

CHANGING THE ENGINE OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: *THE NEXT UN STRATEGY*

by Dennis Ambler



SPPI ORIGINAL PAPER



July 20, 2010

CHANGING THE ENGINE OF THE GLOBAL ECONOMY: THE NEXT UN STRATEGY

by Dennis Ambler | July 20, 2010

SUMMARY FOR POLICY MAKERS

1. Recent remarks by President Obama and Treasury Secretary Geithner, promote the idea that the US can no longer be the primary driver of world economic growth and that other world economies must grow in preference to the US, to achieve “global economic growth”.
2. Released at the same time was a report from the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs, which stated that, “The US dollar is an unreliable international currency and should be replaced by a more stable system”.
3. The very existence of a UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs demonstrates the extent to which the UN has acquired quasi-governmental supra-national powers, without reference to the populations of the countries which provide its funding.
4. The UN proposal is for an expansion of the existing UN International Monetary Fund (IMF) mechanism of Special Drawing Rights, (SDR), whose value would be set by the IMF, effectively making it a Global Federal Reserve, with the power to print money.
5. This is not a new idea and prior to the 2009 G20, Secretary Geithner did not reject Chinese proposals for the use of SDRs as a de facto world currency, administered by the IMF. At the same time he called for G20 leaders to “‘substantially’ increase funding for the International Monetary Fund.”
6. A major plank in the long term objective of UN global governance, is environmental governance, via the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, (UNFCCC) co-sponsor, with the UN World Meteorological Organisation, (WMO), of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, (IPCC).
7. The push for Environmental Governance depends on the reports of the IPCC, claiming that a) human induced catastrophic global warming is occurring, and b) it is as a result of fossil fuel use.
8. Prior to the UN Climate Change Convention in Copenhagen, December 2009, Secretary Geithner spoke of the need for a Global Climate Fund to be administered by another UN body, the World Bank.
9. The World Bank is currently funding several giant coal-burning plants in developing countries, which are not subject to emissions targets, whilst coal-fired power stations in the West are subject to increasingly costly regulation.
10. The US has the world’s highest reserves of coal, sufficient for at least 200 plus years at current usage. Actual coal resources are larger than remaining natural gas and oil resources.

11. The UN Global Carbon Project says that the biggest increase in emissions has taken place in developing countries (with close to 6 billion people) while developed countries (with less than 1 billion people), on average, show “rather steady emissions for the last decade”.
12. At the Copenhagen Convention, Secretary of State Hilary Clinton committed present and future generations to draconian CO₂ emissions reduction targets.
13. There are no such targets for developing countries. In particular, China now exceeds the US in total emissions.
14. Secretary Clinton proposed the creation of a joint \$100 billion a year climate fund by 2020 to address the climate change needs of developing countries.
15. In the period 2007-12, India will spend \$100 billion on weaponry, which will rise to \$120 billion during the following five years (2012-17).
16. The whole premise of CO₂ emission reduction to control global temperature is demonstrably unproven and rests on inaccurate claims of multi-centennial atmospheric CO₂ residence time, when it is shown to be in the order of 5-15 years.
17. The adjunct to this is the false concept of a carbon budget, which claims that historic emissions form part of our “all-time global citizen allowance” and we in the West must now cease CO₂ emissions, whilst allowing undeveloped countries to replace them with their own.
18. The UN Global Carbon Project recognises that over 90% of the growth in coal emissions results from increased coal use in China and India, who of course are not bound by any Kyoto targets.
19. There are major on-going efforts by the UNFCCC and its affiliates to produce a legally-binding global agreement, for ratification at COP16 in Cancun, Mexico, (29 November to 10 December 2010), on further cutting of CO₂ emissions for developed nations.
20. Several UN proponents of the Climate Change agenda are also involved with carbon trading, including the Chairman of the IPCC who is also Chairman of the Indian Climate Exchange and the outgoing UNFCCC secretary, who is leaving to become an adviser on carbon trading to a major international company.
21. The UN says that undeveloped countries should be allowed to increase their CO₂ emissions, i.e. fossil energy usage, to lift them out of poverty. The corollary is that by reducing our CO₂ emissions and increasing our energy costs with heavily subsidised, unreliable and inefficient “renewable” energy, we will increase poverty in the West.
22. Proponents claim that “green” jobs will be created on the way to a Green World Economy. “Green” jobs are false jobs, in that they waste resources replacing existing energy supplies with more expensive ones, to produce the same goods as before, less competitively.
23. We are not running out of energy anytime soon and natural innovation and evolution will provide the long-term move to different energy supplies. To repeat an old saw, we did not change from the horse and cart because we ran out of hay.

