

# Letter to a 'co-conspiracy theorist': Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire

November 30, 2009



Caption Climategate U-turn 'On thin Ice – The hockey stick graph fraud', The Daily Mail UK, Feb 14, 2010

Dear 'co-conspiracy theorist' M – Hi.

What Dr. Tim Ball stated in his concluding remarks in the following climategate video also captures my sentiments:

*“... but you know what, finding out that what I was saying was true*

*there is no pleasure in that whatsoever. No pleasure in 'I told you so' because this is a deeply troubling time not only for climate-science, but Science in general.”* -- Minute 9:30, Climategate: Dr. Tim Ball on the hacked CRU emails, November 21, 2009 on [corbettreport](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ydo2Mwnwpac)

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ydo2Mwnwpac>

And as sweeping as that **“deeply troubling time”** statement is, I would say Dr. Tim Ball still didn't go far enough. He did not unravel the overarching agenda and the galactic extent it permeates its corrupting tentacles as noted in this [Letter to Editor: Understanding the Political Science behind Global Warming February 07, 2009](#), and in this [Response to Financial Times Gideon Rachman's 'And now for a world government' December 11, 2008](#).

And neither did Senator Inhofe examine the 'WHY' of **“cooking that science”** in this exchange on Fox News back in June 2009:

Fox News Anchor: **“Does it appear to you that the EPA buried evidence that would have made the President's climate change bill unnecessary”?**


Sen. Inhofe: **“Oh absolutely Greg. They have been cooking that science since 1998. ...”**

Fox News Anchor: **“And here is what Alan Carlin said [Author of EPA 98-page study on climate change]: 'My view is...there is not currently any reason to regulate carbon dioxide. Global temperatures are roughly where they were in mid-20th century. They're not going up. If anything, they're going down.' In other words, if there is no endangerment, there is no need for a Bill.”**

Sen. Inhofe: **“The thing is phony. I feel so good about being redeemed after all these years... all of those scientists that Al Gore had lined up... all of them used to be on his side, they all said wait a minute, this science isn't right, and that's exactly what Alan Carlin said...”** -- Minute 0:30, Sen. Inhofe On Global Warming: ['This Thing Is Phony'](#), Fox News, June 29, 2009 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Skf8bpl8WSg>




The following is an interesting map of global temperatures – I am not sure of the source or accuracy of the specifics of the data from which it is constructed, but the planetary level temperature cycles are quite empirical:



Caption Global Temperature Chart 2500 BC to 2040 AD By Cliff Harris and Randy Mann  
(Image source longrangeweather.com)

Whereas, not unlike the many previous diabolical mantras deployed by the ruling establishment as pretexts for different facets of its “*imperial mobilization*” agenda, the following is the famous “hockey-stick” science graph used for promoting the mantra of Global Warming:



Caption The `Hockey Stick': A New Low in Climate Science by John L. Daly (graph courtesy wattsupwiththat.com)

Canadian Professors Ross McKittrick and Christopher Essex deconstructed that hockey-stick science along with their notable non-conformist collaborator and businessman from Toronto, Steve McIntyre, in their 2003 book *Taken by Storm*, long before climategate. But Prof. Ross too, circumspectly, only called it **“bad science”**, judiciously refraining from calling it **Science in the Service of Empire** which it is:

'Michael Coren: **“What's all this about a hockey-stick?”**

Ross McKittrick: “Well, the hockey-stick graph. This was back in 2001, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change [IPCC], it's a UN body that every five years puts out a big assessment of the science. And they are especially alert to any evidence that really promotes the Global Warming story and they give it lots of promotion. And in 2001, they latched onto this result that was fairly fresh in the literature, that had to do with what's called paleoclimatology. The study of the behavior of the climate from way back before we had thermometers.

Now, for decades the standard view has been that over the past thousand years, there is a Medieval era, which is very warm compared to the present. You know, the Greenland, the Vikings were able to have farms in Greenland. All over the world there is evidence that it was warmer, and basically better for people. And then things got cold for about 500 years, up to the 1800s, and then we were in a warming phase coming out of the little ice-age as it was called.

In the 2001 IPCC report, they changed all that and presented a graph that looks like a hockey stick lying on its side. So the mean state of the climate is almost constant, up until the year 1900, and then suddenly the temperatures started rising rapidly.

**And this was very dramatic. It was an extremely effective graphics for getting people worried about global warming.**

And it featured prominently in the debates over Kyoto, the government of Canada had it on its website. Actually the government of Canada quoted from it in a pamphlet they sent out to households across the country, and governments around the world did the same thing. Al Gore features it in his movie.” -- Minutes 0:23 to 2:20

Michael Coren: “... **Hold on, you are being very generous here.** The hockey stick was used time and time again, and in fact, it became almost iconic within the Global Warming movement. As you say, movies, and pamphlets sent out to people across Canada. **And you are not saying to me, it was never genuine, either because there was weak research, or even dishonest research, this is kafkaesque.**”

Ross McKittrick: “Well, what we found along the way was there was statistical errors, but one of the big problems was they'd used a contaminated dataset. They had about 400 input data series of these temperature proxies, but they way they were analyzing them was most of the data was thrown out, and there is one little segment of the dataset that all the results depended on, and they are called bristle cone pine series. It's a funny looking tree that grows mostly in Western United States and they grown very old. Thousand years old.

**But, people have long known, and the National Academy of Science has repeated this warning: you shouldn't use them for temperature reconstructions, because they have this hockey-stick shape that's got nothing to do with temperature.**

Well, it turned out that the hockey-stick graph was formed by taking these bristle cone pines and just putting all the weight on them.

