

June 2003



**Friends of  
the Earth**

# Briefing

# Conflict, corruption & climate change

## George Bush's new oil agenda

### Introduction

In June 2001, US President George 'W' Bush published the report of his National Energy Policy Development Group<sup>1</sup>. Its chapter on energy policy overseas is a blue print for the expansion of the global oil industry. Access to oil is now a key US foreign policy objective.

Yet oil exploration and development is leading to widespread corruption and civil conflict. It is increasing the threat of war. And George Bush's plan depends on big increases in oil use when scientists say cuts are needed to combat climate change. Millions of people are expected to lose their lives or livelihoods as pollution from burning fossil fuels causes sea-level to rise and storms and droughts to become more severe. President Bush has even pulled the USA out of the Kyoto Protocol, the only international treaty which will cut the emissions causing the problem.

Meanwhile, the British Government appears unsure whether to abhor the US policy or to ape it. Ministers have committed the UK to cut emissions of carbon dioxide by three fifths from 1990 levels by 2050. Yet the Department for International Development and the Export Credit Guarantee Department still bankroll exploration by British oil giants.

---

**Friends of the Earth inspires solutions to environmental problems, which make life better for people.**

**Friends of the Earth is:**

- the UK's most influential national environmental campaigning organisation**
- the most extensive environmental network in the world, with almost one million supporters across five continents and over 60 national organisations worldwide**
- a unique network of campaigning local groups, working in over 200 communities throughout England, Wales and Northern Ireland**
- dependent on individuals for over 90 per cent of its income.**

**To join or make a donation call us on 0800 581 051**

**Friends of the Earth, 26-28 Underwood Street, London N1 7JQ**

**Tel: 020 7490 1555 Fax: 020 7490 0881 Email: [info@foe.co.uk](mailto:info@foe.co.uk) Website: [www.foe.co.uk](http://www.foe.co.uk)**

Friends of the Earth Limited company number 1012357

♻️ Printed on paper made from 100 per cent post-consumer waste

### The US strategy

The United States is the world's largest oil junkie – consuming more than a quarter of the world's production<sup>2</sup>. Its use of oil is forecast to rise by more than a third by 2020 – adding 2.5 billion barrels to global annual demand<sup>3</sup>. The US is the third largest oil producer in the world, but the days when it could meet its own demand have long gone. US net oil imports more than doubled between 1985 and 2000<sup>4</sup> as its production fell and consumption rose. More than half the oil used in the US is now imported<sup>5</sup>. By 2020, this dependence could rise to two-thirds, if current policies are continued, as domestic production falls further and consumption continues to increase<sup>6</sup>.

US President, George 'W' Bush and his deputy, Dick Cheney are both ex-oil men. Less than two weeks after gaining power, George Bush told Cheney to review US energy policy. His report, published in May 2001, concluded that *“energy security must be a priority of US trade and foreign policy”*<sup>7</sup>.

Chapter Eight of Cheney's report, deals with international energy policy. It sets out a global strategy to enhance US national energy security with detailed recommendations for almost every oil-producing region. America's *“engagement will be global, spotlighting existing and emerging regions that will have a major impact on the global energy balance”*<sup>8</sup>. The Middle East will *“remain vital to US interests”* and *“will be a primary focus of US international energy policy”*<sup>9</sup> as it is forecast to supply 54-67 per cent of the world's oil by 2020<sup>10</sup>. But *“concentration of world oil production in any one region of the world”* is considered to be *“a potential contributor to market instability”*<sup>11</sup>. So, US attention is also focussing on increasing its own production, and in developing production in Central and South America, West and Southern Africa, Russia and Central Asia<sup>12</sup>.

The US strategy rests on two key objectives – opening up oil suppliers to US investment and diversifying supply.

Promoting investment by American energy firms in oil exporting countries *“will be a core element”* in US *“engagement with major foreign oil producers”*. The Report recommends that the US supports action by Algeria, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates and Yemen to open their oil industries to foreign investment<sup>13</sup>. No doubt, Iraq (which was America's sixth biggest supplier in 2000) will also be subject to the same encouragement. But, US support for open access for its energy companies goes beyond the Middle East. The Report also recommends that America's participation in the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) forum, the Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), the World Trade Organisation (WTO) and the Free Trade Area of the Americas (FTAA) be directed to levelling the playing field for US companies overseas, and reducing barriers to trade and investment<sup>14</sup>.

