

Originally Processed With FOIA(s):

FOIA Number:

S

# FOIA MARKER

**This is not a textual record. This is used as an administrative marker by the George Bush Presidential Library Staff.**

---

**Record Group/Collection:** George H.W. Bush Presidential Records  
**Collection/Office of Origin:** Speechwriting, White House Office of  
**Series:** Speech File Draft Files  
**Subseries:** Chron File, 1989-1993

---

**OA/ID Number:** 13519  
**Folder ID Number:** 13519-004

---

**Folder Title:**  
Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change 2/5/90 [OA 4391] [2]

---

Stack:	Row:	Section:	Shelf:	Position:
<b>G</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>4</b>

---

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM: ROGER B. PORTER *RBP*

SUBJECT: Presidential Remarks to the Intergovernmental  
Panel on Climate Change

I recommend one deletion and one addition to the commendatory speech.

Deletion:

Page one, second paragraph, last sentence. The words "most ecologically fragile" should be removed.

The term fragile has developed into an advocacy word used by environmental activists whenever they want something returned to its primitive state. Anyone who visited the Prince William Sound quickly realized, contrary to the statements of the day, that it was not one of the world's more "fragile" places. The same notion applies to the earth's climate. A historical record of billions of years supports the theory that the world's climate has an amazing ability to adapt to change and cannot accurately be described as fragile. *M.F.*

Addition:

Page six, second paragraph, fourth sentence. The sentence should be changed to read, "Developing a National Energy Strategy, which includes initiatives to increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable energies." *M.R.*

Last Friday, the Department of Energy announced a series of initiatives to increase energy efficiency and the use of renewable energy sources. The Department will spend \$336 million on the initiatives over the next 6 years. Energy savings from the initiatives through the year 2000 are expected to exceed \$32 billion. These initiatives will achieve significant air pollution reduction. *M.F.*

90 JAN 1 10 36

## WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ROGERS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>WINSTON</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PINKERTON</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>DELAND</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>BROMLEY</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>                    </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

James W. Cicconi  
Assistant to the President  
and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
Ext. 2702

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate **all** of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the ~~most ecologically fragile~~ creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where **both** sides benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

**You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.**

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up  
by <sup>at least</sup> 25 percent. ?

What we **don't** yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are **not** ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity." Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. **The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.**

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a commitment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, **by more than a factor of ten.**

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption **and** our total emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and *reports* ~~revision~~ *development* of our **National Energy Strategy**, *which includes new energy efficiency and renewable energy initiatives.* And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America. *in existing or Kentucky*

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.** *add energy conservation initiatives*

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create **policy** to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. **It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.**

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

# # #

Barry McBee  
DCA

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

report of this body and  
the

Organization

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate all of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions ~~this organization makes~~ will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

arising  
from  
it

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where both sides benefit -- and neither is compromised.

balance

~~You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.~~

90 JAN 1 10:45 AM

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

been considered

has

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

~~and develop appropriate~~  
~~seasonal responses~~ Mf

Among the

est ever faced  
by mankind

-- And, if so, when these changes will occur

whether they will result in

M.F.

3

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we don't yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, ~~imminent~~ climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Uncomfortable in

Those who ~~see climate change as a clear and present danger~~ represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- ~~if not most~~ -- are ~~not ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted.~~ ing ~~That may be to their credit.~~

And

See it as imminent and irreversible threat to mankind

Question the likelihood of climate change if the world continues on its current path

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate must

yet

~~intensity."~~ Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.

S

-- with absolute certainty

definable and calculable

inadequate understandings of science, or

M.F.

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

MENTION WITH HOUSE SENATE ECONOMICS CONFERENCE THIS SPRING

CONCLUSIONS

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

DISCUSS "NO REGRETS" POLICY

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a commitment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, by more than a factor of ten.

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will also help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

gases now building up in the atmosphere. Let me outline them very briefly:

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption and our total emissions. So we're pursuing new technology development. Creating a revised Clean Air Act with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our National Energy Strategy. And launching a major reforestation initiative to plant a billion trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. We hope to reverse it.

