

NB: On Global Warming

Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a ‘Hegelian Mind Fck’!

**See Response to Financial Times Gideon Rachman's 'And now for a
world government'**

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

December 12, 2008 | Footnotes last updated November 29, 2016

Question: *'Do you really believe that mankind doesn't have anything to do with the climate change? I've posted countless articles, videos on this topic. Pollution is NOT good for our planet and/or ourselves. Ice is melting. Droughts are occurring worldwide. There's going to be wars over water in the future. There is a limited amount of oil and we cannot keep using it as our only fuel source.'*

Project Humanbeingsfirst Responds

Actually, if you look at the coefficients of contributions, things become manifest. Pollution isn't exactly the same thing as global warming, or global cooling, although it certainly impacts them both.

Yes, reducing pollution is very important, so is increasing sustainable living, and respecting the power of the earth to create bounties which make our lives both comfortable and pleasurable. There is a self-sustaining and auto re-generation cycle in the eco-system which can withstand some harvesting, some abuse and some pollution, but crossing the threshold can destroy it, or make the replenishment cycle inordinately long. So we must live far below that threshold of tolerance of the environment. This is but a truism. Only a moron would deny any of it, or work against it. They can be safely ignored, if not outright consigned to the looney bin.

This isn't what is being talked about here however, although, the disinformationists would like one to think so. This is exactly the conclusion you have unfortunately jumped to as well, despite having read so much of my work and knowing that I am really not idiotic, nor unscientific, nor irrational. Of course, if one asked Mr. Paul Craig Roberts who apportioned the following epithet for me *"you are a completely stupid fool, a disgrace to humanity"*, it might lead to a different conclusion. But assuming one does not share in that invective, why would one automatically jump to the conclusion that when a man of science challenges global warming, they are denying the obviousness inherent in the question that you posed?

I say this not to critique, but just to point out how powerful and successful the disinformation and psyops have been. It is the same Foundations who have seeded the sustainable living mantra as population planning. Care to guess who those might be? It is the same impetus that led to NSSM 200 in 1974 which made population control in poor countries a national security imperative for the United States – the country which excels in harvesting the poor nations of all their natural resources and foisting dictatorships upon them! Care to know who seeded it? I happen to know of the team who got the Nobel Prize on this climate issue last year – they are all imperialists, in on the con-game, just like Hillary Clinton and Al Gore. You can easily find the Pakistani on the team who shared in that Nobel prize amidst much hoopla in Pakistan. Visit his website, and try to determine his axioms in the space of world-government, war on terror, 911. They match the axioms of the state as far as I have been able to tell – and I looked at it last year to check-out what kind of people win a Nobel Prize in climate and environment. When the ruling-elite pushes a mantra, knowing what I know today, my first take begins with searching for their motivation. If one does, what on the surface appears to be a good deed, but with evil intentions and Machiavellian motivations, I have no use for such criminal 'good', and neither should you.

The following is the real fact of the matter. I only illustrate the principle. One can chase it down from then on. In order to keep things straight in the head in the obfuscating space of social

sciences laden with deception and political motivations, I tend to rely a lot on thought processes borrowed from computer science and electrical engineering. You may have seen my description of the 'bit' for example. Here is a passage from one of my recent essays on monetary stuff:

'It is also very convenient for the learned to mix up the 'highest order bit' with 'lower order bits' of a complex matter – irrespective of deliberately or inadvertently – for the plebes can hardly tell the difference. And that's just wonderful for creating clever red herrings when the latter are emphasized, and the former is ignored! Surely whatever one comes up with is always a solution to something, and that's just as undeniable as any pathetic tautology. But is it a solution to the 'most significant bit'? Has the problem itself been accurately diagnosed, and the systemic multi-lateral illness accurately mapped out to its very DNA? Not when the sacred-cow axioms remain untouchable! And this is indeed how one wins a Nobel Prize and lucrative appointments. [a30] In some cases, even stays alive.

To explain the commonsense concept of 'bit' drawn from electrical engineering, it's like having a "one" in the 7th decimal place, and also in the 2nd decimal place, to create the total amount One million and Ten dollars, \$1,000,010, and while auditing the books, focussing on the digit position which identifies the Ten dollars and not the one which identifies the Million! The significance of this is not lost to the banksters!' -- *The Monetary Conspiracy for World Government***

Applying that prioritizing, or weightage if you will, principle to this topic of "Global Warming", one observes that the coefficient, or the bit position, or weightage occupied by the planetary level changes in the solar system due to sun's activity is actually a higher order bit position, than the contribution to the measurements from human activity.

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

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

Now, whether there is planetary-level (solar-system level) global warming, or global cooling, is also an entirely orthogonal issue from human contribution to despoiling its environment. Both the former two factors, if they are dominant, tend to occupy the higher order bit relative to human contribution. Wit the Ice-age, followed by the Holocene age. No factories and polluting industries were present then. Unless we explode 10 hydrogen bombs in geostrategic locations to usher in a manmade nuclear winter (and I exaggerate, a smaller number will surely do it), the contribution from coal and cow's emissions (the latter, believe it or not, is also apportioned carbon-credit as I have humorously read somewhere) remain in the lower order bits. They are surely non-zero, and if planetary-level climactic changes in the solar system become normal, as they do between their cyclic extremes, then these lower order bits will become the new higher order bits for management. That's just common sense.

So there are two real issues. First is the following scientific measurement – which can be fairly objective – what is the temperature activity in the solar system. For instance, is Mars cooling down or heating up in the past decades. Since there is no known life or industry on Mars, that can readily answer the question quite accurately for earth too. But better and longer running data is available for earth as well, which is why scientists are dissenting as noted in the Senate Minority Report that I have cited in my response to Mr. Gideon Rachman! I do not know of a single lay person who has actually read that report as yet, or its 2007 predecessor report from last year. Most arguments are religiously being fanned out of sheer ignorance, rather than simply asking the quantifiable questions: what is the empirical measurement data (instead of the sociological one)? How was it taken, where was it taken, what time span does it measure,

and what is the conclusion?

The second real issue is the sociological one that you have alluded to, such as oil consumption, human activity, etc. Please apply those concerns to the Western world first, and specifically to the Americans, not to the entire world, as the affluent Global North is, and has been, the biggest pig. In the Global South, people can hardly make ends meet, they barely subsist on dollar a day wage. And 2/3rd of all humanity lives there. They are routinely harvested of not only what's under their soil, but also what's above it, trees! Thus notice how Rachman has employed the mantra of Global Warming. Even if one assumes for the sake of making the following point that it is the man-made coefficient which is dominant – Gideon Rachman does not advocate that the Western world create a protocol to reduce their gluttonous consumption, but jumps straight to world government! And as everyone knows, the biggest violators of Kyoto, were indeed the Americans themselves. They refused to ratify it! And that, is indeed the second real issue.

I am a scientist. I look at data and reach conclusions. I further look at data forensically, and even look at forces that remain hidden, as well as those which are apparent. My writings are testimony of that. I have no reason to obfuscate or deny any of these factors. Whereas those who are pushing them, have a politically motivated agenda, as has already been shown. Just as the scientists at NIST fudged the reports on how the towers fell, and Popular Mechanics dished out disinformation on how it could have happened, it is already in ample evidence that science is permeated with politics, like every other human endeavor! So before looking at the scientists' results and reading their papers, look at their motivation. Whom do they shill for?

I would be happy to address further questions from anyone. This topic does require doing substantial due diligence before forming opinions. Remember that the subject matter is no less laden with deception, than any other topic which relates to world government, from 'war on terror' to 'money as debt' to the Federal Reserve System. You can't simply pick up a text-book (or 10 books) on any of these topics and assume what you are reading is entirely correct, as one normally does at a university in a typical science curriculum. There, the measurement of learning is often how accurately one has understood what the books are teaching, and one gets an 'A' for perfect recollection and/or solving problems based on the axioms in the books which are rarely if ever challenged. The axioms are taken on faith and assumed correct. One takes $F=MA$ for granted.

Here, you have to assume that the text-books/articles/literature/Nobel-Prizes could also be

lying, telling half-truths through omissions and distortions, or spinning politically motivated mantras as axioms upon which all further discussions are being based. Just like 911 and the 'war on terror'. That is quite a difference in approach to studying! It requires one being a Sherlock Holmes trying to solve a complex puzzle laden with deliberate red herrings more than being a naïve grad-student!

