

Eagle Forum Report

successor to The Phyllis Schlafly Report

200 W. Third St., Ste. 502 • Alton, IL 62002 • (618) 433-8990 • Eagle@EagleForum.org • EagleForum.org

January 2022

Volume 6/Number 1

A Global Warning

CLIMATE HYPOCRITES BLOW HOT AIR

by Craig Rucker, President of CFACT, Committee for a Constructive Tomorrow

The United Nations' 26th "Conference of the Parties," or "COP26," held in Glasgow, Scotland aimed to complete the "rule book" for the Paris Climate Agreement, which is to limit the Earth's temperature increases to no more than 1.5 degrees Celsius.

During the opening ceremonies, leaders from across the world took the stage to urge governments to take significant action on climate change, including President Biden, Prince Charles, French President Emmanuel Macron, and Canadian Prime Minister Justin Trudeau.

President Biden said, "We'll demonstrate to the world the United States is not only back at the table but hopefully leading by the power of our example. I know it hasn't been the case, and that's why my administration is working overtime to show that our climate commitment is action, not words."

That same day, President Biden appeared to fall asleep at COP26 during the opening speeches.

COP26 brought many other attendees from the United States as well, including former President Obama, Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez (D-NY), and even some ill-advised Republican representatives who

failed to see the very real dangers to freedom in participating in the U.N.'s climate talks, including Rep. Garrett Graves (R-LA), Rep. John Curtis (R-UT), and Rep. Dan Crenshaw (R-TX).

No climate summit would be complete without former Vice President Al Gore in attendance. CFACT ran into Mr. Gore in the halls of the conference and tried to ask him why his house in Tennessee uses 34 times more electricity than the average American home. Gore refused to answer as a staffer tried to cover our camera and repeatedly yelled "we gotta go!"

After the speeches were over, there were many new things agreed upon by government representatives in their attempt to further the goals of the Paris Climate Accord through the new "Glasgow Climate Pact."

John Kerry, the United States' "climate envoy," crowed that the Glasgow Climate Pact is the first climate agreement to actually list coal by name in an attempt to eventually eliminate the fuel from global use.

Minutes before nearly 200 nations adopted the final agreement, however, India, working with China, stepped in to protect coal. India amended the agreement to change the words "phase out" of coal to "phase down." For China and India, this edit

actually means increasing coal. Both nations are expanding coal burning as fast as their economies can go. "Phase down" is the verbiage China suckered John Kerry into when China and the U.S. penned a side deal during week one of the conference. China promised Kerry to maybe think about phasing coal down during its 15th five-year plan which does not even start until 2026.



This late change was part of the reason why the conference ended with its president in tears.

As he made his closing remarks, COP26 President Alok Sharma, MP, hung his head and proclaimed through tears, "May I just say to all delegates, I apologize for the way this process has unfolded and I am deeply sorry."

Before the conference began, Sharma had declared that COP26 "must be the COP that consigns coal

(Continued on page 2)

to history.” India and China were not having it.

Additionally, the world leaders agreed to end deforestation by 2030. However, Scotland, the host nation for the COP, cut down 14 million trees to make way for 21 wind turbine projects over the last few years in a futile attempt to meet U.N. climate goals.

More than 100 countries agreed to cut 30% of methane emissions by 2030. This has particular significance to the United States because it is the basis for which the Biden Administration is pursuing new rules through the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to limit methane emissions from U.S. oil and gas production. This is not the first time domestic policy from the Biden Administration has mirrored U.N. goals. The Biden Administration is also pursuing a “30x30” plan to conserve 30% of America’s lands and waters by 2030. This is in lockstep with the U.N. calling for such 30x30 measures around the world.

Despite all the big talk and promises at COP26, few of the things agreed upon contained deadlines or penalties, which is why teen climate activist Greta Thunberg declared all such U.N. conferences and climate policies to be nothing more than “blah, blah, blah.”

We never expected CFACT and Greta to find such significant common ground. Greta is correct that all the back patting and bloviating from the podium will never meaningfully alter the temperature of the Earth.

Yet Greta wasn’t the only one on the Left disappointed by the U.N.’s COP26. *Guardian* reporter John Vidal wrote, “It could have been worse, but our leaders failed us at COP26. That’s the truth of it.”

In addition to failing to “consign coal to history,” the Glasgow Climate Pact failed to mention oil or gas by

name, extends the deadline for nations to submit new emissions reduction plans, does not fund reparations for “loss and damage” from developed nations when poor nations experience natural disasters, and does not mandate ongoing public climate finance.

As a result of these unrealized Leftist goals, U.N. Secretary General António Guterres said limiting warming to 1.5 degrees C is “on life support.”

Any failure of leftist U.N. climate policy is welcome news to liberty, private property rights, and free enterprise.

