

LA SERVITUDE CLIMATIQUE



JEAN-MICHEL BELOUVE

" CLIMATE SERVITUDE, CLIMATE CHANGE, BUSINESS AND POLITICS "
Jean-Michel Bélouve

[See the Summary on page 4](#)

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I – THE HISTORY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE 1896-2009

SUB-CHAPTER 1 GENESIS (1896-1988)

1896-1988 THE DEVELOPMENT OF SCIENCE

The Arrhenius hypothesis

Computers, meteorological and climate models

First alerts from National Science Foundation

The Vostok Ice cores. The International Geosphere-Biosphere Program.

ECOLOGY AND ECOLOGISTS

James Lovelock and Gaia hypothesis.

Political environmentalism emerging

Chernobyl

CHAPTER I – THE HISTORY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE 1896-2009

SUB-CHAPTER 2- CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY AND GEOPOLICY (1988-2009)

CLIMATE CHANGE TURNS INTO A POLITICAL ISSUE

James Hansen's testimony to American Senate and Senator Al Gore

The 1988 turning point: climate issue turns political. Founding the IPCC.

The IPCC getting organized.

The First Assessment report (FAR), 1990

Towards Rio Earth Summit, and the unstoppable rise Maurice Strong's.

The Nations' sovereignties being challenged.

1992-2009 GLOBAL WARMING IN FRAMEWORK OF SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT POLICIES AND QUEST FOR A NEW WORLD ORDER.

From Rio to Kyoto

The Kyoto Protocol

Science, propaganda, business and politics.

The Stern Review

Oslo, Bali, Copenhagen

CHAPTER II: DEBATE AND CONTROVERSY ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE.

THE OFFICIAL THEORY OF GLOBAL WARMING.

The so-called greenhouse gases.

Professor Segalstad's critics

TOOLS FOR LONG-TERM CLIMATE FORECASTING.

The hockey-cross curve contretemps.

What to do with an averaged temperature?

MODELS AND COMPUTER CALCULATION.

The limits of climatic models according to IPCC's third assessment report (2001)

Auditing modelling methodology, IPCC's reporting of results and relevant policymakers' decisions.

CONSENSUS ? DO YOU MEAN CONSENSUS ?

THE FALSIFICATION OF GREENHOUSE EFFECT ACCORDING TO GERLICH AND TSCHEUSCHNER.

THE GREENHOUSE FINGERPRINT IS LOST INDEED

DISPUTES BETWEEN ALARMISTS AND SKEPTICS.

THE PREDICTED DISASTERS THROUGH CLIMATE CHANGE

Threats according to IPCC

What do French politicians infer from the IPCC's advices?

Tempests, tornadoes, hurricanes, cyclones, typhoons and deluges.

The spread of droughts and desertification.

Facing greenhouse effect: mitigation or adaptation ?

THE ALTERNATIVE SCIENTIFIC THEORIES.

The solar cycles theory: Schwabe's cycles and Hale's cycles, and their effect on Earth temperatures

Solar cycles, continued: the effect of cosmic rays.

Ferenc Miskolczi's " Greenhouse Effect in Semi-Transparent Planetary Atmospheres."

Richard Lindzen's and Roy Spencer's works on clouds and the water cycle.

The adiabatic theory of Russian school.

It's plea turn for defence.

Thinking about and debating ethics.

CHAPTER III – MOBILIZING PUBLIC OPINIONS

A STRATEGY OF FEAR.

INFORMATION OR RATHER PROPAGANDA ?

The weight of words.

Prozelytizing and activism among environmentalists.

The media, an apocalyptic Cassandra

Are the media independant ?

DEVELOPING A MYTH: OVER TWENTY YEARS OF MEDIA STRATEGY.

FROM DIALECTICS TO MANIPULATION.

An enquiry on way major american television channels are covering climate change.

Statistics, curves and their magicians.

Forcing skeptics to fall silent.

THE EFFECTS OF THE CAMPAIGNS ON PUBLIC OPINION.

CHAPTER IV: THE CARBON ECONOMY.

A COMPLEX SYSTEM INVOLVING MANYFOLD ACTORS

The carbon allowances trading schemes.

The Clean Development Mechanism and Joint Implementation

THE CARBON FINANCIAL SPHERE

THE STERN REVIEW

William Nordhaus opposite view to N. Stern's

PUBLIC INTERVENTIONISM AND ECONOMY OF CLIMATE RISK.

Clean and renewable energies.

Biofuel

Windmills

Solar energy

Wood and forests

Geothermy

Public financial support to renewable energies and global interventionism.

The green gold mine of climate change.

THE BUSINESS NETWORK OF CLIMATE RISK AND ITS PROSPECTS

Coal and geological capture of carbon dioxide.

Mitigation of emissions in transport

Buildings energy efficiency

The second generation of biofuels.
Geothermal electric power, volcanic geothermy and deep geothermy.
A Keynesian Green Deal to save climate ?

CHAPTER V – ALBERT GORE JR

AN AMBITIOUS FELLOW, BORN UNDER A LUCKY STAR

The red billionaire in America.

THE LEARNING YEARS OF A VICE-PRESIDENT-BOUNDED APPRENTICE

Youth and teen-age

Al Gore in Congress

Earth in the Balance

An activist and influential Vice-President.

THE MILITANT BUSINESSMAN.

CHAPTER VI – MAURICE STRONG, SHADOWY GURU AT UNITED NATIONS.

1929-1972 THE AMAZING SUCCESS OF A YOUNG POOR BUT VERY AMBITIOUS GUY.

Growing with misfortunes of 1929 economical depression.

Discovering a different civilisation: lessons from the Inuit.

Accessing UN through small door

Petroleum, Africa and a trip around the world.

A business eagle's takeoff

Wondering about an unprecedented success

The eagle's takeoff, continued...

BACK TO THE UN, STOCKHOLM.

PETROLEUM, BUSINESS AND DOLLARS.

MAURICE AND HANNE STRONG: SPIRITUALITY AND RELIGION.

A New Age partner

The Interfaith Laboratory

The united religions organization.

1975-1991 ON INTERNATIONAL STAGE.

WHAT KIND OF A MAN ARE YOU, MISTER STRONG ?

The Canadian connexion

Maurice Strong and China

The Trilateral, Bilderberg, Club of Rome and New World Order networks.

REAPING FRUITS OF RIO.

Global Governance and reforming the United Nations.

Ted Turner and Maurice Strong, The United Nations Foundation.

CANKER AT UN'S HEAD, AND MAURICE STRONG'S COLLAPSE

THE SECOND BIRTH OF A PHOENIX IN CHINA

CHAPTER VII. WHAT KIND OF WORLD, TOMORROW ?

The state of Science.

