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Abstract

In recent years the climate change debate has shifted from the peripheries of international political discussions to center stage, manifesting in the Paris Agreement in November of 2016 under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. However, the science behind the climate change debate is disputed and does not support the claims made by global leaders who continue to push for increasing environmental regulations and financial aid to those most adversely affected by the supposed climate change (underdeveloped and developing nations). Examining the geopolitical and economic implications of climate change actions reveals the underlying political philosophies guiding global leaders. The advocacy and adoption of climate agreements stem from a Marxist worldview, seeking a global redistribution of wealth and the disintegration of national sovereignty in favor of a new international system.
Introduction:

In recent years the climate change debate has shifted from the peripheries of international political discussions to center stage, manifesting in the Paris Agreement in November 2016 under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Controversy surrounded this agreement when President Trump announced the United States of America (U.S.) would not participate as a party to the agreement. Many questioned why one of the most powerful leaders in the world would oppose action to quell the effects of climate change. The Paris Agreement claims its goal is to combat rising temperatures and provide assistance to those nations affected by climate change in the form of financial assistance. However, conflicting reports have emerged from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Heartland Institute, and private researchers, demonstrating a lack of consensus among the science community. Not all of these reports support the claims made by global leaders who continue to push for increasing environmental regulations and financial aid to those whom they claim are most adversely affected by the supposed climate change (underdeveloped, and developing nations).

President Barack Obama, unlike President Trump, proved an adamant supporter of the Paris Agreement and other like accords. Obama focused his narrative on the issue of security in a time of a global climate change threat. President Obama delivered an address on the state of climate change at the Brandenburg Gate in Germany; the same gate Reagan delivered his Cold War speech on security, urging Gorbachev to tear down the wall. The symbolic choice of location for the speech leads one to conclude the importance and threat to global security, which the Obama administration attributed to
climate change. Reagan was dealing with a potential nuclear standoff, while seeking the freedom of millions of individuals within the Soviet bloc. However, Obama took this same historical location centering on threats to global security to raise, what he believed to be, the greatest security threat of the twenty-first century. Obama claimed, “For the sake of future generations, our generation must move toward a global compact to confront a changing climate before it is too late. That is our job. That is our task. We have to get to work.” Obama emphasized the urgency and necessity of the task of combatting climate change, shifting the climate narrative from a future danger to a critical threat, warranting immediate attention.

Obama, however, was not promulgating new ideas by deeming climate change a security issue. The term ‘security’ has been expanded from the traditional notion, connoting defense within the international arena, to that which may be affected by the environment and economy. The UN deemed both characteristics of ‘human security’ in 1994. By affirming the expanded definition of security, Obama acknowledged the power of the UN to implement whatever means necessary to fight this issue. By expanding the definition of security and to whom security must be granted, one, also, expands the role and power of government, or in this case, a supranational governing body, such as the UN.

A closer examination of the geopolitical and economic implications of climate change actions and advocacy groups reveals the true nature of the debate. This paper


2 Dalby, “Climate Geopolitics: Securing the Global Economy,” 432-433.
seeks to analyze the underlying political theories driving the climate change debate and their current economic and political implications from the Paris Agreement.

The disputed scientific findings will be discussed prior to examining the climate agreements. The Paris Agreement and similar accords, such as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, will be examined, seeking to determine the goals and objectives of these United Nations actions. The paper will then look to the key policy makers and their ideology driving the climate debate. The agreements and leaders will be compared to the theoretical framework of Marxists, Globalists, and Developmental Theorists. The paper will conclude by analyzing the importance of understanding the geopolitical underpinnings driving the climate change debate.

Scientific Disputes:

If climate change was a reality, the fear instilled in ordinary citizens may be justified. However, this is not the case. In order to combat the arguments and actions set forth by those currently controlling the climate narrative, one must first examine the origins of the climate change debate. The figure of a 2°C increase in temperature is blindly accepted and was not arrived at scientifically or even by observation of recent weather patterns. The European Union debated the impacts of climate change in the 1990s and could not agree to a level of temperature increase by which to base their debates, so 2°C was chosen as a “compromise figure.” If repeated often enough and with enough conviction, anything can become a truth, even if it lacks solid grounding as depicted in the emergence of the 2°C figure. It is this 2°C figure by which the rest of

---

3 Dalby, “The Geopolitics of Climate Change,” 42.
climate change figures have been discovered. For example, by utilizing 2°C, scientists could manipulate models to determine how many gigatons of carbon emissions could be emitted before the 2°C increase was attained.\(^4\) However, one must be wary and question what other variables have been manipulated if the very foundational claim and statistic of climate change discourse lacks scientific backing.

While the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has long maintained the rise of global temperatures, this is not based on reality, or even observable data. In 2000 the IPCC projected a one degree Celsius increase in global temperatures by 2010; however, a rise in global temperatures was not actualized. Rather, if one looked to the temperatures of the 20\(^{th}\) century, “you will find that its up and down pattern does not follow the industrial revolution’s upward march of atmosphere carbon dioxide (CO2), which is the supposed central culprit for man caused global warming.”\(^5\) The earth possesses natural heating and cooling cycles independent of man’s actions.

