the bill become law, the U.N. court would most likely stop dead in its tracks, until the court document is ratified by the U.S. Senate, which would automatically repeal the Helms legislation. Could the Senate ratify the U.N. court? Helms has vowed to block the treaty "so long as there is breath in me."

Realistically, it would take extraordinary maneuvering to get the bill passed by both houses of Congress during the last days of election-year law making. Should it pass both houses, it would likely face a presidential veto, thus leaving the door open for further diplomatic finagling to find language that would allow the court to proceed, while also providing immunity to Clinton, Albright, and other high government officials, if not for the rest of the people in the United States.

What Bill should tell the U.N.

By Henry Lamb

During the U.N. Millennium Assembly, which convenes right after Labor Day, President Bill Clinton will have an opportunity to address the General Assembly, and the heads of state from nearly 160 nations. This is the event at which the agenda for global governance is expected to be adopted. As spokesman for the citizens of the United States, the president has the opportunity, and the responsibility to advance the principles of freedom upon which this nation is built. Here is what one American would like Bill to say:

"Ladies and Gentlemen of the world, we welcome you to New York, and to the United States of America. We are gathered at this momentous juncture in the history of civilization to consider how best to navigate a new century, the first in a new millennium, and more particularly, what the role of the United Nations should be as we plunge forward into uncharted waters.

"There can be no better guide for us, than to look backward to examine our past failures, and our past successes. None of us wants to walk blindly into arrangements that have already proven to be unworkable. All of us want to create new arrangements which will provide the best quality of life for every citizen of every nation.

"Clearly, what doesn't work is a system of governance that ignores the will and wishes of the people who are governed. In the last century, millions of people died trying to escape the scourge of governments that imposed its will upon the people without their consent. We have learned from those failures.

"In fact, it was just such a failure of governance that caused the wars which led to the creation of the United Nations -- created in the hope of abolishing war as a method for resolving disputes. The United Nations was created to provide a neutral forum for sovereign nations to assemble and discuss their differences in pursuit of non-violent solutions. This institution has been helpful from time to time, but it has been far from successful.

"The purpose for our presence here today is to explore ways to make the United Nations more effective as we continue our pursuit of a peaceful world in the 21st century. It is an awesome challenge. "We are confronted with two fundamental choices: we can work toward enforcing peace through a central military power superior to any force that can be mounted by a single nation; or, we can work toward eliminating the need for war by expanding the principles of freedom.

"The concept of a centralized superior military power emerged after World War II, as the best hope for a peaceful world. It has not worked very well because the concept presupposes that member nations are willing to surrender their national sovereignty to a central power. The surrender of national sovereignty to a central power is in direct opposition to the first purpose of

the United Nations -- which is to provide a neutral forum for sovereign nations to discuss their differences.

"In recent months, we have heard from many world leaders who believe that now is time for sovereign nations to rethink the virtue of national sovereignty, and voluntarily relinquish a measure of that sovereignty for what is called 'the greater good.' I am convinced that such thinking and such talk directs the world toward a course we should not travel.

"Regardless of what the intent may be, or what promises are offered, history is clear: when government power is centralized, government oppression follows. The consolidation of military might under the control of the United Nations is a formula ensuring the oppression of those people who disagree, and the creation of a structure which, at some future point, must be overthrown. Every effort to enforce the peace through military superiority has failed. I urge this assembly to reject this course of action in the 21st century, and I offer as sufficient reason, the profound failure of this course of action throughout the 20th century.

"Those who advance the idea of centralized enforcement of peace, recognize and argue that in order to be successful, the United Nations would also need to control other facets of human activity, those activities which create conflict. Economic disparity, for example, and the inequity of resource distribution are said to be among the root causes of interpersonal, and national conflict. In order for the United Nations to enforce peace, the United Nations must have the power to eliminate these root causes of conflict.

"These arguments take the United Nations further from its original purpose, and further down the road toward oppression of the people it seeks to serve. The appropriate role of the United Nations in the 21st century is not to consolidate its power and enforce its will upon the people, but to return to its original purpose of facilitating discussions among sovereign nations that wish to find peaceful solutions to all our problems.

"Just as history provides graphic examples of what doesn't work, it also provides examples of what does work. We should examine those examples and glean from them the principles which promise success in the 21st century.

"It took hundreds of years for people to discover -- and for governments to admit -- that human beings are born with unalienable rights endowed by the Creator. Among these are the right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. These rights are the foundations of sovereignty. Empowered by this sovereignty, people create governments to protect their unalienable rights and to defend their sovereignty.

"Government, therefore, is created by the people, for the people, and derives its just powers from the consent of the people. We who have the privilege of representing our people at grand meetings such as this, must never forget that it is the hard work of our people who pay the taxes that make it possible for us to be here. We cannot assume that because we are here, we have their consent to create a system of global governance that will have the power to make policy decisions that will affect their lives, but which will not provide them the opportunity to grant or deny their consent.

"Fortunately, as we examine what has worked in the past, we can begin to see an alternative course of action for the 21st century. This course of action would recognize first, that national sovereignty is nothing more than the collective sovereignty of the individuals within a nation, expressed through a government which they have created and can control. As such, national sovereignty should be recognized as the highest governmental authority on earth. People within nations should form whatever system of governance they choose; the appropriate role of the United Nations is to help those nations by facilitating discussion when disagreement arises, not by dictating solutions.

"These principles are the foundations of freedom, to which all people everywhere aspire. When people are free to pursue their own happiness and create their own system of governance, the fundamental causes of national conflict diminish, and may, in time, evaporate entirely.

"Governments that exist to protect, defend, and advance the principles of freedom, serve their people; governments that exist for any other purpose, eventually oppress their people.

"As we consider the role of the United Nations in the 21st century, I urge you to consider these principles of freedom and self-governance. Those proposals before you which advance these principles should be adopted; those proposals which ignore the consent of the governed and tend to consolidate and centralize power in the hands of a global government -- should be rejected. "I speak for only one of the more than 180 nations in the world. It is neither my purpose nor desire to tell any nation what form of government it should choose. It is my purpose, and my responsibility to tell you that the United States stands ready to help any nation that wishes to advance the principles of freedom, and to help the family of sovereign nations maintain a forum for discussion of problems and disagreements.

"It is also my duty to tell you that the people of the United States have not consented to yield one ounce of national sovereignty to a world government. Should this body decide to choose a course toward enforced peace and centralized, global policy-making, it will move without the support or cooperation of the United States. Should this body decide that the United Nations should remain the facilitator for interaction among sovereign nations, we will continue to assist in that purpose.

"I hope you will enjoy your stay in our sovereign nation, and return home determined to help all people, everywhere in the world, enjoy the freedom they have every right to expect."

Why America is burning

By Henry Lamb

The fires that are raging across the West are just the beginning of the consequences of inept environmental management policies that the Clinton-Gore administration has inflicted upon the people of America. This administration has legitimized and legalized the pseudo-religious earth worship of environmental extremists. These emotion-based, tree-hugging policies can only result in even worse disasters if common sense continues to be ignored in favor of "sustainable" propaganda.

The Sierra Club, Wilderness Society, and other environmental groups, proudly wage their anti-logging campaign, describing chainsaws as murder weapons, and loggers as pawns of corporate resource rapists. The federal government, now manned by former executives of these organizations, dutifully responds by closing forest roads and outlawing timber cutting.

The nightly news reports as much as five million acres destroyed by wildfire. There is no inventory of the toasted wildlife. There is no measure of the tons of pollution released into the atmosphere, or the miles of streams that will be filled with ash and sediment when rain finally falls.

The best defense against forest fires are firebreaks. Roads through the forest serve this purpose, and roads allow firefighters access to the flame. Common sense. So the Clinton-Gore administration adopts a policy of closing forest roads -- to the cheers of environmental organizations who prefer to blame the fires on climate change caused by use of fossil fuels. Go figure.