The economics of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create policy to manage <sup>CFCs, or</sup> CO<sub>2</sub>, and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in all countries. But we will ~~break the hold of the environmental cold war~~ only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

achieve results

If we hope to promote environmental protection and economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. ~~Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.~~

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with all of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has declined over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth cannot be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in defense of the environment we share. ~~It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.~~

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it must be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

# # #

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

James W. Cicconi  
 Assistant to the President  
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
 Ext. 2702

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

February 1, 1990

MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

FROM: JIM PINKERTON

SUBJECT: Intergovernment Panel on Climate Change draft

This speech is excellent in parts, but it tries to do too much and is too long. Specifically, in explaining that we are taking the middle ground between absolute faith in global warming and absolute skepticism, we bash both sides too much. We believe that the speech should aim to accomplish three things:

First, to underscore that the President's very presence at the conference speaks to his feelings about the issue. He will be, after all, the very first American President to attend such a conference. ✓

Second, we should articulate the President's feelings about his attending, e.g., the President could note that a few days before he was addressing the issue of reducing American and Soviet troop levels and that he considers this issue to be on the same plane of global importance. The President could also expand on his personal feelings about the environment.

Third, we should emphasize, as the draft in part does, that we are taking actions and spending large sums to get better answers on the issue. ✓ ✓

Specific comments:

pg. 1, para. 5, line 1 The cold war metaphor is very apt.

3,4,1 "I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions."

The first sentence in this pair of sentences is the right position to take. It is the second sentence that starts a series of deprecating statements about those who have drawn conclusions on global warming. ✓

These criticisms culminate in the Blake quote -- it's way too harsh, and end at 4,2,2 with "Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture" -- a veiled jab at those who have decided to decide. ✓

(more)

The point is that we do not need to characterize those who have made up their minds.

It is entirely sufficient that the President merely state his willingness to get better answers to this controversy. We do not need, in other words, to go out of our way in order to be critical -- thereby causing controversy to rebound onto the President. ✓

5,2 &3 This is more like it: talking about the importance of stewardship and the commitment of the U.S. to be a leader on this and other environmental issues.

6,2,4 Naturally, we applaud the reforestation language. And the example of the tree-planting in Guatemala at 7,2,1 is the perfect illustration.

###

February 1, 1990

FROM: Mike Deland

TO: Chriss Winston

RE: IPCC SPEECH

Here is a step-by-step walk-through of my handwritten notes in the margins of Monday's draft speech.

Page One:

Either delete "logical" and don't qualify "division" OR state it more clearly by substituting "illogical" -- that, in fact, is what we mean. ✓

Delete "cold war." We have been working together for years on environmental issues with much success. It is an unnecessary and inaccurate negative assessment of the situation. ✓

Page Two:

no comments

Page Three:

I don't believe there exists a scientific link between polar ice sheets and sea ice; one is on land, the other on ocean. One would be "walking on thin ice" to suggest that this comparison offers evidence either way on the global warming question.

The Blake quote is unnecessarily offensive. Those in the audience may not be "passionate" but they are dedicated. The quote is not worth the risk of insulting the group. ✓

"Media-driven emotion" is a bit strong. Something along the lines of "The politics are outstripping the science" might be better. ✓

Page Four:

The function of such models is to help us predict the future. The point to be made here is that while models can be useful in making prediction, they are limited in the degree of certainty they can provide. ✓

The line about the U.S. "continues to lead the world" sounds arrogant coming from the President. It is something that I and others say on his behalf all the time. ✓

The language at the bottom of the page about a "reasoned middle ground" is on target, but is begging for an example. This would be a good place to insert Secretary Baker's language on global climate change from his maiden speech one year ago.

Page Five:

Can we re-phrase "more than any other country" while still taking credit? ✓

Page Six:

Delete "environmental cold war" for same reasons as on page one. ✓

Page Seven:

"Pollution prevention" is a concept that the President supports and has spoken about before. It could be mentioned as a concrete example of the "new kind of environmental cooperation" that is mentioned here. ✓

## WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION	FYI		ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ROGERS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>WINSTON</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PINKERTON</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>DELAND</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>BROMLEY</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>                    </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

**James W. Cicconi**  
 Assistant to the President  
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
 Ext. 2702

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate **all** of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- **a logical** division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

*illogical*

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where **both** sides benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

You are called upon to end the environmental **cold war**.

*have not cold  
working been  
together  
for years.*

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we **don't** yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

*one is  
Sea - ice  
land -  
not sure  
there is  
scientific  
link*

*Scientific  
link?*

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are **not** ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity."

[Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be **compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically**.

