

Letter to Climate@MIT : Is Climate Science Religion or Science?

To: The 22 distinguished faculty members of the MIT Program in Atmospheres, Oceans and Climate who wrote a letter to President Trump

Date: Tuesday, October 30, 2018 at 12:00 pm | Last Updated October 31, 2018 at 04:00 PM

From: Zahir Ebrahim, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

Email: humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com

Email: zahir@alum.mit.edu

Dear respected 22 MIT Professors and Scientists of Climate@MIT :

Hello.

You collectively signed a most carefully worded [letter](#) to President Donald Trump over a year and half ago (dated March 2, 2017) in which you stated that you did not share the views of your colleague Dr. Lindzen who had previously written a [letter](#) (dated February 23, 2017) to the President asking him to withdraw from the UN climate convention, and that in your, and other overwhelming majority of scientists' who have devoted their professional lives to the careful study of climate science, collective view, the risks to the Earth systems associated with increasing levels of carbon dioxide are almost universally agreed by climate scientists to be real ones.

I found your short letter particularly careful in its omissions. You carefully chose not to make any observation on your beliefs on the actual cause of this increase in CO2 levels, nor advocate any solutions. In your letter you made it clear that your collective view disagreed with your colleague's call to withdraw from United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Whilst you explicitly raised the alarm on the potential dangers of high levels of CO2, your omissions make it unobvious to me just from reading your letter whether you also believe that the CO2 levels are man-made, and must be regulated down by international programs such as the Carbon Credit scheme, and the UN Agenda 21. In this letter I presume that you do. I invite correction on any misimpressions of which I am sure there may be a few. None are all knowing, including yourselves.

Of course, no sensible person, let alone a science professor at MIT, will think not to first massively plant new trees and replenish Rainforests and jungles on urgent war footings; not to first stop cutting down trees for housing for the Western world that principally uses timber for structures, and not to first stop clearing forests for cattle-feed farming and agriculture, especially in the Amazon basin and the Americas, that has pretty much drained the primary cleansing sink of human generated CO2 in the delicately balanced human-plant natural eco-system of earth.

Also, no sensible person will think not to first cut down on the pollutants created by heavy industries and multinational corporations; and not to first stop discharging pollutants into rivers and streams in the developing nations where regulations are not as strong as in the developed nations, whereby profit-optimizing multinational corporations headquartered in the West, easily get away with cost cutting short cuts of simply dumping many pollutants outside their factories untreated that they can't do in developed nations due to stricter laws and their stricter oversight.

If China is filling the air with industrial pollutants more than the United States today, the bulk of the end products of that pollution are still exported to the United States and Western countries. All the iphones are made in China but the biggest market and beneficiary is in America. The stock of the most valued company on earth, now surpassing one trillion dollars, and headquartered in California, USA, is traded on Wall Street USA. It goes up or down depending on how many iphones will be sold.

So, what sensible person will not think of first enforcing regulations at the parent source commissioning that pollution in China, before the pollution even gets manufactured downstream and is discharged into the environment 7,000 miles away?

What sensible person will not think that first all multinational corporations manufacturing or harvesting in developing nations for their lower labor costs and resource-richness, bear the cost of discharging their environmental pollutants and waste byproducts as if they were manufacturing in the advanced developed nations of the West where they are headquartered, and pay for the cleanup cost for their past sins?

After all, it is the same earth's atmosphere whether it is over China, Bangladesh, or the United States of America.

MIT in its LEES Lab under the directorship of the late Professor James R. Melcher, who was also my 6.013 teacher, had focused on research and development of advanced technological devices that clean up industrial effluents and air pollutants before these are discharged into the oceans and atmospheres, like the electrostatic precipitator, etc.

These high technologies take investment on the part of multinational corporations to develop and deploy even after these have left the research labs years ago, and why should they do that when they are not forced to, due to the weak regulations and special concessions under which they usually operate in poor nations? The burden then has to be carried by the common man in these impoverished nations who must suffer that cost in all its human and national dimensions, while the stock prices of the multinational corporations go up when their profit margins are higher, and the developed nations rejoice in their economic success. That success, of greed and primacy, creates a self-fulfilling prophecy for creating more environmental pollution – why alter the recipe for higher profit margins, and economic hegemony which comes with it, when one is not forced to?

Therefore, which sensible and moral human being concerned about the environment would not address that *most significant bit* of the matter first, by creating regulations for responsible manufacturing and subjecting all multinational corporations to these standards regardless of where they operate their industries, manufacturing bases, and agricultural farms for global food production, irrespective of whether manufacturing and work is subcontracted to other local corporations or not, and irrespective of what local incentives they might get from tin-pot governments and banana republics who help in the rape and exploitation of their own resource-rich and yet continually impoverished nations as surrogates of the *Economic Hit Men* who craft these mega deals?

Which sensible intellect will not first institute accountability for this mega corruption and exploitation upon the multinational corporations by the fiat of new regulatory laws that define standards for how multinational corporations must operate anywhere in the world, despite these corporations also being the backbone of the advanced military-industrial complex of the West that lends the Global North its supremacy and primacy over the Global South?

All commonsense and goodness first principles for having a cleaner global environment for all its peoples and future generations regardless of any existential crisis today including global warming, global cooling, climate change, or aliens landing.

But, just as no sensible person would think of living in a police state just because it makes the most stable system of governance and offers the most safety from common criminals, no sensible person will also think to put human beings in growth chains and to enslave mankind to the agendas of the elites in a global police state just to get rid of the high levels of CO₂. [See Footnote]

Would you agree with these general statements of commonsensical principles?

Who in their right human mind will not agree, except the *Übermensch* for whom mankind is mere cattle to be herded, culled, and harvested, and therefore, this is only a rhetorical question.

I wonder though, whether you, the distinguished climate focused scientists and narrow-gauged super-specialists at MIT who have devoted your professional lives to the careful study of climate science, are simply unaware of the actual forces driving the solution-spaces in the United Nations based on the alarmist attitude of climate scientists that global warming is man-made?

Are you scholars simply *innocent of knowledge* of the principal underlying political motivations that is funding your science globally?

These are not classified state secrets.

If you were indeed unaware, and truthfully believed in the nobility of tooth-fairies and their great concern for humanity and the earth's environment, so generously funding your climate science, and you only now become aware of the true dimensions of the impact of your life's work as a consequence of carefully reading this letter and the attached document, what would you do?

These are not rhetorical questions. These beg reflection and some soul searching.

Would you at least attempt to dig deeper into the matter I bring before you at my ordinary lay person's level, to ensure that you understand it at your own greater intellectual capacity such that if you still wish to be a willing part of this political agenda, someday in the future, you cannot, in good conscience, and on record, disclaim the famous oops: "I did not know" or "I was misled by ...", or the famous mea culpa: "I was only following orders"? I would like to have you on record now. You really can't think the world is made up of only fools and useful idiots, or intellects that are easily bought.

May I take the liberty to remind you, and other scientists reading this letter, of the fate of the Nazi philosopher at Nuremberg. He was hanged. The German scientists who had willingly enabled the Nazi war machine were of course more useful to keep alive than the Nazi philosopher who embellished the Nazi theology of the superiority of the German race, and were instead secretly squirreled over to the United States in *Operation Paperclip* to reenlist their talents and services for the war machine of the land of the free under new identities.

No moral grounds is the empirical reality of not just state power, but also those brilliant intellectuals whose lives and livelihood depend on the benevolence of the state. It is considered being shrewd and pragmatic to cut any deal. The Nazi rocket scientists were perhaps the most pragmatic scientists the world has ever seen.

Who said this:

“Once the rockets are up, who cares where they come down? That's not my department”

It is a shame that Donald Trump did not think of including their example in *The Art of Deal*. As post President, he may yet do so in its sequel as he is getting first hand experience of uber pragmatism in the international arena. The power of the superstate to corrupt and co-opt is not fairytale.

In the case of United State of America, unlike in the former USSR and Nazi state with their monolithic state control, the American superpower state is reflected not just in the political corridors of power that changes periodically like clockwork, but principally in its vast, mostly privatized, but state supported via contracts and grants, distributed, long-living military-industrial-academe-thinktank-trusts complex.

MIT is an integral and arguably a most important technological part of that global infrastructure and much of its funding comes from it, including the Pentagon, the NIH, and other federal bodies and corporations depending on the priority of the state at any given time.

So, it is not unfair to assert that all who work at MIT work for the military-industrial complex of the state in some capacity, by way their salaries are paid and their research funded. They are funded in their research only if they follow the values, policies, agendas and priorities of the military-industrial complex of the state. Scientists and researchers whose livelihood depends on grants, just naturally know this by how to get their grants approved, and how to get their papers published, and no one need come tell them what the state wants, or strong-arm them with an order as in petty dictatorships.

One can easily tell the priority of the state by what is funded and what isn't, what is published and what isn't, who or what is glorified and who or what is marginalized. One “chooses”, voluntarily, to be part of that privilege of being funded and rewarded when one cares more dearly about career, opportunities for advancement, social standing, accolades that follow, than take unpopular positions and go against the grain when it is clearly career limiting. Having tenure isn't propulsion for scientists dependent upon research grants to advance in their profession.

Today, opportunities for advancement in climate science is in finding scientific justification for global warming aka climate change as being man-made.

I suspect that all such climate researchers are well-funded who make that presupposition their axiom of research. The skeptics are left in want of research grants. In other words, the science of global warming is done, one way or another, and now they are hoping that empirical reality will catch up to their synthetic science!

Who said this:

“If anything, I would like to see the climate change happen, so the science could be proved right, regardless of the consequences. This isn't being political, it is being selfish.”

Speak of putting the cart before the horse!!

By the chauvinist attitudes betrayed, it is easy to conclude that establishment's climate scientists are hoping that the world would buy the sheer brilliance of their climate science with their eyes wide shut, because most normal people and governments are obviously not climate research specialists, and the gods of climate research proclaim that their unassailable gospel, which they also declare no one else may comprehend since they are not climate specialists, must still be accepted on faith in the expertise and anointment of the chosen climate scientists.

I have news for the new wannabe gods. That was the way of the Roman Catholic Church in antiquity, and it took an outsider to drive that nail through its front door.

Science has no gods, no popes, no faith based axioms that cannot be challenged and scrutinized repeatedly. Unlike religion, dissent is part and parcel of science, not outside of it.

You scientists have turned climate science into religion by asserting god-like authority of the climate researchers upon a wholly empirical matter, anointing yourselves as its only credible high priests capable of understanding it.

Anyone who dissents with your version of climate science is dismissed as not being qualified to disagree with it. Just take a look at the annotations by the Union of Concerned Scientists on Dr. Lindzen's [letter](#).

Take religion and self-interest out of science.

This means, you don't have exclusivity to thought, knowledge, understanding, wisdom, reasoning skills, and you should stop pretending that you do. It makes a poor impression of your field.

Your blanket rejection of all dissent with your synthetic construction by men of science, including the 300 who signed Dr. Lindzen's petition (I have not seen their names), and more than a 1000 international scientists listed in the U. S. Senate Minority Report 2008 to 2010 (I have read each one's statement), and your claim to validity by appeal to “almost universally agreed” among your own well-funded coterie of insider climate scientists, is not just pathetically arrogant, but also specious.

When the system auto-rejects those who don't a priori accept its core axiom, then those left behind are self-selecting, and automatically agree among themselves.

What is the intellectual worth of such incestuously self-reinforced “universal agreement” in science?

Let alone it commanding the political power to influence the formulation of a draconian global policy prescription based upon such a meaningless “consensus” among a tiny group of overly specialized climate researchers which will directly impact all seven billion human beings on earth!

I might as well be visiting Alice in Wonderland for the absurdities that do not seem to bother the participants at the tea party.

I am troubled by this absurd chauvinist attitude. Primacy and humility obviously can't live together.

Apart from the topic at hand, MIT professors are not just professional scientists, but also professional teachers in the world's most prestigious institution. Kids die to come learn here. And MIT enrolls some of the brightest starry-eyed teenage applicants from the world over. Many of them go on to become leading scientists and scholars. And what kind of future intellectuals shall they make when their own teachers are cheerleaders for conformist thought, prostituting science in the service of a political theology --- and perhaps not realizing that that's what is being taught by the attitudes displayed in one's own profession? No wonder there isn't a Galileo born to funded science.

Who said this:

“In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual”

Today, the major thesis of establishmentarian climate scientists who have devoted their professional lives to the careful study of climate science, but evidently under the prevailing political axiom that brings funds to their research, is that the crisis is man-made global warming; tomorrow, the thesis may become man-made global cooling; and the day after, something else man-made catastrophe; unless of course the crisis creation is alien invasion or heavenly collision.

And establishment scientists will create the science fantasy to support all of these. Even good science is funded by political goals, just as militarization is funded for political goals. So what of the *pseudo science* that is to directly serve a political agenda? Pick the data and the computer models to support the political theory du jour. Who can ever know what's in it?

And the world would surely have not known what's in the kitchen sink of climate science without the

revelations contained in the East Anglia Emails. I have had the opportunity to read some of them. These candid conversations among the inner circle of climate scientists is disturbing to say the least. To a sharp mind, it is obvious that they are creating a phony science and hoping the reality will catch up with their construction, or, that no one will notice, or ask too many perceptive questions about the inside workings of their models and data. Someone did. And the rest of us did too --- and we don't have to be particularly superior climate scientists to distinguish snake oil when that's what it is.

My analysis in the attached document is not altered by which crisis and which science is the currency du jour as the purpose of, and solution for, all these crises is singular and the same:

To motivate the transition of independent nation-states to Global Governance; to a one-world government under the central control of an elite class who shall decide what's good for the rest of mankind.

