

## Obama's Partner on Global Warming

*Teaming up with environmental criminals in China to bully the world*

By Steven J. Allen

**Summary:** Environmentalists hope the so-called “climate deal” between the U.S. and Communist China will lead to a worldwide Global Warming regime. But is it really a good idea for the U.S. to ally with a totalitarian dictatorship—a systematic violator of the environment and of human rights—in order to bring the rest of the world to heel?

It's the world's greatest environmental criminal. Its economy makes a relative few well-connected cronies rich, their bank accounts filled with profits from slave labor. To maintain its power, it tortures and jails dissidents and it seeks to intimidate anyone from the Free World who gets in its way. It may be the worst violator of human rights in history—it's killed more of its own people than any other government, ever—but to environmentalists, Communist China is the perfect partner in their effort to bully the world on Global Warming policy.

When the Obama administration announced a Global Warming deal in November with the so-called People's Republic of China, “greens” celebrated. “It's a Game Changer” declared the headline on the website of the leftist *Mother Jones*. The story at *ThinkProgress* was headlined: “Why the U.S.–China Deal is an Energy, Climate, and Political Gamechanger.” Media reports described the arrangement as a “breakthrough,” a “landmark,” and “history-making,” although NBC News worried that Republicans might put up “landmines” to block the deal.

Among other things, the deal commits the U.S. to reduce emissions of carbon



**Chinese Communists such as President Xi Jinping (seen with President Obama) wrap themselves in the trappings of glory—but the image most associated with their rule is that of a Tiananmen Square protester obstructing a column of tanks.**

dioxide 26% to 28% below 2005 levels by 2025. China's Communists promised to reduce emissions starting in 2030, with 20 percent of the nation's electricity coming from non-carbon-based sources by that year.

In those promises, China is pledging only to cause things to happen that, most likely, were going to happen anyway. Yet, to Global Warming strategists, it's critical to bring together the U.S. and China, so that the two countries can pressure the rest of the world. That's what prominent environmentalist Stephen Chu suggested in 2010 when he was President Obama's secretary of energy.

In a May 2010 report in *Wired* magazine, Daniel Roth reported that Secretary Chu considered China “the key to America's long-term energy future. Since the U.S.

and China produce some 40 percent of the world's carbon dioxide emissions, Chu argues that far-reaching multicountry agreements aren't really necessary. . . . It's smarter to deal with China alone. A massive investment by the U.S. and China, and a series of strong treaties between the two countries, would have a big effect on actual emissions, and the pacts would also serve as a model

### January 2015

Obama's Partner on Global Warming  
Page 1

*The Enablers:* The Western media  
Page 5

*The Enablers:* The Obama Left  
and its Big Business allies  
Page 6

Green Notes  
Page 8

and inspiration for other countries. . . . If they could agree, others would feel the logjam had broken and follow along. It's like a high school movie: Once the jocks and the nerds unite for a common cause, everyone falls in line."

So that's the plan: The United States teams up with the most corrupt and murderous government in the world in order to bully the rest of the world, then "everyone falls in line."

### The adversary

Those who aren't Global Warming true-believers—and anyone who cares about the danger posed to mankind by the People's Republic of China—may want to factor into any deal the communist government's intentions and its record of abuses.

China clearly hopes to supplant the U.S. as the world's superpower, just as the U.S. supplanted Great Britain. It poses a significant threat to U.S. industry, stealing trade secrets and technology via hacking and other forms of espionage and by extortion (making "turn over your technology or else" demands on companies that have factories in China or that rely on Chinese sources for raw materials), and pirating intellectual property such as movies on DVD. It conducts cyber-attacks on the U.S. military and Intelligence Community, and is responsible for perhaps 80 percent of all cyber-espionage aimed at the U.S.

---

**Editor:** Steven J. Allen

**Publisher:** Terrence Scanlon

**Address:** 1513 16th Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20036-1480

**Phone:** (202) 483-6900

**E-mail:** [sallen@CapitalResearch.org](mailto:sallen@CapitalResearch.org)

**Website:** [CapitalResearch.org](http://CapitalResearch.org)

**Green Watch** is published by Capital Research Center, a non-partisan education and research organization classified by the IRS as a 501(c)(3) public charity. Reprints are available for \$2.50 prepaid to Capital Research Center.

