

DICED is UN's Environmental Constitution for the World and our own Constitution Will Be Diced

 freedomoutpost.com/diced-is-uns-environmental-constitution-for-the-world-and-our-own-constitution-will-be-diced/

6/11/2017

I am sure there are many Americans who have no idea nor care what “The Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development” (DICED) is. They should. The Draft Covenant is the “[Environmental Constitution of Global Governance](#).”

The first version of the Covenant was presented to the United Nations in 1995 on the occasion of its fiftieth anniversary. It was hoped that it would become a negotiating document for a global treaty on environmental conservation and sustainable development.

The fourth version of the Covenant, issued on September 22, 2010, was written to control all development tied to the environment, “the highest form of law for all human activity.’

The Covenant’s 79 articles, described in great detail in 242 pages, take Sustainable Development principles described in Agenda 21 and transform them into global law, which supersedes all constitutions including the U.S. Constitution.

All signatory nations, including the U.S., would become centrally planned, socialist countries in which all decisions would be made within the framework of Sustainable Development.

In collaboration with Earth Charter and Elizabeth Haub Foundation for Environmental Policy and Law from Canada, the Covenant was issued by the International Council on Environmental Law (ICEL) in Bonn, Germany, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) with offices in Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK.

Federal agencies that are members of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) include U.S. Department of State, Commerce, Agriculture (Forest Service), Interior (Fish and Wildlife, National Park Service), and the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). The same agencies are members of the White House Rural Council and the newly established White House Council on Strong Cities, Strong Communities (Executive Order, March 15, 2012).

The Draft Covenant is a blueprint “to create an agreed single set of fundamental principles like a ‘code of conduct’ used in many civil law, socialist, and theocratic traditions, which may guide States, intergovernmental organizations, and individuals.”

The writers describe the Covenant as a “living document,” a blueprint that will be adopted by all members of the United Nations. They say that global partnership is necessary in order to achieve Sustainable Development, by focusing on “social and economic pillars.” The writers are very careful to avoid the phrase, “one world government.” Proper governance is necessary on all levels, “from the local to the global.” (p.36)

The Covenant underwent four writings, in 1995, 2000, 2004, and 2010, influenced by the Johannesburg World Summit on Sustainable Development, by ideas of development control and social engineering by the United Nations, “leveling the playing field for international trade, and having a common basis of future lawmaking.”

Article 2 describes in detail “respect for all life forms.”

Article 3 proposes that the entire globe should be under “the protection of international law.”

Article 5 refers to “equity and justice,” code words for socialism/communism.

Article 16 requires that all member nations must adopt environmental conservation into all national decisions.

Article 19 deals with "Stratospheric Ozone." *Rex Communis* is the customary international law regime applicable to areas beyond national jurisdiction: in particular to the high seas and outer space." (p. 72)

Article 20 requires that all nations must "mitigate the adverse effects of climate change." If we endorse this document, we must fight a non-existent man-made climate change.

Article 31, "Action to Eradicate Poverty," requires the eradication of poverty by spreading the wealth from developed nations to developing countries.

Article 32 requires recycling, "consumption and production patterns."

Article 33, "Demographic policies," demands that countries calculate "the size of the human population their environment is capable of supporting and to implement measures that prevent the population from exceeding that level." In Malthusian model, humans were supposed to run out of food and starve to death. In a similar prediction, this document claims that the out-of-control multiplication of humans can endanger the environment.

Article 34 demands the maintenance of an open and non-discriminatory international trading system in which "prices of commodities and raw materials reflect the full direct and indirect social and environmental costs of their extraction, production, transport, marketing, and where appropriate, ultimate disposal."The capitalist model of supply and demand pricing does not matter.

Article 37 discusses "Transboundary Environmental Effects and article 39 directs how "Transboundary Natural Resources" will be conserved, "quantitatively and qualitatively." According to the document, "conserve means managing human-induced processes and activities which may be damaging to natural systems in such a way that the essential functions of these systems are maintained."

Article 41 requires integrated planning systems, irrespective of administrative boundaries within a country, and is based on Paragraph 10.5 of Agenda 21, which seeks to "facilitate allocation of land to the uses that provide the greatest sustainable benefits and to promote the transition to a sustainable and integrated management of land resources." The impact assessment procedure is developed by the World Bank.

"Aquifers, drainage basins, coastal, marine areas, and any areas called ecological units must be taken into account when allocating land for municipal, agricultural, grazing, forestry, and other uses." Agricultural subsidies are discouraged, as well as subsidizing private enterprises.

