



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 5, 2019

## UN Military Action to Enforce Climate Agenda? It May Happen, Says Academic

If the proposal to [arrest](#) climate change realists wasn't enough to create suspicion about Big Warming, try this on for size:

A Danish academic has stated that the United Nations may use force against countries defying its climate change mandates.

Ole Wæver, a prominent University of Copenhagen international relations professor, is apparently of the Ocasio-Cortez "Humanity has only 12 years left" school of climate alarmism. He claims that we've delayed remedial climate action so long "that any political response will likely become an international security issue — and could threaten democracy," [reports](#) the Australian Broadcasting Corporation (ABC). Wæver says that "climate inaction could lead to armed conflict," the site writes.



{modulepos inner\_text\_ad}

ABC continues:

"At some point this whole climate debate is going to tip over," he tells RN's Late Night Live.

"The current way we talk about climate is one side and the other side. One side is those who want to do something, and the other is the deniers who say we shouldn't do anything."

He believes that quite soon, another battle will replace it. Then, politicians that do 'something' will be challenged by critics demanding that policies actually add up to realistic solutions.

When decision-makers — after delaying for so long — suddenly try to find a shortcut to realistic action, climate change is likely to "be securitised".

Professor Wæver, who first coined the term "securitisation", says more abrupt change could potentially threaten democracy.

"The United Nations Security Council could, in principle, tomorrow decide that climate change is a threat to international peace and security," he says.

Then what? Well, Wæver says that "classifying climate change as a security issue could justify more extreme policy responses," ABC also informs.

"If there was something that was decided internationally by some more centralised procedure and every country was told 'this is your emission target, it's not negotiable, we can actually take military measures if you don't fulfil [sic] it,'" he stated, "then you would basically have to get that down the



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 5, 2019

throat of your population, whether they like it or not.”

So, a “global dictatorship, justified by a climate hoax. Does it get any more sinister?” [asks American Thinker](#) rhetorically. And, the site quips, “What’s the carbon footprint of a military invasion?”

It’s not that simple, though. As the top commenter under *Breitbart’s* [article](#) on the subject writes, “Outstanding. Start with China and see how that works out. I’ll bring the popcorn.”

Thus could we ask: What’s the carbon footprint of a world war?

Of course, this won’t happen. While China is the world’s biggest polluter — and also leads in CO<sup>2</sup> (which is *not* a pollutant) emission — bullies, including green bullies, only pick on soft targets.

Climate alarmism is a Western neurotic obsession, and any Chinese Greta Thunberg would possibly end up in a reeducation camp. Sure, China may mouth green platitudes, but her leaders play the game because they have no intention of abiding by the CO<sup>2</sup> mandates that, upon institution, would hobble the West economically. And note: From economic power flows *military power*.

Speaking of which, where’s “the army that the U.N. would use to invade a country that emits the CO<sub>2</sub> that [makes the world greener and greener](#)?” *American Thinker* also asks. One would be necessary, and developing international armies has long been a goal of internationalists.

Just consider that since 2007, “the European Union has had four multinational military ‘battlegroups’ at its disposal,” [wrote Breitbart](#) last year, though they’ve never been deployed. Moreover, French president Emmanuel Macron [actually proposed](#) in 2018 the creation of an EU army, an idea that was quickly endorsed by German chancellor Angela Merkel.

Of course, all this talk about global armies and military force against climate realists only intensifies the suspicion that for many global warming movement leaders, the agenda is merely a pretext for establishing a world government that can enforce collectivist policies.



Some believe this intention has been confessed, too. For example, at a 2015 news conference in Brussels, Belgium, “Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of U.N.’s Framework Convention on Climate Change, admitted that the goal of environmental activists is not to save the world from ecological calamity but to destroy capitalism,” [according](#) to *Investor’s Business Daily* (IBD).

“This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally, within a defined period of time, to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the Industrial Revolution,” IBD quotes her as saying. Reiterating this in reference to a new treaty, Figueres also stated that their task was to “intentionally transform the economic development model for the first time in human history.”

In the same vein, Saikat Chakrabarti, ex-chief of staff for Rep. Alexandria Occasion-Cortez (D-N.Y.),



Written by [Selwyn Duke](#) on December 5, 2019

---

[admitted](#) earlier this year that the congresswoman’s Green New Deal “wasn’t originally a climate thing at all.... We really think of it as a how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy thing.”

In fairness, it’s not clear whether Figueres was saying that environmentalism is merely a means to advance global statism or if global statism is a means to advance environmentalism, or, as a climate alarmist Chakrabarti collaborated with [claimed](#), it’s both. And, obviously, different people have different motivations.

What’s for certain is that there can’t be globalized climate regulations without a global governing body exercising global control, and this would scare even sincere environmentalists — were they wise. After all, the [freest nations have the cleanest natural worlds](#), while autocratic, left-wing governments tend to ravage nature.

In other words, if you’re troubled by the environment right now, just wait and see how bad it is when the army-backed “environmentalists” are in charge.

*Photo: United Nations*

*Selwyn Duke (@SelwynDuke) has written for The New American for more than a decade. He has also written for The Hill, Observer, The American Conservative, WorldNetDaily, American Thinker, and many other print and online publications. In addition, he has contributed to college textbooks published by Gale-Cengage Learning, has appeared on television, and is a frequent guest on radio.*



## Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



### What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

**Subscribe**