Hope this fleshes out all the dimensions of the question. For the simple reason that Global Warming mantra is to be Machiavellianly employed to control humanity, and we have even seen a glimpse of that in the Financial Times editorial, I oppose it. If it turns out that the human emissions are the most significant bit, let the affluent nations bring themselves down to the level of poor nations before demanding from them to do anything. After all, the ruling-elite are pitching that we are one ship of humanity and global control is necessary. Let not the upper-deck live in plunderous wealth while the lower decks are thrown to the sea! That is only fair for something as intimately shared as the environment!

Zahir Ebrahim

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

** <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/11/monetary-conspiracy-world-government.html>

- ### -

Footnotes

Updates and Related References: (Last Updated Tuesday, November 29, 2016)

[0] Geo Engineering

In the dismantling of the core lie above of whether or not global warming is man-made and

Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a 'Hegelian Mind Fck'!

what really lies behind that boogeyman, we haven't even touched upon the subject of Geo Engineering. This is to deliberately engineer the earth's weather and artificially induce global climate change to precipitate the climate crisis in order to lend the mantra du jour some legitimacy – be it global warming, or global cooling, or some yet to be thought of even more frightening crisis such as global earthquakes, or other more imaginative earth-centric or earth-impacting catastrophes, which can give new lease on life to these mantras to continue pursuing the real agenda behind it all in the pretext of fighting these global crises. Just like the mantra of war on terror. We already observe how new global enemies are inexplicably birth-panged in the blood of the ordinary people to give this well-worn mantra a new lease on its life.

Whether the climate change boogeyman is crafted in mantras alone, or in mantras backed by manufactured crisis such as through [Geo Engineering](#) or [extra-terrestrial engineering](#), in order to fabricate the data to continually fuel that frightening narrative, the outcome is singular: the introduction of carbon credit by which to limit and control population growth. When you limit carbon emissions, you automatically limit production, and consequently control population growth. We already know without doubt that population reduction is a ruling agenda as per NSSM-200 in which Dr. Henry Kissinger stated, as the then Secretary of State, that rise of third world population was a threat to the National Security of the United States. We also know that all the news related to climate and weather is controlled and disseminated to the newsmedia from a private organization called [Weather Central](#) in which the House of Rothschild purchased a 70% majority stake in 2011. The Wall Street Journal headlined it: **Even the Rothschilds Are Weather Obsessed, 'The couple's private-investment company, E.L. Rothschild LLC, is slated to acquire 70% of Weather Central, which provides weather forecasting services and graphics to local television stations and TV programs such as ABC's "Good Morning America."** <http://blogs.wsj.com/deals/2011/01/31/rothschilds-buy-majority-stake-in-weather-central/> (January 31, 2011).

Why is the banking cabal so interested in providing that service to mankind? This is what Sir Evelyn Rothschild said: ***“As a family, the Rothschilds have always been dedicated to the utmost quality of our products and services. With respect to our investments, we focus on entering into long-term partnerships with people who share our values. As weather becomes more extreme around the planet, with greater human and financial ramifications, we believe that Weather Central will play a major role in mitigating damage and improving lives. This is important to the Rothschilds, as it is to Weather Central. We are proud of our new partnership with them.”***,

<http://www.businesswire.com/news/home/20110131007054/en/E.L.-Rothschild-LLC-Acquires-Majority-Stake-Weather> (January 31, 2011).

The interconnection of common threads of interest of the same banking cabal is open for all to see. First they controlled the money supply via acquiring monopoly control over nations' central banks and the issuance of their own national currency as a debt secured by the taxation levied upon the peoples of these nations. The same cabal is now seeking to control all humanity via the global carbon credit scam which will give them control over all means of production, including of human beings. Thus it makes sense for the cabal to control the primary source of all news and propaganda dissemination on weather and climate, just as they already control other news dissemination sources and news agencies such as the Associated Press. There is an extensive bibliography on this subject, the pathetic unfamiliarity with which leads to the disbelief and confusion among the public as well as among their mild-mannered gallant stewards across the board, from science to politics, that there is a diabolical conspiracy afoot to control mankind. None dare call it conspiracy. Which is why, the popes and the laity alike are easily led to buy one control regime after another in the name of some higher purpose. Such as, securing their nation from this or that threat, danger, crisis, catastrophe or calamity.

To secure mankind from the threat of the terrorists, the public has been made to accept the war on terror and the concomitant police-states that virtually all of mankind now live in. To secure mankind from climate change, all governments are now being goaded and directed to accept legal controls on carbon emissions. This will soon translate to the number of human beings and factories on the planet that can be sustained in eco-balance of the new manufactured reality of climate change!

This not so hidden motivation is in plain sight. It is not a classified state secret. And yet, incredibly, as in all matters of controlling the public mind by way of omission, the most effective form of propaganda, there is absolute silence on any mention of Geo Engineering in the calculus of climate change among the very officialdom who are leading the charge on limiting carbon emissions. No word in the press, or among the academics, or among the pundits and the pulpits. The powers that be had long purchased their own scientists, prostitutes and pressman, not to forget the politicians and the robes, to both spin the mantra of global warming, and to participate in the fruits and labors of Geo Engineering. And they have purchased the primary source of narrative distribution on this subject as well. To learn more about Geo Engineering, try searching for that term in [Google](#). The first item that crops up is in fact this Newspeak definition of Geo Engineering to make it appear benign: **Geoengineering**

is the artificial modification of Earth's climate systems through two primary ideologies, Solar Radiation Management (SRM) and Carbon Dioxide Removal (CDR).

The new propaganda lines for useful idiots to promulgate to the masses to get them to accept this whole scam appears to be by way of **the technique of infamy, invent two or more lies instead of just one, and have the public vigorously debate which of them is true or the better alternative:** the de-carbonization of environment for sustainable development by carbon credit vs. SRM and CDR ideologies to manage the earth's climate for the greater benefit of the public. All very scientifically couched of course. Weather modification and control techniques have countless patents published on the US patent website that are open for anyone to study. Global supremacy in weather modification techniques has openly been declared time and again as having military dimensions and its complete mastery a military objective. None of this is ever mentioned in the annual climate change conferences where the political leaders of the world legally sign away their grandchildren's future with great fanfare of saving the earth. The following two documentaries dive deeply into the subject of Geo Engineering for the lay person. The excellent website <http://geoengineeringwatch.org> is a stupendous resource for further due diligence.

"What in the World Are They Spraying?"

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xFQ2_0QNiks]

"Why in the World are They Spraying?"

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mEfJ00-cTis>]

[0a] Report from Iron Mountain 1967

Finally, not to forget that the environment, and specifically climate and pollution, are mentioned in the 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 corralling mankind. It 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 global political authority in a one-world government, even if just for a moment the skeptic may accept that hypothesis, 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 it would soon end with nary a new enemy in sight, stated in its Section 6, Substitutes for the Function of War, for 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 in the major league mainstream by former vice president Al Gore on precisely that timeline.

The entire diabolical subsection titled POLITICAL and a few shocking passages each from subsections titled SOCIOLOGICAL and ECOLOGICAL, of Section 6 are reproduced below to lend full overarching context under which the latter day Global Warming menace, now re-titled as the Climate Change menace, as well as many other menaces for behavior and population control which should easily be familiar today, are *potentially* being engineered. It is for the reader to make up his or her own damn mind whether the adverb "potentially" should be

“actually”, or some other. It is well for the reader to remember what the Report itself stated at the very outset about the lay public **“unexposed to the exigencies of higher political or military responsibility”** not having the intellectual and moral capacity to appreciate this report: **“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

[0b] Report by the Council of the Club of Rome - The First Global Revolution 1991

Also not to forget that 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> .

[0c] The United Nations Agenda 21 and Social Engineering Play Book 1992

Again, also not to forget that directly on 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 mechanics of global warming / climate change employing crafty pseudo science cannot be fully appreciated in isolation to its big brother umbrella, the United Nations Agenda 21. The broader picture of full spectrum global control of humanity easily emerges once Global Warming / Climate Change is understood as part of the overall propaganda system based on this and that threat to lend justification to the madness of Agenda 21. There is a systematic method to that madness once the layers of green masks are peeled off.

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.”***

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 expositing 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.

