

## Briefing Paper

### *United Nations and Local Program Relationships*

Prepared by

Thomas R. Cuba, Ph.D., CEP, CLM

August 3, 2011

---

On August 2<sup>nd</sup>, I was asked to put together a brief on the relationship between the United Nations and several apparently otherwise distinct groups. It is a bit convoluted, so I will offer a summary as an introduction.

The groups are the United Nations, International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), American Institute of Certified Planners (AICP), County and City governments, various Non Governmental Agencies (NGO), and the Florida Local Environmental Resources Agencies, Inc. (FLERA). This is not a complete list and others, like the Urban Land Institute (ULI), are also deeply interwoven into the fabric which I will attempt to explain.

To begin, AICP, FLERA, and other NGO's are not the problem I hope to explain. The problem is the relationship. I will try to connect the dots.

#### Summary.

The United Nations has prepared an outline of what our global future should look like. The United States has not adopted the UN vision. The UN has initiated a program to circumvent the formal adoption process and implement the policies by going directly to NGOs and County or Municipal governments. The problem I wish to highlight is that the UN program as described circumvents the protections in our constitution from foreign intrusion. In short, the UN has determined how the US should conduct itself and if that cannot be achieved through formal means, the UN shall implement its program through informal means.

#### FLERA.

FLERA is a long standing group of what are called "local programs" See Chapter 373 and

403.182, F.S. for insight on what constitutes a local program. Essentially these are county and city environmental resource or regulatory departments. FLERA provides a forum which allows them to convene and share problems and solutions. Originally intended as a self help group, it has grown into a lobbying force within legislative circles in Tallahassee.

### Context.

Please bear with me as I build some context, without which little of what I have to say will make sense. Some of it may seem overly dramatic at first. Please take the time to think it through. It is not necessary that we all embrace these concepts but it is important that we all understand them in order to understand a fair portion of today's conservative voters.

First and foremost, there are a growing number of people who recognize that the United Nations as currently constructed is indeed a threat to the sovereignty of the United States. I know it may be tempting to stop reading now, but I urge you to go on. The key phrase in the statement above is "...as currently constructed..."

There is nothing wrong with a global effort at cooperation and many UN programs are valuable and effective. As an example, without the food provided, the starvation rampant in the Horn of Africa would be much worse. But the UN is engaged in more than feeding the hungry and providing medical attention.

The underlying problem is that the United Nations does not represent the values and principles of the United States and does not always respect individual freedoms. In fact, the United Nations is not a representative body at all, but is an oligarchy controlled by the Security Council. These members are permanent (5) or elected (10), and the permanent five members have veto power. Not all members of the Security Council adhere to basic principles of freedom within their own countries.

Unlike the member states in the United States, where all share fundamental tenets as expressed in the Constitution, members of the United Nations, even Security Council members, do not share fundamental social tenets. In fact, many do not even conduct themselves in accordance with the tenets as expressed in the UN charter. One of many which can be used as an example is that UN members are to be "peace loving" (UN Charter Ch 2, Art 4, para 1).

Our United States functions because each state shares a representative form of government and respects the rights of the people. The United Nations member states do not all have the same forms of government nor respect for their people. This alone would not necessarily be problematic were we able to insulate ourselves from actions of the UN which are contrary to our constitution.

I refer to the attempts made by the UN to tax US citizens directly (a UN Income Tax). I refer to

the commitment of US forces to Libya without Congressional approval because, as Secretary of State Clinton stated, "It was authorized by the UN." I refer to the UN position that self defense by a citizen is not a basic human right and the push by the UN, and the member nations, to confiscate all handguns worldwide. These actions are incremental exercises in exerting power over the US (and other nations) by the UN. There are several mechanisms by which the UN is exerting control over the US (and other countries). One is the World Bank: As foretold by President Thomas Jefferson "Banking institutions are more dangerous to our liberties than standing armies." (Jefferson 1816). That, however, is another topic and is mentioned only for context.

