

## Have you heard about the *Copenhagen Treaty* that is to be signed this December?

You most likely haven't because the mainstream media is not covering it at all. The only coverage it has received to this date comes from Glenn Beck

(<http://www.glennbeck.com/content/articles/article/196/32085/>) and that is only as a result of British Lord Christopher Monckton raising the alarm. Lord Monckton is the man best known for debunking many of the claims made by Al Gore in his Academy Award™ winning propaganda piece, *An Inconvenient Truth*. The British government was on the verge of introducing Gore's film into the school systems as part of its environmental education (indoctrination) agenda, but Lord Monckton's counter-claims against the film identified such egregious errors and lies in it that they could not be ignored. As a result, the film was banned from being shown in schools in Britain.

Your representatives aren't telling you about the treaty either; President Obama certainly isn't telling you about it; the news isn't telling you about it. So, what is it?

The *Copenhagen Treaty* is billed as a "climate change" treaty, a treaty designed—at least by outward appearances—to address the major issues of "global warming" (which is now conveniently referred to as "climate change," thanks to the mountain of evidence that shows only **decreases** in global temperatures since 1998).

The true nature and intent of the treaty is, however, much more nefarious than its billing.

Let's piece it together:

- First, to help assure you that everything being said here is true and legitimate, here is the link to the treaty on the United Nations website:  
<http://unfccc.int/resource/docs/2009/awglca7/eng/inf02.pdf>  
It is 181 pages long. Later in this document, references to the most dangerous parts of this treaty will be provided.
- Second, watch this video of Lord Monckton raising the alarm about this treaty, laying out what will happen and begging US to do something about it:  
[http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PMe5dOgbu40&feature=player\\_embedded](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PMe5dOgbu40&feature=player_embedded)  
Here's a summary of it:
  - Creation of a World Government that is instituted without election or our input by citizens of the world
  - Transfer of the wealth of developed, industrialized nations (mostly America) to third-world countries to satisfy the "climate debt" that we owe for having done so much damage to the environment in course of our development
  - Subjugation of the world's citizens to policing and enforcement of treaty policies by the new world government.
- Third, listen to Barack Obama speaking at the United Nations effectively endorsing the treaty and stating that "*The danger posed by climate change cannot be denied. Our responsibility to meet it must not be deferred.*" He is referring directly to this treaty and all but vowing to sign it in December. <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MQRlurd1-VE>

- Fourth, let's tie all the pieces together to assure ourselves we're not being duped. If you refer to the treaty document in the first link, under section 38 you will find the following references (emphasis added):
  - (a) The **government** will be ruled by the COP with the support of a new subsidiary body on adaptation, and of an Executive Board responsible for the management of the new funds and the related facilitative processes and bodies. The current Convention secretariat will operate as such, as appropriate.
  - (b) The Convention's financial mechanism will include a multilateral climate change fund including five windows: (a) an Adaptation window, **(b) a Compensation window, to address loss and damage from climate change impacts [read: the "climate debt" Monckton refers to]**, including insurance, rehabilitation and compensatory components, © a Technology window; (d) a Mitigation window; and (e) a REDD window, to support a multi-phases process for positive forest incentives relating to REDD actions.
  - (c) The Convention's facilitative mechanism will include: (a) work programmes for adaptation and mitigation; (b) a long-term REDD process; © a short-term technology action plan; (d) an expert group on adaptation established by the subsidiary body on adaptation, and expert groups on mitigation, technologies and on monitoring, reporting and verification; and **(e) an international registry for the monitoring, reporting and verification of compliance of emission reduction commitments, and the transfer of technical and financial resources from developed countries to developing countries. The secretariat will provide technical and administrative support, including a new centre for information exchange [read; enforcement].**

As you can see, section (a) refers to the establishment of a "government" that is not elected by any body of citizens, but is instead appointed, presumably by the United Nations and specifically those who are the driving force behind this treaty. It's reasonable to assume that such individuals will appoint themselves, along with others sympathetic to their cause, as "the government."

The adoption of such a treaty in the United States requires the approval of a two-thirds majority of the Senate, which may lead us to believe that it's a long shot for Obama to get passed. Unfortunately, there are already plans in place to subvert this Constitutional requirement through legal means and make this happen right under our noses, plans that only require a simple majority from both houses. There are two documents that have been discovered that shine a bright light on this nefarious plan:

1. A former Clinton State Department official named Nigel Purvis laid out the extremely detailed blue-print for passing climate-treaties without Senate approval in a paper he wrote entitled "Paving the Way for U.S. Climate Leadership: The Case for Executive Agreements and Climate Protection Authority." written in April 2008. <http://www.rff.org/RFF/Documents/RFF-DP-08->

[09.pdf](#) The abstract of this document lays out very clearly the plan to subvert the constitution and work around the law using congressional-executive agreements.

2. [http://www.fed-soc.org/doclib/20090216\\_HornerEngage101.pdf](http://www.fed-soc.org/doclib/20090216_HornerEngage101.pdf) This document is a legal analysis by a lawyer that determines that this process would be legal – though potentially politically damaging. There is a summary conclusion at the very end that wraps it all up.

If, like me, this raises your hackles, sets off alarm bells and is freaking you out leaving you wondering what can we do – my answer is: I don't know.

But we can start with sharing this document and information with as many people as possible, **especially media and political activist groups**. We must raise awareness of this! It took a British guy to raise the alarm – now it's up to US, our fellow Americans, to spread the alarm and make this a front page issue!!! Maybe then we'll be able to figure out what to do about it.

Research for this document contributed by Phil801, NeatBrian, Christopher, AZ Heat