

# A Project Humanbeingsfirst Document

The Plebeian Antidote to Hectoring Hegemons!

## **The Global Warming Psyops That People Don't Get**

**Primer on Global Warming  
For Intelligent People**

**Zahir Ebrahim**

**Project Humanbeingsfirst.org**

# **The Global Warming Psyops That People Don't Get**

## **Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People**

© 2019 Zahir Ebrahim | Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

United States of America

First Published on Monday, January 7, 2019 11:00 pm Pages 148

Updated PDF Generated on Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:00 PM Pages 154

### **Download PDF:**

<https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/primer-the-global-warming-psyops-that-people-dont-get-zahirebrahim.pdf>

### **Short URL:**

<https://tinyurl.com/primer-global-warming-psyops>

Full Copyright Notice and Reprint License on Last Page

**“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.”**

The First Global Revolution, 1991

Report by the Council of the Club of Rome

<https://www.clubofrome.org/about-us/>

## Table of Contents

Preface	Open Letter Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People	<a href="#">5</a>
Chapter 1	Global Warming / Climate Change has Become a New Religion - What's it all About?	<a href="#">9</a>
	1.0 Summary	<a href="#">14</a>
	2.0 Backdrop	<a href="#">23</a>
	2.1 The Council on Foreign Relations	<a href="#">24</a>
	2.2 Report from Iron Mountain 1967	<a href="#">24</a>
	2.3 Report by the Council of the Club of Rome - The First Global Revolution 1991	<a href="#">31</a>
	2.4 The United Nations Agenda 21 and Social Engineering Play Book 1992	<a href="#">32</a>
	2.5 The Real Green – The Real Sustainable Development	<a href="#">49</a>
	3.0 Conclusion	<a href="#">53</a>
Chapter 2	NB: On Global Warming Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a 'Hegelian Mind Fck'!	<a href="#">59</a>
Chapter 3	Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire - Letter to a 'co-conspiracy theorist'	<a href="#">102</a>
Chapter 4	Response to Financial Times Gideon Rachman's 'And now for a world government'	<a href="#">129</a>
Chapter 5	Letter to Climate@MIT : Is Climate Science Religion or Science?	<a href="#">134</a>
	Reprint License	<a href="#">153</a>

# Preface

## Open Letter Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People

### Dear Teachers and Professors:

Happy New Year. Please share this [Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People](#) with students and science colleagues, requesting them to read it to educate themselves on counterpoints to their own knowledge and to try and *falsify* its singular thesis. And may I humbly request that you do the same to educate yourselves for the same benefit and reason. None are too old to learn, and none are so arrogant to think that they know it all that they cannot learn something new, and, most importantly, unlearn what they thought they knew as the “truth”.

Most of what many of us think we know as imposing experts is often false! Including in science. This *Primer on Global Warming For Intelligent People* demonstrates this latter aspect. It demonstrates that science has cunningly been transformed into a religion in the service of empire.

There is today a church of science that serves the interests of empire just as previously the Church of Christianity served the interests of both imperial Papacy and its *la mission civilisatrice*, the *white man's burden* if you will, and the 'Church' of Islam served the interests of Muslim Empires (and evidently still does as the Hegelian Dialectic stool pigeon for America's *imperial mobilization* agenda towards a one-world government).

The pulpits of any religion have always corrupted, or more diabolically misdirected, the truth of their domain. The pulpits in the church of science are no exception. And they do it for the same reason: self-interest.

To have a real debate on science, one must zoom into the axioms of that domain and treat these as something *falsifiable* rather than as *divine truths* beyond the pale of earthly examination!

I hope that this fundamental method of science can finally be taught to students, especially to

science students. I never learnt that as a college student myself. In fact, I had to unlearn many religiously held precepts spanning the full gamut of axiomatic beliefs, before I could even begin to comprehend modernity.

We fail our students when we don't teach them how to rationally examine matters that one is close to, especially, how to examine closely held beliefs on any subject. We lead our impressionable students to think that beliefs are only in world religions, and the rest of man's activity, especially in science, is all based on empirical objectivity. We rush to either denigrate others' beliefs, or, as is more often the case, promulgate our own as *la mission civilisatrice*.

Certain topics in science are no exception. When these topics are abstract matters, such as the big bang theory, or evolution, beliefs don't have an immediate existential impact. So it is largely immaterial what one believes is the origin of universe and life. However, other science topics, such as what is causing climate changes, have a direct impact on national and international policies which in turn have an immediate existential impact on all mankind.

More highly educated a student is in the present higher education system anywhere in the world, more ill equipped he or she appears to be to rationally evaluate convoluted subjects that have intermixed Machiavellian political agendas with even what is supposed to be empirical science. Thus, making it easier to get such learned people to accept and sign off on political solutions based on the legitimacy conferred to these by pseudo science and its respectable brand name exponents. There is a brand name to appeal to the sensibility of every category of demographics.

In advertising, as in world's religions, that is called appeal to authority figures and celebrity appeal. Both are potent in selling products by appealing to the baser human instincts rather than to the human intellect. While that is the natural bread and butter of religious pulpits which cater to the human need for pondering upon the why of life and his proclivity towards the esoteric for hope and spiritual fulfillment, political agendas wrapped in pseudo science are also being marketed to the common man and to entire nations no differently than soaps and shampoos.

Fortunately, I am not a teacher, nor am I in advertising. But I have learnt as a student of many notable teachers, that even honest teachers are often the greatest purveyors of *divine truths* on earth. They tend to forget that *falsification of divine truths* is also an integral part of science, while acceptance of divine truths is only part of religion, not science. Before they realize it, the more notable a teacher, the easier it is for him or her to become the *mullah* of their domain. The tragedy is that they don't see the mote in their own eyes as they rush to critique all the mullahs in the world's religions whose very job definition it is to peddle beliefs in the name of authority figures.

Thank you for your time.

Best wishes for a great year

Zahir Ebrahim

Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

(your humble student).

**Source URL:** <https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2019/01/open-letter-primer-on-global-warming.html>

---

**“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.”**



# Chapter 1

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

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

Last Updated Wednesday, March 6, 2019 11:00 pm

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

### *Précis*

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

### *Abstract*

The New York Times reported on [Nov. 3, 2017](#): “*Directly contradicting much of the Trump administration’s position on climate change, 13 federal agencies unveiled an*

[exhaustive scientific report](#) on Friday that says humans are the dominant cause of the global temperature rise that has created the warmest period in the history of civilization. ... The report was approved for release by the White House, but the findings come as the Trump administration is defending its climate change policies.”

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

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

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

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

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

The public mind, now thoroughly confused by the plethora of “expert” opinions, naturally gravitates towards officially sanctioned authority figures to tell them what is true and what isn't --- and in this way their new political beliefs are cast, and old ones reinforced, and their behavior molded. That officialdom's authority figures have, in this November 2017, released its official bible of sacred truths for the global public at large – for whatever is true for the United States of America with respect to climate change,

is obviously also true for the rest of the world as well. The new sacred truths are part of the new religion being fashioned worldwide, that it is humanity that is causing Global Warming / Climate Change, and that the planet must be saved from humanity in order for the planet to be saved for humanity!

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


- 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.**

### ***About the author***

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

# 1.0 Summary

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



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

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

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

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

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

'The real value of *Tragedy and Hope* ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr.

Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were “in on the take” and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes. **As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on a world-wide basis.'** (W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, pg. 6)

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

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

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




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

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

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

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

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




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



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

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



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


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

4. “The IPCC has actually become a closed circuit; it doesn’t listen to others. It doesn’t have open minds... I am really amazed that the Nobel Peace Prize has been given on scientifically incorrect conclusions by people who are not geologists.” - Indian geologist Dr. Arun D. Ahluwalia at Punjab University and a board member of the UN-supported International Year of the Planet.

5. “So far, real measurements give no ground for concern about a catastrophic future warming.” - Scientist Dr. Jarl R. Ahlbeck, a chemical engineer at Abo Akademi University in Finland, author of 200 scientific publications and former Greenpeace member.

6. “Anyone who claims that the debate is over and the conclusions are firm has a fundamentally unscientific approach to one of the most momentous issues of our time.” - Solar physicist Dr. Pal Brekke, senior advisor to the Norwegian Space Centre in Oslo. Brekke has published more than 40 peer-reviewed scientific articles on the sun and solar interaction with the Earth.

7. “The models and forecasts of the UN IPCC "are incorrect because they only are based on mathematical models and presented results at scenarios that do not include, for example, solar activity.” - Victor Manuel Velasco Herrera, a researcher at the Institute of Geophysics of the National Autonomous University of Mexico



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

8. "It is a blatant lie put forth in the media that makes it seem there is only a fringe of scientists who don't buy into anthropogenic global warming." - U.S Government Atmospheric Scientist Stanley B. Goldenberg of the Hurricane Research Division of NOAA.
9. "Even doubling or tripling the amount of carbon dioxide will virtually have little impact, as water vapour and water condensed on particles as clouds dominate the worldwide scene and always will." – . Geoffrey G. Duffy, a professor in the Department of Chemical and Materials Engineering of the University of Auckland, NZ.
10. "After reading [UN IPCC chairman] Pachauri's asinine comment [comparing skeptics to] Flat Earthers, it's hard to remain quiet." - Climate statistician Dr. William M. Briggs, who specializes in the statistics of forecast evaluation, serves on the American Meteorological Society's Probability and Statistics Committee and is an Associate Editor of Monthly Weather Review.
11. "The Kyoto theorists have put the cart before the horse. It is global warming that triggers higher levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, not the other way round... A large number of critical documents submitted at the 1995 U.N. conference in Madrid vanished without a trace. As a result, the discussion was one-sided and

### Technetronic Weather Modification

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

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

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

heavily biased, and the U.N. declared global warming to be a scientific fact,” Andrei Kapitsa, a Russian geographer and Antarctic ice core researcher.