**And the original author had redone his analysis taking this small number of bristle cone pines out, and the whole shape changes. The graph just loses its shape, it just becomes sort of noisy and nothing. So, they knew when they published this study.”**

Michael Coren: **“They lied!”**

Ross McKittrick: **“I wouldn't say they lied. I think what they did was they didn't disclose the fundamental weakness of the original result.”** ' -- Minute 4:42 to 6:20, conversation with Professor Ross McKittrick, The hockey stick is wrong and result of bad science, on Michael Coren Show <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1k4mFZr-gE>



As the above narratives brazenly disclose, one can't expect any effective policing of empire by those fed from the crumbs of empire, never mind unravel the hidden agendas! Just look at even Professor Ross McKittrick's apologetics on behalf of his fellow-scientist whose fraud he himself exposed, as being mere errors of omissions and not outright lying despite the acute probing by the interviewer. That modus operandi of crafty omissions and half-truths, as is examined later in this letter, is a full lie and the vulgar propagandists' key mechanism for manufacturing mantras, dissent, and consent for empire.

In any event, as the political science thesis contained in my aforementioned Letter to Editor argues, there is indeed a prime reason for **“cooking that science”** of climate-change. It is, quite un-surprisingly, along the same global axis as the prime reason for **“cooking the science”** of Swine Flu as already unraveled in The Swine Flu Chronicles 2009: Why to say 'No' to the Swine Flu Vaccine. See its Preamble for a succinct examination of the principle modus operandi in the globalists' own handwritings. In this case, it is to fabricate plausible

sounding justifications for legally ushering in the architecture of 'carbon credit', regardless of whether there is global warming, global cooling, or no significant temperature change. That is the real heart of the matter and the focus of heated debates for the past ten years being whether or not there is global climate change, as now in the climategate that there isn't, is a gigantic red herring.

**The point of focus shouldn't be the unraveling of the deception, but the unraveling of the crucial agendas behind the deception for which mantras are so painstakingly fabricated and consent manufactured.**

As both, Zen wisdom and forensic science dictate, these revelations are ***“like a finger pointing away to the moon – don't concentrate on the finger or you will miss all that heavenly glory”!***

That Letter to Editor noted above examined the 'why' question, quoting from an earlier analysis of Global Warming:

'And as is entirely obvious from Mr. Gideon Rachman's article why this is politically motivated, the reasons become clear why this confusion is deliberately being created. If you accept the Capitalist conspiracy for world government, as I have described it, and if you accept the NSSM-200 agenda for population reduction as I have also described it, tying in the hand of Rockefeller to the UN and their agenda for population reduction (citations for these statements are in my various essays), then you must realize why the ruling elite wants to control 'life activity', and carbon-credit is their architecture of control!

It is somewhat akin to acquiring control of a nation's money supply in the guise of managing the economy better. Few in the public understand why such a control is bad anyway, but those who do try to understand it are thrown layers upon layers of obfuscation. Something similar is happening here. Think of acquiring control of 'carbon-credits' almost equivalent to acquiring control of a nation's money supply! This will control every aspect of sustaining life, just as control of money determines every aspect of sustaining the economy. You name it, between the two of them, it will control it in a world-government. And the first recipient of these controls, the carbon-credit specifically, is the developing world, the Global South, because that is where development must be arrested, and populations thinned out! Just as control of money was first

exercised where there was a superfluity of industry and commerce, control of 'carbon-credit' is intended to be exercised where there is a superfluity of populations aspiring to grow their nascent economies!' -- NB: On Global Warming December 12, 2008

And it is instructive to juxtapose all of that perspective with the motivation for population control expressed by David Rockefeller at the UN Ambassadors dinner, as transcribed in Project Humanbeingsfirst's Monetary Reform Bibliography:

“Ironically however, the very innovations that are making possible dramatic improvements in human well-being are also creating new problems which raise the spectre of an alarming and possibly catastrophic disaster to the biosphere we live in. And herein lies the dilemma that we all face. Let me illustrate. Improved public health, has caused the world's infant mortality rate to decline by 60 percent over the last 40 years. In the same period, the world's average life expectancy has increased from 46 years in 1950s to 63 years today. This is a development which as individuals we can only applaud. However the result of these positive measures is that the world population that has risen during the same short period of time geometrically to almost 6 billion people, and can exceed easily 8 billion by the year 2020.

**The negative impact of population growth on all of our planetary ecosystems is becoming appallingly evident. The rapid growing exploitation of the world's supply of energy and water is a matter of deep concern. And the toxic by products of widespread industrialization and increased atmospheric pollution to dangerous levels. Unless nations will agree to work together to tackle these cross-border challenges posed by population growth over consumption of resources and environmental degradation, prospects for a decent life on our planet will be threatened. The recent UN meeting in Cairo is appropriately focussed on one of these key issues, population growth.**

But the controversies which have erupted at the conference illustrate the problem of coming to grips with issues that are deeply divisive and which have a profound moral dimension. The United Nations can and should play an essential role in helping the world find a satisfactory way of stabilizing the world

population and stimulating economic development in a manner that is sensitive to religious and moral considerations.