Agenda 21 continues on the same axis as the global warming scam and 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 this enemy is United Nations Agenda 21 for Sustainable Development!

This Hegelian Dialectic is far more sophisticated 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](#) [17n] to understand how that is most cunningly accomplished through perception control. See [Hegelian Dialectic for Dummies](#) [17p] for understanding that mechanism.

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 one-world government.

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 world police-state.

This is the real alarm. The real man-made menace. Not Global Warming / Climate Change.

Here are some of the official Agenda 21 documents, and some dissecting video presentations which systematically expose the hidden in plain-sight tapestries behind the plurality of alarm and “sustainable” propaganda threads (from [Agenda 21 for Dummies](#) [17b]):

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](#)

“Agenda 21 For Dummies”

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

“Millions to be KILLED under Agenda 21”

[<http://youtube.com/watch?v=iiUdHW1dHyE>]

“How your community is implementing AGENDA 21, 2011, Danville, California”

[<http://youtube.com/watch?v=CEHWsdimVO4>]

“Agenda 21. Open Mind Conference 2013, Denmark”

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

“Agenda 21, Bradley County, TN”

[<http://youtube.com/watch?v=0K6CACOGdEM>]

[0d] Propaganda System In Play

Lastly, a dissecting note on the sophisticated propaganda system deployed to make the public mind is necessary in order to situate the mechanistic context of how Global Warming scam is technically being carried out by well-known establishmentarian scientists using *pseudo science* and *deep social engineering* in cahoots with the political establishment – putting [science in the service of empire](#). It is borrowed from [The `Hockey Stick': A New Low in Climate Science](#) and is courtesy of the late [John L. Daly](#). In his meticulous dissection of aspects of the Climate

Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a ‘Hegelian Mind Fck’!

Change / Global Warming propaganda system, John Daly stated in his detailed deconstruction of the infamous 'Hockey Stick' graph which was concocted by a young scientist named Michael Mann who, as good fortunes would have it, also saw a meteoric rise in his career as well as in his public presence in *synchronicity* with his 'Hockey Stick':

Begin Excerpt from [The 'Hockey Stick': A New Low in Climate Science](#)

The 'Hockey Stick'

Dr Michael Mann of the Department of Geosciences, University of Massachusetts was the primary author of the GRL paper, and in one scientific coup overturned the whole of climate history [16].

Using tree rings as a basis for assessing past temperature changes back to the year 1,000 AD, supplemented by other proxies from more recent centuries, Mann completely redrew the history, turning the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age into non-events, consigned to a kind of Orwellian 'memory hole' [22]. Fig.4 shows Mann's revision of the climatic history of the last millennium.




Fig.4 - The 'Hockey Stick'

From the diagram, the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age have disappeared, to be replaced by a largely benign and slightly cooling linear trend in climate - until 1900 AD.

At that point, Mann completed the coup and crudely grafted the surface temperature record of the 20th century (shown in red and itself largely the product of urban heat islands) onto the pre-1900 tree ring record. The effect was visually dramatic as the 20th century was portrayed as a climate rocketing out of control. The red line extends all the way to 1998 (Mann's 'warmest year of the millennium'), a year warmed by the big El Niño of that year. It should be noted that the surface record is completely at variance with the satellite temperature record [20]. Had the latter been used to represent the last 20 years, the effect would have been to make the 20th century much less significant when compared with earlier centuries.

As a piece of science and statistics it was seriously flawed as two data series representing such different variables as temperature and tree rings simply cannot be credibly grafted together into a single series.

In every other science when such a drastic revision of previously accepted knowledge is promulgated, there is considerable debate and initial scepticism, the new theory facing a gauntlet of criticism and intense review. Only if a new idea survives that process does it become broadly accepted by the scientific peer group and the public at large.

This never happened with Mann's 'Hockey Stick'. The coup was total, bloodless, and swift as Mann's paper was greeted with a chorus of uncritical approval from the greenhouse industry. Within the space of only 12 months, the theory had become entrenched as a new orthodoxy.

The ultimate consummation of the new theory came with the release of the draft of the Third Assessment Report (TAR-2000) [11] of the IPCC. Overturning its own previous view in the 1995 report, the IPCC presented the 'Hockey Stick' as the new orthodoxy with hardly an apology or explanation for the abrupt U-turn since its 1995 report. They could not even offer any scientific justification for their new line.

Within months of the IPCC draft release, the long-awaited draft U.S. 'National

Assessment' Overview document featured the 'Hockey Stick' as the first of many climatic graphs and charts in its report, affirming the crucial importance placed in it by the authors and by the industry at large. This is not an esoteric theory about the distant past, marginal to the global warming debate, but rather is a core foundation upon which a new publicity offensive on global warming is being mounted.

Two issues are raised by Mann's 'Hockey Stick'.

- 1) Why did the climate community fail to critically review the validity of the new theory, indeed to uncritically embrace it in its entirety?
- 2) Is any of it true? Or is it a means of disposing of the inconvenient Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age, and thus avoid the problem of the role of the sun in climate history?

The Origins of the 'Hockey Stick'

Tree rings are the primary proxy behind the 'Hockey Stick', particularly the earlier part of the millennium. Tree rings are only laid during the growing season, not the whole year, and so they tell us little or nothing about annual climate. For example, this year (2000) there was a warm winter and early spring in the north-eastern USA, followed by an unusually cool summer and fall. Since the two events are largely self-cancelling, the year may finish as fairly average, but the tree rings would only record the cool summer and thus give a completely false impression of the full-year temperature. Tree rings do not even record night temperatures since photosynthesis only occurs in the daytime. Yet winter and night temperatures are an essential component of what we understand by the concept 'annual mean temperature'.

All a tree ring can tell us is whether the combined micro-environmental conditions during the growing season were favourable to tree growth or not. This is because tree rings are influenced by numerous factors other than temperature, such as rainfall, sunlight, cloudiness, pests, competition, forest fires, soil nutrients, frosts and snow duration. Thus they are not even a good daytime temperature proxy for the few months of the growing season. Other proxies such as isotopes in coral, ice, minerals and

sediments are vastly superior.

Trees only grow on land. Since 71% of the planet is covered by oceans, seas and lakes, tree rings can tell us nothing about the maritime climate, even though the oceans are known to be the prime determinants of climate conditions throughout the world.

In other words, historical climate simply cannot be described without taking into account the winter and adjacent months temperatures, night-time temperatures, and ocean sea surface temperatures. Tree rings, no matter how carefully they are measured and examined, cannot provide information on any of these key parameters, and are a doubtful proxy even for daytime temperatures on land in summer.

A final weakness arises when calibrating the tree rings against temperature. When measuring the width or density of a tree ring, exactly what temperature is represented by that measurement? This can only be determined by calibrating recently laid rings against known temperatures that existed at the time. Even this is problematic as the 'known temperatures' can mean using a temperature series seriously contaminated by heat island and other local errors. If the calibrating temperatures are wrong, the whole tree ring temperature reconstruction for the distant past is also compromised.

There are many sub-specialties within the greenhouse sciences, 'dendrochronology' (study of tree rings) being one of them. That particular sub-branch has both prospered and been highly successful in projecting itself to the broader climatic community on the basis of what is a very weak proxy.

In respect of Europe and Greenland, the IPCC and 'National Assessment' do not challenge the existence of the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age as they are too well recorded in other proxy indicators and historical accounts of the time. Instead, these events are now presented as being purely local to Europe and Greenland, but completely absent elsewhere in the world.

In general, the greenhouse industry disregards historical evidence, claiming them to be merely 'anecdotes'. However, the idea that historical evidence can be easily dismissed as 'anecdotes' in favor of questionable proxies like tree rings is to suggest that professional historians cannot be trusted to be objective.

Objectivity comes from how the evidence is treated, not the nature of the evidence itself. Historians can be just as objective as any scientist. Indeed most of them regard their work as science. As a prominent Finnish scientist remarked about a historical military event in his country's distant history, "if `anecdotal' ice is thick enough to carry a whole army, we can infer the ice was both thick and durable as an objective conclusion based on a documented historical fact."

Similar inferences can be made elsewhere in the world. For example, if whole populations suffered from drought-induced famine, we can infer a reduced rainfall. We don't need the proxies to tell us - indeed they might even mislead us. When a society is ravaged by great floods, we can infer increased precipitation. When the Polynesians were able to populate the Pacific Islands by outrigger boats, we can make climate inferences there too.

