

were previously controlled by state-owned monopolies. The Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species has removed the elephant as an economic resource from African countries.

Treaties that affect nations' internal workings is a new enough idea that it did not occur to the Constitutional Convention meeting in Philadelphia in 1787. The United States Constitution is therefore ambiguous on the subject of the authority of treaties. The Constitution states that, "This Constitution, and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof; and all Treaties made ... shall be the supreme law of the land." Faced with the novel possibility that treaties could be used to abrogate the Constitution and its Bill of Rights, conservatives, smarting from the Yalta Agreement at the conclusion of the Second World War, mounted an effort to amend the Constitution to clarify that in internal politics the Constitution trumped all treaties. This effort failed narrowly in the 1950s, but has been resurrected just this year, as the real threat posed to our political order by international agreements has once again come to the attention of conservatives.

While the second Conference of Parties' call for binding limits on greenhouse gas emissions is therefore not an entirely new thing under the sun, it is nonetheless an unprecedented and remarkable development. It is so extraordinary simply because the matter to be regulated is so ordinary. Compare carbon dioxide to chlorofluorocarbons. Banning CFCs caused some economic dislocations and required some scientific innovation and economic adaptation. Limiting carbon dioxide emissions is different because there is a direct correlation between energy consumption and economic activity. Carbon dioxide is a by-product, not of one industrial activity or another, but of industrial civilization itself.

Environmentalists and other advocates of the doctrine of sustainable development will object to this claim. They will say that the history of technological innovation is one of ever-increasing energy efficiency and that limiting greenhouse gas emissions will only force the rate of innovation. This is a comforting and even somewhat plausible thought. Unfortunately, the only technology currently available that could begin to replace fossil fuels is nuclear power generation, which the environmental movement has made politically radioactive in nearly every nation.

Indeed in 1988, the major environmental groups in the United States released their massive "Blueprint for the Environment" and announced that the single greatest threat to the environment was global warming caused by the combustion of fossil fuels. But in response to reporters' questions, they were adamant that the solution to global warming should not and could not be either nuclear or hydroelectric power--thereby eliminating the only two viable replacements for fossil fuels. This dyed-in-the-wool opposition to nuclear power should convince even the most skeptical observer that the environmentalists who proclaim global catastrophe are not primarily interested in the environment at all. Their primary goal is to impose centralized economic planning.

The promise of industrial civilization has always been its open-endedness--of opportunities to create wealth limited only by human abilities. If an agreement is reached at Kyoto to set binding limits on greenhouse gas emissions, then the international environmental movement will have achieved a goal that it has been dreaming about and working toward for three decades, namely the transformation of industrial civilization into a zero-sum game. For one nation to advance will henceforth require another to decline.

It is my purpose here today to trace the outlines of how we reached this point and to draw a moral from the story relevant to the concerns before us. Although I intend to skip rapidly over the events that led up to the Earth Summit in 1992, we need to understand that the Framework Convention on Climate Change or something like it was implicit from the beginning of modern environmentalism.

The modern environmental movement swept the globe in the late 1960s and '70s as part of that

reaction against the conventions of society called the counter-culture. In its attack on Western industrial civilization, a central feature of the counter-culture was its criticism of Western modes of logical thinking as being narrow and linear. These were contrasted unfavorably with those traditions that strive to integrate the human personality in itself and into a larger whole. The syllogism was out, holism was in. For a time, to tack the adjective "holistic" in front of almost anything was enough to make it fashionable. Thus in addition to holistic religious practices and holistic communities, we had holistic diets, holistic healing, holistic therapy, and even holistic footwear.

Modern environmentalism fitted nicely into this new mindset. Its premise is that every creature in a biological system is connected to every other creature and therefore that every action will affect everything else. Only the world is large enough a stage for the environmentalist. It was therefore entirely natural that soon after the first Earth Day in 1970 came the first Conference on the Human Environment in 1972. This United Nations Conference in Stockholm led to creation of the United Nations Environment Program. Nineteen seventy two also brought the Club of Rome's ominously titled report, Limits to Growth.

