

THE DEWEESE REPORT

WWW.AMERICANPOLICY.ORG

Is the Security and Prosperity Partnership the Beginning of a North American Union?

Address By Tom DeWeese

February 3, 2007

Is our government working quietly to create the equivalent of a North American Union – much on the lines of the European Union?

Some charge that such a Union will eventually override our Constitutional government, our judicial system, our economic system and even our currency, which, some speculate, will be replaced by something called the Amero. Can it be possible?

Others say such charges are just another trumped up conspiracy theory of a lunatic fringe.

I can't possibly address every issue and describe the complete history of the situation in our short time together, but I can go over the highlights and give you an idea as to why many of us are greatly concerned and in fact believe we are entering the fight of our lives.

Here's a quick run down.

On March 23, 2005 President Bush

met with Mexican President Vicente Fox and Canadian Prime Minister Paul Martin in what was officially described as a "Summit." The three leaders then announced the signing of an agreement to create common policies concerning various economic and security issues among the three nations.

The initiative is called the Security and Prosperity Partnership or the SPP.

It's purpose?

According to a joint statement from the three leaders, the SPP is to "establish a common approach to security to protect North America from external threats, prevent and respond to threats within North America, and further streamline the security and efficient movement of legitimate low-risk traffic across our shared borders."

Desirable or not, such an undertaking represents a radical change in how the three nations interact and cooperate with each other. It is a matter of changed foreign policy, monetary policy, and military policy.

Yet there has been no Congressional oversight or authorization for the undertaking. No funds appropriated.

Meanwhile, since that Summit in 2005, at least 20 working groups have been organized under the SPP to produce memorandums of understanding and trilateral declarations of agreement covering nearly every issue affecting our daily lives.

Whether or not you accept the idea that a North American Union is being established, clearly it must be acknowledged that a new layer of tri-national government bureaucracy is being created.

As you know, the major debate in the US today is over border security. Our nation is being flooded with hordes of illegal aliens. They are over-burdening our schools, hospitals and social services.

In many parts of the nation, hospitals and services are being forced to shut down, damaging the quality of life of American citizens.

On top of the illegal alien situation, we face danger from the threat of terrorists as Americans are forced to surrender liberty in the name of fighting this threat.

And there is the flood of illegal drugs pouring over the border, straight into our kid's schools.

More than 80% of the American people have demanded something be done to secure the borders.

Yet, the Administration has fought efforts to close the border. Why? It appears obvious in light of agreements made in the creation of the Security and Prosperity Partnership.

The SPP calls for "harmonizing" our borders into one seamless entity called North America.

IN THIS ISSUE:

4. ABSOLUTES: Forcing Global Warming Nightmares on Children
7. INSIDER'S REPORT: Ron Paul Reintroduces "We The People" Act To Stop Activist Judges
8. SPOTLIGHT ON THE OPPRESSORS: Global Warming Ethics, Pork and Profits

So, under what authority are more than 16 government agencies being organized to create the SPP?

As reported by Congressman Ron Paul:

According to Administration officials, "...*The SPP is neither a treaty nor a formal agreement. Rather it is a 'dialogue' launched by the heads of state of Canada, Mexico, and the United States... 'What is a dialogue? We don't know. What we do know, however, is that Congressional oversight of what might be one of the most significant developments in recent history is non-existent. Congress has no role at all in this 'dialogue'. According to the SPP, this 'dialogue' will create new supra-national organizations to 'coordinate' border security, health policy, economic trade policy, and energy policy between the governments of Mexico, Canada and the United States. As such it is but an extension of NAFTA and CAFTA like agreements that have far less to do with the free movement of goods and services than they do with government coordination and management of international trade.*"

Congressman Paul went on to say the SPP is "*an unholy alliance of foreign consortiums and officials from several governments.*"

It is important to note that administrators of NAFTA and CAFTA are major participants in SPP working groups. Thus the connection to these trade agreements is obvious and substantial.

According to Article 5.11, under the NAFTA agreement, participating nations must reform their laws to NAFTA regulations.

The United States Supreme Court has held that the US government cannot hide behind a claim of federalism to avoid its "international obligations."