The geopolitical context

ENERGY SECURITY

Petroleum and natural gas

Energy Security and Climate change remain two distinct issues

Nuclear power

The debate within global governance.

Governments must make their policies clear.

TAXING CO₂ IN ORDER TO TAX ENERGY

BUSINESS LOBBIES

GLOBAL OVER-POPULATION

THE NORTH-SOUTH ANTAGONISM

THE ZERO-GROWTH MYTH

IS DEMOCRACY AT AN END?

EPILOGUE: WHAT KIND OF ENVIRONMENTALISM DOES OUR PLANET NEED ?

NOTES

SUMMARY

CHAPTER I – THE HISTORY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE 1896-2009 SUB-CHAPTER 1 : GENESIS (1896-1988)

Science's progress 1896-1988.

In 1896 Svante Arrhenius published an article about CO₂ and atmospheric greenhouse effect, where he stated that, should concentration of this gas double, earth's temperature would increase by 5° C. The irradiative explanation he used to support this theory was falsified by Robert W Wood thirteen years later: air convection does raise temperatures in a garden greenhouse, but infrared radiations don't. However, Arrhenius' thesis was resumed in 1950's by David Keeling, who made first exhaustive measurements of atmospheric CO₂ concentration and by David Callendar who stated, as Arrhenius did it before, that temperatures increased as CO₂ concentration rose. Then Gilbert Plass ran the first computer model simulating effect of atmospheric CO₂ and forecast a 30 % increase of its concentration and a 1° C temperature increase at end of twentieth century.

As meteorological models grew more efficient, more powerful climate models were ran in 1970's, and produced alarming results. The US National Science Foundation published a report and a first World Climate Conference was organized by the WMO¹ in 1979 (Geneva). There, a worldwide research program was launched, under control from UN's WMO and UNEP², and International Council for Science. Climate models were forecasting temperature increases varying from 1,5° C to 4° C for a doubled concentration in CO₂. They showed there were positive feedbacks, which were multiplying the greenhouse effect of CO₂, main one being atmospheric water vapor. Then, researches on gas included in polar ice-cores noticed a close correlation between CO₂ concentration and temperatures, during past 140 000 years.

Ecology and ecologists

The word "ecology" was first used by Ernst Haeckel (1834-1919) who propagated Darwin's theory and supported a monist philosophy. He defined "ecology" as "science of the interactions between living organisms and their environment". Thus, ecology was originally construed as a scientific discipline, as a part of biology, drawing its content from several sciences, such as physiology, ethology, genetics, evolution, etc. Various concepts were then elaborated, such as the biosphere, ecosystems, homeostasy... In 1920's, ecologists began studying effects of human activities on natural environment : this branch was named "human ecology". Some philosophers reflected upon such scientific surveys and advised people to act in order to preserve natural environment, so that ecology got a second meaning to designate a kind of behavior. Among those philosophers, Arnae Næss, an activist and a pacifist, founded the movement "Deep Ecology". For him, humans did not have any higher rights than other living beings such as animals and vegetals. Nature was not made for men, and all beings were equal elements of a so-called "ecosphere".

At the end of sixties and beginning of seventies, James Ephraim Lovelock noticed that living reign was interacting with atmosphere, and he published the "Gaia hypothesis" of Earth being a living entity with its own metabolism. Thus, he warned against possible extinction of mankind which, he said, endangered itself by its own development and behavior.

Lovelock's works have greatly influenced several modern currents and have also been picked up by activists or ideological and political movements. The New Age spirituality, hippie subculture refer to Gaia concept.

¹ World Meteorological Organization

² United Nations Environment Program

One of most important steps was a meeting of numerous public figures at the Club of Rome. These people met for the first time in Rome, in 1968. They referred to Lovelock and Malthus, and their mentors were Alexander King, a scientist from Great Britain, and Aurelio Peccei, a Fiat trustee. Among the members stood prominent figures such Henri Kissinger, Giovanni Agnelli, Zbigniew Brzezinski...

In 1972, they published the so-called “Meadows report” with the title “The Limits to Growth”. It asserted that we cannot afford let production develop indefinitely, that human species is over-proliferating, and these trends lead to exhaustion of natural resources and the ruin of environment. Thus, the report recommended the imposition of drastic birth control policies, heavy taxes on industry, everlasting struggle against pollution. A later report told that any delay in doing so would lead to a “breaking point”, beyond which nothing could effectively be done.

Several worldwide environmentalist networks appeared or were developing in the sphere of “non governmental organizations”. Most of them have been enlisted by the UN and are cooperating with its Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC) [*Jean-Michel B elouve gives details about Friends of Earth, WWF, Greenpeace, Sierra Club, and also the alter-globalist organization ATTAC*]. All of them are under influence of Lovelock and the Club of Rome. JM B elouve also notices that many former Marxist and Communist activists have joined such environmentalist organizations, bringing with them their authoritarian and anticapitalist ideology. Most have joined in reaction to de-Stalinisation, and, above all, of the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia in 1968. Ecological activism was also inspired with Galbraith’s and Nader’s aconsumerism.

These ideas spread over a substantial part of Western public, who considered those bizarre but sympatethic people harmless, all while did not giving up on demanding pay raises for more consumption.

Thus, there was fertile ground for political ecology to grow in our Western lands ! In several Western democracies, new political parties were forming: the so-called “Greens” ! But in order to persuade voters, you must offer more than environmentalist hectoring. The Greens started picking pieces of leftist demands in order to effect social changes. The Greens have also tried to form coalitions with left-wing political parties. At same time, Right began to understand that the environment was a real concern of many voters, and they might loose parts of their market if they ignored it. As a consequence, they integrated environmental topics into their programs.

While playing such a game, Greens have lost part of their popularity. In most countries they remain small parties and rally few voters. But they compensate for their electoral misfortunes thanks to the embrace given to environmentalist NGOs by the UN, where they are considered as major representatives of civil society. This enables them to play a substantial role in the geopolitical arena.

The Chernobyl catastrophe, in April, 1986, gave the Greens and other environmentalists organizations a boost of credibility and legitimacy. Chernobyl was a watershed for several reasons. First, disaster offered a worldwide example of a major environmental crisis. Second, it weakened Soviet economy and probably hastened the collapse of Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact. And third, Chernobyl caused a dramatic halt in nuclear power development. All three aspects accelerated the development of the global warming movement in context of the “New World Order”.

CHAPTER I – THE HISTORY OF GLOBAL CLIMATE CHANGE 1896-2009

SUB-CHAPTER 2- CLIMATE CHANGE POLICY AND GEOPOLICY (1988-2009)

James Hansen, then Director of the Goddard Institute for Space and Technology, testified before the US Senate, In July 1988. In his testimony , he forecast a 2,5° to 5° C increase of global temperatures for the middle of 21st century, which he alleged would cause serious harms and various catastrophes for the planet and its inhabitants. The Senate Commission was chaired by Senator Al Gore. Both men have been supporting one another since, as they wage a continuous campaign against alleged man-caused global warming.