**Economic growth is of course an inevitable corollary of a growing population, and is essential to improved standards of living. But without careful coordination, unrestrained economic growth poses further threats to our environment.**

This was a major subject of discussion at the conference in Rio de Janeiro on the environment two years ago. The focus then was on sustainable growth, and global development. It was pointed out at the conference that growth is most efficiently managed by the private sector, but regulation of the process by national governments and international bodies is also needed. And once again, United Nations can certainly be among the catalysts and coordinators of this process.” -- David Rockefeller, United Nations Ambassador's Dinner, hosted by the Business Council for the United Nations, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ClqUcScwnn8>



So many learned people betray shock and surprise by climategate that they betray their own pathetic ignorance of the doctrinal craftsmanship of empire. Yes, and among them are the most brilliant scientists on the planet – a phenomenon I call the **“ignorance of the learned”**. Some are pleased or have the 'told you so' reaction, and some just pooh-pooh it as insignificant, but few betray any deep forensic comprehension of the full import of the Machiavellian agenda behind the mantra now becoming unraveled. I haven't bothered studying these leaked materials since the confirmation they proclaim is a waste of my time. **As the good Dr. Tim Ball candidly stated, it also gives me absolutely no pleasure to receive**

**confirmation that I see the tortuous reality for what it is.** I'll examine their details when it becomes pertinent to some analysis I am doing. These climategate leaks contain no profound knowledge which can benefit me – and that's because Hari Seldon's statecraft of 'psychohistory', I mean Machiavellian political science, predicts the hijacking of hard-science as well as social-science accurately. It is manifest across the board.

And Dr. Tim Ball acutely put his finger on the precise modus operandi used in imperial science today as its key loci of control for conferring credibility and respectability to priesthood for inclusion into empire's officially approved churches: the **peer-review** process. I call it “**incestuous science**”! The peer-review process cannot approve or adjudicate, by definition, anything outside of the conventional wisdom endorsed by the peers of empire if the science ever goes against the principal interests of empire. So, while it can work well for science which does not challenge empire's interests or entrenched prevailing wisdom, peer-review has undeniably become a bloody scam to promote establishment's own agendas, to issue grants, to authenticate pseudo-scientific plausible-sounding justifications for pre-determined outcomes, and to see who falls in line for further reward and who qualifies for ostracization.

This should be self-evident irrespective of the climategate brouhaha. Page 101 of John Perkins 2004 book “**Confessions of the Economic Hitman**” for instance, also reveals an example of the perverse respectability gained from peer-review publishing of entirely bogus mathematical econometric-theory in furtherance of the hegemonic agenda for diabolically acquiring control over developing nations and their natural resources. This is what John Perkins confesses in the opening pages of Chapter 17, titled *Panama Canal Negotiations and Graham Greene*:

'Bruno came up with an idea for an innovative approach to forecasting: an econometric model based on the writings of a turn-of-the-century Russian mathematician. The model involved assigning subjective probabilities to predictions that certain specific sectors of an economy would grow. It seemed an ideal tool to justify the inflated rates of increase we liked to show in order to obtain large loans, and Bruno asked me to see what I could do with the concept.

... By 1977, I had built a small empire that included a staff of around twenty professionals headquartered in our Boston office, and a stable consultants from MAIN's other departments and offices scattered across the globe. I had become the youngest partner in the firm's hundred-year history. In addition to my title of

Chief Economist, I was named manager of Economics and Regional Planning. I was lecturing at Harvard and other venues, and newspapers were soliciting articles from me about current events. I owned a sailing yacht that was docked in Boston Harbor next to the historic battleship *Constitution*, “Old Ironsides”, renowned for subduing the Barbary pirates not long after the Revolutionary War. I was being paid an excellent salary and I had equity that promised to elevate me to the rarified heights of millionaire well before I turned forty. True, my marriage had fallen apart, but I was spending time with beautiful and fascinating women in several continents.

... [With that as background] I brought a young MIT mathematician, Dr. Nadipuram Prasad, into my department and gave him a budget. Within six months he developed the Markov method for econometric modeling. Together we hammered out a series of technical papers that presented Markov as a revolutionary method for forecasting the impact of infrastructure investment on economic development.

It was exactly what we wanted: a tool that scientifically “proved” we were doing countries a favor by helping them incur debts they would never be able to pay off. In addition, only a highly skilled econometrician with lots of time and money could possibly comprehend the intricacies of Markov or question its conclusions. The papers were published by several prestigious organizations, and we formally presented them at conferences and universities in a number of countries. The papers – and we – became famous throughout the industry.'

And specifically, returning to climategate, in the case of the first author of climategate sciences in the service of empire, John L. Daly wrote the following of Michael Mann in [The 'Hockey Stick': A New Low in Climate Science](#):

### **'Michael Mann**

At the time he published his 'Hockey Stick' paper, Michael Mann held an adjunct faculty position at the University of Massachusetts, in the Department of Geosciences. He received his PhD in 1998, and a year later was promoted to Assistant Professor at the University of Virginia, in the Department of Environmental Sciences, at the age of 34.

He is now the Lead Author of the 'Observed Climate Variability and Change' chapter of the IPCC Third Assessment Report (TAR-2000), and a contributing author on several other chapters of that report. The Technical Summary of the report, echoing Mann's paper, said: "The 1990s are likely to have been the warmest decade of the millennium, and 1998 is likely to have been the warmest year."

Mann is also now on the editorial board of the 'Journal of Climate' and was a guest editor for a special issue of 'Climatic Change'. He is also a 'referee' for the journals Nature, Science, Climatic Change, Geophysical Research Letters, Journal of Climate, JGR-Oceans, JGR-Atmospheres, Paleo oceanography, Eos, International Journal of Climatology, and NSF, NOAA, and DOE grant programs. (In the 'peer review' system of science, the role of anonymous referee confers the power to reject papers that are deemed, in the opinion of the referee, not to meet scientific standards).

He was appointed as a 'Scientific Adviser' to the U.S. Government (White House OSTP) on climate change issues.