You must know that this feudal architecture was forcibly overthrown at the revolutionary founding of the United States of America. It appears that a new global revolutionary battle is required to overthrow it once again before it succeeds in constructing its global empire in complete fait accompli.

As principal stewards of global thought from the premiere academy of science and technology in the world, and my alma mater, I invite you to read and reflect upon the attached document. I hope that you will correct my misimpressions so that others may also benefit from your honest intellect and not be misled by an enthusiastic ordinary layman only able to do basic arithmetic correctly.

Who said this:

“Freedom is the freedom to say that two plus two make four. If that is granted, all else follows.”

Remarkably, I can do simple addition rather well, and also proclaim the result without being beholden to a license from authority figures to grant me that freedom to speak.

To seek a license before one can find the noble courage to do commonsense arithmetic correctly and speak of the unspeakable result, is to succumb to moral cowardice. The labors of Socrates (whether legend or reality is irrelevant) showed the world the lengths and distances one must go to uphold intellectual integrity if one is a real seeker of truth about reality. And that's what scientists are, or supposed to be, and which is why most of us become scientists in the first place. But along the way reality meets morality and guess which one takes the back-seat?

Interestingly though, I did not learn this basic arithmetic skill at MIT, nor the courage to proclaim it freely, despite learning higher mathematics and electrical engineering among many other things.

Chances are, based on sheer statistics of the number of learned people in the United States of America with advanced post graduate degrees from its more than 2000 colleges and universities still unable to call a spade a spade, you may also be the victim of the same absurdity: being able to solve complex differential equations easily, but not able to correctly add two plus two to make four, and speak it out loud.

Our higher education systems of course, and our social values, leave much room for improvement, especially in the use of basic commonsense. Exercising commonsense under some circumstances takes more courage than is evidently common, which is why it takes uncommon courage to add two plus two to make four and to speak the unspeakable. It is far easier to say five. And even easier to think five! There is no cognitive dissonance in that case.

Virtually all learned scientists, scholars and experts in the Third Reich had also become victim to the same absurdity, whereby, its best minds enabling the Nazi technological war machinery with highest levels of science and industry in the world at the time, united we stood with Mein Führer and his grotesque geostrategic imperatives for *Lebensraum* without a qualm. This was only two to three generation of scientists ago.

Indeed, no civilization can escape this failing of conforming to the diktats and wisdoms of their ruling power and authority figures, which, in our modernity, is not always exercised at the point of the bayonet as it was in the Third Reich, or the former USSR, or in room 101.

Unless the best minds in society rise to challenge their own *banality of evil* first, they cannot break through the myriad forces that ensure obedience and silence on truth. Brilliant intellectuals just as easily become obedient slaves to this system *United We Stand* as the rest of the ordinary public who would do anything to pursue their “American Dreams” including sell their conscience, but under carefully managed illusions. This is just a statement of empirical fact, and quite self-evident. When intellectuals seek, and are dependent upon, “universal agreement” to sell their “wares”, they dare not stand alone lest they be forced to drink the hemlock like Socrates, and recant like Galileo.

Conformist thoughts lead to conformist behavior, and vice versa. It does not take a great deal of intelligence to see that this obedience to authority leads to corrupting all paradigms of objectivity, of science and scholarship, which demand non conformity and independence of thought as first principles in order to break the mold of entrenched dogmas. Be it in hard sciences, or in social sciences, art, literature, humanities, and policy-making. Under its dominance, both Socrates and

Galileo were made to suffer the courage of their convictions as we all learn in elementary school.

That's generally too hefty a price to pay for most normal people. Especially for those whose bread and butter begins and ends in prestigious establishment universities that form an integral part of its vast military-industrial-academe complex.

As is obvious, if you want to do science, you must play ball with those who control your purse strings, or your funding will dry up. Without funding, your research and your publications and your promotions will dry up as well. That's how the academic system works in the United States (and elsewhere in the industrialized West) and we all know it.

Surely no MIT scientist can believe that they are uniquely unsusceptible to these universal forces?

So, I must ask once again, in all the humility that is the station of a common man harboring no illusions of the *Übermensch* and their imperatives, but still must ask due to its import in discerning motivation and intent which are never divorced from one's work:

Are climate scientists, especially those at MIT including yourselves, genuinely *innocent of knowledge* of the unhidden forces driving transformation towards Global Governance from the elite top? A global empire that has been the dream of all conquerors throughout world history? And that all of you are equally complicit in providing one of the many enabling pretexts?

The spirit of primacy which fuels every sociopath's dream of ruling the world remains quite untamed.

If anything, our *Technetronic Era* has made it not just possible, but quite practicable, for a handful of people to control the world and rule all humanity. This was already much anticipated, even speciously dignified, and also planned. Surely you are more than literate in Zbigniew Brzezinski's clairvoyant classic *Between Two Ages: The Role of America in the Technetronic Era*; Bertrand Russell's equally seminal prognostications of the impending future in *The Impact of Science on Society*; H. G. Wells' similar self-serving predictions in *The New World Order*; Carroll Quigley's troublesome confirmation of the secretive role of the handful of financial super-elites behind the pyramid of political power in the West and the affairs of the world, in *Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*; etc. The bibliography is extensive and blueprints modernity rather accurately.

The instinct for primacy remains unabated. At the top of its hierarchy in our *Technetronic* modernity is the instinct for intellectual primacy from which supremacy and hegemony follow. Science and scientists are part of that primacy. That's just self-evident.

As someone once said, we may have descended from the tree top, but we have yet to lose our tail. This appendage is clearly visible in all the technological barbarism the super militarized state regularly visits upon the *Untermenschen* without its freedom loving free peoples and brilliant scientists batting an eye.

Have you been to a zoo lately? Just watch the primates for a while on your next visit with your children and grandkids --- others remain quite unconcerned as the alpha male beats up his closest reach. Our reach is much greater, but little else appears to have changed.

As I stated in my recent letter to one of the more aggressive PR spokesperson for Climate Science, who is also the uber skeptic of all normal skeptics of global warming mantra, and I reproduce that thought here because of its relevance to all scientists everywhere:

“As much as uber scientists might like to believe that they are Mr. Spock, science for us earthians is not divorced from social science, specifically political science, social psychology, and psychology, since those doing science are social beings, given to all the same failings and limitations of human beings. This include primacy, co-option, greed, the banality of evil, will to power, and the list is long.”

I am sure that as learned scholars you are more than familiar with all these basic human failings which apply to all human beings, and also with the human potential to rise above our limitations.

But, as we all know, it does take working against the force of gravity to rise even a step beyond ground level. To escape its clutches altogether takes the exercise of a counter-force greater than gravity to be able to reach escape velocity! And risk going up in smoke on the launch pad, to boot.

I would be pollyannaish if I believed that MIT scientists are immune to such pressures to conform to the political and professional wisdom du jour, and that they are all rocket propulsion specialists.

But I am also certain that good human beings everywhere daily resist making any kind of Faustian bargain. MIT scientists included.

How successfully? Let's see.

The Source URL for what follows is:

<https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/global-warming-has-become-new-religion.html>

I look forward to your comments on my analysis and precautionary advocacy in that report and in this letter. I tend to agree with your own advocacy in your letter to President Trump and I do not suggest that the United States unilaterally withdraw from international climate conventions as did Dr. Lindzen in his letter. I believe these UN conventions can serve a useful purpose, though not the one the political elites have in mind. But I also agree with what is commonsensical in Dr. Lindzen's more explicit letter, irrespective of whether or not he may be funded by the lobby on fossil fuels as is often alleged to dismiss all his rational and pertinent critique of climate science. I am more scrutinizing and discerning in all matters and do not foolishly throw the baby out with the bath water.

Instead, I advocate that climate scientists transcend their typical a-moral and “pragmatic” attitude towards science. This will automatically compel their awakened consciences (I presume they have one which lies suppressed) to stop deceiving themselves. This in turn will lead them to use their participation in international bodies to speak the whole truth, not half-truth, not establishment's truth, not the IPCC's truth, and not the truth convenient to advancement of careers and social standing.

I advocate conscionable climate scientists offer commonsensical alternatives to nations other than what's pitched by the political elites from their tower of babel.

If you distinguished scholars of climate science simply pursued the commonsense principles expressed in this letter, conveyed this commonsense to the president of the United States, and to the convention participants, you could more effectively forge a real consensus internationally to commence a less draconian solution-space based on these principles, and defer making decision on *the sky is falling* global catastrophe of global warming destroying earth, until climate change due to natural causes is specifically ruled out by empiricism (and not by synthetic computer modeling).

If nature is indeed the culprit today as it has empirically always been in the past, then there is little that man can do about it. There is certainly no political mileage to be derived from that assessment. In fact, it would derail the political agenda of man-made global warming altogether. It may yet be replaced by man-made global cooling before too long.

Some establishment scientists will again rush to define new environmental markers to suggest that the first cause is again man-made; new threat scenarios will be outlined, and principally the same solution-spaces outlined in Agenda 21, or its newer version, pitched to put mankind in growth chains.

I dare to think that only conscionable scientists who are not “pragmatic” like the Nazi scientists, shall be the effective moral impediments to all such scams. Beyond that, only a global rebellion.

May I conclude this long letter from my voice of conscience by humbly suggesting that MIT's talented

and distinguished climate scientists step out of their ivory shells as the narrow-gauge super-specialists that you are, and dedicate some time to acquiring the wherewithal of all the forces driving the agendas at the UN and its conventions. If you knowingly wish to be part of that political game, and knowingly wish to become enablers of the draconian agendas of world government as its petty technicians, that's your cross to bear. And mankind's misfortune. You better choose your Faustian bargain with great forethought because your progeny shall sail in the same boat. None of us, including yourselves I am sure, wish to live in a global police state anymore than we wish to live in any police state. However, Nazi scientists were quite happy living in their police state. So were Soviet scientists. But we are already spoiled. And we might indeed be the generations caught between two ages. Those who are born in a police-state after this transition age, will have no angst.

But I dearly hope that many of you, nay all of you, and all those scientists who might read this letter, wish to make this a better world in the true sense of the word, for all its ordinary peoples. Benevolent science and technology research programs that MIT Spectrum continually brings to my electronic door every now and then, and MIT's altruistic science and technology open education programs that bring life-long learning to far away lands, alone cannot bestow benevolence, nor un militarize a highly militarized world hurtling at breakneck speed towards dystopia. Making sense of an apparently senseless world takes seeing all the forces that shape events, not just those near to you.

Who said this:

“Aspire to be like Mt. Fuji, with such a broad and solid foundation that the strongest earthquake cannot move you, and so tall that the greatest enterprises of common men seem insignificant from your lofty perspective. With your mind as high as Mt. Fuji you can see all things clearly. And you can see all the forces that shape events; not just the things happening near to you.”

As Socrates might have pleaded before the elites of his time in his own defence against their charge of corrupting the youths of Athens and disrespecting their gods with his non-conformist intellect:

‘Agree with me if I seem to you to speak the truth; or, if not, withstand me might and main that I may not deceive you as well as myself in my desire, and like the bee leave my sting in you before I die. And now let us proceed.’ (from classicist Edith Hamilton)

Thank you.

Best regards,

Zahir Ebrahim

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

Footnote

[**Extraneous Clarification Note Oct. 31, 2018:** See attached document to observe that this matter of high levels of their environmental degradation marker CO₂, is itself highly contested by non establishment scientists. Here, I am *prima facie* accepting establishment scientists on their own reported principal axiom driving their climate science, that CO₂ levels are unbearably high. The logic of this letter does not depend upon it being true or false, only that it be falsifiable.

High levels of environmental pollution itself is a self-evident fact, visible to everyone. To agree or disagree on axioms and presuppositions that are intended to scientifically understand its make-up, and to make differing observations based on the starting point, is itself an integral part of science whose falsifiability, and not religiosity, is what incrementally advances the overall understanding of nature forward.

Yesterday, upon receiving my letter, Dr. Lindzen generously sent me the PDF of his second letter to the White House dated March 07, 2017, as response to my letter, in which he had explained in more detail to the President of the United States, why his petition signed by approximately 330 scientists, called for withdrawal from UNFCCC of all governments, and not just the United States.

Dr. Lindzen pointed out in his letter that UNFCCC was in fact created 25 years ago to “*find support for dangers from increasing carbon dioxide.*” Dr. Lindzen continued: “*While this has led to generous and rapidly increased support for the field, the purported dangers remain hypothetical, model-based projections.*”

In plainer words, paraphrasing without syntactic sugaring, the purpose of UNFCCC was to find scientific justification for high levels of CO₂ causing climate change attributed to man. See *Report from Iron Mountain* in the attached document for the idea of climate change presenting a useful political crisis, being floated decades earlier, in the early 1960s.

I now have to agree with Dr. Lindzen that all governments ought to withdraw from this farcical UN convention if that is the presupposition of the convention and its *raison d'être*. However, until such time that governments do withdraw, my advocacy outlined in my letter is based on shrewdly using the Jujitsu principle to turn the tables on one's opponents. Using their own strengths and power to mold public opinion, disseminate the whole truth of the matter from the same UN conventions. I am not privy to the mechanisms of these UN conventions to opine further beyond expressing this general theme from the pragmatic art of war. For, this is indeed just that, a war of intellectual primacy, in which one side is much weaker than the other, despite visibly being on a higher plane of scientific integrity.

Furthermore, my approach to technical disagreements is that these are an integral part of science --- so do science; falsify others' axioms, methods, models, data, observations and predictions if yours are different. This is exactly what the dissenting scientists appear to be doing. While the establishment scientists appear to be resisting doing science in favor of religion, by their insisting upon their specious consensus and special anointment as their principal epistemology.