---

It engages in saber-rattling with the U.S. and its allies such as the recent encounter between a Chinese J-11 fighter and a U.S. Navy surveillance plane off Hainan Island in the South China Sea. This year, China is preparing to arm its nuclear submarine fleet with JL-2 nuclear missiles that can reach the continental U.S. from Chinese coastal waters. Former Secretary of State Henry Kissinger has likened China's current behavior to that of Germany prior to World War I.

In order to intimidate the West, China keeps afloat the government of nuclear-armed North Korea, one of the few governments even more repressive than China's. (The implied threat is that, if the West stands up to China, it will unleash the North Koreans as a surrogate threat.)

Meanwhile, China is working to build an axis with Russia and with Cuba and Cuba's allies such as Venezuela. After the Nobel Peace Prize went to a Chinese dissident, the communists came up with their own version, the Confucius Prize, which has been awarded to Russia's Vladimir Putin and Cuba's Fidel Castro. Said the Chinese boss, Xi Jinping: "I feel that as socialist countries, China and Cuba are intimately united to fight for the same missions, ideals, and goals." Fidel Castro's brother, Raul, who fronts for Fidel as dictator, has declared that China and Russia are building "a new international order," and the Chinese and Russians are exploring for oil off the coast of Cuba, which, of course, is about 90 miles from the United States.

The PRC is working to corner the market on strategic materials such as the rare earths needed for cellphones, computers, lasers, big-screen televisions, hybrid cars, solar panels, and wind turbines. For some rare earths, China controls 99 percent of the world supply. Anne Applebaum of the *Washington Post* noted that mining those elements "is dirty, labor-intensive and ideally suited for cheap production in a country with low wages and lower environmental standards." (The quest for rare earths has led to another of China's

environmental crimes: building roads that threaten the ancient paths for the "Great Migration" of animals in East Africa.) While the U.S. government runs up unimaginable debt, much of it to the Chinese, Americans become increasingly dependent on China for important products such as medicine, with 40 percent of active pharmaceutical ingredients in the U.S. coming from China.

China's corrupt "green" practices include the funneling of billions of dollars into wind and solar scams backed by well-connected businessmen, often the "Princelings," the millionaire and billionaire offspring of Communist Party officials. For example, the government funneled at least \$30 billion into the solar panel industry in 2010 alone, and is now flooding the world market in solar panels—which, by the way, means that the communists will lose a fortune if governments such as those in the U.S. and the EU stop subsidizing solar power and forcing their people to use it. Overall, the Chinese government "invested" a reported \$65 billion in so-called "renewables" in 2012, more than the whole of Europe, and it has created a system of pilot programs for another scam, the trading of carbon-emissions credits. Not surprisingly, these rip-offs are often cited by erythrosinophilic (Red China-loving) pundits as models for the U.S. to follow, lest we fall behind the Chinese. *Mother Jones* declared in a September headline: "China Just Got Serious About Global Warming. Now We're Really Out of Excuses." [For more on China as a role model, see the postscript on page 6.]

### Environmental devastation by the Left

From the ruination of the Aral Sea, which the Soviets drained of 80 percent of its volume, to the destruction of the Iraqi marshlands by Saddam Hussein's Ba'athists, most of the world's greatest environmental crimes have been perpetrated by Leftists. In a review of the communist record on the environment, Jesse Myerson noted in *The Federalist* that, during the communist occupation of

East Germany, almost half of the region's lakes became unable to sustain fish. At the time of Poland's liberation from Communism, children from the Upper Silesia area were found to have five times more lead in their blood than children from Western European cities, according to the Cato Institute. And, reported *Pacific Standard*, Soviets killed at least 45,000 humpback whales for a reason that, while amazing, makes sense if one understands communism:

Unlike Norway and Japan, the other major whaling nations of the era, the Soviet Union had little real demand for whale products. . . . Why did a country with so little use for whales kill so many of them? . . . The Soviet whalers, [Russian scientist Alfred] Berzin wrote, had been sent forth to kill whales for little reason other than to say they had killed them. They were motivated by an obligation to satisfy obscure line items in the five-year plans that drove the Soviet economy, which had been set with little regard for the Soviet Union's actual demand for whale products. "Whalers knew that no matter what, the plan must be met!" Berzin wrote. [A Soviet whaling ship] seemed to contain in microcosm everything Berzin believed to be wrong about the Soviet system: its irrationality, its brutality, its inclination toward crime.

