

Clinton takes contradictory policies to Kyoto summit

by Marsha Freeman

For months, there has been pressure on the White House from the environmental-hoax lobby and the British government to announce severe cutbacks in this country's so-called greenhouse gas emissions, at the global climate meeting that will take place at the beginning of December in Kyoto, Japan. There has been counter-pressure from energy and other industries, economic policymakers inside the administration, labor unions, and Congress, which have pointed out that cutting emissions would come at the expense of jobs and the standard of living of Americans.

In typical Baby Boomer fashion, President Clinton has put forward a middle-of-the-road compromise in an attempt not to antagonize either side, saying there should be cuts in greenhouse gas emissions, but making them voluntary, and based on "incentives," until the end of the first decade of the next century.

But, the worst compromise the President is making is to give credence to the scientifically incompetent propaganda that man's industrial activity is causing global warming, simply because it is, as he stated, the "overwhelming consensus" in the scientific community. As he should know, having had to deal for years with an "overwhelming consensus" in the media that he is a crook, "overwhelming consensus" is not truth.

As stressed by *EIR*, and by honest and competent scientists around the world, there is absolutely *no* evidence that global warming is occurring. Such climatic changes could never be measured over the span of decades, much less through the nightly TV weather forecasts. Climate, as opposed to weather, is caused by long-term astronomical, orbital, and geologic cycles and processes, measured in tens of thousands of years, which science has yet to fully understand.

By refusing to commit the United States to mandatory industrial emissions cutbacks, and emphasizing that new

technology should be used to reduce emissions, President Clinton has left the door open for the recommitment of this nation to the use of nuclear and other efficient energy conversion technologies, although he chose not to mention more than "new technologies" in energy conservation, in his Oct. 22 speech. His just-concluded agreement with China's President Jiang Zemin, to certify that nation for the import of nuclear power plants from the United States, must be motivated by the science of economics, not the hoax of global warming.

Floods, malaria, and bunk

The campaign from within the Executive branch to convince the President, the American people, and skeptical Third World governments that their standard of living will have to be sacrificed on the altar of a scientific hoax, has been led by Vice President Al Gore.

Gore kicked off his campaign leading into the Kyoto global climate summit, in a speech in Glacier National Park, Montana, on Sept. 2. There, the vice president warned that the glaciers in the park "are melting away at an alarming rate," a phenomenon, he asserted, which is part of a global pattern.

If we fail to act on global warming, Gore said, "infectious diseases could spread . . . farmers and rural communities could be in jeopardy . . . our seas could rise by one to three feet, flooding thousands of miles of Florida, Louisiana, and other coastal areas." In a dishonest fallacy of composition, Gore said, "We've seen people struck by severe heat waves—more than 400 lives lost in Chicago just two years ago." The truth of the matter is that the lives were lost, not because of global warming, but because elderly people could not afford to turn on their air conditioners, and were too frightened of crime even to open their windows.

The environmental lobby in the White House also orga-

nized a briefing for 100 television weather forecasters on Oct. 1, to work them over on global warming. There, they were told that “the scientific evidence of climate change is solid. . . . The overwhelming majority of the world’s climate scientists have concluded that if we don’t cut our emissions of greenhouse gases, temperatures will rise and will disrupt global climate.”

Left unsaid was the fact that under sworn testimony before the Senate Energy Committee a few years ago, the gurus of this “overwhelming majority of the world’s climate scientists” admitted under oath, that their climate forecasting models were so flawed that, if they were elected officials, they would not vote for any laws based on the conclusion that there is, or will be, global warming.

On Oct. 6, President Clinton attended the White House Conference on Climate Change, at which so-called experts recounted anecdotal stories of people who have “personally experienced” global warming! Vice President Gore compared the fact that people question global warming, to the fact that for 30 years, the tobacco industry denied there was any link between smoking cigarettes and lung cancer.

The President’s proposal

On Oct. 22, the President made his long-awaited policy speech on his proposals for the Kyoto summit. Clinton’s Global Climate Proposal would commit the United States to “returning to emissions of 1990 levels between 2008 and 2012.” Whereas, the global climate mafia and British Prime Minister Tony Blair had been pressuring President Clinton to commit to reducing emissions to 15% *below* the 1990 level, by the year 2010.

“Since it’s a long-term problem requiring a long-term solution, it will be phased in over time,” President Clinton said. He announced that the Federal government will encourage innovation in energy production and the use of resources, by considering \$5 billion in incentives, such as tax breaks, for such activities.

In his speech, the President skirted around the highly contentious issue of how to deal with Third World “polluters” at Kyoto. Bowing to pressure from the Republican-controlled Congress, that developing countries should “suffer” as much as the United States to control nonexistent global warming, but mindful that the largest nations in the world—namely, China and India—have no intention of destroying their potential for industrial development in such a ruse, the President stated that the United States will propose a “flexible mechanism” to meet emission-control targets.

The nuclear option

The President’s Global Climate Proposal should be seen in the context of the political forces that have begun to support his proposal to remove the sanctions against China, which prevent that nation from importing U.S. nuclear energy technology. Every environmental hoaxster has warned that, if China continues to grow economically, it will become the

world’s largest producer of “greenhouse” gases. It has dawned on some, that China proposes to avoid this, not by halting its growth, but by buying nuclear plants.

In the week prior to the President’s statement, even historically anti-nuclear Congressional representatives have been reconsidering their refusal to rely on the nuclear option to solve what they have unfortunately been convinced by “scientific” snake-oil salesmen, is global warming.

In response to the President’s announcement of his Kyoto summit program, the ranking minority member of the House Science Committee, George E. Brown (D-Calif.), who has not been a promoter of nuclear technology, issued a statement on Oct. 22, which, after praising the President’s climate proposal, read: “American technology leadership can ease our transition to a more energy-efficient economy. And it can lead to new economic growth through the export of technologies to other nations, as exemplified by China’s current interest in U.S. advanced design, passively-safe fission reactors.”

Better yet, tell the truth

When President Clinton began his recent tour of Venezuela, Brazil, and Argentina in the middle of October, he brought up his environmental concerns and the danger of global warming in meetings with the three heads of state. On the last day of his trip to South America, at an environmental event in Bariloche, Argentina on Oct. 18, the President stated that the developing nations must pull their weight in the fight against global warming.

Yet, while he stressed that there must be targets for so-called greenhouse gas emissions for these countries, he said that the United States and his administration will not allow emission targets to stop economic growth. “I do not believe that any reasonable person can look at the world of today and imagine the world of tomorrow, and believe that America can gain by someone else’s economic loss. We have an interest in finding a way to grow together,” President Clinton said in Brazil.

For years, the nuclear industry thought that it would regain public support for building nuclear power plants in the United States, by opportunistically trying to “sell” them on the basis of fighting global warming. The result is that the only market there has been for U.S. nuclear plants in the last decade has been in Asia. People who promote environmental hoaxes are interested in cutting world population and standards of living, not building nuclear plants.

When President Clinton began his recent tour of South America, he said that he was coming in the spirit of two Democratic Presidents who preceeded him there, Franklin Roosevelt and John F. Kennedy. In fact, when President Kennedy announced his Alliance for Progress program for Ibero-America, one of the initiatives most important to him was an invitation to Ibero-American students to come to the United States to study and become nuclear engineers, in order to bring this new advanced technology to their nations.