As a common man directly impacted by the current instantiation of climate science, in this letter I have mainly questioned the insanity of instrumenting a global policy based upon an incomplete and incoherent picture of nature that reeks of political theology more than science.

For MIT climate scientists, of all peoples, becoming part of a political ideology with respectability of science stamped all over their credentials, is a disgrace to science whose only primacy over the dogmas of religion is that it is objective and not ideological. It reeks of the time when eugenics was scientifically couched to formulate immigration policy in the United States at the turn of the twentieth century, to keep out the *untermensch* and only admit the preferred races and peoples.

Eugenics science remained in vogue as a respectable pursuit throughout the early decades of the twentieth century. Even philosophers were in on it to cull the "useless eaters" who they stated never contributed to civilization and were a burden upon the productive white races for their high birth rates. See Bertrand Russell's misanthropic arguments for birth control of the *untermensch* races in *The Impact of Science on Society*, so that the preferred races could procreate to their heart's desire.

It was Adolf Hitler who gave eugenics a bad name with his concentration camps. But the pseudo science did not die away. It was simply reborn as the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), for a more benign sounding public relations approach to eugenics. The agenda is the same. See the declassified United States National Security Strategy Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200) dated 1974, drafted by then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and signed off by president Gerald Ford as NSDM 312 in 1975. Who lives and who dies is again decided by race and usefulness to the

advanced white civilizations of the world, but syntactically sugared to map to the Least Developed Countries (LDC) with significant over populations. High growth rates in the 13 LDC listed is presented as threat to the national security of the United States of America (and its Western allies obviously). The racial eugenics bibliography is extensive, the dominant role played by scientists and scholars harboring a political ideology, not particularly being a secret.

It raises the dilemma of whether there should be statutory laws to police the corruption of science by scientists in the service of a political agenda. If there is any respectable place for debating this, it is at MIT, especially with climate science being given so much importance by its own administration as noted by Dr. Lindzen in his second letter to the White House. Be part of America's military-industrial-academe complex, as that is the lifeline and raison d'être of MIT, but not by supporting the corruption of science and mathematics, by creating pseudo versions of these, in the service of misanthropic ideology at least on its own academic territory.

Climate science is not the first to put pseudo science in the service of primacy. See John Perkins' *Confessions of Economic Hit Man*, for his revelations on how he employed an Indian mathematician working at MIT in the 1970s, to construct advanced pseudo mathematics based on complicated and indecipherable Markov model gooblydocks which no one could comprehend (just like today climate science would prefer it), and got it published in peer reviewed mathematics journals (just like today climate scientists follow that template). Perkins and this MIT mathematician took the academic respectability so gained from this contrived publishing of junk math, to third world countries to encourage them to take on mega loans for mega construction projects under the false projections from the mumbo jumbo of this pseudo math, that return growth rates from building bigger than necessary, would be in double digits and sufficient to pay back the monstrous loans.

The foolish and often mercenary leadership of these nations bought into it by various means of persuasion (just as foolish nations today are buying into the wares of climate scientists with copious help from NGOs and the Mighty Wurlitzer's global propaganda machinery). The projected high growth rates of course were fictitious and based on hypothetical models that could never transpire in reality; sounds familiar? These resource-rich but impoverished nations all ended up in the World Bank's debt enslavement trap, with the WB-IMF tag team forcing these nations to restructure and privatize their economies and their public commons (primacy through neoliberalism) in order to be given additional loans to pay just the interests on the mega loans. Yes indeed. See Chapter 17 of the *Economic Hit Man*, titled *Panama Canal Negotiations and Graham Greene*, or see the pertinent excerpts in reference [2] of the attached document.

History is evidently repeating with Climate @ MIT. There may be other cases as well in other

departments of MIT serving similar interests of primacy with the wonderful magic of numbers and computers.

It is high time that, at least in this day and age, MIT forged its own institutional policy and mechanisms for policing this subversion of ethics, science, and academic integrity – if they care for any of these matters as they proclaim, and daily indoctrinate their impressionable young minds to believe.

Responsible Citizenship begins right here, which also happens to be a hot button for the President of MIT, Dr. Rafael Reif, these days. In the lofty exercise of that virtue, it will require far more courage to take a principled stand on this pernicious corruption of science and ethics in the pursuit of misanthropic ideologies as its President, than it has taken me to write this letter as its ordinary alum. MIT administration and MIT Corporation will have to tradeoff institutional integrity against the establishment's funds so generously available to anyone willing to compromise themselves.

That principled stance of saying “No” to the institutional *banality of evil*, will teach the value of Responsible Citizenship at MIT to its individual members more than any platitude scribed on sacred parchment ever can.]

Source URL for this Letter: <https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/letter-climate-mit-religion-or-science.html>

Source PDF for this Letter: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/letter-to-climate-at-mit-is-climate-science-religion-or-science-zahirebrahim.pdf>

Emailed and published Tuesday, October 30, 2018 at 12:00 pm 5624 23932

Extraneous Clarification Note added as Footnote October 31, 2018 at 4:00 pm

A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

Global Warming / Climate Change has Become a New Religion - What's it all About?

Zahir Ebrahim | ProjectHumanbeingsfirst.org

Last Updated Friday, October 26, 2018 10:00 am

“In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual” --- Galileo Galilei

Précis

There is an unhidden Agenda behind the crisis of Global Warming: To implement UN Agenda 21 for Sustainable Development Worldwide, as the Solution to this “man-made” crisis! This solution is drastic and inimical to human life. It is formulated by the elite among the elites, who think of mankind as a virus infecting the earth. Is the earth's perceived climate change man-made? Or is it significantly by natural causes beyond the control of man? Should nations of the world urgently accept implementing Agenda 21 due to its saintly wording and pleasing sounding goals under the existential threat of an impending catastrophe that will otherwise leave the earth barren for future generations?

Abstract

The New York Times reported on [Nov. 3, 2017](#): *“Directly contradicting much of the Trump administration’s position on climate change, 13 federal agencies unveiled an [exhaustive scientific report](#) on Friday that says humans are the dominant cause of the global temperature rise that has created the warmest period in the history of civilization. ... The report was approved for release by the White House, but the findings come as the Trump administration is defending its climate change policies.”*

Exactly nine months earlier, 22 MIT Faculty Members working on Climate had addressed a [letter](#) to President Trump, dated [March 02, 2017](#), pre-justifying that blanket assertion by the 13 federal agencies in their exhaustive scientific report: *“It has come to our attention that our colleague Richard Lindzen, Professor Emeritus at MIT, has sent you a [letter](#) urging you to withdraw from the UN climate convention, claiming that actions with respect to global climate are not scientifically justified. As his colleagues at MIT in the Program in Atmospheres, Oceans, and Climate, all of whom are actively involved in understanding climate, we write to make it clear that this is not a view shared by us, or by the overwhelming majority of other scientists who have devoted their professional lives to careful study of climate science. The risks to the Earth system associated with increasing levels of carbon dioxide are almost universally agreed by climate scientists to be real ones. This include, but are not limited to, sea level rise, ocean acidification, and increase in extreme flooding and droughts, all with serious consequences for mankind.”*

So, is there, or isn't there, man-made Global Warming? American President Donald Trump's position on virtually every matter including global warming is usually one of strawman --- for the American and international establishment's actual policies are rarely if ever crafted in the White House itself. The fact of the matter is that all establishments and their scientists worldwide tote a common party-line: they religiously claim that Global-Warming / Climate Change is man-made. Their staunchest detractors also religiously claim that there isn't any global warming at all, but are then hard pressed to explain the drastic changes in weather seen occurring worldwide which is now presented by the establishment party-line not as Global Warming as it was a decade ago, but as planetary level Climate Change. Some other detractors suggest that Climate Change may be real, but that it is principally not due to man's activity; that, planetary level climate change is predominantly a natural cyclic phenomenon based on the sun's activity, and therefore it is likely solar system wide

phenomenon. While still others, only a handful, perhaps more in tune with the political vagaries of Machiavellian statecraft and the making of the public mind with Hegelian Dialectic imposed political choices, suggest that the alarmist attitude is to Machiavellianly fashion a boogiemer as the problem pretext, in order to usher in Carbon Credit as the solution. They believe that the real agenda behind these pseudo science laced political shenanigans is to curtail humanity's unbridled growth and population explosion --- the long running real agenda of the oligarchy driving nation-states towards one-world government. This group of detractors fear that the ultimate political agenda of the world government exponents is dystopic eugenics, selective mass population reduction, and the enactment of global laws for controlled living, controlled breeding, wherein, birthing is transformed from the natural right of the human species to a law-sanctioned privilege as has been witnessed in Communist China! They see big government surreptitiously in the making under the United Nations umbrella through its various programs, agendas, working groups, and international bodies, all of which are designed to usher in Global Governance in baby steps. Once one baby step is taken, it is a fait accompli toward the next baby step, until the eventual outcome, which would be unpalatable to virtually everyone if forcibly taken in one giant step, is eagerly accepted by everyone; indeed, demanded by everyone.

This rather well-read intelligent lot of detractors who comprehend social engineering, and who understandably so fear dystopia that they perceptively see its seeds being planted in virtually every global policy that is signed off by the so called representative governments which surreptitiously erode national sovereignty in small baby-steps, are generally dismissed by the establishment and their plethora of experts and academics as "conspiracy theorist", kooks and nut-jobs. To assist in that labeling and marginalization of truth, a great deal of "*beneficial cognitive diversity*" is also cunningly introduced into the mix of public opinion which pitches outlandish and absurd theories.

All this creates massive confusion in the public mind. Whom to believe? What to believe? No sensible mind would throw the baby out with the bath water, but who has the time and inclination to sift through this noise from the Mighty Wurlitzer? Is science really divorced from political science? Is pseudo science being used to globally push an elitist agenda down mankind's throat? What a Hegelian Mind-fck!

The public mind, now thoroughly confused by the plethora of "expert" opinions, naturally gravitates towards officially sanctioned authority figures to tell them what is

true and what isn't --- and in this way their new political beliefs are cast, and old ones reinforced, and their behavior molded. That officialdom's authority figures have, in this November 2017, released its official bible of sacred truths for the global public at large – for whatever is true for the United States of America with respect to climate change, is obviously also true for the rest of the world as well. The new sacred truths are part of the new religion being fashioned worldwide, that it is humanity that is causing Global Warming / Climate Change, and that the planet must be saved from humanity in order for the planet to be saved for humanity!

This report dismantles that sacred truth as being nothing more than a *Noble Lie* – like the WMDs in Iraq which facilitated its invasion by the United States of America. Once such a step is fait accompli, no power can undo it. No “oops” and “intelligence failure” can put the fired bullet back into the gun. Precisely because of its irreversibility, that the public must first understand and then oppose this sacred truth which makes mankind out as a *virus infecting the earth*. Without first unraveling the overarching political theory upon which the many misanthropic chemotherapy protocols designed to control this human virus proliferation in the guise of benevolence are based, such as the United Nations Agenda 21, the Carbon Credit, the World Wildlife Fund or Federation, the mandatory vaccination programs under the WHO that provide the scientific as well as political mechanism for stealth sterilization, etc., the public as well as their local and national governments are easily fooled into signing off on them. The subsequent generations will end up living in growth chains unless man comes to grips with the multifaceted devils running the world today.

About the author


He is just an ordinary fellow, a common man. But one who suffers no fools, takes no prisoners, bows before no authority figures as bearers of divine truths, and remains just as unimpressed by the metaphysics of the *turban* as by the scholarship of the *gown*. There is not much else to say about him. He was quite imperfectly educated in the elite secular universities of both the United States of America and Pakistan, which is perhaps how he managed to escape from these factories of *jahiliya* with his mind still intact and his brain still firing on all cylinders. It is only because of the imperfection of his education, and because of the failure of the system to obedience train him to *United We Stand* with absurdities, that his deconstruction of the global warming scam is able to capture reality the way it actually is, minus all of *truth's protective layers*. At least me thinks so. My name is Zahir Ebrahim, and I am the archetype *plebeian antidote to hectoring hegemons*. My contribution to making *America great again* can be gleaned at the United States Patent Office (<https://tinyurl.com/Zahir-Patents>). My contribution to making her almost human can be read at my website <http://humanbeingsfirst.org> .

Summary

My shrewd take on this question is that so long as ushering *Carbon Credit* is the principal underlying agenda of Global Governance, so long as global warming menace is the means employed by the United Nations Agenda 21 to forcibly induce changes in attitude and behavior that give preference to the natural processes of “Gaia” over human existence and human experience, so long as political will and its legalisms continue to be enacted on the core premise laid out in the Club of Rome report ***“In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together. ... All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.”***, the principal focus of the public's attention, as well as the scientists' and all the national and international political pied pipers', should not be on this red herring question of is there or isn't there Global Warming.

Climate change due to sun's activity is a natural and cyclic phenomenon. To overload that phenomenon with the Machiavellian motivation to search ***“for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like,”*** is a cunning misdirection that is sucking up the productive energies of well-intentioned and concerned people, while enlisting useful idiots at the grass-roots level to the cause of UN Agenda 21.

The common public attention should instead be focused on the Carbon Credit scam and the Global



Caption Creating Pseudo Science by the Process of Self-fulfilling Prophecy – The naïve and simplistic view of Corruption of Science in the Service of Empire (Image source Richard S. Lindzen, *Science in the Public Square: Global Climate Alarmism and Historical Precedents*, Journal of American Physicians and Surgeons, Volume 18 Number 3 Fall 2013)

Governance agenda under UN Agenda 21 which is being diabolically legalized using a multiplicity of propaganda covers including the fear of Climate Change in order to lend that exercise “legal” and political legitimacy.