The fact that the greenhouse sciences were reluctant to declare the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age as non-events in Europe suggests that the historical evidence was too overwhelming to make selected proxies believable. Such a claim for Europe would have been met with derision. While greenhouse science may regard proxies as being more objective than historical `anecdotes', that viewpoint is only shared among that peer group. The wider academic community, governments, and public opinion (**the most important peer group of all**) will give much more credibility to well-researched historical evidence.

If the IPCC were genuine about the need for full information about millennial climate, they would involve historians everywhere to research their resources to determine past climates as observed and experienced by human societies. The fear of some global warming proponents is that the historians would indeed find the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age all over the world and that governments and public opinion would accept the historical accounts over tree rings.

In Mann's original formulation, the `Hockey Stick' only applied to the Northern Hemisphere. However, the U.S. National Assessment treated it as if it were a global history by reproducing Mann's original graph with a new title implying it has global rather than hemispheric application [19]. This revised version of Mann's graph is shown in Fig.5.




Fig.5 - The 'Hockey Stick' according to the U.S. 'National Assessment'

Apart from the subtle 'globalisation' of the graph in the title, this version omits the wide error margins that were included with the original Mann graph (Fig.3), shown in yellow. These error margins were the only indication by Mann that his formulation could be wrong, conceding in his paper that the pre-1400 data was uncertain. **The idea that global temperature 1,000 years ago could be calculated to an accuracy of 0.1°F based on a limited number of tree rings is simply not credible by any reasonable standard.** [emphasis added]

The 'National Assessment' disregarded these issues and threw its full weight behind the new theory with this stark assertion.

"New studies indicate that temperatures in recent decades are higher than at any time in at least the past 1,000 years." - (NACC Overview p.11)

Mann himself made a similar conclusion in his original paper with these concluding remarks in the abstract to his paper -

"Our results suggest that the latter 20th century is anomalous in the context of at

least the past millennium. The 1990's was the warmest decade, and 1998 the warmest year, at moderately high levels of confidence".

The statement was dramatic and uncompromising, with barely a hint of the uncertainties inherent in his whole analysis. There was no dissent - except from those scientists who were already on record as being sceptical of global warming anyway. The final claim, that '1998 was the warmest year of the millennium' was exactly what the climate change industry wanted to hear in the run-up to the next round of conferences on the Kyoto Protocol.

The Science that Lost its Way

It is now clear that the climate history of the northern hemisphere and the globe as a whole bears no similarity whatever to that portrayed by Mann's 'Hockey Stick'. It is inconceivable that two major climatic events of the last millennium, the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age, could be observed at the same points in time in such varied locations and with such a variety of proxies, around the world and yet be missed by Mann's study. One possible explanation for this discrepancy is that tree rings are inappropriate as temperature proxies, something most dendrochronologists are reluctant to acknowledge.

The question must then be asked, why do people who claim scientific credentials in the field cling so tenaciously to a characterization of past climate that is so patently false? Why was there so little challenge to the Mann theory among his peers? Why is there collective denial about the role of the sun when published and peer-reviewed evidence from solar scientists demonstrates a clear relationship between solar change and climate change?

A booklet titled **"On Being a Scientist: Responsible Conduct in Research"** [18], published by the National Academy of Science in 1995, provides us with a well-presented set of criteria to guide the conduct of scientists as they navigate their way through the difficult choices they have to make in the way they conduct themselves ethically.

"The fallibility of methods is a valuable reminder of the importance of skepticism in

science. Scientific knowledge and scientific methods, whether old or new, must be continually scrutinized for possible errors. Such skepticism can conflict with other important features of science, such as the need for creativity and for conviction in arguing a given position. But organized and searching skepticism as well as an openness to new ideas are essential to guard against the intrusion of dogma or collective bias into scientific results."

Here, scepticism is held up as a virtue, in contrast with the hostile treatment afforded to sceptics in the climate sciences. But we also have this cogent warning against dogma and collective bias intruding into a science. This caution is directly applicable to those involved in climate change research as they have demonstrated numerous times a collective bias in their work, a bias that must inevitably contaminate the peer review process itself.

A common failing of scientists, particularly those engaged in research which may have impacts upon the public, is to reject any input from the public in the conduct of their work. The peer review process provides an effective barrier to public scrutiny of a science, as is the tendency to regard the public as people to 'be educated' instead of being learned from. The resulting intellectual arrogance has the effect of making scientists into a sort of medieval priesthood, keepers of secret and exclusive knowledge, and to be kept away from prying public eyes. Such an attitude, common with many scientists, is unpardonable given that most research is paid for by public money. This however, does not prevent such scientists from adopting a proprietorial view of their research results. The NAS booklet cautions -

"In fulfilling these responsibilities scientists must take the time to relate scientific knowledge to society in such a way that members of the public can make an informed decision about the relevance of research. Sometimes researchers reserve this right to themselves, considering non-experts unqualified to make such judgments. But science offers only one window on human experience. While upholding the honor of their profession, scientists must seek to avoid putting scientific knowledge on a pedestal above knowledge obtained through other means."

This is a direct criticism of '**scientism**', a belief held by many scientists that knowledge not acquired by professional scientists is knowledge not worth having. Scientism is an

affront to free people everywhere as it denies the right of the public to judge the work of science, even where this work is funded from taxpayer's money. It is a formula that holds scientists above criticism, and unaccountable to anyone but their own peers. It is an anti-democratic view of the world and is clearly opposed by the National Academy.

Yet in the climate sciences, we have numerous examples of public criticism and concern being dismissed with gratuitous statistics and spurious appeals to academic authority. [emphasis added]

'Michael Mann

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

[Zahir's note 2016: At present, Dr. Michael Mann is Professor of Meteorology, Director, Earth System Science Center, Pennsylvania State University. He wrote a glowing review of the 2016 handbook of climate change by Elizabeth Woodworth & David Ray Griffin, [*Unprecedented Climate Mobilization: A Handbook for Citizens and Their Governments.*](#)]

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

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

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

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

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

End excerpt John Daly

[1] No Need to Panic About Global Warming – The Wall Street Journal, [op-ed January 27, 2012](#): There's no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to 'decarbonize' the world's economy; and Concerned Scientists Reply on Global Warming – The Wall Street Journal, [op-ed February 21, 2012](#): The authors of the Jan. 27 Wall Street Journal op-ed, 'No Need to Panic about Global Warming,' respond to their critics.

Zahir's Take: Full text from both these WSJ op-eds reproduced below – signed by 16 prominent scientists in the field, including the well known MIT Professor, Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, see footnote [15] below. What is missing in the two op-eds by these brilliant scientists despite their most perceptive insight: **“One reason to be on guard, as we explained in our original op-ed, is that motives other than objective science are at work in much of the scientific establishment.”**, is any explicit indication of the real motivation behind the fiction of Global Warming apart from **“but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money."”**. They inexplicably fail to see the elephant in the bedroom, that the exercise of so much state power behind fabrication of this pretext is primarily intended for ushering in the global carbon credit scam as a means of full spectrum control over human life.

Nevertheless, putting the non junk hard science of these dissenting scientists with the political science that drives the hard road to world order, also coherently explains why billionaire Bill Gates, the retired founder of Microsoft, is so altruistically pursuing his global vaccination program for reducing the earth's population in the Third World by drawing upon the fiction of Global Warming and the alarmist mantra of reducing CO2 emissions to save earth. Watch Bill Gates' presentation at TED talk, read these op-eds by the non junk scientists, and the 'Hegelian Mind Fck' behind the concern for environment, the concern for over population, and the concern for global health with its concomitant legally enforced vaccination regimens in the Third World nations, all begin to make sense. The entire house of cards of fear-mongering is built on the single fiction of Global Warming. Take away that fiction and what remains? **A new fiction will be invented to create a new pretext for the same outcome.**

Watch Bill Gates first speak at the [Feb 2010 TED Talk: Innovating to Zero](#). This is what the humanitarian says with the unmatched candor that often accompanies hubris:

“If you gave me only one wish for the next 50 years -- I could pick who's president, I could pick a vaccine, which is something I love, ...” The [video](#) shows Gates' infamous CO2 slide (at time 3:53): **“CO2 = P x S x E x C”** and he explains it: *“This equation has four factors, a little bit of multiplication: So, you've got a thing on the left, CO2, that you want to get to zero, and that's going to be based on the number of people, the services each person's using on average, the energy on average for each service, and the CO2 being put out per unit of energy. So, let's look at each one of these and see how we can get this down to zero. Probably, one of these numbers is going to have to get pretty near to zero. Now that's back from high school algebra, but let's take a look. **First, we've got population. The world today has 6.8 billion people. That's headed up to about nine billion. Now, if we do a really great job on new vaccines, health care, reproductive health services, we could lower that by, perhaps, 10 or 15 percent, but there we see an increase of about 1.3.”** (transcript, http://www.ted.com/talks/bill_gates)*

[<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JaF-fq2Zn7I>]

Now the WSJ Opeds have a context that lends a whole new perspective that is greater than the sum of what's stated in each one of these signed letters from prominent climate scientists.