Scott Johnson, a hydrogeologist and professor at Northern Arizona University, explains the natural heating and cooling cycle of the earth through plate tectonics and the weathering of silicate material. Johnson explains, “In the grand sweep of Earth history, its climate has remained within a habitable temperature range – thanks in part to the

\(^4\) Dalby, “The Geopolitics of Climate Change,” 42-43.

moderating influence of feedback loops within the system. The weathering of silicate minerals in bedrock pulls CO2 out of the atmosphere, for example.” Johnson breaks down the loop into a simple formula. As silicate minerals in bedrock are weathered, the CO2 in the atmosphere decreases as the silicate minerals are carbonized, and global temperatures begin to fall. When temperatures rise, the weathering process speeds up as carbonization of the silicate minerals occurs faster in a warmer climate, thus leading to a decrease in atmospheric CO2 and a stabilization of temperatures.

Global warming alarmists seek to portray the tropics as the region in which the greatest damage from climate change may be felt; however, the tropics are naturally warmer than the rest of the earth. Thus, carbonization of silicate minerals would occur at a faster rate, leading to a decrease or even stabilization of temperatures rather than the drastic effects projected. The weathering process is a cycle built into the Earth, preventing drastic temperature changes, contrary to that which is projected by the UN’s IPCC. If the IPCC had looked to the observable data and taken into consideration the diverse variables such as the weathering of silicate minerals, it might have noticed global temperatures cooling and in a period of decline, rather than increase, for the past ten years. The decrease in temperatures conflicts with the claims and goals purported in the

---


7 Johnson, “500 Million Years of Climate History Pinned on Plate Tectonics.”

8 Ferrara, “Sorry Global Warming Alarmists, The Earth Is Cooling.”
various climate agreements. There is a lack of scientific consensus and the issue is far from settled.

**Historical Climate Agreements:**

The Paris Agreement built upon previous accords and treaties, including, but not limited to, the Durban Platform for Enhanced Cooperation, the Kyoto Protocol, and the United Nations’ 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. All three emphasize the importance of reducing emissions to limit the rise of global average temperatures, and the importance of providing financial aid to the Less Developed Countries (LDCs) and developing countries in order to assist in their fight against climate change. The Kyoto Protocol lays out commitments to “provide financial resources, including for the transfer of technology, needed by the developing country Parties to meet the agreed full incremental costs of advancing the implementation of existing commitments.”

The Kyoto Protocol essentially advocates subsidizing the developing world, as was implemented in the Paris Agreement. Hadas Thier, socialist writer and speaker, argues, “Climate change is a collective problem, and it demands a collective action.” By subsidizing the developing world, the global economy is becoming not only more greatly entwined, but also moving towards a socialist ideal surrounding the redistribution of wealth.

---


However, developing nations need to produce in order to modernize. Production and manufacturing to generate a profit in order to create further capital for investment in newer technologies would necessitate cheap energy. Cheap energy is oil and natural gas, yet they are deemed global evils, as they produce carbon emissions. Thus, by limiting the means by which the developing world can modernize, those already industrialized and modern States, must provide aid in the form of newer technology that LDCs may not be able to afford or operate, so as to maintain global emissions levels below the established quota. Bill Crane, political analyst and writer, asserts, “Supplies of fossil fuels are a presupposition for modern capitalist production.”\textsuperscript{11} Will Meyers continues the arguments established above in his article on the “Politics of Climate Change” by calling the defeat of capitalism the only ethical option to achieve climate justice.\textsuperscript{12}

Marx echoes the writers above in his belief that capitalism brought about the problems of the world and it is capitalists who ought to be held accountable. Marx artfully wrote, “Modern bourgeois society with its relations of production, of exchange and of property, a society that has conjured up such gigantic means of production and of exchange, is like the sorcerer who is no longer able to control the powers of the nether world whom he has called up by his spells.”\textsuperscript{13} Climate alarmists believe capitalists overproduced and the problems associated with climate change are a direct result of the sorcery they have conjured. Thus, Crane, Myers, and other like-minded individuals


\textsuperscript{12} Myers, “The Politics of Climate Change.”

\textsuperscript{13} Marx, \textit{The Communist Manifesto}, 14.
lobbied and advocated for the removal of fossil fuels as a means of limiting the free-
market. Anti-capitalist notions were carried over into the Paris Agreement with the
promise of a minimum of $100 billion in aid to developing countries.\footnote{See \textit{Finance}, paragraph 54 in \textit{Adoption of the Paris Agreement}.}

The UN’s 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development focuses on the issue of
inequality throughout the world as exacerbated by climate change. The 2030 Agenda
highlights the LDCs and small island states, which are already among the most
impoverished in the world, as the same nations who will be most adversely affected by
climate change (be that rising seas or extreme weather patterns). These nations, though
not having contributed greatly to the proposed causes of climate change, are the ones who
will have to adapt. However, they lack the financial resources to diversify their
economies and construct climate barriers. It is this basis the UN is utilizing to further
redistribute capital throughout the world. Paragraph 41 of the agenda states, “We
recognize that these will include the mobilization of financial resources as well as
capacity-building and the transfer of environmentally sound technologies to developing
from the developed countries to provide to those deemed “most impoverished,” under the
premise of climate change is merely a guise for the redistribution of wealth on a global
scale.
The word “urgent” is repeated throughout the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development seven times, demonstrating the importance attributed to the issue, once more, by the United Nations. According to the UN, not only is climate change an impending problem and must be dealt with, but action must be taken immediately to aid those impoverished countries before the grave effects begin to take place throughout the world. In other words, redistribution of technology and capital must occur as soon as possible. President Obama, like the drafter of the 2030 Agenda, was adamant climate change was an urgent global security dilemma with which must be dealt. One need only look to the man who influenced much of Obama’s political career, Saul Alinsky, to understand why Obama and the other framers placed a great immediate gravity on the climate change agenda.