A second defense against forest fires is thinning the growth. Selective harvest of mature and diseased trees keeps the fuel supply at a minimum. Common sense. So the Clinton-Gore administration adopts a policy of non-removal of any trees, even those blown down by storms. Environmental organizations file lawsuits by the dozens to prevent any timber harvest by invoking the Endangered Species Act to protect some obscure so-called endangered bug or beetle. It's acceptable, however, if those same bugs and beetles are roasted in a massive barbecue.

Forest fires, though, are not the most serious consequence of this extreme reverence of the earth.

The same extremism has prevented exploration and development of oil and coal reserves in the United States. More than half our energy comes from foreign sources. The Clinton-Gore administration reflects the wish of the extreme environmental organizations to eventually ban the use of fossil fuel and force Americans to rely on solar, wind, and other "alternative" fuels.

"Force" is the active word here. Technology -- in pursuit of free markets -- will supply an alternative source of energy when it is advantageous to do so. Extreme environmentalists are unwilling to rely on the marketplace, and are using government to force the market to accept technology that is neither adequate, nor environmentally appropriate.

A drive through the windmill farms east of Oakland, Calif., will convince most people that mile after mile of giant, noisy windmills -- through which eagles fear to fly -- is far more destructive to the environment than a modern oil well, which can produce far more energy per square foot of land, than windmills or solar panels.

Environmental extremists are lobbying to remove hydroelectric dams on rivers across the country to protect some species of fish. To them, the fish are more important than the humans who depend upon the electricity, or upon the income produced from use of the waterway. Environmental extremists claim that naturally-bred fish are superior to hatchery-bred fish, and club the hatchery-bred fish to death, while claiming that the same species is endangered.

The consequence of this earth-worshipping nonsense will inevitably be an energy shortfall. As bad as the forest fires are, they are nothing when compared with the absence of energy. As bad as high-energy prices are, they are nothing when compared with the absence of energy.

If a crash program were launched today to meet the anticipated energy demands of 2020, it is unlikely that the demand could be met. But there is no crash program. Instead, there are policies in place that make it nearly impossible to build a new nuclear generating plant, or to build a new oil refinery, or to even pump oil from known oil reserves. The entire coal industry has been nearly shut down for fear of releasing carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. But it's acceptable to burn the forests, which releases more carbon dioxide in a single fire than coal burning plants release over many years. Go figure.

Perhaps the worst consequence of this environmental extremism is the growing acceptance of the idea that somehow government knows best, providing, of course, that government is informed by the former executives of environmental extremist organizations. Government is consolidating its power to control, not only land and resource use, but the lives of individuals as well. The opposite side of every new power government assumes, is the loss of freedom for individuals.

The Conservation and Reinvestment Act -- heralded by the Clinton-Gore administration and environmental extremists alike, as the most significant conservation legislation since Teddy Roosevelt -- represents an incredible loss of freedom for private land owners. Propaganda surrounding the proposed law says that only "willing sellers" will be asked to sell their land to the government. The fact is, however, this administration is well-practiced in making "willing sellers" out of any individual who is targeted. What's called multi-media enforcement of an arsenal of regulatory procedures can -- and has -- crushed individuals who dare stand between the federal government and its goals.

Environmental extremists have succeeded in transforming America from a nation where common sense informed responsible environmental stewardship into a nation where the color of science is used to camouflage what is actually a form of paganistic earth worship. Environmental

extremists have infiltrated our institutions of higher learning, our schools, our government, our churches, and they are succeeding in transforming our nation.

The wildfires that are burning across the country are an early warning of the consequences yet to come if this environmental extremist philosophy continues to shape our public policy.

Energy: A deepening dilemma

By Henry Lamb

America's robust economy is racing down the highway, apparently unaware that just beyond the range of the headlights is an intersection pointing to two different futures. The road to the left promises a pollution-free future, dependent upon windmills and solar panels; the road to the right promises adequate, affordable energy as far as the eye can see. The road we take may be chosen as soon as Nov. 7.

There seems to be a disconnect between the public and politicians when it comes to our unprecedented prosperity and its dependence upon energy. The only time the public or politicians seem to care is when the price of gasoline passes \$1.50 per gallon. The energy crisis is much deeper than the current price at the pump.

A significant number of people in the world agree with Al Gore, who believes that fossil fuel must be eliminated as the primary source of our energy supply. These same people believe that neither nuclear energy nor hydroelectric dams can be considered as alternatives. That leaves solar panels, windmills, biomass, conservation -- and new technologies that may be developed in the future.

The people who agree with Al Gore have taken control of America's energy policy in recent years and have forced a reduction in the use of domestic energy supplies. Through the U.N. Climate Change Treaty, and its subsequent Kyoto Protocols, Gore's soul mates are taking control over the use of fossil fuels around the world. Clearly, Al Gore intends to take the road to the left and leave fossil fuel in the ground, forcing the world to rely on energy sources that cannot possibly meet the demands of our burgeoning economy.

Gore says the economy will not skip a beat because as we shift to the new energy technologies -- yet to be developed -- new jobs will be created, and in the doing of it, we will spare the earth from the horrible catastrophes associated with continued use of fossil fuels.

Is this visionary thinking, as our school children have been taught, or is this foolish fantasy?

The sobering reality is that alternative energy cannot possibly meet our energy requirements in the foreseeable future. Even if wind and solar energy were available in adequate supplies, they would come at great economic and environmental costs.

Neither solar nor wind energy is environmentally friendly. California leads the nation in the production of wind energy. Four major wind farms, employing more than 13,000 windmills, covering several thousand acres, produce 2.9 billion KW per year.

By contrast, a single coal-fired plant near Knoxville, Tenn., produces 10 billion KW per year. Which is friendlier to the environment? The windmills spin blades that are 58-feet long, producing a deafening roar for miles around. Birds enter the area at their peril. Humans who must drive through Altamont Pass, east of San Francisco, are advised to take earmuffs.

There is not enough land in America to erect enough windmills to supply a fraction of the energy needed to maintain the economy. Solar panels are even less efficient when it comes to the space required to produce energy, although they are quieter than windmills and don't kill birds.

Currently, coal provides about 55 percent of our electricity. Nuclear energy supplies about 22 percent; hydroelectric dams produce about 10 percent; and natural gas produces about 9 percent. All alternative energy sources combined produce about 2 percent of our electricity needs.

The stark reality is that alternative energy cannot begin to replace fossil fuels with the technology that is available, or on the horizon. This fact does not suggest that we should abandon alternative energy research. On the contrary, we should continue to seek new and better sources of energy, as we have been doing for several decades.

It does mean, however, that it is foolish to abandon the use of fossil fuels before technology pushes them into obsolescence. Energy policies predicated upon the whimsical notion that oil and coal are somehow bad, are not only shortsighted, they are misleading and downright dangerous.

If, as the Carter administration predicted, fossil fuels were exhausted at the dawn of the new millennium, our economy, and the world economy, would have ground to a screeching halt. No more air conditioning; no more trucks hauling goods from manufacturer to consumer; no more manufacturing; no more refrigeration; no more life as we know it. What a tragedy for civilization.

If the use of fossil fuel is denied, while abundant supplies remain in the ground, how much more is that tragedy compounded? This is precisely what Al Gore's vision of the future requires. Even worse, the United Nations, through the Kyoto Protocols, is attempting to take control over the phase-out of fossil fuel. Interestingly, the U.N. plan would force developed nations to phase out fossil fuel use first, leaving developing nations to use fossil fuel until their economies are brought into equity with the developed countries. Then the plan is to force all nations into energy use that is seen to be environmentally acceptable to the United Nations.

America cannot continue its apathetic response to the relentless attack on the use of fossil fuels.

Abundant, affordable energy is the basis of our health, wealth and prosperity, and the hope of the rest of the world. Fossil fuel is both abundant and affordable; no other energy source is. We cannot allow misguided environmental extremists to deny society the use of this energy.