In the same year, major nations decided to associate together to cope with climate change. This was culmination of a sixteen years' agitation on the part of UN. Jean-Michel B elouve describes different stages of this period: Stockholm Climate Conference in 1972, and creation of United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), both managed by the Canadian UN official Maurice Strong, the World Commission for Environment and Development, under presidency of Gro Harlem Brundtland with active participation of Maurice Strong. In 1987, the Brundtland's Commission produced a document, so-called "Brundtland Report" with the official title "Our Common Future". This report acted as a source document for a key meeting of G7, in Toronto, in 1988. There, Seven decided to integrate environment and development in every fields of their policies, they decided to co-operate for the preservation of the atmosphere and entrusted the UN with creating a group of climate experts. The IPCC was formed immediately, and proceeded to gather scientific information on the emissions of greenhouse gases and man's responsibility in climate change.

The author wonders why the Seven would choose such a political organization as United Nations, rather than a scientific one to manage the program, as for instance the International Council for Science? Secret motivations, or rather political influence of Brundtland and Strong, and also from Club of Rome and Trilateral Commission whose members were numerous in the Brundtland Commission ?

JM B elouve describes the structure and working methods of the IPCC. Then he proceeds with the preparation of Earth Summit of Rio (1992); this major Conference was prepared within the Trilateral Commission³, under control of David Rockefeller and Maurice Strong. The details of the decisions and agreements of Rio Summit had been examined one year earlier at a meeting of the Trilateral Commission and were published under title "Beyond Interdependence" (1991-1992). This include "Rio Declaration", United Nations Framework on Climate Change (UNFCCC), Agenda 21. Maurice Strong was tasked with preparing Conference and managing it as its General Secretary. He skilfully got major political concepts ratified, such as "sustainable development", "precautionary principle", "Civil Society", the latter being structured in nine "Major Groups", etc. The new UNFCCC was entrusted with organizing a subsequent conference, in order to determine compulsory targets of greenhouse gases emissions. That was done in Kyoto, Buenos Aires and Bonn, six years later.

The author points out that all these decisions had been worked out by a private organization, an impenetrable think tank by the name of Trilateral Commission, inspired by its own conception of World, rather than by appointed representatives of the UN's member states. Wouldn't That seem to be a problematic approach for an organization which supposedly represents sovereign nations?

Then Jean-Michel B elouve develops a large section where he describes the idea of a "New World Order", various concepts of global governance, and the report from the Trilateral Commission meeting of 1975, which questioned the effectiveness of democracies. Democracies, it claimed, seem to be inefficient, but dictatorship is neither convenient, nor morally acceptable, so global threats may be useful to mobilize populations, and such threats may be found in the environmental area, such as (why not ?) global warming.

The book describes first an second assesment reports of IPCC. It mentions the establishment of "World Business Council for Sustainable Development"⁴ and creation of "Earth Council" for better synergy between environmentalist organizations. Both have been initiated by Maurice Strong. The book makes another digression to introduce tycoon Ted Turner, the founder of CNN, who donated one billion dollars to the UN to create the so-called United Nations Foundation, only to impose himself as its chairman, and his fellows Maurice Strong and Al Gore's mate Timothy Wirth respectively as Chief Executive Officer and as President of this new organization. Is such private money actually supposed to rule international bodies?

³ The Trilateral Commission is a private organization, established to foster closer cooperation between USA, Europe and Japan. It was founded in 1973 at initiative of David Rockefeller, a Chairman of Rockefellers' controlled Chase Manhattan Bank, with assistance of Zbigniew Brzezinski, a political scientist who would be an advisor to president Carter a few years later and is one main ideologist of New World Order.

⁴ The WBCSD was created by Maurice Strong's friend and partner for preparing Rio, Stephan Schmidheiny. This was the culmination of Strong's fifteen years efforts to reconcile business and environmentalism.

The Kyoto Protocol

The first meeting, held in Kyoto on December 1997 was followed by two others in Buenos-Aires (1998) and Bonn (1999) during which the Protocol was elaborated and signed by 167 nations. The main characteristic of treaty is that only 38 developed or industrialized nations got involved in compulsory emissions limitations (the countries listed in an Annex A to Protocol). The 129 others, so-called *developing countries*, did not have any such restrictive commitment (those listed in Annex B). Among those, stood China and India, the second and the fourth greenhouse gas emitters, and other steadily industrializing countries, as Brasil, South Africa, Mexico, and so on. Their GDPs were then increasing at a pace of 6 to more than 10% every year, and so were their emissions of greenhouse gases. Today, these developing countries are jointly the source of 47% of worldwide emissions.

The countries listed in annex A were committed to lowering their overall emission by 5,2 % in 2008-2012, base year being 1990. This global target was split among 38 members of the list.

The Protocol established three mechanisms for flexibility. The first of them was a trading emission allowance scheme. Each country listed in annex A could buy or sell allowances representing tons of CO₂, so that if a country was emitting more than its quota, it might buy allowances from another which had not entirely consumed its own. Same mechanism should be established between firms. Soon after, Al Gore and Maurice Strong launched Chicago Climate Exchange (CCX), which was first carbon stock exchange. Another mechanism is Clean Development Mechanism (CDM), through which developed countries and their firms might invest in clean projects in countries in annex B, both parties getting CDM tradable allowances with regard to greenhouse gas spared. The third mechanism is the “Joint Implement”, which organizes a similar system between two annex A countries.

Jean-Michel Bélouze relates about history of the Protocol, George Bush’s refusal to introduce the Protocol to ratification by the Senate, the creation of different carbon exchange places, the development of a state-subsidized “green economy”, of “green taxes” and “green laws”, the prolific propaganda stream pouring all over the world, and the role of Al Gore, as an activist and a propagandist, as well as a successful businessman supported by many friends and partners among policymakers. The author mentions the large “green” investor networks which attract significant funds.

A paragraph is devoted to the so-called Stern Review, a report which painted depressing economic prospects should greenhouse gas emissions develop further, and advised devoting 1% of global GDPs to mitigate and adapt to alleged climate risks.

The last paragraph, “Oslo, Bali, Copenhagen”, deals with Nobel Peace Prize being awarded to Al Gore and the IPCC, with the fourth assessment report (AR4), Bali conference and with the road map towards Conference of Parties in Copenhagen, in december 2009, which is supposed to plan, among others, new emissions cuttings from 2013 to 2050.