NAFTA, then, appears to be the governing entity for the SPP. That means NAFTA regulations (and ultimately SPP regulations) will supersede U.S. laws. NAFTA courts (and ultimately SPP courts) will overrule U.S. courts. And NAFTA policy (and ultimately SPP policy) will override U.S. labor, energy, environmental, health and economic policy.

The Security and Prosperity Partnership is basically NAFTA on steroids.

But how will the Administration move forward to fully implement the SPP without Congressional oversight?

Answer: Fast Track.

Renewed again in 2002, President Bush has been given by Congress the power to freely negotiate treaties and trade agreements with foreign nations.

According to the lobbying group, Public Citizen, the bottom line of Fast Track is that "*the White House signs and enters into trade deals before Congress ever votes on them. Fast Track also sets the parameters for congressional debate on any trade measure the President submits, requiring a vote within a certain time with no amendments and only 20 hours of debate.*"

Mexican economist Miguel Picard wrote in an article published in the foreign press detailing the "deep integration" planned for North America. He said there will be no single treaty and nothing will be submitted to legislatures of the three countries. Instead, he says, the plan for a "merged future" will be implemented through the signing of regulations not subject to citizen review.

Picard concluded by saying the schedule calls for beginning with a customs union, then a common market, then a monetary and economic union, and finally the adoption of a single currency.

Who benefits from the creation of such a union? Multinational corporations.

They are the driving force behind its creation. They seek one currency, one set of rules, one controlling entity - to enable them to move goods and services effortlessly across the border.

Above all, they do not want the public involved in the process.

At a September meeting in Banff, Canada, top officials from all three nations met to outline policies within topics such as "A Vision for North America," and "Demographic and Social Dimensions of North American Integration."

Top US officials, including former Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld and U.S. Trade Representative Carla Hills were in attendance. No media was present. No details of these top level discussions were released.

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Vol. 13, No. 3 March 2007

Published by
American Policy Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Copy Editor
Virginia DeWeese

Correspondence/Fulfillment
Sascha McGuckin
Carolyn DeWeese

Graphics/Layout
Kristy Wilson

The DeWeese Report
70 Main Street, Suite 23
Warrenton, VA 20186

Phone: (540) 341-8911
Fax: (540) 341-8917

E-mail:
apcmail@americanpolicy.org

Web Page:
www.americanpolicy.org

© 2007 American Policy Center
ISSN 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Newsletter of the
American Policy Center

Permission to photocopy, reprint and quote articles from The DeWeese Report is hereby granted, provided full acknowledgment is included. All reprinted articles must say: "Written by Tom DeWeese, editor of The DeWeese Report (unless another author is listed). All reprints must carry The DeWeese Report address and phone number. Samples of the reprint must be provided to The DeWeese Report.

However, the Toronto Star, on September 20th, reported, *“The public has been kept in the dark while business elite have played a lead role in designing the blueprint for this more integrated North America.”*

One participant at the Banff meeting didn't like what he was witnessing. Mel Hurtig, a noted Canadian author said, *“We're talking about such an important thing, we're talking about the integration of Canada into the United States. For them to hold this meeting in secret and to make every effort to avoid anybody learning about it, right away you've got to be hugely concerned.”*

The SPP is not about free trade. Its use of public/private partnerships creates an elite of certain, chosen global corporations which basically become part of government at the expense of their competition and our national independence.

One more major example of how this works is the planned NAFTA Super Highway or, as it is officially called, the Trans Texas Corridor.

This massive highway would be ten lanes wide, with rail lines, utility corridors for natural gas and oil and power lines running down the middle.

It is designed for containers loaded in foreign lands, such as Asia, to arrive in Mexican ports, there to be loaded in trucks and shipped up the NAFTA corridor through the U.S. and into Canada.

As global corporations are now reaping the benefits of using cheap labor in foreign lands such as China, South Korea and Indonesia, now they want to use the NAFTA Super Corridor to reduce the transportation costs as well.

These corporations certainly care little about national sovereignty or security.

The borders would be little more than speed bumps. Truck would not be stopped and inspected. Instead, they would be simply scanned by high-tech gamma ray screening in drive-by inspections.