Mann lists his 'popular media exposure' as including - "CBS, NBC, ABC, CNN, CNN headline news, BBC, NPR, PBS (NOVA/Frontline), WCBS, Time, Newsweek, Life, US News & World Report, Economist, Scientific American, Science News, Science, Rolling Stone, Popular Science, USA Today, New York Times, New York Times (Science Times), Washington Post, Boston Globe, London Times, Irish Times, AP, UPI, Reuters, and numerous other television/print media" [17].

Mann's career highlights a serious problem with the modern climate sciences, namely the 'star' system where high-profile scientists are promoted swiftly to influential positions in the industry. Such a star system reduces a science to the level of Hollywood.'

Unfortunately, the last passage in the aforementioned complete quote is where John L. Daly too failed to appreciate the import of Science in the Service of Empire, narrowly pinning the problem as only plaguing "*modern climate sciences*".

It should be evident to all men and women of science that neither Darwin nor Galileo would

ever have passed peer-review. The fact that genuine scientists seeking the peer review process don't seem to care about this blatant obviousness which is even rooted in historical precedence, suggests that they wisely choose to remain within the allowable confines of acceptable research, i.e., funded research, even when they have no diabolical or mal intent of their own. The control in science is exercised in a manner not too dissimilar to permitting vigorous and contrarian social debate within an allowable spectrum to give the illusion of free speech and freedom of thought! Those falling outside the allowable limits are of course variously labeled and marginalized.

Thus, while no one may challenge the sacred-cow Holocaust™ narrative in the EU or Canada without going to jail as everyone already knows, debating and developing competing theories on Islamofascism and maligning Islam and its Prophets is greatly encouraged as the epitome of freedom of speech and profound intellectualism. **But challenging the very premise of Osama Bin Laden or 'Radical Islam' is frowned upon, and will likely soon be labeled 'terrorism' if it isn't already.** Rendition can't be that far behind. Nevertheless, it is still easier to survive being marginalized in the social discourse arena. But quite impossible to do so in science which has become a big budget operation requiring institutional support and endorsement.

That abuse of science, the “**incestuous science**”, in the present vaccination drive for the swine flu forms the underpinning of this [Note on Vaccination](#) which expresses a unique concern that is still largely outside the many paradigms of concern expressed by many of the nay-sayers in their own formulations of why they are against the swine flu vaccine, or against vaccination in general:

'My immediate concern is the latter which includes an entire gamut of political abuse, from eugenics to GMO foods to epidemics – which harvests justifications and techniques from science and technology – all for population culling and elimination. It's akin to abusing Islam to create the fabled enemy of 'Islamism' for a war-making agenda – whether or not there is some inherent deficiency in the religion is irrelevant and orthogonal to its political abuse for “imperial mobilization”.' -- [The Swine Flu Chronicles 2009: Why to say 'No' to the Swine Flu Vaccine](#)

The aforementioned concern is even more eloquently voiced by the polymath Spanish Benedictine nun at San Benet of Montserrat's Monastery in Barcelona, Dr. Teresa Forcades,

with the peerless credentials: Physician specialist in Internal Medicine, Ph.D. in Public Health, and Degree in Theology from Harvard University.



And that full spectrum abuse of science, the **“incestuous science”** in the service of empire, is the crucial heart of the matter today.

The fact that we see it occurring repeatedly across the board – from the government sanctioned official but absurd NIST report on how the WTC towers catastrophically collapsed into their own footprints on 911, to the fraudulent climate-change science of Global Warming, to the brazenly criminal medical science of swine flu pandemic promulgated by government sanctioned official bodies like WHO and CDC – minimally shows how science is being perversely used in the service of empire. What a tortuous implementation of Sir Francis Bacon's drive to inter-link the pursuit of the nascently emerging Western science in the 17th century with imperial funding from the superpower du jour, in order to more effectively deploy the harvest of science in the service of humanity (and of course empire): **“human knowledge and human power meet in one”!**

It is immensely interesting to also note in passing that Noam Chomsky insisted on 911 science be peer-reviewed before he'd read the papers written by Jones et. al. And when it finally got published by a maverick online journal (I sent a thank you note to them), my dear professor Noam Chomsky – to whom I will forever remain indebted as the teacher who actually taught me to think critically – insisted that he will wait for other credible scientists in that domain to critique it before reading and/or offering his own opinion as he was not a domain expert in how tall buildings collapse, and that letting the domain experts sort it out first in peer-reviewed journals is the acceptable process of science!

What a new born baby octogenarian – or perhaps Noam Chomsky had understood rather well

that going against the grain on 911 would be severely career limiting for any technical domain expert, and thus it was, and perhaps still is, safe to argue in this way? A specious red herring? Or merely intellectual convolutions to continue echoing empire's sacred-cow axioms of ***“imperial mobilization”*** while appearing to challenge its deadly expression?

Does it take a domain expert, or some ordinary un co-opted commonsense observation to realize that this free-fall symmetrical collapse into its own footprint suspiciously looks like controlled demolition, and that this and this catastrophic instantaneous powdering of tall buildings into fine dust are hardly the gravity collapse of a standing steel structure due to fire; never mind the fact that no response from empire's imposing air defense systems on that ill-fated day when the hijacking drama was unfolding smacks of active collusion at the highest levels of the US military high-command; and therefore, minimally, to pin 911 on Osama Bin Laden based on some newly discovered faith in officialdom after a life of dissent is profoundly anti-intellectual?

All are empire's own multifaceted instruments of public relations, as well as its “approved science”, and its “approved dissent”. The political abuse of science to serve hegemonic agendas is a monumental scam, and Dr. Ball's following terse expression is very perceptive:

“... [in the debate about the hockey-stick] these people are all publishing together, and they all peer-reviewing each other's literature. So there is a classic example of [incestuous self-reinforcement] ... **why are they pushing the peer-review issue so big, why are they saying well, you haven't published peer-review ... and now of course we realize is because they have control over their own process.** That's clearly exposed in these emails. On a global scale it is frightening.... they control the IPCC. They manipulated that ... The IPCC has become the basis in all governments for the Kyoto Protocol, the Coopenhagen Accord, and so on!” Minute 1:20, Tim Ball, Op. cit.