The author also tells about consultations within the G8, the Trilateral Commission, Obama’s climate policy in contrast to Bush’s, and the tough debate on the Waxman Markey Bill at the Congress. He emphasizes President of European Union, Vaclav Klaus, warning against tendentious environmentalism endangering global freedom, a lonely rebelling voice emerging from the choir of Western peoples’ leaders. The paragraph ends with a short evaluation of main nations’ requests prior to Copenhagen, and East-West dissensions.

CHAPTER II : DEBATE AND CONTROVERSY ABOUT CLIMATE CHANGE.

The chapter deals with the state of scientific knowledge and controversies about climate change and mankind’s alleged influence on greenhouse gas effect.

First of all, author explains classical irradiative theory of greenhouse gas effect. It is a scientific popularization to provide enough knowledge and scientific vocabulary. *[Notice: It is necessary to take into account much scientific material, even in an economical and political document about global warming. Global warming requires a global approach, because it is a complex system where science, economy and politics are overlapping and interdependent. The one who says "I don't care about the science" puts himself in a bad position to comprehend issue. One may also make a similar commentary about those who only concern themselves with the science]*⁵.

Then chapter goes on describing the criticisms from scientists about methods and approaches used by the official scientists and scientific institutions. This includes their premises, their means of measurement and proxies, as well as their mistakes and outright falsifications.

Some scientists explain why an averaged temperature is of no use, others point out the unreliability of the measuring equipments, the poor homogeneity of data collected over large periods, the unsuitable data fittings and alterations, the unverifiable procedures and reckonings.

The most questionable method is the use of computer climate models. Many recall how inaccurate models have been as means of forecasting the climate. Such critics refer to chaos, a random phenomenon occurring within complex systems where coupled non linear relations are involved, which make such systems unpredictable on principle. Others point out to the lack of adequate knowledge on major elements of the climate, leading to questionable "parameterization"⁶. The latter remark is, among others, addressed to calculations concerning cloudiness, since there have been so far no methods available to reckon and simulate the forming of clouds.

Many critics point out that modelling research centers earn huge amounts of money for developing and running models, and that modellers care more about their earnings than about the accuracy of their temperature forecasts. It is so difficult to test and verify such complex software and impossible to check them against events which are supposed to occur a century later! Bélouve reports about a very interesting audit of IPCC forecasts of global average temperatures. The audit was performed by two specialists of scientific forecasting methods, Scott Armstrong and Kesten Green. In their report, the two experts refute the relevance and accuracy of climate models computation and forecasting.

Then, the book addresses the catchword "consensus", used by IPCC to typify contents of its assessment reports, and which is picked up by media to make believe that almost every scientist agrees with IPCC's theories.

More than 30 000 scientists have signed petitions against IPCC's methods and conclusions, and many scientists have published that they did not agree with such and such statement or have proposed alternate scientific interpretations. These scientists are known under the name of "skeptics", whereas IPCC supporters call them "deniers" or "flat earthers".

An important contribution is paragraph on "Falsification of the Atmospheric CO₂ Greenhouse Effect within the Frame of Physics" written by Gerhard Gerlich and Ralph Tscheuschner. This paragraph may be somewhat difficult to read for some, but it is nevertheless important, because it purports to demolish the whole theory of greenhouse gas effect through very careful and meticulous mathematical developments, and has never been disproved until now. Unfortunately, this paper is not widely known, because media won't publish about it and perhaps because it is mathematically difficult and also written in a confusing scientific jargon.

Another falsification, easier to understand, is developed under paragraph "the missing fingerprint of the greenhouse effect". This refers to a supposed "hot spot" which, according to scientists and the models, should be found in upper troposphere of inter-tropical area, but has never been observed by real measurements: crucial evidence for the alleged "greenhouse effect" is indeed missing !

⁵ Commentary from the writer of the present summary

⁶ This scientific neologism refer to statistical methods for computing phenomena for which mathematical equations do not exist.

Jean-Michel B elouve describes the climate of hate which reigns among climate scientists, where anathemas, insults and slanders are commonly being traded between “alarmists” and “deniers”. This is not a worthy and suitable way for scientists to behave, and this shows to what extent politics has corrupted this professional environment. The author also stigmatises the way non-scientists trade lies and insults in papers, blogs and forums. The debate is degenerating into a kind of verbal civil war. Fortunately, some good books, which B elouve mentions, are available and fairly account for the current controversies.

Another original and efficient way to express skepticism is fiction, particularly with a talented writer. Michael Crichton is one of these authors. His novel, “State of Fear”, is a fascinating thriller, which sends a clear message on the dangers encountered by our civilization.

The following paragraph leads readers through the alleged “catastrophes of climate change” forecast. There, author depicts range of cataclysms to be encountered in future. These alarming descriptions have no solid basis in science. The level of oceans is not a severe problem. A few decimeters is nothing when you supposedly have eighty years to adapt to it. No scientific reasoning support the thesis of an increase in number and violence of tempests. As far as drought and desertification are concerned, this would rather be a result of the scarcity of water resources in some countries where population is proliferating and the economy is affected by poverty, ignorance and inappropriate agricultural methods.

What about illnesses and diseases? should temperatures increase by 2 to 5 ° C, who dares say that medicine will be impotent in 21st century? Why should countries like ours be affected by the pathologies which would strike a few warmer areas in world?

Not only are catastrophes neither certain nor even likely, but should global warming occur, we would have plenty of resources to face it.

The end of chapter is devoted to several alternative theories of climate. Although public money is overwhelmingly channelled to researches in the IPCC line, creative and tenacious scientists keep exploring different hypothesis which have led them to very important discoveries.

Climate change has always occurred in the past time, and one of oldest and most obvious explanations for such variations is solar activity. Solar activity undergoes slight periodic changes, and solar irradiance too. There are several types of solar cycles of different periods. Most useful to explain variations within a century are eleven-years Schwabe cycles. Sunspots appear on solar surface, and when that happens, solar irradiance increases. There were many such sunspots during the twentieth century, and exceptionally so during its second half, but this important activity cannot explain more than a 0.15° C increase in temperature, while average temperature rose by 0.7° C. The IPCC acknowledge that, contending that the remaining 0.55° C was caused by greenhouse effect.

Nevertheless, recent satellite observations have highlighted fact that cloud coverage was noticeably reduced during the twenty last years of past century, something which let through a higher amount of sunlight, so that more solar energy warmed up earth’s surface. This phenomenon can fully explain the slight temperature increase of 1980-1998 period.

Satellite measurements of cloud coverage are relatively recent, so generalizations are premature. But observation may be matched to a theory developed by the Swedish scientist Henrik Svensmark. The Earth is continuously bombarded with cosmic rays coming from galactic exploding stars. Svensmark has highlighted fact that when the activity of Sun increases, a lesser amount of cosmic rays reaches our atmosphere. The explanation is following: when Sun is more active, it creates a larger and stronger magnetic field, which deflects away trajectories of cosmic rays and reduces their impact on our planet. This is a demonstrated and uncontested theory.