But it is the diversification of supply that features most strongly in the new US policy. Dick Cheney's report says *“US policies in each of these high-priority regions will focus on improving the investment climate and facilitating the flow of investment”*<sup>15</sup>. It contains detailed recommendations for each, major oil producing region.

The United States already enjoys a diversity of oil supply. Only one-fifth of its imports come from the Persian Gulf (mostly from Saudi Arabia and Iraq) and only two-fifths from OPEC

countries<sup>16</sup>. Besides Saudi Arabia and Iraq, its biggest suppliers are Mexico, Canada, Venezuela and Nigeria, but imports from the UK, Angola, Colombia, Norway and Gabon combined are almost as significant as any one of these<sup>17</sup>.

Future diversification will be accelerated using new technology – enabling deep water exploration in the Atlantic Ocean (*“stretching from off-shore Canada to the Caribbean, Brazil and West Africa”*) and Caspian Sea, and *“heavy oil”* reserves in Canada and Venezuela<sup>18</sup>.

Canada and Mexico, as its nearest neighbours, are obviously extremely important to US energy policy. The continued development of Canada’s *“heavy oil”* could be a *“pillar of sustained North American energy and economic security”*, the report says, while Mexico’s oil reserves (25 per cent larger than those of the US) make it *“a likely source of increased production over the next decade”*<sup>19</sup>.

But the US oil strategy goes well beyond its near neighbours. Venezuela is already extremely important to the US, but it now wants to agree a bi-lateral investment treaty to *“provide investors from both the United States and Venezuela with incentives for increased investment”*<sup>20</sup>. Brazil is also mentioned as a source of off-shore supply and the report recommends that the Summit of the Americas be used to *“foster reliable supply sources of all fuels within the region”*<sup>21</sup>.

Africa, meanwhile, is *“expected to be one of the fastest-growing sources of oil and gas for the American market”*<sup>22</sup>. Nigeria is expected to more than double production over the next decade and Angola *“is thought to have the potential to double its exports”* over the same period<sup>23</sup>. Other significant exports mentioned include Gabon and Congo-Brazzaville while US firms are already investing in a pipeline to carry 250,000 barrels of oil per day from inland Chad to the Cameroon coast<sup>24</sup>. Again, the report recommends the Americans use their influence to *“promote a more receptive environment for US oil and gas trade, investment and operations”*<sup>25</sup>.

The other region identified as having a high potential for growth is the Caspian Basin. Proven oil reserves in Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan are only slightly less than those in the US itself, and further discoveries are expected<sup>26</sup>. Exports are expected to double by 2005 *“as the United States works closely with private companies and countries in the region to develop commercially viable export routes, such as the Baku-Tbilisi-Ceyhan (BTC) and Caspian Pipeline Consortium oil pipelines”* and could *“grow even more substantially in subsequent years”*<sup>27</sup>. Meanwhile, the US is lobbying to support its oil companies’ investments in Russia, which is the second largest oil exporter in the world<sup>28</sup>.

## **Oil – a global power game?**

US energy policy is not only concerned with the supply of oil to Americans. *“In a global energy marketplace, US energy and economic security are directly linked”* to the energy supplies of its trading partners<sup>29</sup>. Yet, the US forecasts worldwide consumption will rise by two per cent a year for the next two decades - with demand in developing countries rising particularly fast<sup>30</sup>. It says this will *“exert increasing pressure on oil availability”*<sup>31</sup>.

Significantly, the US strategy will minimise its dependence on Middle Eastern oil and provide infrastructure to link non-OPEC suppliers like Russia, Azerbaijan and Kazakhstan to European markets. Meanwhile developing countries in Asia, *“are expected to remain heavily dependent on Middle East imports”*<sup>32</sup>. Diversity of supply is clearly not for everyone.