[WSJ op-ed January 27, 2012]

Editor's Note: The following has been signed by the 16 scientists listed at the end of the article:

A candidate for public office in any contemporary democracy may have to consider what, if anything, to do about "global warming." Candidates should understand that the oft-repeated claim that nearly all scientists demand that something dramatic be done to stop global warming is not true. In fact, a large and growing number of distinguished scientists and engineers do not agree that drastic actions on global warming are needed.

In September, Nobel Prize-winning physicist Ivar Giaever, a supporter of President Obama in the last election, publicly resigned from the American Physical Society (APS) with a letter that begins: "I did not renew [my membership] because I cannot live with the [APS policy] statement: '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.' In the APS it is OK to discuss whether the mass of the proton changes over time and how a multi-universe behaves, but the evidence of global warming is incontrovertible?"

In spite of a multidecade international campaign to enforce the message that increasing amounts of the "pollutant" carbon dioxide will destroy civilization, large numbers of scientists, many very prominent, share the opinions of Dr. Giaever. And the number of scientific "heretics" is growing with each passing year. The reason is a collection of stubborn scientific facts.

Perhaps the most inconvenient fact is the lack of global warming for well over 10 years now. This is known to the warming establishment, as one can see from the 2009 "Climategate" email of climate scientist Kevin Trenberth: "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." But the warming is only missing if one believes computer models where so-called feedbacks involving water vapor and clouds greatly amplify the small effect of CO₂.

The lack of warming for more than a decade—indeed, the smaller-than-predicted warming over the 22 years since the U.N.'s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) began issuing projections—suggests that computer models have greatly exaggerated how much warming additional CO₂ can cause. Faced with this embarrassment, those promoting alarm have shifted their drumbeat from warming to weather extremes, to enable anything unusual that happens in our chaotic climate to be ascribed to CO₂.

The fact is that CO₂ is not a pollutant. CO₂ is a colorless and odorless gas, exhaled at high concentrations by each of us, and a key component of the biosphere's life cycle.

Plants do so much better with more CO₂ that greenhouse operators often increase the CO₂ concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO₂ concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Better plant varieties, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields of the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO₂ in the atmosphere.

Although the number of publicly dissenting scientists is growing, many young scientists furtively say that while they also have serious doubts about the global-warming message, they are afraid to speak up for fear of not being promoted—or worse. They have good reason to worry. In 2003, Dr. Chris de Freitas, the editor of the journal *Climate Research*, dared to publish a peer-reviewed article with the politically incorrect (but factually correct) conclusion that the recent warming is not unusual in the context of climate changes over the past thousand years. The international warming establishment quickly mounted a determined campaign to have Dr. de Freitas removed from his editorial job and fired from his university position. Fortunately, Dr. de Freitas was able to keep his university job.

This is not the way science is supposed to work, but we have seen it before—for example, in the frightening period when Trofim Lysenko hijacked biology in the Soviet Union. Soviet biologists who revealed that they believed in genes, which Lysenko maintained were a bourgeois fiction, were fired from their jobs. Many were sent to the gulag and some were condemned to death.

Why is there so much passion about global warming, and why has the issue become so vexing that the American Physical Society, from which Dr. Giaever resigned a few months ago, refused the seemingly reasonable request by many of its members to remove the word "incontrovertible" from its description of a scientific issue? There are several reasons, but a good place to start is the old question "cui bono?" Or the modern update, "Follow the money."

Alarmism over climate is of great benefit to many, providing government funding for academic research and a reason for government bureaucracies to grow. Alarmism also offers an excuse for governments to raise taxes, taxpayer-funded subsidies for businesses that understand how to work the political system, and a lure for big donations to charitable foundations promising to save the planet. Lysenko and his team lived very well, and they fiercely defended their dogma and the privileges it brought them.

Speaking for many scientists and engineers who have looked carefully and independently at the science of climate, we have a message to any candidate for public office: There is no compelling scientific argument for drastic action to "decarbonize" the world's economy. Even if one accepts the inflated climate forecasts of the IPCC, aggressive greenhouse-gas control policies are not justified economically.

A recent study of a wide variety of policy options by Yale economist William Nordhaus showed that nearly the highest benefit-to-cost ratio is achieved for a policy that allows 50 more years of economic growth unimpeded by greenhouse gas controls. This would be especially beneficial to the less-developed parts of the world that would like to share some of the same advantages of material well-being, health and life expectancy that the fully developed parts of the world enjoy now. Many other policy responses would have a negative return on investment. And it is likely that more CO2 and the modest warming that may come with it will be an overall benefit to the planet.

If elected officials feel compelled to "do something" about climate, we recommend supporting the excellent scientists who are increasing our understanding of climate with well-designed instruments on satellites, in the oceans and on land, and in the analysis of observational data. The better we understand climate, the better we can cope with its ever-changing nature, which has complicated human life throughout history. However, much of the huge private and government investment in climate is badly in need of critical review.

Every candidate should support rational measures to protect and improve our environment, but it makes no sense at all to back expensive programs that divert resources from real needs and are based on alarming but untenable claims of "incontrovertible" evidence.

[Signed by]

Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the World Federation of Scientists, Geneva.

[WSJ op-ed February 21, 2012]

Editor's Note: The authors of the following letter, listed below, are also the signatories of "No Need to Panic About Global Warming," an op-ed that appeared in the Journal on January 27. This letter responds to criticisms of the op-ed made by Kevin Trenberth and 37 others in a letter published Feb. 1, and by Robert Byer of the American Physical Society in a letter published Feb. 6.


The interest generated by our Wall Street Journal op-ed of Jan. 27, "No Need to Panic about Global Warming," is gratifying but so extensive that we will limit our response to the letter to the editor the Journal published on Feb. 1, 2012 by Kevin Trenberth and 37 other signatories, and to the Feb. 6 letter by Robert Byer, President of the American Physical Society. (We, of course, thank the writers of supportive letters.)

We agree with Mr. Trenberth et al. that expertise is important in medical care, as it is in any matter of importance to humans or our environment. Consider then that by eliminating fossil fuels, the recipient of medical care (all of us) is being asked to submit to what amounts to an economic heart transplant. According to most patient bills of rights, the patient has a strong say in the treatment decision. Natural questions from the patient are whether a heart transplant is really needed, and how successful the diagnostic team has been in the past.

In this respect, an important gauge of scientific expertise is the ability to make successful predictions. When predictions fail, we say the theory is "falsified" and we should look for the reasons for the failure. Shown in the nearby graph is the measured annual temperature of the earth since 1989, just before the first report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Also shown are the projections of the likely increase of temperature, as published in the Summaries of each of the four IPCC reports, the first in the year 1990 and the last in the year 2007.

These projections were based on IPCC computer models of how increased atmospheric CO₂ should warm the earth. Some of the models predict higher or lower rates of warming, but the projections shown in the graph and their extensions into the distant future are the basis of most studies of environmental effects and mitigation policy options. Year-to-year fluctuations and discrepancies are unimportant; longer-term trends are significant.

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.



The Trenberth letter tells us that "computer models have recently shown that during periods when there is a smaller increase of surface temperatures, warming is occurring elsewhere in the climate system, typically in the deep ocean." The ARGO system of diving buoys is providing increasingly reliable data on the temperature of the upper layers of the ocean, where much of any heat from global warming must reside. But much like the surface temperature shown in the graph, the heat content of the upper layers of the world's oceans is not increasing nearly as fast as IPCC models predict, perhaps not increasing at all. Why should we now believe exaggerating IPCC models that tell us of "missing heat" hiding in the one place where it cannot yet be reliably measured—the deep ocean?