*different  
quite  
needed  
audience  
may not  
be 'passionate'  
but it is  
dedicated*

*don't  
want to offend*

*a bit strong -  
"politics"  
"the sciences" might  
be better  
outstripping*

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

*models are designed to predict - some accuracy do*

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

*Sounds arrogant  
but Pres. something  
2 say on his behalf  
all the time*

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a committment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

*Sec. Baker language from his maiden speech one yr. ago?*

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, **by more than a factor of ten.**

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

*we are!  
Can we  
Phon it  
difficultly +  
still take  
credit  
?*

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption **and** our total emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**. And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.**

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create **policy** to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

Change phrase

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. <sup>ie. Pollution prevention</sup> Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. **It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.**

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

# # #

WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

0833

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION FYI	
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE: MEMORANDUM FOR CHRISS WINSTON

February 1, 1990

The NSC staff believes the draft Presidential remarks: Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change are needlessly confrontational by invoking the image of an environmental cold war, which does not accurately reflect the cooperative nature of the work being done in the IPCC. Additional comments are noted throughout the text.

Brent Scowcroft

James W. Cicconi
Assistant to the President
and Deputy to the Chief of Staff
Ext. 2702

RECEIVED

90 FEB 1 P 1: 44

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate all of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where both sides benefit -- and neither is compromised.

You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.

bad symbol  
environmental  
cold war doesn't  
exist. President  
shouldn't appear  
Confrontational.

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic advance growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

M. L.  
 IPCC not  
 divided on this  
 issue, but  
 highlight  
 divisions  
 that don't  
 exist

1800s,

*pick a  
more recent  
date people  
can identify  
with.*

the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we **don't** yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

*- the  
percent  
saved / or  
population  
observation*

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are **not** ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

*change has  
been detected,  
we don't know  
its significance  
nor whether  
it will  
persist at  
same rate*

[When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity." Here, too,] we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.

*This was  
Yeats re the  
Irish Revolution  
Not a good quote  
for this  
occasion*

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

*improving*  
 Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. <sup>or be the basis of chaotic decisions</sup> Above all, ~~responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.~~

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

→ With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a committment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, **by more than a factor of ten.**

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption **and** our total emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**. And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.**

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create **policy** to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. **But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.**

*not needed*

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. ~~It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.~~

Enough!

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

# # #



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

**NOTICE:**

Enclosed are comments from staff members of the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). Such comments do not necessarily represent the official position of the Director of OMB or of the Office of Management and Budget. If you wish to have the Director's personal comments, please let me know -- and contact me if you have any questions.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "David J. Haun". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

David J. Haun  
Executive Assistant  
to the Director

11:11 AM FEB 2 1980

## WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM

DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMEYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ROGERS</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>WINSTON</u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>PINKERTON</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>DELAND</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>BROMLEY</u>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>                    </u>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE: *See comments*

James W. Cicconi  
Assistant to the President  
and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
Ext. 2702

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate **all** of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and <sup>us</sup> ~~we~~ who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where **both** sides benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.

*This is too strong it implies an ambitious IPCC outcome.*

*deyer*

*Your efforts must lay the ground work for improving our*

~~This will be possible only if we understand~~ that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must usher in a new era of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources, <sup>and</sup> Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States <sup>is strongly committed to</sup> believes the I.P.C.C. ~~is the best forum to~~ <sup>process of international cooperation</sup> develop ~~policy~~ on global climate change. ~~We're committed to international cooperation on this issue.~~ And we consider it vital, that the community of nations <sup>needs to be</sup> ~~is~~ drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

*We don't want the IPCC to set policy.  
Hoyer*

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we **don't** yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, ~~imminent~~ climate change.

Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're **growing** in size.

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are **not** ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity." Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. **The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.**

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should ~~attend to what is known about climate change -- and~~ work to know more.

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

*Notes: Several other countries are doing extensive work also.*  
*Shady 4/8/44*

In the search for answers, the United States <sup>is among the</sup> ~~continues to~~ lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a commitment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

*This part is not very clear. Is the intention to say "So much remains unknown that it is not possible to evaluate the effects of policy actions with any degree of confidence"?*

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our assistance to developing and East Bloc nations. ~~And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.~~

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, **by more than a factor of ten.**

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes <sup>an increase of \$2</sup> ~~a total of over \$70~~ billion to environment-related ~~work.~~ <sup>programs.</sup> Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- and will <sup>initiate the</sup> ~~fund the launch of the first~~ U.S. Earth Observing System, <sup>in cooperation with Europe and Japan,</sup> ~~to~~ advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

Study  
4/14/91  
Action

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to <sup>increase the efficiency of</sup> stabilize ~~--- and reduce wherever we can ---~~ both <sup>use</sup> our energy consumption <sup>thus reduce total</sup> and ~~our total~~ emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**. And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a **billion** trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.**

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer technical support to those who need it.