INTRODUCTION

The comments on June 29th 2010, from President Barack Obama and Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner about the position of **the US as a long time driver of the World Economy** were, by an amazing co-incidence, reported on the same day as a Press Release from the **United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs**, which stated that **“The US dollar is an unreliable international currency and should be replaced by a more stable system”**.

This was the first report:

U.S. Can't Continue As Engine That Drives the Global Economy, Obama and Geithner¹ Say -

“We are in a very good position now of being able to deliver relatively strong growth rates to which we are seeing in major economies,” Geithner told BBC. “But I think the world understands now that world growth in the future can't depend on the United States as much as it did in the past. So, **for the world to grow together**, we have to see **more growth in the other major economies**.”

This was not a new message and Secretary Geithner prepared the ground last year on **November 17, 2009**, in written testimony to the **Senate Foreign Relations Committee²** and prior to the UNFCC COP 15 event in Copenhagen.

“In the wake of the most severe global recession in decades, strong American growth will require **stronger growth in our trading partners**.”

“To establish a more **global foundation** for growth and avert future crises of this nature, **we must rebalance global demand**.”

“**We asked** the **International Monetary Fund³** (IMF) to assist us in a mutual assessment process by evaluating whether policies pursued by individual G-20 countries are consistent with a more sustainable and balanced trajectory for **the global economy** and, if needed, recommending how policies could be adjusted to improve the global outlook.”

The IMF has 187 member countries. **It is a specialized agency of the United Nations** but has its own charter, governing structure, and finances.

The second report, seemingly unconnected to the first, was the **UN press release⁴**, seeking to **“ditch the dollar”**.



The very existence of a UN Department of Economic and Social Affairs demonstrates the extent to which the UN has acquired quasi-governmental supra-national powers.

“Under this proposed system, countries would no longer have to buy up foreign currencies, as China has long done with the U.S. dollar. Rather, they would accumulate the right to claim foreign currencies, or special drawing rights, or **SDRs**, rather than the currencies themselves.”

“The special drawing rights would be backed by a basket of currencies, which would make them less susceptible to volatility in any one currency. And because **the value of a special drawing right is defined by the IMF**, changes in the value of any one currency could be adjusted for.”

Secretary Geithner is not very far removed from the sentiments expressed in that press release, having worked from 2001 to 2003 as Director of the Policy Development and Review Department at the IMF, before he left to become President of the New York Federal Reserve.

In March last year he signalled that he was **not averse to the idea**⁵, prior to the 2009 G20.

“US Treasury Secretary Tim Geithner confessed on Wednesday that he had not read the plans by China's central bank governor for a "super-sovereign reserve currency" run by the International Monetary Fund, but nevertheless let slip that Washington was "open" to the idea.”

China's proposal is to activate the IMF's power to issue Special Drawing Rights (SDRs). The IMF would be groomed as de facto central bank for the planet. The SDRs would gradually become an "accepted means of payment".

He was also calling for **more funding**⁶ for the IMF:

“Washington, March 11 - In a statement released ahead of the G20 Finance Ministers and Central Bank Governors Meeting this weekend, US Treasury Secretary Timothy Geithner called for G20 leaders to 'substantially' increase funding for the International Monetary Fund.”

IMF – THE GLOBAL FED? (New American, 8th February 2009)

“Is the International Monetary Fund headed toward becoming the **Federal Reserve of the world?**⁷ Although one-world elitists in political and banking circles have been promoting the idea for many years, it has taken the current global economic crisis to provide the appearance of urgency and legitimacy needed to make the Global Fed scheme sellable to the public.

Issuing bonds is "an avenue that merits consideration," Lipsky, an American and the IMF's number two man, said in an interview published in the Wall Street Journal on February 1. This would be an unprecedented move for the IMF and indicates the Fund is headed toward **“supersizing,”** a term recently adopted by proponents of transforming the IMF into a **global monetary authority**.