Given this dubious track record of prediction, it is entirely reasonable to ask for a second opinion. We have offered ours. With apologies for any immodesty, we all have enjoyed distinguished careers in climate science or in key science and engineering disciplines (such as physics, aeronautics, geology, biology, forecasting) on which climate science is based.

Trenberth et al. tell us that the managements of major national academies of science have said that "the science is clear, the world is heating up and humans are primarily responsible." Apparently every generation of humanity needs to relearn that Mother Nature tells us what the science is, not authoritarian academy bureaucrats or computer models.

One reason to be on guard, as we explained in our original op-ed, is that motives other than objective science are at work in much of the scientific establishment. All of us are members of major academies and scientific societies, but we urge Journal readers not to depend on pompous academy pronouncements—on what we say—but to follow the motto of the Royal Society of Great Britain, one of the oldest learned societies in the

world: nullius in verba—take nobody's word for it. As we said in our op-ed, everyone should look at certain stubborn facts that don't fit the theory espoused in the Trenberth letter, for example—the graph of surface temperature above, and similar data for the temperature of the lower atmosphere and the upper oceans.

What are we to make of the letter's claim: "Climate experts know that the long-term warming trend has not abated in the past decade. In fact, it was the warmest decade on record." We don't see any warming trend after the year 2000 in the graph. It is true that the years 2000-2010 were perhaps 0.2 C warmer than the preceding 10 years. But the record indicates that long before CO2 concentrations of the atmosphere began to increase, the earth began to warm in fits and starts at the end of the Little Ice Age—hundreds of years ago. This long term-trend is quite likely to produce several warm years in a row. The question is how much of the warming comes from CO2 and how much is due to other, both natural and anthropogenic, factors?

There have been many times in the past when there were warmer decades. It may have been warmer in medieval times, when the Vikings settled Greenland, and when wine was exported from England. Many proxy indicators show that the Medieval Warming was global in extent. And there were even warmer periods a few thousand years ago during the Holocene Climate Optimum. The fact is that there are very powerful influences on the earth's climate that have nothing to do with human-generated CO2. The graph strongly suggests that the IPCC has greatly underestimated the natural sources of warming (and cooling) and has greatly exaggerated the warming from CO2.

The Trenberth letter states: "Research shows that more than 97% of scientists actively publishing in the field agree that climate change is real and human caused." However, the claim of 97% support is deceptive. The surveys contained trivial polling questions that even we would agree with. Thus, these surveys find that large majorities agree that temperatures have increased since 1800 and that human activities have some impact.

But what is being disputed is the size and nature of the human contribution to global warming. To claim, as the Trenberth letter apparently does, that disputing this constitutes "extreme views that are out of step with nearly every other climate expert" is peculiar indeed.

One might infer from the Trenberth letter that scientific facts are determined by majority vote. Some postmodern philosophers have made such claims. But scientific facts come from observations, experiments and careful analysis, not from the near-unanimous vote of some group of people.

The continued efforts of the climate establishment to eliminate "extreme views" can acquire a seriously threatening nature when efforts are directed at silencing scientific opposition. In our op-ed we mentioned the campaign circa 2003 to have Dr. Chris de

Freitas removed not only from his position as editor of the journal *Climate Research*, but from his university job as well. Much of that campaign is documented in Climategate emails, where one of the signatories of the Trenberth et al. letter writes: "I believe that a boycott against publishing, reviewing for, or even citing articles from *Climate Research* [then edited by Dr. de Freitas] is certainly warranted, but perhaps the minimum action that should be taken."

Or consider the resignation last year of Wolfgang Wagner, editor-in-chief of the journal *Remote Sensing*. In a fulsome resignation editorial eerily reminiscent of past recantations by political and religious heretics, Mr. Wagner confessed to his "sin" of publishing a properly peer-reviewed paper by University of Alabama scientists Roy Spencer and William Braswell containing the finding that IPCC models exaggerate the warming caused by increasing CO₂.

The Trenberth letter tells us that decarbonization of the world's economy would "drive decades of economic growth." This is not a scientific statement nor is there evidence it is true. A premature global-scale transition from hydrocarbon fuels would require massive government intervention to support the deployment of more expensive energy technology. If there were economic advantages to investing in technology that depends on taxpayer support, companies like Beacon Power, Evergreen Solar, Solar Millenium, SpectraWatt, Solyndra, Ener1 and the Renewable Energy Development Corporation would be prospering instead of filing for bankruptcy in only the past few months.

The European experience with green technologies has also been discouraging. A study found that every new "green job" in Spain destroyed more than two existing jobs and diverted capital that would have created new jobs elsewhere in the economy. More recently, European governments have been cutting subsidies for expensive CO₂-emissionless energy technologies, not what one would expect if such subsidies were stimulating otherwise languid economies. And as we pointed out in our op-ed, it is unlikely that there will be any environmental benefit from the reduced CO₂ emissions associated with green technologies, which are based on the demonization of CO₂.

Turning to the letter of the president of the American Physical Society (APS), Robert Byer, we read, "The statement [on climate] does not declare, as the signatories of the letter [our op-ed] suggest, that the human contribution to climate change is incontrovertible." This seems to suggest that APS does not in fact consider the science on this key question to be settled.

Yet here is the critical paragraph from the statement that caused the resignation of Nobel laureate Ivar Giaever and many other long-time members of the APS: "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." No reasonable person can read this and avoid the

conclusion that APS is declaring the human impact "incontrovertible." Otherwise there would be no logical link from "global warming" to the shrill call for mitigation.

The APS response to the concerns of its membership was better than that of any other scientific society, but it was not democratic. The management of APS took months to review the statement quoted above, and it eventually declared that not a word needed to be changed, though some 750 words were added to try to explain what the original 157 words really meant. APS members were permitted to send in comments but the comments were never made public.

In spite of the obstinacy of some in APS management, APS members of good will are supporting the establishment of a politics-free, climate physics study group within the Society. If successful, it will facilitate much needed discussion, debate, and independent research in the physics of climate.

In summary, science progresses by testing predictions against real world data obtained from direct observations and rigorous experiments. The stakes in the global-warming debate are much too high to ignore this observational evidence and declare the science settled. Though there are many more scientists who are extremely well qualified and have reached the same conclusions we have, we stress again that science is not a democratic exercise and our conclusions must be based on observational evidence.

The computer-model predictions of alarming global warming have seriously exaggerated the warming by CO₂ and have underestimated other causes. Since CO₂ is not a pollutant but a substantial benefit to agriculture, and since its warming potential has been greatly exaggerated, it is time for the world to rethink its frenzied pursuit of decarbonization at any cost.

[Signed by]

Claude Allegre, former director of the Institute for the Study of the Earth, University of Paris; J. Scott Armstrong, cofounder of the Journal of Forecasting and the International Journal of Forecasting; Jan Breslow, head of the Laboratory of Biochemical Genetics and Metabolism, Rockefeller University; Roger Cohen, fellow, American Physical Society; Edward David, member, National Academy of Engineering and National Academy of Sciences; William Happer, professor of physics, Princeton; Michael Kelly, professor of technology, University of Cambridge, U.K.; William Kininmonth, former head of climate research at the Australian Bureau of Meteorology; Richard Lindzen, professor of atmospheric sciences, MIT; James McGrath, professor of chemistry, Virginia Technical University; Rodney Nichols, former president and CEO of the New York Academy of Sciences; Burt Rutan, aerospace engineer, designer of Voyager and SpaceShipOne; Harrison H. Schmitt, Apollo 17 astronaut and former U.S. senator; Nir Shaviv, professor of astrophysics, Hebrew University, Jerusalem; Henk Tennekes, former director, Royal Dutch Meteorological Service; Antonio Zichichi, president of the

World Federation of Scientists, Geneva.