Anecdotally, I will recall for you some interesting personal experiences of the abuse of peer review by individuals. In the late 1980s when I worked as a development engineer in a computer company, my new office-mate, a recent Ph.D. from a very reputed top school in the United States and only 25 years of age (he celebrated his 25th birthday after his first day at work), had published almost 20 or so papers on the operating system he had worked on for his Ph.D. thesis. In any case it was a large number of papers, I may be forgetting the precise number. So, one day, having nothing better to do, I read all his published papers that were

listed on his imposing resume – there was no web at the time, and only hardcopy of these papers existed which he fortunately had in the office. I also read his Ph.D. thesis. And I was very puzzled. 90% of the content in the refereed and conference papers was identical. To my mind, the differences didn't warrant new papers, only perhaps separate sections, and at most 2 or 3 papers. So I asked him about it. He candidly told me that this is how the game is played, and that those who didn't play it, paid the price. This scholarship inflation is indeed rewarded with academic respectability, not just in academe, but in corporate research as well. A few years later, another graduate student in computer science developed a fancy piece of software to automatically synthesize an entirely gibberish but plausible sounding paper in context by scanning words and sentences in already published papers, and submitted his genius to one or more peer-reviewed journals.

My god – one of them actually published it. I do not recall the full details now, except that the gallant chap also sent in a note informing them how the paper was created. And as I vaguely remember, there was both amusement, and minor discussion on the poor peer-review process by over-worked professors, but no major scandal. Obviously! And lastly, a few years ago when I briefly consulted for a big-shot scientist in Pakistan, when he introduced himself to me by saying he had 600 publications to his credit, I recalled for him that possibly the mightiest physicist of the 20th century after Einstein, the Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman of Caltech, had only 37 or so published papers, and that how did he get so many. I can't even remember this inflated egoist's answer today!

All this isn't “**incestuous science**” per se and is perhaps more akin to tolerable noise in any system. But it does show that the glorified peer review is far from being the pristine scientific process that it is made out to be, and that people will be people, and when quantity of publications is incentivized, they will routinely find clever ways to harness the process for their own narrow interests which may have nothing to do with the science per se in no less measure than the ruling establishment.

The same arguments are easily extended to the examination and granting of patents, fancifully called the intellectual property rights. All of my patent filings for instance were primarily a business decision made by the corporation to create a patent portfolio as a currency of barter in patent infringement lawsuits. I doubt very much that the patent examiners anywhere have the wherewithal to know what is prior art and what isn't, as all engineering and technology fields have exponentially grown since the concept of patenting was invented as a business tool to allow entrepreneurs to capitalize on their product inventions for a limited time. That has

today transformed into the abhorrent WTO extortion racket to mainly prey upon the developing nations!

Dear M, returning to the Machiavellian political science which lends so much insight into almost everything man endeavors, it is almost as if my favorite science fiction novelist, the galaxologist Isaac Asimov, was vicariously projecting Hari Seldon's psycho-historical calculations for guiding the course of "future-history" of his fictional empire on the vast intergalactic canvas, as a profound clue to mankind to get them to forensically comprehend manufactured reality. Just like Plato had done in his *Myth of the Cave*, 2500 years earlier.

People in the West tend to go all gaga when an obvious conspiracy is finally revealed to be true, as in this case of climategate. But worse, many of them tend to focus on its how-whiz minutiae when the iron is hot instead of doing something useful with it, and then simply move-on deeming the scandal to be a one-of case of some misguided policy gone awry or case of individual corruption. And at best, a nefarious but myopic agenda which is not related to any other agenda of the establishment. This armchair anguish also remained the case with the revealing of the Iran-Contra scandal in the 1980s which momentarily riveted the attention of the American public. No one at the time questioned why was America criminally assisting the two neighborly countries of Iran and Iraq to fight each other to death; only that it did this in some non-kosher way. The exact same thing is once again transpiring in climategate. Few are focussing on connecting the dots towards a bigger picture – deliberately missing the Zen of political science.

This circumscribing of the imagination in the erudite Western intellect is almost as if the Western mind has been calculatingly indoctrinated into the notion that the pursuit of sciences is a pristine, highly objective endeavor of incredibly moral supermen devoid of any political agendas in promulgating the objectives of empire that funds it. It is akin to the Eastern mind long having become attuned to the notion of predestination because of which it silently continues to suffer its fate at the hands of its own oligarchy. Each half of the world, apparently, are wont to sacrifice different half of their brain at the altar of their respective feudal priestdoms.

The military-industrial complex of America for instance is entirely scientist driven at its technological forefronts. This is plainly visible and openly conducted, and therefore, not one sane person in the world would deny that such science and technology pursuits entirely serve the interests of Western hegemony.

But when caught in a lie for executing far more diabolical objectives of the hectoring hegemony in circuitous ways – because these may not be articulated or pursued so openly even when it is not a state-secret and the information is available to anyone – the Western intellect suddenly fails! How could these scientists possibly have been working for the establishment's own Machiavellian agendas – it must surely be that they were merely personally corrupted at best, or just did “poor science” in an incestuous cabal. The “lone-gunman” theory of sciencegate!

