

NGO's is driven in part by great media force and pressure. The environmental movements and the UNO have done an exemplary job in mobilizing sympathetic media coverage. A recent study published by the Media Research Center, a media watchdog group⁷⁶⁸ found that although there is considerable scientific uncertainty about the global warming theory, TV news routinely has ignored the many scientists questioning the theory while giving generous coverage to global warming theory proponents. Some key findings from the study, which looked at 51 prime time stories during 2001 on global warming, included:

- Views that man-made global warming will cause catastrophic climate change received six times as much media attention as the views of scientists who doubt this.
- Networks gave Kyoto supporters more than twice as much airtime as was given to supporters of Bush's decision to reject Kyoto.
- There were only seven references to the fact that some scientists are sceptical that human actions are causing global warming, though 17,000 scientists have signed an anti-Kyoto petition.⁷⁶⁹

Such positive media coverage undoubtedly influenced public opinion. In Canada and the EU politicians routinely made mention of public support as evidence of their need to ratify the accord. In neither jurisdiction however, was there any parliamentary debate on the accord. In fact there was little public debate either politically or via the media on the merits and demerits of the agreement. Over time as more doubts and confusions about the agreement were filtered through the media, citizens came to question the purpose of the accord. In Canada for example public support declined dramatically from a large majority in 2000, to a minority by the end of 2002, with a significant percentage of those being polled stating that Canada should withdraw from the protocol.⁷⁷⁰ Nevertheless without a referendum or parliamentary debate the Federal Government of Canada, contravening its own Constitution to respect the rights of provinces

on matters of energy and resource development, signed the accord in December 2002. This is juxtaposed against the US, where the Senate debated and then without dissent rejected Kyoto.

It does appear as if many national governments were pursuing the accord not because of its scientific veracity, but more to do with the feel good politics of leftist environmental support and the possibilities to enforce further taxes and regulations. Politicians feel that the moral and political vote getting support for environmental protection precludes the usage of hard science or rational economics to limit carbon dioxide emissions. Sir John Houghton, chief scientist of the United Nations-sponsored Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), calls global warming a 'moral issue.' According to Houghton, reducing greenhouse gas emissions will, 'contribute powerfully to the material salvation of the planet from mankind's greed and indifference.' A former Canadian Minister of the Environment, Christine Stewart has admitted, 'No matter if the science [of global warming] is all phony . . . climate change [provides] the greatest opportunity to bring about justice and equality in the world.'⁷⁷¹ This is a statement that environmental activists and socialists would firmly endorse. How Kyoto is going to bring 'justice and equality' to mankind is of course never supported in detail by Stewart or anyone else promulgating the necessity of Kyoto especially if Kyoto is used to obstruct trade and economic growth.

In any event it is pretty clear that voting patterns in many countries are sympathetic to environmental issues. Most EU nations, Canada, New Zealand and other nascent democracies have strong left of centre parties, and voting blocs. For most politicians the environmental movement is a motherhood issue that cannot easily be attacked by opponents. By endorsing Kyoto and embracing multi-lateralism [and saving the climate], national politicians position themselves nicely for media support and voter sympathy. By not revealing the true costs of the accord and ignoring the science of the accord, politicians can focus on simple eco-friendly messages that resonate well with voters. As well they position their governments to expand their power into industry and increase taxes and regulations.