Geithner seems to be very much in synch with the IMF's above-mentioned Lipsky, who also happens to be a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, as well as a former vice chairman of JP Morgan and the former chief economist for Chase Manhattan Bank (now merged as JP Morgan Chase & Co.). Both of those institutions played central roles in creating and promoting the financial practices that led to the global market meltdown.”

GLOBAL GOVERNANCE

In 2008, there was a **Financial Summit**⁸ which contained all the ingredients for advancing Global Governance:

“The International Monetary Fund (IMF), created at the Bretton Woods economic summit near the end of World War II, is being touted as the obvious candidate for a global financial regulatory organization.

Keynes and the rest of the British and American delegations to Bretton Woods wanted the agreement to create a global reserve currency (which Keynes wanted to call the bancor), but ended up establishing the dollar as the world's fallback currency instead. They also created the **SDR** (Special Drawing Right), a **quasi-currency** in which all accounts at the IMF were and are reckoned.

Now, it appears, the IMF is being primed for a much larger role, to be remade into a bona fide **instrument of global governance** — just as the original General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (GATT), also created at Bretton Woods, was later transformed into the World Trade Organization (WTO).”

CLIMATE CHANGE

One of the greatest tools in the UN global government tool-chest, is the concept of human-induced global warming, now morphed into the all-embracing term, Climate Change. In June, it was announced that **Global environmental governance** would be one of the priority areas for the United Nations at its 65th Session of the General Assembly (UNGA) to be held in September. Secretary Geithner noted the Administration’s approach to energy and climate policy, in his November 2009 testimony to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.



A major plank in the long term objective of UN global governance, is environmental governance, via the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.

“The President has outlined **comprehensive changes in how we use energy**, focusing on policies to advance energy and climate security while promoting economic recovery efforts, job creation, and driving clean energy manufacturing.”

Was he referring to this January 2008, Senator **Obama interview**^{9,10} with the San Francisco Chronicle, before he became President?

“What I've said is that we would put a **cap and trade system** in place that is as aggressive, if not more aggressive, than anybody else's out there.

The push for Environmental Governance depends on the reports of the IPCC, claiming that a) human induced catastrophic global warming is occurring, and b) it is as a result of fossil fuel use.

I was the first to call for a 100% auction on the cap and trade system, which means that every unit of carbon or greenhouse gases emitted would be charged to the polluter. That will create a market in which whatever technologies are out there that are being presented, whatever power plants that are being built, that they would have to meet the rigors of that market and the ratcheted down caps that are being placed, imposed every year.

So if somebody wants to build a coal-powered plant, they can; **it's just that it will bankrupt them** because they're going to be charged a huge sum for all that greenhouse gas that's being emitted.

Under my plan of a cap and trade system, **electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket**. Even regardless of what I say about whether coal is good or bad.

Because **I'm capping greenhouse gases**, coal power plants, you know, natural gas, you name it — whatever the plants were, whatever the industry was, uh, they would have to retrofit their operations. **That will cost money. They will pass that money on to consumers.**”

No change there then. Secretary Geithner continued his November Senate address with familiar words:

“**We must seek a global agreement** with significant action by all major economies. As part of that agreement, **developing countries will need financial support to reduce their emissions** and create new markets for clean energy technologies, as well as to adapt to the unavoidable effects of climate change.”

Remember, this was prior to Copenhagen.

“In the context of a new climate agreement, we have argued that **a new climate fund should be established** at an existing international financial institution to deploy financial resources effectively. We expect such a fund to build on the experience of


the **Climate Investment Funds (CIF) at the World Bank**, which this Administration has strongly supported.“

The World Bank will specifically have a **central role** in contributing to financing the **transition to a green economy** by assisting countries in integrating climate change concerns into their core strategies.

Did he mean **this** strategy, reported in **The Times**“, September 16, 2009?

WORLD BANK SPENDS BILLIONS ON COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS

“The World Bank is spending billions of pounds subsidising new coal-fired power stations in developing countries despite claiming that burning fossil fuels exposes the poor to catastrophic climate change. The bank, which has a goal of reducing poverty and is funded by Britain and other developed countries, calls on all nations in a report today to “act differently on climate change”. It says that the world must reduce its dependence on fossil fuels, but it is funding several giant coal-burning plants that will each emit millions of tonnes of carbon dioxide a year for the next 40 to 50 years.”