A decade later the U. N. reviewed the results of its Environmental Program and convened a high-profile commission, the World Commission on Environment and Development. Its report, issued in 1987 and generally referred to after its chairman as the Brundtland Report, called on the world to attain sustainable development by limiting consumption, redistributing resources, taxing energy, and a host of other statist devices meant to make people poorer. The Commission also called for a United Nations Conference on Environment and Development to act on these recommendations. This became the 1992 Rio Earth Summit.

Before discussing the events leading up to the Earth Summit, I would like to take notice of two things. The first is that the aims of global environmentalism fit in nicely with the interests and goals of all those who, for whatever reason, seek to expand the size and authority of the United Nations. Internationalists fell in step with global environmentalism because it offered another way of strengthening international institutions. United Nations officials fell in step because it offered more U. N. jobs and bigger budgets. And so on.

The second point is that the original rationale for global environmentalism was that industrial civilization was necessarily running out of raw materials and was poisoning the planet while doing so. Unfortunately for the proponents of sustainable development, human resourcefulness is making raw materials more plentiful, human ingenuity is discovering and creating new raw materials, and industry is responding to pollution by cleaning up its production processes. The result is a cleaner and wealthier world.

This good news for man and earth alike is not good news for global environmentalism. It diminishes global environmentalism's reason for existence. Luckily, help was on the way in the form of carbon dioxide. Heretofore a harmless, beneficial, and indeed necessary gas, the hypothesis of manmade global warming made carbon dioxide and the other greenhouse gases into planetary toxins. Human industrial activity, it turns out,--or so they say-- is frying the planet.

I am sure I am not the first to notice that this momentous scientific discovery seems a little too convenient. Just at the point when the automobile industry succeeds in eliminating virtually all pollutants from automobile exhaust, just at the point when mammoth capital investments to reduce air pollutants from smokestack industries are completed, just at that point we find that carbon dioxide is a much more serious problem than mere irritants to the lungs. It is hard not to conclude that if carbon dioxide didn't exist, global environmentalism would have had to invent it. Some few cynics might even suspect that they did invent it.

Amidst the clamor preceding Kyoto, it is easy to forget that the clamor before the Rio Summit was even louder. The threat posed by global warming was at that time claimed to be much greater

than subsequent predictions have been able to sustain. Climate models were predicting temperature rises of two to six degrees celsius in less than a century. (Even the most confident climate modellers, by the way, have reduced their predictions to one to two degrees celsius; and yet in the face of this ever-lessening potential threat, the environmentalists are calling for ever-more draconian controls.)

Every nation of the world, it seemed, wanted a treaty with binding limits on greenhouse gases. The only holdout was the United States; and even in the United States there was strong pressure for mandatory limits. Then-Senator Al Gore and then-Senator Timothy Wirth were beating the drum hard, and the presumptive Democratic presidential nominee, then-Governor Bill Clinton, soon picked up the rhythm. Even within the Bush Administration, there was strong pressure for mandatory limits.

The Earth Summit presented President George Bush with an interesting predicament. During the 1988 campaign, he had announced that he wanted to be the "environmental president." By this, I think that he meant that he sincerely cared about protecting the natural world and its wildlife and providing a healthy environment for future generations. He did not mean what modern environmentalists understand by that term, although it is doubtful that he recognized the confusion. At the same time, President Bush was an internationalist by birth, training, and experience. The positive side of his internationalist inclination could be seen in the way he managed the Gulf War against Iraq. The negative side became apparent during the Rio debacle.

President Bush did not decide to go to Rio until the last moment. The Administration used his holdout to negotiate a global warming agreement that set only voluntary limits on greenhouse gas emissions. Once that concession had been made, President Bush announced with a tingle in his voice (after all he loved international pow-wows) that he would attend the Earth Summit and sign the Framework Convention on Climate Change. He left hanging his decision on the Convention on Biological Diversity, which President Clinton signed in June 1993, but which has not been ratified by the Senate.

At the time all this was going on, the chief proponent of attending the Rio Summit was William K. Reilly, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, a convinced globalist and environmentalist, who deeply believed that important decisions should be made by elite bureaucracies. His allies, surprising to me, were to be found among the pollsters and consultants in the Bush re-election campaign, who were scared to death that Candidate Clinton was going to make inroads with environmentally-conscious suburban Republican voters.