### Oil and war

Control of oil has long been seen as a key factor in global conflicts<sup>33</sup>. Increasing evidence is mounting that oil is also a source of conflict in its own right – particularly in developing countries. The Global Policy Forum in New York says:

*“Black gold’ may produce great wealth for some, but it often brings hardship and misery to the societies where it is found. Petroleum-dependent countries are plagued by corrupt and authoritarian governments, lopsided and unsustainable economic development and violent conflict. Disaffected rebels challenge governments and both use oil and gas revenues to purchase arms. Environmental damage by oil extraction can give rise to protest movements, which are frequently met by violent repression. Trans-boundary disputes between states over oil reserves represent yet another link between oil and violence”<sup>34</sup>.*

Unsurprisingly, many of the countries listed by Dick Cheney’s report as growing sources of US oil are listed by the Global Policy Forum as suffering from conflicts over oil, and already, evidence is mounting that oil issues are influencing US policy towards boundary disputes.

### Africa

Africa, where production for the US market is expected to grow quickly, suffers some of the worst disputes and most corrupt regimes. Conflict between the **Nigeria’s** rulers and oil companies, such as **Shell** and **Chevron**, on the one hand and local people in the Niger Delta on the other have long been a source of concern. Recent reports give no cause to believe the conflict is being resolved. An oil pipeline was blown up “*with tools suspected to be explosives*” last month<sup>35</sup> and oil production is now down by 40 per cent<sup>36</sup>.

Oil has also become a stimulus to **Sudan’s** long-running civil war. In 2001, Christian Aid accused Sudan’s government of a scorched earth policy – of “*emptying the land of civilians, killing and displacing hundreds of thousands of southern Sudanese*” in oil-producing regions<sup>37</sup>. It urged oil companies, including **BP**, to divest their holdings in Sudanese oil. Recent reports from the Nairobi-based International Crisis Group suggest that oil still threatens efforts to patch up a peace deal. The group says an “*offensive from late December [2002] until the beginning of February [2003] was an extension of the government’s long-term strategy of depopulating oil-rich areas through indiscriminate attacks on civilians*”<sup>38</sup>.

Meanwhile, more and more evidence is emerging that US policy toward international disputes is being dominated by oil considerations. “*In the midst of America’s international campaign against terrorism, the Bush administration is permitting Big Oil to legitimize the illegal occupation of an invaded country – Western Sahara*” said a report for the allAfrica news agency<sup>39</sup>. A US-backed plan drawn up by former Republican Secretary of State, James Baker, is forecast to leave the territory in Moroccan hands, to the benefit of US company, **Kerr McGee** which has already negotiated drilling concessions. Even the Economist says “*the battle for Western Sahara is now being waged at sea, by way of the multinational firms prospecting for oil off the Atlantic coast*”<sup>40</sup>.

Meanwhile, the World Court at The Hague has ruled that **Cameroon** is the rightful owner of the oil-rich Bakassi Peninsula, that had long been claimed by **Nigeria**<sup>41</sup>. Experts noted that it was in US interests to resolve the dispute to provide a “*secure operating environment for oil companies*” including **Exxon-Mobil** which is active in the region. However, Nigeria rejected the ruling and at one point, it seemed possible the dispute would flare into open war<sup>42</sup>. The

UN is now mediating between the two sides<sup>43</sup>.

Besides fuelling conflict within and potentially between African countries, oil has allowed some of the continent's most corrupt and oppressive regimes to remain in power. London-based, Global Witness reported in 2002 on "*the devastating story of oil and banking in Angola's privatised war*"<sup>44</sup>. Economic analysis suggests that up to US\$1.4 billion of oil revenues – a third of the state's income – went missing in 2001<sup>45</sup>. Meanwhile, Global Witness' investigations uncovered a bank account with Angolan signatories in the British Virgin Islands containing US\$1.1 billion<sup>46</sup>. Companies such as **Exxon-Mobil** are accused of making hundreds of millions of dollars in 'signature payments' to the Angolan government for oil concessions<sup>47</sup>. Much of this is believed to have been used for "*clandestine arms purchases*"<sup>48</sup>.

Global Witness has also exposed the apparent loss of US\$300-500 million of oil-revenue from Equatorial Guinea into an American bank account controlled by the country's President-for-life, Teodoro Obiang. This hasn't stopped US President, George Bush from re-opening the American Embassy in Equatorial Guinea which is expected to become Africa's third largest oil producer (after Nigeria and Angola)<sup>49</sup>. **ExxonMobil** and **Amerada Hess** are accused of making payments directly to Obiang's account.