In making better guns and bigger bombs, bioweapons and econometrics, and other assorted technetronic-gadgets for empire that enables backing its MacDonald franchises with McDonnell Douglas, since all of it is an open enterprise, no one doubts that scientists and technicians work for empire and are generously rewarded for it. In fact, it is even bandied about with great eloquence:

**“The hidden hand of the market will never work without a hidden fist -- McDonald's cannot flourish without McDonnell Douglas, the builder of the F-15. And the hidden fist that keeps the world safe for Silicon Valley's technologies is called the United States Army, Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps.”** -- Thomas L. Friedman, A Manifesto for the Fast World, NYT March 28, 1999

But to make the multi-pronged complex architecture of diabolical control of humanity possible, well, that just can't be. That is just conspiracy theory! So let's just narrowly concentrate only on the facts that have been disclosed ... like why the sum of squares goes negative in the source code of climategate!

As is amply evident over the past few weeks since the climategate scandal broke, almost all people of scientific acumen continue to focus on the fascinating mechanics of how Mann et. al., said their “gun” worked, but it actually didn't! So bad-bad-scientists. Let's just clean up the climate sciences of its rotten eggs and move-on. This attitude is clearly visible in almost all the stellar conversations on climategate in cyberspace even among the academics. Especially among the academics! See for instance this open letter by Prof. Judith Curry, and her editorial.

This tunnel vision isn't limited to climategate however, but permeates all imperial mantras the most prominent and most deadly to date of course being the “**Global War on Terror**”. I look forward to the day when similar email revelations will show how 911 was an inside job and how any challenge to the official narrative was to be suppressed, including in science publications and only the Popular Science version which elaborated on the NIST science was to be

promulgated. At that time, all the uber intelligent beings will once again similarly become fixated with the minutiae of the obvious. But yesterday, as today, when boldly asserting so by influential men and women of science could surely have derailed ***“imperial mobilization”*** to Afghanistan and Iraq thus preventing all the horrendous crimes against humanity which followed, it remained a conspiracy theory of the lunatic fringes who saw gods in the sky.

My all time favorite physicist of Pakistan, the MIT literate prodigy, Dr. Pervez Hoodbhoy, the scholar who contributed his own punditry to the mantra of Islamism in dialectical penmanship to Daniel Pipes' in erudite prose like “Between Imperialism and Islamism” and “The Threat From Within”, once wrote me in response to my trying to get him to see that Bin Laden couldn't have done 911 as WTC collapses looked like controlled demolition and that he, Hoodbhoy, was failing to connect all the dots which clearly lead to puppetmasters, saying something to the effect: ~ ***“remember how our ancestors connected the dots in the sky and saw all those shapes as their gods...”***.

So henceforth, Pervez Hoodbhoy judiciously avoided connecting the dots lest he too be misled into seeing things that aren't there, while of course finding it infinitely pleasurable to continue echoing the mantras and axioms of empire. Not only MIT trained scientists, but apparently almost all major scientists and scholars of any IVY and other lofty pedigree are pregnant with imperial wisdom in that way.

These brilliant scholars only see puppetshows, and painstakingly describe them, but never go towards uncovering the forces which drive them. Since I have already described their salient characteristics in detail before, let me just reproduce it here as its worthwhile to relate that to the topic at hand:

- None of them betray that they possess long term memories, or any comprehension of even recent history that can be contextualized to the present.
- None of them seem to have heard of 'covert-ops' and 'black-ops'; none of them have read the shrewd analysis of the imperial thinkers themselves of the necessity of real mobilizing pretexts such as the *“New Pearl Harbor”* and *“clear and present danger”* as otherwise *“Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization”*.
- None of them apparently understand that covert-ops while they are operational and active, are meant to be secretive and mendacious, which is why they are called 'covert', and that their unraveling necessitates perceptively seeing beyond what's

being deliberately made manifest and what's being insisted upon as **'two plus two equals five'** - for hard receipts for them will only be uncovered by historians through the famed declassification process post faits accomplis.

- Thus all of these 'astute' thinkers, commentators, and media pundits none too miraculously reach the same minimal and common conclusion space regardless of their own starting thesis or the circuitous routes taken in their analysis and speculations, that at the bare minimum, the scourge of 'fundamentalism' and 'militant Islam' needs to be checked with renewed commitment in the global 'war on terror', or else no one in the 'civilized world' would remain safe from these antiquated Taliban style 'evil jihadis' and 'al qaeeda'. That root of terror has now been successfully showcased as residing in Pakistan – the *'Terror Central'*!
- It is indeed deemed a 'clash of civilizations', not of the East and the West titans, but of 'radical antiquated militant Islam' and the rest of civilized humanity! That *"Today [even] if one could wipe America off the map of the world with a wet cloth, mullah-led fanaticism will not disappear"*, as the distinguished native-informant par excellence, the world class physicist Pervaiz Hoodbhoy, has conclusively observed in his latest analysis of the matter in "Preventing More Lal Masjids", and which he had earlier explored in great analytical depth in "The Threat From Within". And none [too] surprisingly, echoing the same mantra of Pakistan becoming a 'terrorist sanctuary' [as] CNN a few days ago [which] aired the documentary by Nick Richardson "Pakistan - The Threat Within". The unanimity of this conclusion space is scary to say the least – at least for us Pakistanis.
- It would appear that the world's leading thinkers, journalists, newsmedia, scholars and leaders *"united we stand"* that Pakistan poses a serious threat to world peace! **Not the hectoring hegemony who have cleverly utilized 911 "to goosestep the Herrenvolk across international frontiers"** in what only appears to be another 'operation canned goods' or the 'Reichstag fire' or the much coveted 'New Pearl Harbor' to achieve the 'transformation of [its] forces' to achieve 'full spectrum dominance' over the planet and outerspace, **but my wretched lands of the ancient Indus valley, and my wretched peoples – we are the world threat!** -- Saving Pakistan from Synthetic 'Terror Central' - Orchestration of 'Lal Masjid' – a precursor to 'shock and awe'? July 13-23, 2007.