The Chinese Communists, heirs to the environmental barbarity of the Soviet Communists, are working hard to outdo their predecessors as environmental criminals. By 2007, the *New York Times* reported that ambient air pollution alone was killing hundreds of thousands of Chinese each year, that 500 million people were without safe drinking water, and that a pitiful one percent of the 560 million then living in cities were breathing air considered safe by European Union standards. Andrew Browne noted in the *Wall Street Journal* that the number of premature deaths from air pollution rose to an estimated 1.2 million by 2010 and that, at one point in 2013, Beijing suf-

fered air pollution at 70 times the level considered safe by U.S. standards.

In November, Seth Doane of CBS News reported on the disappearance, since a census 20 years ago, of some 27,000 rivers (that's not a typo) and the forced relocation of a third of a million people:

The Yongding River, which once fed Beijing, ran dry along with 27,000 other rivers in China that have disappeared due to industrialization, dams and drought. "Some of the large parts of the north China [plain] may suffer severe water shortages," said environmentalist Ma Jun. "Some of the cities could literally run out of water." To try to solve the problem, China's government is planning to spend nearly \$80 billion to build nearly 2,700 miles of waterways—almost enough to stretch from New York to Los Angeles.

Four-fifths of China's fresh water lies in its south. The idea behind the project is to move some of that water to the parched—and populous—north by connecting existing bodies of water. That's meant relocating 350,000 people to settlements.

Zhang Xiaofeng, who was moved to a settlement, was asked if she wanted to come to this place. "It does not matter if you're willing or not," said Zhang. "We had to move here. If we didn't our home would be under water." She used to sell jade but now scrapes by selling whatever she can from a small shop in her "relocation village"—dubbed "Harmony" by the local government.

As big an environmental disaster as China appears to be, it may actually be worse, because the government strictly controls the flow of information about pollution. According to the *Wall Street Journal*, a factory worker was jailed for three years after petitioning local officials over the poisoning of Lake Tai, the country's third-largest freshwater body; a forestry official who tried to publish a book on deforestation was sentenced to three years for running an illegal busi-

ness (that is, printing books without a license); and data on pollution is kept under wraps by government officials who classify that information as official state secrets.

### **Slave labor camps, censorship, torture, and betrayal**

Taking advantage of its most valuable resource, the slave labor of almost 1.4 billion people, the Communist-ruled totalitarian dictatorship has built, by some accounts, the world's largest economy, producing \$17.6 trillion in goods and services. As John Gelernter noted in *National Review Online*:

China's Communist dictators operate more than a thousand slave-labor camps.

The camps are called "laogai," a contraction of "lǎodòng gǎizào," which means "reform through labor." They were conceived under Mao; unlike Stalin's gulags, they never closed — though the CCP [Chinese Communist Party] has tried to abolish the name "laogai." In the Nineties, it redesignated the camps "prisons." The conditions, though, don't seem to have changed.

Our picture of life in the laogai is murky, but here's what has been reported: The prisoners are given uniforms and shoes. They have to purchase their own socks, underwear, and jackets. There are no showers, no baths, and no beds. Prisoners sleep on the floor, in spaces less than a foot wide. They work 15-hour days, followed by two hours of evening indoctrination; at night they're not allowed to move from their sleeping-spots till 5:30 rolls around, when they're woken for another day of hard labor. Fleas, bedbugs, and parasites are ubiquitous. The prisoners starve on meager supplies of bread, gruel, and vegetable soup. Once every two weeks they get a meal of pork broth.

In order to maintain their totalitarian regime, Chinese communists rely on

strict censorship. In turn, people resort to all manner of subterfuge to get around it.

The government long ago blocked Internet searches for “June 4, 1989,” the date of the mass murder of dissidents in Tiananmen Square, and websites using the term were taken down, so people started using “May 35” or “535” or “VIIIIV,” until those terms were blocked, at which point people began to post pictures in which they held up playing cards indicating (from right to left) 6/4/8/9 plus A/K/4/7 for the AK-47s that were used in the murders.