The subversion by misdirection is worldwide --- no statesman who has any standing, is standing up to this Big Lie. This grotesque reality of universal co-optation was most perceptively captured in 1970 by a former FBI agent after reading Carroll Quigley's 1966 book *Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*, with these portentous words:

'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)



Caption 'On thin Ice – The hockey stick graph fraud' *Climategate U-turn as scientist at centre of row admits: There has been no global warming since 1995* ----- So, is there, or isn't there, man-made Global Warming? What a Hegelian Mind-fck! (image source The Daily Mail UK, Feb 14, 2010)

The tortuous reality of global co-optation, as stated by the powers that be themselves, is that:

“The few who understand the system will either be so interested in its profits or be so dependent upon its favours that there will be no opposition from that class, while on the other hand, the great body of people, mentally incapable of comprehending [the system], will bear its burdens without complaint, and perhaps without even suspecting that the system is inimical to their interests.”


Today, in the latter part of the second decade of the twenty-first century, the empirical reality around me just tells me that it is only a matter of time before carbon credit is a done deal, a *fait accompli*.

The red herring question whether or not there is Global Warming or Climate Change due to man's activity would soon become a moot point as global masses come to accept and live in growth chains under the United Nations Agenda 21. Unlike in nuclear fission reaction which requires compression pressure to increase to the point of critical mass to set off the nuclear chain reaction to make a nuclear explosion, mankind does not appear to have such a critical mass of compression. We have demonstrated throughout our short history on earth how much we are able to be oppressed with ease and still get used to it --- mankind's innumerable prophets' lofty platitudes of boldly casting aside the chains of servitude notwithstanding.

This is what the powers that be are banking on --- our infinite capacity to not just voluntarily accept servitude, but under the right set of perception management / psychologically persuasive / pharmacological cocktails, even come to love it.

Aldous Huxley had called this latter control the “ultimate in malevolent revolution”. That is the path which has been ordained for humanity by the powers that be and it is not obvious how *hoi polloi* can effectively counter it before it is *fait accompli*. Platitudes abound, including [my own two cents worth](#). These look rather nice on paper, or from pulpits and podiums, even appear self-evident, but, in the history of civilizations that is recorded, has never come to pass en masse. In our modernity which is characterized by universal deceit, when just speaking the plain truth is deemed to be a “revolutionary act”, when false hopes and false prophets shepherd the herd to this and that form of “awakening” and run them in circles, the real ray of hope perhaps comes from witnessing the daily courage of resistance of the common man in places like Palestine.


To percolate that courage upwards, from oppression by visible bayonet that is resisted through the fight or flight natural response, to oppression by the more intangible mind-behavior control methods when one is made to love one's servitude and consequently disarmed of all courage to resist ab initio, is the hard challenge. **A challenge for those few who do understand the system and are**



Caption Graph Reality Versus Alarm --- Concerned Scientists Reply on Global Warming 'From the graph it appears that the projections exaggerate, substantially, the response of the earth's temperature to CO2 which increased by about 11% from 1989 through 2011. Furthermore, when one examines the historical temperature record throughout the 20th century and into the 21st, the data strongly suggest a much lower CO2 effect than almost all models calculate.' (image source The Wall Street Journal, op-ed February 21, 2012)

neither interested in its profits and nor so dependent upon its favours that it can stop them without killing them.


Here is an excerpt from statements of dissenting scientists worldwide which puts an immediate end to the Big lie of “consensus”. The latest version of this [2008 excerpted report](#) is the [December 8, 2010 U.S. Senate Minority Report](#) (http://cfact.org/pdf/2010_Senate_Minority_Report.pdf) which updates this 2008 number of More Than 700 (Previously 650), to *More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims to Debunk Fading “Consensus”*. It begs the question why newsmedia, politicians, scholars, pulpits, governments, just ignore it. The self-evident answer – those who know are already playing in the shell game. And those who don't know? At least some among them refuse to know but think they know enough to write a whole handbook on it: [Unprecedented Climate Mobilization: A Handbook for Citizens and Their Governments](#). The rest --- well, efforts like these is for their sake.



Caption Graph Annual Global Mean Surface Temperature Anomalies “No warming since 1997 and no statistically significant warming since 1995 (the red fuzz represents the error ‘bars’)” (Image source MIT Professor of Atmospheric Sciences, Richard Lindzen, via WUWT, March 11, 2008)

1. “I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion.” - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.
2. “Since I am no longer affiliated with any organization nor receiving any funding, I can speak quite frankly....As a scientist I remain skeptical...The main basis of the claim that man’s release of greenhouse gases is the cause of the warming is based almost entirely upon climate models. We all know the frailty of models concerning the air-surface system.” - Atmospheric Scientist Dr. Joanne Simpson, the first woman in the world to receive a PhD in meteorology, and formerly of NASA, who has authored more than 190 studies and has been called “among the most preeminent scientists of the last 100 years.”
3. Warming fears are the “worst scientific scandal in the history...When people come to know what the truth is, they will feel deceived by science and scientists.” - UN IPCC Japanese Scientist Dr. Kiminori Itoh, an award-winning PhD environmental physical chemist.

4. "The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn't listen to others. It doesn't have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists." - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.
5. "So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming." - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.
6. "Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time." - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth.
7. "The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do



Caption "In September 2015, the international scientific journal *Nature* published a cartoon showing the temple of "Robust Science" in a state of collapse. What is going on?" -- Rupert Sheldrake. Arguably, what's going on in the most naïve apolitical sense is the merging of epistemological problems naturally arising in applying the *Scientific Method* under the human limitations of **Data Availability Bias** and **Data Assimilability Bias**, with self-interest created by the *publish or perish* culture of modern science that naturally induces **Confirmation Bias** and *moral clarity* (see [https://tinyurl.com/Some-Problems-in-Epistemology#\[7\]](https://tinyurl.com/Some-Problems-in-Epistemology#[7])). In the shrewd Machiavellian sense, it is diabolically engineering consent for an unpalatable political agenda by creating pretexts for it using the gibberish of pseudo science, and disseminating it with the propaganda machinery of the Mighty Wurlitzer (see <https://tinyurl.com/MightyWurlitzer>). Also see *Bibliography Corruption of Science*, <https://tinyurl.com/Science-in-Service-of-Empire#Bibliography> . (Image courtesy of Nature via Rupert Sheldrake, *The Replicability Crisis in Science*, a brief survey of the epistemology of Science pertaining to replicability failure, September 2015, <http://www.sheldrake.org/about-rupert-sheldrake/blog/the-replicability-crisis-in-science>)

not include, for example, solar activity.” - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico

8. “It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don’t buy into anthropogenic global warming.” - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.
9. “Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapour and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will.” – . Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ.
10. “After reading [UN IPCC chairman] Pachauri’s asinine comment [comparing skeptics to] Flat Earthers, it’s hard to remain quiet.” - Climate statistician Dr. William M. Briggs, who specializes in the statistics of forecast evaluation, serves on the American Meteorological Society’s Probability and Statistics Committee and is an Associate Editor of Monthly Weather Review.
11. “The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round...A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace. As a result, the discussion was one-sided and heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact,” Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher.
12. “I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken...Fears about man-made global warming are unwarranted and are not based on good science.” - Award Winning Physicist Dr. Will Happer, Professor at the Department of Physics at Princeton University and Former Director of Energy Research at the Department of Energy, who has published over 200 scientific papers, and is a fellow of the American Physical Society, The American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Sciences.
13. “Nature’s regulatory instrument is water vapor: more carbon dioxide leads to less moisture in the air, keeping the overall GHG content in accord with the necessary balance conditions.” – Prominent Hungarian Physicist and environmental researcher Dr. Miklós Zágoni reversed his view of man-made warming and is now a skeptic. Zágoni was once Hungary’s most outspoken supporter of the Kyoto Protocol.


14. "For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?" - Geologist Dr. David Gee the chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress who has authored 130 plus peer reviewed papers, and is currently at Uppsala University in Sweden.
15. "Gore prompted me to start delving into the science again and I quickly found myself solidly in the skeptic camp...Climate models can at best be useful for explaining climate changes after the fact." - Meteorologist Hajo Smit of Holland, who reversed his belief in man-made warming to become a skeptic, is a former member of the Dutch UN IPCC committee.
16. "The quantity of CO2 we produce is insignificant in terms of the natural circulation between air, water and soil... I am doing a detailed assessment of the UN IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science." - South African Nuclear Physicist and Chemical Engineer Dr. Philip Lloyd, a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author who has authored over 150 refereed publications.
17. "Many [scientists] are now searching for a way to back out quietly (from promoting warming fears), without having their professional careers ruined." - Atmospheric physicist James A. Peden, formerly of the Space Research and Coordination Center in Pittsburgh.
18. "All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead." - Geophysicist Dr. Phil Chapman, an astronautical engineer and former NASA astronaut, served as staff physicist at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
19. "Creating an ideology pegged to carbon dioxide is a dangerous nonsense...The present alarm on climate change is an instrument of social control, a pretext for major businesses and political battle. It became an ideology, which is concerning." - Environmental Scientist Professor Delgado Domingos of Portugal, the founder of the Numerical Weather Forecast group, has more than 150 published articles.
20. "CO2 emissions make absolutely no difference one way or another...Every scientist knows this, but it doesn't pay to say so...Global warming, as a political vehicle, keeps Europeans in the driver's seat and developing nations walking barefoot." - Dr. Takeda Kunihiko, vice-chancellor of the Institute of Science and Technology Research at Chubu University in Japan.
21. "The [global warming] scaremongering has its justification in the fact that it is something

that generates funds.” - Award-winning Paleontologist Dr. Eduardo Tonni, of the Committee for Scientific Research in Buenos Aires and head of the Paleontology Department at the University of La Plata.

22. “Whatever the weather, it's not being caused by global warming. If anything, the climate may be starting into a cooling period.” Atmospheric scientist Dr. Art V. Douglas, former Chair of the Atmospheric Sciences Department at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, and is the author of numerous papers for peer-reviewed publications.
23. “But there is no falsifiable scientific basis whatever to assert this warming is caused by human-produced greenhouse gasses because current physical theory is too grossly inadequate to establish any cause at all.” - Chemist Dr. Patrick Frank, who has authored more than 50 peer-reviewed articles.
24. “The ‘global warming scare’ is being used as a political tool to increase government control over American lives, incomes and decision making. It has no place in the Society's activities.” - Award-Winning NASA Astronaut/Geologist and Moonwalker Jack Schmitt who flew on the Apollo 17 mission and formerly of the Norwegian Geological Survey and for the U.S. Geological Survey.
25. “Earth has cooled since 1998 in defiance of the predictions by the UN-IPCC....The global temperature for 2007 was the coldest in a decade and the coldest of the millennium...which is why ‘global warming’ is now called ‘climate change.’” - Climatologist Dr. Richard Keen of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at the University of Colorado.
26. “I have yet to see credible proof of carbon dioxide driving climate change, yet alone man-made CO₂ driving it. The atmospheric hot-spot is missing and the ice core data refute this. When will we collectively awake from this deceptive delusion?” - Dr. G LeBlanc Smith, a retired Principal Research Scientist with Australia’s CSIRO (The full quotes of the scientists are later in this report)

Backdrop

There is an overarching social-political theory behind the propaganda of Global Warming / Climate Change. And that is the construction of one-world government. That entails, inter alia, how mankind should be organized, governed, their attitudes and behavior changed, in a massive reboot of all civilizations into a standardized civilization with standardized new religion, new habits, new lifestyles, with much of the planet earth off limits to the vast masses of humanity in the name of preserving nature, wildlife, environment, Gaia (mother earth), for future generations. Individual rights to be subsumed under community rights. Private property rights abolished for the public (not for the elite who hold property under corporations, tax-exempt foundations, non-governmental organizations called NGOs, etc.) Such a massive overhaul of mankind, a global transformation, cannot be brought about by peoples and nations simply agreeing to giving up their rights and national sovereignty. So it is to be accomplished by stealth, in baby-steps, disguised firstly in nice-sounding mantras easily palatable to the public mind. One of those nice sounding things is the “green” agenda called “Sustainable Development”. Secondly, the stealth is disguised as solutions to crises and menaces that people and governments would easily accept under conditions of psychological fear and physical terror. One of those menaces is Global Warming / Climate Change and its solution is Carbon Credit and Agenda 21. Similarly, another menace is terrorism, and its solution is global war on terror that enables instituting global standardized police-state polices. There are many



When I had entered MIT to study science and engineering in the 1970s as any excited kid in a candy store, little did I understand that like political science and religion, science and pseudo science also interplay in the service of empire. The following is my contribution to speaking up following in the footsteps of the first patron saint of modern science to have demonstrated the courage of his convictions at the risk of the gallows, Galileo. *Just look through the telescope*, he hath pleaded before the church of his time, countering their divine authority with uncommon boldness: **“In questions of science, the authority of a thousand is not worth the humble reasoning of a single individual”**. Except that today it is the church of science that has taken over from the Church of Christendom. The risks today are also substantially the same. Only the labels might be different. Among the tens of thousands of scientists and engineers worldwide, there are evidently too few Galileos alive to make any impact on the new Church of Science that has taken hold in the twenty-first century.

more aspects to this and covers the whole gamut of human activity.

The Council on Foreign Relations

To understand the overarching big picture and why these methods are actually masks for a Machiavellian game plan, let's begin with the CFR, Council on Foreign Relations:

“In short, the ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion’ to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault.

Of course, for political as well as administrative reasons, some of these specialized arrangements should be brought into an appropriate relationship with the central institutions of the U.N. system, but the main thing is that the essential functions be performed.