While the specific goals and numbers of each climate report and COP change from year to year, the U.N.’s dangerous agenda that it is trying to enact through climate policy has never changed. U.N. bureaucrats and climate activists have consistently called for socialist-style takeovers of the world’s government and economic systems in the name of “saving the planet” for decades.

As the conference wrapped up, climate activists staged several massive demonstrations through the streets of Glasgow. Over 100,000 marchers called for “climate action.”

CFACT attended the protest and interviewed many participants asking them why there were in attendance. As could be expected, everyone talked about socialism, and very few talked about climate science.

“We are Socialists. I am a Socialist. We are Socialists from all over the world,” one marcher told CFACT.

“The problem is capitalism,” said another. “It is this particular economic system that provides massive wealth inequality and that destroys the environment.” “What do we need to replace capitalism with?” We asked. “Socialism,” he replied.

“Stopping car travel. Go back to bicycles and horseback, really. Go

back to simpler times,” is the prescription offered by another marcher. Life in those “simpler times” has been described as “nasty, brutish and short.” Socialists should be careful what they wish for.

At the conference, John Kerry promised the U.N. \$100 billion plus a whole lot more. Kerry said that “billions won’t cut it” and announced a plan to spend trillions of dollars on “climate finance.”

The Biden Administration is ignoring debt and welcoming inflation. The Left is working overtime to fundamentally shift economic life from free market capitalism to central government planning.

The U.N. may not know how to alter the temperature of the Earth, but they do know how to make a buck. Nothing the U.N. or any government does will have much of, if any, impact on global temperatures.

The U.N.’s ridiculous climate agenda, dangerous to the freedoms we take for granted, must be continually exposed and resisted.

While COP26 may not have been the “home run” many climate activists were looking for, that won’t deter the Biden Administration from continuing to pursue its costly climate agenda through every government department and agency.

The next COP has already been announced to be taking place in Egypt. Hopefully by then, the climate agenda will be exposed for the “pyramid” scheme it really is. 

EAGLE FORUM

President: *Colleen Holcomb*

Report Editor: *Cathie Adams*

Yearly membership \$25.00

Call 618-433-8990 to subscribe

Extra copies available:

1/\$1, 50/\$15, 100/\$25

GLASGOW IS HALF EMPTY

by E. Calvin Beisner, Ph.D., a theologian and historian, is Founder and President of The Cornwall Alliance for the Stewardship of Creation.

Did anything good come from Glasgow? Well, that depends on how far back you go.

Go back 245 years to Adam Smith's *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* in 1776. The University of Glasgow professor of moral philosophy solidified the case for free-market economies, arguably indispensable to the Industrial Revolution's lifting more and more of humanity out of extreme poverty.

Go back another 8 years and you get Rev. John Witherspoon leaving his church in Paisley to become President of the College of New Jersey, which became Princeton University. That, too, was most definitely good, Witherspoon serving as a member of the Continental Congress, where he made a strong case for separating from Great Britain, and teaching moral philosophy, including politics, to 19 members of the Constitutional Convention.

Jump forward to 1865 and Joseph Lister studied the role of microscopic germs in causing infection, leading to his development of disinfectants, the practice of sterilizing surgical theaters and devices in hospitals for the first time, and household disinfectants. (One, Listerine, was developed just 14 years later by Joseph Lawrence, a chemist in St. Louis, Missouri.) That undoubtedly good prevented untold millions of deaths from infection.

But jump all the way forward to 2021, and the question, "Did anything good come from Glasgow?" could elicit a different answer: not much, maybe nothing. Or, ironically, a lot of good. It all depends on one's perspective.

Glasgow hosted COP26. Government representatives from almost

every nation, including 130 heads of state, were joined by U.N. bureaucrats, leaders and activists from hundreds of nongovernmental organizations.

The New York Times said world leaders gathered "to debate how to deliver on the unmet promises of the past", but in summation:

Diplomats from nearly 200 countries on Saturday struck a major agreement aimed at intensifying global efforts to fight climate change by calling on governments to return next year with stronger plans to curb their planet-warming emissions and urging wealthy nations to "at least double" funding to protect poor nations from the hazards of a hotter planet.

The translation from bureaucratese is: failing to achieve anything substantive, diplomats agreed to try again next year.

As an accurate summation of COP26's main purpose, it's safe to say it achieved little if anything.

From the standpoint of people scared to death that we're all going to fry 9 years from now (since it was 3 years ago that Congresswoman Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, D-NY, declared, "The world is gonna end in 12 years if we don't address climate change") — or maybe 15 or 80 years, we're doomed unless we scratch fossil fuels and replace all their energy with wind, solar, and other "renewables" — from that standpoint, nothing good came out of Glasgow last month.

For those who think human-induced carbon dioxide emissions do contribute to global warming, *aka* climate change, but that the warming:

- is nothing much in the grand scale of things,
- will likely bring more benefits

than harms,

- even at its worst would only make the average person at the end of this century about 4.34 times rather than 4.5 times wealthier than today (as even the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change admits), and
- would be accompanied by enormous greening of the planet and reduction of hunger as plants feast on increased atmospheric CO₂.