As we work to create **policy** <sup>on</sup> ~~to manage~~ CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. But we will <sup>develop effective and acceptable solutions</sup> ~~break the hold of the environmental cold war~~ only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for <sup>the emissions of</sup> a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

So we need to work with the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry to assist developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

~~As I said a moment ago,~~ I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. **It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.**

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

# # #

# WHITE HOUSE STAFFING MEMORANDUM



DATE: 2/1/90 ACTION/CONCURRENCE/COMMENT DUE BY: 2/1/90 5:00 PM

SUBJECT: PRESIDENTIAL REMARKS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE

	ACTION FYI			ACTION	FYI
VICE PRESIDENT	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	MCCLURE	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SUNUNU	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NEWMAN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
SCOWCROFT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PORTER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
DARMAN	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	ROGICH	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
BATES	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	UNTERMAYER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CARD	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	ROGERS	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
CICCONI	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	WINSTON	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
DEMAREST	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	PINKERTON	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
FITZWATER	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	DELAND	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
GRAY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	BROMLEY	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HAGIN	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

REMARKS: Please forward any comments directly to Chriss Winston, Rm. 122, x2930, no later than 5:00 PM TODAY, Tuesday, February 1, with a copy to my office. Thank you.

RESPONSE:

*Please see attached memo plus comments in text*  
*DA*

96:96 1 JAN 90

D. Allan Bromley  
 Director, OSTP

James W. Cicconi  
 Assistant to the President  
 and Deputy to the Chief of Staff  
 Ext. 2702

**GENERAL POINTS  
ON THE PRESIDENT'S IPCC REMARKS**

1. This is a unique opportunity for the President to establish clearly the continuity, direction and strength of the U.S. program relating to climate change. the Watkins-Reilly memo emphasized this; the DPC Working Group endorsed it, but this draft does not take adequate advantage of this opportunity for the President to reaffirm U.S. leadership in addressing climate change on the basis of sound science and sound economics, as well as concrete actions already taken.
  
2. The President should use the occasion of this talk to build upon his Malta announcement and discussion with President Gorbachev and now announce that he is inviting a small but representative cross-section of the world's most senior science, economics and environmental officials to participate in a seminar in Washington April 18-19, where he intends to participate personally in the discussions and educate himself on these matters. In hosting this seminar, it is his intention to improve the quality and understanding of the analytic tools and data required to address the problems of climate change; to sensitize the science, economics and environmental research communities to each other's activities, uncertainties and problem areas; and to at least begin developing an international research plan that would draw upon the experience, expertise and data of all the participating countries in addressing the gaps and uncertainties remaining in our understanding of the science and economics of global change.

It is his clear intent that this seminar break new ground in bringing the scientific and economic aspects of global change into close interaction and that the results of the seminar would feed into this IPCC process. We would hope to provide new information toward the formulation of sound policy in this area.

3. The President should use this occasion to reinforce his Malta invitation to host the first negotiating session on The Framework Convention. Not to do so would imply a desire to pull back from that invitation and leave the President open to a whole range of unfair charges.

**D. ALLAN BROMLEY**  
2/1/90

(Lange/Cawley)  
February 1, 1989  
10:45 A.M.  
[IPCC.DOC]

1990 JAN 32 PM 12:04

PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: INTERGOVERNMENTAL PANEL ON CLIMATE CHANGE  
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1990  
10:15 A.M.

Thank you, Dr. Bolin [Bo-leen]. Professor Obasi. Dr. Tolba. Delegates of the World Meteorological Congress, and the United Nations Environment Program. Let me thank and congratulate **all** of you, for taking on an issue of such great importance. The decisions this organization makes will have a profound effect on the world's environmental and economic policy.

In the post-war era, we've produced the most technologically advanced creations of man. We've also gained new understanding -- though still incomplete -- of the most ecologically fragile creations of nature.