Another is the series of Conventions which are adopted. Two of particular note are the Kyoto Protocol and the Convention on Biodiversity. Neither of these were ratified by the United States. The ISO-14000 convention was ratified, but only applies to international commerce, just like ISO-9000. The last, and most extensive Convention, is known as Agenda 21 (<http://www.un.org/esa/dsd/agenda21/>).

### The Problem,

Agenda 21 is the formal UN title to a 40 chapter, very broad-based, and expansive set of protocols which permeates every aspect of life as we now know it; and sets forth a design for life as the UN would like it to be; including a vision that 50% of the United States be set aside into Preserve Status. Florida Forever reflects this goal. Agenda 21 was not ratified by the United States. In fact it was not even debated. For clarification, each convention and protocol is presented to the United States in the same manner as is an international treaty. It requires Senate approval. It is possible to interpret the previous statement as being in direct conflict with the UN Charter, Article 25, *The Members of the United Nations agree to accept and carry out the decisions of the Security Council in accordance with the present Charter.* From the viewpoint of the UN, simple ratification by the UN is sufficient to authorize global implementation of a Convention. I will leave that to the attorneys. Groups like Patriots Ink view Article 25 as "Abdication of Sovereignty by Treaty." That view is supported by the actions of the UN described below.

The UN, faced with rejection of these conventions and protocols by the US Senate (and other countries) created a subordinate organization known in the past as ICLEI (International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives). This organization is an international NGO with the sole purpose of implementing the action plans of Agenda 21, Biodiversity, Kyoto, and others, even in the absence of ratification.

The strategy is to work at a local level and without direct association with the UN. The result is that ICLEI, and others like the ULI, are circumventing the provisions of the United States Constitution, often without the conscious knowledge of the local agencies, like members of FLERA. During the past several years, the US Administration has implemented rejected UN

programs through executive order. This may be legal, but it is certainly unethical given the fact that the Senate rejected these same programs. For a summary of the implementation of a rejected Convention, see the UN report on the USDA:

<http://www.un.org/esa/agenda21/natlinfo/countr/usa/natur.htm>

FLERA, for all the good it does, consciously or unwittingly relies on documents and programs which are directly or indirectly traceable to the United Nations creating, in the minds of the conservatives for whom I write, a “*guilt by association.*” The position of the conservatives is not a statement that Florida Local Programs should not share information and successes, but that FLERA “appears” to be a partner in the circumvention of the Constitutional process of representative government. In other words, it is not about the good work the UN does nor the good work that FLERA does: It is about honoring the constraints of our constitution.

FLERA is not alone in this situation. Planners relying on the concept of sustainable development and the AICP have also been cast into the shadow of the UN. *Sustainable Development* as a buzz-phrase has replaced the concept of sustainability contained in the original descriptions. It has lost the adjectives of “economically,” “ecologically,” “socially,” and “politically” which constrain “sustainability” and which are often, in practice, exclusive. Some ecologically sustainable developments may not be socially sustainable, for example.

Also lost in the abbreviation is the concept of the level of effort required for sustainability. There are no self sustaining developments. Each will require a variable level of maintenance effort. The original concept in sustainable development was to reduce the relative level of effort while maintaining or enhancing the relative level of performance. The new concept is complete self sustainability. To be thorough, please understand that the word “development” may refer to a hard structure, infrastructure, or even a program or policy.

#### Concluding Statement.

The UN is not well known for its reliance on sound science. It is not aligned with fundamental doctrines of the United States. FLERA may well be in the path of the backlash. I hope that this report provides at least a superficial understanding of the international web of forces at work which may well lead to the loss of cherished freedoms here in the United States. I hope that we can salvage the good work of sound environmental management from the unfortunate association with the unratified programs of foreign origin.

Respectfully,



Thomas R. Cuba, Ph.D., CEP, CLM