### **Technetronic Weather Modification (contd.)**

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

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

12. “I am convinced that the current alarm over carbon dioxide is mistaken...Fears about man-made global warming are unwarranted and are not based on good science.” - Award Winning Physicist Dr. Will Happer, Professor at the Department of Physics at Princeton University and Former Director of Energy Research at the Department of Energy, who has published over 200 scientific papers, and is a fellow of the American Physical Society, The American Association for the Advancement of Science, and the National Academy of Sciences.

13. “Nature's regulatory instrument is water vapor: more carbon dioxide leads to less moisture in the air, keeping the overall GHG content in accord with the necessary balance conditions.” – Prominent Hungarian Physicist and environmental researcher Dr. Miklós Zágoni reversed his view of man-made warming and is now a skeptic. Zágoni was once Hungary's most outspoken supporter of the Kyoto Protocol.

14. “For how many years must the planet cool before we begin to understand that the planet is not warming? For how many years must cooling go on?” - Geologist Dr. David Gee the chairman of the science committee of the 2008 International Geological Congress who has authored 130 plus peer reviewed papers, and is currently at Uppsala University in Sweden.

15. “Gore prompted me to start delving into the science again and I quickly found myself solidly in the skeptic camp...Climate models can at best be useful for explaining climate changes after the fact.” - Meteorologist Hajo Smit of Holland, who reversed his belief in man-made warming to become a skeptic, is a former member of the Dutch UN IPCC committee.

16. “The quantity of CO2 we produce is insignificant in terms of the natural circulation between air, water and soil... I am doing a detailed assessment of the UN IPCC reports and the Summaries for Policy Makers, identifying the way in which the Summaries have distorted the science.” - South African Nuclear Physicist and Chemical Engineer Dr. Philip Lloyd, a UN IPCC co-coordinating lead author who has authored over 150 refereed publications.

17. "Many [scientists] are now searching for a way to back out quietly (from promoting warming fears), without having their professional careers ruined." - Atmospheric physicist James A. Peden, formerly of the Space Research and Coordination Center in Pittsburgh.
18. "All those urging action to curb global warming need to take off the blinkers and give some thought to what we should do if we are facing global cooling instead." - Geophysicist Dr. Phil Chapman, an aeronautical engineer and former NASA astronaut, served as staff physicist at MIT (Massachusetts Institute of Technology)
19. "Creating an ideology pegged to carbon dioxide is a dangerous nonsense...The present alarm on climate change is an instrument of social control, a pretext for major businesses and political battle. It became an ideology, which is concerning." - Environmental Scientist Professor Delgado Domingos of Portugal, the founder of the Numerical Weather Forecast group, has more than 150 published articles.
20. "CO2 emissions make absolutely no difference one way or another....Every scientist knows this, but it doesn't pay to say so...Global warming, as a political vehicle, keeps Europeans in the driver's seat and developing nations walking barefoot." - Dr. Takeda Kunihiko, vice-chancellor of the Institute of Science and Technology Research at Chubu University in Japan.
21. "The [global warming] scaremongering has its justification in the fact that it is something that generates funds." - Award-winning Paleontologist Dr. Eduardo Tonni, of the Committee for Scientific Research in Buenos Aires and head of the Paleontology Department at the University of La Plata.
22. "Whatever the weather, it's not being caused by global warming. If anything, the climate may be starting into a cooling period." Atmospheric scientist Dr. Art V. Douglas, former Chair of the Atmospheric Sciences Department at Creighton University in Omaha, Nebraska, and is the author of numerous papers for peer-reviewed publications.
23. "But there is no falsifiable scientific basis whatever to assert this warming is caused by human-produced greenhouse gasses because current physical theory is too grossly inadequate to establish any cause at all." - Chemist Dr. Patrick Frank, who has authored more than 50 peer-reviewed articles.
24. "The 'global warming scare' is being used as a political tool to increase government control over American lives, incomes and decision making. It has no place in the Society's activities." - Award-Winning NASA Astronaut/Geologist and Moonwalker Jack Schmitt who flew on the

Apollo 17 mission and formerly of the Norwegian Geological Survey and for the U.S. Geological Survey.


25. "Earth has cooled since 1998 in defiance of the predictions by the UN-IPCC....The global temperature for 2007 was the coldest in a decade and the coldest of the millennium...which is why 'global warming' is now called 'climate change.'" - Climatologist Dr. Richard Keen of the Department of Atmospheric and Oceanic Sciences at the University of Colorado.
26. "I have yet to see credible proof of carbon dioxide driving climate change, yet alone man-made CO2 driving it. The atmospheric hot-spot is missing and the ice core data refute this. When will we collectively awake from this deceptive delusion?" - Dr. G LeBlanc Smith, a retired Principal Research Scientist with Australia's CSIRO (The full quotes of the scientists are later in this report)

## 2.0 Backdrop

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

terrorism, and its solution is global war on terror that enables instituting global standardized police-

### Galileo on Science



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

state polices. There are many more aspects to this and covers the whole gamut of human activity.

## 2.1 The Council on Foreign Relations

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

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

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

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

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

## 2.2 Report from Iron Mountain 1967

The environmental menace, and specifically climate change and pollution, is mentioned in this 1967 [Report from Iron Mountain](#) published by The Dial Press, as the alternate means of corralling human behavior based on fear in the absence of the menace of war corralling mankind. The report stated:



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

## **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

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

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

***“The Common enemy of humanity is Man: In searching for a common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together. But in designating these dangers as the enemy, we fall into the trap, which we have already warned readers about, namely mistaking symptoms for causes. All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.”*** --- Ch 5, The Vacuum, pg 75 (pg 86 / 184 in PDF: <https://archive.org/stream/TheFirstGlobalRevolution#page/n85/mode/2up> .

## 2.4 The United Nations Agenda 21 and Social Engineering Play Book 1992

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

The United Nations Agenda 21 is intended to force mankind to make broad changes in its attitudes, behaviors, and lifestyles in accordance with the wishes of the powers that be. The macro social change is to be wrought, and is being brought about, in baby steps, legally, just as in the Global Warming / Climate Change scam, with the blunt force of *hammer unto anvil* by international treaties, global laws, and local statutes. And just as for international agreement on limiting carbon emissions under the magical “climate change” propaganda cover, United Nations Agenda 21 is cloaked in the magical propaganda word “sustainable”, as in Sustainable Development, in order to make it appear to be in the public's own best interest.

Only nutters, fools, crazies and evil-doers would ever argue with “Sustainable Development”! And therefore, any dissent and public resistance to draconian and austerity measures in the name of “sustainable” is easily managed and dispensed with by labels such as kooks, crazies, mentally ill, and when all else fails, eco-terrorists with invitation to enjoy *state hospitality centers*.



The motivation for the scientific sounding mechanics of Global Warming / Climate Change **“Problem”** or dogma employing [crafty pseudo science](#) (see: *Crafting Pseudo Science Out Of Thin Air: The East Anglia Emails*, in sidebar), under the stewardship of UN international body called The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (UN IPCC), established by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the World Meteorological Organization (WMO) in 1988 to *“provide the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of knowledge in climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic impacts”*, and subsequently endorsed by the UN General Assembly to make it legal, cannot be fully appreciated in isolation to the profound justification that it lends to its big brother **“Solution”** umbrella, the United Nations Agenda 21.

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

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

[1212063122](#)

Mike,

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

[1228330629](#)

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

[1228330629](#)

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

[1228330629](#)

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

[1228330629](#)

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

[1252164302](#)

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

[1210367056](#)

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

[1107454306](#)

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

national sovereignty of nation states to Global Governance under one world government.

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

United Nations WHO institution for instance is legally chartered by international treaty to globally control and direct each nation's domestic response to WHO's unilateral declaration of Pandemic. Individual nation's right to adjudicate on the matter through one's own scientific minds, and to apply one's own national remedies, have been stripped away for all nations who have signed on to the WHO Convention. That is virtually all nations of the world; just like in the case of Agenda 21. WHO works hand in glove with the United States CDC

and big-pharma to push global vaccination programs using manufactured and/or propagandized threats (as for instance the Swine Flu scare of 1976, 2009), just like the fictitious threat of WMD from

## **The East Anglia Emails (contd. 2)**

[1107454306](#)

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

[1109021312](#)

I'm getting hassled by a couple of people to release the CRU station temperature data.

Don't any of you three tell anybody that the UK has a Freedom of Information Act !

**IPCC**

[1177890796](#)

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

[1256735067](#)

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

**PEERS**

[1089318616](#)

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

[1237496573](#)

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

[1047388489](#)

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

Iraq in 2003 under the United Nations Security Council aegis which had led to the preplanned “solution” of invading that defenseless Muslim nation by the strongest military in the world. When sovereign nations can be invaded under cover of propaganda systems and legalisms enforced under the United Nations institutions in the name of protecting other nations, invading individual people's bodies, private lives, and lifestyles in the name of protecting other people hardly poses a moral dilemma. This should be self-evident just by observation, that moral calculus plays no role in international relations, or in the pursuit of any political agenda, except as PR for rallying the public to the *cause célèbre* du jour.