America must begin now to develop an energy strategy that will first and foremost, rid this nation of its dependence upon OPEC or the United Nations for its energy supply. There are enough known coal reserves under the United States to supply our electricity needs for about 200

years. We can't use it because of the fantasies shared by Al Gore and his soldiers stationed throughout the administration. Since 1994, 628 coalmines have been closed, sending 16,200 mineworkers to the unemployment lines.

We should have been opening new mines and adding more workers to supply new power generating plants to meet the growing demand for electricity. Every KW of electricity supplied by coal frees petroleum and natural gas to be used for transport, heating, and industry.

Instead, the EPA has forced many coal-fired plants to switch to natural gas, putting an unnatural price pressure on a commodity that is better suited for other purposes. Natural gas prices have doubled in the last year. Most homes in the Midwest will feel the price crunch this winter.

Oil imports continue to climb because the Clinton-Gore administration continues to tighten the noose around the petroleum industry. New oil fields cannot be explored or developed because of so-called adverse environmental impacts. Where is the adverse impact of the noise pollution and bird slaughter at the Altamont Pass windmill farm?

Nearly 58 percent of our oil now comes from abroad. Al Gore's response -- sending Secretary Richardson to beg OPEC to increase production -- is beyond insulting, it is almost un-American. Our government must recognize the need to once again become self-sufficient in energy.

How stupid is it to give Saddam Hussein \$25 million a day for his oil, which we put in our airplanes to fly over Iraq to keep his airplanes on the ground? This is necessary, we are told, to prevent disturbing the "fragile" ecosystem of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Get a grip; it's frozen tundra! How many Americans have seen, or will ever see, or benefit from that vast stretch of snow that looks exactly like the rest of the northern slope? There is enough oil there to replace all the oil we import from Iraq -- and probably much, much more. Why should Americans not be benefiting from that oil, rather than continuing to pay Iraq for its oil?

Getting to the energy sources is only a part of the problem. This administration has also prevented the development of increased capacity to process and utilize fossil fuel energy. Only one refinery has been added to our capacity in the last decade. When Al Gore told his boss to release 30 million barrels of oil from our strategic reserves, our refineries were already operating at 96 percent capacity. All the gesture accomplished was to replace about 36-hours worth of oil supplied by OPEC with oil from our reserves. A slight blip in the world market price was the total effect; it provided no new oil for a thirsty economy.

For years, electricity suppliers have been warning that the demand for energy is increasing. To keep up with the demand, new generating plants must be brought on line. This administration has not heeded the warnings, and has thwarted efforts by the free market to meet demand. For years, the petroleum industry has warned that new fields and new refineries are necessary to meet the growing energy demand. Again, this administration has not heeded the warnings, and instead of allowing expansion, has penalized the fossil fuel industry and promoted the fantasy of alternative energy and reduced consumption.

Every summer, the rolling-brownout warning is issued by electricity generators in urban centers. The maze of specialized fuel formulations required by the Environmental Protection Agency keep refineries operating at maximum capacity. Prices at the pump continue to edge upwards as the total demand for energy continues to outstrip our capacity to supply it.

The problem is not OPEC; it is Al Gore and his fellow travelers in la-la land. If we start now with an energy policy founded on reality, and let free markets use the resources available, we can have the energy we need to continue our incredible race to the future. If we fail, our future may look a lot like yesteryear.

Coincidence or collusion?

By Henry Lamb

It could just be a coincidence that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's (IPCC) Executive Summary of its Third Assessment Report was released two weeks before the election. Had Al Gore been leading in the polls, the Summary might have been released at the U.N. Climate Change meeting which gets underway in the Hague November 13, a week after the election. Surely, no one would think that the U.N. has an interest in the outcome of the U.S. election.

The IPCC has now issued three Assessment Reports. These documents often range to 2,000 pages of highly technical scientific reports. Only scientists write them - and read them. The policymakers write an Executive Summary, which is their interpretation of what the scientists have said. When the first Assessment Report was issued, along with the Executive Summary, an uproar arose from many scientists who claimed that the Executive Summary did not reflect what the report actually said.

When the second report was issued, along with the Executive Summary, an even a louder uproar arose from scientists who claimed that the original report had been extensively edited by the policy makers, omitting language which conflicted with the interpretation of the policy makers.

Even with the changes, the strongest statement that could be made was that "the balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence" on global climate.

The Third Assessment Report has been available for months. Scientists around the world have reviewed the full report, and have been offering comments and criticism. Strangely, none of these scientists have sounded alarm about new findings or new threats. Not until the policymakers' Executive Summary was released - two weeks before the election - do we hear that "...it is likely that man-made greenhouse gases already have contributed substantially to the observed warming over the last 50 years." And that "the earth's average surface temperatures can be expected to increase between 2.7 and nearly 11 degrees Fahrenheit by the end of this century."

It is extremely significant that the Summary specifies *surface* temperatures. In previous reports, projections have been based on tropospheric measurements - from the surface to about 15,000 feet - and reported in Centigrade measurements. The 1 to 3 degree increase predicted previously is not as threatening as the 2.7 to 11 degree increase now being projected.

Tropospheric measurements in the last half of the century show no statistically-significant increase or decrease. Surface measurements, on the other hand, show a steady increase during the same time period.

Many of the most ardent global warming advocates were predicting a new ice age back in the 1970s, as the result of increasing atmospheric carbon dioxide. When the surface temperature

measurements revealed a constant increase in temperatures, the scientists claimed that the readings were distorted by the “urban sink” effect. The measurements were taken at airports and other urban centers where concrete and paved surfaces retained heat, and distorted the real temperature. Atmospheric measuring devices were developed and launched in 1979 which measure the temperature 24-hours a day, from the surface to about 15,000 feet, in 2.5 meter grids. These measurements reveal no increase, and the measurements are reaffirmed by measurements taken by weather balloons.

But urban sinks continue to expand, and collect heat, and distort the surface temperature reading. Now, however, these are the readings that the IPCC is using to make its ominous predictions.

Al Gore is in seventh-heaven. As he misrepresented the Rand “opinion” paper about Texas education on Tuesday, on Thursday, he is misrepresenting the IPCC report. Within hours after the release of the Summary, Mr. Gore was on national television claiming that your children will have to confront an 11-degree warming of the earth – as if it were gospel.

Al Gore, perhaps more than any other single person, is responsible for the Kyoto Protocol. The U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change was adopted and ratified in 1992, during the Bush administration. The treaty called for voluntary reductions of greenhouse gas emissions.

When the parties to the treaty assembled for the first time in 1995 in Berlin, Timothy Wirth headed the U.S. delegation. The first item of business was to convert the voluntary treaty to legally binding commitments - by 34 developed nations, excluding the other 150 nations.

The United States was asked to agree to legally binding commitments to reduce greenhouse emissions, by a measure to be determined by the United Nations at sometime in the future, without knowing how the emissions would be measured, how the reductions could be achieved, or what the penalty for non-compliance might be. Al Gore authorized Timothy Wirth to enter into this agreement, which was known as the “Berlin Mandate.” The mandate required that a Protocol be developed by the Third meeting of the parties to the treaty, which would assemble in Kyoto, Japan in 1997.

I attended every U.N. climate change meeting throughout 1996 and 1997, watching the negotiations proceed at a snail’s pace until the Kyoto meeting. Shortly before the Kyoto meeting, the U.S. Senate unanimously adopted a resolution which said it would consider a Protocol only if it included all nations, and produced no adverse economic impact on the United States. Two weeks before the Kyoto meeting, the President, on national television, said he would not accept a Protocol which did not meet the Senate’s requirements.

This statement by the President completely undermined the position Timothy Wirth had agreed to in Berlin two years earlier. Wirth resigned his position in the State Department, leaving the U.S. delegation to explain why it was reneging on the position it took in Berlin.

Throughout the first week in Kyoto, delegates lambasted the United States for saying in Berlin that 150 developing nations would be excluded, but in Kyoto, saying they could not be excluded.

The negotiations ground to a screeching halt. China, second only to the United States in greenhouse gas emissions, leading a group of 77 developing nations, adamantly refused to be included in the Protocol. The U.S. delegation, in response to the Senate Resolution and the President's statement, could not accept a Protocol that excluded most of the world. Gridlock.