In his book, Rules for Radicals, Mr. Alinsky outlines the means and tactics by which liberals ought to achieve social and political change. Alinsky advocates the creation of a cause that will grip the younger generation and drive them to action by claiming, “What the present generation wants is what all generations have always wanted – a meaning, a sense of what the world and life are – a chance to strive for some sort of order.” For the present generation this is an imperative call to protect the earth, while those in power continue to assume increasing power to bring about a socialist order. Increased fear through an artificially-generated threat leads individuals to both look to the State for guidance, or panic and turn a blind eye. Regardless, fear is a tactic best used to

16 “Transforming Our World: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.”

gain control and maintain power. Alinsky not only recognized this, but advocated the implementation as a means of controlling the populace and subsuming greater power within the State, which is precisely what climate advocates have achieved.

Global leaders, today, often claim to be globalists, seeking to foster a stronger international community, rather than Marxists or disciples of Alinsky. However, globalism’s roots lie with Karl Marx. Marx believed that as economies modernized, class conflict would emerge. The world economies would gradually embrace a capitalist system, which Marx argued could be simplified into two classes: “Freeman and slave, patrician and plebeian, lord and serf, guildmaster and journeyman, in a word, oppressor and oppressed.” He believed capitalism enabled the exploitation of large classes of individuals (the proletariat) by the few (the bourgeoisie). Globalist scholars argue Marx’s “emphasis on exploitation, discernible historical patterns of capitalist development and expansion, and the importance of understanding the ‘big picture.’” The shared importance of historical analysis between Marxists and Globalists leads to a common affinity for viewing the world through the exploited and the exploiter, the global North (industrialized) and the global South, or as Marx stated, himself, “The bourgeoisie…has made barbarian and semi-barbarian countries dependent on the civilized ones, nations of peasants on nations of bourgeois, the East on the West.” Globalist leaders conclude that the industrialized nations, North America and Europe, implemented tools to keep the


developing nations from developing, so they could exploit their natural resources and now the developed world must make reparations for its sins through the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and similar accords.

Globalists, like Marxists, obsess over production and the capitalist’s means and resources to produce their goods.\(^{21}\) Fernando Henrique Cardoso, leading globalist scholar, argues, “The situation of underdevelopment came about when commercial capitalism and then industrial capitalism expanded and linked the world market nonindustrial economies that went on to occupy different positions in the overall structure of the capitalist system.”\(^{22}\) Cardoso believes underdevelopment in the peripheral States and, subsequently, inequality within the world system emerged as a byproduct of capitalism. States in the global south are comprised of natural resources and human capital utilized by the capitalists of the global north to further their economies at the expense of the rest.

Cardoso’s notions of development epitomize Marx’s view of the proletariat. Marx wrote, “[The Proletariat] becomes an appendage of the machine, and it is only the most simple, most monotonous, and most easily acquired knack, that is required of him. Hence, the cost of production of a workman is restricted, almost entirely, to the means of subsistence that he requires for his maintenance.”\(^{23}\) Natural resources and the control of

\(^{21}\) Viotti, “Globalism,” 400.
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energy prove crucial for both adherents of free market economics and Globalists and Marxists.

Both Marxists and Globalists, also, adhere to the belief that the exploitation by developed nations has led to the perpetuation of poverty of the LDCs. They believe that following decolonization the LDCs were granted a subordinate role in society, as developed capitalist States saw LDCs as inferior. Both believe that in order for capitalism to emerge in the industrialized nations, an abundance of natural resources and cheap labor was necessary. LDCs provided both. Thus, capitalist, developed nations of the West are credited with bolstering their own economy at the expense of others, who are now amongst the most impoverished in the world. The ‘periphery’ States were too weak to oppose the militarily and economically dominant ‘core.’ The narrative of the industrialized West acting as the source of plight for the rest of the world emerges throughout much of the dialogue on the global stage, including the climate change debate. Recognizing the failings of globalized free market policies, Marxists and Globalists both believe the world lacks a centralized political power to correct the capitalist overreach by hindering their acquisition of the means of production. The United Nations (UN) could serve as the supranational entity for which Globalists and Marxists are searching.