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

### **The East Anglia Emails (contd. 3)**

[1047388489](#)

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

[1051190249](#)

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

[1051190249](#)

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

[1106322460](#)

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

#### **HIDE THE DECLINE**

[1054736277](#)

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

[1256747199](#)

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

[843161829](#)

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

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

One cannot pretend that because a modicum of rational thinking is necessary for sensible human existence in order to rise above what appears to be man's natural proclivity for superstitions, that insane amounts of rationality wielded by uber sociopaths is insanely good for humanity. This *rationality trap* of uber self-interest which calculatingly removes empathy and the absoluteness of the Golden Rule: **“Do unto others as you have others do unto you; and don't do to others what you don't want others to do to you”** from its calculus, as these principles do not serve the self-interest of power, is the bane of rationality.

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

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

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

[1255352257](#)

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

[942777075](#)

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

[1257546975](#)

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

[826209667](#)

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

[1252164302](#)

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

[938018124](#)

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

[938018124](#)

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

police state with unified draconian policies that span the gamut of human activity, from banking to breathing.

One only has to read their own hand writings spanning the gamut of political theory, from those expressed in fables to those couched in philosophical justifications, in order to fully comprehend the whole which, as any perceptive system analyst understands, is often masked by focus on individual components that appear (and at times made to appear) disconnected and unrelated to each other.

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

The public documents listed below outline the scope of United Nations Agenda 21 for "Sustainable Development", of which the mantra of climate change is but one part, to secure the

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

[1255523796](#)

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

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

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

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

(<https://tinyurl.com/eastangliaemails-archives>)

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

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 exposing full spectrum of deceit from clever half-truths to outright lies that most people without much thinking would immediately agree with. Such as “Sustainable Development”.

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

***‘The beginning of experimental weather modification is credited to the first forced precipitation of rain - “cloud seeding” - by Vincent Schaefer using dry ice in 1946. The following year the same effect was demonstrated by Bernard Vonnegut using silver iodide crystals. ...***

***“Army, Navy and Air Force are spending close to a million dollars a year on weather modification and their tremendous interest suggests that military applications extend far beyond visiting a few showers upon an enemy.***

***It does not require a sharp mind to figure out that wartime storms might readily be infected with virulent bacteriological and radiological substances.” ... Orville***

*also reported that the USSR "... had conducted numerous unpublicized but still detectable experiments apparently aimed at finding ways to speed melting of polar icecaps; and has even offered to join the United States in a project to turn the Arctic Ocean into a sort of warm water lake by melting the polar icecap." ' (pgs. 4-5 [WEATHER MODIFICATION](#))*

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

The list of public disclosures is endless. The bibliography on the admission of *technetronic capability* for modifying weather as weapon available to many nations (and of course to the “terrorists” just like their possessing “WMD”) is easily accessible. To what extent is this capability actually deployed as a weapon on any given instance of weather anomaly, of course only becomes known ex post facto, years later, and on which historians, newspaper columnists, and hungry scholars earn their keep (and some even their Ph.D.) as they proudly strut their new found discoveries of a past which cannot be changed. Shame that few learn from history to understand the present and to preempt the future

while waiting for its receipts: **“We are made wise not by the recollections of our past, but by the responsibility for our future.”** This shortsightedness is deliberate and calculated – for it does not take great deal of intelligence to see that a *pound of flesh* is extracted for breaking the code of silence when it can make the most difference to the deeds of history's actors:

**“We're an empire now, and when we act, we create our own reality. And while you're studying that reality -- judiciously, as you will -- we'll act again, creating other new realities, which you can study too, and that's how things will sort out. We're history's actors . . . and you, all of you, will be left to just study what we do.”** (New York Times, Oct. 17, 2004)

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

Whenever the great political and intellectual leaders of mankind get together to sign global Accords on Climate Change, only man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is put on the table and its rectification is signed off as the “green” solution. That's because the stealth agenda is to **force a global transformation using any pretext, be it wholly propagandistic, or manufactured technetronically**, to lend credibility to the propaganda campaign. As the Report from Iron Mountain had perceptively suggested: **“Credibility, in fact, lies at the heart of the problem”** for any mind-game to succeed.

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

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

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



The skeptical reader who has bought into the religion of Global Warming must surely realize by now that the “sustainable” project, by necessity, requires a “credible problem” and propaganda system to affect the draconian changes to public attitudes and behavior that are inimical to their interests. That's just self-evident. And what has been demonstrated here is that when the “credible problem” is difficult to confirm empirically by the *scientific method* (of making observations on actual data and making theoretical models to explain that empirical data which are subsequently used for making predictions which, if they come true then, as the outcome of the *scientific method*, are deemed to represent reality to the first order, but only to the extent that the models stay “falsifiable” by future discoveries and do not become “religion”), despite pseudo science making every effort in creating convoluted computer models to fabricate “credibility” from bogus data to synthesize an alarmist religion around their models, and given the evidence from the aforementioned Senate Minority Report which documents over 1000 scientists worldwide dissenting with the so called official IPCC “Consensus” on Global Warming, then, credibility can also be “tickled” into existence by covert *technetronic helpers* creating the necessary illusions.

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

### **Epistemological Method of Science:** **Science vs. Religion**

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

**Every Church needs a Galileo to break its dogmatic hold.**

The skeptical reader also cannot have failed to observe how the original *first-cause prime-mover* is cleverly retained for this new menace as well: due to man-made CO2 emissions – the core belief to be implanted among the global public as that is also the *first-cause axiomatic theme* for enabling United Nations Agenda 21. This core belief is not permitted to be challenged without being labeled a heretic, kook, and incurring the risk of losing or tarnishing one's respectable career.

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

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

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

Begin Quote Giaever

**“I resigned from the society in 2011. First: nothing in science is incontrovertible. Second: the “measured” average temperature increase in 100 years or so, is 0.8 Kelvin. Third: since the Physical Society claim it has become warmer, why is everything better than before? Forth: the maximum average**

temperature ever measured was in 1998, 17 years ago. When will we stop wasting money on alternative energy?”

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

“In Albany, New York, where I live, there is ~80 K between max and min temperature. Do you believe 0.8 K degree makes a big difference?”

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

End Quote Giaever

There is a clearly visible pattern of narrative control here by the powers that be. We already observed that the principal axiom of Global Warming was most cunningly transformed into a religious

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

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

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

Regardless of the pattern of climactic changes, the political agenda is to blame it on man-made CO2 levels using whatever scientific justifications that the imaginative minds plaguing climate science can conjure up. The *Reality Versus Alarm* graph is in the sidebar at the very beginning of this report.

Here is MIT climate scientist Richard S. Lindzen, Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Sciences, explaining the empirical reality of CO2 to American President Donald Trump in a followup letter to the White House dated [March 9, 2017](#):

Begin Quote Richard Lindzen

Let me explain in somewhat greater detail why we call for withdrawal from the UNFCCC.

The UNFCCC was established twenty five years ago to find scientific support for dangers from increasing carbon dioxide. While this has led to generous and rapidly increased support for the field, the purported dangers remain hypothetical, model-based projections. By contrast, the benefits of increasing CO2 and modest warming are clearer than ever, and they are supported by dramatic satellite images of a greening Earth.

We note that:

- The UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) no longer claims a greater likelihood of significant as opposed to negligible future warming,
- It has long been acknowledged by the IPCC that climate change prior to the 1960's could not have been due to anthropogenic greenhouse gases. Yet, pre-1960 instrumentally observed temperatures show many warming episodes, similar to the one since 1960, for example, from 1915 to 1950, and from 1850 to 1890. None of these could have been caused by an increase in atmospheric CO2,
- Model projections of warming during recent decades have greatly exceeded what has been observed,
- The modelling community has openly acknowledged that the ability of existing models to simulate past climates is due to numerous arbitrary tuning adjustments,
- Observations show no statistically valid trends in flooding or drought, and no meaningful acceleration whatsoever of pre-existing long term sea level rise (about 6 inches per century) worldwide,

- Current carbon dioxide levels, around 400 parts per million are still very small compared to the averages over geological history, when thousands of parts per million prevailed, and when life flourished on land and in the oceans.

Calls to limit carbon dioxide emissions are even less persuasive today than 25 years ago. Future research should focus on dispassionate, high-quality climate science, not on efforts to prop up an increasingly frayed narrative of “carbon pollution.” Until scientific research is unfettered from the constraints of the policy-driven UNFCCC, the research community will fail in its obligation to the public that pays the bills.

End Quote Richard Lindzen

The United Nations Agenda 21 offering “sustainable development” as the solution, continues on the same principal axis as the alarmist CO2 global warming scam. It posits man's very existence on the face of the earth to be a dire threat to “Gaia's” natural processes even beyond his natural carbon emissions. The principle is directly taken from the aforementioned handbook of social control in which the Club of Rome authors hath stated (repeating for emphasis): **“All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then is humanity itself.”** The solution to the crisis of this real enemy destroying the earth is the United Nations Agenda 21 for Sustainable Development!