There was mumbling in the halls about two years of wasted effort. Blame for the failure of the negotiations was piling on the United States. Rumors emerged about the possibility that Al Gore might come to Kyoto. By the end of the first week, it was confirmed, Al Gore would come and save the negotiations.

Al Gore did arrive in Kyoto. Early in the second week, Al Gore stood before the delegates and said he had instructed the U.S. delegation "to be more flexible." Shouts rang out across the enormous hall. Thousands of delegates raced to negotiating sessions with new enthusiasm. By the end of the week, the first draft emerged, detailing the commitments each of the developed nations would be required to make - no commitments for the 150 developing nations. Some of the developed nations thought that the U.S. commitment should be greater - so back to the negotiating table.

The Conference was scheduled to adjourn at 5: p.m. on Friday. On Friday at 5:p.m., the delegates were still negotiating. They were still at it, at midnight. Many of the delegates had flights scheduled for Saturday morning. Would the negotiations fail after all?

In the wee hours, before the sun rose over Kyoto, a document emerged. The bedraggled delegates stumbled into the hall and quickly adopted the last-minute agreement - and rushed to the airport.

In the end, Al Gore's instruction "to be more flexible" resulted in America's acceptance of an agreement that ignored the Senate's instruction and the President's promise. The Protocol excludes 150 developing nations -- China, Mexico, Brazil, and Indonesia among them -- while committing the United States to reduce its emissions to a level seven percent below 1990 levels by the first reporting period of 2008 - 2012.

Al Gore is, indeed, important to the United Nations, and particularly to those who have benefitted from the billions of dollars that have been invested in the global warming industry.

Thousands of scientists have publicly disputed the findings of the IPCC. Some very prominent climatologists have repeatedly drawn attention to scientific flaws in the IPCC's assumptions. Their voices are routinely ignored, and often discredited by suggesting that their research is tainted by grants from industry. Truth be known, those scientists who most strongly support the global warming scenario are those who feed most sumptuously at the government trough. As early as 1992, Dr. Richard Lindzen, a highly respected scientist at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, reported "The Politics of Global Warming," (*eco-logic*, May, 1992, p. 16), in which he identified several scientists whose funding was reduced or eliminated because their findings conflicted with the global warming scenario reported by the IPCC. The billions of dollars that have been poured into the global warming industry does not go to those whose findings do not support the U.N.'s desired outcome.

Al Gore's *Earth in the Balance* pronouncement, that what is needed, is a globally coordinated plan to eliminate the internal combustion engine by 2017, is little more than the ranting of an environmental extremist, to many Americans. The Kyoto Protocol, however, is such a globally coordinated plan. Who can say confidently, that phase two of the Protocol, tentatively scheduled for 2017 - 2022, will not require certain developed nations to eliminate the use of the combustion engine?

Is the release of the IPCC's Executive Summary, two weeks before the election, a coincidence, or collusion?

Kyoto freezing in The Hague

By Henry Lamb

Den Haag (The Hague) could use a heavy dose of "global warming." As the steady drizzle here approaches the threshold to snow, the rhetoric heats up at the conference center, where thousands of delegates, and twice as many NGO observers, argue over every detail of the Kyoto Protocol.

Meanwhile, in Nepal, television cameras captured the spectacle of 26 world religions joining with environmental extremist organizations to pledge "sacred gifts" to the earth. Christians "pledged" to put land under environmental management, according to the report. Another group pledged to stop hunting the snow leopard. Among the dignitaries participating in the event, was England's Prince Phillip. The religious leaders and eco-zealots barely had time to recover from jet lag from their last gathering in New York last September. That event was led by Mikhail Gorbachev and Maurice Strong, designed to bring the world's religions together to wage a sacred campaign to save the earth.

Simultaneously, in England, another group of environmental extremists launched a major demonstration denouncing "GM" -- not the car company but Genetically Modified food. It's hard to comprehend the planning and coordination -- to say nothing of the funding -- necessary to bring about this global outpouring for mother earth.

What each of these events has in common is their relationship to the United Nations' agenda to dictate the terms by which the earth will be saved. The NGO observers-protesters-advocates-agitators, get a significant portion of their funding through United Nations agencies or programs. Of course, at least 25 percent of all U.N. money comes from the United States.

The propaganda surrounding The Hague conference is broad, deep and pervasive. To participants arriving at the Conference, a World Wildlife Fund operative, dressed in a polar bear costume, distributes a card which says "don't sink the Protocol!" A pamphlet which explains how participants must purchase coupons to exchange for food, advises that all foods are prepared with "ecologically beneficial" ingredients. A hundred or more NGO exhibits distribute tons of literature. An attendee package prepared by the U.N., contains a book of photos and poetry describing the tragic condition of mother earth -- caused by man's greedy exploitation. Throughout the conference facility, large posters repeat the theme "Work it out!"

The theme refers to the hundreds of questions left unanswered in Kyoto where the Protocol was formally adopted in 1997. For nearly three years, now, these same conferees have been meeting in various cities around the world several times each year, negotiating answers to these unanswered questions. For example, the European Union and New Zealand want the word "reforestation" to include natural regeneration of forests that have been logged. China, Malaysia and other nations say absolutely not. This is an example of the mountain of minutia that the conferees are climbing. Incidentally, they have not yet agreed on what a forest is, either.

The larger questions, such as what the term "legally binding" means, have not yet been answered. This session in The Hague is supposed to provide answers to all these questions so the Protocol can be fully implemented by 2002. It is a very high mountain to climb.

The really, really big questions -- Is human activity actually causing climate change? Will the Protocol make any difference if fully implemented? Will the burden of implementation be equally shared? -- have been answered to the satisfaction of the United Nations functionaries, most of the delegates, a handful of outspoken scientist-advocates, and an army of NGO observers.

Their answers: Human activity may have an influence on global climate; full implementation of the Protocol will make no difference on the global climate; and the burden will be equally shared among 38 developed nations. This is sufficient justification for full and immediate implementation of the Protocol and for the theme "work it out" to all differences that hinder implementation.

A part of the pressure to act quickly, if irrationally, is to establish the global structure for implementation so the failure to reach phase-one targets can be measured -- and penalized -- and so that the delegates can get on to the important work of setting the targets for phase two.

Phase one targets are to be met by 2008-2012. Since it has taken nearly nine years to negotiate the Protocol and the rules for implementation, the delegates know full well that they must soon begin negotiating the targets and terms of the next phase.

The delegates, and most of the observers here, seem to have little or no concern that the Protocol may be rejected. The arguments center around how strong the Protocol will be, not around the validity of the effort. Only 30 nations have ratified the Protocol since it was adopted; none of them are bound by the Protocol. According to the Protocol's ratification provisions, it cannot go into force unless it is ratified by the United States, even if ratified by all the 150 nations that are not bound by it.

In the corridors, between sessions, there is talk of putting off some decisions until COP 7 next year, which will meet in Morocco. U.N. officials continue to press for decisions now, to "work it out," realizing that the possibility of unraveling the entire process is quite real.

Outside the global warming industry -- and it has become a multi-billion dollar industry -- people are growing weary of hearing the doom-and-gloom predictions. There is a growing "fatigue" about the whole idea. The demonization of dissenters is looking more like the propaganda it is, to a growing number of journalists and citizens, especially in the United States. The U.S. Congress appears to continue under the leadership of Republicans -- a reality that strikes fear in the hearts of global warming advocates.

This fear is not openly discussed at The Hague. It is more felt than heard. It is real, nonetheless. Each day, the delegates arise with the sun, proceed to the Conference hall, and stick their heads deep into the sand to continue discussing the meaning of such lofty terms as regeneration, forests, mechanisms and compliance.

What the world really needs...

By Henry Lamb

THE HAGUE -- More than anything else, the world needs an abundant supply of affordable energy. Energy transforms life from hard, brutish and short, to easy, prosperous and long. The millions of dollars being spent by the thousands of delegates assembled at The Hague this week, might be better spent discussing ways to get energy to more people, rather than discussing ways to deny people the energy they need.