"Physical planning must follow an integrated approach to land use – infrastructure, highways, railways, waterways, dams, and harbors. Town and country planning must include land use plans elaborated at all levels of government."

"Sharing Benefits of Biotechnology" is a similar requirement to the Law of the Sea Treaty which demands that final products of research and development be used freely, no matter who develops an idea or how much it costs to bring that idea to the market.

Article 51 reveals that we will have to pay for these repressive new requirements while Article 52 shows that we must pay 0.7 percent of GDP for Official Development Assistance. This reaffirms the political commitment made in Paragraph 33.13 of Agenda 21 in 1992.

Article 69 deals with settlement of disputes by the Permanent Court of Arbitration, the International Court of Justice, and/or the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea.

Article 71 describes the amendment process, which is submitted to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. UN Secretary-General would review the implementation of this document every five years.

Writers of the Draft Covenant are approximately 19 U.S. professors of Law, Biology, Natural Resources, Urban

Planning, Theology, Environmental Ethics, two General Counsel Representatives from the Environmental Protection Agency, chair of the IUCN Ethics Working Group, two attorneys in private practice in the U.S., a judge from the International Court of Justice, a U.S. High Seas Policy advisor of the IUCN Global Marine Programme, foreign dignitaries, ambassadors, and 13 members of the UN Secretariat, including the Chairman, Dr. Wolfgang E. Burhenne. (2006-onwards)

Since this Draft Covenant has a Preamble and 79 articles, it is obviously intended to be a "world constitution for global governance," an onerous way to control population growth, re-distribute wealth, force social and "economic equity and justice," economic control, consumption control, land and water use control, and re-settlement control as a form of social engineering.

Article 20 is of particular interest because it forces the signatories to DICE "to mitigate the adverse effects of climate change." When President Trump withdrew the U.S. from the Paris Climate Accord, "climatologists" from Hollywood and millennials brainwashed by their professors that CO2 is going to destroy the planet and kills us all, took to microphones and podiums to express their displeasure with such a "criminal" decision.

It did not matter that the President explained in a very logical manner that this accord was nothing else than an economic scheme to steal and redistribute wealth from the United States to the third world while real heavy polluters like China and India were allowed to continue to pollute until 2030 when, at that time, they could be bribed to reduce their pollution and perhaps China would install smokestack scrubbers.

President Trump explained how many millions of American jobs would be lost and how our energy generation is getting cleaner while we are exploring other forms of energy. Once President Obama declared that the science has been settled, the science provided and the IPCC modeling had been adjusted to fit the globalist man made global warming agenda, so called anthropogenic.

Since none of Al Gore's predictions of islands under water due to the melting of ice cap have turned out true, we have more ice than ever this year, the globalists changed the title of their global warming hoax to climate change. Who would object to that term? Everybody knows that climate change but it is not because of humans spewing CO2 in the atmosphere. I don't see any liberals who have stopped breathing and passing gas. But we do see Hollywood jet set everywhere or sail in their expensive yachts, build mansions on the most beautiful beach side properties in the world, right after they chew humanity out for destroying the planet with our very existence and civilization.

How did man become the main perpetrator of climate change? How did we become so powerful that we can change climate with our very existence but, if we pay carbon taxes to the third world, we correct our guilt of existing, of breathing, and we turn climate into a favorable proposition for all – no hurricanes, no tornadoes, no droughts, no hail, no torrential rains, no earthquakes, no tsunamis, nothing but serene climate year after year.

The Club of Rome, the premier environmental think-tank, consultant to the United Nations and the alleged writer of U.N. Agenda 21's 40 chapters, explained, "The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy is the humanity itself."

Environmentalists tell us that the science is "settled" yet 31,000 scientists have signed a petition against the theory that humans are causing climate change. There is certainly a need to reduce pollution of our oceans, rivers, soil, and air but humans are not causing climate change. Temperatures and CO2 concentrations were much higher when there was no industrial activity or even humans.

The Vostock ice core samples taken by a team of Russian and French scientists proved beyond any doubt that CO2 concentrations in deep ice were six times higher than they are today. There are more serious variables that affect the climate, including solar flares, volcanic activity on earth and in oceans, and oceanic currents. Then there is the

deliberate government weather tampering by seeding clouds from flying airplanes with various chemicals in order to “mitigate the effects of global warming.”

Dr. David Frame, climate modeler at Oxford University said, “The models are convenient fictions that provide something very useful.” Prof. Chris Folland from the Hadley Centre for Climate Prediction and Research explained, “The data doesn’t matter. We’re not basing our recommendations on the data. We’re basing them on the climate models.”