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

The core propaganda spiel of Agenda 21 is premised upon the necessity of preserving earth's

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

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

- 1. Maintain humanity under 500,000,000 in perpetual balance with nature.**
2. Guide reproduction wisely — improving fitness and diversity.
3. Unite humanity with a living new language.
4. Rule passion — faith — tradition — and all things with tempered reason.
5. Protect people and nations with fair laws and just courts.
6. Let all nations rule internally resolving external disputes in a world court.
7. Avoid petty laws and useless officials.
8. Balance personal rights with social duties.
9. Prize truth — beauty — love — seeking harmony with the infinite.
- 10. Be not a cancer on the earth — Leave room for nature — Leave room for nature.**

Under the propaganda cover of “Sustainable Development”, vast public spaces on earth are to be legally declared off-limits to man. The habitable as well as previously inhabited lands, water sources, and open spaces, are to be legally classified as public parks, natural preserves. Right alongside the drive for the outright abolition of private property ownership by individuals. All space is only to be



leased for limited time and designated use from state authority and their proxies, the so called NGOs and non-profit tax-exempt foundations that are to take charge of the new world's public commons. Only corporations and non-profit foundations will be able to own land as the supposed custodians of public property as producers. Most of the world's open spaces is already being put under these umbrella organizations ostensibly in public interest. One of them is the famous international organization World Wildlife Fund or Federation (WWF).

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

Combined with carbon-credit and its repercussions of what man may legally eat, grow, produce, and if and how many he may procreate, under the overarching United Nations Agenda 21, where man may legally live, how much space he may legally occupy, and where and when he may legally travel, all under full surveillance, is intended to make a global prison state for *hoi polloi*. Fable and reality are merging rapidly.

## 2.5 The Real Green – The Real Sustainable Development

In [Letter to Climate@MIT : Is Climate Science Religion or Science?](#), dated October 30, 2018:

Begin Quote Letter Climate @ MIT

Dear respected 22 MIT Professors and Scientists of Climate @ MIT

You collectively signed a most carefully worded letter to President Donald Trump over

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

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

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

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

If China is filling the air with industrial pollutants more than the United States today,

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

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

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

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

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

These high technologies take investment on the part of multinational corporations to develop and deploy even after these have left the research labs years ago, and why should they do that when they are not forced to, due to the weak regulations and special concessions under which they usually operate in poor nations?

The burden then has to be carried by the common man in these impoverished nations who must suffer that cost in all its human and national dimensions, while the stock prices of the multinational corporations go up when their profit margins are higher, and the developed nations rejoice in their economic success. That success, of greed and primacy, creates a self-fulfilling prophecy for creating more environmental pollution – why alter the recipe for higher profit margins, and economic hegemony which comes with it, when one is not forced to?

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

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

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

But, just as no sensible person would think of living in a police state just because it makes the most stable system of governance and offers the most safety from common criminals, no sensible person will also think to put human beings in growth chains and to enslave mankind to the agendas of the elites in a global police state just to get rid of the high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>.

End Quote Letter Climate @ MIT

Notice that none of the above commonsense is ever brought to the international negotiating tables for environmental policy-planning, climate change mitigation, and sustainable development by the experts in the United Nations, the United States, the European Union, or the BRIC nations (Brazil, Russia, India, China). That collusion by cunning omission is telling. Because it is the first logical step that even ordinary commonsense dictates for forging a comprehensive international treaty on environment, whether or not mankind, greenhouse gases, CO<sub>2</sub> levels, Ozone layer depletion, etc. are the first-cause of global climate change. All environmental protocols to date, including UN's

Kyoto Protocol, have focused on reducing greenhouse gases based on the specious CO2 mantra dismantled here. Why not take the above mentioned measures in a big way regardless? Duh!

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

### 3.0 Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

### **Video Presentations**

**“AGENDA 21 ON HOW IT WILL AFFECT YOU”**

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

**“Agenda 21 For Dummies”**

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

**“Sustainable Destruction - Exposing Agenda 21 in Rural America”**

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

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

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

## References

[1] Summarized and Adapted from Detailed Report (2008-2017): [On Global Warming Mind-Fck](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/nb-on-global-warming.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/nb-on-global-warming.html>

[2] More Dismantling Climate Science: [Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate.html)  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/11/let-co-conspiracy-theorist-climategate.html>

[3] More Dismantling Agenda 21: [Agenda 21 For Dummies](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/agenda-21-for-dummies.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/03/agenda-21-for-dummies.html>

[4] More Dismantling Hegelian Dialectic: [Hegelian Dialectic for Dummies](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/11/hegelian-dialectic-what-is-it.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2013/11/hegelian-dialectic-what-is-it.html>

[5] More Dismantling *Crippled* Epistemology: [Some Problems in Epistemology](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/some-problems-in-epistemology.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/some-problems-in-epistemology.html>

[6] Shorter version of the above: [Introduction to Epistemology](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/intro-to-epistemology-by-zahir-ebrahim.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/intro-to-epistemology-by-zahir-ebrahim.html>

[7] More Dismantling Propaganda Systems: [Report on the Mighty Wurlitzer - Architecture of Modern Propaganda for Psychological Warfare](http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html),  
URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2009/05/note-on-mighty-wurlitzer.html>

[8] Agenda 21: Earth Summit: The United Nations Programme of Action from Rio, United Nations,  
URL: <http://www.amazon.com/Agenda-21-Summit-Nations-Programme/dp/1482672774/>

[9] Behind the Green Mask: U.N. Agenda 21, by Rosa Koire, 2011 (deconstructs the UN play book),  
URL: <http://www.amazon.com/BEHIND-THE-GREEN-MASK-Agenda/dp/0615494544/>

[10] Nature, Not Human Activity, Rules the Climate, S. Fred Singer, ed., March 2, 2008, *Summary for Policymakers of the Report of the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change*, Chicago, IL: The Heartland Institute, 2008,  
URL: <http://www.heartland.org/publications-resources/publications/nature-not-human-activity-rules-the-climate-pdf>



[11] **The Sun, Not Man, Still Rules Our Climate**, by Zbigniew Jaworowski, Spring 2009, 21st Century Science & Technology, *dissects the false “fingerprint” of man-made warming and the Malthusian hand promoting it*,

URL: [http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles\\_2009/Sun\\_Climate\\_sp09\\_01.pdf](http://www.21stcenturysciencetech.com/Articles_2009/Sun_Climate_sp09_01.pdf)

[12] **Why Scientists Disagree About Global Warming, The NIPCC Report on Scientific Consensus**, by Craig D. Idso, Robert M. Carter, S. Fred Singer, Second edition 2016, The Heartland Institute,

URL: [http://www.heartland.org/\\_template-assets/documents/Books/Why%20Scientists%20Disagree%20Second%20Edition%20with%20covers.pdf](http://www.heartland.org/_template-assets/documents/Books/Why%20Scientists%20Disagree%20Second%20Edition%20with%20covers.pdf)

[13] **Other References for Further Study**, compiled by Peter Meyer, serendipity.li, [The Global Warming Scare Hoax](#),

URL: [http://www.serendipity.li/climate/global\\_warming\\_scare.htm](http://www.serendipity.li/climate/global_warming_scare.htm)

[14] **Letter to President Donald Trump, The White House**, from Richard Lindzen, MIT, March 09, 2017, [6-Personal PAOC Explanation](#),

URL: <http://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/misc/Cacheof-6-Personal-PAOC-Explanation-March-09-2017-Richard-Lindzen-MIT-courtesy-of-Lindzen.pdf>

[15] **Letter to John Cook, skepticalscience.com, George Mason University**, from Zahir Ebrahim, October 26, 2018, [Global Warming: Religion or Science?](#),

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/lette-global-warming-religion-or-science.html>

[16] **Letter to Climate@MIT**, from Zahir Ebrahim, October 30, 2018, [Is Climate Science Religion or Science?](#),

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/10/letter-climate-mit-religion-or-science.html>

[17] **Letter to Tariq Banuri, Chairman HEC**, from Zahir Ebrahim, December 12, 2018, [On Global Warming](#),

URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2018/12/letter-to-tariq-banuri-on-global-warming.html>

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

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

**Print URL:** <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2016/11/global-warming-climate-change-whats-it.html>

**Homepage URL:** <http://humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/p/global-warming-climate-change-religion.html>

**Source PDF:** <https://sites.google.com/site/humanbeingsfirst/download-pdf/global-warming-climate-change-whats-it-all-about-zahir-ebrahim.pdf>

First Published as Summary of [1] on November 30, 2016 | Last updated on Wednesday, March 6, 2019 11:00 pm 19306



# Chapter 2

## **NB: On Global Warming**

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

**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 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 Earths 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](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xFQ2_0QNiks) ]

“Why in the World are They Spraying?”

[ <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=mEfJO0-cTis> ]

**[0a] Report from Iron Mountain 1967**

See [Chapter 1](#).

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

See [Chapter 1](#).

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

See [Chapter 1](#).

**[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 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 John Daly 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](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 CO<sub>2</sub>.

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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub>.

The fact is that CO<sub>2</sub> is not a pollutant. CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> that greenhouse operators often increase the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This is no surprise since plants and animals evolved when CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub>. The graph strongly suggests that the IPCC has greatly underestimated the natural sources of warming (and cooling) and has greatly exaggerated the warming from CO<sub>2</sub>.

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 CO<sub>2</sub>.

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 CO<sub>2</sub>-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 CO<sub>2</sub> emissions associated with green technologies, which are based on the demonization of CO<sub>2</sub>.

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 CO<sub>2</sub> and have underestimated other causes. Since CO<sub>2</sub> 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), 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), 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](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](#))

**[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.

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](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) ( <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:** <https://tinyurl.com/Global-Warming-Mind-Fck>

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

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

---


# Chapter 3

## Reflections on Modernity, Climategate, Pandemic, Peer Review, and Science in the Service of Empire

### Letter to a 'co-conspiracy theorist' by Zahir Ebrahim

Are the mighty men and women of science really all that much different from any astute politician?

November 30, 2009



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

Dear 'co-conspiracy theorist' M – Hi.