In China, atrocities abound. Filmmaker Jezza Neumann has documented some of the crimes committed by the Chinese during the illegal occupation of Tibet, including forcing nomads into concrete camps, flooding villages entirely, and conducting forced sterilization without anesthetic. (In November, President Obama declared his solidarity with the Chinese regarding Tibet: “We recognize Tibet as part of the People’s Republic of China. We are not in favor of independence.”)

Throughout China, members of the Falun Gong, a religious movement related to Buddhism, have suffered (according to journalist Ethan Gutmann) rape by gangs of criminals, violation with electric prods, and, in an estimated 65,000 cases, the harvesting of organs—sometimes prior to death.

In Hong Kong, which thrived as a British colony and became one of the freest (and thus, richest) places on earth, the Chinese have declared “void” the treaty that protects the city’s autonomy. As reported by L. Gordon Crovitz in the December 14 *Wall Street Journal*:

The 75 days of Hong Kong’s Umbrella Movement protest, broken up last week, showed how far Beijing officials go to suppress demands for political accountability.

Protests began when Beijing announced it would not honor its promise of universal suffrage for the people of Hong Kong. The Com-

munist Party declared that the next leader would again be selected by a small group of Beijing appointees, a system that has produced successively less popular Hong Kong chief executives lacking legitimacy. The pepper-spraying of peaceful student demonstrators led 100,000 Hong Kong people to join the protests. . . .

“Hong Kong is a test of China’s willingness to comply with its international commitments,” Sen. Sherrod Brown (D., Ohio) said. “If China can so easily renege on its promises to Hong Kong, then how can we expect China to hold up its end of the bargain on issues like World Trade Organization compliance or future trade agreements?”

As Crovitz noted, the British-Chinese Joint Declaration was supposed to protect Hong Kong’s autonomy, its free market economy, its rule of law, and freedom of the press, for 50 years. That agreement was signed 17 years ago.

One of the communists’ greatest atrocities is rooted squarely in the Left’s view of science. Like many other leftists around the world, the Chinese communists believe in the “Population Bomb,” a variant of the views of the British thinker Thomas Malthus (1766-1834). Now-discredited Malthusian “population science” holds that the human population is destined to expand rapidly beyond the ability of the world’s economies to produce food and to fulfill other critical needs.

Based on this pseudoscientific belief, the Chinese communists implemented a policy, the “one-child” policy, limiting most couples to a single child. The policy has been an unmitigated disaster. It leaves elderly parents in poverty, without the multiple children who might care for them in old age. The policy dooms China to weak economic growth in the future due to an unnatural increase in the median age (together with the fact that younger workers are more productive). “One-child” has resulted in an estimated 400 million “prevented” births, often by

abortion. And the abortions, often performed by force under the supervision of communist officials, have disproportionately taken the lives of girls because parents prefer a boy. By 1999, the shortage of females had become so severe that, as projected by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, some 111 million men were never going to find wives. The shortage has led to widespread kidnapping and forced marriages, the growth of slaver gangs, and even the capture of Vietnamese women to provide wives for Chinese men.

The Chinese communists’ behavior is no surprise. After all, murder is at the root of the People’s Republic of China. Its founding father, Mao Zedong, envisioned in 1948 that “one-tenth of the peasants would have to be destroyed” to bring about the proper distribution of farmland. The Heritage Foundation’s Dr. Lee Edwards, chairman of the Victims of Communism Memorial Foundation, wrote:

For Mao, the No. 1 enemy was the intellectual. The so-called Great Helmsman reveled in his blood-letting, boasting, “What’s so unusual about Emperor Shih Huang of the China Dynasty? He had buried alive 460 scholars only, but we have buried alive 46,000 scholars.” Mao was referring to a major “accomplishment” of the Great Cultural Revolution, which from 1966-1976 transformed China into a great House of Fear.

The most inhumane example of Mao’s contempt for human life came when he ordered the collectivization of China’s agriculture under the ironic slogan, the “Great Leap Forward.” A deadly combination of lies about grain production, disastrous farming methods (profitable tea plantations, for example, were turned into rice fields), and misdistribution of food produced the worse famine in human history. Deaths from hunger reached more than 50 percent in some Chinese villages. The total number of dead from 1959 to 1961 was between 30 million and 40 mil-

lion—the population of California.

Only five years later, when he sensed that revolutionary fervor in China was waning, Mao proclaimed the Cultural Revolution. Gangs of Red Guards—young men and women between 14 and 21—roamed the cities targeting revisionists and other enemies of the state, especially teachers.