Misuse of oil revenues is also a major concern in **Chad**, which is shortly to benefit from the completion of the Chad-Cameroon pipeline, whose backers included **Exxon-Mobil**, **Chevron** and the World Bank. The creation of an 'oversight committee' controlling an off-shore bank account to hold oil revenues has not stopped Chad's President Idriss Deby from spending US\$4.5 million from a 'signing bonus' on weapons to combat insurgents<sup>50</sup>.

### South America

The conflict and corruption caused by oil in Africa are mirrored across the Atlantic in **Colombia** where oil has long been a factor in the country's four decade long civil war. **Occidental Petroleum's** 480-mile Cano Limon pipeline has frequently been attacked by guerrilla groups seeking to deny oil revenues to the Government<sup>51</sup>. The US is spending US\$93 million this year on security for the pipeline which has cut the number of attacks dramatically<sup>52</sup>. George Bush has asked for another US\$110 million for next year – a subsidy of US\$3 for every barrel of oil moved<sup>53</sup>. Meanwhile indigenous Uwa people continue to resist plans for oil drilling on their lands. The conflict in Colombia has threatened to spill over to **Ecuador**, where oil workers have been kidnapped and pipelines attacked<sup>54</sup>.

Oil has exacerbated the conflict between **Venezuela** and **Guyana** over the disputed Essequibo region. Venezuela threatened in 2000 to grant oil concessions in the region, which is currently administered by Guyana<sup>55</sup>. Oil is also a factor in the continued opposition of right-wing groups (and reportedly US intelligence agencies) to the left-wing Venezuelan President Hugo Chavez.

### Central Asia

The Caspian Basin in Central Asia is yet another region, prone to conflict, and earmarked for oil investment by the United States.

**Azerbaijan**, where much of the oil is found, fought a war with neighbouring **Armenia** from 1991-4 over the secession of the Armenian-dominated Nagorno-Karabakh region<sup>56</sup>. 35,000

## CONFLICT, CORRUPTION & CLIMATE CHANGE

people were killed and 1,000,000 people were driven from their homes, before a Russian-mediated ceasefire was imposed<sup>57</sup>. Now a consortium, led by **BP**, and backed by the US wants to build the Baku-Ceyhan oil pipeline from Baku in Azerbaijan via **Georgia** to Ceyhan on the Mediterranean coast of Turkey<sup>58</sup>. Needless to say it avoids Armenia. The pipeline, if built, would generate billions of dollars of revenue for Azerbaijan. Yet, Azeri president, and former KGB chief, Heidar Aliyev has said oil contracts would enable him to re-arm and force the Armenians out of Azeri territory<sup>59</sup>. The Armenians may take pre-emptive action – either by damaging the pipeline itself (it passes close to Armenian-dominated areas) or by seeking protection from **Russia** which stands to lose oil revenue when it is built<sup>60</sup>. This in turn could provoke conflict with **Turkey** which would lose revenue should the pipeline be blocked. Meanwhile, ethnic Kurds in Turkey may also see the pipeline, a source of revenue for the Turkish Government, as a threat. Turkey has witnessed years of internal conflict between the state and Kurdish groups seeking autonomy. The pipeline will pass through the North East of the country where Kurds represent a large minority of the population, increasing the risk of conflict with the Turkish Gendarmerie which will be responsible for pipeline security and which has a history of human rights abuses.

Meanwhile, oil development in the Caspian is upping the stakes in a dispute over its ownership. **Azerbaijan** and **Kazakhstan** argue the Caspian is a sea and that, under international law, they are entitled to territorial waters. **Russia**, **Iran** and **Turkmenistan** say it is a lake, and that, under international law, most of it should be administered jointly. Talks continue but oil exploration is already exacerbating the situation - an **Iranian** gunboat forced two **BP** exploration vessels out of disputed waters in July 2001<sup>61</sup>.