Nor do they care about private property ownership in their drive for cost cutting.

In Texas alone, some 584,000 acres of private land is scheduled to be taken by eminent domain for the highway. Texas Department of Transportation has the authority to use the “Quick Take” provision, which will allow them to give notice to property owners that they must leave their land in just 90 days.

Even if the landowner disagrees on the compensation -- and appeals the decision, they still must be off the land in 91 days.

As part of the Corridor's public/private partnership, the Texas state government is keeping up its end of the deal by stonewalling every effort to obtain information as to whose property is affected. They have operated virtually in secret.

When news has leaked out about the NAFTA Highway, Texas officials deny it and simply say it is just improving its state highway system.

The Trans Texas NAFTA Corridor is not, however, an improvement project for I-35, as the state claims.

The NAFTA corridor will be a completely separate highway – a toll road run by a foreign corporation. The state of Texas has signed a 50 year lease with a Spanish company named Cintra. The company will build the highway, run it and collect the tolls.

That lease contains a “no compete” clause meaning that I-35 can not be expanded nor can any other non-tolled competitive highway be improved.

Above all, as goods are shipped into Mexican ports, use of American ports on our East and West coasts will be drastically reduced, costing Longshoreman jobs.

These facts are causing great concern among U.S. labor unions. The corridor will allow free access to the U.S. for Mexican trucks, which means the containers can be moved through

the U.S. by Mexican nationals. In addition, the flood of Mexican trucks will not be required to meet U.S. standards for safety.

These are just a very few of the details concerning the SPP. We believe it is the beginning of the creation of a North American Union much on the lines of the European Union.

The game plan is very much the same. The excuse for the EU was trade. But today, according to the former president of Germany, 84% of that nation's laws now come from the European Union.

It begins in secrecy and slowly builds incrementally. But step by step a structure is put into place run by communitarian law and regional governing councils of appointed, well connected, yet unknown and unreachable officials hiding behind public/private partnerships, not answerable or responsive to citizens.

This is why we fear the creation of a North American Union.

The United States is the most unique nation on earth. We are the only nation which was created to protect our natural rights.

The greatness of the American system arises from the fundamental principle that governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed.

That means that public policy must be enacted only by elected representatives of the people. This principle ensures that the people can remove and replace policy makers who make policy with which the people disagree.

To harmonize this land with nations which do not share our values and governing principles can only result in a lessening of our liberty and our quality of life.

To do it in secret, refusing to allow us to engage in debate before such massive changes take place is nothing short of treason.



ABSOLUTES....!

Forcing Global Warming Nightmares On Children

By Tom DeWeese

The amount of propaganda poured into the heads of little children in the name of education is astonishing. Case in point: I just received a letter from a little girl in elementary school asking why I don't believe in global warming. She said her class had watched Al Gore's outrageous propaganda file, "An Inconvenient Truth," and then her letter began to spew all of its incredible inaccuracies. She was writing to me because she wanted to know why I didn't believe in global warming.

First, I have a hard time believing this little girl sat down and wrote the perfectly produced letter on her own. I believe she was participating in a class project perpetrated by a teacher who is probably telling the children about the outrageous skeptics that still exist out there, even after that great visionary, Al Gore, has provided us with all the facts. I can hear the teachers instructing the class "let's write to those skeptics and see how they crumble under Al's logic."

I could be wrong, but I invite you to read the actual letter and judge for yourself. Here it is.

"I am a student at xxxxxx Elementary School in xxxxxxxx,xxxxxx. My class watched the movie, An Inconvenient Truth, by Mr. Al Gore. The movie told us that Al Gore goes around the world to many different places and shows a slide show about global warming. I don't know if you have seen his slide show, but it gives some very good evidence about global warming. I read that you don't believe in global warming, and I heard why you don't believe in it, but in my opinion, I think global warming is real.