- ### -

[2] **Climategate U-turn as scientist at centre of row admits: There has been no global warming since 1995**, [dailymail.co.uk](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1250872/Climategate-U-turn-Astonishment-scientist-centre-global-warming-email-row-admits-data-organised.html), Jonathan Petre, 14th February 2010, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1250872/Climategate-U-turn-Astonishment-scientist-centre-global-warming-email-row-admits-data-organised.html> ; and **The professor's amazing climate change retreat**, [dailymail.co.uk](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1250813/MAIL-ON-SUNDAY-COMMENT-The-professors-amazing-climate-change-retreat.html), 13th February 2010, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/debate/article-1250813/MAIL-ON-SUNDAY-COMMENT-The-professors-amazing-climate-change-retreat.html>

- 'Data for vital 'hockey stick graph' has gone missing
- There has been no global warming since 1995
- Warming periods have happened before – but NOT due to man-made changes'



[3] Bloom exposes more global warming scammers at the European Parliament, Strasbourg, 20 January 2010 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vYj5baVfB0Y>

[<https://youtube.com/watch?v=vYj5baVfB0Y>]

[4] **Global Warming Fraud Collapses Amidst Deception And Scandal**, prisonplanet.com, Wednesday, January 27, 2010, <http://www.prisonplanet.com/global-warming-fraud-collapses-amidst-deception-and-scandal.html/comment-page-2#comment-711495> ; and **The billion-dollar hoax**, HeraldSun.com.au, January 27, 2010, <http://www.heraldsun.com.au/opinion/the-billion-dollar-hoax/story-e6frfhqf-1225823736564>

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org Says in its Letter to Editor to both:

January 27th, 2010 at 1:02 pm

Hello.

Don't be fooled. The agenda for which global warming was constructed has obviously nothing to do with weather, climate, or environment. But with full-spectrum control of human life through the architecture of carbon-credit.

And that agenda can be pushed with many more mantras, including still, climate-change (in any direction).

Try not patting one's self on the back like the anti-war movement did with the size of turnouts irrespective of whether it actually scuttled war or not. Here, unless and until all the diabolical architectures of global governance, inter alia, carbon credit, are scuttled, "*the mad faith that has cost us so many futile billions already*" will not only continue to cost several times that, but also cement incremental faits accomplis through various manufactured 'hegelian mind fcks' longer matters linger.

See: [Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a 'Hegelian Mind Fck'!](#)

Thank you.

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

[5] **IPCC officials admit mistake over melting Himalayan glaciers**, guardian.co.uk, Wednesday 20 January 2010, <http://guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/jan/20/ipcc-himalayan-glaciers-mistake>

[6] **The Record Company and How the Hegelian Dialectic Works**, Marlena Doucette, AFP, Wednesday, 20 January 2010
<https://web.archive.org/web/20100129055847/http://www.atlanticfreepress.com/news/1/12635-the-record-company-and-how-the-hegelian-dialectic-works.html>

[7] **Rothschild Rues Difficulty Of Activating “Global Governance Agenda” At Copenhagen**, Steve Watson, Infowars.com, Dec 16, 2009 <http://www.truthnews.us/?p=3456>

[8] **The hockey stick is wrong and result of bad science.** Canadian Professors Ross McKittrick and Christopher Essex deconstructed that 'hockey-stick science' along with their notable non-conformist collaborator and businessman from Toronto, Steve McIntyre, in their 2003 book *Taken by Storm*, long before climategate. But Prof. Ross too, circumspectly, only called it **“bad science”**, judiciously refraining from calling it pseudo **Science in the Service of Empire** which it is (see footnote [17a] for expansion upon that *Baconian* phrase in bold)
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-1k4mFZr-gE>

[<https://youtube.com/watch?v=-1k4mFZr-gE>]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Michael Coren: **“They lied!”**

Ross McKittrick: **“I wouldn't say they lied. I think what they did was they didn't disclose the fundamental weakness of the original result.”** ' -- Minute 4:42 to 6:20, conversation with Professor Ross McKittrick, The hockey stick is wrong and result of bad science, on Michael Coren Show

[9] **'Global Warming' establishment scientist Prof. Stephen H. Schneider of Stanford University has Journalist Phelim McAleer thrown out for inconvenient questioning: Armed Response to 'Climategate' question** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aUtzMBfDrpl>

[10] **ClimateGate Who's Who** https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Cu_ok37HDuE

[11] **ClimateGate Who's Who References** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v05N8KGWpVo>

[12] **Climategate Code Proves Inadequate, bogus data** <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=v8X2P3072Tg>

[13] **UNESCO Statement, 1946, Cited in 'The Move to Depopulate the Planet' By Stephanie R. Pasco**, <http://www.infowars.com/the-move-to-depopulate-the-planet/> ; cached <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/cacheof-the-move-to-depopulate->

[the-planet-by-stephanie-r-pasco.pdf](#)

“As long as a child breathes the poisoned air of nationalism, education in world-mindedness can produce only precarious results. As we have pointed out, it is frequently the family that infects the child with extreme nationalism. The schools therefore use the means described earlier to combat family attitudes that favor jingoism (nationalism)...we shall presently recognize in nationalism the major obstacle to development of world mindedness. We are at the beginning of a long process of breaking down the walls of national sovereignty. UNESCO must be the pioneer.” -- William Benton, Assistant U.S. Secretary of State at UNESCO 1946 (UNESCO is the United Nations Education, Science and Cultural Organization)

[14] Council on Foreign Relations Statement in its Foreign Affairs, April 1974, in 'The Hard Road to World Order' by Richard N. Gardner


<http://thepowerhour.com/articles/HardRoadtoWorldOrder.pdf>

“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.” (pages 558-559)

[15] MIT Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Atmospheric Sciences, Department of Earth, Atmospheric and Planetary Sciences, Dr. Richard S. Lindzen, in on the Conspiracy Theory (?) – Conspiracy Theory with Jesse Ventura S01E03 Global Warming, Minute 50:20, *“I personally think that Global Warming will turn out to be a disgrace to the scientific community and the environmental movement. ... You have the environmental movement with this flagship. You have Carbon Trading which is a trillion, multi-trillion dollar business. You have the science funding. By now it's estimated the US alone has spent something on the order of 70 billion dollars on research. The last thing in the world anyone would want to do is solve the problem. Why shake this gravy-train. ... Good or bad, the temperature stopped increasing, so the projections of disaster have basically been folding. **The agendas essentially are: raising money, raising taxes, gaining control of peoples' lives, and the fact that the consumer and the tax-payer will not benefit from it. Well, we'll satisfy them by telling them they are saving the world. And that they should get a high from that.**”* See tepid press coverage of Ventura's Global Warming investigation in <https://web.archive.org/web/20141206172950/http://www.examiner.com/article/jesse-ventura-s-conspiracy-theory-tv-show-investigates-global-warming> ; MotherJones more sympathetic coverage in <http://www.motherjones.com/mojo/2009/12/jesse-ventura-body-slams-climate-change> ; and Professor Lindzen's bio at <http://www-eaps.mit.edu/faculty/lindzen.htm>. Watch S01E03 – Global Warming [here](#), [here](#), or [here](#). The following graph is from Dr. Richard Lindzen who shared it with [WUWT](#) stating: **“There has been no warming since 1997 and no statistically significant warming since 1995”**



Caption “No warming since 1997 and no statistically significant warming since 1995 (the red fuzz represents the error ‘bars’)” Richard Lindzen (Image source [WUWT](#))

Caption Video Conspiracy Theory with Jesse Ventura S01E03 Global Warming

[16] U. S. Senate Minority Report: More Than 700 (Previously 650) International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Scientists Continue to Debunk “Consensus” in 2008, [Link to Press Release on epw.senate.gov](#) , Download PDF [Link to Full Printable 255-Page December 11, 2008 PDF U. S. Senate Minority Report](#) ; Update March 16, 2009: Now [More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made](#)

[Global Warming Claims](#) ; Update December 8, 2010: [More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore](#) , Download PDF [Link to Complete 321-Page December 8, 2010 PDF Climate Depot Special Report](#).

Zahir's Take: Evidently none among the pro global warming crowd, scientists and laity alike, have read these dissenting consensus among climate scientists far greater in number than those who participated in preparing the consensus 2007 UN IPCC Summary for Policymakers. See for yourself in the lengthy excerpt below what is kept hidden in the mainstream media even when it is available on the Floor of the House in the US Senate! The “United We Stand” crowd of simpletons and the credulous do not even bother to read and comprehend what is publicly available from the same sources of officialdom that create the *mantras du jour* in the first place.