Corruption is also likely to prove a significant problem in the Caspian Basin. In 1999, **Azerbaijan** was ranked by Transparency International as one of the world's most corrupt countries<sup>62</sup>. A year earlier, when himself on trial for corruption, the former speaker of the Azeri parliament accused President Aliyev of accepting up to US\$50 million and implied he had "salted away" hundreds of millions more<sup>63</sup>. Bribery is also a problem in **Kazakhstan**. In April 2003, a former executive of **Mobil** (now part of **ExxonMobil**) was accused of failing to declare a US\$2 million kickback from a Kazakh oil deal<sup>64</sup>. Another US businessman has been accused of making more than US\$78 million of illegal oil-related payments to Kazakh officials<sup>65</sup>.

### Oil and climate change

As if the conflict and corruption caused by oil exploration and development are not enough, the expansion of the industry also undermines attempts to combat climate change.

The UN scientific body set up by the world's governments to advise it on climate change says that global average temperatures could rise by almost six degrees by the end of the century and sea levels by up to a metre, if emissions are not cut severely<sup>66</sup>. Millions of people could lose their lives or their livelihoods as a result of flooding and more severe storms and droughts brought about by the temperature change<sup>67</sup>. The poorest people in the poorest countries are likely to suffer most, because they are most dependent on agriculture and because their governments cannot protect them<sup>68</sup>. Climate change may of itself cause conflict. Climate scientists predict changes in rainfall patterns will lead to increased water stress and reduced crop yields for millions of people. This could create millions of refugees and provoke conflict over water supplies<sup>69</sup>.

Modelling suggests emissions must fall by 80 per cent from 1990 levels by 2050 in order to keep average global temperature increases below two degrees Celsius<sup>70</sup> - the level regarded as the maximum that could be experienced without intolerable economic and ecological damage. But for the most vulnerable communities, even the modest warming witnessed so far is putting lives at risk. Yet the US is assuming that world oil consumption grows by 2.1 per cent per year till 2020 – an increase of 50 per cent over twenty years<sup>71</sup>. The United States, which has ratified the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, is committed to taking “precautionary measures to anticipate, prevent or minimize the causes of climate change”<sup>72</sup>. Yet, in 2001, George Bush rejected the Kyoto protocol, the only international treaty that would have cut the emissions causing the problem.

### Conclusion

Debate raged, before the recent Anglo-American invasion of **Iraq**, over whether Iraq’s oil reserves – the second largest in the world – were a factor in the invasion. There were clearly other factors at play. Yet, this briefing has demonstrated that oil and energy security is a prime consideration in US foreign policy. Abject dependence on fossil fuels distorts US policy, prevents it from dealing rationally with countries from Colombia to Kazakhstan, and constitutes a major threat to global security and peace, as well as to the global climate.

The need for the world in general and the US in particular to cut dependence on fossil fuels has never been greater. Not the least of the political errors of President Bush has been to review energy policy, and then, like an SUV driver with his eyes closed, put the pedal to the metal and head resolutely in completely the wrong direction. This policy is already fuelling conflict and corruption in South America, Africa and Central Asia. It is exacerbating the threat of conflict escalating into war.

Meanwhile, British policy is in a muddle. In 2001 Tony Blair also ordered a review of energy policy. This led to a White Paper which aims to put the UK “on a path to cut” its carbon dioxide emissions by “some 60 per cent by about 2050”<sup>73</sup>. But the review on which the White Paper was based also concluded that “the UK will be increasingly dependent on imported oil and gas”, and that “increased reliance on imports from Europe and elsewhere underlines the need to integrate our energy concerns into our foreign policy”<sup>74</sup>. And in January this year, Foreign Secretary Jack Straw outlined the UK’s seven strategic priorities for foreign policy to senior staff from Britain’s embassies abroad. Bolstering “the security of British and global energy supplies” was number six on the list<sup>75</sup>.

As the American-led drive for oil intensifies, the behavior of the British Government and British corporations like **BP** and **Shell** is likely to come under increasing scrutiny. Will Britain remain a leader on global climate change (as it likes to claim it is) or will it, as in Iraq, follow the American lead?

### Stop Press!!

The implications of the new US obsession with oil are becoming clearer and clearer.