Svensmark has compared situation with what happens in experimental clouds chambers where physicists make particles collide and where a droplet trace produced by the particles mark their trajectories. Cosmic

rays are high-energy particles, like ones studied in cloud chambers, and a similar phenomenon probably happens in water vapor of the atmosphere. The first experiments Svensmark performed in his Copenhagen laboratory were promising and another experiment called CLOUD is under way, with important equipment and a larger research staff, at the CERN accelerator near Geneva. The experiment is presently managed by Jasper Kirkby, who has enhanced Svensmark's theory and reconstituted chain of micro-physical and chemical transformations from the particle up to a water droplet. The big special chamber ordered for experiment has just been delivered and Kirkby thinks he will get an experimental proof of theory within the year.

Another research result eclipsed by media, which has been neither refuted nor even seriously disputed is Ferenc Miskolczi's "*Greenhouse Effect in Semi-Transparent Planetary Atmospheres*". This work is pure theoretical physics: Miskolczi states that current greenhouse effect equations are incomplete because they do not include correct boundary conditions. Classic theory does not comply with second law of thermodynamics, something which is impossible for a balanced system. The new theory presented in Miskolczi's paper shows that atmosphere maintains a "saturated" greenhouse effect, controlled by water vapor content. One main conclusion of the survey is that, as concentration of CO₂, or any greenhouse gas, increases, average concentration in water vapor must decline in order to keep total greenhouse effect balanced. And that is exactly what can be observed from the NOAA's statistics since 1948: this is not a final proof of the theory, but, however, it is a reliable indication.

Very important observations have been made by Richard Lindzen and Roy Spencer. Undoubtedly, core of climate issue stands in water cycle, and especially in clouds and precipitations. Lindzen has published a thesis, "Iris hypothesis", where he tells that the highest clouds, the cirruses, get smaller and fewer as temperatures increase (like iris regulates the light flux entering an eye). Cirruses are thin clouds which do not reflect much sunlight. On other hand, they absorb a lot of infrared rays, thus contributing substantially to greenhouse effect. As they shrink, greenhouse effect is also reduced and that results in a negative feedback from a temperature increase. This conclusion is the opposite of IPCC's scientists contentions and of the hypotheses programmed in climate models.

Moreover, Lindzen's colleague and friend Roy Spencer, who leads team in charge of measuring device on NASA's AQUA satellite, an who gets all source data concerning atmospheric humidity, cloud coverage, etc, has confirmed Lindzen's Iris thesis and put forward an exhaustive explanation of what happens with clouds, snowfall and rainfall. He has presented his conclusions in a very good paper, readable even by non scientists, "Global Warming and Nature Thermostat", and, of course, in many communications in most prestigious scientific magazines. The clouds react as a thermostat, which responds with a negative feedback to any variation in temperature. This is true for cirruses, as Lindzen had stated, but also for lower clouds.

One month ago, Lindzen published an article in which he compares ERBE satellite measurements with the results of 11 IPCC's climate models. The ERBE satellite shows that there is a correlation between the reflected solar energy (outgoing short waves radiations) and temperature changes. The clouds reflectance do react to temperatures with a negative feedback, while eleven IPCC climate models show a totally opposite relation, which was to be expected, since they have been programmed with positive feedbacks !

Jean-Michel Bélouve concludes that there is no scientific consensus about greenhouse effect and climate change, and that it is not time yet to choose between the different theories, that of the IPCC's and alternative ones, as many causal determinants remain unknown or unexamined. However, he takes exception to huge amounts of public money devoted to the IPCC-selected research programs, while very promising scientific works are postponed or neglected because they lack funding and they get very little publicity. What is more serious than wasting money and time, is fact that science has been hijacked, deprived of essential freedom which is only way to advance and progress. And author recalls the premonitory Heidelberg Appeal of 1992 : "*We are worried at the dawn of the twenty-first century, at the emergence of an irrational ideology which is opposed to scientific and industrial progress and impedes economic and social development...etc*".

CHAPTER III – MOBILIZING PUBLIC OPINIONS

It is quite clear that governing people, scientists and media have agreed on a “strategy of fear”. The author quotes several declarations made by head of IPCC, ministers, international leaders and prominent academics who publicly say that disasters must be announced, that they don’t care if science is false, because climate fear may help them impose their policies, that journalists should not cover skeptical scientists, etc. The cynic quotations from two ministers, IPCC vice-president, a King-to-be, a major press editor and a Professor at Stanford University, show that there is a large agreement among powerful or influential people to use popular fears among the public to achieve their political or ideological aims. They have corrupted science to serve their own objectives!

These people use all resources from semantics, pictures, the media to exaggerate a few selected assertions from scientists. Environmental activists are permanently persuading their neighbours, their colleagues, children, and they often choose professional careers, associative structures or trade union activism to peddle their messages. Many of them choose careers in education, trade unions, media ...or environmentalism, climatology, charities...Environmental NGOs do have a lot of funds to finance media campaigns and stage spectacular events.

The french media, including AFP agency, are almost unanimously broadcasting catastrophic declarations mainly obtained from IPCC, and a few number of media-savvy or self-styled scientists, incompetent politicians, famous propagandists like Al Gore or French Nicolas Hulot, John Reeves...Most climate reporters do a very superficial job. The author quotes Professor Martine Tabéaud’s survey of articles from *Le Monde*, where she notes a lack of scientific culture, a lack of information, “*poor content*”.

The British press shows better editorial quality, according to a survey by the Institute for Public Policy Research. We may observe that by checking on online British press. Like French one, they are somewhat sensationalist and prone to catastrophism, but content of their papers is more substantial and, often enough, they report the skeptics’ conclusions. This has not been popular with Blair and Brown governments, nor with royal family, who would prefer more “discipline”.

Are media independent ? are journalists free enough to submit themselves to deontological rules of their community? Bélouve reminds us of rules, and answer is that journalists’ freedom is kept within narrow margins. The press and the media belong to a few big groups. Journalists have to protect their careers and are very often forced to comply with will of their bosses, and with marketing constraints.

Jean-Michel Bélouve worries about enormous political power acquired by fabulously rich media tycoons, such as Rupert Murdoch, Ted Turner, Edgar Bronfman and Sumner Redstone. These individuals are not only media kings, they also have political ideas and plans of their own. There are powerful connections between them and bankers, politician, stars, and they support their elitist anti-democratic ideology. What is even more disquieting is fact that these men meet together in secret clubs, that they belong to formidable Bilderberg Group, mentor and historical leader of which, David Rockefeller, who has been presenting his thanks to the media leaders who faithfully attend the Bilderberg meetings, keep silent about debates and have been supporting ideas developed. All that is consistent with declarations of the leaders of Club of Rome, Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider, who wrote, in 1992, in “*the First Global Revolution*” that the threat of global warming should be used to accomplish objectives of Club. Michel Bélouve writes : “*The fight against global warming is clearly in line with a plan for a global political system*” .