The question is whether this more modest approach can do the job. Can it really bring mankind into the twenty-first century with reasonable prospects for peace, welfare and human dignity? The argument thus far suggests it better had, for there seems to be no alternative. But the evidence also suggests some grounds for cautious optimism.” --- Richard N. Gardner, *The Hard Road to World Order*, 1974, published in CFR's Foreign Affairs, <http://thepowerhour.com/articles/HardRoadtoWorldOrder.pdf>

So let's observe **the bottom up** methods applied to build the **‘house of world order’ to bring mankind into the twenty-first century with reasonable prospects for peace, welfare and human dignity.**

Report from Iron Mountain 1967

The environmental menace, and specifically climate change and pollution, is mentioned in this 1967 [Report from Iron Mountain](#) published by The Dial Press, as the alternate means of corralling human

behavior based on fear in the absence of the menace of war corraling mankind. The report stated:

“The existence of an accepted external menace, then, is essential to social cohesiveness as well as to the acceptance of political authority. The menace must be believable, it must be of a magnitude consistent with the complexity of the society threatened, and it must appear, at least, to affect the entire society.”

If the overarching agenda is to form a one-world government, even if just for a moment the skeptic may entertain that hypothesis which is being openly pursued by the CFR (and of course the United States influential newspaper [The Financial Times](#), read by virtually every business executive on earth worth his weight in gold, also explicitly laid the method out in [December 2008](#)), then, what better global menace than the environment which threatens the whole world! It is easily made **believable**, and especially if the ecological menace can be coincided with natural ecological / climate cycles due to sun's activity, and the requisite political as well as cultural propaganda employing credible “experts” is brought to bear on the principal cause being man-made. **After *fait accompli*, it would be a moot point whether the menace was politically invented, or natural or man-made.**

This is what the shockingly uncanny report, commissioned in 1961-62 at the height of the Cold War in the aftermath of the Cuban missile crisis when it was already being anticipated by the powers that be that the Cold War would soon end with nary a new enemy in sight, stated in its Section 6, Substitutes for the Function of War, for new Political alternatives to war. The reader should be mindful that this study is well over a half century old. Whether real or fictionalized political treatise, it is uncannily in the footprints of Machiavelli's *The Prince*, the diabolical political blueprint for political authority to engineer consent from the public mind for their own behavior control by politically structured means:

“Nevertheless, an effective political substitute for war would require “alternate enemies,” some of which might seem equally farfetched in the context of the current war system. It may be, for instance, that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species. Poisoning of the air, and of the principal sources of food and water supply, is already well advanced, and at first glance would seem promising in this respect; it constitutes a threat that can be dealt with only through social organization and political power. But from present indications it will be a generation to a generation and a half before environmental pollution, however severe, will be sufficiently menacing, on a global scale, to offer a possible basis

for a solution.”

Note the *coincidence* of that last sentence with the emergence of the Global Warming mantra which was kicked off first in the intellectual space by the private elitist Club of Rome publishing their report in a book titled: *The First Global Revolution* in 1991; followed by major league governmental participation of virtually all nations of the world in what is called the United Nations Earth Summit in 1992; followed by vicariously kicking off public alarm in the mainstream by former vice president Al Gore in the 2000s making his Global Warming documentary. It was watched by millions in the mainstream worldwide and brought the public's fears on board the same page. Note that all these fall on precisely that timeline, ***“generation to a generation and a half before environmental pollution, however severe, will be sufficiently menacing, on a global scale, to offer a possible basis for a solution.”*** Newspapers, books, television shows, Hollywood movies, have continued to echo that menace in different flavors.

The entire diabolical subsection titled POLITICAL and a few shocking passages each from subsections titled SOCIOLOGICAL and ECOLOGICAL, of Section 6 of Report from Iron Mountain are reproduced below to lend full overarching context under which the latter day Global Warming / Climate Change menace, as well as many other menaces for behavior and population control which should easily be familiar today, are *potentially* being engineered to make the public mind. It is once again for the reader to make up his or her own damn mind whether the adverb “potentially” in that last sentence should be “actually”, or some other. Don't bow to any authority figures --- if you can help it. It is well for the reader to also remember what the Report on Iron Mountain itself stated at the very outset about the lay public mind ***“unexposed to the exigencies of higher political or military responsibility”*** not having the intellectual and moral capacity to appreciate this report (and this actually works to your advantage if you are not a sociopath and become filled with disgust reading it for it helps undo their propaganda system):

“Because of the unusual circumstances surrounding the establishment of this Group, and in view of the nature of its findings, we do not recommend that this Report be released for publication. It is our affirmative judgment that such action would not be in the public interest. The uncertain advantages of public discussion of our conclusions and recommendations are, in our opinion, greatly outweighed by the clear and predictable danger of a crisis in public confidence which untimely publication of this Report might be expected to provoke. The likelihood that a lay reader, unexposed to the exigencies of higher political or military responsibility, will misconstrue the purpose of this project, and the intent of its participants, seems obvious. We urge that circulation of

this Report be closely restricted to those whose responsibilities require that they be apprised of its contents.”

Begin Excerpt From Section 6, [Report from Iron Mountain](#)

POLITICAL

The war system makes the stable government of societies possible. It does this essentially by providing an external necessity for a society to accept political rule. In so doing, it establishes the basis for nationhood and the authority of government to control its constituents. What other institution or combination of programs might serve these functions in its place?

We have already pointed out that the end of the war means the end of national sovereignty, and thus the end of nationhood as we know it today. But this does not necessarily mean the end of nations in the administrative sense, and internal political power will remain essential to a stable society. The emerging "nations" of the peace epoch must continue to draw political authority from some source.

A number of proposals have been made governing the relations between nations after total disarmament; all are basically juridical in nature. They contemplate institutions more or less like a World Court, or a United Nations, but vested with real authority. They may or may not serve their ostensible post-military purpose of settling international disputes, but we need not discuss that here. None would offer effective external pressure on a peace-world nation to organize itself politically.

It might be argued that a well-armed international police force, operating under the authority of such a supranational "court," could well serve the function of external enemy. This, however, would constitute a military operation, like the inspection schemes mentioned, and, like them, would be inconsistent with the premise of an end to the war system. It is possible that a variant of the "Unarmed Forces" idea might be developed in such a way that its "constructive" (i.e., social welfare) activities could be combined with an economic "threat" of sufficient size and credibility to warrant political organization. Would this kind of threat also be contradictory to our basic premise?--that is, would it be inevitably military? Not necessarily, in our view, but we are skeptical of its capacity to evoke credibility. Also, the obvious destabilizing effect of any global social welfare surrogate on politically necessary class relationships would create an entirely new set of transition problems at least equal in

magnitude.

Credibility, in fact, lies at the heart of the problem of developing a political substitute for war. This is where the space-race proposals, in many ways so well suited as economic substitutes for war, fall short. The most ambitious and unrealistic space project cannot of itself generate a believable external menace. It has been hotly argued that such a menace would offer the "last, best hope of peace," etc., by uniting mankind against the danger of destruction by "creatures" from other planets or from outer space. Experiments have been proposed to test the credibility of an out-of-our-world invasion threat; it is possible that a few of the more difficult-to-explain "flying saucer" incidents of recent years were in fact early experiments of this kind. If so, they could hardly have been judged encouraging. We anticipate no difficulties in making a "need" for a giant super space program credible for economic purposes, even were there not ample precedent; extending it, for political purposes, to include features unfortunately associated with science fiction would obviously be a more dubious undertaking.

Nevertheless, an effective political substitute for war would require "alternate enemies," some of which might seem equally farfetched in the context of the current war system. It may be, for instance, that gross pollution of the environment can eventually replace the possibility of mass destruction by nuclear weapons as the principal apparent threat to the survival of the species. Poisoning of the air, and of the principal sources of food and water supply, is already well advanced, and at first glance would seem promising in this respect; it constitutes a threat that can be dealt with only through social organization and political power. But from present indications it will be a generation to a generation and a half before environmental pollution, however severe, will be sufficiently menacing, on a global scale, to offer a possible basis for a solution.

It is true that the rate of pollution could be increased selectively for this purpose; in fact, the mere modifying of existing programs for the deterrence of pollution could speed up the process enough to make the threat credible much sooner. But the pollution problem has been so widely publicized in recent years that it seems highly improbable that a program of deliberate environmental poisoning could be implemented in a politically acceptable manner.

However unlikely some of the possible alternate enemies we have mentioned may seem, we must emphasize that one must be found, of credible quality and magnitude,

if a transition to peace is ever to come about without social disintegration. It is more probably, in our judgement, that such a threat will have to be invented, rather than developed from unknown conditions. For this reason, we believe further speculation about its putative nature ill-advised in this context. Since there is considerable doubt, in our minds, that any viable political surrogate can be devised, **we are reluctant to compromise, by premature discussion, any possible option that may eventually lie open to our government.**

SOCIOLOGICAL

Another possible surrogate for the control of potential enemies of society is the reintroduction, in some form consistent with modern technology and political processes, of slavery. Up to now, this has been suggested only in fiction, notably in the works of Wells, Huxley, Orwell, and others engaged in the imaginative anticipation of the sociology of the future. But the fantasies projected in *Brave New World* and *1984* have seemed less and less implausible over the years since their publication. **The traditional association of slavery with ancient preindustrial cultures should not blind us to its adaptability to advanced forms of social organization, nor should its equally traditional incompatibility with Western moral and economic values. It is entirely possible that the development of a sophisticated form of slavery may be an absolute prerequisite for social control in a world at peace.** As a practical matter, conversion of the code of military discipline to a euphemized form of enslavement would entail surprisingly little revision; the logical first step would be the adoption of some form of "universal" military service.

When it comes to postulating a credible substitute for war capable of directing human behavior patterns in behalf of social organization, few options suggest themselves. Like its political function, the motivational function of war requires the existence of a genuinely menacing social enemy. The principal difference is that for purposes of motivating basic allegiance, as distinct from accepting political authority, the "alternate enemy" must imply a more immediate, tangible, and directly felt threat of destruction. It must justify the need for taking and paying a "blood price" in wide areas of human concern.

In this respect, the possible enemies noted earlier would be insufficient. One exception might be the environmental-pollution model, if the danger to society it posed was genuinely imminent. The fictive models would have to carry the weight of extraordinary conviction, underscored with a not inconsiderable actual sacrifice of life; the

construction of an up-to-date mythological or religious structure for this purpose would present difficulties in our era, but must certainly be considered.

Games theorists have suggested, in other contexts, the development of "blood games" for the effective control of individual aggressive impulses. It is an ironic commentary on the current state of war and peace studies that it was left not to scientists but to the makers of a commercial film to develop a model for this notion, on the implausible level of popular melodrama, as a ritualized manhunt. **More realistically, such a ritual might be socialized, in the manner of the Spanish Inquisition and the less formal witch trials of other periods, for purposes of "social purification," "state security," or other rationale both acceptable and credible to postwar societies.** The feasibility of such an updated version of still another ancient institution, though doubtful, is considerably less fanciful than the wishful notion of many peace planners that a lasting condition of peace can be brought about without the most painstaking examination of every possible surrogate for the essential functions of war. **What is involved here, in a sense, is the quest for William James' "moral equivalent of war."**

It is also possible that the two functions considered under this heading may be jointly served, in the sense of establishing the antisocial, for whom a control institution is needed, as the "alternate enemy" needed to hold society together. The relentless and irreversible advance of unemployability at all levels of society, and the similar extension of generalized alienation from accepted values may make some such program necessary even as an adjunct to the war system. **As before, we will not speculate on the specific forms this kind of program might take, except to note that there is again ample precedent, in the treatment meted out to disfavored, allegedly menacing, ethnic groups in certain societies during certain historical periods.**

ECOLOGICAL

Considering the shortcomings of war as a mechanism of selective population control, it might appear that devising substitutes for this function should be comparatively simple. Schematically this is so, but the problem of timing the transition to a new ecological balancing device makes the feasibility of substitution less certain. ...

There is no question but that a universal requirement that procreation be limited to the products of artificial insemination would provide a fully adequate substitute control for population levels. Such a reproductive system would, of course, have the added

advantage of being susceptible of direct eugenic management. Its predictable further development---conception and embryonic growth taking place wholly under laboratory conditions--would extend these controls to their logical conclusion. The ecological function of war under these circumstances would not only be superseded but surpassed in effectiveness.

The indicated intermediate step--total control of conception with a variant of the ubiquitous "pill," via water supplies or certain essential foodstuffs, offset by a controlled "antidote"---is already under development. There would appear to be no foreseeable need to revert to any of the outmoded practices referred to in the previous section (infanticide, etc.) as there might have been if the possibility of transition to peace had arisen two generations ago.

End Excerpt

Report by the Council of the Club of Rome - The First Global Revolution 1991

Directly upon the heels of the Machiavellian prescriptions laid out in the Report from Iron Mountain, came the infamous Club of Rome's actual recipe to propagandize the ecological global threat. In its carefully worded report on environment and habitat of Man on earth titled: The First Global Revolution, 1991, the Club of Rome authors, Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider, made global warming and climate change the new hard menace to corral mankind towards the behavior and attitude change desired by the powers that be:

“The Common enemy of humanity is Man: In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together. But in designating these dangers as the enemy, we fall into the trap, which we have already warned readers about, namely mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real

enemy then is humanity itself.” --- Ch 5, The Vacuum, pg 75 (pg 86 / 184 in PDF:
<https://archive.org/stream/TheFirstGlobalRevolution#page/n85/mode/2up> .

