

## Cat.9 # 2 Copenhagen-five questions- eight statements

The discussion on climate change and climate policy is very complex and very hot indeed. Asking five questions we formulate eight statements around the topic.

“Global warming” or “Climate change”?

We hardly noticed it, but the discussion has shifted from “Global warming” to “Climate change”. Why?

Over the last decades the interest in the climate has increased to an issue of global concern and importance. In 1988 the UN founded the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, IPCC. This organization stresses the “global warming” and the fact that it are the human/industrial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions that cause this danger. In 1992, at the first UN Summit on Sustainable Development, named Earth Summit, in Rio, a framework for a treaty on the climate was signed, leading to the Kyoto-protocol 1998. As not all nations signed this protocol, a follow-up treaty was necessary: The Convention at Copenhagen 2009. However, in the meantime it has become clear that there are many, many scientists, most of them not being invited to Kyoto, who state

- a. that the developments at stake are not global but regional, and
- b. that not CO<sub>2</sub> emissions but the sun, and periodically, causes climate changes.

The contribution of the second group of scientists, since Kyoto increased to 32000, 9000 of which hold a PhD, from many nations, has gained some recognition by now: the issue is no longer “Global warming” but “Climate change”, because not warming but cooling seems to be occurring. In fact, also the questions whether human activity is causing all this or not, and the question whether these are global or regional developments, should be freshly discussed.

(Quite shocking, at the end of November (2007) data from one of the four laboratories, where climate data are gathered and interpreted, were leaked, showing that the results of research and also the interpretations had been frauded, manipulated, in order to maintain the “warming up” position. Though the IPCC tries to down play this, several nations fear that this “Climategate” will have enormous impact in Copenhagen.)

But the political climate has not cooled at all. After Kyoto and now in Copenhagen, almost spasmodic, they try to save the earth of a great danger: industrial CO<sub>2</sub> emissions. Those who question this approach are labelled conservative; sceptical scientists are treated as politically not correct.

Statement 1: Political pressure controls the interpretation of scientific research.

Survival of the Earth?

In the 1970-ies Pieter was an environmental activist and taught on the responsibility for the environment, motivated by his Christian faith. His fellow activists expressed their envy of him for having such a clear “philosophy”.

That has all changed now. In 1970 New Age environmental activists introduced Earth-day, and published the “Environmental Handbook”, as a help for teachers to inform their pupils about the environmental crisis. The Handbook suggested that *the Christian religion*, its ethics and expansionism are responsible for the environmental pollution. At the first UN Conference on Sustainable Development, Rio de Janeiro 1992, the Earth Summit, the concept of sustainability, was stretched to a holistic concept, with three parameters (a-controlled economy, -a controlled flow of resources and -social equity and equality), comprehending everything, from legislation to social structures to economic models. Everything should be “sustainable”, morally focussed on the survival of the Earth (with capital E!). The (Greek) goddess Gaia, Mother Earth, was given all attention, and very strongly so in UN circles. The Earth Summit was set up to design a new course for the planet, Agenda 21 (aiming at the 21ste century). Gaia-sophy, eco-utopism, feministic theology, population control activists and new agers found each other in a common goal: The Survival of Mother Earth (and in fighting a common enemy: fundamentalists who hang on old values and produce too many children). Helene summarized the second UN-Earth Summit, Johannesburg 2002, “Since Johannesburg sustainability is the fulfilment of the law”.

Statement 2: The care for the environment, vulnerable and finite as it is, was central in the creative mandate given to Adam, before the Fall (!), and is still central: Man is responsible for creation to the Creator.

Statement 3: In about 40 years new environmental ethics have conquered the world and have become politically dominant: the “Earth” is said to be living and sacred, and only able to survive with a restricted number of humans who behave green. *This is idolatry*: Man must serve Earth to make her survive.

Towards another economy?

It is beyond question that in a free ("capitalist") market-system individualism can grow wild, at the expense of good industrial relations and at the expense of the environment, serving some regions and causing poverty and pollution in others. Through global religious and/or political pressure such developments need to be controlled. Now the Copenhagen treaty proposes far reaching measures to reduce the CO2 emissions. This requires far reaching adaptations of the industries, at high costs. But because of the "climate debt" of the rich nations to the poor nations, these costs "should" be taken by the rich nations.