24 Viotti, “Globalism,” 408.
As the left focuses on binary relationships denoting a form of exploitation, one must also analyze the manner in which this dichotomy shapes the way in which the left understands the process of development and modernization in third world States. Climate alarmists hold that the inferiority and lack of development plaguing the LDCs and other lesser-developed States lies in the industrialist and colonial mentality enforced upon them by Europe and North America, the “global North”. Equality of condition is a foundational component to the Marxist mentality, as summarized through Marx’s quote: “from each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.” All men should have exactly what they need, no more and no less. One need only to turn to the *International Socialist Review* to find proponents of such a view today embracing this notion in their bold claims, “it is the world’s wealthy and national elites who must ‘adapt’ so the poor and future generations will not ‘suffer.’” Climate change proponents do not desire the industrialized nations to continue innovating and the developing nations to strive for innovations of their own. Rather, the left advocates hindering the growth of all, while devolving the status achieved by many within developed nations. They understand

_________________________

26 Throughout the remainder of the paper ‘the left’ will signify both Marxists and Globalists, since the differences in their views on international politics, and thereby geopolitics, are negligible for the purposes of this paper.


western development on the premises of exploitation, as the oppressor and the oppressed; therefore, one, naturally, concludes that the oppressor must atone for his discretions through a leveling of his assets and position in society. He must be brought to the same level as those still developing. Therefore, one is led to the left’s beliefs with regards to development and modernization. To them it is less of enabling LDCs and similar States to achieve development equivalent to the former colonizing powers, and more of retarding the developmental progress achieved by the ‘global North,’ ushering forth greater equality of condition.

The Durban Platform states, “Governments clearly recognized the need to draw up the blueprint for a fresh, universal, legal argument to deal with climate change beyond 2020, where all will play their part to the best of their ability and all will be able to reap the benefits of success together.” Durban’s phrasing is reminiscent of Marx’s saying, “From each according to his abilities, to each according to his needs.” All nations are expected to contribute as much as they can and those that cannot contribute as much will be aided by those who can. Inklings of the redistribution of wealth paired with the notion that all are working towards a common goal, the protection of the earth, demonstrates a Marxist undertone in the writing of the Durban Platform.


30 Marx, “Critique of the Gotha Programme.”
The United Nations adopted the 32-page document that is the Paris Agreement on December 12, 2015 led by the President of the UN at the time, H.E. Mr. Mogens Lykketoft of Denmark. Lykketoft served as the President of the United Nations General Assembly (UNGA) during the drafting of the Paris Agreement and was therefore influential in its passage. Without his support, it may not have even been brought about for debate. Prior to serving as President of UNGA, Lykketoft worked as a trained economist before turning to politics. As a member of the Danish Parliament, he has served as the Chairman of the Social Democratic Party (2002-2005), as well as the Minister for Taxation and the Foreign Minister. His long career can be characterized by a commitment to advancing the economic and foreign policy of the Social Democratic Party with an emphasis on increasing development assistance and aid to LDCs and similar countries.  

Mr. Lykketoft claims, “We have to understand that inequality inside nations and, especially, between nations, is a route to conflict, a route to not using the resources of billions of people sufficiently.” Lykketoft demonstrated a key issue for him: inequality throughout the globe. Inequality and the need for the government to compensate for varying levels of wealth in order to prevent “conflict” is reminiscent of both Marxism and Globalism.


By examining the party platform for Denmark’s Social Democratic Party, one gains an insight into the philosophical foundations driving Lykketoft’s advancement of the climate debate and redistributive aid money. The very symbol of the party, a red rose, is quite telling with respect to the underlying philosophical bent of the Danish Social Democrat Party. The red rose is derived from the French Socialist Party, meaning “socialism with a human face.” Such a symbolic meaning gives understanding to the importance of development aid in the eyes of a social democrat.

Danish Social Democrats claim all (both within Denmark and internationally) are capable of work, yet all may face difficult times. One of their principles in the party platform states, “We believe that all people have a responsibility for one another, especially those who are most vulnerable.” They believe that all have a right to aid when needed, but, also, are subject to the responsibility to provide aid to others when possible; once again, bringing to mind, Marx’s notion of each giving that which he is able to produce and receiving that which he needs. Another primary facet of the Danish Social Democrat Party is its international scope. It is not merely a national party, desiring to advance its platform within Denmark. Although that much is true, the party maintains international ties to the Social Democrat Party throughout many nations, such as the French Socialist Party mentioned above; therefore, members, including Lykketoft, 
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subscribe to the notion of international cooperation as a means of advancing democratic socialist values throughout the world.36

In preparation for the Paris climate talks, Christina Figueres, Executive Secretary of the Framework Convention on Climate Change identified her goal: change the global economic model through an amalgamation of previous climate accords, including the Durban Platform and its redistributive goals. Ms. Figueres, having led the Paris Agreement, was invited to present a TED Talk, where she admitted the key to her success in those negotiations: “intentionally decid[ing] to change the course of the global economy in order to protect the most vulnerable and improve the life of all of us.”37 An examination of the Paris Agreement should be approached with Figueres’s intentions in mind.

Paris opens by outlining common beliefs that all Parties to the agreement claim to possess. These include:

Recognizing that climate change represents an urgent and potentially irreversible threat to human societies and the planet and thus requires the widest possible cooperation by all countries… Also recognizing that deep reductions in global emissions will be required in order to achieve the ultimate objective of the Convention… Also acknowledging the specific needs and concerns of developing country Parties… Recognizing the urgent need to enhance the provision of finance, technology and capacity-building support by developed country Parties, in a predictable manner, to enable enhanced pre-2020 action by developing country Parties.38

36 Socialdemokratiet. “Social Democratic Principles.”


By signing onto this agreement all States are affirming these goals, many of which are rooted in Marxist principles as demonstrated below.