The World Bank is currently funding several giant coal-burning plants in developing countries, which are not subject to emissions targets, whilst coal-fired power stations in the West are subject to increasingly costly regulation.

The World Bank is an independent **specialized agency of the UN** as well as a member and observer in many UN bodies.

\$100 BILLION DOLLAR COMMITMENT AT COPENHAGEN

Secretary of State Hilary Clinton presented the **Administration’s policy**¹² at the UN Climate Change Convention in Copenhagen last December. She announced emissions cuts of 17% below 2005 levels by 2020, extending to 30% by 2025 and exceeding 80% by 2050. She also spoke of the need for generous financial and technological support to developing countries for emissions reduction and climate change adaptation, to be provided in the form of a **global Climate Fund**:

“And today I’d like to announce that, in the context of a strong accord in which all major economies stand behind meaningful mitigation actions and provide full transparency as to their implementation, the United States is prepared to work with other countries toward a **goal of jointly mobilizing \$100 billion a year by 2020 to address the climate change needs of developing countries.**”


Did she mean **these** climate change needs?

Arms Spending: India grows as West shrinks: **Deloitte-CII report**

“The Deloitte-CII report points out that as defence expenditure drops in the traditionally big-spending western economies, including the USA, Indian defence spending will grow steadily over the next 20-25 years, as New Delhi implements a major defence modernisation. During the **current Five Year Plan** (2007-12), India will spend **\$100 billion on weaponry**, which will rise to \$120 billion during the next Five Year Plan (2012-17).”

Or did she mean **these** Chinese needs? — **Coal Fired Build Rate – China and US**

National Energy Technology Laboratory **Summary for Year**¹³ 2009



- Eight plants totalling 3,218 MW have become operational. 2009 has had the largest new coal capacity additions in one year since 1991.
 - (This statistic was seized upon by environmental groups, as evidence that coal was back on the agenda, but they ignored the rest of it and the chart above.)
- “Progressing” projects have **decreased** by 18 plant (8 which are now operational, with a decrease in total MW involved (from 26,131 MW to 17,355 MW).

- 4,605 MW of new capacity have been proposed and **14,915 MW have been cancelled** – out of the 14,915 MW of cancelled plants, 65% were in the early announced phase and **35% were in an advanced progressing phase.**
- Compared to previous year, few “announced” projects are being proposed.


US COAL RESERVES

The US has the largest coal reserves in the world and actual **coal resources**¹⁴ are larger than remaining natural gas and oil resources. As of January 1, 2008, The Energy Information Administration (EIA) reported **489 billion tons** of demonstrated reserve base, (DRB). The U.S. uses just over a billion tons of coal each year, giving in excess of 400 years of coal at current usage.

The US has the world's highest reserves of coal, sufficient for at least 200+ years at current usage.


Of course it may not all be recoverable if environmentalists have their way, and the EIA says that because of property rights, land use conflicts, and physical and environmental restrictions, only about **50 percent** of the demonstrated reserve base (DRB) may be **available** or accessible for mining, but even that gives around 200 years of domestic energy resource.

US ENERGY FUTURE IS BLOWING IN THE WIND



Coal provides just about half of US domestic energy but it is going to be priced out of the market, whilst developing countries are expanding coal-fired energy plants with no limits.

They also qualify for funding from the UN Clean Development Mechanism, (CDM), which allows companies from developed nations to buy permission to emit CO₂ at home, a cheaper option than retro-fitting or replacing existing plant. There is no net reduction in CO₂ emissions as a result.



CONTRACTION AND CONVERGENCE

The process whereby developed countries sacrifice their home industries and populations by imposing ever higher taxes on energy, is known in UN parlance as **“Contraction and Convergence.”**¹⁵

It is described by its initiator as “An International Conceptual Framework for Preventing Dangerous Climate Change” and has been adopted and subscribed to by the UN and member countries of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, (UNFCCC).

The narrative says that there is a finite global budget for carbon dioxide content in the atmosphere, a total amount beyond which the world will heat uncontrollably and human kind will be visited by dreadful climate disasters, including, but **not limited to**¹⁶, stronger hurricanes, rising sea levels, droughts, floods and plagues.