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

*“... but you know what, finding out that what I was saying was true there is no pleasure in*


*that whatsoever. No pleasure in 'I told you so' because this is a deeply troubling time not only for climate-science, but Science in general.”* -- Minute

9:30, Climategate: Dr. Tim Ball on the hacked CRU emails, November 21, 2009 on corbetteport

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

## The Death Blow to Climate Science


By Dr. Tim Ball Saturday, November 21, 2009




**HOUSE OF ILL REPUTE**  
Climatic Research Unit  
University of East Anglia

Global Warming is often called a hoax. I disagree because a hoax has a humorous intent to puncture pomposity. In science, such as with the Piltdown Man hoax, it was done to expose those with fervent but blind belief. The argument that global warming is due to humans, known as the anthropogenic global warming theory (AGW) is a deliberate fraud. I can now make that statement without fear of contradiction because of a remarkable hacking of files that provided not just a smoking gun, but an entire battery of machine guns.

Someone hacked in to the files of the Climatic Research Unit (CRIU) based at the University of East Anglia. A very large file (61



Dr. Tim Ball [Bio](#)  
[Print friendly](#)  
[E-mail a friend](#)  
[Contact Us](#)

SHARE 

[Hypertension](#)

9:36 / 9:58 720p

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

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

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

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


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

Sen. Inhofe: **“The thing is phony. I feel so good about being redeemed after all**

**these years... all of those scientists that Al Gore had lined up... all of them used to be on his side, they all said wait a minute, this science isn't right, and that's exactly what Alan Carlin said..."** -- Minute 0:30, Sen. Inhofe On Global Warming: 'This Thing Is Phony', Fox News, June 29, 2009  
<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Skf8bpl8WSg>




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





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

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



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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Ross McKittrick: “Well, what we found along the way was there was statistical errors, but one of the big problems was they'd used a contaminated dataset. They had about 400 input data series of these temperature proxies, but 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 <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1k4mFZr-gE>



As the above narratives brazenly disclose, one can't expect any effective policing of empire by those fed from the crumbs of empire, never mind unravel the hidden agendas! Just look at even Professor Ross McKittrick's apologetics on behalf of his fellow-scientist whose fraud he himself exposed, as being mere errors of omissions and not outright lying despite the acute probing by the interviewer.

That modus operandi of crafty omissions and half-truths, as is examined later in this letter, is a full lie and the vulgar propagandists' key mechanism for manufacturing mantras, dissent, and consent for empire.

In any event, as the political science thesis contained in my aforementioned Letter to Editor argues, there is indeed a prime reason for **“cooking that science”** of climate-change. It is, quite unsurprisingly, along the same global axis as the prime reason for **“cooking the science”** of Swine Flu as already unraveled in The Swine Flu Chronicles 2009: Why to say ‘No’ to the Swine Flu Vaccine. See its Preamble for a succinct examination of the principle modus operandi in the globalists' own handwritings. In this case, it is to fabricate plausible sounding justifications for legally ushering in the architecture of 'carbon credit', regardless of whether there is global warming, global cooling, or no significant temperature change. That is the real heart of the matter and the focus of heated debates for the past ten years being whether or not there is global climate change, as now in the climategate that there isn't, is a gigantic red herring.

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

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

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

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

It is somewhat akin to acquiring control of a nation's money supply in the guise of managing the economy better. Few in the public understand why such a control is bad anyway, but those who do try to understand it are thrown layers upon layers of obfuscation. Something similar is happening here. Think of acquiring control of

'carbon-credits' almost equivalent to acquiring control of a nation's money supply! This will control every aspect of sustaining life, just as control of money determines every aspect of sustaining the economy. You name it, between the two of them, it will control it in a world-government. And the first recipient of these controls, the carbon-credit specifically, is the developing world, the Global South, because that is where development must be arrested, and populations thinned out! Just as control of money was first exercised where there was a superfluity of industry and commerce, control of 'carbon-credit' is intended to be exercised where there is a superfluity of populations aspiring to grow their nascent economies!' -- NB: On Global Warming December 12, 2008

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

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

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

But the controversies which have erupted at the conference illustrate the problem of

coming to grips with issues that are deeply divisive and which have a profound moral dimension. The United Nations can and should play an essential role in helping the world find a satisfactory way of stabilizing the world population and stimulating economic development in a manner that is sensitive to religious and moral considerations.

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

This was a major subject of discussion at the conference in Rio de Janeiro on the environment two years ago. The focus then was on sustainable growth, and global development. It was pointed out at the conference that growth is most efficiently managed by the private sector, but regulation of the process by national governments and international bodies is also needed. And once again, United Nations can certainly be among the catalysts and coordinators of this process.” -- David Rockefeller, United Nations Ambassador's Dinner, hosted by the Business Council for the United Nations, <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=C1qUcScwnn8>



So many learned people betray shock and surprise by climategate that they betray their own pathetic ignorance of the doctrinal craftsmanship of empire. Yes, and among them are the most brilliant scientists on the planet – a phenomenon I call the **“ignorance of the learned”**. Some are pleased or have the 'told you so' reaction, and some just pooh-pooh it as insignificant, but few betray any deep forensic comprehension of the full import of the Machiavellian agenda behind the mantra now becoming unraveled. I haven't bothered studying these leaked materials since the confirmation they proclaim is a waste of my time. **As the good Dr. Tim Ball candidly stated, it also gives me**

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

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

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

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

... By 1977, I had built a small empire that included a staff of around twenty professionals headquartered in our Boston office, and a stable consultants from MAIN's other departments and offices scattered across the globe. I had become the youngest partner in the firm's hundred-year history. In addition to my title of Chief Economist, I was named manager of Economics and Regional Planning. I was lecturing at Harvard and other venues, and newspapers were soliciting articles from

me about current events. I owned a sailing yacht that was docked in Boston Harbor next to the historic battleship *Constitution*, "Old Ironsides", renowned for subduing the Barbary pirates not long after the Revolutionary War. I was being paid an excellent salary and I had equity that promised to elevate me to the rarified heights of millionaire well before I turned forty. True, my marriage had fallen apart, but I was spending time with beautiful and fascinating women in several continents.

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

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

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

### **'Michael Mann**

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

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



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

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

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

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

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

It should be evident to all men and women of science that neither Darwin nor Galileo would ever have passed peer-review. The fact that genuine scientists seeking the peer review process don't seem to care about this blatant obviousness which is even rooted in historical precedence, suggests that they wisely choose to remain within the allowable confines of acceptable research, i.e., funded research, even when they have no diabolical or mal intent of their own. The control in science is exercised in a manner not too dissimilar to permitting vigorous and contrarian social debate within an allowable spectrum to give the illusion of free speech and freedom of thought! Those falling outside the allowable limits are of course variously labeled and marginalized.

Thus, while no one may challenge the sacred-cow Holocaust™ narrative in the EU or Canada without going to jail as everyone already knows, debating and developing competing theories on

Islamofascism and maligning Islam and its Prophets is greatly encouraged as the epitome of freedom of speech and profound intellectualism. **But challenging the very premise of Osama Bin Laden or 'Radical Islam' is frowned upon, and will likely soon be labeled 'terrorism' if it isn't already.** Rendition can't be that far behind. Nevertheless, it is still easier to survive being marginalized in the social discourse arena. But quite impossible to do so in science which has become a big budget operation requiring institutional support and endorsement.

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

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

The aforementioned concern is even more eloquently voiced by the polymath Spanish Benedictine nun at San Benet of Montserrat's Monastery in Barcelona, Dr. Teresa Forcades, with the peerless credentials: Physician specialist in Internal Medicine, Ph.D. in Public Health, and Degree in Theology from Harvard University.

[https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4CVSL\\_vV\\_Bo](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4CVSL_vV_Bo)



And that full spectrum abuse of science, the “**incestuous science**” in the service of empire, is the

crucial heart of the matter today.

The fact that we see it occurring repeatedly across the board – from the government sanctioned official but absurd NIST report on how the WTC towers catastrophically collapsed into their own footprints on 9/11, to the fraudulent climate-change science of Global Warming, to the brazenly criminal medical science of swine flu pandemic promulgated by government sanctioned official bodies like WHO and CDC – minimally shows how science is being perversely used in the service of empire. What a tortuous implementation of Sir Francis Bacon's drive to inter-link the pursuit of the nascently emerging Western science in the 17th century with imperial funding from the superpower du jour, in order to more effectively deploy the harvest of science in the service of humanity (and of course empire): **“human knowledge and human power meet in one”!** (Francis Bacon, quoted in John Gascoigne, *Science in the Service of Empire: Joseph Banks, the British State and the Uses of Science in the Age of Revolution*, Cambridge, 1998, pg. 16)

It is immensely interesting to also note in passing that Noam Chomsky insisted on 9/11 science be peer-reviewed before he'd read the papers written by Jones et. al. And when it finally got published by a maverick online journal (I sent a thank you note to them), my dear professor Noam Chomsky – to whom I will forever remain indebted as the teacher who actually taught me to think critically – insisted that he will wait for other credible scientists in that domain to critique it before reading and/or offering his own opinion as he was not a domain expert in how tall buildings collapse, and that letting the domain experts sort it out first in peer-reviewed journals is the acceptable process of science!

What a new born baby octogenarian – or perhaps Noam Chomsky had understood rather well that going against the grain on 9/11 would be severely career limiting for any technical domain expert, and thus it was, and perhaps still is, safe to argue in this way? A specious red herring? Or merely intellectual convolutions to continue echoing empire's sacred-cow axioms of **“imperial mobilization”** while appearing to challenge its deadly expression?