And Bélouve describes the progressive steps of a long-term media strategy which began with pomp of Rio summit, collusion of environmentalist NGOs with the UN and Maurice Strong’s Earth Council, global hype about the IPCC’s assesment reports, the appointment as missionaries of self-styled experts like James Hansen, billions poured into media campaigns toward public and enterprises, pamphlets, books, Al Gore’s Jeffrey Skoll-funded “Inconvenient Truth” and finally Nobel prize for Gore and IPCC.

The author refers to an enquiry by US Business and Media Institute. It shows in which biased way big TV broadcasting networks treat issue of Climate Change. Sophistry, persuasion, bullying, exaggeration, dramatization, rumors, slogans, manipulated curves and statistics...all stratagems operated by these media professionals are reviewed by the author⁷.

Nonetheless, such a gigantic hype has not achieved so much effect on American opinion, as the yearly Gallup inquiries about environmental pollution haven't shown much change in the last seventeen years. Between alarmists and skeptics, opinion is evenly divided, and Bélouve notes that people's common sense has not disappeared.

CHAPTER IV: THE CARBON ECONOMY.

Some people argue that we should fight against global warming, even if we have no proof of its occurrence! For instance, Jean-Marc Jancovici⁸ alleges that to pay in order to avoid warming would be similar to insuring your house against a fire, even if it never burns down. That would only be rational if such warming could be avoided at a cost consistent with the expected losses this would prevent. Every precautionary investment must be balanced against the consequences of its possibly having been made in vain, and that risk is the risk to which the so-called precautionary principle is systematically blind. What if such an alleged "insurance policy" wreaks havoc on our economies and has no discernible effect on the loss it purports to try and avoid? As a consequence, rational decision-makers must assess the future gains and losses from global warming, the probability of its occurrence and the likelihood that anyone could do anything about it.

That is why the following questions must be answered prior to any decision being made, and we have no evidence that policymakers have, to any satisfactory extent:

Does global warming occur at all? To what extent is it caused by man, compared with natural causes? Who would benefit and who would suffer from it, and to what extent? Would it be more costly to fight it than adapt to it and for whom? Who should make the decisions, and when? The answer to those questions depend on more information being gained: who is to decide that such is adequate, and when?

The author is questioning whether we should keep researching the matter before deciding, since the so-called Hansen tipping point has no basis in science. To apply a precautionary principle in the present context is totally inappropriate. To impose expenses to limit CO₂ concentration at 450-550 parts per million (ppm) would be economically severe. But if such impositions have but a negligible effect, that is absurd to boot! Yet, this is what Western countries have been intent upon.

Perhaps some decisions could be immediately taken, under condition that they produce favourable results in domains independent from global warming. This could be case of actions aiming for energy security, which actually is a real problem, and we are able to evaluate relevant risks. For instance, reducing fuel consumption, developing electric cars or nuclear and solar power are certainly efficient policies. In such case, why should people be told that it is done to curb CO₂ emissions?

Then author describes mankind as a more or less organized system where a lot of countries and myriads of enterprises, organizations and individuals are acting. All of them are more or less free, more or less interdependent. Each has different prospects and purposes as far as energy security and global warming are concerned. It is doubtful that a good consensus could be reached in such a context. Even a global dictator could not control the system efficiently! Mankind's system is going its own irresistible way as the resultant force of billions interacting individual forces.

The Kyoto Protocol illustrates the consequences of such actors' games. No less than 129 of the 167 parties involved could not or would not cooperate, so that only 38 got involved in making costly efforts. Of these 38, Russia and Eastern European countries got an enormous advantage from the choice of 1990 as the base

⁷ Which is useful too for considering all kind of information !

⁸ A french consultant in climate change enterprise policy, energy efficiency and environmental diagnosis.

year, since they were certain to meet their targets and moreover make money on the top of it with their extra carbon offsets. The United States has refused to play game, but hasn't given up the match. The Western European nations and Japan were the eventual losers of game, but so far they have managed to beat system through a lax quota allocation policy. Even provisions which had been enacted in order supposedly to help poor countries have been bent, as fifty per cent of the so-called Clean Development Mechanism projects were used in favour of China and India, and 35 % of them has been given to Latin America, mainly Brazil and Mexico! Bélouve describes numerous pernicious effects of Kyoto system. He points out that natural market of fuel and gas trading has been much more potent than the Protocol, as CO₂ emissions were dramatically reduced in 2008, when oil prices were climbing close to \$150 a barrel ! Moreover, he shows that cap and trade carbon market is ineffectual during recessions, but turns into an anti-growth mechanism when economy restarts.

The book describes Carbon financial system, allowance exchange places, The Chicago Climate Exchange, CCX, and its European branch, ECX, BlueNext, the main trading place. It expounds the structure and functioning of European Union Emission Trading Scheme, warns against new European climate & energy packet, to be imposed after 2012, and he concludes on the wilful blindness of the European intent upon ignoring that neither China, nor India will ever cooperate in a global effort drastically to lower carbon emissions.

Concerning the *Stern Review*, Bélouve notes that it draws from an economic modelling which does not allow its conclusions. Naturally, in order to reach his conclusions, Stern exaggerated the downside of warming and downplayed its advantages, while underestimating the burdens and overestimating the efficiency of a fight against it. The alleged review was the mere outcome of a political mandate from the Chancellor of Exchequer to support Tony Blair's policies. Here the reader is invited to a thought experiment: suppose the Stern team had been formed back in 1905, and should asked to divine what would happen during twentieth century, of course with no knowledge of future discoveries and other unforeseeable events to come? Does the Stern team really claim to have more gray matter than the billions of heads to be active during 21st century ?

The book also presents the Nordhaus report of 1999, the conclusions of which are the opposite of Stern's.

The expression "sustainable development" implies a quite different economic paradigm from that of a capitalistic and free-market economy: it involves massive interventionist impositions which favour an array of deals between politicians and business moguls, which Bélouve calls a "*Capitalisme de connivence*" (crony capitalism). Several pages are devoted to a survey of the new state-sponsored economy of sustainable development and its channels. We have there a collection of activities which could not develop without taxpayer support and would most probably wither without it, together with admittedly promising but yet unprofitable innovations such as electric cars, nanotechnologies, nanocondensers, fuel-producing algae, high-power deep geothermy...