The Climate Action Network (CAN), consisting of the world's most powerful environmental organizations, has declared that the use of fossil fuel, nuclear energy, and hydroelectric dams, are not sustainable. Therefore, these energy sources are not to be used in the future.

If the environmental extremists get their way, not only will the developing world be denied the use of affordable energy, the developed nations would have to curtail their use of energy from these sources.

Casual observers might scoff at the idea of reducing the energy supply in America. Better take another look. The dams on the Columbia River produce electricity for much of the Northwest; they are under severe attack by environmental extremists -- to protect the salmon.

The world's largest supply of low-sulfur coal lies under the Escalante National Monument, which can never be converted to affordable energy -- to protect the environment. These same environmental extremists have prevented any expansion of nuclear energy for nearly two decades.

Whether or not the casual observer has noticed, the environmental extremists represented at The Hague by CAN, are curtailing the use of affordable energy, and they are trying to write into international law, a prohibition of its use for all time.

More than 95 percent of the world's energy comes from the sources on CAN's hit list. If this energy is not sustainable, and therefore, not available, what is left?

Solar panels and windmills are all that is available at the moment, and promises of future technology that could transform the world without pollution. Environmental extremists believe that a supreme government (the U.N.) must ban the use of unsustainable energy sources, and use whatever money it takes to force the development of new, clean energy sources. There is not a whisper of concern about the economic and social implications of such a policy between the time it is adopted, and the time the fantasy technology is developed.

The world needs energy now, without a reduction in its availability or a substantial increase in its cost.

What the world doesn't need is a supreme government (the U.N.) dictating what the people of the world must, or must not, do -- even if those dictates are informed by the supreme wisdom of the environmental extremist elite such as CAN.

The world didn't need a government mandate to teach horses how to pull more than a man can pull. The world didn't need a government to outlaw the use of whale oil in order to develop the internal combustion engine. Free people, using their own ingenuity, do whatever needs to be done. They do it at their own risk, for their own benefit, and the rest of the world is the better for their efforts.

The pursuit of personal profit is by far a better motivator than is a government mandate. The reason the fantasy technology for energy has not been developed yet, is the absence of profit. Exotic energy -- solar, wind, whatever -- costs more than the energy readily available from traditional sources. There is no valid need to use costly exotic energy sources -- yet.

The global warming hype, generated by these same environmental extremists, is supposed to be the need that justifies the policy actions they recommend. Even if their claims of death and destruction were fully supported by scientific evidence, their top-down, government-mandated solutions are the wrong way to solve the problem. Free markets can do it better, faster, more efficiently, and with less cost, than any government program.

If there is a role for the United Nations in this global warming scenario, it should be limited to collecting and disseminating the best possible independent scientific research -- without prejudice or political comment -- so that nations and individuals can act on that information in their own best interest.

If there is a market for new technology, free people will find a way to supply the market demand -- unless government stands in the way. The discussions now underway at The Hague appear to be constructing an enormous roadblock to affordable energy, which, if successful, will condemn the world to unnecessary hardship.

Global governance erupts at The Hague

By Henry Lamb

THE HAGUE -- Jacques Chirac, president of France, told the delegates negotiating the Kyoto Protocol in The Hague, that the Protocol is an important step toward global governance. Most of the 8,000 delegates and observers enthusiastically embrace the idea of a United Nations agency mandating energy policy for 38 developed nations. There are a few notable exceptions.

The U.S. congressional delegation was on hand to hear the French president link the Protocol to the U.N.'s global governance agenda. In private conversations after the day's business was concluded, Sen. Chuck Hagel had sharp words of disapproval of attempts to transform the U.N. into a world government.

The Protocol, as conceived, though not yet fully negotiated, would give the U.N. body a double-whammy club to beat up on 38 developed nations. First, by setting emissions targets, the U.N. body would be able to effectively dictate the fossil fuel energy that a developed nation might use. Second, the U.N. would have the authority to "enforce" compliance, using procedures, sanctions and penalties that have not yet been defined.

Americans would not likely stand for an international law that openly gives the U.N. the power to set energy-use limits. So instead of attacking the input end of the energy pipe, the politically astute U.N. machinery is attacking the output end of the energy pipe. "Controlling emissions" is said to be the goal, and is presented as necessary to save the planet. Controlling energy use is the actual goal, and is necessary for the redistribution of wealth, with little or no impact on the planet.

The penalty for non-compliance has presented a particularly thorny problem, because most of the 38 developed nations will be unable to meet their agreed targets. This means that most of the affected nations will have to pay the costs -- whatever they are -- once the decision is taken. Consequently, compliance negotiations go on behind closed doors, with periodic reports that "some progress has been made." These negotiations have been ongoing for three years -- since the Kyoto Protocol was adopted in 1997.

Chirac's global governance announcement could be the straw that breaks the back of the entire Protocol. After eight days of intense negotiations, there has been little movement on three major issues that must be resolved: emissions trading, carbon sinks and penalties for non-compliance. Add to these unresolved issues the implications of global governance, and the entire process could easily unravel.

Perhaps this would be the best possible outcome of COP 6 -- admission by the delegates that the Protocol they pieced together in Kyoto is simply unworkable.

One of the many problems with this fatally flawed Protocol is that it attempts to do two things at once: 1) reduce carbon dioxide emissions in the atmosphere and 2) empower the United Nations to enforce those reductions. Either of these two objectives is a formidable undertaking. As the delegates have struggled over the last six years, it has become increasingly apparent that empowering the U.N. has become more important than reducing emissions.

Having heard Jacques Chirac say, not once, but twice, during his presentation, that global governance is the larger objective, the congressional delegations will have a new dimension to report to their colleagues when they return to Washington.

Regardless of the decisions that are taken -- or not taken -- during this two-week session, the delegates will find some way to save face. One scenario being discussed in the halls is the "Kyoto scenario." This is a situation -- as occurred in Kyoto -- in which no agreement was reached until the last day, several hours after the scheduled adjournment. Delegates could again go into closed session late in the week, and stay in session until the last minute, and then simply announce that agreement has been reached on some of the important issues.

Credence was attached to this scenario when rumors spread through the halls that the U.S. would cave-in on up to 60 percent of the outstanding questions about carbon sinks. The European Union and the U.S. have been at odds on this issue since Kyoto. Environmental extremists have been lobbying heavily for the delegates to reject the U.S. position.

Adding to the uncertainty here is the uncertainty in the U.S. Presidential race. Some speculation has emerged that should George Bush be declared the winner, the U.S. delegation might withdraw resistance to all outstanding issues in order to advance the Protocol as far as possible before a new slate of delegates is appointed by a new administration

. Publicly, the U.S. delegation says that the present administration will be in place until Jan. 20, and the elections struggle has no effect on their negotiating positions. Traditionally, the rumors in the halls tend to be very accurate.

By the end of the week, the delegates will prove or disprove the rumors, and some kind of face-saving document will be applauded as progress. It will not likely repeat Jacques Chirac's reference to global governance. But like a stone once thrown, his words cannot be recalled, and his words will have an impact wherever they land. His words will land in the U.S. Congress, and they will land across America.

Those skeptics who have been unwilling to believe that the U.N. is, indeed, contriving a world government need only to listen to the president of France.

Shades of Kyoto at The Hague

By Henry Lamb

THE HAGUE -- Sometime after midnight yesterday, Jan Pronk, prime minister of the Netherlands, and president of The Hague climate change conference, released his own draft of the proposed agreements delegates from 180 nations must adopt in order to move the Kyoto Protocol further toward implementation. For two weeks, the delegates have been gridlocked over major issues left unanswered when the Protocol was adopted in Kyoto in 1997.

In Kyoto, no agreement had been reached by the final day. The delegates went into a closed session and emerged near daylight with an agreement in hand.