Professors were dressed in grotesque clothes and dunce caps, their faces smeared with ink. They were then forced to get down on all fours and bark like dogs. Some were beaten to death, some even eaten—all for the promulgation of Maoism. A reluctant Mao finally called in the Red Army to put down the marauding Red Guards when they began attacking Communist Party members, but not before 1 million Chinese died.

As the U.S. teams up with Communist China to impose a Global Warming regime on the rest of the world, it's important for Americans to keep in mind the nature of our partners in this endeavor.

Today, people wonder how it is that, for millennia, slavery was simply an accepted fact of life. In their zeal to blame America for the world's evils, Leftists zero in on the fact that, in the U.S. prior to the Civil War, many businesses in the United States outside the slave states traded in slave-made goods or otherwise made money off slavery, and many Northern academic institutions depended on wealth that can be traced to slave labor. This is seen, properly, as an outrage. Yet today, many businesspeople, most of the major news media organizations, and many on the Left have no trouble at all partnering with the monstrous Chinese government when it serves their purpose. In the years to come, they will be seen as enablers and collaborators, profiting from the misery of the Chinese people, and of a kind with those who profited from New World slavery.

*Dr. Steven J. Allen (JD, PhD) is editor of Green Watch.*

## **Postscript I:**

### **The Enablers:**

#### **The Western media**

If you're surprised by some of the things you're reading about Communist China in this issue of *Green Watch*, one reason is the regime's relationship with Western media, both the entertainment media and the news media.

Increasingly, Hollywood depends on international business to make money on its movies. That means, especially, China, which is opening a reported 30 movie screens a week. Also, China is valuable to Hollywood as a place to make movies. The media conglomerates that make movies are also involved in other business deals with China, such as in the casino business. China must not be offended. (How many movies have you seen criticizing the criminal regime of Communist China, compared to, say, movies criticizing the U.S.?)

The original *Red Dawn* was a famous Cold War movie about a Soviet invasion of the U.S. In the recent remake, the villain was China—until it was changed, implausibly, to North Korea, so as not to offend the Chinese government. During the filming of the movie *Iron Man 3* (a production of Marvel Studios, part of Disney), the Chinese had a censor on site in order to make the censorship more efficient. (If you need to change a line of dialogue to accommodate the communists, it's better to do it during principal photography than later in the editing room.) When ABC News, also owned by Disney, did a story on the filming of *Iron Man 3*, the presence of the censor was treated as the normal, expected course of business.

Even with the on-site censor, though, the movie's producers were obliged to add a scene for the Chinese version of the film showing that Iron Man's technology was fueled by a milk-grain drink from Inner Mongolia. William Wan of the *Washington Post* wrote of the change: "It's a sign of how eager Hollywood has become to court China's Communist Party leaders,

who maintain an iron fist over the country's booming movie market."

Sometimes the censorship makes perverted sense. According to columnist John Fund, censors clipped a scene in *Men in Black 3* in which Will Smith's character erased memories of bystanders in Chinatown, on the ground that filmgoers might perceive the scene as a comment on—Chinese censorship.

As for the news media, what happens to Western reporters who investigate the Chinese government? China has denied visas or renewals for U.S. journalists who reported on the wealth amassed by Communist Party officials. But the real problem is that, just as the media kowtow to the Obama administration for business reasons as well as ideological ones, they avoid offending the Chinese regime. The *International Business Times* recently reported on a case involving a major news service:

"Yes, I absolutely feel threatened," said Ben Richardson, the latest high-profile departure from Bloomberg News amid disclosures that editors there spiked a story for fear of political ramifications in China that could compromise Bloomberg's financial data business in the world's second-biggest economy.

Richardson [the editor at large for Asia news] had in the year prior worked on a report that probed ties between top Chinese leaders and China's wealthiest man, Wang Jianlin. Though senior executives at Bloomberg News have insisted the story was held because it simply wasn't ready, a November 2013 *New York Times* report strongly implied that Bloomberg brass feared its publication might sour business relations with China. (It would not have been an unreasonable fear: After Bloomberg News ran a 2012 story exposing the family wealth of Communist Party President Xi Jinping, sales of Bloomberg financial terminals in China declined.)