As a member of the U. S. Senate, I went to the White House several times to plead the case against going to Rio or signing any global warming treaty. President Bush's chief advisers agreed with my reasoning and with my conclusion. Yet they responded by shaking their heads sadly and explaining that it was a political decision that was out of the hands of mere policy makers.

The United States became the fourth country to officially ratify the Framework Convention on October 7, 1992. The debate on the floor of the Senate was less than inspiring. Reuters reported that, "The Senate, racing to finish its business before adjourning for the year, ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change with a two-thirds voice vote in a nearly empty hall."

We in the United States are often a little too eager to describe ourselves in moralistic tones as something along the lines of the world's last best hope. Although this rhetoric is understandably often repugnant to people in other countries, it is undoubtedly the case that the United States did play that role in the run-up to Rio. If the United States had refused to participate, the Earth Summit would have fallen flat. But instead, the better judgment of the Bush Administration gave way to political calculation (and in my view mistaken political calculation at that).

In preparing for Kyoto, it is instructive to go back and read the news clippings from the spring

and summer of 1992. Reports use words and phrases like "high pressure," "last minute changes," "circus atmosphere," "hothouse atmosphere," "chaotic spectacle," "amid the hoopla," "an ecological Bretton Woods," "the most important meeting in the history of mankind," "the fate of the planet." The point I want to make based on these descriptions is that the Earth Summit in Rio was a disaster waiting to happen and so too is the Kyoto Summit. The fact is that these vast and momentous international confabulations create intense excitement and put enormous pressures on national leaders to produce something significant. At the last minute, a deal is usually worked out to put in some sort of language to protect vital interests. And everyone goes home with a piece of paper in his hands, a smile on his face, and a successful outcome to proclaim to the voters.

The reality after Rio was rather different. The Earth Summit generated a huge amount of publicity for environmental issues, both real and perceived. It created tremendous energy within the global environmental movement, which has much more experience and skill in manipulating the process than do national governments. And it produced an ongoing process and institutions with significant personnel and resources to carry on what was begun at Rio. Why should Kyoto turn out any differently?

At the time President Bush announced he would attend the Earth Summit and sign a greenhouse treaty with only voluntary limits, a prominent administration official was quoted that they had "dodged a bullet." President Bush and his top advisers really thought they had successfully finessed the situation. On the one hand, Bush got full credit for going to Rio and signing a treaty. On the other hand, the United States did not have to agree to binding targets on greenhouse gas emissions. But did those officials ever think what would occur once the United States and other countries failed to achieve the voluntary targets they had agreed to? Did they think that the environmental movement or the U. N. bureaucracy would lose interest and fade away?

The challenge that confronts us is not simply the binding targets proposed last year at the second Conference of Parties. The problem goes back to the voluntary limits agreed to at Rio. With that decision, the nations of the world conceded the point that greenhouse gases must be reduced, and they unintentionally created an institutional juggernaut to achieve that goal. The only question that remained was the method by which those reductions would be achieved.

Rather than dodging a bullet, I would suggest another metaphor to describe what happened at the Earth Summit. A noose was put around the necks of the industrialized countries, but the time when it would be tightened was left to a later and uncertain date. Our necks are still in the noose, and the time approaches to pull the rope tight. It would have been much easier to resist at any point before the noose was put on. But now that it is on, we must do everything in our power to further postpone the day it is tightened. And we must use every day that is given to us to try to get that noose off our necks.

I don't think it is too strong to say that we were ambushed at Rio. We must take counsel together to see that we are not ambushed again at Kyoto. Australia finds itself in a difficult position in opposing an agreement that has the purported support of nearly every nation in the world, including its chief ally, the United States. It will only become more difficult in the coming months to stand up against the pressure that will be put on your government to acquiesce. No doubt, deals will be offered to fudge the issue. Perhaps some agreement will be cobbled together that commits the signatories to binding limits in principle, but leaves the size and timing of the reductions to be achieved to a further set of negotiations and yet another summit. I hope that Australia's government will oppose any such deal. I believe that the U. S. Senate will not fall for such a ploy a second time. At this late date, only the most steadfast resistance can save the day.