But unfortunately, somewhere along the way, we picked up a bias, that has harmed both man and nature: a mistaken belief that there is a divergence of interests -- a logical division -- between the natural world and we who inhabit it.

Nothing could be further from the truth -- or more central to the work of this Panel. You are called upon to strike an unprecedented international bargain: a convergence between global environmental policy, and global economic policy, where **both** sides benefit -- and **neither** is compromised.

You are called upon to end the environmental cold war.

- There is no environmental cold war - ~~at least~~
- internationally, not a good reference

This will be possible only if we understand that economic growth and environmental integrity are **not** contradictory priorities. One reinforces and complements the other.

A sound environment is the basis for the continuity and quality of human life and enterprise. And strong economies allow nations to fulfill the obligations of environmental stewardship. Where there is economic strength, such stewardship is considered a necessity. But where there is poverty, it is too often a luxury.

For that reason, I believe we must **usher in a new era** of global cooperation: for environmental protection **and** economic growth. For intelligent management of industrial **and** natural resources. Above all, for **sustainable** development -- around the world.

The United States believes the I.P.C.C. is the best forum to develop policy on global climate change. We're committed to international cooperation on this issue. And we consider it vital, that the community of nations is drawn together -- in an ordered, rational way -- to assess the potential for climate change.

The state of the science; the social and economic impacts; and the right response strategies: all are crucial components to a global resolution. **The stakes here are very high.**

There is no question that human activities are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented ways. Since the mid-

*Stier is not a new idea. It is exactly what the RSW6 (IPCC) is doing - also Brundtland + others*

*already here ✓*

*nice*

Why say any of this? Remember, this is a meeting of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

1800s, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has gone up by 25 percent.

What we don't yet understand is the extent of the alterations we've brought about -- and how they're linked to a significant, imminent climate change.

here is not good

<sup>for ex.</sup> Last fall, many clear thinkers -- among them, world leaders -- were citing a significant thinning of sea ice at the poles as evidence that global warming had arrived. Recent observations show that the polar ice sheets are not melting, they're growing in size.

sea ice ≠ polar ice sheet

*While both statements are true, they are 2 very different phenomena. Linking them this way is*

I'm not prepared -- academically, or otherwise -- to draw conclusions. But I have noticed something about the scientists drawing the conclusions.

not quite correct + can be misread

Those who see climate change as a clear and present danger represent one distinct minority. Those who discount it completely, represent another minority. But many scientists -- if not most -- are not ready to claim that the extent of global climate change can now be reliably detected -- or predicted. That may be to their credit.

When he was observing the fervor of the French Revolution, the English poet William Blake wrote, "The best lack all conviction, while the worst are filled with passionate intensity." Here, too, we are called upon for action based on observation -- not media-driven emotion, or the politics of apocalypse. The decisions being made are too important to be compromised intellectually -- or polarized politically.

kind of \*insulting, see below

not appropriate

\* The people at this conference are here because they care about the issue - many have devoted their careers to the issue. That does not make them "the worst."

Questions remain: about the reflective effects of cloud cover, the cooling effects and CO2 absorption of oceans, and other sinks and feedback mechanisms we don't yet understand. Those questions, among others, suggest that we should attend to what is known about climate change -- and work to know more.

*this group knows this*

Current computer models are marvels of mathematics. Still, they cannot yet be said to represent reality -- and cannot be expected to predict the future. Above all, responsible policy cannot rest on the shifting sands of hypothesis and a chaos of conjecture.

In the search for answers, the United States continues to lead the world. We're seeking hard data and new ways to improve the science. Because what science now knows with confidence, policy-makers can't use. And what policy-makers need to make decisions, science doesn't yet know.

*rephrase*

In spite of this uncertainty, some suggest we should act now, on the chance that significant climate change becomes certain. Others point to the opposite edge of that sword: any meaningful preemptive policies would bring only the certainty of prohibitive expense; conflict with Third World development; and declining standards of living, worldwide.

*why say this to this group?*

I believe we can do better. There is a reasoned middle ground, that matches policy to emerging scientific knowledge -- and reconciles environmental protection to economic development.

With every word, with every decision made here, we're also making a committment that is profoundly personal. I think all of

*nice*

us understand, deep inside, how the actions we take now speak to the future.

*nice*  
Last week, in my State of the Union address, I spoke of stewardship. I believe it's something we owe our children and grandchildren -- because the earth we stand upon is only borrowed, never owned.