Once again, the delegates have failed to reach agreement during the regular negotiating sessions. Once again, the conference leaders have produced a draft in the middle of the night. Once again, selected negotiators will go behind closed doors and will likely negotiate until some kind of agreement is reached.

This is what the United Nations calls an open, transparent, democratic process.

All week, Pronk has warned the negotiators to "remove the brackets," referring to clauses in the draft on which there is disagreement. He promised that if the negotiators failed to compromise, he would write his own draft.

He did.

Many of the delegates will be leaving today, because their travel arrangements require it. Any agreement reached at this late hour will be without the review of observers and without the participation of many of the delegates.

Pronk has said that his draft will force all nations to bear the pain equally. What that really means is that only the developed nations will bear the pain -- 150 developing nations are not bound by the Protocol. Should the U.S. delegates sign such an agreement, they would be deliberately ignoring a unanimous Senate resolution that says the Senate will not ratify a treaty that fails to bind all nations.

Delegates are confronted with only two choices: 1) accept some version of Pronk's draft and pretend that it represents a great victory for diplomacy, or 2) reject the agreement, admit failure and watch years of effort unravel. Smart money is on some kind of agreement.

Failure to reach real agreement, after five years of negotiations, should send a pretty strong signal that there may be some fundamental flaws in the basic document. The most basic flaw was incorporated in the original Berlin Mandate at the first Conference of the Parties in 1995 -- the

decision to exclude 150 developing nations. The second basic flaw was also included -- the decision to make the Protocol legally binding, with absolutely no idea how to make it legally binding or what the penalty might be for noncompliance. A third fatal flaw was the decision to set a firm time line for implementation.

The time line began in 1995, in Berlin, by declaring that a Protocol would be adopted in Kyoto in 1997. In Kyoto, the delegates declared that the rules for implementation would be agreed at The Hague in 2000, in order to achieve full implementation by 2002 -- to celebrate the 10th anniversary of the 1992 Rio Conference on Environment and Development where the original Climate Change Treaty was adopted.

The Kyoto document was premature, incomplete, ill-conceived and adopted anyway. The vacuous deficiencies of the Kyoto document have been compounded by efforts to shape rules for implementation of unclear or undefined objectives.

Any agreement adopted under the circumstances that prevail at The Hague is bound to do more harm than good. The unintended consequence of such an agreement will be nothing more than the empowerment of a U.N. body to do what the representatives of 180 nations could not do -- write the procedures through which the United Nations can dictate the energy policies of 38 developed nations.

This is precisely what 150 developing nations want and it is precisely what the United Nations wants. The primary objective of the United Nations is to force what it calls "equity" on all nations. The United Nations intends to be the equalizer, the manager of the earth's resources, to ensure that all people enjoy the benefits of the earth's bounty equally.

This is the classic, utopian dream of socialism. It fails to recognize a fundamental principle in nature: Benefit from the earth's resources must be earned. Benefits acquired by any other method are either a gift, or theft. Forced equity is not a gift.

Climate talks end in colossal collapse

By Henry Lamb

THE HAGUE -- Just before dawn Saturday morning, John Prescott stormed out of the climate change negotiations at The Hague, signaling dismal failure for the two-week negotiating session, which puts the future of the entire Kyoto Protocol in great jeopardy.

Prescott, Britain's Deputy Prime Minister, and Frank Loy, U.S. chief negotiator, reached agreement on the major outstanding issues sometime after 3 a.m. "We physically shook hands," Loy said. "Are we in now in full agreement, is this a deal?" Loy said that Prescott, and representatives from two other European countries in the room said "yes."

The deal fell apart when Prescott could not sell it to the rest of the European Union.

Jurgen Trittin, Germany's environmental minister led the resistance to Prescott's deal, and, in the end, it was rejected, causing a collapse in the negotiations that stunned veteran observers.

Jan Pronk, president of the conference, had issued his own set of proposed agreements on Friday, in an effort to avoid a negotiating stalemate. By late afternoon on Friday, Pronk said in a public statement that agreement on the details may not be possible, and the effort shifted to the development of a "broad statement of principles" on which the delegates could agree.

This maneuver is called "saving face." It frequently occurs to avoid the appearance of failure while setting the stage for further negotiations at a later date.

The undecided U.S. presidential race, and the possibility of a new slate of U.S. negotiators, undoubtedly provided motivation for the U.S. negotiators to surrender even more ground to the European Union in an effort to achieve agreement before The Hague conference ended. Thus, the near-dawn session between the U.S. and the U.K.

When the deal was rejected by the European Union, it revealed a breach that has heretofore hovered just beneath the surface, and threw the entire Kyoto process into an unprecedented diplomatic typhoon.

Until now, the friction within the European Union has not erupted in the climate change talks. The German environmental minister represents the Green Party, a near-militant extremist group. With support from Dominique Voynet, France's environmental minister, who is also a Green Party member, and four Nordic countries, the environmental purists flexed their muscles and derailed five years of tough, expensive negotiations.

"We came so close," Prescott said.

A spokesman for the U.S.'s National Environmental Trust, said this was the European Union's "best opportunity to achieve a strong climate treaty, and they decided to pass it up."

In an effort to make the failure appear to be something other than the disaster it is, the U.N. spin doctors decided not to "adjourn" the conference, but to "suspend" the negotiations, until COP 6 Part II, to be convened in May or June, 2001. This unprecedented invention throws the negotiating schedule into a cocked hat. COP 7 is already scheduled for Morocco in the fall of 2001, with several intersessional meetings required before then.

In practical terms, the failure in The Hague has left the Kyoto Protocol in diplomatic limbo. Add the growing likelihood that a new slate of negotiators will bring a Bush philosophy to the table, the emergence of Green Party Power in the European Union and the startling declaration of the French president that the Kyoto Protocol is the first "component of an authentic global governance," then all the ingredients are present for a big bang that may well disintegrate the entire global warming industry, and possibly thwart the U.N.'s global governance agenda.

The heart of the matter is the U.N.'s effort to reconcile an immovable object with an irresistible force. On the one hand, the United States negotiators are limited by the reality of Senate ratification, based on the principle that government is empowered by the consent of the governed. On the other hand, the Green Party extremists have no such concept, nor patience with a government that cannot simply impose its will upon the people.

"It's extremely difficult to negotiate between groups where political cultures are so different," laments Dominique Voynet. Jergen Trittin says his people think the U.S. position is "ridiculous."

This fundamental philosophical difference on the source of political power is the baseline conflict that cannot be reconciled. It is the same conflict that spawned two world wars. In recent times, this conflict has been camouflaged by propaganda that promotes "global" problems that can be met only by "global" action, directed by a central body of power wielders. Much progress has been made by the proponents of centralized government power. The Millennium Declaration, adopted by most of the world's heads of state, and the U.N. General Assembly, attest to that progress.

The failure of the climate change talks lays bare this fundamental conflict. It is an unexpected development that gives American citizens an opportunity to reexamine the role the United States is playing in the world, and the role it should play. Were it not for the necessity of Senate ratification, the current U.S. negotiators would have given away the store. Frank Loy repeatedly told his European colleagues that he had to negotiate abroad what was possible at home.

A new slate of delegates may insist that global agreements be based on the American principle that requires the consent of the governed before empowerment. Were this principle to replace the Green Party mentality that "government knows best," we could see a whole new era of international negotiations. We could see a whole new era of national development, based on voluntary agreements among nations, without the approval and enforcement of a "Big Brother" United Nations machine.

The failure of the climate change talks may be the collapse of the house of cards built with U.N. propaganda over the last two decades. The United States now has the opportunity to exert its influence, rather than acquiesce to the influence of the Green Party extremists that drive the U.N. global governance agenda. The collapse of the climate change negotiations may be the best possible outcome of the Kyoto experience.

Clinton on eco rampage

By Henry Lamb

Bill Clinton is attempting to do what thousands of U.N. delegates have failed to do in three years of negotiations -- fix the Kyoto Protocol for final implementation.