Over the past year, President Clinton and a parade of top Clinton Administration officials have come to Australia to tell you that the die is cast--that the United States and the rest of the world are ready to bind themselves to mandatory greenhouse gas reductions. We in the United States are forced to listen to these assertions on a daily basis. Our Secretary of the Interior, Bruce Babbitt,

who is responsible for managing our vast federal lands, recently gave us a clear taste of how the Clinton Administration plans to conduct the debate over Kyoto. Secretary Babbitt, in a radio interview, accused opponents of mandatory limits of conspiracy. He said, and I quote: "...(T)he oil companies and the coal companies in the United States have joined in a conspiracy to hire pseudo-scientists to deny the facts, and then begin raising political arguments that are essentially fraudulent....(W)hat they're doing is un-American in the most basic sense. They are compromising our future by misrepresenting the facts, by suborning scientists onto their payrolls and attempting to mislead the American people."

The Clinton Administration's strategy, in short, is to demonize their opponents. Curiously, while they express total faith in the long-range climate projections of speculative computer models, they have been forced to claim that short-term economic forecasts are too unreliable to take seriously. Dr. Janet Yellen, Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisors, testified to that effect last month before the U. S. House Representatives. Dr. Yellen apologized that she couldn't submit any of the results of Administration studies of the economic impacts of mandatory greenhouse gas reductions because they had concluded that their several economic models were just too primitive to produce adequate forecasts.

The Clinton Administration has thus been forced into the position of proclaiming utter faith in highly speculative and comparatively primitive computer models--models that can't yet account for the past century's climate patterns--to predict climate changes over the next one or two or even three centuries, while at the same time dismissing the predictions over the next ten or twenty years of highly sophisticated and time-tested economic models. This intellectually embarrassing position became laughable when, at about the same time as Dr. Yellen's testimony, the Clinton Administration was forced to release a Department of Energy study that they had tried for months to suppress. That elaborate study predicted devastation for six energy-intensive American industries if a carbon tax was adopted.

The Department of Energy study was in close agreement with others that have been done, including your own massive ABARE study, which Brian Fisher will discuss this afternoon. No wonder that the Clinton Administration is desperate to turn what should be a reasoned debate into a shouting match.

In the face of all this hot air from the Clinton Administration, your Prime Minister, John Howard, and his government have stated that Australia will not commit economic suicide on the basis of highly dubious scientific predictions. I commend Prime Minister Howard for having the courage and demonstrating the statesmanship to stand up and say that in the face of widespread media hysteria as well as international pressure.

Why have I left my Wyoming ranch in the middle of a glorious summer to fly half way around the world to attend this conference? And why have a U. S. Senator and Representative, representing our two political parties, interrupted their annual summer vacations to come all this way? I will let Senator Hagel and Representative Dingell speak for themselves, but I am here to tell you that regardless of what President Clinton, Vice President Gore, and Undersecretary of State Timothy Wirth have said to you, there is strong opposition to President Clinton's position in the U. S. Congress and among the American people. I do not believe that the U. S. Senate will ratify any treaty that Under Secretary Wirth brings back from Kyoto. Ratification requires a two-thirds vote, or sixty seven out of one hundred Senators. Nor do I believe that Australia will be ostracized by the world community and be made a pariah nation if you continue to oppose a Kyoto treaty.

However, I do believe that Australia's continuing opposition is essential to those of us in the United States who are opposing the Clinton Administration. We must work together to oppose binding emission limits, and we must work to find and develop new allies in other countries.

The question before is us whether we are going to allow the noose that was put around our necks at Rio to be drawn tighter or whether we are going to resist. By standing together, Australia and your allies in the United States Congress and throughout the world can pull the world back from a most foolish decision. I hope that this conference will make a major contribution to greater international understanding and co-operation.

(Malcolm Wallop is chairman of the Frontiers of Freedom Institute in Arlington, Virginia, USA. A rancher from Big Horn, Wyoming, he represented Wyoming in the United States Senate from 1976 until his retirement in 1995.)