

driven motive of the capitalistic economy is clearly going to solve for that factor. It has worked in the United States for the last 200 years, and I'm not sure why it would not work now. Secondly, they talk about how current models essentially—the Conference of Mayors is what they really focus on—show the actual benefits and costs. First you have to remember that's only 17 cities. But furthermore, the Conference of Mayors does not actually hold the businesses or the people of their cities to any binding agreements. The Kyoto Protocol is binding and has a timetable; the Conference of Mayors does not. Therefore, there is a huge difference and you cannot really compare the two. If they have no timetable—the timetable is the exact problem. We only have four years to do these drastic measures, and the fact of the matter is that the small businesses that can't afford it can't get it done in four years. So you can't compare something that has no timetables and is not legally binding to anybody within the cities to the actual Kyoto Protocol—that simply is not fair.

Then they talk about how we can use CDMs to help China and India. Well, first of all, China and India need to be willing to help themselves. They talked about how China is actually reducing coal, but this comes from 2006: it's out of Beijing, it says that China is planning 562 new coal-fired power stations, nearly half the world total of plants. So clearly, China is really not doing that good on their own and why are we responsible for China's emissions? We would also like to point out that in the *National Interest* in the Summer 2006 edition it says that China and India at the 2006 meetings in Bonn, Germany, are entirely unwilling at this point in time to sign and ratify Kyoto post-2012. So come 2012, the Kyoto Protocol is looking like it is not in a very strong state anyway and if you don't have those 134 developing countries on board, it's really becoming much less of a global solution because you just took out 134 out of 160—those numbers are not very impressive.

They also stated that Congress—this refers to our military exemption point—don't worry about it because Congress said that our military should be exempt. Well, it's nice that Congress said that, and I do agree with Congress—they are right. The UN has not said that, and they are not allowing our military to be exempt. It comes at a huge cost in national security. The Pentagon is saying that it will require up to six weeks longer to deploy in a crisis because their training cannot go on as it does right now because of the carbon-dioxide emissions of our training. The U.S. military is not exempt and that's a huge problem that needs to be handled before we just take rash decisions and ratify the Kyoto Protocol.

Going back to sum up our case a little more. What we have talked about and looked to first is the fact that the Kyoto Protocol doesn't solve. If it doesn't solve, I would see that as a huge problem and notice they didn't produce any ways that it does solve. It's going to change our temperature by one-twentieth of one degree Celsius according to Steve Mock as well as according to the Hoover Institute. Scientists are deeming that