- Republicans on the House of Representatives’ International Relations Committee have pushed through a measure calling for a deal on immigration from Mexico to be conditional on Mexican agreement to open its state oil company to US investment<sup>76</sup>.
- The Wall Street Journal reports Pentagon plans to shrink US forces in Germany to allow

## CONFLICT, CORRUPTION & CLIMATE CHANGE

for new deployments in Africa and the Caucasus. “The push”, it says, “... is driven by the increasing importance that the US is placing on protecting key oil reserves in Africa and the Caucasus region near the Caspian Sea”. US officials say “that a key mission for US forces would be to ensure that Nigeria’s oil fields ... are secure” while General Charles Wald, deputy commander of the US European Command is quoted as saying: “in the Caspian Sea you have large mineral reserves ..We want to be able to assure the long-term viability of those resources”<sup>77</sup>.

Meanwhile, the British confusion is all too apparent. For all its rhetoric about leading on climate change, the UK Government has not challenged the US-led oil expansion. Instead, Tony Blair is promoting the Extractive Industries Transparency Initiative – a voluntary agreement whereby oil companies promise to publish the payments they make to governments<sup>78</sup>.

### Notes

- 1 National Energy Policy Development Group 16 May, 2001 “Reliable, Affordable and Environmentally Sound Energy for America’s Future” [www.whitehouse.gov](http://www.whitehouse.gov)
- 2 Ibid. p. 8-3
- 3 US Energy Information Administration “International Energy Outlook 2002” Appendix A Reference Case Projections
- 4 National Energy Policy Development Group op cit. p. 1-11
- 5 Ibid. p. 1-13
- 6 Ibid. p. 1-13
- 7 Ibid. p. xv and 8-4
- 8 Ibid. p. 8-5
- 9 Ibid. p. 8-4/5
- 10 Ibid. p. 8-4
- 11 Ibid. p. 8-6
- 12 Ibid p. 8-7/14
- 13 Ibid. 8-5
- 14 Ibid. 8-6
- 15 Ibid. 8-7
- 16 US Energy Information (2002) “Country Analysis Briefs – United States of America” p. 4
- 17 US Energy Information (2003) “Crude Oil and Total Petroleum Imports: top 15 countries”
- 18 National Energy Policy Development Group op cit. p. 8-7
- 19 Ibid. 8-8 and 8-9
- 20 Ibid. 8-10
- 21 Ibid. 8-11
- 22 Ibid. 8-11
- 23 Ibid 8-11
- 24 Ibid. 8-11
- 25 Ibid. 8-11

- 
- 26 Ibid 8-12
- 27 Ibid. 8-12
- 28 US Energy Information Administration (2002) "Russia Country Analysis Brief"  
[www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/Russia.html](http://www.eia.doe.gov/emeu/cabs/Russia.html)
- 29 National Energy Policy Development Group" op cit. 8-3
- 30 Ibid. 8-16
- 31 Ibid. 8-16
- 32 Ibid. 8-14
- 33 Yergin D. (1991) "Prize: The epic quest for oil, money & power"
- 34 <http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oilindex.htm>
- 35 This Day 7 April 2003 "Escravos Crude Pipeline Blown Up"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2003/0408pipe.htm>
- 36 The Guardian 1 April 2003 "Violence cripples Nigeria's oil output"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2003/0401cripples.htm>
- 37 Christian Aid 2001 "The Scorched Earth" Executive Summary
- 38 International Crisis Group 10 February 2003 "Africa briefing: Sudan's oilfields burn again: brinkmanship endangers the peace process"
- 39 Madsen W (9 January 2003) "Big oil and James Baker target the Western Sahara"  
<http://allafrica.com/stories/200301090677.html>
- 40 The Economist (13 June, 2002) "Western Sahara: numbered days"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/issues/wsahara/2002/0619us.htm>
- 41 Lacey M and Banerjee N (11 October 2002) "World Court rules for Cameroun in prolonged oil-land border dispute with Nigeria" New York Times <http://www.globalpolicy.org/wldcourt/icj/2002/1011bakassi.htm>
- 42 Committee for a Workers' International 12 November 2002 "No to war over oil: for a democratic referendum among the Bakassi people" [www.worldsocialist-cwi.org/contents.html](http://www.worldsocialist-cwi.org/contents.html)
- 43 This Day 5 February 2003 "Bakassi: UN Chief happy with Nigeria, Cameroun efforts"  
<http://allafrica.com>
- 44 Global Witness (2002) "All the Presidents' Men"  
<http://www.globalwitness.org/reports/index.php?section=Oil>
- 45 Ibid. p. 3
- 46 Ibid. p. 22
- 47 Ibid. p. 35-36
- 48 Ibid. p. 36
- 49 Silverstein K 20 January 2003 "Oil boom enriches African leader" Los Angeles Times  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2003/0122gui.htm>
- 50 Silverstein K 21 March 2003 "With war, Africa oil beckons" Los Angeles Times  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/soecon/tncs/2003/0321beckon.htm>
- 51 Dunning T and Wirpsa L February 2001 "Oil Rigged" Resource Center of the Americas  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2001/0201colo.htm>
- 52 US Department of State International Information Programmes (5 March 2003) "US Committed to helping Colombia defeat narco-terrorism, says diplomat"  
<http://usinfo.state.gov/topical/pol/terror/03030703.htm>