The United Nations Agenda 21 and Social Engineering Play Book

1992

Immediately upon the heels of the Club of Rome report, came the United Nations Agenda 21 in 1992. In the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development (UNCED), also known as the Rio de Janeiro Earth Summit, held in Brazil in June 1992, virtually all member countries of the UN signed on to this Agenda 21, including the United States of America. Its prime-mover was the 1991 Club of Rome recommendations that had identified all the menaces facing humanity including humanity itself, rectification of all of which suddenly became internationally endorsed global policies known as United Nations Agenda 21. It is an actual play by play rule book for attitude and behavior modification in a massive global *reset and reboot* that covers the gamut of present day organizational combines from international to national to districts to cities to local to neighborhood and community levels.

The United Nations Agenda 21 is intended to force mankind to make broad changes in its attitudes, behaviors, and lifestyles in accordance with the wishes of the powers that be. The macro social change is to be wrought, and is being brought about, in baby steps, legally, just as in the Global Warming / Climate Change scam, with the blunt force of *hammer unto anvil* by international treaties, global laws, and local statutes. And just as for international agreement on limiting carbon emissions under the magical “climate change” propaganda cover, United Nations Agenda 21 is cloaked in the magical propaganda word “sustainable”, as in Sustainable Development, in order to make it appear to be in the public's own best interest. Only nutters, fools, crazies and evil-doers would ever argue with “Sustainable Development”! And therefore, any dissent and public resistance to draconian and austerity measures in the name of “sustainable” is easily managed and dispensed with by labels such as kooks, crazies, mentally ill, and when all else fails, eco-terrorists with invitation to enjoy *state hospitality centers*.

The motivation for the scientific sounding mechanics of Global Warming / Climate Change **“Problem”** or dogma employing [crafty pseudo science](#) (see: *Crafting Pseudo Science Out Of Thin Air: The East Anglia Emails*, in sidebar), under the stewardship of UN international body called The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC), established by the United Nations

Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in 1988 to “provide the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of knowledge in climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic impacts”, and subsequently endorsed by the UN General Assembly to make it legal, cannot be fully appreciated in isolation to the profound justification that it lends to its big brother “**Solution**” umbrella, the United Nations Agenda 21.

The broader picture of full spectrum global control of humanity and the planet easily emerges once Global Warming / Climate Change is seen as just one among the many enabling threat components of the overall perception control system, the “Problem” component. Virtually all of these “Problem” components are based on this and that threat, some real, some imagined, some fabricated to look real, but in every case exaggerated with propaganda machinery of the [Mighty Wurlitzer](#), to lend justification to the madness of the “Solution” proposed for solving it. In this case, the singular pursuit of “green” under United Nations Agenda 21 which, in itself, is also just one among the many “Solution” means being pursued to complete the transformation of national sovereignty of nation states to Global Governance under one world government.

The powers that be pushing for Global Governance have employed several programs under the central institutions of the United Nations to accomplish this global transformation – just as the CFR author had openly stated in

[Crafting Pseudo Science Out Of Thin Air: The East Anglia Emails](#)

[1212063122](#)

Mike,

Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re (IPCC)? Keith will do likewise. Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same?

[1228330629](#)

When the FOI requests began here, the FOI person said we had to abide by the requests. It took a couple of half hour sessions – one at a screen, to convince them otherwise...

[1228330629](#)

I’ve got to know the FOI person quite well and the Chief Librarian – who deals with appeals. The VC is also aware of what is going on

[1228330629](#)

At present, I’m damned and publicly vilified because I refused to provide McIntyre with the data he requested.

[1228330629](#)

had I acceded to McIntyre’s initial request for climate model data, ...I would have spent years of my scientific career dealing with demands for further explanations

[1252164302](#)

Please write all emails as though they will be made public.

[1210367056](#)

Keep this quiet also, but this is the person who is putting in FOI requests for all emails Keith and Tim have written ... We think we’ve found a way around this.

[1107454306](#)

If they ever hear there is a Freedom of Information Act now in the UK, I think I’ll delete the file rather than send to anyone.

The Hard Road to World Order, 1974: ***“In short, the ‘house of world order’ will have to be built from the bottom up, rather than from the top down. It will look like a great ‘booming, buzzing confusion’ to use William James’ famous description of reality, but an end run around national sovereignty, eroding it piece by piece will accomplish much more than the old-fashioned frontal assault. Of course, for political as well as administrative reasons, some of these specialized arrangements should be brought into an appropriate relationship with the central institutions of the U.N. system,”***.

United Nations WHO institution for instance is legally chartered by international treaty to globally control and direct each nation's domestic response to WHO's unilateral declaration of Pandemic. Individual nation's right to adjudicate on the matter through one's own scientific minds, and to apply one's own national remedies, have been stripped away for all nations who have signed on to the WHO Convention. That is virtually all nations of the world; just like in the case of Agenda 21. WHO works hand in glove with the United States CDC and big-pharma to push global vaccination programs using manufactured and/or propagandized threats (as for instance the Swine Flu scare of 1976, 2009), just like the fictitious threat of WMD from Iraq in 2003 under the United Nations Security Council aegis which had led to the preplanned “solution” of invading that defenseless Muslim nation by the strongest military in the world. When sovereign nations can be invaded under cover of propaganda systems and legalisms enforced under the United Nations institutions in the name of protecting other nations,

The East Anglia Emails (contd. 2)

[1107454306](#)

And don't leave stuff lying around on ftp sites – you never know who is trawling them.

[1109021312](#)

I'm getting hassled by a couple of people to release the CRU station temperature data. Don't any of you three tell anybody that the UK has a Freedom of Information Act !

IPCC

[1177890796](#)

I tried hard to balance the needs of the science and the IPCC , which were not always the same.

[1256735067](#)

As we all know, this isn't about truth at all, its about plausibly deniable accusations,

PEERS

[1089318616](#)

I can't see either of these papers being in the next IPCC report. Kevin and I will keep them out somehow – even if we have to redefine what the peer-review literature is!

[1237496573](#)

I'm having a dispute with the new editor of Weather. I've complained about him to the RMS Chief Exec. If I don't get him to back down, I won't be sending any more papers to any RMS journals and I'll be resigning from the RMS.

[1047388489](#)

I think we have to stop considering “Climate Research” as a legitimate peer-reviewed journal. Perhaps we should encourage our colleagues in the climate research community to no longer submit to, or cite papers in, this journal.

invading individual people's bodies, private lives, and lifestyles in the name of protecting other people hardly poses a moral dilemma. This should be self-evident just by observation, that moral calculus plays no role in international relations, or in the pursuit of any political agenda, except as PR for rallying the public to the *cause célèbre* du jour.

This is the natural outcome of seeking global control with “military style objectivity” – the *ubermensch*'s uber rationality for achieving any political objective by any means irrespective of its consequences to the *lesser humanity*. This is termed “amoral” --- devoid of the calculus of morality; the *force majeure* of power over its subjects from time immemorial. This topic of uber rationality that leads to justification for any agenda, any goal, any outcome, is explored further in the essay: [Morality derived from the Intellect leads to Enslavement!](#). The dystopic consequences which naturally follow from uber rationality drawing upon “will to power”, can easily be gleaned in uber rationalist philosopher Bertrand Russell's “respectable” justification for one-world government in his book: [Impact of Science on Society](#).

One cannot pretend that because a modicum of rational thinking is necessary for sensible human existence in order to rise above what appears to be man's natural proclivity for superstitions, that insane amounts of rationality wielded by uber sociopaths is insanely good for humanity. This *rationality trap* of uber self-interest which calculatingly removes empathy and the absoluteness of the Golden Rule: “**Do unto**

[The East Anglia Emails \(contd. 3\)](#)

[1047388489](#)

I will be emailing the journal to tell them I'm having nothing more to do with it until they rid themselves of this troublesome editor.

[1051190249](#)

One approach is to go direct to the publishers and point out the fact that their journal is perceived as being a medium for disseminating misinformation under the guise of refereed work.

[1051190249](#)

I use the word ‘perceived’ here, since whether it is true or not is not what the publishers care about — it is how the journal is seen by the community that counts.

[1106322460](#)

If you think that Saiers is in the greenhouse skeptics camp, then, if we can find documentary evidence of this, we could go through official AGU channels to get him ousted.

HIDE THE DECLINE

[1054736277](#)

it would be nice to try to “contain” the putative “MWP”, even if we don't yet have a hemispheric mean reconstruction available that far back...

[1256747199](#)

Keith succeeding in being very restrained in his response. McIntyre knew what he was doing when he replaced some of the trees with those from another site.

[843161829](#)

I swear I pulled every trick out of my sleeve trying to milk something out of that.

I don't think it'd be productive to try and juggle the chronology statistics any more than I already have

others as you have others do unto you; and don't do to others what you don't want others to do to you" from its calculus, as these principles do not serve the self-interest of power, is the bane of rationality.

To reject this *rationality trap* that is sprung upon mankind using dogmas of science and technology is in itself rational and an existential self-defence. Its blanket rejection neither constitutes an endorsement of irrationality nor belief in tooth-fairies. To accuse those who reject this *rationality trap* as being irrational is part of ensuring that Unspeakable remain unspoken. This is what's behind marginalizing those who do not accept the dogma of man-made Global Warming / Climate Change.

There is a systematic method to the apparent madness of these (often phantasmic) threats arising out of nowhere and the officialdom's heavy-handed response to them once the layers of green, white, and other humanitarian or security masks are peeled off. These responses almost always strip away individual freedom, engender more conformity to dogmas, more standardization in individual behavior as well as in global policy prescriptions, and more world government which looks more and more like global police state with unified draconian policies that span the gamut of human activity, from banking to breathing.

One only has to read their own hand writings spanning the gamut of political theory, from those expressed in fables to those couched in philosophical justifications, in order to fully

[The East Anglia Emails \(contd. 4\)](#)

[1255352257](#)

The fact is that we can't account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can't. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.

[942777075](#)

I've just completed Mike's Nature trick of adding in the real temps to each series for the last 20 years (ie from 1981 onwards) and from 1961 for Keith's to hide the decline.

[1257546975](#)

Land warming since 1980 has been twice the ocean warming — and skeptics might claim that this proves that urban warming is real and important.

[826209667](#)

Also, it is important for us if you can transfer the ADVANCE money on the personal accounts which ... will not be more than 10,000 USD. Only in this case we can avoid big taxes and use money for our work as much as possible.

[1252164302](#)

We cherry-picked the tree-ring series in Eurasia.

[938018124](#)

everyone in the room at IPCC was in agreement that this was (cooling trend) a problem and a potential distraction / detraction from the reasonably consensus viewpoint we'd like to show

[938018124](#)

I believe that the recent warmth was probably matched about 1000 years ago.

comprehend the whole which, as any perceptive system analyst understands, is often masked by focus on individual components that appear (and at times made to appear) disconnected and unrelated to each other.

Important system and causal properties (cause and effect) of a complex system often remain hidden in the interconnection between components. To get at the whole understanding of the system, one has to be able to see all the forces that shape events; not just what's happening near to one. Specious and false arguments, clever misdirections and red herrings are cunningly prepared by uber minds to ensure that this understanding of the whole does not arise in the public mind; the Unspeakable remain unspoken. Those able to reconstitute the whole from the components are craftily dismissed by employing many sophisticated perception management techniques. Some of these techniques have been examined in [Anatomy of Conspiracy Theory](#).

The public documents listed below outline the scope of United Nations Agenda 21 for "Sustainable Development", of which the mantra of climate change is but one part, to secure the earth from the menace of man in the name of saving man from his own excesses. Just as the Club of Rome had stated: ***"All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself."***

[The East Anglia Emails \(contd. 5\)](#)

[1255523796](#)

The fact that we can not account for what is happening in the climate system makes any consideration of geoengineering quite hopeless as we will never be able to tell if it is successful or not! It is a travesty!

[Source link for the above excerpts.](#)

"As you know, I'm not political. If anything, I would like to see the climate change happen, so the science could be proved right, regardless of the consequences. This isn't being political, it is being selfish." --- Phil Jones, head of CRU, University of East Anglia, to climatologist John Christy, University of Alabama, 5 July 2005

"On 20 November 2009, emails and other documents, apparently originating from with the Climate Research Unit (CRU) at the University of East Anglia. The authenticity of these emails has been confirmed by most of the relevant parties including the CRU at Univeristy of East Anglia and many of the authors. These emails contain some quite surprising and even disappointing insights into what has been happening within the climate change scientific establishment. Worryingly this same group of scientists are very influential in terms of economic and social policy formation around the subject of climate change." --- [East Anglia Confirmed Emails from the Climate Research Unit](#) (<https://tinyurl.com/eastangliaemails-archives>)

Also see: [The Trick, Steve McIntyre, 2009 Nov 26 Climate Audit](#) and [contentions](#) and [IPCC: "inappropriate" to show the decline](#) and [Beyond Climategate: Virtually all climate 'science' temp. data is irrelevant / PHONY.](#)

Agenda 21 is designed to corral all mankind in all nations of the world into a state of existence that the world's public would, of their own volition, never select for themselves. Therefore, the objectives of United Nations Agenda 21 are to be achieved by stealth, in incremental stages, in the pretext of solving this and that menace. The menace is manufactured, or exponentially amplified, with propaganda cover exposing full spectrum of deceit from clever half-truths to outright lies that most people without much thinking would immediately agree with. Such as “Sustainable Development”.

Who in their right mind would not like the word “sustainable” as the panacea for the global threats of rising pollution, rising population explosion, rising food shortages, rising water shortages, rising famine, increased aridity of land, increasing terrorism, frequent pandemics, fear of global warming causing rising sea levels and destroying coastal cities, then fear of global cooling freezing out agriculture and rain forests, etc. etc. etc. The powers that be are only constrained by the imagination of the Rand Corporation and other think-bodies such as the Rockefeller Foundation to come up with [new threat scenarios and menaces](#) from where the Rand expert group assembled at [Iron Mountain](#) had left off in 1962. The powers that be are also only constrained by the technological advancements of the *Technetronic Era* to actually tickle crisis by intervention, to exacerbate it at will, or to outright manufacture it. [Geo-engineering](#) is used for weather modification and is examined in the [full report](#). Advanced nations have long held command over [environmental modification techniques](#) as a [Weapon of War](#) that can change weather patterns, cause flood or drought at will, prolong or shorten monsoon season, melt polar ice caps or winterize, change atmospheric charge, temperature, and pressure to generate storms or to mitigate them.

