Can We Sustain the UN's Sustainable Goals?

August 27, 1997

Google Ads are provided by Google and are not selected or endorsed by Eagle Forum

It looks as though American taxpayers may be suckered into paying an additional $819 million to the United Nations on the UN's promise to "reform." It should be a good rule of thumb for legislators to vote No on anything labeled reform because it always costs money and usually turns out to be a cheat.

Do you think the UN is going to reform itself after getting more U.S. handouts disguised as "dues"?? If so, I have a good bridge I'd like to sell you.

Laying off a few thousand unnecessary hangers-on at the over-staffed New York City headquarters won't cause the UN to miss a beat in its march toward its global goals. Replacing Boutros Boutros-Ghali as Secretary General with Kofi Annan didn't accomplish anything except to provide the UN with a smoother salesman for world government, now called "global governance."

The executive chairman of Annan's "UN Reform Program" is Maurice Strong, a David Rockefeller protege and a Canadian. His meteoric career has led him through many exotic positions: secretary general of the 1972 Earth Summit in Stockholm, director of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), senior adviser to the World Bank president, and secretary general of the 1992 Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro, which laid out the agenda for global governance.

The Rio Earth Summit produced the Framework Convention on Climate Change to reduce greenhouse emissions (ratified in 1992, and scheduled to be morphed in Kyoto, Japan in December from voluntary into compulsory restrictions on U.S. energy consumption), the Convention on Biological Diversity (which the Senate refused to ratify, but which the Clinton Administration is implementing anyway through UNESCO's Man and the Biosphere Program), and two agreements signed by President Bush called Agenda 21 and Sustainable Development Commission (which establish the framework to control all human activity and property in order to protect the environment).

Clinton's Council on Sustainable Development is the outgrowth of these latter two agreements. This Council uses global warming, ozone depletion, and worries about biodiversity to rationalize plans to take over private property, institute federal land-use control, and convert enormous U.S. areas into wilderness.

The Council's 1996 report officiously proclaims on its cover that it represents "A New Consensus" on Al Gore-style gobbledegook about global interdependence. Of course, there is no such consensus in America, and none of the report's conclusions about "sustainable development" has ever passed through America's institutions of self-government or free market.

They are not supposed to. Decision-making about human behavior, land ownership and use, and our economic future are now supposed to be the result of "collaborative approaches" with as yet unidentified persons, using the power of government "to convene and facilitate, . . . setting goals, creating incentives, monitoring performance."

That's far removed from full disclosure and American processes of self-government, but we are now in the global marketplace where decisions about our ecosystems are made by "consensus" rather than elections. That's how Clinton thought he could get by with this summer's grab for control over all U.S. rivers through his American Heritage Rivers Initiative.

Kofi Annan's appointee Maurice Strong has emerged as the human link in the intricate network of UN agencies seeking global control. He was a member of the UN-funded Commission on Global Governance, whose 1995 report, "Our Global Neighborhood," recommended removing U.S. veto power in the Security Council, creating an Economic Security Council to oversee the world's economy, changing the World Bank into a central bank like the Federal Reserve, establishing an international court superior to U.S. courts, creating a permanent UN standing army while disarming all nations and individuals, establishing a global taxation system, giving the UN control over the "global commons" (the air, the oceans and outer space), and creating a parliamentary body of "civil society" made up of Non-Governmental Organizations called NGOs (private pressure groups).

An acknowledged genius at organizational networking, Maurice Strong is the kingpin of the NGOs, which he has taught how to access foundation funds and manipulate "consensus" at UN conferences. He developed this technique in the 1970s by bringing NGOs into the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN), where now some 700 NGOs control the agenda even though the IUCN membership includes 74 governments and 104 government agencies.

U.S. members of the IUCN not only include government agencies such as the Environmental Protection Agency, but also private lobbying groups such as the Sierra Club, the National Audubon Society, Nature Conservancy, and the National Wildlife Federation. The IUCN substantially wrote the treaties and agreements that came out of the Rio Earth Summit, which Maurice Strong chaired.

Tightening the screws of world governance is the kind of "reform" that the executive director of the "UN Reform Program" is seeking. And now he's going to do it with American taxpayers' money.