The agreement continues by expounding upon the reasons as to why climate action is necessary and such an urgent matter for the international community in paragraph 17 of the Paris Agreement, which states,

“Notes with concern that the estimated aggregate greenhouse gas emission levels in 2025 and 2030 resulting from the intended nationally determined contributions do not fall within least-cost 2 °C scenarios but rather lead to a projected level of 55 gigatonnes in 2030, and also notes that much greater emission reduction efforts will be required than those associated with the intended nationally determined contributions…”\(^{39}\)

The United Nations claim a 2°C increase in temperatures would lead to rising sea levels and escalating extreme weather patterns, such as droughts, hurricanes, and tornados. The UN, also, holds to the notion that greenhouse gas emissions at the proposed reduction levels will still lead to at least a 2°C rise in global average temperatures by the period of 2025-2030. They claim this is reason for concern and the agreement hopes to address this grievance. To reflect the gravity of climate change, the Paris Agreement requires all signing Parties to decide and report their national contributions to carbon emissions reduction by 2020, earlier than the previously stated 2025 and 2030 deadlines,\(^{40}\) emphasizing the urgency the UN assumes is necessary for combatting the problem of climate change. Many nations within the UN have unquestioningly supported the Paris

\(^{39}\)Adoption of the Paris Agreement.
\(^{40}\)Adoption of the Paris Agreement.
Agreement and other similar resolutions in the name of securing the earth for future generations.

The Paris Agreement, then, outlined several steps crucial for the reduction of carbon emissions, and subsequently attaining the goal of evading a 2°C rise in global average temperatures. While the first step has already been described as each individual country outlining plans for their carbon emissions reduction, it is important to note that this nationally determined plan would be submitted to the UN, which will publish every nation’s goals in hopes of seeking greater accountability for all signatories. In addition to global transparency, the UN has declared “prior to 2025 the Conference of Parties serving as the meeting of the Parties to the Paris Agreement shall set a new collective quantified goal from a floor of USD 100 billion per year, taking into account the needs and priorities of developing countries.”

By agreeing to the Paris Agreement, countries are also agreeing to donate, collectively, a minimum of $100 billion by 2025 to those nations that may not be able to cut emissions, while also attempting to modernize their country, and secure it from the predicted rising seas and extreme storms. It should be emphasized this $100 billion is not part of the aid promised by the World Bank to developing countries as they attempt to combat and adapt to climate change. Only those countries which are deemed developed (mainly those of North America and Europe), would be expected to

---
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contribute to the promised $100 billion developmental aid fund. One should, also, take note of the use of the term “floor” when describing the endowment of aid, as this denotes the promised $100 billion as a minimum requirement for aid. Thus, it is possible, and most likely as the figure has continued to rise in recent years, that those signatories to the Paris Agreement with the means of providing additional aid will be requested, and possibly required, to do so.

The other crucial facet of the Paris Agreement, which should not be ignored, lies in the UN’s plan to adopt non-market approaches for sustainable development. Market approaches appear more frequently within the UN climate framework agreements. These arise when countries set carbon emissions limits higher than their actual emissions, generating a surplus. Other countries set their carbon emissions limits lower than the realized emissions, thus generating a deficit. The countries with deficits can ‘buy’ the surplus emissions from countries with a surplus. This allows the total global carbon emissions to remain the same, while allowing for some countries to fail in their projected goals. Thus, principles of a market economy are applied to emissions reduction.43

Non-market mechanisms for reducing carbon emissions differ greatly, and are as much of a reason for concern as the slippery slope of development aid described above. According to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, non-market mechanisms were added to the Paris Agreement, yet not defined. They were intentionally left in broad terms. However, following the Paris Agreement, signatories have begun to

describe their views of non-market mechanisms and how these might manifest within the international system. A popular notion of a non-market mechanism lies in the idea of taxing emissions. The United Nations’ webpage outlines popular notions of what non-market mechanisms may entail, writing, “the non-market approaches mechanism can be anything and everything, provided it’s not market-based… it could include fiscal measures, such as putting a price on carbon or applying taxes to discourage emissions.”

Thus, by agreeing to generic terms with little to no defined meaning, all countries, which were Party to the Paris Agreement, ceded power to the United Nations, a supranational body, to tax their citizens and private corporations depending on the amount of carbon emissions produced, all in the name of saving the environment.

The adoption of the power to tax as a means of discouraging production is one of Marx’s key tenets for how to bring about the international socialist order. Marx advocated for “a heavy progressive or graduated income tax.” Implementation of a tax on emissions would equate to a graduated income tax in that those who produce greater quantities of goods and services, usually utilized greater energy. Therefore, the same individuals who produce much of the world’s goods would be forced to pay greater taxes on their emissions than those who have yet to develop. Lykketoft and his fellow party members prefer to utilize existing institutions to gradually bring about the international socialist order. By subsuming greater power to the United Nations through the clause in the Paris Agreement regarding non-market mechanisms, as well as limiting the means of

---

44 “What Are Market and Non-Market Mechanisms?”
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production of free-market economies, social democrats, under the direction of Lykketoft, successfully advanced the international socialist order through the Paris Agreement. Taxes discourage production, which is precisely what Marxist leaders desire: a decrease in production in order to bring about greater equality. Three major principles, thus, emerged from the Paris Agreement: limits on carbon emissions, promised minimum of $100 billion in development aid, and power to tax by a supranational entity, all of which strengthen the sovereignty of the UN at the expense of the nation-State.