Shortly after the *Times* report ran, projects and investigations editor Amanda Bennett resigned from Bloomberg News, and Mike Forsythe, who also worked on the Wang Jianlin story, was suspended, to be later hired by the *Times*.

(By the way, the CEO and 88 percent owner of Bloomberg LP, parent of Bloomberg News, is Michael Bloomberg, the former New York City mayor who now funds left-wing causes such as promoting a belief in Global Warming theory. For more on Bloomberg, see our sister publication *Foundation Watch*, September 2012.)

The Chinese government also pressures advertisers in order to affect media coverage. For example, the banks HSBC and Standard Chartered, under Chinese pressure, dropped advertising in Hong Kong newspapers critical of the communists. —SJA

## **Postscript II:**

### **The Enablers: The Obama Left and its Big Business allies**

Sometimes, people in the President's circle have inappropriately cited Mao as an icon, in a manner suggesting ignorance of his historic evil. Anita Dunn, former communications director in the Obama White House, speaking at a high school graduation in 2009, called Mao Zedong and Mother Teresa "my favorite political philosophers." During the President's first Christmas season in the White House, one of the decorations on the White House Christmas tree was an ornament featuring the face of Mao. (The President's defenders pointed out that he didn't select the ornament—that, in fact, the decorations were overseen by a designer who had created a yuletide window display for Barney's New York featuring Margaret Thatcher as a dominatrix.)

Over the years, there have been people in Barack Obama's circle and among

leading pundits and businesspeople who like what they see in China. In some cases, China-style communism is their preferred form of government. In other cases, they acknowledge its flaws but admire its supposed ability to (as the expression goes) make the trains run on time.

For example, Frank Marshall Davis was a widely known poet and journalist and, according to the President's autobiography, the mentor to a young Barack Obama. In *Dreams From My Father*, Obama mentions him more than twice as often as he mentions his wife, Michelle. A member of the Communist Party USA, Davis was a strong supporter of Communist China, portrayed President Truman as a fascist, and declared that America's leaders were "aching for an excuse" to have a nuclear war with the Soviets and Chinese.

Another person in Obama's orbit who has China ties is Michael Klonsky, who once formed a Maoist organization called the "October League," which was later known as "Communist Party (Marxist Leninist)." He was one of the first Americans invited to visit Communist China, until he broke with the regime in 1981 on the grounds that it was insufficiently communist. Later, his activism was funded with \$2 million from nonprofit organizations of which Barack Obama was a board member, and during the 2008 campaign he was given a "social justice" blog on the official Obama campaign website.

In the famous leftist organization Students for a Democratic Society, Klonsky was a colleague of Bill Ayers, who would later split off from SDS to form the terrorist Weathermen a.k.a. the Weather Underground. The founding statement of that organization called for "the creation of a mass revolutionary movement . . . akin to the Red Guard in China." Ayers, who signed a letter "Long live People's China. Long live Comrade Mao" and was one of the most famous terrorists in America, would go on to be a key early supporter of Barack Obama's political

activities. [See *Green Watch*, September 2013.]

Some Obama-style "Progressives" just think China's cool.

In a 2005 column, *New York Times* columnist Thomas Friedman, whom leftists consider an intellectual, mock-prayed: "I cannot help but feel a tinge of jealousy at China's ability to be serious about its problems and actually do things that are tough and require taking things away from people. Dear Lord, please accept my expression of remorse for harboring such feelings. Amen."

Friedman wrote in 2009 about the superiority of China's government: "One-party autocracy certainly has its drawbacks. But when it is led by a reasonably enlightened group of people, as China is today, it can also have great advantages. That one party can just impose the politically difficult but critically important policies needed to move a society forward in the 21st century."

In 2010, Friedman contrasted the enlightened Chinese communists with ignorant U.S. Republicans:

While American Republicans were turning climate change into a wedge issue, the Chinese Communists were turning it into a work issue. "There is really no debate about climate change in China," said Peggy Liu, chairwoman of the Joint U.S.-China Collaboration on Clean Energy, a nonprofit group working to accelerate the greening of China. "China's leaders are mostly engineers and scientists, so they don't waste time questioning scientific data."