Does it take a domain expert, or some ordinary un-co-opted commonsense observation to realize that this free-fall symmetrical collapse into its own footprint suspiciously looks like controlled demolition, and that this and this catastrophic instantaneous powdering of tall buildings into fine dust are hardly the gravity collapse of a standing steel structure due to fire; never mind the fact that no response from empire's imposing air defense systems on that ill-fated day when the hijacking drama was unfolding in the public eye, at least smacks of active collusion at the highest levels of the US military high-command; and therefore, minimally, to pin 9/11 on Osama Bin Laden based on some newly discovered faith in officialdom after a life of dissent is profoundly intellectual?

All are empire's own multifaceted instruments of public relations, as well as its “approved science”,

and its “approved dissent”. The political abuse of science to serve hegemonic agendas is a monumental scam, and Dr. Ball’s following terse expression is very perceptive:

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

Anecdotally, I will recall for you some interesting personal experiences of the abuse of peer review by individuals. In the late 1980s when I worked as a development engineer in a computer company, my new office-mate, a recent Ph.D. from a very reputed top school in the United States and only 25 years of age (he celebrated his 25th birthday after his first day at work), had published almost 20 or so papers on the operating system he had worked on for his Ph.D. thesis. In any case it was a large number of papers, I may be forgetting the precise number. So, one day, having nothing better to do, I read all his published papers that were listed on his imposing resume – there was no web at the time, and only hardcopy of these papers existed which he fortunately had in the office. I also read his Ph.D. thesis. And I was very puzzled. 90% of the content in the refereed and conference papers was identical. To my mind, the differences didn’t warrant new papers, only perhaps separate sections, and at most 2 or 3 papers. So I asked him about it. He candidly told me that this is how the game is played, and that those who didn’t play it, paid the price. This scholarship inflation is indeed rewarded with academic respectability, not just in academe, but in corporate research as well. A few years later, another graduate student in computer science developed a fancy piece of software to automatically synthesize an entirely gibberish but plausible sounding paper in context by scanning words and sentences in already published papers, and submitted his genius to one or more peer-reviewed journals.

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

the Nobel Laureate Richard Feynman of Caltech, had only 37 or so published papers, and that how did he get so many. I can't even remember this inflated egoist's answer today!

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

As is amply evident over the past few weeks since the climategate scandal broke, almost all people of scientific acumen continue to focus on the fascinating mechanics of how Mann et. al., said their

“gun” worked, but it actually didn't! So bad-bad-scientists. Let's just clean up the climate sciences of its rotten eggs and move-on. This attitude is clearly visible in almost all the stellar conversations on climategate in cyberspace even among the academics. Especially among the academics! See for instance this [open letter](#) by Prof. Judith Curry, and her [editorial](#).

This tunnel vision isn't limited to climategate however, but permeates all imperial mantras the most prominent and most deadly to date of course being the “**Global War on Terror**”. I look forward to the day when similar email revelations will show how 911 was an inside job and how any challenge to the official narrative was to be suppressed, including in science publications and only the Popular Science version which elaborated on the NIST science was to be promulgated. At that time, all the uber intelligent beings will once again similarly become fixated with the minutiae of the obvious. But yesterday, as today, when boldly asserting so by influential men and women of science could surely have derailed “**imperial mobilization**” to Afghanistan and Iraq thus preventing all the horrendous crimes against humanity which followed, it remained a conspiracy theory of the lunatic fringes who saw gods in the sky.

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

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

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

- None of them betray that they possess long term memories, or any comprehension of even recent history that can be contextualized to the present.

- None of them seem to have heard of 'covert-ops' and 'black-ops'; none of them have read the shrewd analysis of the imperial thinkers themselves of the necessity of real mobilizing pretexts such as the *"New Pearl Harbor"* and *"clear and present danger"* as otherwise *"Democracy is inimical to imperial mobilization"*.
- None of them apparently understand that covert-ops while they are operational and active, are meant to be secretive and mendacious, which is why they are called 'covert', and that their unraveling necessitates perceptively seeing beyond what's being deliberately made manifest and what's being insisted upon as **'two plus two equals five'** - for hard receipts for them will only be uncovered by historians through the famed declassification process post *faits accomplis*.
- Thus all of these 'astute' thinkers, commentators, and media pundits none too miraculously reach the same minimal and common conclusion space regardless of their own starting thesis or the circuitous routes taken in their analysis and speculations, that at the bare minimum, the scourge of 'fundamentalism' and 'militant Islam' needs to be checked with renewed commitment in the global 'war on terror', or else no one in the 'civilized world' would remain safe from these antiquated Taliban style 'evil jihadis' and 'al qaeeda'. That root of terror has now been successfully showcased as residing in Pakistan – the *'Terror Central'*!
- It is indeed deemed a 'clash of civilizations', not of the East and the West titans, but of 'radical antiquated militant Islam' and the rest of civilized humanity! That *"Today [even] if one could wipe America off the map of the world with a wet cloth, mullah-led fanaticism will not disappear"*, as the distinguished native-informant par excellence, the world class physicist Pervaiz Hoodbhoy, has conclusively observed in his latest analysis of the matter in "Preventing More Lal Masjids", and which he had earlier explored in great analytical depth in "The Threat From Within". And none [too] surprisingly, echoing the same mantra of Pakistan becoming a 'terrorist sanctuary' [as] CNN a few days ago [which] aired the documentary by Nick Richardson "Pakistan - The Threat Within". The unanimity of this conclusion space is scary to say the least – at least for us Pakistanis.
- It would appear that the world's leading thinkers, journalists, newsmedia, scholars and leaders *"united we stand"* that Pakistan poses a serious threat to world peace! **Not the hectoring hegemony who have cleverly utilized 911 "to gosestep the Herrenvolk across international frontiers"** in what only appears to be another *'operation canned goods'* or the *'Reichstag fire'* or the much coveted *'New Pearl Harbor'* to achieve the *'transformation of [its] forces'* to achieve *'full spectrum dominance'* over the planet and outerspace, **but my**



**wretched lands of the ancient Indus valley, and my wretched peoples – we are the world threat!** -- Saving Pakistan from Synthetic 'Terror Central' - Orchestration of 'La Masjid' – a precursor to 'shock and awe'? July 13-23, 2007.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Only genuine 'conspiracy theorists'!

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

'The real value of Tragedy and Hope ... [is the] bold and boastful admission by Dr. Quigley that there actually exists a relatively small but powerful group which has succeeded in acquiring a choke-hold on the affairs of practically the entire human race. Of course we should be quick to recognize that no small group could wield such gigantic power unless millions of people in all walks of life were "in on the take" and were willing to knuckle down to the iron-clad regimentation of the ruthless bosses behind the scenes. **As we shall see, the network has succeeded in building its power structure by using tremendous quantities of money (together with the vast influence it buys) to manipulate, intimidate, or corrupt millions of men and women and their institutions on a world-wide basis.**' -- W. Cleon Skousen, *The Naked Capitalist*, 1970, pg. 6

Oligarchs have of course always existed, and presumably always will. Aldous Huxley noted in his

famous talk in 1962 at Berkeley that the rulers getting the serfs to love their own voluntary servitude would be the **“ultimate revolution”** in social control. That notion, of puppetmasters seeking ways and means to control the populace, is simply empirical.

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

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

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

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

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

My teacher, Noam Chomsky, is perhaps the most egregious example of this. The New York Times called him **“arguably the most important intellectual alive”**. Indeed he is. His imposing books are undeniably the most exhaustive compilation of the crimes of empire. But in critically examining his prolific life of dissent without being snowed in by his voluminous body of work, at least on two of the gravest moments in any ordinary intellectual's life, never mind the **“most important intellectual alive”**, when the most urgent need of the hour was to publicly show bold skepticism for the

narratives of power, Noam Chomsky persisted in exactly echoing the core sacred-cow axioms of empire. From the officially promulgated lone-gunman theory of JFK assassination, to the officially promulgated 19 hijackers theory of 911, he cleverly echoed the sacred-cow axioms of empire even in his dissent!

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

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

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


Best wishes,

Zahir Ebrahim, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

## **Bibliography Corruption of Science**

[1] Martin Fleischman (Fellow of the Royal Society), *Reflections on the Sociology of Science and Social Responsibility in Science, in Relationship to Cold Fusion*, Accountability in Research, 2000. 8: p. 19, Taylor and Francis, cached copy at URL: <https://web.archive.org/web/20130616021040/http://humanbeingsfirst.files.wordpress.com/2011/04/cacheof-reflections-on-the-sociology-of-science-and-social-responsibility-in-science-in-relationship-to-cold-fusion-by-martin-fleischmann-fleischmanreflection.pdf>

[2] Rupert Sheldrake, *The Replicability Crisis in Science*, a brief survey of the epistemology of Science pertaining to replicability failure, approx. date September 2015, source URL: <http://www.sheldrake.org/about-rupert-sheldrake/blog/the-replicability-crisis-in-science>



Caption “In September 2015, the international scientific journal Nature published a cartoon showing the temple of “Robust Science” in a state of collapse. What is going on?” -- Rupert Sheldrake (image courtesy of Nature via Rupert Sheldrake)

[3] John Bohannon, *Who's Afraid of Peer Review?*, Science 04 Oct 2013, Vol. 342, Issue 6154, pp. 60-65. A spoof paper concocted by Science reveals little or no scrutiny at many open-access journals, source URL: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/342/6154/60.full> , PDF: <http://science.sciencemag.org/content/342/6154/60.full.pdf>