So the United States remains committed to a leadership role on environmental issues. In our domestic programs. Our work to forge international agreements. Our <sup>thoughtful</sup> ~~(assistance)~~ *aggressive and (intelligent) action* to developing and East Bloc nations. And here, by leading the Response Strategies Working Group.

Overall, we're already doing more than any other country to understand and address global warming -- in terms of financial and human resources, by more than a factor of ten.

I just proposed a budget to our Congress for fiscal 1991 that devotes a total of over [\$70] billion to environment-related work. Funding for the U.S. Global Change Research Program will increase by nearly 60 percent, to over \$1 billion.

That will allow NASA to move forward with its "Mission to Planet Earth" -- <sup>together with our international partners</sup> and will fund the launch of the first U.S. Earth Observing System, to advance the state of knowledge about the planet we share.

<sup>In our own country,</sup>  
We've already taken many steps that bring major benefits in their own right. Steps that make sense on their own merits, and that will **also** help reduce emissions of carbon dioxide and other

→ These should be rephrased ~~to~~ to be sensitive to the fact that there will be many very poor countries in the audience.

gases now building up in the atmosphere. **Let me outline them very briefly:**

We want to stabilize -- and reduce wherever we can -- both our energy consumption and our total emissions. So we're pursuing new **technology development**. Creating a revised **Clean Air Act** with incentives for industry to find creative, market-driven solutions. Working out a comprehensive review and revision of our **National Energy Strategy**. And launching a major **reforestation initiative** to plant a billion trees a year on private land across America.

We're also working through diplomatic channels, and through innovative measures like debt-for-nature swaps, to do more than simply reduce global deforestation. **We hope to reverse it.**

The **economics** of our response strategies to climate change are getting intensive study. We intend to develop real data on

the costs of various response strategies, assess new measures, and challenge other nations to follow suit. And we will offer

technical support ~~to those who need it~~. ~~on international colleagues~~

As we work to create **policy** to manage CO2 and other emissions, we want to encourage the most innovative responses. Wherever possible, we believe that market mechanisms should be applied -- and that policy must be consistent with economic growth and free market principles in **all** countries. But we will break the hold of the environmental cold war only through dialogue -- through a shared commitment to consensus.

*no war!*

*note: we aren't the only ones doing this.*

*good*

If we hope to promote environmental protection **and** economic growth around the world, it will be important to work with, not against industry. That will mean moving beyond the tradition of command, control, and compliance -- toward a new kind of environmental cooperation. Many industries, in fact, are already providing crucial research and solutions. And a few are already ahead of us.

*not in this speech!*

~~One power-plant management firm, just across the river in Virginia, donated \$2 million in 1988 for tree planting in Guatemala -- to compensate for a coal-fired plant it was building in Connecticut. And the company expects to couple tree-planting programs with **all** of the new power plants now on its drawing boards.~~

Where developing nations are concerned, some suggest we'll have to abandon the laissez-faire, free-market principles that allowed the industrial world to prosper. In fact, we think it's all the more crucial, in the developing countries, to apply the principles of the free market in the **service** of the environment.

To the extent we can accelerate the **advancement** of these nations, it will take **less** energy for them to produce wealth: in modern industrial countries, energy use per unit of G.N.P. has **declined** over time -- steadily, and dramatically.

*look forward to working with*  
So we ~~need to work with~~ the developing nations: Applying the power of the marketplace, considering technology transfer, and encouraging industry *to work with* ~~to assist~~ developing nations in making quantum leaps in technologies. That will allow developing

nations to grow more quickly and easily -- and may help them avoid making the environmental mistakes we older nations have made.

As I said a moment ago, I believe we should make use of what we know. We know that the future of the earth **cannot** be compromised. We bear a sacred trust in our tenancy here -- and a covenant with those most precious to us: our children, and theirs.

We also know of the efficiency of economic incentive -- and that free markets yield the most creative solutions. We must now apply the wisdom of the market, in **defense** of the environment we share. ~~It is time to heal this false schism. It is time to put an end to the environmental cold war.~~

Working together, with good faith and earnest dialogue, I believe it can be done. But more important: We know it **must** be done.

Thank you -- and God bless you.

###

More here about the good work of IPCC, etc and wish them <sup>luck</sup> well in their continuing efforts to address this very difficult issue

nice

no war!