“Climate justice” demands that everyone on the planet has an equal right to emit the same amount of CO₂. Greedy western nations have, since the industrial revolution, used up their share of this allowable CO₂ amount and must now pay reparation to the undeveloped nations who have not industrialised.

Developed nations must **“Contract”** their economies by cutting fossil fuel usage to levels reported in 1990 (the Kyoto Protocol) and then transfer knowledge, technology and finance to developing nations, to bring them up to the new lowered expectations of the developed nations, described as **“Convergence.”**

However, there is a problem and it is that there are two paradigms in force, mutually antagonistic to each other. “Climate Equity and the Millennium Development Goals” require that undeveloped nations are allowed to use fossil fuels to lift them from poverty, whereas “CO₂-induced Climate Catastrophe Theory” says global emissions must peak by 2015 and then start coming down to save the planet.

There are no targets, caps or limits on the emissions of CO₂ by developing nations and it is unlikely they will wish to, at some point in the future, give up their improved standards of living brought about by greater access to fossil fuel energy. Emissions from developed nations are being replaced by emissions from developing nations.

Chart 1 below, using data from the **BP Statistical Review**¹⁷ of World Energy June 2010, shows that in terms of total primary energy usage, China has already “converged” with the US and has left the UK far behind. However, whilst this shows the rapid growth of China, and the

increasing growth of India, it does not show usage **per capita** and here is where the environmentalists get excited.

CHART 1 — Primary Energy Use for the US, UK India and China – 1999-2009 in million tonnes of oil equivalent (mtoe)





Chart 2 — Percent change in population and primary energy consumption for the US, UK, India and China – 1999-2009



(Data from **BP Statistical Review**¹⁷ of World Energy June 2010)

CLIMATE EQUITY

The US currently uses four times more energy per capita than China, but China uses four times more per capita than India, so should China stop emitting CO₂ now to let India catch up? The UK uses almost twice as much energy per capita as China, but the US uses twice as much energy as the UK.

Should the UK therefore, in the interests of climate equity, step up its energy usage to match the US, should the US step down to match the UK, should the UK step down to match China? The flaws in the UN World Socialist Climate Equity argument immediately become apparent, because the different needs of each country, relative to its development and GDP, are not taken into account. Are we to believe that, even within a country, everyone will use the same amount of energy?

The US would need to reduce energy consumption by **almost 80%** to meet China's **current per capita consumption** and hence we get the "pie in the sky" auctions of promises by politicians, talking vapidly of **80% reduction by 2050**, imposing untold hardship on future as well as present generations.


But of course, China's current per capita consumption is not an end point and will continue rising until it reaches present western levels, before tailing off, as higher proportions of their population have access to reliable energy. The same situation will apply to other nations, such as India and South Africa, whereas Chart 2 above suggests it is likely that the developed countries' energy needs will not rise significantly from current levels, except in response to demographic or economic changes.

This point is also confirmed by yet another UN offshoot, the **Global Carbon Project**. This is how they describe themselves:

The Global Carbon Project was formed to assist the international science community to establish a common, **mutually agreed knowledge base** supporting policy debate and action to slow the rate of increase of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere.

The Global Carbon Project is responding to this challenge through a shared partnership between the International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (**IGBP**), the International Human Dimensions Programme on Global Environmental Change (**IHDP**), the World Climate Research Programme (**WCRP**) and **Diversitas**. This partnership constitutes the Earth Systems Science Partnership (**ESSP**).

They say that **the biggest increase** in emissions has taken place **in developing countries** (with close to 6 billion people) while **developed countries** (with less than 1 billion people), on average, **show rather steady emissions for the last decade**.



*The whole
premise of CO₂
emission reduction
to control global
temperature is
demonstrably
unproven.*

They also say that fossil fuel CO₂ emissions continued to grow in 2008 at **2% per year**, which led to a record high of 8.7 billion tons of carbon emitted to the atmosphere. That figure is 29% above emissions in 2000, and 41% above the Kyoto reference year 1990. (The use of “tons of carbon” is misleading, because carbon of course, is soot and this is a calculation of the **carbon component** from the estimated CO₂ gaseous emissions for each country. It would probably be quite difficult to sell the idea of a gaseous footprint. The increase in atmospheric CO₂ in 2008 was 0.48%)


They note that coal is the largest fossil-fuel source of CO₂ emissions and that **over 90% of the growth in coal emissions results from increased coal use in China and India**, who of course are not bound by any Kyoto targets.