Progressing towards an increasingly powerful entity is prescribed by Marx. Marxism asserts the necessity to compensate for “the exploitation of the many by the few” with a redistribution of wealth and an endowment of increasing power to the paternal State.\(^\text{47}\) Marxism presupposes the non-existence of God as demonstrated by Marx’s statement “that philosophy is nothing more than religion brought into thought and developed by thought, and that it is equally to be condemned…”\(^\text{48}\) Non-existence of God entails the lack of an absolute sovereign, unless one turns elsewhere to discover a Sovereign. Subscribers to Marxism seek an alternate entity to fill the void, emerging from the removal of a higher being, leading Marxists to turn to the State, rendering to it absolute sovereignty, to serve as a paternal figure.

However, for Marxists, the nation-State is not the ultimate sovereign or goal. Marxists look forward to an epoch in which an international, classless, stateless society

\(^{47}\) Viotti, “Globalism,” 402.

exists. Marxists hold to dialectical materialism, as developed by Hegel, presupposing that all of history is engaged in a struggle, gradually moving towards the desired international order. Marx wrote in *The Communist Manifesto*, “The proletariat will use its political supremacy to wrest, by degrees, all capital from the bourgeoisie, to centralize all instruments of production in the hands of the State…”\(^{49}\) They believe that every struggle or conflict exists to aid in bringing about the classless society. Marx and Engels bring this belief to center stage by opening the *Communist Manifesto* by stating, “The History of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.”\(^{50}\) Society cannot advance towards international socialism without conflict between the disciples of Marx and those still holding onto capitalism. Karl Marx elaborated on his beliefs surrounding the eventual failure of capitalism in his book *Capital*, wherein he proclaims, “We, like the rest of Continental Europe, suffer not only from the development of capitalist production, but also from the incompleteness of that development.”\(^{51}\) He contends that capitalism is merely a stage in the grand scheme of history to bring about the international socialist order. Marx continues by comparing society and the ruling economic system of the day to “an organism capable of change, and [one that] is constantly changing.”\(^{52}\) Marxists look to generate conflict within society in hopes of swinging non-believers’ ideology and


\(^{52}\) Marx, *Capital*, 7.
political philosophy closer in line with their own, so as to usher forth a socialist society over time, changing the organism that is the prevailing economic system.

Christiana Figueres, the former Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change from 2010-2016, the precise time from which much of the climate change agreements emerged, openly seeks to alter the global economic system. She has participated in the climate change negotiations since 1995 and founded the Centre for Sustainable Development of the Americas (CSDA) as a think tank to advocate climate change policy.

Ms. Figueres openly admitted her goal of Paris was to alter the global economy; however, the TED Talk after the ratification of the Paris Agreement was not the first time Ms. Figueres hinted at her intentions. During a press conference in Brussels in February of 2015 she stated, “The 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…It is a process because of the depth of transformation.”53 She continued to reiterate the notions of a ‘global north’ and a ‘global south,’ which signals an ‘us’ and ‘them’ mentality, or the ‘oppressed’ and the ‘oppressor’ as Marx would assert.54 Figueres speeches mirror Marx’s preface to Capital when he asserts, “My standpoint, from which the evolution of the economic formation of society is viewed as a process of natural history, can less than any


54 The Inside Story of the Paris Climate Agreement.
other make the individual responsible for relations whose creature he socially remains, however much he may subjectively raise himself above them.” Figueres has accomplished precisely what Marx detailed in *Capital*. She recognized the next step in the historical process of economic systems and deliberately sought to move the world closer towards the international socialist order, which Marx believed supersedes capitalism. Thus, through one 14-minute speech and a press conference Figueres provides insight into her influences in crafting the climate change accords: the socialism of Marx.

In addition to the UN’s actions to combat climate change, the World Bank and its subsidiary organization, the International Financial Corporation, have made strides in what is termed ‘climate financing.’ ‘Climate Financing’ generally surrounds the notion of providing aid to those developing nations most at risk to bear the brunt of climate change effects. In 2018, alone, the World Bank provided $20.5 billion (USD) towards climate action, doubling their efforts from prior to the Paris Agreement. The World Bank’s contributions to climate finance are funding separate from that of the UN. Already providing vast amounts of aid, the World Bank through the International Finance Corporation believes “the historic global agreement on climate change adopted in Paris helped open up nearly $23 trillion in opportunities for climate-smart investments in emerging markets between now and 2030.” The aid money would only benefit those nations deemed unable to finance their imperative climate actions; therefore, developed countries would be contributing to these funds, yet receiving nothing in return. A