You know that the polar ice caps are melting, because the temperature is rising. We learned that the greenhouse gases are keeping all of the sun's rays inside the atmosphere. The rays bounce off the ice caps like a mirror and back up out of the atmosphere. But, whenever they bounce off the ice caps, they melt a little bit. So, if more and more of the sun's rays are staying in the atmosphere, the water will get warmer and warmer, and melt the rest of the ice caps, because water takes in ninety percent of the ray's heat. So if there was enough heat to make the water hot around the ice caps, the ice caps will melt. If that happens to all the ice, like in Antarctica and Greenland, the sea level will rise. If the sea level rises, then some places will flood. After the terrorist attack, 9-11, they were going to build a memorial for the people who lost their lives. If the sea level rises, the World Trade Center Memorial would be under water.

There are many ways to help stop global warming. A few ways I have learned are to change a regular light bulb to a fluorescent light bulb. It would save tons of carbon dioxide from going into the air. When people burn forests, it releases tons of carbon dioxide into the air, making those greenhouse gases which stop sun rays from going back into the sun.

Natural disasters, like tornados, floods, droughts and hurricanes are getting worse every year. Al Gore said it was because the heat from the oceans is getting hotter and hotter, making the hurricane's velocity and moisture increase, making them more intense, just like Hurricane Katrina. Hurricane Katrina wasn't that bad as it passed over Florida, it was a factor 1 hurricane. But as Katrina went over the ocean, the velocity and moisture increased, making it more and more dangerous. That's why it did what it did to New Orleans.

Everyone has their own opinion, and yours might be that global warming is one hundred percent not true. Al Gore's opinion is that global warming is one hundred percent true. My opinion is, knowing that our winters are getting warmer and warmer, I would have to say that global warming is true. I don't think it's exactly one hundred percent true, like others might think, but learning from Al Gore and seeing all the effects that global warming has had, I would say that global warming is a big possibility. I would really appreciate if you would respond to me, because I would like to know what you think about it."

So do you think she wrote this letter on her own? I don't either.

...THESE THINGS REALLY ARE HAPPENING!

But I did take the time to write her a response. Perhaps it will help in some way to dilute the vile, one-sided, brain-numbing education machine and get a little truth into one classroom.

Dear Student:

I thank you for your letter concerning my position on global warming. It is so very important that young students such as yourself learn there is more than one side to the global warming argument. It is vital to understand that open debate and discussion is not only important, but absolutely necessary in a free society.

Let me, however clear up one point from your letter about my position. I have not said that global warming doesn't exist – I have said there is no conclusive evidence of “man” causing the warming. Second, my position has been very clear concerning “consensus” by scientists that man-made global warming is a fact. The truth is there is no such consensus. There is a large group of scientists from around the world, while acknowledging there is a slight warming occurring, believe it is the result of very natural causes and nothing to be alarmed over.

Here are some reports from just a few of the scientists who dispute the position of Al Gore and others promoting the global warming scare:

Scientists at Duke University, after careful examination, said, “The magnitude of future global warming will likely fall well short of current highest predictions.”

Dr. Richard Lindzen, atmospheric scientist at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), said that global warming is unlikely to be a dangerous future problem.

Dr. Fred Singer of the University of Virginia says there is no evidence to support the man-made hypothesis.

Much of the misconception over the entire global warming issue centers on the theory that carbon dioxide released into the atmosphere holds in the heat. Of course the contention is that man produces the CO-2. Would it surprise you to learn that carbon dioxide or CO-2 is not a pollutant and is essential for us to live? It is important to note that the volcano in the Philippines, Mt Pinatubo, has erupted several times during man's existence. Each time it spews more CO-2 into the atmosphere than ALL of the CO-2 man has EVER put there – and it happens EVERY time the volcano erupts. Clearly, man-made CO-2 can have very little impact on the atmosphere.

So what is causing the minor warming that is certainly taking place? Science is now showing evidence of a regular 1,500-year cycle of warming periods, followed by periods of cooling. As an example, the evidence of such a 1,500-year cycle goes back to the Romans who wrote about growing grapes in England. Then, during the Dark Ages, it was too cool to grow them. During the Medieval period, the Britons themselves wrote about growing wine grapes –then for 650 years it was too cool.

Study shows that the Vikings started farms in Greenland. Then it grew too cold and their settlements died. There have been, in fact, some 600 warming periods in the last million years. It's natural. More evidence comes from study of ice cores in both Greenland and the Antarctic.