In spite of this, the climate refuses to warm, but the developed nations are still in the dock for what was emitted from 1750 onwards. The IPCC claim that CO₂ residence time in the atmosphere is **fifty to 200 years** and that current emissions will act as a ticking bomb for future generations. Their concept of a **fixed CO₂ budget**¹⁸ to “stop climate change”, is the basis for all the emissions schemes, carbon footprints, renewable energy subsidies and a constant expansion of research departments and government agencies.


Back in 1997, **Segelstadt**¹⁹ said that the real atmospheric CO₂ residence time is only about **5 years**. A **2009 paper**²⁰ by Dr. R. H. Essenhigh, Professor of Energy Conversion at Ohio State University, also found that the residence time for the molecule ¹²CO₂, is about **5 years**, while for the trace molecule ¹⁴CO₂, it is about **16 years**. There is also the work of **Georg Beck**²¹, whose analysis of historic chemical CO₂ measurements, shows periods of higher atmospheric CO₂ levels than today, within the last and previous centuries, rather than the “pre-industrial steady state” theory preferred by the IPCC.

This is dismissed by IPCC, but as we know from Climategate, anything that doesn't fit the theory won't get past the gatekeepers.

Who are these Global Carbon people? Well, there are no surprises, they are the same people who are running the IPCC, as described by Susan Solomon in this **ESSP presentation**:²²(Earth System Science Partnership).



The adjunct to this is the false concept of a carbon budget, which claims that historic emissions form part of our “all-time global citizen allowance” and we in the West must now cease CO₂ emissions, whilst allowing undeveloped countries to replace them with their own.



A summary of her figures shows that the **ESSP group** provided majority input to AR4 as follows:

- ✓ 91% of Co-ordinating Lead Authors
- ✓ 66% of Lead Authors
- ✓ 68% of reviewers
- ✓ 31% of contributing authors.

The World Climate Research Program, (WCRP) is an offshoot of the WMO, which is co-sponsor of IPCC with UNFCC, (*don't you just love all the initials and acronyms*). Kevin Trenberth, (*can't find the missing heat*), is Chairman of the WCRP Observations and Assimilation Panel. He is currently head of Climate Analysis at NCAR.

The International Geosphere – Biosphere Program (IGBP) includes several of Trenberth's colleagues from NCAR and has Mann colleague Ray Bradley, Jean Palutikof, a former Director of CRU, and Dahe Qin, Solomon's co-chair on WG1 as appointees of the International Council for Science (ICSU). Palutikof is now spreading the **CRU message**²³ in Australia.

The IGBP is proudly proclaiming on its website that **"sixty two experts from the "IGBP community"** - scientific steering committees, national committees, networks - have been selected as authors or reviewers for **IPCC AR5** and will contribute to all three IPCC working groups".

I expect we could write the Summary for Policy Makers now.

The International Human Dimensions Program on Global Climate Change, (IHDP), is more global governance by the UN, and again has network members on its advisory board, for example, Rik Leemans, who is the ESSP Scientific Committee Chairman. It also has Katrina Brown from UEA and Frank Bierman, the founding director of the **Global Governance Project**²⁴, a research programme of 12 European institutes, including the London School of Economics, (Lord Stern *et al*).

Diversitas is another group-think eco-catastrophe outfit, which, as at 3 April 2008 had serial doomster **Paul Ehrlich** on its advisory board, together with **Jane Lubchenko**, now Chief Administrator at **NOAA**²⁵.



Several UN proponents of the Climate Change agenda are also involved with carbon trading.

THE WESTERN LIFESTYLE WILL HAVE TO CHANGE

Dr Rajendra K Pachauri, founder and adviser to Texan oil company, GloriOil and also Head of the IPCC, **knows the script**²⁶ by heart, quoted here in a 2009 interview, speaking in his IPCC role:

“Remember, **the problem** has been caused not by today’s emissions or the last twenty-five years of emissions; it’s been **caused by cumulative emissions beginning with industrialization**. The role of the industrial countries is paramount in having contributed to human-induced climate change.”