The beginning of experimental weather modification is credited to the first forced precipitation of rain - "cloud seeding" - by Vincent Schaefer using dry ice in 1946. The following year the same effect was demonstrated by Bernard Vonnegut using silver iodide crystals. ... "Army, Navy and Air Force are spending close to a million dollars a year on weather modification and their tremendous interest suggests that military applications extend far beyond visiting a few showers upon an enemy. It does not require a sharp mind to figure out that wartime storms might readily be infected with virulent bacteriological and radiological substances." ... Orville also reported that the USSR "... had conducted numerous unpublicized but still detectable experiments apparently aimed at finding ways to speed melting of polar icecaps; and has even offered to join the United States in a project to turn the Arctic Ocean into a sort of warm water lake by melting the polar icecap." ' (pgs. 4-5 [WEATHER MODIFICATION](#))

The United States Air Force has a 1996 public document outlining “owning the weather” completely by 2025 as a [Force Multiplier](#). The then United States Secretary of Defence, William S. Cohen, publicly stated his apprehension of “**eco- type of terrorism**” as the justification for the United States also pursuing the same capabilities. In his [DoD News Briefing in 1997](#), William Cohen, responding to the question: “how prepared we are to deal with [threats]”, said: *“There are some reports, for example, that some countries have been trying to construct something like an Ebola Virus, and that would be a very dangerous phenomenon, to say the least. Alvin Toeffler has written about this in terms of some scientists in their laboratories trying to devise certain types of pathogens that would be ethnic specific so that they could just eliminate certain ethnic groups and races; and others are designing some sort of engineering, some sort of insects that can destroy specific crops. **Others are engaging even in an eco- type of terrorism whereby they can alter the climate, set off earthquakes, volcanoes remotely through the use of electromagnetic waves. So there are plenty of ingenious minds out there that are at work finding ways in which they can wreak terror upon other nations. It's real, and that's the reason why we have to intensify our efforts, and that's why this is so important.**”* Official documents uncovered show the British RAF caused the flood of 1952 in the Devon village of Lynmouth in England due to their cloud seeding experiments under [Operation Cumulus](#). The British government had of course termed the disastrous flood which killed 35 people “**the hand of God**”, but, as the UK Guardian newspaper reported, *'new evidence from previously classified government files suggests that a team of international scientists working with the RAF was experimenting with artificial rainmaking in southern Britain in the same week and could possibly be implicated. **“We flew straight through the top of the cloud, poured dry ice down into the cloud. We flew down to see if any rain came out of the cloud. And it did about 30 minutes later, and we all cheered.”*** ' (ibid.)

The list of public disclosures is endless. The bibliography on the admission of *technetronic capability* for modifying weather as weapon available to many nations (and of course to the “terrorists” just like their possessing “WMD”) is easily accessible. To what extent is this capability actually deployed as a weapon on any given instance of weather anomaly, of course only becomes known ex post facto, years later, and on which historians, newspaper columnists, and hungry scholars earn their keep (and some even their Ph.D.) as they proudly strut their new found discoveries of a past which cannot be changed. Shame that few learn from history to understand the present and to preempt the future while waiting for its receipts: **“We are made wise not by the recollections of our past, but by the responsibility for our future.”** This shortsightedness is deliberate and calculated – for it does not take great deal of intelligence to see that a *pound of flesh* is extracted for breaking the code of silence when it can make the most difference to the deeds of history's actors:

“We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while

you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do." (New York Times, Oct. 17, 2004)

Today, based on the understanding from the rich bibliography on this subject, it also does not take a rocket scientist to see that the climate change menace potentially has many other covert man-made *technetronic helpers* besides the sun's natural activity, neither of which is accounted for in the propaganda spiel of man-made carbon emissions causing Global Warming in what appears to be a universal conspiracy of dunces that sees no evil, hears no evil, and speaks no evil.

Whenever the great political and intellectual leaders of mankind get together to sign global Accords on Climate Change, only man-made CO2 is put on the table and its rectification is signed off as the "green" solution. That's because the stealth agenda is to force a global transformation using any pretext, be it wholly propagandistic, or manufactured *technetronically* to lend credibility to the propaganda campaign. As the Report from Iron Mountain had perceptively suggested: **"Credibility, in fact, lies at the heart of the problem"** for any mind-game to succeed.

Unlike the sex prostitutes in every major city on earth who earn their honest keep selling their bodies without deceiving their customers about the nature of their services, the prostitutes of empire do so by wearing the garb of academic respectability, morality, piety, and concern for humanity, outright deceiving their customers. Jesus had just one word for such "moralists". The Bible calls them hypocrites. The problem however is far more severe than mere hypocrisy. It is criminal. A war crime. For it is the ubiquitous war on the public mind which can only be waged credibly by way of deception.

The wolf must appear in sheep's clothing in order to guide its flock first to the constricted hen house and then to the slaughter house. And it must also convince those most in the position to understand its overarching game-plan, to pretend to not notice it.

It's a shell game from top to bottom and permeates science as much as it permeates political science.

The skeptical reader who has bought into the religion of Global Warming must surely realize by now that the "sustainable" project, by necessity, requires a "credible problem" and propaganda system to affect the draconian changes to public attitudes and behavior that are inimical to their interests. That's just self-evident. And what has been demonstrated here is that when the "credible problem" is difficult to confirm empirically by the *scientific method* (of making observations on actual data and making theoretical models to explain that empirical data which are subsequently used for making

predictions which, if they come true then, as the outcome of the *scientific method*, are deemed to represent reality to the first order, but only to the extent that the models stay “falsifiable” by future discoveries and do not become “religion”), despite pseudo science making every effort in creating convoluted computer models to fabricate “credibility” from bogus data to synthesize an alarmist religion around their models, and given the evidence from the aforementioned Senate Minority Report which documents over 1000 scientists worldwide dissenting with the so called official IPCC “Consensus” on Global Warming, then, credibility can also be “tickled” into existence by covert *technetronic helpers* creating the necessary illusions.

The skeptical reader must also see how the propaganda machinery has now switched its pitch from the “Global Warming” menace which could not be confirmed empirically despite the alarmist attitude on CO2 levels, to extremes in weather fluctuations and relabeled that as the “Climate Change” menace.

The skeptical reader also cannot have failed to observe how the original *first-cause prime-mover* is cleverly retained for this new menace as well: due to man-made CO2 emissions – the core belief to be implanted among the global public as that is also the *first-cause axiomatic theme* for enabling United Nations Agenda 21.

This core belief is not permitted to be challenged without being labeled a heretic, kook, and incurring the risk of losing or tarnishing one's respectable career.

And lastly, the skeptical reader, who is now surely wide awake, has witnessed that the corruption of

Epistemological Method of Science: Science vs. Religion

Religion permits no falsification of its axioms, its presuppositions of faith, its core beliefs. Religion therefore, is generally considered to be a noun (except when one embarks on a spiritual journey in search of truth where nothing is presupposed, and where there are no axioms). Whereas, axioms of science, its own presuppositions of convenience, its assumptions that are often necessary in any domain and upon which the scientific method is built to discover and develop that domain, are contingent upon their being falsifiable. This means that when the axioms of science are so chosen that they cannot ever be proved to be true (or false), or, not permitted to be scrutinized at all by the fiat of power, then these turn into dogmatic axioms of religion. Science thus becomes like religion, a noun rather than the verb it is intended to be; the process by which to rationally and empirically discover reality the way it actually is. Science now becomes faith based; faith in dogmas that become religiously held by its high priests, and whose validity is not permitted to be scrutinized by the fiat of unchallengeable power. The Church of Science is born. And when it engages in pseudo science gibberish to achieve some political agendas, this church becomes part of social engineering in service of empire. **Every Church needs a Galileo to break its dogmatic hold.**

science begins at its very foundation when the presupposition of its axioms, and making these axioms *unfalsifiable* and/or *unscrutable*, is driven by political agendas rather than by the [epistemological method of science](#) (see: *Epistemological Method of Science: Science vs. Religion*, in sidebar) that rationally mandates making all its axioms *falsifiable* and *scrutable* in order to prevent science from becoming “religion”.

This is why Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever, quoted above, stated: **“I am a skeptic... Global warming has become a new religion.”**

It bears looking a bit more closely at this one Physics Nobel Laureate scientist's views who, in his 80s, appears quite unafraid of losing “academic respectability”. In his statement in response to the policy declaration of APS (American Physical Society): **“Emissions of greenhouse gases from human activities are changing the atmosphere in ways that affect the Earth's climate. They are emitted from fossil fuel combustion and a range of industrial and agricultural processes. The evidence is incontrovertible: global warming is occurring. If no mitigating actions are taken, significant disruptions in the Earth's physical and ecological systems, social systems, security and human health are likely to occur. We must reduce emissions of greenhouse gases beginning now.”**, Giaever told [The Sunday Telegraph](#) in 2011: **“Incontrovertible is not a scientific word. Nothing is incontrovertible in science.”** The newspaper reported that Giaever had testified before the US Senate about his doubts on Global Warming: **“Global warming has become a new religion. We frequently hear about the number of scientists who support it. But the number is not important: only whether they are correct is important.”** Ivar Giaever revisited his reasons and analysis for resigning from APS in The Lindau Nobel laureate Meetings in 2015. In his presentation titled [Global Warming Revisited](#) (video), Giaever stated:

Begin Quote Giaever

“I resigned from the society in 2011. First: nothing in science is incontrovertible. Second: the “measured” average temperature increase in 100 years or so, is 0.8 Kelvin. Third: since the Physical Society claim it has become warmer, why is everything better than before? Forth: the maximum average temperature ever measured was in 1998, 17 years ago. When will we stop wasting money on alternative energy?”

“From ~1880 to 2015 temperature has increased from ~288 K to 288.8 K (0.3%), i.e., amazingly stable.”

“In Albany, New York, where I live, there is ~80 K between max and min

temperature. Do you believe 0.8 K degree makes a big difference?”

“To my surprise both 'alarmist' and 'deniers' accept the fact that you can measure the average temperature of the **whole** earth for a **whole** year to a **fraction of a degree** and that the result is significant. Of course it's not. How can you possibly measure the average temperature for the whole earth and for the whole year and come up with a fraction of a degree?”

“I think the average temperature of the earth is equal to the emperor's new clothes. Was a boy who cried out that the emperor has no clothes on. And I would cry out and say you can't measure the temperature for the whole earth with such accuracy. ... It is ridiculous.”

“Now this is what they have come up with however, and this is for the last 19 years, roughly speaking. The temperature has not gone up. It's been constant for 19 years. There was a big peak in 1998, that's very recognizable. (Graph-1 RSS global mean temperature change: 219 months October 1996 to December 2014 – No Global Warming for 18 years 3 months). So what do the people who measure temperature do with that?

Well, here is the latest temperature they have measured now (Graph-2 Global Land–Ocean Temperature Index). And you look at the curve here and the temperature goes up.

How can that be when I just showed you the other curve (Graph-1) where the temperature has been constant? Well the reason for that is that they include now the **Ocean**. But for a hundred years the ocean has not been included.

Why do you think they include the ocean? Because it's more accurate? Or because they can fiddle with the data. That's what NASA does.

So Obama said last year that 2014 was the hottest year ever. But it's not true. It's not the hottest year.

Here is some satellite data (Graph-3 UAH Satellite-Based Temperature of the Global Lower Atmosphere). This is the peak in 1998, and basically the satellite data shows the same thing. The temperature has not increased.”

“From 1898 – 1998 (the hottest year) temperature has increased ~0.8 degrees and the CO2 concentration increased from 295 ppm to 367 ppm i.e. 72 ppm in a hundred years. That's a fact.

Now from 1998, which is basically the hottest year, CO2 has increased from 367 ppm to 403 ppm, i.e., 36 ppm or **half of the previous 100 years while temperature has been stable. So why hasn't the temperature increased 0.4 degrees then?**

I mean if you are a physicist for heaven's sake, and here is the experiment, and you have a theory, and the theory doesn't agree with the experiment, then you have to cut out the theory. You were wrong with the theory. So you can't believe then the people who are the alarmist that CO2 is a terrible thing. And therefore you can't drive and use solar cells and stuff because otherwise the world will go to pot. But it's not true. It's absolutely not true.”

“Global warming has really become a new religion. Because you can't discuss it. It's not proper. If you look at Lindau here today, then all the notable people they have said Climate Change in their talks. All of them have said it. I don't know whether they know what they mean, but they have said it anyway. Everybody talks about climate change. The American Physical Society of which I was a member, said the evidence is **incontrovertible that Global Warming exists. Now think about that. It is s a physical society. And they say you cannot discuss global warming because we believe it's happening. It's like the Catholic Church. There are lots of incontrovertible truths in the Catholic Church I am sure. And here there is a incontrovertible truth in a physical society. ”**

End Quote Giaever

There is a clearly visible pattern of narrative control here. We already observed that the principal axiom of Global Warming was most cunningly transformed into a religious belief which cannot be scrutinized without incurring the wrath of scientific priesthood. Now we also observe narrative control that is cunningly built upon that axiom of faith. Why control the narrative? Because narrative control is a principal first axiom of [psychological warfare](#). No propaganda system can be successful without control of the narrative. When important people and authority figures continually repeat the same *Big lie* over and over again, it not only becomes a *Big truth* for the contemporary public, but also a *Big fact* for subsequent generations once institutional pied pipers, namely scholars, historians, journalists, scientists and academics start exercising their pens in “respectability”. Within no time a

Big lie is turned into a *Big fact* with the control of the narrative.