In the light of what is transpiring in Pakistan today, it is not at all prescient that Pervez Hoodbhoy should have written the following in his ode to Daniel Pipes: "The Threat From Within". In response to it, I had been compelled to write to dissent-specialist Hoodbhoy that had there not been an author's name in that document and someone had asked me to guess who had written it, I would have easily guessed Daniel Pipes. Take a look at the following passage for instance:

### **'Is Radical Islam Inevitable?**

With the large and growing popular sentiment against Musharraf and his army, one cannot rule out the possibility that in the years ahead nuclear armed Pakistan may fall under a neo-Taliban style Salafi-Wahabi-Deobandi leadership allied with conservative senior military leaders. If it does, then Pakistan could become the world's most dangerous state. But, although possible, it is certainly not inevitable – countervailing forces work against this nightmare scenario.' -- Pervez Hoodbhoy, Pakistan – The Threat From Within, Pakistan Security Research Unit (PSRU), Brief Number 13, 23rd May 2007.

The crafty Machiavellian omissions present in that saintly expression of fear by uber physicist Pervez Hoodbhoy: "***in the years ahead nuclear armed Pakistan may fall under a neo-Taliban style Salafi-Wahabi-Deobandi leadership allied with conservative senior military leaders. If it does, then Pakistan could become the world's most dangerous state***", was once again most recently dismantled in Response to 'Wahabization- Salafization of Pakistan and Muslim Ummah : Fighting the Terrorists But Supporting Their Ideology'.

It is respected scholars like these – hiding behind academic freedom of speech and the press – who continually manufacture disinformation as agents, assets, and sayanim of the Mighty Wurlitzer that has caused me to waste so much of my precious time penning the million obvious words on my website to refute their half-truths and Machiavellian spins, for **it takes a sentence to construct a lie, considerably more space and time to refute it.** Noam Chomsky had himself noted this bit of truism, I am sure realizing its full import for his own writings of crucial omissions. And who has the time to read the long refutations even if someone bothers to diligently offer them, even inviting a riposte? Those being refuted simply ignore it. None may withstand the glare of truth in bright sunlight except those wearing sunglasses!

Omission, the cardinal sin of all totalitarian propagandists when they do purvey half-truths

instead of outright full lies – which, as Gary Null put it, “**there is an old Jewish saying, a half truth is a full lie**” – is even more effective for deception. Aldous Huxley had insightfully noted its impact in the (circa 1946) Preface to his 1931 novel *Brave New World*:

‘The greatest triumphs of propaganda have been accomplished, not by doing something, but by refraining from doing. **Great is truth, but still greater, from a practical point of view, is silence about truth.** By simply not mentioning certain subjects, by lowering what Mr. Churchill calls and “iron curtain” between the masses and such facts or arguments as the local political bosses regard as undesirable, totalitarian propagandists have influenced opinion much more effectively than they could have done by the most eloquent denunciations, the most compelling of logical rebuttals.’ -- Aldous Huxley, pg. 11, *Brave New World*

And this appears to be how science and scientists are both put to work for echoing the message of empire. Through calculated omissions and retaining the sacred-cow axioms, be it pertaining to hard science, such as in this climatology scam and in the 911 NIST report scam, or related to social science as in the 911 Commission Report scam in order to perpetuate the same political theology of empire while appearing to investigate it.

This modus operandi is what we had been seeing of the Global Warming mantra even before the climategate brouhaha erupted. Awarding of the Nobel Prize to Al Gore only added Public Relations manufacturing to the game. Now, all new born baby pundits may also verifiably glean how the establishment was pulling its invisible strings to fabricate the mantras and the silence about truth. It didn't seem to have worked to the establishment's complete satisfaction this time around – but in how many other cases has it worked, and is still working?

Science is a blatant instrument of empire when it is necessary for it to be so, even when the scientists might proclaim themselves innocent like the new-born baby. Interestingly, or perhaps sadly, many whom I know personally do tend to behave as if they were indeed born yesterday when it comes to comprehending dialectical social engineering! They often proclaim, when their naïveté is challenged, that political science is not their field – as if it requires a Ph.D. to know when is one being taken for a ride on the horns of erudite gibberish!

Are the mighty men and women of science really all that much different from any astute politician? While one may pen much prose to show the reasons for their apparent gullibility, from self-deception to actual collusion, from having accepted or told one lie to the necessity of accepting and/or narrating subsequent lies until the soul is in so deep that it can't extricate

itself either mentally or physically, etceteras, the undeniable fact remains that ultimately, both the politician and the scientists are fed from the same coffers and therefore serve the same ruling interests. If they didn't, or if they made waves, they'd be out. Those who ultimately control the purse strings control the research as well as the opinions. The paymasters decide the science that gets funded, and the science which is not pursued. This is most brazenly obvious in the Big-pharma led medical science today that is pushing vaccination, vaccines, and other toxic cocktails to the exclusion of all natural and alternate remedies.

And who doesn't open their mouth wide for the great benefits – both tangibles and intangibles – to be accrued from cooperating with the ruling wisdom, and minimally, for the opportunity to passionately pursue well-funded science in the mainstream and earn all its rewards of respectability and a productive career? Who will jeopardize that?

Only genuine 'conspiracy theorists'!