The Western lifestyle will have to change. Therefore, it would be far easier for us to embark on a very different path of development, and not emulate the same lifestyle, because there would be much less pain in doing that than to go after exactly what the West has done and then to have to cut down drastically.

That was in May last year, but he never worries about anything he has said previously, and he popped up again in July with this **emphatic declaration**²⁷, speaking in his role as an energy entrepreneur:

“Supporting India's stand that it **would not** budge under pressure from the western world to **accept emission reduction standards**, Dr R K Pachauri, Director-General (Teri), said that India cannot be "pressurized" on the issue and asked the developed world to act first.”

THE BATTLE TO RENEW KYOTO

The IPCC has created such an enormous false paradigm based on computer models, that they have frightened some politicians who believe it, into draconian domestic energy taxation measures and given others, who don’t believe it, the opportunity to grandstand on the world stage and push for global energy taxation measures. The concept of cumulative anthropogenic emissions from the start of industrialisation, somehow sitting in the

atmosphere, separate from natural emissions and warming the planet like some radiant room heater, is quite bizarre.

However, advocate scientists have built careers on it, financiers and carbon traders are making fortunes out of it, developing nations and Small Island States, advised by NGO's, see it as a source of free money from the West.

There are major on-going efforts by the UNFCCC and its affiliates to produce a legally-binding global agreement.

The charade must continue and we have scientists telling us that not only do we have to stop using fossil fuels, we should also take our “old” CO₂ out of the atmosphere, or capture it from the processes of energy generation and store it underground for goodness knows how many millennia. Again, the cost of such futile madness is ignored, but in 2007, Ken Caldeira, one of the authors of the IPCC Special Report on Carbon Capture and Storage, estimated the **worldwide cost**²⁸ could be a massive \$800 billion annually.

One thing is for sure, the push for a legally binding global deal on emissions will not abate, because they are desperate for a continuation of carbon trading brought in by the Kyoto Protocol, which expires in 2012.

Leading the charge will be the Chairman of the Indian Climate Exchange, Dr R. K. Pachauri, also Chairman of the IPCC, who, in 2007 at a “Sustainable Development” Conference in Delhi, said that, “in the case of climate change, **the atmosphere is to be managed efficiently**” and “The (Kyoto) Protocol has resulted in the initiation of **a carbon market that shall expand in future**. After the apparent failure of Copenhagen in December, he was still in confident mood in this Indian newspaper report, remembering that Kyoto was once, like Copenhagen, just an “Accord”:

“Days after the Copenhagen climate summit, one of the world’s top climate analysts has predicted that a new legally-binding emission-curbing treaty will emerge at the 2010 summit in **Mexico City**²⁹ to replace the Kyoto Protocol.

But the new agreement should contain the key Kyoto provisions, as the world could not “possibly jump off the protocol at this time,” cautioned R K Pachauri, who heads the UN Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change.

“A fresh agreement with a **brand new name** is required to bring the US on board in a **new global climate order**. Without any US commitment on emission cuts, the global effort to cut down the level of carbon dioxide from the atmosphere will remain laggard.

A new agreement is also required because any legally binding treaty with the Kyoto tag will not be approved by the American Senate since the US did not ratify the protocol.

In 2010, the negotiations will centre on **how much of the Kyoto provisions can be copied and pasted onto the new legal agreement.**”

The current Kyoto Protocol was to last from 2005 to 2012 and more ambitious CO₂ emission cuts would be required from 2012. The Kyoto agreement gave life to carbon trading, but because of the economic situation, prices have been lower than expected. There has also been major fraud, both with the European ETS and the UN CDM. To preserve carbon trading, a legally binding successor to Kyoto has to be found, in which there are globally agreed emission limits for developed countries, together with a tax-payer-funded floor price for “carbon”.

In April there was a UNFCCC **meeting in Bonn**³⁰ of the Working Group on **Further Commitments** for Annex I Parties (developed nations), under the Kyoto Protocol (AWG-KP 11) and the Working Group on Long-term Cooperative Action under the Convention (AWG-LCA 9).