*In other words: based on the above-mentioned idolatrous appreciation of the "earth", and the above-mentioned questionable climate prognoses, measures of a global restructuring of industrial and commercial ethics is proposed, rather superimposed on the nations. For the poor nations, because of the suggested advantages, it will be tempting to agree, whereas the rich nations are pressured morally to agree.*

Statement 4: The rich (western) nations need to repent about their colonial past and about their neo-colonialism.

They need to seek ways for restitution; they need to turn from their materialistic world trade and industry policy. It will be costly to stop structurally the money making out of addictions, and out of the dumping of trade surpluses. They (we) need to stop wasting resources, and exhausting and polluting nations that has low wages. But it is necessary before God and for our consciences.

Statement 5: Survival of Mother Earth is a questionable (and idolatrous) measure.

Reduction of CO2 emissions, which is a questionable reason, costing billions, is not true and not truthful, towards the poor nations and towards God.

One World Government?

The Copenhagen treaty proposes a "Conference of Parties" (COP) in charge of the detailed legislation and the financing of this enormous endeavour. The COP is just another office of the UNEP, United Nations Environmental Programme. The whole operation is shocking for all nations and more over very costly for the rich nations. However, the COP is not democratically elected.

It is not surprising that sceptics suggest that through the Copenhagen treaty a kind of One World Government is forced upon us, and even one of socialist character. Moreover, the UN is already labelled as unmanageable, money spending and corrupt. Can we expect that in the execution of the proposals at hand the UN will act completely different?

The push towards a One World Government has got a long history (see Helene's article "Copenhagen - No bread from stones"). Different UN secretary-generals have publicly spoken out "that it is time for a oneworld-government, and that the UN is the only institution which can and should fulfil that task". At the Millennium Assembly (September 2000) the UN suggested its institutions to grow towards a One World Government. At the end of Ban Ki Moon's half-way evaluation of the accomplishments regarding the Millennium Development Goals, he reminded the nations of it again. The given rationale is that ever more problems can only be solved globally.

The Copenhagen treaty can hardly be seen other than another attempt to the same goal. The emphasis in the 180-page document on the new ethics, sustainability, on the responsibility for the developing nations and on the environment, without anywhere a democratic filter in place, should not be overlooked.

Any UN treaty (as is true also for EU treaties) holds that international law takes precedence over national law. When government leaders with a shortage of information sign this treaty and their parliaments ratify it, the consequences will be severe. Already they have signed away much of their independence, and there is no turning back.

Statement 6: The COP, as presented in the Copenhagen treaty, is not structured democratically.

It is assigned an authority of almost a One World Government. This is organizationally irresponsible and politically intolerable.

Statement 7: The UN conference in Copenhagen fits the UN policy since the 1990-ies: For overstated "global" problems undemocratic solutions are proposed, even manipulated, leading towards further concentration of supranational power.

End time dynamics?

At the start of this millennium exceptional developments are happening. Aggressive nationalism, rumours of war, rumours of pandemics, rumours of global warming, (suggestions) of the rising of the sea level and of the extinction of animals. There is a severe economic crisis, aggressive antisemitism, Islamic fundamentalism. Really, global shakings.

*But also*, more governments say sorry for historic mis-conduct, and governments dedicate their nation or city to God: the youngest examples are Papua New Guinea 2007, Dem Rep Congo 2008 and Sierra Leone 2009! All these global developments can hardly be understood other than signs of the end time: the opening of the seals of God's end time book by Jesus, and the blowing of the trumpets by the angels, being the cosmic count down towards the coming of Jesus as King of a One World Government in Jerusalem, the Kingdom of Peace.

Statement 8, Conclusion: Since the building of the tower of Babel the concept of a OneWorld -Government has played a role in world politics.

It is still being pursued in Islam, Freemasonry, Buddhism and now by the UN (even with a One World Religion around Mother Earth). But the one world government can be claimed only by the Author of this concept, the coming King of kings and presidents. Only He can, and will, reign in righteousness and justice; only He can grant peace and prosperity.