Professor Daniel A. Bell of Tsinghua University in Beijing and previously of Stanford and Princeton wrote in 2012 in the *Christian Science Monitor* of "the success of meritocracy in China" as opposed to "western-style democracies" where "less talent goes to the bureaucracy." The summary of his article reads: "Democracy has its problems. The world—especially the US—could learn from China's 'political meritocracy.' Its

one party selects leaders based on ability and judgment. They balance the interests of an entire country—and the world, not just finicky voters or big donors.” Bell suggested that the Chinese Communist Party consider changing its name.

Andy Stern, former president of the Service Employees International Union, was the most frequent visitor to the White House early in the Obama administration. In 2011, Stern served as a member of a delegation meeting with top Chinese officials, and as he wrote in a *Wall Street Journal* op-ed, he was thrilled to read “the emerging outline of China’s 12th five-year plan,” with the aim of “a 7% annual economic growth rate,” “a \$640 billion investment in renewable energy,” “construction of six million homes,” and other improvements, “while promoting social equity and rural development.”

For more than 80 years, the Soviet concept of “five-year plans,” adopted by the Communist Chinese, has been the object of ridicule throughout the world—including, underground, in the Soviet Union and China. Indeed, the term “five-year plan” in this context is used by educated people only ironically. But Stern missed the point of the ridicule.

Some Americans are drawing lessons from this [China’s five-year plan]. Last month, the *China Daily* quoted Orville Schell, who directs the Center on U.S.-China Relations at the Asia Society, as saying: “I think we have come to realize the ability to plan is exactly what is missing in America.” The article also noted that Robert Engle, who won a Nobel Prize in 2003 for economics, has said that while China is making five-year plans for the next generation, Americans are planning only for the next election. . . .

The conservative-preferred, free-market fundamentalist, shareholder-only model—so successful in the 20th century—is being thrown onto the trash heap of history in the 21st century. . . . While we debate, Team China rolls on.

Former Microsoft Chief Operating Officer Robert Herbold, in a separate *WSJ* op-ed, issued similar praise for “the 12th five-year plan” which included “making significant improvements in the environmental footprint of China.” He wondered:

Can you imagine the U.S. Congress and president emerging with a unified five-year plan that they actually achieve (like China typically does)?

The specificity of China’s goals in each element of the five-year plan is impressive. For example, China plans to cut carbon emissions by 17% by 2016. In the same time frame, China’s high-tech industries are to grow to 15% of the economy from 3% today. . . . Let’s face it—we are getting beaten because the U.S. government can’t seem to make big improvements. Issues quickly get polarized, and then further polarized by the media, which needs extreme viewpoints to draw attention and increase audience size. The autocratic Chinese leadership gets things done fast (currently the autocrats seem to be highly effective).

In the op-ed, Herbold made an attempt to be even-handed in his criticism. While on human rights and free speech, “China has a ton of work to do,” the opposing view from the Chinese “is that we are nuts for not blocking pornography and antigovernment points-of-view from our youth and citizens.”

In a 2012 interview with Charlie Rose, General Electric CEO Jeffrey Immelt (who once headed NBC and MSNBC and chaired the Obama administration’s Jobs Council) weighed in.

The one thing that actually works, you know, state-run communism may not be your cup of tea—but their government works. . . . They have five-year plans. I always tell our team: Read the twelfth five-year plan, which is the segment we’re in. Typically what they’re doing makes sense in the Chinese context.

Another person who looks on China’s system with favor is Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of the U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change. As reported by Bloomberg News:

China, the top emitter of greenhouse gases, is also the country that’s “doing it right” when it comes to addressing global warming, the United Nations’ chief climate official said. . . .

China is . . . able to implement policies because its political system avoids some of the legislative hurdles seen in countries including the U.S., Figueres said. Key policies, reforms and appointments are decided at plenums, or meeting of the governing Communist Party’s more than 200-strong Central Committee. The National People’s Congress, China’s unicameral legislature, largely enforces decisions made by the party and other executive organs.

The political divide in the U.S. Congress [with Republicans in control of the House of Representatives] has slowed efforts to pass climate legislation and is “very detrimental” to the fight against global warming, she said.

Keep in mind that Communist China may have the worst environmental record of any country, ever. That doesn’t stop the U.N.’s top Global Warming official from being a big fan.