Studies also show that sea levels have been rising -- about 400 feet – over the past 18,000 years. It's nothing new. In addition, it is a falsehood to say Polar Bear populations are in decline. Quite the opposite is true.

Yet, as I'm sure you've read and discussed in class, a new report was just released by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in which the news media reported that it said man made global warming is a fact. Would it surprise you to learn that the scientific report hasn't even been released yet? In fact that report won't be released until next May. What was released to the news media was a “summary” prepared for lawmakers and public officials. It contained no scientific evidence for any of its claims about global warming. This was done specifically to allow the news media to sound the alarm and promote the global warming agenda.

(Cont'd on Pg. 6)

ABSOLUTES....! (Cont'd from Pg. 5)

It is important to know that the IPCC has a history of releasing false and misleading reports on global warming. In a report released by the IPCC in 1996, two vital paragraphs were left out. Those paragraphs, written by the scientists who studied the global warming issue, said:

1. *“None of the studies cited about has shown clear evidence that we can contribute the observed climate changes to increases in greenhouse gases.”*
2. *“No study to date had positively attributed all or part of the climate changes...to man-made causes.”*

Yet, after that 1996 report was released (without these two vital paragraphs) the news media (and Al Gore) used it to declare that global warming was a real threat to the world. There is little hope that the new study, no matter what the science shows, will fair any better.

Finally, according to government statistics, there has been no dramatic increase in Hurricanes in the past 35 years. The average number of storms per year is about 28.5. So far, in the 2000s, there has been an average of 25 storms per year. And in 2006, storms were almost non-existent. Hurricane Katrina did get stronger as it passed over the Gulf of Mexico from Florida. That is a natural occurrence. However, it was not Katrina which caused the major damage in New Orleans. It has in fact been downgraded to a Category 3 storm, hardly out of normal range. The damage to the city occurred when the levies broke, flooding the city. That was a result of government not doing its job, allowing the levies to go into disrepair – hardly a reason for the rest of the world to panic over “killer storms.”

The ocean temperatures do rise about every ten years causing more severe storms. That’s because of a natural occurrence called El Nino. And that’s what we were experiencing in 2005 when such strong storms hit our coasts.

So, if all of this is true, why do so many, like Al Gore, sound the global warming alarm? Money and political power. It is a sad fact that many people will spread such lies and fear for money and power. But it has happened throughout history. Politicians don’t always tell the truth.

We have a saying in politics. “Follow the money.” In other words, to understand why some people do certain things, find out who is getting paid and why. Scientists who use climate change to explain natural environmental changes receive massive grants from government, private foundations and even corporations. The U.S. government will issue over \$6.5 billion in grants in 2007. Politicians use global warming as an excuse to create what we call “pork barrel” alternative energy projects. That means they are able to put more than \$14 billion into the hands of friends or corporations who in turn donate to their election campaigns. In all, there is more than \$20 billion being spent by government, foundations, corporations and environmental activist groups to promote the hysteria of global warming. Each has either money or power to gain.

By the way, let me assure you that my organization has never taken a dime from anyone trying to get me to promote my position on global warming.

Meanwhile, there is a very frightening effort underway to silence the “skeptics” of global warming. Some officials have even advocated that those who oppose global warming hysteria should be arrested. To do so would mean the end of free thought and free speech in the United States.

Whether you agree with anything I’ve said about global warming, surely you and your teachers would not support the jailing of people who simply don’t agree with your positions. To do so would drive this nation into a Dark Ages of fear and superstition with everyone afraid to speak out on any issue. Tyranny would rule us.

These are my answers to your questions. I am sorry that young people like you are forced by school officials and politicians to bear such heavy burdens on your shoulders. No one in elementary school should have to suffer such fear in their young lives.

Please don’t worry. Global warming is not a horror that will destroy the earth. It is completely natural. We’ll get used to the warmer winters and the longer growing seasons for our crops. The sea levels will not swallow whole islands and the 911 memorial in New York will never be under water – I promise.



INSIDER'S REPORT

Ron Paul Reintroduces "We The People" Act To Stop Activist Judges

Congressman Ron Paul has again introduced the "We the People" Act. The new bill number is H.R. 300. The "We the People" Act is aimed at limiting the jurisdiction of federal courts and ending the tyranny of activist, or "Constitutionally-defiant" judges.