[4] Prinz et. al, *Believe it or not: how much can we rely on published data on potential drug targets?*, Correspondence Nature Reviews Drug Discovery 10, 712, September 2011. The Bayer HealthCare, Germany, authors claims that only in ~20–25% of the projects was the relevant published data completely in line with their own in-house findings, and in almost two-thirds of the projects the published findings could not be validated! Source URL: <http://www.nature.com/nrd/journal/v10/n9/full/nrd3439-c1.html>

[5] Zahir Ebrahim, *Global Warming / Climate Change has Become a New Religion - What's it all About?*, November 30, 2016 | Updated October 26, 2018, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2016/11/global-warming-climate-change-whats-it.html>

[6] Zahir Ebrahim, *Between Global Warming and Global Governance – Concern for Environment is a 'Hegelian Mind Fck'!* A short study in the epistemology of climate-science when Science is in the Service of Empire, December 12, 2008, see extended footnotes and bibliography in context, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/nb-on-global-warming.html>

[7] Zahir Ebrahim, *Comment on Judy Wood's 'The New Hiroshima'*, A short study in the epistemology of 9-11 science when Science is in the Service of Empire, April 26, 2011, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/04/comment-on-judywoods-new-hiroshima.html>

[8] Zahir Ebrahim, *911 The Sacred Cow of Science*, Demonstrating the epistemology of 9-11 science when Science is NOT in the Service of Empire, April 17, 2014, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/04/faq-prove-that-911-narrative-is-big-lie.html>

[9] Zahir Ebrahim, *Was America's Moon Landing a Big Lie? How can one forensically investigate that question today?* Disambiguating Religion, Science and Psychological Warfare Operations, May 24, 2014, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2014/05/was-americas-moon-landing-big-lie.html>

[10] Zahir Ebrahim, *What's the truth about modern medicine?* Good Medicine vs. Bad Medicine - Corruption of Medicine in the Service of Empire, November 19, 2011 | Revised July 9, 2015, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/11/whats-thetruth-about-modern-medicine.html>

[11] Zahir Ebrahim, *Ushering in Big Brother*, The Fable of the Bees and the Seduction of Science and Technology Corrupting the Intellect and the Soul, November 10, 2011, source URL: <http://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2011/11/seduction-of-science-and-technology.html>

[12] Zahir Ebrahim, *Some Problems in Epistemology*, December 18, 2016 | Final version January 21, 2017, source URL: <http://faith-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2016/12/some-problems-in-epistemology.html>

**Short URL:** <https://tinyurl.com/Science-in-Service-of-Empire>

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

First Published: 11/30/2009 12:00:06 8897 | Last updated (homepage) 06/17/11 10:00:05 9159

Links fixed and bibliography added Thursday, January 21, 2016 01:00 am 9726

Bibliography updated October 26, 2018

---



# Chapter 4

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

Zahir Ebrahim

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

December 11, 2008

'I have never believed that there is a secret United Nations plot to take over the US. I have never seen black helicopters hovering in the sky above Montana. **But, for the first time in my life, I think the formation of some sort of world government is plausible.** A “world government” would involve much more than co-operation between nations. It would be an entity with state-like characteristics, backed by a body of laws. The European Union has already set up a continental government for 27 countries, which could be a model. The EU has a supreme court, a currency, thousands of pages of law, a large civil service and the ability to deploy military force. So could the European model go global? There are three reasons for thinking that it might. First, it is increasingly clear that the most difficult issues facing national governments are international in nature: there is global warming, a global financial crisis and a “global war on terror”. ... **But – the third point – a change in the political atmosphere suggests that “global governance” could come much sooner than that. The financial crisis and climate change are pushing national governments towards global solutions, even in countries such as China and the US that are traditionally fierce guardians of national sovereignty.** --- [And now for a world government, Financial Times, December 8 2008.](#)

And there you have it, right from the mouthpiece of high finance, the shill for the New World Order, the media asset of the intelligence apparatus, testing the water temperature.

This time, the FT's chief foreign affairs columnist, Gideon Rachman, lets the full caboodle out of the bag, saying exactly what Project Humanbeingsfirst has been warning about: that the most natural solution to global fictions and global manufactured crises will be presented as “world government”. As David Icke had pointed out over ten years ago, there has to come a point at which the devilish conspiracy for world government will need to break surface. But before that time, all references to it must be discredited as 'tin-hatted' conspiracy theories. That breaking of surface has been happening gradually in disjoint bits and fragments for the past few years. Even Congressman Ron Paul blatantly [talked about it](#) during the 2008 Republican Debates carried on CNN – something that would have been unheard of in mainstream coverage in the past. But this instance in the Financial Times editorial is the most egregious testing of the waters because it brings all the manufactured global boogiemens together, and exactly posits their solution-space as “world government”. It brings to full circle implementation these ominous words of G. Edward Griffin from '[The Capitalist Conspiracy](#)':

***“Create conditions so frightful at home and abroad, that the abandonment of personal liberties and national sovereignty, will appear as a reasonable price for a return to domestic tranquility and world peace.”***

A bit of high-school level few studious nights homework would reveal that all three items on Mr. Gideon Rachman's list are elaborately manufactured fictions.

To know that **a) global warming**, is a politically motivated global fiction, or at best, of a highly contentious nature among scientists themselves and therefore, hardly a scientific fact upon which such a monumental global policy as world-government can be advocated, begin at Steve Watson's short news story '[Over 650 Scientists Challenge Global Warming “Consensus”](#)', and [download PDF](#) of the full 231 page report released December 11, 2008, titled: '**U. S. Senate Minority Report: More Than 650 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims - Scientists Continue to Debunk “Consensus” in 2008**'. Or read its [Introduction Chapter here](#).

To learn that **b) global financial crisis**, is deliberately manufactured, the [Monetary Reform Bibliography](#) contains sufficient references and perspective which ties it all together.

To understand that **c) global war on terror**, is synthetic and fabricated, read the minuscule compilation of Project Humanbeingsfirst's reports which succinctly unravels it all: [The WAR on TERROR 2008 Omnibus Collection \(PDF\)](#).

After doing one's due diligence and all that homework, where does that leave a bewildered but commonsensical person? It at least leaves one to ponder that such deep intelligence propaganda programs spinning manufactured death in a perpetual war that is intended to last for lifetime, spinning manufactured global financial collapse as happenstance of overspending due to Wall Street shortsightedness, and spinning natural climate changes as manmade – all to create [global governance structures](#) (PDF) piece-meal and through *faits accomplis* – are being relentlessly seeded into peoples' consciousness, and not one in the worldwide mainstream news media is able to call on it?

Are all of them morons? Or are they all sell-outs? How can that be? How does the “[Mighty Wurlitzer](#)” accomplish this?

The answer to that can also be easily understood – for we know far too much from recent history, if only one is reminded of it. Notice how Rachman begins his editorial “***I have never believed that there is a secret United Nations plot to take over the US***”, such that in a single opening sentence, he puts to rest why he might now be saying the same thing that the so called [conspiracy-theorists](#) have been asserting for many years. He presents his version as a new emerging necessity to the global problems. What is this – other than a very sophisticated intelligence psy-op to now make it acceptable to take the conspiracy out of the previously discredited realm of 'tin-hatters' and start discussing it as the preferred solution-space? But coming from a respectable news media like the Financial Times(?), they are hardly a tabloid newspaper, one might ask. Such psyops and disinformation is the norm rather than the exception, as the following two articles disclose: Carl Bernstein's '[THE CIA AND THE MEDIA](#)', and Richard Keeble's '[Hacks And Spooks](#)'.

In addition, the following passage from the court testimony of expert witness Mr. William Schaap on psyops and disinformation, dated November 30, 1999, is very useful in acquiring a perspective that is denied to most Western peoples. Watch his hour long [video testimony](#) or read its [transcript](#). This is what he says on 'conspiracy':

***“The average American would hear something from the government or hear the news on television and assumes that what they're hearing is the truth unless they're shown otherwise. They assume that almost nothing is ever a conspiracy.***

*In Europe it's very much the opposite. Anything happens. They tend to think it's a conspiracy unless you show them that it wasn't a conspiracy. I mean, after all, "conspiracy" just means, you know, more than one person being involved in something. And if you stop and think about it, almost everything significant that*

*happens anywhere involves more than one person.*

***Yet here there is a -- not a myth really, but there's just an underlying assumption that most things are not conspiracies. And when you have that, it enables a government which has a propaganda program, has a disinformation program, to be relatively successful in -- in having its disinformation accepted. ... But another reason it works is that disinformation is very, very effective over time. The longer that you, whoever you are, can control the spin on a story, the more that spin becomes accepted as the absolute truth. And in this country the government has a great deal of power and influence over that spin."***

The conclusion of this response [ to Gideon Rachman's propagandistic pitch for world government as a panacea for all that ails mankind ] therefore, is best expressed in the 1974 prescriptive words of the CFR author Richard N. Gardner, from his article in Foreign Affairs titled: '[The Hard Road To World Order](#)'. The former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations under Kennedy and Johnson, and a member of the Trilateral Commission, had accurately captured the [Zeitgeist](#) which was to exist in the near future – and that future is here today – in which, the import of Mr. Gideon Rachman's editorial becomes clear:

***"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."***

(If the above link for the Financial Times news story doesn't work, access it through Mr. Rachman's [Financial Times blog](#). Also see his two followups after being bombarded by adverse comments [here](#) and [here](#).)