56 “Climate Finance.”
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One need only look to the automobile industry to see the impact of $23 trillion on the market. Tesla can produce its Model 3, a lower-cost, electric car, for approximately $35,000.\footnote{Fred Lambert, “Tesla Achieves Model 3 Production of 1,000/Day, Pushes to Maintain It and Reduce Costs,” Electrek (Electrek, November 30, 2018), last modified November 30, 2018, accessed March 4, 2019, https://electrek.co/2018/11/30/tesla-model-3-production-rate-1000-day-maintain-reduce-costs/.} A single Model 3 would reduce the carbon emissions by approximately 4.6 metric tons per year.\footnote{“Greenhouse Gas Emissions from a Typical Passenger Vehicle,” EPA (Environmental Protection Agency, May 10, 2018), last modified May 10, 2018, accessed March 4, 2019, https://www.epa.gov/greenvehicles/greenhouse-gas-emissions-typical-passenger-vehicle.} If the $23 trillion were invested in Tesla one would see the production of about 657,142,857 electric vehicles, thereby reducing carbon emissions by 3.02 gigatons per year. The Paris Agreement holds an emissions reduction goal of approximately 40 gigatons by 2030. Over 12 years, private industry without further development, would almost reach this goal without any government-assisted reduction in emissions. The estimated carbon reduction figure does not take into consideration the compounded growth that may occur with investment in technological development within Tesla or similar companies. Therefore, private development and the free-market
alleviate the left’s concerns with climate change if allowed to function. However, the removal of $23 trillion through confiscatory taxes takes the financial capital away from companies like Tesla, who could utilize those funds to further develop energy efficient vehicles at an ever-increasingly affordable cost. These financial resources are not merely petty cash seeking to aid nations, but a redistributive cash flow yielding a greater sum than the world’s largest economy at the expense of business.

One grasps the intricacies of the Paris Agreement and similar climate action plans. While not all agreements are exact replicas of each other, they all center on the same notions of urgent action, emissions reduction, and redistributive aid to third world nations.

**Counter Claims**

The climate change debate is founded on falsified data; however, falsification of data is not the only issue within this supposed settled science. Many global leaders, as demonstrated by the ratification of the Paris Agreement, believe that oil production and consumption must be limited to combat the carbon emissions and, consequently, delay the increase in average global temperatures. Failure to utilize oil, leads to a failure to further innovate, or even develop in many of the third world countries. Suriname provides a strong example of a country, which through the use of oil was able to begin developing its infrastructure and modernizing its technology. Wil Hout analyzes the modernizing power of oil in Suriname in his article, “Development under Patrimonial Conditions: Suriname’s State Oil Company as Development Agent.” Although much of Suriname’s economy is State controlled, the oil company, Staatsolie, being no different, free market economics snuck into the oil sector and enabled growth to occur. This article
compares Staatsolie with Brazil’s state-owned oil sector, which prospered when it allowed private investors and competition into the sector.\textsuperscript{61} When Staatsolie was exposed to free market economic practices, greater development and economic success were achieved in a former colony.

Although Suriname has not experienced large economic growth since its independence in 1975, the oil sector proves a counter to the rest of the economy, which has been greatly subsidized by development aid from the Dutch government, Suriname’s former Mother country. Staatsolie has gradually increased oil production to an average of 4.25 million barrels by 2003/2004, and can produce enough crude oil to meet its own energy requirements since 2001. During the same time period, the United States, a much larger nation, only produced a little over 1 million additional barrels of crude oil than Suriname.\textsuperscript{62} Vast production by Suriname demonstrates great progress being made within the energy sector; however, the 1990s and into the early 2000s proved especially volatile economic times for Suriname. This time frame aligned with a development grant from the Dutch of approximately 1.95 billion Euros. A common theme throughout the world is the countries, which benefit from foreign aid and profits from state-run business are less accountable to the people, as they rely less on domestic taxes. The State, able to survive on the foreign aid money, regardless of the condition in which the people live, thus


continues to rely on development aid instead of encouraging industry and manufacturing, choosing to follow production limits established by other States, so as to maintain the aid money. However, the people of the recipient State never benefit. Staatsolie proved more successful in part because it had to answer to both the government, as well as private investors.

China recognized the importance of fossil fuels to its development, as well. Writing in the *UCLA Law Review*, Cass Sunstein, a left-leaning professor of jurisprudence, details the dilemma the world faces in encouraging China and the United States to willingly limit their emissions. Sunstein concedes there are no significant benefits for the United States or China to impose emissions reductions. China, in particular, holds the argument, “emphasizing its relative poverty, its relatively low per capita emissions, and the fact that the existing stock of greenhouse gas emissions is a product of the industrialized nations, which benefited from those emissions.” China, by no means a conservative State, recognizes that which Suriname recognized: cheap energy is the means of development and the path out of poverty. By limiting production and consumption of fossil fuels, one is condemning the State and its people to poverty. China, needing to maintain control over its people, must seek to bring its citizens out of impoverishment and into the industrialized world.

---
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It is important to understand the difference between the free market mechanisms employed to bring about actual development within nations, and the development aid, which traditionally hinders developmental progress within those same nations. Global leaders continue to advocate for increasing amounts of aid to protect these developing nations from the effects of climate change, while denying them the power to harness oil as a development agent, as it was in Suriname, greater dependency upon international entities is found within LDCs and similar countries. So long as these nations remain dependent upon foreign aid, they continue to allow supranational polities like the UN to grasp increasing amounts of sovereignty.