These activities, apart from the crucial public subsidies, are most often financed through new "green" investors funds, created under form of hedge funds, using big credit-leverage effect. They have proliferated in the United States, in Great Britain and Switzerland, and also in tax-havens like Cayman Island, and are inflating a green bubble. Al Gore has created and chairs one of them, *Generation Investment Management*. All taken together, they constitute a powerful lobby. In the United States, they have gathered around INCR, "*Investor Network on Climate Risk*" which has attracted thousand of billions dollars. This network presses heavily on federal government, states' administrations and on the Congressmen. They are conspicuously supported by the United Nations.

The conclusion of chapter is that a new "green" Keynesian deal is being developed. The self-styled green businesses try to persuade governments that present economic depression could be overcome through massive subsidies to the green economy and its supposed new markets, provided that a major part of public reflation funding be poured in the climate risk business. Green businessmen are expecting opportunities from Obama's policies, and it is true that Waxman Markey Bill, if passed, could be a bonanza for them.

They have numerous supporters among congressmen, but senators' vote is not certain, since the getting the sixty necessary votes for passing the bill might be out of their reach, and the likelihood of getting those might decrease further as a global agreement at Climate Conference of Copenhagen seems more remote.

CHAPTER V – ALBERT GORE JR

The fifth and sixth chapters are devoted to the biographies of Al Gore and Maurice Strong. Those two figures have been major global promoters of anthropic global warming propaganda and policies. It is not necessary to dwell about them in present summary. The book reveals many details about their lives, their characters, their motivations.

Albert Gore's career is a good typical example of political success in American society. He was born a lucky boy: his father was a major politician, with rich and powerful connections (Soviet rulers included!). He became an influent and powerful Vice President in the Clinton administration, where he played an important role in new information and communication technologies and was main promoter of sustainable development. Then, he became an exceptional propagandist for global warming alarmism, as well as a pugnacious and successful businessman, somewhat bulimic and cynic, a curious and mysterious personality.

This chapter, - and following one about Maurice Strong-, offers a panorama over American ruling class, its political and economical mores. The picture departs readily from the free-market and democratic image which we might have developed about the American elites. The readers are given a glimpse of a cynic and corrupt social milieu. Moreover, they may find that traditional American pride for sweet homeland is not shared by this elitist class: many of these people belong no more to a nation, but they are stateless individuals, making allegiance to an international diaspora, the new global aristocracy of a new feudal system, rather different from but somewhat similar to a nomenklatura.

CHAPTER VI – MAURICE STRONG, SHADOWY GURU AT THE UNITED NATIONS.

The Canadian Maurice Strong is an amazing personality. His life is a novel that no writer could have imagined. He has been described as an hybrid of Machiavelli and Rasputin by reporter Ann-Mary McDonald! How child of a pauper Canadian family turns into a demiurge, a business genius, a guru and a money-multiplier, this is fairy tale which chapter is telling. Strong's fingerprint on the UN is indelible. He officially was a number two, but he was actual master under Kofi Annan's General secretariat. He reigned over environmental and development branch of United Nations. He managed biggest power and petroleum firms of Canada, he personally owns a network of enterprises, he has been a sponsor of several new religious cults and has introduced a religious spirit in UN's environmental credo. He has made a personal fortune but has ruined some of his friends and partners, he has been one of developers of the concept of a New World Order. He feels at home everywhere in world. His friends and allies have been Kings, Presidents, Prime ministers, business tycoons. They have been at the top in Canada, his country of origin, in the USA, Kenya and eastern Africa, China, North and South Korea, Switzerland, Sweden, United Kingdom, Norway, Russia, Mexico and Costa Rica. He has been a major member or had powerful allies in Bilderberg Group, Council on Foreign Relations, the Trilateral Commission, Club of Rome, WWF, Aspen Institute. He has said that he hates America and wants to destroy its industry. He has dreamt of turning the UN into a World government, but dream turned into nightmare and wreck, as he was involved in a nasty affair of backhander from Saddam Hussein. He is admiring the Chinese way of "*achieving socialism with capitalistic means*" and he is presently an environmental advisor to chinese government, while also promoting coal-fired powerplant networks in China. He does not believe that much in global warming theory but he thinks using it is good for mankind.

While following Maurice Strong through his extraordinary adventures, you get a better knowledge of people like Ted Turner, media magnate who said that the population of the world should be reduced to 250 millions, Mikhail Gorbachev, the newly-found apostl of religion of Earth and of global governance. You'll meet David Rockefeller, Prince Philip of Edinburgh, Paul Martin father and son, James Wolfensohn, Gro

Harlem Brundtland, Kofi Annan, international korean crook Tong Sun Park, divine-Earth religion worshipper Hanne Marstrand-Strong, New Age priestess Shirley McLaine, and many others. You penetrate the mysteries of Canadian government. You discover UN's bureaucracy, its organization, its functioning and its turpitudes. *[Then, you may choose whether you vote for a global government according to such a model and sailed by such a crew]*⁹.

CHAPTER VII. WHAT KIND OF A WORLD, TOMORROW ? EPILOGUE: WHAT KIND OF ECOLOGY DOES OUR PLANET NEED ?

Questions are so numerous and so poorly answered about climatology and climate of 21st century that we may wonder how policies could have been based on such shaky science. Mysteries remain about clouds and their role, accuracy of climate models is widely overrated. According to Jean-Michel Bélouve's advice, an audit of such models is in order, as well as another audit of IPCC's working methods.

The author points out that, as he got himself the necessary information to write his book, policymakers most probably had access to the same, and even more, or they should have, and as a consequence he seriously doubts that they actually believe in their man-made global warming story. What are they aiming at, then?

Are they committed to the so-called "precautionary principle"? What a joke! even the IPCC's own projections are nothing to be so frightened about: they only say that climate in Strasbourg a century from now will be that which now prevails in Bordeaux or Marseille! Surely, we could deal with that! If the precautionary principle must lead to a collapse of our economies within ten or twenty years, or even to a substantial loss of capital and well-being, then real caution mandates that we leave aside said alleged "principle". Moreover, there is no possible agreement with developing countries, which only want better lives for their people and do not believe in global warming. Within such a context, none of our alleged global warming policies can succeed.

Jean-Michel Bélouve believes that our policymakers have other concerns; while saying "climate change", what they have mind is...energy security, finding excuses for increased taxation, global overpopulation, the North-South balance, and Club of Rome's zero growth. Moreover, they want to bend the democratic governance, and find in fear a convenient way to manipulate the citizenry. And some of them are rooting for world government, *[A dangerous and irresponsible dream ! Just try and suggest that to Chinese, Indian, and the Arab nations!]*¹⁰.

Jean-Michel Bélouve answers these questions.