Please send your letter to editor to [Project Humanbeingsfirst](#), and to the [Financial Times](#), airing your opinion whether you agree, or acquiesce, to losing the independence of your nation-state to solve the problems outlined by the Financial Times and the [global ruling elite](#)!

Thank you.

**Short URL:** <https://tinyurl.com/And-now-for-a-world-government>

**Source URL:** <https://print-humanbeingsfirst.blogspot.com/2008/12/responseto-ft-gideon-rachman-worldgov.html>

First Published December 11, 2008 | Links fixed November 23, 2016

---

# Chapter 5

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

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

**Date:** Tuesday, October 30, 2018 at 12:00 pm

**From:** Zahir Ebrahim, Project Humanbeingsfirst.org

**Email:** humanbeingsfirst@gmail.com

**Email:** zahir@alum.mit.edu

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

Hello.

You collectively signed a most carefully worded [letter](#) to President Donald Trump over a year and half ago (dated March 2, 2017) in which you stated that you did not share the views of your colleague Dr. Lindzen who had previously written a [letter](#) (dated February 23, 2017) to the President asking him to withdraw from the UN climate convention, and that in your, and other overwhelming majority of scientists' who have devoted their professional lives to the careful study of climate science, collective view, the risks to the Earth systems associated with increasing levels of carbon dioxide are almost universally agreed by climate scientists to be real ones. [ Lindzen's [followup letter](#) to the White House (dated March 09, 2017) ]

I found your short letter particularly careful in its omissions. You carefully chose not to make any observation on your beliefs on the actual cause of this increase in CO2 levels, nor advocate any solutions. In your letter you made it clear that your collective view disagreed with your colleague's

call to withdraw from United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Whilst you explicitly raised the alarm on the potential dangers of high levels of CO<sub>2</sub>, your omissions make it obvious to me just from reading your letter whether you also believe that the CO<sub>2</sub> levels are man-made, and must be regulated down by international programs such as the Carbon Credit scheme, and the UN Agenda 21. In this letter I presume that you do. I invite correction on any misimpressions of which I am sure there may be a few. None are all knowing, including yourselves.

Of course, no sensible person, let alone a science professor at MIT, will think not to first massively plant new trees and replenish Rainforests and jungles on urgent war footings; not to first stop cutting down trees for housing for the Western world that principally uses timber for structures, and not to first stop clearing forests for cattle-feed farming and agriculture, especially in the Amazon basin and the Americas, that has pretty much drained the primary cleansing sink of human generated CO<sub>2</sub> in the delicately balanced human-plant natural eco-system of earth.

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

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

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

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

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

States of America.

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

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

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

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

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

But, just as no sensible person would think of living in a police state just because it makes the most stable system of governance and offers the most safety from common criminals, no sensible person



will also think to put human beings in growth chains and to enslave mankind to the agendas of the elites in a global police state just to get rid of the high levels of CO2. [ [See Footnote](#) ]

Would you agree with these general statements of commonsensical principles?

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

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

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

These are not classified state secrets.

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

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

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

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

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

Who said this:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Who said this:

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

Speak of putting the cart before the horse!!

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

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

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

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

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

Take religion and self-interest out of science.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Who said this:

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

Today, the major thesis of establishmentarian climate scientists who have devoted their professional lives to the careful study of climate science, but evidently under the prevailing political axiom that brings funds to their research, is that the crisis is man-made global warming; tomorrow, the thesis

may become man-made global cooling; and the day after, something else man-made catastrophe; unless of course the crisis creation is alien invasion or heavenly collision.

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

And the world would surely have not known what's in the kitchen sink of climate science without the revelations contained in the East Anglia Emails. I have had the opportunity to read some of them. These candid conversations among the inner circle of climate scientists is disturbing to say the least. To a sharp mind, it is obvious that they are creating a phony science and hoping the reality will catch up with their construction, or, that no one will notice, or ask too many perceptive questions about the inside workings of their models and data. Someone did. And the rest of us did too --- and we don't have to be particularly superior climate scientists to distinguish snake oil when that's what it is.

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

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

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

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

Who said this:

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

Remarkably, I can do simple addition rather well, and also proclaim the result without being

beholden to a license from authority figures to grant me that freedom to speak.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Unless the best minds in society rise to challenge their own *banality of evil* first, they cannot break through the myriad forces that ensure obedience and silence on truth. Brilliant intellectuals just as easily become obedient slaves to this system *United We Stand* as the rest of the ordinary public who would do anything to pursue their "American Dreams" including sell their conscience, but under

carefully managed illusions. This is just a statement of empirical fact, and quite self-evident. When intellectuals seek, and are dependent upon, “universal agreement” to sell their “wares”, they dare not stand alone lest they be forced to drink the hemlock like Socrates, and recant like Galileo.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

If anything, our *Technetronic Era* has made it not just possible, but quite practicable, for a handful of people to control the world and rule all humanity. This was already much anticipated, even speciously dignified, and also planned. Surely you are more than literate in Zbigniew Brzezinski's clairvoyant classic *Between Two Ages: The Role of America in the Technetronic Era*; Bertrand

Russell's equally seminal prognostications of the impending future in *The Impact of Science on Society*; H. G. Wells' similar self-serving predictions in *The New World Order*; Carroll Quigley's troublesome confirmation of the secretive role of the handful of financial super-elites behind the pyramid of political power in the West and the affairs of the world, in *Tragedy & Hope: A History of the World in Our Time*; etc. The bibliography is extensive and blueprints modernity rather accurately.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I would be pollyannaish if I believed that MIT scientists are immune to such pressures to conform to



the political and professional wisdom du jour, and that they are all rocket propulsion specialists.

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

How successfully? Let's see.

The Source URL for what follows is:

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

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

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

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

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

If nature is indeed the culprit today as it has empirically always been in the past, then there is little that man can do about it. There is certainly no political mileage to be derived from that assessment.

In fact, it would derail the political agenda of man-made global warming altogether. It may yet be replaced by man-made global cooling before too long.

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

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

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

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

Who said this:

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

**And you can see all the forces that shape events;  
not just the things happening near to you.”**

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

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

Thank you.

Best regards,

Zahir Ebrahim

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

## Footnote

[ **Extraneous Clarification Note Oct. 31, 2018:** See [attached document](#) to observe that this matter of high levels of their environmental degradation marker CO<sub>2</sub>, is itself highly contested by non establishment scientists. Here, I am *prima facie* accepting establishment scientists on their own reported principal axiom driving their climate science, that CO<sub>2</sub> levels are unbearably high. The logic of this letter does not depend upon it being true or false, only that it be falsifiable.

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

Yesterday, upon receiving my letter, Dr. Lindzen generously sent me the PDF of his second letter to the White House dated March 07, 2017, as response to my letter, in which he had explained in more detail to the President of the United States, why his petition signed by approximately 330 scientists,

called for withdrawal from UNFCCC of all governments, and not just the United States.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

It was Adolf Hitler who gave eugenics a bad name with his concentration camps. But the pseudo science did not die away. It was simply reborn as the United Nations Population Fund (UNFPA), for a more benign sounding public relations approach to eugenics. The agenda is the same. See the declassified United States National Security Strategy Memorandum 200 (NSSM 200) dated 1974, drafted by then Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, and signed off by president Gerald Ford as NSDM 312 in 1975. Who lives and who dies is again decided by race and usefulness to the advanced white civilizations of the world, but syntactically sugared to map to the Least Developed Countries (LDC) with significant over populations. High growth rates in the 13 LDC listed is presented as threat to the national security of the United States of America (and its Western allies obviously). The racial eugenics bibliography is extensive, the dominant role played by scientists and scholars harboring a political ideology, not particularly being a secret.

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

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

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

History is evidently repeating with Climate @ MIT. There may be other cases as well in other departments of MIT serving similar interests of primacy with the wonderful magic of numbers and computers.

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

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

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

**Short URL:** <https://tinyurl.com/letter-climate-mit-sci-or-rel>

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

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

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

Link to Lindzen's followup letter to the White House added December 13, 2018

---

# The Plebeian antidote to Hectoring Hegemons

Home is [Humanbeingsfirst.org](http://Humanbeingsfirst.org)

INDEX [here](#).

Okay to copy, print, or post this [document](#); verbatim reproduction only.

Comment [here](#). Full Copyright Notice [here](#).

---



## Reprint License

All material copyright (c) Project Humanbeingsfirst™, with full permission to copy, repost, and reprint, in its entirety, unmodified and unedited, for any purpose, granted in perpetuity, provided the source URL sentence and this copyright notice are also reproduced verbatim as part of this restricted Reprint License, along with any embedded links within its main text, and not doing so may be subject to copyright license violation infringement claims pursuant to remedies noted at <http://www.copyright.gov/title17/92chap5.html>. All figures, images, quotations and excerpts, are used without permission based on non-profit "fair-use" for personal education and research use only in the greater public interest, documenting crimes against humanity, deconstructing current affairs, and scholarly commentary. The usage by Project Humanbeingsfirst of all external material is minimally consistent with the understanding of "fair use" laws at <http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/17/107.html>. Project Humanbeingsfirst does not endorse any external website or organization it links to or references, nor those that may link to it or reprint its works. In accordance with Title 17 U.S.C. Section 107 of US Copyright Laws, you are provided the material from Project Humanbeingsfirst upon your request, and taking any action that delivers you any of its documents in any form is considered making a specific request to receive the documents for your own personal educational and/or research use. You are directly responsible for seeking the requisite permissions from other copyright holders for any use beyond "fair use".

---

Primer Published on Thursday, March 7, 2019 10:00 PM Pages 154 56106

**Thank you!**