Christine Stewart, former Canadian Minister of the Environment, also said, “No matter if the science of global warming is all phony... climate change provides the greatest opportunity to bring about social justice and equality in the world.”

Timothy Wirth, President of the U.N. Foundation, said, “We’ve got to ride this global warming issue. Even if the theory of global warming is wrong, we will be doing the right thing in terms of economic and environmental policy.”

The sad thing is that many mayors around the country have decided to disobey President Trump’s decision on the Paris Climate Accord and reported publicly that they will continue their membership even though such a move is illegal under our Constitution. Art. VI, paragraph 2, states, ...”and all Treaties made, or which shall be made, under the Authority of the United States, shall be the supreme Law of the Land; and the Judges in every State shall be bound thereby; any Thing in the Constitution or Law of any State to the Contrary notwithstanding.”

According to the Tennesseestar.com, the mayor of Nashville, Megan Barry, said that “The Constitution does not apply here in Nashville: ‘I am committed to meeting the goals of the Paris Agreement . . . Even if the President is not.’”

Mayor Barry, who is joined by the mayors of Knoxville, Madeline Rogero, the mayor of Chattanooga, Andy Berke, and “187 U.S. mayors, mostly Democrats, representing 52 million Americans,” [have decided to ignore Article I, Section 10 of the U.S. Constitution](#) which prohibits states governments, including towns in those states, from “entering into any treaty, alliance, and confederation.”

These dissenting mayors have not pledged their allegiance to the U.S. Constitution but to the Global Covenant of Mayors, one of the arms of implementation around the globe of U.N. Agenda 21, now morphed into Agenda 2030. Using grants from our own government, the Compact of Mayors and the European Union’s Covenant of Mayors have influenced initiatives at the local, city, and state governments, forcing their globalist agenda called “visioning” on the hapless population who are now forced to accept decisions made by mayors and boards of supervisors that are robbing them of freedom of movement, of their property rights, of the use of their cars, of farming, in the name of “transitioning to a low emission and climate resilient economy,” a pie in the sky goal. The real goal is to transform and redistribute the wealth of developed countries and to arrest their development by eventually curbing completely the use of fossil fuels and turning them into a more primitive society dependent on unreliable solar and wind power. Such a global society would have no borders, no sovereignty, no suburbia, no private property, no cars, and would be controlled by the United Nations umbrella of octopus NGOs.

There is no surprise that there is such a drive from the left to have a Convention of States (COS) in order to replace our U.S. Constitution with their own environmental constitution of the world, which is called The Draft International Covenant on Environment and Development (DICED).

James Delingpole wrote in a recent article at [breitbart.com](#) that “Global warming is a myth – so say 80 graphs from 58 peer-reviewed scientific papers published in 2017.”

The scientific “consensus” about the global warming lie, cited by the left without hesitation, is not science and President Trump was right in pulling the U.S. out of the Paris Climate agreement, [an agreement based on the pretense that the massive lie of global warming is true.](#)

[India alone needs \\$2.5 trillion between now and 2030](#) to comply with the requirements of the Paris Climate agreement, a sum which would come from the largest developed countries, mainly the U.S. And there are many other third world nations that would demand such redistribution of wealth from us in order to “decarbonize” and reduce pollution.

Delingpole cites in a [Breitbart article](#) the quote given in an interview to Dr. Charles Battig on November 13, 2010. Dr. Ottmar Endenhofer, International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Co-Chair of Working Group 3, stated, “We [UN-IPCC] redistribute de facto the world’s wealth by climate policy... One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore...”

[Dr. Charles Battig amply documents the advancement of Agenda 21 in the United States via ICLEI](#) and gives successful examples of municipalities who were able to extricate themselves from the global warming hoax pushed at the local level by the International Council on Local Environmental Initiatives (ICLEI), an arm of U.N.’s many octopus Agenda 21 non-governmental organizations (NGOs) who use federal grants, mayors, and local boards of supervisors to insinuate their own plans called “visioning” onto the local community who, most of the time, has no voting rights nor input into the plans.

Patrick Wood wrote on LinkedIn, *Exposing: AGENDA 21*, “It’s time to go tell your city leaders to kill climate change initiatives. #StopTechnocracy.” It is time that American mayors follow the U.S. Constitution and not the U.N.’s environmental Constitution called D.I.C.E.D.

Don’t forget to Like Freedom Outpost on [Facebook](#), [Google Plus](#), & [Twitter](#). You can also get Freedom Outpost delivered to your Amazon Kindle device [here](#).