- 
- 53 Corporate Watch (6 March 2003) "Update on Occidental petroleum and Plan Colombia"  
[www.corpwatch.org/bulletins/PBD.jsp?articleid=5810](http://www.corpwatch.org/bulletins/PBD.jsp?articleid=5810)
- 54 Stratfor.com 19 December 2000 "Tensions spark over Ecuadorian oil attacks"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/001219ec.htm>
- 55 Associated Press 26 July 2000 "Venezuela will grant oil concessions in disputed Essequibo region"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/docs/oil6.htm>
- 56 Reuters 10 April 2001 "Bush encourages resolution of conflict in oil-rich region"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2001/0410us.htm>
- 57 Shaitelman K (1999) "The Azerbaijan-Armenia conflict: the war in Nagorno-Karabakh, Section 907 and their impact on oil pipeline routes"  
<http://www.wws.princeton.edu/~wws401c/1998/ken.html>
- 58 <http://www.caspiandevlopmentandexport.com/ASP/Home.asp>
- 59 Shaitelman op cit.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 The Economist 2 August 2001 "Storm in a precious teacup"  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/centralasia/2001/0802casp.htm>, and;  
Stern D 24 July 2001 "Azeri-Iran dispute deepens" Financial Times  
<http://www.globalpolicy.org/security/natres/oil/2001/0724iran.htm>
- 62 The Corner House et al (2003) "Some Common Concerns: imagining BP's Azerbaijan-Georgia-Turkey pipelines system" p. 103
- 63 Ibid. p. 104
- 64 Christian Aid (2003) "Fuelling poverty: oil war and corruption" p. 37
- 65 Ibid p. 37
- 66 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2001) "Climate change 2001: the scientific basis" p. 13-17
- 67 Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (2001) "Climate change 2001: impacts, adaptation and vulnerability" p. 7
- 68 Ibid. p. 8
- 69 [http://www.mod.uk/issues/strategic\\_context/physical.htm](http://www.mod.uk/issues/strategic_context/physical.htm)
- 70 Climate Action Network (2002) "Preventing dangerous climate change" p. 11  
<http://www.climatenetwork.org>
- 71 National Energy Policy Development Group op cit. 8-16
- 72 United Nations "Framework Convention on Climate Change" Article 3(3)
- 73 Department of Trade and Industry (2003) "Energy White Paper: our energy future – creating a low carbon economy" p. 11
- 74 The Cabinet Office (2002) "The Energy Review" A Performance and Innovation Unit Report Executive Summary and Foreword by the Prime Minister  
<http://politics.guardian.co.uk/foreignaffairs/story/0,11538,869868,00.html>
- 75 Alexander's Gas and Oil Connections 3 June 2003 "Mexicans outraged at US plan to link immigration with oil"
- 76 Jaffe G 10 June 2003 "In a massive shift, US plans to reduce troops in Germany" Wall Street Journal
- 77 [http://www.dfid.gov.uk/News/News/fileseiti\\_draft\\_report.htm](http://www.dfid.gov.uk/News/News/fileseiti_draft_report.htm)