From their standpoint — which is mine — that little to nothing came out of Glasgow is good. When you expect to get hit by a truck and don't, that's something good!



Perhaps the worst thing that *could* have come out of COP26 would have been a major international treaty that would have brought to realization what 21 years ago was in the Kyoto Protocol: "the first step toward global governance."

The Glasgow summit could have set us on the path sought by FCCC Executive Secretary Christiana Figueres six years ago. Just before the Paris climate summit began, she said, "This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial

(Continued on page 4)

Revolution.” The hope of most of the marchers and protesters was “System change, not climate change!”

Writing for the *Manhattan Contrarian* the day after COP26, Francis Menton summed up the most important potential outcomes:

1. A “path of strict world socialism” in which “the entire world is forced, through binding international agreements, into an energy straitjacket, mandating reduction and then elimination of the use of fossil fuels within two or three decades at most.”
2. No binding agreements, though “everybody talks a good game about decarbonization but, lacking meaningful binding agreements, most of the countries, with most of the population, continue to pursue whatever energy system is most reliable and cost effective.”

The first would lead to global disaster, not just economically but also politically as governments come to rule more and more of our lives. The second would see “a small number of wealthy, small-population jurisdictions” like “Germany, California, New York, the U.K. push[ing] the limits of decarbonization and intermittent renewable energy sources” as “the guinea pigs for the rest of the world to find out whether a decarbonized energy system can be made to work, and at what cost.”

COP26’s organizers and boosters wanted number 1. They got number 2. And that’s good. As Menton explains:

The key difference between the two scenarios is what happens in the nearly inevitable circumstance where the new “decarbonized” energy system fails to work cost-effectively or reliably, leading to enormously increased prices, shortages, and/or frequent blackouts.

On Path 1, when that happens, the world’s people get forced into

universal energy poverty with no obvious way to escape, and the bureaucrats and left wing press undoubtedly find some way to blame oil companies or some other capitalist bogeymen for the disaster.

On Path 2, the 97–98% of the world that has not committed energy suicide can sit back and observe while the guinea pigs self-destruct. Eventually, the people in the guinea pig jurisdictions will catch on that they are being forced to pay a multiple of a reasonable price, and for energy that does not work very well, and they will replace their politicians.

Reading the globalbureaucratese (yes, I intended that to be all one word; globalbureaucratese is the only language even more detestable than ordinary bureaucratese) in COP26’s 97 theses, which includes words like *recognizes, welcomes, expresses, recalls, stresses, notes, emphasizes, or urges* — nary an *agrees* or *commits* or *pledges* or “anything comparable” among them. In short, nobody made any enforceable agreement to do anything.

The COP26 failure is an important obstacle to environmentalists’ attempt to stop or reverse the conquest of poverty throughout the developing world — a subject little discussed at Glasgow.

But that failure does not mean that advocates of liberty and prosperity can rest on our laurels. As Menton concluded, “At this point, the biggest risk is that Biden and the Democratic Congress together put through enough of a ‘Green New Deal’ to effectively destroy the U.S. energy sector and leave the world with no clear shining example of energy success.”

COP26 did not even bring any new progress toward the world’s developing countries’ meeting their pledge at 2009’s COP15 in Copenhagen to transfer \$100 billion per year to developing countries for climate

finance, which they have not done. It said it regretted the failure and urged repentance. That’s all. No enforcement mechanism — just like with everything else COP26 did.

One major aim of the COP was to adopt language calling the world to “phase out” coal. The closest they got was “phase down” — with no penalty to meet the (nonexistent) target date and amount. Developing countries like India, China, South Africa, and Iran who are building coal plants at breakneck speed to lift their billions out of poverty, were never going to embrace that aim anyway.

Historian and former Member of the European Parliament Paul Nuttall called COP26 “a total waste of time, money, and carbon” — the last being a nod toward the 400-some private jets on which negotiators and the glitterati came to and left Glasgow, emitting as much carbon dioxide as 1,600 Scots emit in a year.

Journalist Rupert Darwall, a senior fellow of the RealClearFoundation, called the conference “a strategic defeat for the West, and for Britain in particular.” But don’t mourn that defeat. Celebrate it. It means the developing world refused to be stuffed into the developed world’s box. It’s insisting on freedom to lift its people out of poverty the way we did — with fossil fuels.

Climate blogger Paul Homewood wrote “we have seen the beginning of the end for the UN’s climate agenda. Developing countries around the world are standing up and refusing to cut back on fossil fuels, because they know they have no alternative if they want to grow their economies and give their people a better life. They have got off the Climate Train. So should we.”

Both President Joe Biden and British Prime Minister Boris Johnson described COP26 as the world’s last, best chance to save the planet. Thank God, we missed it! 