So great is their power that school boards are literally banning everything from school prayer to wearing a tee shirt with a Christian message, for fear federal courts will take action against school officials. Now, even state and local judges are making identical rulings for fear of being overturned by a higher federal court.

To the rescue comes Congressman Ron Paul (R-TX) as he reintroduces his bill, H.R. 300. As Rep. Paul explains the bill, "Federal judges are undermining republican government by imposing their preferred policies on states and local governments. Instead of respecting the policies adopted by those elected by, and thus accountable to, the people.

The "We the People" Act forbids Federal courts, including the Supreme Court, from adjudicating cases

concerning State laws and policies relating to religious liberties or "privacy" including cases involving sexual practices, sexual orientation or reproduction. The Act also protects the traditional definition of marriage from judicial activism by ensuring the Supreme Court cannot abuse the equal protection clause to redefine marriage.

Action To Take:

Rep. Paul now needs more cosponsors for the bill in order to assure it receives the proper and necessary attention of the Congress. Call or write your U.S. Congressman and ask him/her to sign on as a cosponsor of the "We the People" Act, H.R. 300.

1. How to Write:

Congressman _____
United States House of Representative
Washington, D.C. 20515

2. How to Call:

Capitol Switchboard (202-225-3121)
Ask for your Representative by name.



SPOTLIGHT... (Cont'd from Pg. 8)

rules will create valuable property rights and reward companies that reduce CO2 emissions, often by replacing old, inefficient, high-polluting plants that they want to retire anyway.

DuPont and BP will get money for biofuels, GE for its portfolio of climate protection equipment, ADM for ethanol, Lehman Brothers for emission trading and other deals. Environmental activists will be able to influence corporate, state and federal policy, and rake in still more cash. Insurance companies can blame global warming for rate increases and coverage denials.

Lobbying and deal brokering will enter a new era. As Thenardier the innkeeper observed in Les Miserables, "When it comes to fixing prices, there are lots of tricks he knows. Jeas, it's just amazing how it grows." Indeed, the opportunities to

"game the system" will be limited only by one's "eco-magination."

To determine the losers, look in the mirror. Activists and politicians are creating a Frankenstein climate monster on steroids. Were it real, we'd need to dismantle our economy and living standards to slay the beast. How else could we eliminate 80-90% of US and EU fossil fuel emissions by 2050, to stabilize carbon dioxide emissions and (theoretically) a climate that has always been anything but stable?

Think lifestyles circa 1900, or earlier. Ponder the British environment minister's latest prescription: World War II rationing, no meat or cheese, restrictions on air travel, no veggies that aren't grown locally. France wants a new government agency that would single out, police and penalize countries that "abuse the Earth." Others want to put little solar panels on African huts, while kleptocratic dictators get millions of dollars for trading away their people's right to

generate electricity and emit CO2.

We should improve energy efficiency, reduce pollution, and develop new energy technologies. But when we demand immediate action to prevent exaggerated or imaginary crises, we stifle debate, railroad through programs that don't work, create enough pork to fill 50 Chicago stockyards, and impose horrendous unintended consequences on countless families. That is shortsighted and immoral.

Paul Driessen is senior policy advisor for the Congress of Racial Equality and Center for the Defense of Free Enterprise, two groups that have received some ExxonMobil support for work by Driessen and others on malaria eradication, Third World agriculture, energy and economic development, climate change, and other issues. He is the author of *Eco-Imperialism: Green Power · Black Death* (www.Eco-Imperialism.com).



SPOTLIGHT ON THE OPPRESSORS



GLOBAL WARMING ETHICS, PORK AND PROFITS

Global warming alarmism generates political and financial incentives



Paul Driessen

The ink has barely dried on its new code of conduct, and already Congress is redefining ethics and pork to fit a global warming agenda. As Will Rogers observed, “with Congress, every time they make a joke, it’s a law. And every time they make a law, it’s a joke.”