Unhappy with the collapse of The Hague climate change meeting last month, Clinton has initiated efforts to reach agreements which eluded the negotiators. In the waning hours of The Hague meetings, the U.S. retreated from its previous position, and gave away the store, so to speak, which was sufficient for the British negotiator, John Prescott, to "shake hands" on the deal.

But Prescott was unable to sell the Green Party extremists from Germany, France and four Nordic countries. Consequently, the deal, and the negotiations collapsed like a house of cards.

Clinton, U.K. Prime Minister Tony Blair and French President Jacques Chirac want the Kyoto Protocol implemented. Chirac told the delegates at The Hague that the Protocol represents an essential "component of an authentic global governance."

A British newspaper reports that "a huge amount of effort is going on behind the scenes." Clinton and Blair are scheduled to meet on Dec. 13 in Nice, France, to discuss a framework for a new deal. U.S. Chief Negotiator Frank Loy is working to get a ministerial-level conference arranged in Norway before Christmas. To appease the developing nations that are not being consulted in this effort, the British newspaper reports that the deal on the table includes "\$1 billion per year to help them develop their economies."

The Nice conference, at which the climate change deal is to be struck, is actually a pre-scheduled meeting to resolve contentious voting problems within the European Union. Chirac is the current president of the EU, and wants to secure agreement on EU issues and the climate change issues before his term ends.

We are witnessing the world's movers and shakers working their will on the people of the world, without regard for the rule of law. The U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change spent years developing rules by which agreements would be reached. When that procedure failed to produce the agreement desired by the movers and shakers, they disregarded the rules and proceed on their own to accomplish their objectives.

The U.S. Constitution sets forth, very clearly, the terms by which the United States may enter into treaties with other nations. Bill Clinton has refused to allow the U.S. Senate to consider the agreement his administration signed in Kyoto, and he is now trying to fashion his own deal with Tony Blair and Jacques Chirac -- to be forced down the throats of the American people and the people of the rest of the world.

The urgency to reach agreement, both in the EU disputes and the climate change disputes, is caused by the expanding resistance to both the European Union and to the Kyoto Protocol and, most importantly, to the idea of global governance.

For years, the movers and shakers scoffed at the idea of global governance, calling such ideas nothing more than scare tactics of right-wing extremists. Now that the Commission on Global Governance has issued its report; now that the Millennium Declaration has embraced the recommendations contained in the report; now that the official agenda of the U.N. General Assembly includes several of those essential recommendations; and now that Chirac has publicly declared the Kyoto Protocol to be an essential component of global governance -- now the people of the world are beginning to realize that global governance is real, and that it is here.

The likelihood of a Bush administration further underscores the urgency of their reaching agreement. A delegate at The Hague was overheard saying that a Bush presidency in the U.S. would set back U.N. plans by 20 years.

Whatever agreements may be reached by Clinton and his global-governance allies in Nice will be beyond the reach of Congress and, consequently, beyond the reach of the American people. The movers and shakers will make their deals and direct their underlings to implement their deals. Nowhere in this process is the consent of the governed even considered.

This is the fundamental flaw with global governance. Whether policy is set by the climate change conference, or by the General Assembly, or by any other international body -- the consent of the governed is not considered.

The simple principle that legitimate government is empowered by the consent of the governed, cannot be lost; it is in great jeopardy as Clinton races to ignore it in Nice.

New U.N. treaty ratified quietly

By Henry Lamb

The U.N. Convention to Combat Desertification was ratified by the U.S. Senate on October 18, but few Senators yet know that it has been ratified. Senator Craig Thomas (R-WY) introduced a package of 34 treaties, all of which were ratified by a show of hands -- no recorded vote.

Initially, Senator Thomas' office told callers that the Senator had nothing to do with the ratification. On December 8, his office called to explain that Senator Thomas just happened to be on the Senate Floor late in the afternoon of October 18 -- and was asked by the leadership to handle procedurally, the package of treaties. Senator Thomas has asked the Foreign Relations Committee to explain how, and why, the Desertification Treaty was included in the package.

At the recent climate change talks in the Hague, Senator Larry Craig (R-ID) said the treaty had not been ratified, until corrected by one of his staff. Phone calls to Senator Fred Thompson (R-TN), and other Senators, caught staffers off guard: Nobody knew how their boss voted on the ratification. They could not know -- there was no recorded vote.

This treaty was signed by the Clinton administration in 1994. It has been locked up in the Foreign Relations Committee since. Normally, treaties of such monumental importance are debated in committee and then forwarded to the Senate floor for further debate and disposition.

Not this time. The treaty appeared in a package of 34 treaties -- most of which were single-issue treaties with single nations, dealing with stolen vehicles, criminals, and the like. The Desertification Treaty, however, is not a single-issue treaty with a single nation.

This treaty is one of several environmental treaties that emerged from the 1992 U.N. Conference on Environment and Development in Rio de Janeiro. One of those treaties, the Convention on Climate Change, was ratified in 1992. The Convention on Biological Diversity failed ratification in 1994. The Convention to Combat Desertification was skillfully maneuvered through the Senate to avoid the public reaction which killed the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The Desertification Treaty claims jurisdiction over 70% of the earth's land area -- virtually all of the land that is not covered by the Convention on Biological Diversity. Moreover, this new treaty creates a structure through which all other environmental treaties are supposed to be integrated under a common United Nations implementation regime. A companion treaty is now being developed by the U.N. Commission on Water for the 21st Century. The United Nations is, in fact, creating the structure in international law and, through its extensive bureaucracies, to control the use of all natural resources on earth.

The U.S. Senate ratified the treaty on October 18, 2000 -- whether or not it knew what it was doing. On November 17, the Clinton administration delivered the ratification documents to the

United Nations. The United States is now bound by the international law that claims the power to dictate land use in 70% of the earth's land.

The name of the treaty implies that it is concerned about deserts -- in fact, it is concerned about all land use. To combat desertification, the treaty seeks to prevent land use that its enforcers think may lead to desertification. Converting forests to pasture, for example, or pasture to row crops, or crop land to subdivisions, are all uses that may lead to desertification, according to literature produced by the United Nations.

There is no distinction between federal land and privately owned land when it comes to land use under the jurisdiction of the U.N. The U.N. sees its role to be the establishment of policy -- it is up to the participating nations to see that the policy is implemented. The recent rash of land acquisition measures promoted by the administration and Congress seeks to get more land under federal ownership. The vast expansion of regulatory control over land use by all federal agencies makes it easier for the United States to comply with its international obligations under a variety of international treaties. This new treaty extends even further the U.S. obligation to control land use.

According to the treaty itself, no reservations can be included in its ratification (Article 37). The Resolution of Ratification adopted by the Senate contains several reservations -- all of which will be ignored by the United Nations.

Withdrawal from the treaty cannot even begin until after three years of participation -- and then another year must pass before withdrawal is recognized by the U.N. -- assuming, of course, that there is some desire in the Senate to withdraw.

Finally, finality

By Henry Lamb

The election of George W. Bush provides nothing more than a window of opportunity for those of us who have worked so long to promote the principles of freedom in public policy, rather than the stroke-of-the-pen-executive-order mentality that has dominated the federal government for the last eight years.

At the very least, there will be a changing of the guard: no more Bruce Babbitt; no more Carol Browner; no more Bill Richards; no more George Frampton; and, we hope, no more arrogance. There is no guarantee the new crew will be any better; they cannot be worse. Whoever replaces the Clinton/Gore appointees, become the targets of our opportunity. Our work is just beginning.

We can assume nothing. We must expect that every disappointed environmental extremist will target us, and the new administration, for venomous demonization as we try to promote the principles of freedom in public policy - protection of private property rights and multiple use of federal lands and natural resources.

The new administration and the Congress will be under enormous political pressure to end the fighting, to act in a “bi-partisan” fashion. Neither Congress, nor the new administration, will benefit from public expressions of our impatience if they fail to act as promptly as we would like. We need to be steadfast in our convictions about the application of the principles of freedom, but we need also, to be realistic in our expectations. Government is, after all, a political process.