The importance of oil and natural gas, though underscored in the case study above, should not be disregarded in the developed world. The winter months of January through March in 2018 possessed the highest mortality rate in England since 2009. There were 153,717 deaths, mainly attributed to the unexpected cold weather and influenza. The Office of National Statistics in England holds, “When controlling for changes in the size and age structure of the population there were still 10,771 more deaths over the quarter than expected.”65 This demonstrates the grave impact cold can have on a population. Now, if cheap energy sources were to be eliminated, such as oil, propane and natural gas, which comprise three of the four cheapest manners in which individuals may acquire heating for their home, them many more than 10,771 would face death from the cold each winter. Oil and natural gas not only provide a means out of poverty, but aid in
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promoting better health conditions through the form of heat in the long winter months. If one were to eliminate these cost-effective means of heating a home, then many more in the traditionally ‘global north’ could be condemned to death as the renewable energy costs could prove too high for many who barely afford the $1,022 average heating costs with gas, presently.\(^6^6\) Therefore, oil and natural gas ought to be encouraged as a means of development, rather than removed from the equation in the name of climate change.

**Conclusion**

The most recent development within the climate change political movement surrounds Representative Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez’s Green New Deal. Although the deal claims to be an economic policy to prevent climate change, its economic policies are reminiscent of her self-proclaimed socialist principles. She argues the “United States must take a leading role in reducing emissions through economic transformation.”\(^6^7\) She hopes to achieve an alleviation to climate change through a 10 year nationalization plan. This includes an overhaul of the transportation system to create a “Zero-emission vehicle infrastructure,” as well as providing “economic security for all people of the United States.”\(^6^8\) While attempting to fight climate change through the reduction of emissions,


this deal also includes provisions for universal health care and higher education. These two elements of the deal do not combat climate change, but merely require additional funds to finance, which will be produced through increasing taxes. Therefore, individuals will be expected to pay more to the government in order to provide health insurance and college education in the name of climate change. An expansion of government in the role of the individual’s life will occur much to the chagrin of free market apologists if this deal is implemented.

Ms. Ocasio-Cortez is an emerging voice in the climate change debate. Ocasio-Cortez, a former campaign organizer for Senator Bernie Sanders, derives much of her beliefs and platform from his. Thus, one should look to who played a crucial role in shaping the ideology of Sen. Sanders. City Hall in Burlington, Vermont during Sen. Sanders’ time as mayor displayed a picture of Eugene Debs and his present senate office contains a “plaque honoring Debs…near the window.” Debs, a prominent labor organizer, became the founder of the Social Democratic Party of America in 1897 and serves as inspiration to both Sanders and Ocasio-Cortez. Debs’ vision for America included government-owned means of production and a “social welfare safety net for all


families." Eugene Debs greatly influenced Bernie Sanders and, consequently, Ocasio-Cortez. Ocasio-Cortez, through her Green New Deal, hopes to centralize the production of energy, while also providing healthcare for all: Two tenets of Debs’ dream for America. Both of these tenets contain notions of greater national government power and redistributed wealth throughout American society, revealing the socialist agenda tied into Ms. Ocasio-Cortez’s Green New Deal.

One may be tempted to question why the increasing sovereignty of the UN or the State is potentially problematic. Climate alarmists’ ultimate goal is to usher forth a new international socialist order in which all citizens of all nations look to an international polity as absolute Sovereign. The hindrance of developed countries by limiting their oil and natural gas production and consumption through the arbitrarily established carbon emissions reductions requirements has already demonstrated the left’s attempts to equalize the conditions of all. They seek to deny the LDCs the means to efficiently develop, while taking capital from developed nations, thus bringing all countries onto the same developmental level. All may be equal, but it is equality within global poverty.

Marxist-leaning scholars do not hide their intentions, either. Simon Dalby plainly stated, “Our theoretical gaze and political passions have to shift from a concern with the environment per se to a concern and passion for the construction of a different politics.” The left desires not to protect the planet, but to utilize the fear generated from narrative of

---
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climate change to transform the international order and system into a single supranational polity. The left believes capitalism is evil, and the nation-state system must be slowly eroded in order to achieve the international socialist order they see as inevitable. It matters not the quantity of evidence mounted against the left and their beliefs that capitalism cannot bring about greater global equality (though disproven through the use of oil as a developing agent). Marxists such as Hadas Thier will continue to hold these beliefs and attempt to advance the international socialist order, “no matter how much evidence piles up in front of it or how many technological solutions are available.”

Ideology drives the left’s climate change narrative, not science or facts. Marxists will not stop attempting to advance climate change action as a fundamental tool in their quest for greater sovereignty within supranational polities. Climate change, a product of the left, is merely a geopolitical fear tactic to subsume greater sovereignty under the UN. The sooner political leaders and their constituents recognize the lack of supporting evidence for climate change and ideology driving those climate activists, the sooner action can be taken to stop the continuous secession of greater amounts of authority to international polities, which subsequently infringe upon national sovereignty.

---
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