Energy resources are actually unlimited, and we shall use other sources in a medium and longer terms. Natural oil will dry up, but we don't know when. Meanwhile, price of oil and gas will have reached such levels that we will have shifted to other energy sources. There is much more coal, though that also is an exhaustible resource too. But we have inexhaustible sources of energy: nuclear power (including high-speed neutron technologies), photovoltaic energy, high power deep geothermy, second and third generations of biofuels, and perhaps ITER. The only dilemma is our present security, considering that the oil fields are controlled by a few number of countries, several of them unreliable. This is evidently a problem to be dealt with apart from alleged global warming and long-term energy availability.

Taxing energy had been projected long before CO₂ was indicted. Governments had always projected such a tax! French TV reporter Nicolas Hulot has suggested to tax all products according to CO₂ emitted to manufacture and transport them. The idea was taken up in "*Grenelle de l'Environnement*", and developed by a commission headed by Michel Rocard. The Hulot suggestion is too complicated, and the Rocard commission only proposes more taxes on oil, gas and coal. Such extra taxation could reduce consumption

⁹ Note of the writer of the summary.

¹⁰ Note of the writer of the summary

of fossil energy, but what would be the resulting social and economic burdens ? Such a tax would hurt poor. Some manufacturers would shift their factories offshore and increase unemployment. Our products would be penalized, compared with those being imported from lands which do not bear any corresponding taxes. Should such a tax be imposed, as we suffer from economic depression and unemployment ? Is it necessary to inflict that tax, as our individual CO₂ emissions are the lowest in Europe, and as the economic crisis is mitigating our emissions, and our CO₂ emissions per individual already are lowest in Europe?

Green business ! lobbies ! It's a crucial problem. Powerful "green" lobbies are backing interventionist policies and taxes upon which their profitability crucially depends. Their empires spread over the world and some of them are more powerful than whole nations. The two preceding chapters have shown us how that system of connivance is functioning. Our governments tell us that "green" business will create employment, but it is another lie: making electric-powered cars will not increase consumers' budgets for buying cars ! Purchasing power will not increase in countries where electricity costs 60% more ! In the best of cases, subsidies to "green" business can only move employment, never create it. On contrary, interventionism only destroys employment.

Is world over-crowded ? The Netherlands, where 393 inhabitants live in each square kilometer is not perceived as over-crowded. France, with 118 inhabitants per square kilometer produces far more food than is necessary for its population. On the other hand, Niger is overcrowded, despite a density of 10 inhabitants per square kilometer. Overpopulation is a localized problem. It is a result of poverty, ignorance, lack of capital and failed governments. The emerged landmasses only host 45 inhabitants per km². Should the global population climb to 9 billions, which will happen within forty years, density will only reach 60 inhabitants per square kilometer. This is manageable, all the more so since mankind shall go on making progress *[on the condition that freedom, democracy and property rights all together still exist !]*¹¹. It is the responsibility of each government to manage its own demographic problem. We, europeans, have our own ageing problem, while other countries must limit their demographic growth. Overpopulation is not a global problem, but global warmists want to turn it into one. Of course, developing countries will be consuming more natural resources as their populations and their welfare grow. But natural resources are not a privilege of the richer countries!

The ideology of global anthropic climate change and problems which are linked to it have led to the development of an antagonism between North and South. Western governments are worried over the growth and demographic trends in Southern nations. Jean-Michel B elouve points out the similarity between the obsession with finite so-called "natural resources" and the former ideology of the *"deutschen Lebensraum"*. In their run, developing countries are stigmatizing responsibility of richest countries in the accumulation of CO₂ in the atmosphere, blaming their high energy consumption per inhabitant. Those charges are piled upon the former ones concerning colonization, slavery and so on. Diasporas living in many Western countries are importing these disputes within frontiers of developed countries. All that results in xenophobia, violence and terrorism. It is not said that global warming is causing xenophobia and terrorism, but that the ideology which hides behind global warming has indeed played a role.

To stop economic development is a major aim of Club of Rome, of many environmentalists, self-styled philosophers and policymakers. Jean Michel B elouve declares that it is impossible to do so. Increased production does not necessarily involve greater quantities. Economic growth results from added values that men create as they work and innovate. In the developing countries, growth translates into bigger consumptions of goods, and that is normal and necessary. But in our affluent societies, improvement means quality, not quantity. We eat less calories, but we want better taste. We do not need more cars, but appreciate safer and more comfortable ones. Each of us wants to produce and to create, we love progress. That is mankind's DNA! Our combined efforts and synergies create wealth, and this means growth. In countries where men are free, they produce more added value, thus generating growth. Under dictatorships, men are far less efficient, because they use too much personal energy trying to beat system. B elouve says : *"La croissance z ero rabaisse l'homme au rang d'animal qui ne fait que perp etuer des comportements ataviques"*. Zero-growth is not human, zero-growth is only suitable for animals.

¹¹ note of the writer of the present summary.

The title of the last paragraph is challenging: "The End of democracy?" .

Among all political systems experimented, democracy is only framework which allows individual freedom within limits of other men's freedom. It is only one which gives us sufficient margins of freedom to be performing and happy. Nevertheless, prominent thinkers and politicians now denounce what they call "the weakness of democracies". Michel B elouve shows how and why such ideas have been developing among members of Club of Rome and of Trilateral Commission. They say that the main point is that mankind's major problems allegedly cannot be faced by a jumble of sovereign nations and have to be managed by a global governance, or a global government (there's no difference !). And, of course, it seems difficult to manage a democracy which would gather seven to nine billion inhabitants and hundreds of peoples. For these ideologists, European Union is a laboratory, and the experiment must be improved through the Lisbon treaty and others to follow. According to that model, United Nations could become the top of a federal global system.

For B elouve, those dreams are in vain. The world is so large, so various and so complex a system that it is impossible to conceive of a rational organization for it. Mankind has its own dynamics and processes. It cannot be managed from the top down. The only realistic way is to go on with multilateral cooperation between sovereign nations. This cooperation may improve as men are travelling more, trade develops, and individual alliances, -in culture, business, sport, friendship and love-, go on increasing too. That is way to ride for a better world.

In epilogue, Jean-Michel B elouve deals with environmentalism. Environmentalism must base itself on accurate scientific knowledge. It must not be the preserve of ecologists, but everyone must be an "* cologue*" [that is the French word he chooses to distinguish between scientific ecologists and political activists]. Scientific ecology has to be taught at school, and population needs to be accurately informed. We do not need "deep ecology", nor a "sustainable development" as imagined by Brundtland or Maurice Strong. Ecology is law, development is action. Both are necessary, but different and must not be confused. The book has shown the drift which turns ecology into a commodity.

J.M. B elouve finally concludes that he doesn't know what the climate will be in fifty years, but climate change is a present danger indeed, a danger for freedom.