The entire barrel of apples is rotten to the core! The intellectual corruption of modernity has amazingly seeped into all fabrics of society, almost without exception, from organized religion to organized science and everything in between. And the primemover source of that corruption is namely one today! It is the one with the deepest and most infinitely replenished pockets to spend on all that is vile disguised as philanthropy, the pursuit of science, the humanities, the arts, and for the good of high society. Some of it of course is. But the good is also a veneer to pursue world-domination agendas of those who rule from behind the scenes. A patient but forensic read of Prof. Carroll Quigley's seminal history text of empire "Tragedy and Hope" makes that abundantly clear. In his commentary on that text, the following statement of W. Cleon Skousen sheds the most pertinent light on the calculated "ignorance of the learned":

'The real value of Tragedy and Hope ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr. Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were "in on the take" and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes. **As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on**

**a world-wide basis.'** -- W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, pg. 6

Oligarchs have of course always existed, and presumably always will. Aldous Huxley noted in his famous talk in 1962 at Berkeley that the rulers getting the serfs to love their own voluntary servitude would be the **“ultimate revolution”** in social control. That notion, of puppetmasters seeking ways and means to control the populace, is simply empirical.

Indeed, since time immemorial, the kingmaker has been either a god, or the oligarchs. And some uber skeptics even argue that our entire conception of organized religion is an invention too. I don't quite go that far unless the Anunaki arrive from planet Nibiru in my own lifetime. Then, I might perhaps concede the obviously compelling argument that all controlling dogmas on planet earth were indeed fabricated instruments of social cohesion and control throughout our social evolution, and which, going forward in our continued evolution according to the prevailing tenets of social Darwinianism, is to be replaced by Adam Wieshaupt's Secular Humanism. But I doubt I'll ever stop being a **theist** even then, for I can't imagine believing that we are merely an extended amoeba without a soul! Those who don't need that 'crutch' are certainly mightier than I. They are welcome to their superman state.

And to take on these 'ubermensch' in every generation, and to keep them in check, is the only way to keep the real primemover of evil also in check. That dialectical Manichean struggle automatically enables, and is otherwise also culpable, for all the good or evil that follows.

That is clearly the responsibility of us all. But only the 'idle conspiracy theorists' seem to recognize it, or want to take it on as a moral imperative.

So, I am writing this letter to you, my dear co-conspiracy theorist M, for pondering the profound question: **how can this general polymath wisdom of Hari Seldon's political-science be shared with others before it becomes mainstream confirmation; before it becomes fait accompli?**

Ex post facto, when it is time for it to become history for public consumption, of course all will see it. Like the old proverb says, something to the effect, they come running with the news after all the barbers in town already know! And they laugh their way to their bank penning their narratives, with lofty prizes and prestigious titles awarded them by the very instruments of empire they appear to hector before their flock.

My teacher Noam Chomsky, is perhaps the most egregious example of this. The New York

Times called him “*arguably the most important intellectual alive*”. Indeed he is. His imposing books are undeniably the most exhaustive compilation of the crimes of empire. But in critically examining his prolific life of dissent without being snowed in by his voluminous body of work, at least on two of the gravest moments in any ordinary intellectual's life, never mind the “**most important intellectual alive**”, when the most urgent need of the hour was to publicly show bold skepticism for the narratives of power, Noam Chomsky persisted in exactly echoing the core sacred-cow axioms of empire. From the officially promulgated lone-gunman theory of JFK assassination, to the officially promulgated 19 hijackers theory of 911, he cleverly echoed the sacred-cow axioms of empire even in his dissent!

While Noam Chomsky has eruditely accused empire of manufacturing consent by deceiving the public, I strongly suspect him of manufacturing dissent to effectively assist the empire at the most crucial times in the same. To me, the New York Times awarding that title to an intellectual like him is akin to awarding the Nobel Peace prize to Jimmy Carter – as both a reward for a job well done for empire, and to help fabricate a dissent-chief for the malcontents resisting empire. The epithet proudly adorns Noam Chomsky's many books and has surely helped him acquire a prestige which even prompted a notable rebel leader like President Chavez of Venezuela, to wave one of his books from the United Nations as the epitome of moral resistance to empire.

So I ask you in conclusion dear M, is there any intellectual discourse at all possible to explain all this to others, and have one see not only its palpable wisdom, but also the categorical imperatives that automatically spring from it, which, if one voluntarily shirks responsibility for, one acquires the blood of an accomplice on one's hands?

Or, would only the Charles Dickens' character, Madame Defarge, with her guillotine basket, provide the right motivation to enable one to call reality the way it is in this age of atheistic relativism when spiritualism is dead even for many a pious savant still on the prayer mat?

Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim, [Project Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org)

**Source URL:** <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate.html>

**Mirror URL:** <http://bloghumanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/2009/11/30/letter-to-a-co-conspiracy-theorist-reflections-on-modernity-climategate-peer-review-and-science-in-the-service-of-empire-by-zahir-ebrahim/>

**Source PDF (no video version):** <http://humanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/files/2011/06/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate-nov302009i.pdf>

**Source PDF (original version):** <http://humanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/files/2009/11/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate-nov302009.pdf>

---

The author, an ordinary researcher and writer on contemporary geopolitics, a minor justice activist, grew up in Pakistan, studied EECS at MIT, engineered for a while in high-tech Silicon Valley (<http://tinyurl.com/zahir-patents>), and retired early to pursue other responsible interests. His maiden 2003 book was rejected by countless publishers and can be read on the web at <http://PrisonersoftheCave.org>. He may be reached at <http://Humanbeingsfirst.org>. Verbatim reproduction license and use of copyrighted material at <http://humanbeingsfirst.org#Copyright>.

---

First Published: 11/30/2009 12:00:06 8897 | Last updated (no video) 06/17/11 10:00:11 9159