The world witnessed something similar on 9-11 when shocking Terror was “tickled” into existence with full spectrum [propaganda cover](#) to make the [Global War on Terror credible to the public mind](#) against that external enemy over there, the “[Islamist terrorists](#)” – the new religion of empire. Sophisticated computer models were constructed not just by scientists, but also respectable scientific institutions like NIST, to show how the WTC buildings, terrorized by those “Islamist terrorists” flying over to the *sacred land of the free* from the Hindu Kush mountains on America's finest jet liners, could collapse so catastrophically due to jet-fuel induced fire which supposedly weakened the building structures which subsequently initiated their so called *gravity collapse*. While the [observable truth](#) was (and still is) right before everyone's eyes – steel-concrete tall buildings have never imploded into its own footsteps (WTC-7) / and exploded into fine dust (WTC-1 WTC-2) that way, especially not due to any fire in the history of fires in tall buildings, except under the deliberate force of some kind of controlled demolition that brings them down at free-fall speed as was observed on 9-11. Great propaganda cover was lent to these so called “scientific studies” for the benefit of the skeptics. Fortunately for those with eyes to see, that also helped “out” all the great “moral” public intellectuals [who cunningly shepherded the disbelieving flock](#) to the [same core beliefs](#) as the wolves wanted; same applies to [foisting “sustainable” agenda upon the disbelieving mind](#).

The core belief has to be universally implanted in the public mind that it is man that is responsible for Climate Change. It can only escape the notice of a complete dunce head (and there is no shortage of useful idiots in the world) that how earlier the religious dogma was “Global Warming”, then it became weather extremes because honest scientists demonstrated the former to be outright bunk, and it is soon to become “Global Cooling” (if it hasn't already) as the global temperatures are actually measured to be slightly declining (as some argue) and snow cover on the mountains and glaciers increasing.

The United Nations Agenda 21 continues on the same principal axis as the global warming scam. It posits man's very existence on the face of the earth to be a dire threat to “Gaia's” natural processes even beyond his carbon emissions. The principle is directly taken from the aforementioned handbook of social control in which the Club of Rome authors hath stated (repeating for emphasis): **“All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.”** The solution to the crisis of this real enemy destroying the earth is the United Nations Agenda 21 for Sustainable Development!

This Hegelian Dialectic is far more sophisticated (and convoluted) than others that have come before

it within our own lifetimes and requires considerable acuity of mind to comprehend. An acuity which is enfeebled by dumbing down the public mind and occupying it between *bread and circuses*. See the [Report on Mighty Wurlitzer](#) to understand how that is most cunningly accomplished through perception control. See [Hegelian Dialectic for Dummies](#) to understand the diabolical mechanism of social engineering for orchestrating an unpalatable outcome in small baby-steps, through deliberate crises creation, and then offering their antitheses as the solutions, which ultimately lead to the desired outcome in stages. The [gestalt transformation](#) to one-world governance cannot be taken voluntarily, or in one giant step, as it goes against the tribal and national instincts. It must be done in stages. And to take each baby-step towards the next stage needs a reason, a pretext, that would force that transformation. The irrational push for the acceptance of the alarmist dogma of man-made Global Warming despite the science not supporting it, can be perceptively understood in that context of pretext creation. Then, it no longer appears so irrational, as the planned enabler of Agenda 21. The noble concern for the environment is motivated by the same reason, as enabler of Agenda 21.

The core propaganda spiel of Agenda 21 is premised upon the necessity of preserving earth's natural processes from man's incessant encroachment, unbridled harvesting, and unbridled despoiling, through his attitude and behavior change under “sustainable” living. The “Gaia”, or mother earth, is deemed supreme, and Man, the common man that is, is deemed not just one among its many inhabitants, but also the worst one, and therefore, he must be treated like game in a reservation; he must be guided, shepherded, profiled, controlled, and culled. All this sounds grotesque and far-fetched, but that is indeed the underlying premise of the tiny elite who want to own and rule the earth in a one-world government. This government is by governance. The local / regional / national administrations may well be elected and form their government and fly their own flag. But their laws and constitution and its policing are formulated by the unelected elites as in the EU, which may be rubber-stamped for electoral legitimacy in order to maintain the requisite illusions.

It is shocking to see etched in 18 feet tall granite stone monument in Elbert County, Georgia, USA, called the Georgia Guidestones, these new Ten Commandments for a new world order, written in English, Spanish, Swahili, Hindi, Hebrew, Arabic, Chinese, and Russian, that world population should be maintained at half a billion (today it is seven billion --- where are the other 6.5 billion and rising to go? Who lives and who dies who decides? UN Agenda 21!)

- 1. Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature.**
2. Guide reproduction wisely — improving fitness and diversity.
3. Unite humanity with a living new language.

4. Rule passion — faith — tradition — and all things with tempered reason.
5. Protect people and nations with fair laws and just courts.
6. Let all nations rule internally resolving external disputes in a world court.
7. Avoid petty laws and useless officials.
8. Balance personal rights with social duties.
9. Prize truth — beauty — love — seeking harmony with the infinite.

10. Be not a cancer on the earth — Leave room for nature — Leave room for nature.

Under the propaganda cover of “Sustainable Development”, vast public spaces on earth are to be legally declared off-limits to man. The habitable as well as previously inhabited lands, water sources, and open spaces, are to be legally classified as public parks, natural preserves. Right alongside the drive for the outright abolition of private property ownership by individuals. All space is only to be leased for limited time and designated use from state authority and their proxies, the so called NGOs and non-profit tax-exempt foundations that are to take charge of the new world's public commons. Only corporations and non-profit foundations will be able to own land as the supposed custodians of public property as producers. Most of the world's open spaces is already being put under these umbrella organizations ostensibly in public interest. One of them is the famous international organization World Wildlife Fund or Federation (WWF).

In the developed West, beginning with the United States, the number and size of no-go, no-grow, no-farm, no-cultivate, and no-live spaces for individuals and communities is rising rapidly, right alongside geographically marked urbanized hi-rise clustering where most of humanity is eventually to be made to live in controlled spaces with strict control over their movements. That is already possible with electronic credit and electronic identity cards – which can be programmed to only work (when the person is behaving acceptably that is) in certain geographic areas or at certain times of the day. Thus human cloistering in regulated areas or “reservations” becomes the natural outcome of rapid *technologization* of human life in the *Technetronic Era*. Hollywood has been continually priming us psychologically with various dystopic outcomes for decades now. Few are surprised today let alone resist that millions of people go through x-ray body scanners daily as the new normal. More dystopia is introduced vicariously through movies, television, novels, fables, easier it becomes to accept it. The fact that a *Hunger Games* like society may well emerge as the peak of *Technetronic Era*, it is being banked, will just as easily be accepted by the public as body scanners.

Combined with carbon-credit and its repercussions of what man may legally eat, grow, produce, and

if and how many he may procreate, under the overarching United Nations Agenda 21, where man may legally live, how much space he may legally occupy, and where and when he may legally travel, all under full surveillance, is intended to make a global prison state for *hoi polloi*. Fable and reality are merging rapidly. Or at least being enabled.

It all started with the bogus alarm of man-made global warming, moved to the nice sounding idea of sustainable development, and is intended to end up in dystopic one-world police-state with no *unalienable* human / civil / political rights. The only public and individual rights, if any, are those accorded by the global state, or its functionaries, at their discretion, to meet the state's needs, and to maintain necessary illusions of self-empowerment as needed for ease of governance of *mothership* earth. The EU constitution is already a practicable and real Orwellian template for this much sought after global outcome. Its *Doublespeak* is the agreeable template to make giving up one's rights and freedoms to arbitrary definitions determined by the state, amenable to the simpleton public mind.

Conclusion

This agenda for the elitist control of all humanity on earth is the real alarm. The real elitist-made menace which needs the global public's interdiction. Not Global Warming / Climate Change which, if indeed real and a significant threat to mankind, is a natural phenomenon and man's contribution to it is a *lower order bit* in relation to solar activity. Man can do little about the impact of sun's activity on earth except to move to another planet or out of the solar system. It is very easy to adjudicate --- at least in theory --- what's the change of climate on mars? Is its surface temperatures also going up, or going down, or erratic?

Planetary scientists need to study this phenomenon of Climate as such, without special interests dominating their funding, or their own narrow self-interests co-opting both their science and their moral acumen. The fact that this truism, a cliché of the objectivity of science that is believed by the public mind from pre-kindergarten to post-graduate and beyond, even needs stating, speaks to the evergreen corruption of science at the hands of its own priestly class in obedience to the ruling class. How different is that from the corruption of the priestly class in every religion in obedience to the ruling class? They both serve identical masters in service of empire.

The priestly classes concerned about their pristine professions serving masters of politics rather than masters of truth, must publicly reckon with this inconvenient fact that theirs is worse than the world's oldest profession; theirs deceives their customers! If Dante's hell is to be believed, deceivers and

hypocrites occupy the lowest recesses of hell, the *Ninth Circle*, that he labeled *malebolge*. Interestingly, the same principle is true of both Christianity and Islam. The *ubermensch* of course see no use for such religions except when needed as control systems for organizing the beliefs and habits of the masses. Whereas, Divine religions, when followed as per their own respective Scripture rather than by what's written by scholars in commentaries of these Scriptures, lead the way forward for all humanity, such as by their common standard which gives precedence to the primacy of all mankind over the *ubermensch* for equitable co-existence, the Golden Rule: **“Do unto others as you have others do unto you; and don't do to others what you don't want others to do to you”!**

Political leaders and representatives of governments authorized to sign away their nation's sovereignty to *Noble Lies*, before putting down their signatures to specious treaties must clearly reckon that they are doing so as petty mercenaries wittingly pushing Global Governance upon their naïve public, and not as unwitting *Useful Idiots* fooled by sacred truths from authority figures.

The common man, whether too lazy to comprehend the multifaceted devils running the world today, or too apathetic to do anything about it, will only get what's coming to the sheep; the butchers will never protest the habit of mutton eaters!

All ex post facto laments and excuses for having been *innocent of knowledge*, for everyone, have herewith been cleaved asunder.

To learn more about UN Agenda 21, below are links to some archived documents and video presentations. An informed and awakened citizenry putting pressure upon their government at all levels, is the only effective antidote to hectoring hegemons. That's obviously a wonderful theory! In some cases, in the United States of America (mainly), it has even been put into practice (occasionally, but all too infrequently). As the video talks betray, the United States is rapidly being urbanized, and its vast lands are being reserved against man. The resistance by local communities is not sufficient to overturn the thrust for local implementations of Agenda 21, unless this thrust is resisted at the national and federal levels. Federal and state funding of local communities ensures it.

1. [PDF Cacheof Our Global Neighborhood from sovereignty.net](#)
2. [PDF Cacheof United Nations Sustainable Development Rio June 1992 Agenda21](#)
3. [PDF Cacheof National Implementation of Agenda 21 JOHANNESBURG SUMMIT 2002 summarypublication](#)
4. [PDF Cacheof Global Biodiversity Assessment 1140 Page Report Annoucement, The United](#)

[Nations Environment Programme UNEP Nov 2002 UNEP](#)

5. [PDF Cacheof Unsustainables UN Global Bio Div Assess 95 Pages](#)
6. [PDF Cacheof IUCN Draft Test Guide to Biodiversity Assessment April 2000 biodiversity assessment guide](#)
7. [PDF Cacheof Redevelopment The Unknown Government August 2004](#)

Video Presentations

“AGENDA 21 ON HOW IT WILL AFFECT YOU”

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Q0qT0XKcL1o>]

“Agenda 21 For Dummies”

[<https://youtube.com/watch?v=TzEEgtOFFIM>]

“Sustainable Destruction - Exposing Agenda 21 in Rural America”

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=V-U-Ov1Ay30>]

“Rosa Koire: Agenda 21. Open Mind Conference Denmark, 2013”

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=7ykELwj1Ta8>]

References

[1] Summarized and Adapted from Detailed Report (2008-2017): [On Global Warming Mind-Fck](#)

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/nb-on-global-warming.html>

[2] More Dismantling Climate Science: [Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire](#)

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

[3] More Dismantling Agenda 21: [Agenda 21 For Dummies](#)

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/agenda-21-for-dummies.html>

[4] More Dismantling Hegelian Dialectic: [Hegelian Dialectic for Dummies](#)

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/11/hegelian-dialectic-what-is-it.html>

[5] More Dismantling *Crippled* Epistemology: [Some Problems in Epistemology](#)

URL: <https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/some-problems-in-epistemology.html>

[6] Shorter version of the above: [Introduction to Epistemology](#)

URL: <https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/intro-to-epistemology-by-zahir-ebrahim.html>

[7] More Dismantling Propaganda Systems: [Report on the Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare](#)

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

[8] Agenda 21: Earth Summit: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio, United Nations,

URL: <https://www.amazon.com/Agenda-21-Summit-Nations-Programme/dp/1482672774/>

[9] Behind the Green Mask: U.N. Agenda 21, by Rosa Koire, 2011 (deconstructs the UN play book),

URL: <https://www.amazon.com/BEHIND-THE-GREEN-MASK-Agenda/dp/0615494544/>

Short URL: <https://tinyurl.com/global-warming-new-religion>

Source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/global-warming-has-become-new-religion.html>

First Published as Summary of [1] on November 30, 2016 | Last updated Friday, October 26, 2018
10:00 am 16821