They met **again**³¹ in June, when outgoing UNFCCC secretary Yvo de Boer, said that “**progress made** during the two weeks opens the way for Cancún to deliver the full package of operational measures that will allow developing countries to take faster, stronger action across all areas of climate change.”

**“Green”
jobs are
false jobs.**

This is a “spin” way to say that developed countries will have to make even more cuts to transfer more funds to developing nations via carbon trading and deceptively implies that developing nations are going to cut emissions. Renewable energy systems such as solar and wind are only on the periphery of their energy matrix and core energy supplies will be from fossil fuels for many years to come.

De Boer, who is leaving the UNFCCC to advise KPMG on carbon trading, underlined the need for governments to make full use of the **next two** formal sessions ahead of Cancún, as well as the need for intense work at all levels to help and give guidance. They will **meet again** in **August**³².

You can almost hear them saying, “Cancun we do it? Yes, we can”.



REFERENCES

1. <http://www.cnsnews.com/public/content/article.aspx?RsrcID=68617>
2. <http://www.ustreas.gov/press/releases/tg410.htm>
3. <http://www.imf.org/external/about/overview.htm>
4. <http://edition.cnn.com/2010/BUSINESS/06/29/un.report.dollar/index.html?fbid=C3iT5p7nmOq>
5. <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/finance/economics/5051075/A-world-currency-moves-nearer-after-Tim-Geithners-slip.html>
6. <http://www.forbes.com/feeds/afx/2009/03/11/afx6154715.html>
7. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/index.php/economy/economics-mainmenu-44/766>
8. <http://www.thenewamerican.com/economy/commentary-mainmenu-43/496-upcoming-financial-summit-about-global-governance>
9. <http://hotair.com/archives/2008/11/02/obama-ill-make-energy-prices-skyrocket/>
10. <http://newsbusters.org/node/25829?q=blogs/p-j-gladnick/2008/11/02/hidden-audio-obama-tells-sf-chronicle-he-will-bankrupt-coal-industry#ixzzotMpX6aFb>
11. <http://www.timesonline.co.uk/tol/news/environment/article6836112.ece>
12. <http://www.state.gov/secretary/rm/2009a/12/133734.htm>
13. <http://www.netl.doe.gov/coal/refshelf/ncp.pdf>
14. <http://www.eia.doe.gov/neic/infosheets/coalreserves.html>
15. http://www.gci.org.uk/Briefings/C%26C29sept_.pdf
16. <http://www.numberwatch.co.uk/warmlist.htm>
17. http://www.bp.com/liveassets/bp_internet/globalbp/globalbp_uk_english/reports_and_publications/statistical_energy_review_2008/STAGING/local_assets/2010_downloads/statistical_review_of_world_energy_full_report_2010.pdf
18. <http://www.globalcarbonproject.org/carbonbudget/08/hl-brief.htm>
19. http://www.geocraft.com/WVFossils/Reference_Docs/Carbon_cycle_update_Segalstad.pdf
20. http://www.co2web.info/Segalstad_CO2-Science_090805.pdf
21. <http://www.biomind.de/realCO2/>
22. http://unfccc.int/files/methods_and_science/research_and_systematic_observation/application/pdf/essp_part_1.pdf
23. http://www3.griffith.edu.au/03/ertiki/tiki-read_article.php?articleId=16801
24. <http://www.glogov.org/>
25. <http://www.gloucestertimes.com/local/x383291258/Audit-cites-wide-fund-abuse-by-NOAA-cops>
26. <http://www.progressive.org/intvo509.html>
27. http://www.teriin.org/index.php?option=com_teriinnews&task=details&sid=1057
28. <http://www.businessandmedia.org/articles/2007/20071025163217.aspx>
29. <http://www.deccanherald.com/content/42868/copenhagen-accord-diplomatic-challenge-basic.html>
30. http://unfccc.int/meetings/intersessional/bonn_10/items/5533.php
31. <http://unfccc.int/meetings/sb32/items/5573.php>
32. <http://unfccc.int/meetings/items/2654.php>

Cover photo from 2012predictions.net, modified In Photoshop.



Science & Public Policy Institute

"Science-based policy for a better world."

Robert Ferguson

SPPI President

bferguson@sppinstitute.org

202-288-5699

P.O. Box 209

5501 Merchants View Square

Haymarket, VA 20169

www.scienceandpublicpolicy.org