It is our responsibility to know the process, and to become more skillful in the exercise than our opponents. It is counter-productive to bad-mouth those who fail to do what we want them to do, especially if we have not done our part to convince them that our point of view is better than the course they pursue.

Our work begins today. Each of us needs to learn all we can about those issue that affect us, and commit ourselves to developing a convincing argument, substantiated with concrete documentation. Then, we have to persuade every official for whom we vote, that our point of view is the best alternative.

This requires real work. It is much more difficult than keeping up with chat rooms and churning out e-mail. It is also much more productive. Chat rooms and e-mail are excellent sources of information, providing it is filtered through the test of accuracy. Information exchanged only among choir members, however, fails to win many converts.

Local organizations are the infantry in the public policy battle. Participation takes time and effort, but the rewards are worth the cost. Aside from the encouragement, inspiration, and new ideas, the group dynamic is greater than the sum of its individual parts. We encourage everyone who is concerned about reversing the regulatory nightmare that has befallen this country, to join

a local organization, where one exists. If there is none, consider organizing a local chapter of the Property Rights Congress in your area. Executive Director, Marge Welch, is ready and able to assist local chapters in the area east of the Rockies.

Use all of our web sites to gather documentation on the range of issues we address. Become the local expert on your issues. Attend public meetings of your city council, county commission, water authority, school board, and other government agencies. Volunteer to serve on “Smart Growth” committees, and “visioning councils.” Be there. Present your views. Convince the participants that individual freedom is more important than arbitrary growth limits imposed by government.

As the new year rises on the horizon, eight years filled with clouds of abuse, are fading. A new administration is a new opportunity which promises a healthy harvest. We must plant the seeds. We must cultivate and nurture the seeds we plant. We must tend the garden where our harvest grows. The harvest we yield, ultimately, will be no more fruitful than the effort we invest.

A new era of U.N.-U.S. relations?

By Henry Lamb

While President-elect George W. Bush will not have a shortage of advice about what he should do when he assumes the most powerful position in the world, relations with the United Nations is not likely to be high on the priority list. It should be.

Sen. Jesse Helms and Joe Biden crafted a "deal" which would pay the U.N. most of the so-called arrearage, the U.N. claims is owed by the United States, providing that the U.N. reduces the percentage of the U.N. budget the U.S. pays from 25 to 22 percent, for regular operations, and for peacekeeping operations, a reduction from 30 to 25 percent. The U.N. has refused to make these changes, and, now, Sen. Biden is looking for a compromise.

U.S.-U.N. relations must be re-evaluated from a much broader perspective than the amount of money the U.S. provides. The new administration, and the new Congress, should take a long hard look at what the United Nations is becoming. It is no longer a forum where sovereign nations meet to discuss their disputes; it is rapidly becoming a sovereign entity in its own right, with the power to compel once-sovereign nations to comply with policies crafted by the United Nations and its various subsidiary bodies.

Students of the United Nations know full well that originally, the institution was conceived to be a world government, to which all nations would be subservient. The original idea was for the United Nations to be the world's peacekeeper, by requiring all nations to turn over the bulk of their military might to the U.N., and maintaining only police power at the national level. As recently as 1961, the U.S. State Department supported this concept in its [Publication 7277, "Freedom from War: The United States Program for General and Complete Disarmament in a Peaceful World"](#) (subscription required). The Cold War prevented this general and complete disarmament, until the Berlin Wall collapsed. The original objective -- world government -- is, once again, on the front burner at the United Nations.

Since 1991, the strategy for achieving world government has changed. To begin with, the very term "world government" has been abandoned. The term "global governance," is now in vogue. The difference between the two terms, however, is similar to the difference between rape and date-rape; one begins with seduction.

General and complete disarmament has lost much of its appeal, since the danger of global nuclear war has diminished. Now the global threat is environmental degradation of the planet. This new strategy has evolved over the last two decades, but shifted into high gear during the 1990s. The U.N. Conference on Environment and Development adopted its ambitious "[Agenda 21](#)," in 1992. It was heralded as a nonbinding blueprint to save the planet. Since then, many of the "nonbinding" provisions have been incorporated into international law through U.N. treaties.

The Framework Convention on Climate Change, with its subsequent Kyoto Protocol; the Convention on Biological Diversity; and the Convention to Combat Desertification are three treaties which go quite far toward giving the United Nations jurisdiction over all the land and natural resources on the entire planet.

While these three treaties were evolving in three different U.N. subsidiary bodies, other U.N. agencies worked on different aspects of the global governance agenda. The U.N. endorsed and partially funded the Commission on Global Governance, which published its plan to achieve global governance in 1995. The U.N. Commission on Sustainable Development began to implement Agenda 21 objectives through National Councils on Sustainable Development, using agencies of government to voluntarily impose policies through regulatory powers. The U.N. Commission on Water for the 21st Century was authorized to begin developing an international treaty on water use. Throughout the world, U.N. subsidiary bodies are working around the clock to implement individual components of a well-conceived, well-coordinated, well-funded plan to achieve a new kind of world government.

In the past, concerns such as these, when voiced, have been met by ridicule and claims of "black helicopterism" by those who promote world government. No more. At the recent Kyoto Protocol negotiations at the Hague, French President Jacques Chirac told the delegates that agreement on the Kyoto Protocol was essential, that it is a "component of an authentic global governance." Jacques Chirac cannot be included in the black-helicopter crowd.

The Millennium Declaration adopted by 160 heads of state and the U.N. General Assembly in September 2000, embraced virtually all the recommendations contained in the report of the Commission on Global Governance. Among those recommendations is the elimination of the veto and permanent member status in the U.N. Security Council. This recommendation is under active consideration. George W. Bush's new ambassador to the U.N. must be instructed not to let this happen.

Another recommendation is to provide the U.N. with adequate, independent funding, preferably through the so-called "Tobin Tax," a levy on foreign exchange. This would free the U.N. from dependence upon its member nations -- especially the United States -- for the money necessary to implement its agenda. George W. Bush's new ambassador to the U.N. must be instructed not to let this happen.

The idea of general and complete disarmament has not been completely abandoned; it has simply been recast in the language of a permanent peacekeeping force under the auspices of the U.N. secretary general. Already, nations are eager to supply troops and equipment to this effort. George W. Bush's new ambassador to the U.N. must be instructed not to let this happen.

Even more ambitious goals are now articulated publicly by U.N. agencies. The recommendation for U.N. regulation of multinational corporations is given new credence with the adoption of the final text of a new U.N. Convention on POPs (Persistent Organic Pollutants), which will ban eight important chemicals and control four others.

No longer can the U.N.'s steady march toward global governance -- world government -- be discounted as the ranting of right-wing zealots. The question now is what should the new administration and the new Congress do about it?

The first step is to stop the denial, and recognize that the U.N. agenda is, in fact, an integrated, deliberate effort to achieve the world government it has long coveted. The next step is to prevent it.

This does not mean that the United States should withdraw from the international community. Quite the contrary. It means that the new administration has a unique opportunity to lead the world away from global socialism, toward a world of freedom. The rest of the world wants what America has -- prosperity. Prosperity was not bestowed on the United States by the United Nations. Nor can prosperity be bestowed upon the rest of the world by the United Nations. Prosperity arises only from the creation of wealth, not from the redistribution of it.

America's greatest gift to the world is not our wealth; it is our desire to share with the rest of the world the principles of freedom which made it possible for our nation to create its wealth. At the beginning of a new century, a new administration and a new Congress have the opportunity to share those principles with the world, but it cannot be done by acquiescing to the global governance agenda advanced by the United Nations.

The new administration, through all its appointees to all the various U.N. agencies, should insist that U.N. conferences be nothing more than a forum for sovereign nations to discuss their differences and share ideas. The United Nations must not become a global EPA, or a global police force, or a global banking institution, or a global welfare agency.

The United Nations is, and forever should be, nothing more than a global debating society; or it should follow the path of the failed League of Nations into the dustbin of history.