The pro-China/pro-“green” coalition is quite broad, ranging from left-wing extremists whose goal is the destruction of capitalism to prominent business-people who want to make money and don’t know—or don’t care—about the evils and mind-boggling inefficiency of communism. Is this coalition powerful enough to push through a world regime based on fears of Global Warming? We will soon find out.—*SJA*

***GW***

**Please consider contributing now  
to the Capital Research Center.**

# GreenNotes

In December, **President Obama** signed a presidential memorandum putting 30 million acres of **Alaska's North Aleutian Basin** off limits to drilling for oil and natural gas. "These waters are too special and too valuable to auction off to the highest bidder," he declared. As reported by **Michael Bastasch** of the **Daily Caller News Foundation**, "This action comes after the Obama administration declared 266 million acres—twice the size of **California**—of Alaskan coastline to be protected habitat of the Arctic ringed seal, which is listed as 'threatened' under the **Endangered Species Act**."

Actually, the Arctic ringed seal is a *subspecies* of the ringed seal (*Pusa hispida*), a species that, according to the **National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration**, is "found in all the **Arctic** seas and in the **North Pacific** as far south as **Japan**. . . . The ringed seal is the most abundant of the Arctic ice seals. Although no accurate estimate exists, there are probably more than 2,000,000 ringed seals world wide." That may be an understatement: The Arctic ringed seal appears to be the *most numerous* of five subspecies of the ringed seal, with the **MarineBio Conservation Society** putting its worldwide population at two to seven million.

So why is the Arctic ringed seal, which is neither a species nor threatened (much less endangered), designated falsely as a species in need of protection under the Endangered Species Act? Global Warming, of course! Environmentalists say that the seals, like polar bears (of which the seals are primary prey), are endangered because of the threat of Global Warming. To prove the threat of Global Warming, they point to the fact that polar bears and seals are endangered by it. Isn't environmentalist logic fun?

One of the 2014 election's biggest upsets was the **Maryland** governor's race, where Lt. Gov. **Anthony Brown** (D) lost by nine points to Republican businessman **Larry Hogan**. Many attributed Brown's loss in large part to the "rain tax," a much-ridiculed tax that was levied on property owners' "impervious surfaces" as a "stormwater remediation fee." Now **Prince George's County**, a **D.C.** suburb, is offering a way for churches to avoid the tax, which averages an estimated \$744 per church. All they have to do is go "green."

The **Washington Post** reports that churches negotiated a deal to make "green" improvements and preach "green" sermons. For example, one church will "install rain barrels, build rain gardens, plant trees and, perhaps, replace their blacktop with permeable pavement"—and the government will cover most of the cost, while virtually eliminating the tax. Some pastors "agreed to start 'green' ministries to maintain the improvements at their churches, and to preach environmentally focused sermons to educate their congregations. . . . Churches, synagogues, mosques and other houses of worship are an 'untapped resource' to help inspire the larger community to 'do what is right,' **Jon Capacasa** of the **Environmental Protection Agency** said."



The government of **Peru** says it will press charges against **Greenpeace** activists who damaged the **Nazca lines**, an artifact listed as a World Heritage site by the **United Nations**. [See photo.] The fragile lines, depicting creatures, stylized plants, and imaginary figures and fully visible only from aircraft, were scratched out on an arid plateau 1,500-2,000 years ago. The activists entered an area where access is "strictly prohibited" and laid giant letters in yellow cloth. The stunt coincided with U.N. climate talks held in nearby **Lima**.

In 2011, **President Obama** promised to flood America's highways with plug-in cars—to make the U.S. "the first country to have a million electric vehicles on the road by 2015." Well, not quite. Despite handing out \$7,500 in taxpayers' money per vehicle, the Obama administration fell some 750,000 short of that goal. Incidentally, because of the vehicles' cost (and technicalities such as the ineligibility of used vehicles for the subsidy), virtually all the benefit goes to the richest one percent of the population.

Perhaps it's just as well electric cars flopped. The **Associated Press** reports on a study in the **Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences**: "People who own all-electric cars where coal generates the power may think they are helping the environment. But a new study finds their vehicles actually make the air dirtier . . . 'It's kind of hard to beat gasoline' for public and environmental health, said study co-author **Julian Marshall**, an engineering professor at the **University of Minnesota**. . . . The study finds all-electric vehicles cause 86 percent more deaths from air pollution than do cars powered by regular gasoline."