So, is there, or isn't there, Global Warming? What a Hegelian Mind-fck!

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, as well as the scientists', and all the national and international political pied pipers' attention 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.

Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a ‘Hegelian Mind Fck!’

The common public attention should instead be focussed on the Carbon Credit scam and the Global 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-option 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)

The tortuous reality of global co-option, 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](#). [17q] 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 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 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.

Begin Excerpt

U. S. Senate Minority Report:

More Than 700 (Previously 650) International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims

Scientists Continue to Debunk “Consensus” in 2008

[Update: December 10, 2010: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Challenge UN IPCC & Gore](#)

[Update: March 16, 2009: Prominent Scientists Continue to Join Report: Now More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims](#)

Link to Intro and full updated 2009 report: (<http://tinyurl.com/pr-senateminorityreport-2008>)

[Link to Full Printable 255-Page PDF Report](#) (<http://tinyurl.com/senateminorityreport2>)

INTRODUCTION:

Over 650 dissenting scientists from around the globe challenged man-made global warming claims made by the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and former Vice President Al Gore. This new 231-page U.S. Senate Minority Report -- updated from 2007's groundbreaking report of [over 400 scientists who voiced skepticism about the so-called global warming “consensus”](#) -- features the skeptical voices of over 650 prominent international scientists, including many current and former UN IPCC scientists, who have now turned against the UN IPCC. This updated report includes an additional 250 (and growing) scientists and climate researchers since the initial release in December 2007. The over 650 dissenting scientists are more than [12 times the number of UN scientists](#) (52) who authored the media-hyped IPCC 2007 [Summary for Policymakers](#).

The chorus of skeptical scientific voices grow louder in 2008 as a [steady stream of peer-reviewed studies, analyses, real world data](#) and [inconvenient developments](#) challenged the UN's and former Vice President Al Gore's claims that the "science is

settled" and there is a "consensus." On a range of issues, 2008 proved to be challenging for the promoters of man-made climate fears. Promoters of anthropogenic warming fears endured the following: [Global temperatures failing to warm](#); [Peer-reviewed studies predicting a continued lack of warming](#); [a failed attempt to revive the discredited "Hockey Stick"](#); [inconvenient developments](#) and studies regarding [rising CO2](#); [the Spotless Sun](#); [Clouds](#); [Antarctica](#); [the Arctic](#); [Greenland's ice](#); [Mount Kilimanjaro](#); [Global sea ice](#); [Causes of Hurricanes](#); [Extreme Storms](#); [Extinctions](#); [Floods](#); [Droughts](#); [Ocean Acidification](#); [Polar Bears](#); [Extreme weather deaths](#); [Frogs](#); [lack of atmospheric dust](#); [Malaria](#); [the failure of oceans to warm](#) and [rise as predicted](#).

In addition, the following developments further secured 2008 as the year the ["consensus" collapsed](#). [Russian scientists "rejected the very idea that carbon dioxide may be responsible for global warming"](#). An American Physical Society editor conceded that [a "considerable presence" of scientific skeptics exists](#). [An International team of scientists countered the UN IPCC, declaring: "Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate"](#). [India Issued a report challenging global warming fears](#). [International Scientists demanded the UN IPCC "be called to account and cease its deceptive practices,"](#) and [a canvass of more than 51,000 Canadian scientists revealed 68% disagree that global warming science is "settled."](#)

This new report issued by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee's office of the GOP Ranking Member is the latest evidence of the growing groundswell of scientific opposition challenging significant aspects of the claims of the UN IPCC and Al Gore. Scientific meetings are now being dominated by a growing number of skeptical scientists. The prestigious International Geological Congress, dubbed the geologists' equivalent of the Olympic Games, was held in Norway in August 2008 and prominently featured the voices of scientists skeptical of man-made global warming fears. [**See: [Skeptical scientists overwhelm conference: '2/3 of presenters and question-askers were hostile to, even dismissive of, the UN IPCC' & see full reports here & here](#)**]

Even the mainstream media has begun to take notice of the expanding number of scientists serving as "consensus busters." A November 25, 2008, [article in Politico](#) noted that a "growing accumulation" of science is challenging warming fears, and added that the "science behind global warming may still be too shaky to warrant cap-and-trade legislation." Canada's [National Post](#) noted on October 20, 2008, that "the number of climate change skeptics is growing rapidly." *New York Times* environmental reporter Andrew Revkin noted on March 6, 2008, "As we all know, climate science is not a numbers game (there are heaps of signed statements by folks with advanced degrees on all sides of this issue)," Revkin wrote. ([LINK](#)) In 2007, *Washington Post* Staff Writer Juliet Eilperin conceded the obvious, writing that climate skeptics "appear to be expanding rather than shrinking."

Skeptical scientists are gaining recognition despite what many say is a bias against them in parts of the scientific community and are facing significant funding disadvantages. Dr. William M. Briggs, a climate statistician who serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee, explained that his colleagues described "absolute horror stories of what happened to them when they tried getting papers published that explored non-'consensus' views." In a March 4, 2008, report Briggs described the behavior as "really outrageous and unethical ... on

the parts of some editors. I was shocked.” ([LINK](#)) [Note: **An August 2007 report detailed how proponents of man-made global warming fears enjoy a monumental funding advantage over skeptical scientists.** [LINK](#) **A July 2007 Senate report details how skeptical scientists have faced threats and intimidation - [LINK](#) & [LINK](#)]**

Highlights of the Updated 2008 Senate Minority Report featuring over 650 international scientists dissenting from man-made climate fears:

“I am a skeptic...Global warming has become a new religion.” - Nobel Prize Winner for Physics, Ivar Giaever.

“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.”

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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

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

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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)

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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.

“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)

#

End Excerpt

[17] Other Project Humanbeingsfirst Reports Related to Science, Medicine, Justice, Nobel Prizes in the Service of Empire – Empire Studies that is not taught in universities

[a] More analysis of this specious science of global warming is in: Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate.html>

[b] Documents on United Nations Agenda 21: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/agenda-21-for-dummies.html>

[c] Like climate science, medicine too is not exempt from being put into the Service of Empire, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/11/whats-thetruth-about-modern-medicine.html> ; <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/swine-flu-is-real-swine.html>

[d] Verification of the overarching agenda of world government is in the Financial Times, <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/responseto-ft-gideon-rachman-worldgov.html>

[e] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/pop-control-mcnamara-rockefeller-aids.html>

[f] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/02/letter-polisci-behind-global-warming.html>

[g] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/12/letter-sppi-climategate.html>

[h] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/12/openletter-stevemcintyre-climategate.html>

[i] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/12/lett-truly-hegelian-mind-fck-is-endless.html>

[j] Related:

<https://web.archive.org/web/2010/http://humanbeingsfirst.wordpress.com/files/2009/12/letter-to-david-michaels-letter-to-editor-concerning-david-michaels-book-and-the-endless-hegelian-mind-fck-dec102009.pdf>

[k] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/10/how-to-win-nobel-peace-prize.html>

[m] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2010/02/draafia-justice-inthe-service-of-empire.html>

[n] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

[p] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/11/hegelian-dialectic-what-is-it.html>

[q] Related: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2016/08/higher-states-of-consciousness.html>

Short URL: <http://tinyurl.com/Global-Warming-Mind-Fck>

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

Print URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/on-global-warming-mind-fck.html>

Home Page URL: <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/on-global-warming-mind-fck.html>

PDF: <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/on-global-warming-mind-fck-zahir-ebrahim.pdf>

Zahir Ebrahim, an ordinary researcher and writer on contemporary matters, grew up in Pakistan, studied EECS at UET, MIT, and Stanford, engineered for a while in high-tech Silicon Valley (<http://tinyurl.com/zahir-patents>), and retired early to pursue other responsible interests. His maiden 2003 book of protest, written in the aftermath of 9/11, was rejected by countless publishers and can be read on the web at <http://PrisonersoftheCave.org>. Zahir's Bio at: <http://zahirebrahim.org>. Zahir may be contacted via <http://Humanbeingsfirst.org>. Verbatim reproduction license at <http://humanbeingsfirst.org/#Copyright>. Index of Zahir's writings at: <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/index.html>

First Published December 12, 2008 | Footnotes last updated November 29, 2016 12:00 PM
21535