However, life-altering, economy-wrecking climate bills are no laughing matter. That’s why we need to recognize that the Kyoto Protocol and proposed “climate protection” laws will not stabilize the climate, even if CO₂ is to blame. It’s why we must acknowledge that money to be made, and power to be gained, from climate alarmism and symbolism is a major reason so many are getting on the climate “consensus” bandwagon.

In accusing ExxonMobil of giving “more than \$19 million since the late 1990s” to public policy institutes that promote climate holocaust “denial,” Senate Inquisitors Olympia Snowe and Jay Rockefeller slandered both the donor and recipients. Moreover, this is less than half of what Pew Charitable Trusts and allied foundations contributed to the Pew Center on Climate Change alone over the same period. It’s a pittance compared to what US environmental groups spent propagating climate chaos scare stories.

It amounts to 30 cents for every \$1,000 that the US, EU and UN spent since 1993 (some \$80 billion all together) on global warming catastrophe research. And it ignores the fact that the Exxon grants also supported malaria control, Third World economic development and many other efforts.

Aside from honest, if unfounded, fears of climate disasters, why might others support climate alarmism?

Scientists who use climate change to explain environmental changes improve their chances of getting research grants from foundations, corporations – and US government programs

that budget a whopping \$6.5 billion for global warming in 2007. They also increase the likelihood of getting headlines and quotes in news stories: “Climate change threatens extinction of rare frogs, scientist says.” Climate disaster skeptics face an uphill battle on grants, headlines and quotes.

Politicians get to grandstand green credentials, cement relationships with activists who can support reelection campaigns and higher aspirations, magically transform \$14-billion in alternative energy pork into ethical planetary protection, and promote policies that otherwise would raise serious eyebrows.

Corporate actions that cause even one death are dealt with severely; but praise is heaped on federal mileage standards that cause hundreds of deaths, as cars are downsized and plasticized to save fuel and reduce emissions. High-energy prices are denounced at congressional hearings, if due to market forces – but praised if imposed by government “to prevent climate change.” Drilling in the Arctic or off our coasts is condemned, even to create jobs, tax revenues and enhanced security; but subsidizing wind power to generate 2% of our electricity is lauded, even if giant turbines despoil millions of acres and kill millions of birds.

Alarmist rhetoric has also redefined corporate social responsibility, created the Climate Action Partnership and launched the emerging Enviro-Industrial Complex.

Environmental activists have turned climate fears into successful fund-raising tools – and a brilliant strategy for achieving their dream of controlling global resource use, technological change and economic development, through laws, treaties, regulations and pressure campaigns. Recent developments promise to supercharge these efforts.

Environmental Defense is collaborating with Morgan Stanley, to promote emission trading systems and other climate change initiatives – giving ED direct monetary and

policy stakes in the banking, investment and political arenas, and in any carbon allowance or cap-and-trade programs Congress might enact. Other environmental groups, companies and Wall Street firms will no doubt follow their lead.

ED designed and led the disingenuous campaign that persuaded many healthcare agencies to ban DDT, resulting in millions of deaths from malaria. Greenpeace, Sierra Club, Union of Concerned Scientists, ED and other groups still post deceitful claims about DDT on their websites, further delaying progress against this killer disease. By blaming climate change for malaria, they deflect criticism for their vile actions.

Climate catastrophe claims enable activists to gain official advisory status with companies and governments on environmental issues. They also make it “ethical” for Rainforest Action Network and other pressure groups to oppose power generation in Third World countries, where few have access to electricity – and thereby keep communities perpetually impoverished.

Meanwhile, Prince Charles gets lionized for appropriating 62 first class jetliner seats for his entourage of 20, on a trans-Atlantic trip to receive an environmental prize and lecture Americans on saving the Earth – because at least he didn’t use his private jet.

Companies in the CAP and EIC can develop and promote new product lines, using tax breaks, subsidies, legal mandates and regulatory provisions to gain competitive advantages. They get favorable coverage from the media, and kid-glove treatment from members of Congress who routinely pillory climate chaos skeptics.

Some worry that this could become a license to further redefine corporate ethics, present self-interest as planet-saving altruism, and profit from questionable arrangements with environmental groups and Congress. Certainly, cap-and-trade

(Cont’d on Pg. 7)