

# Climate Change lies

## Exposed by hard facts

### Introduction

In this paper I want to keep commentary to a minimum and expose the blatant lies of Climate Change alarmists showing that their entire argument is based on:

- Bad scientific practices.<sup>1</sup>
- Fraud.<sup>2</sup>
- Cherry picked basic data.<sup>3</sup>
- Utterly fabricated data.<sup>4</sup>
- Deviation from known physical laws.<sup>5</sup>

You need to understand that this global panic is not caused by concern for environmental issues but a political strategy to:

- Transfer money from the poor to the rich (e.g. increased utility bills, carbon taxes).
- Facilitate corporate plans for investment, such as sustainable energy projects worth trillions.
- De-industrialise the 'Christian' west to undermine it.
- Stimulate new carbon free appliances that cost more money.
- Push down coastal property values so the rich can buy them cheap.
- Push up the insurance premiums of coastal properties.
- Create fear and panic in the gullible population to make it more compliant.<sup>6</sup>
- Destroy the ability of developing nations from prospering and gaining political power.
- Prepare the way for a global, Socialist, fascist government – this is the main objective.

---

<sup>1</sup> For proof see multiple exposes by Lord Christopher Monckton, Ian Plimer, Paul Fahy, *The end of climate change doom* (1 and 2).

<sup>2</sup> See for example, the University of East Anglia climate change emails fraud scandal (New American, 23 November 2009, 'IPCC researchers admit global warming fraud') and many others. They falsified global mean temperatures. Many claims will be shown to be fraudulent in this paper. Michael Mann even fraudulently claimed to have a personal Nobel Prize and forged a false certificate. National Geographic hid the warm pre-1960 data from their November 1976 graphic.

<sup>3</sup> About 50% of the NOAA temperature graphs are estimated and computer modelled, not genuine readings. Michael Mann et. al.'s hockey stick graph ignored all the peak temperatures after 1000 AD until the 20<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>4</sup> For proof see Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Rewriting America's history', 25 September 2019. For example, NASA 'US Temperature NASA 1999' which shows a cooling, compared to NASA 'US Temperatures NASA 2019', which shows a warming – the data was adulterated.

<sup>5</sup> See the research by Michael and Ronan Connolly summarised in Paul Fahy, *The end of climate change doom* (1 and 2).

<sup>6</sup> HL Mencken (1880–1956, US journalist, philosopher and literary critic), '*The whole aim of practical politics is to keep the populace alarmed (and hence clamorous to be led to safety) by menacing it with an endless series of hobgoblins, all of them imaginary*'.

The elite's strategy in this narrative has been iniquitous. It has involved massive lies and fraud in multiple situations. It has co-opted the media to be complicit in perpetrating this fraud. It has convinced its cohorts in academia and education to brainwash kids to believe utter lies and be dominated by fear (i.e. child abuse). And it has even used a vulnerable, mentally afflicted 16-year old girl to be the poster messiah for the movement (which is also child abuse). This girl is not only dominated by her Leftist, activist, scandalous parents but also a handler that works for arch-elite leader George Soros. The poor kid is so deluded that she claims to be able to see CO<sub>2</sub> – an invisible gas.<sup>7</sup> Yet this bewildered child is dominating governmental policy makers committing to trillions of pounds of taxpayers' money (Theresa May committed Britain to over a trillion spend by 2050 to be carbon neutral).<sup>8</sup>

The lies and hypocrisy spouted day after day must be resisted by truth; herewith some examples.

### Abbreviations

- CO<sub>2</sub> – Carbon Dioxide.
- ER – Extinction Rebellion. An action group protesting climate change but its published goals are the overthrow of western governments.
- IEA – International Energy Agency.
- IPCC – The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a division of the United Nations.
- MIT – Massachusetts Institute of Technology.
- NASA – The National Aeronautics and Space Agency. An independent agency of the federal US government.
- NOAA - National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.
- pH – A logarithmic measurement of the difference in alkalinity or acidity of a substance measured on a scale of 1 to 14. Acids have a pH from 0 to 7 while alkalis (bases) have a pH of 7 to 14. PH ('pondus Hydrogenium', lit. the weight of Hydrogen) refers to the concentration of hydrogen ions.
- PPM – Parts per million.
- UN – United Nations.

---

<sup>7</sup> The Afrinik, 'My daughter can see CO<sub>2</sub> with the naked eye', 2 May 2019.

<sup>8</sup> Apart from being an impossibility (humans are made of carbon, plants need CO<sub>2</sub>, animals produce more CO<sub>2</sub> than humans, the seas produce CO<sub>2</sub> etc.) if we did eliminate CO<sub>2</sub> from the earth all life would become extinct. This is how stupid this policy is.

## Greenland is not getting significantly warmer

### Lie

Greenland is getting hotter and its glaciers are melting very fast, threatening ocean rise.

Since 1998 [Greenland ice has] been melting due to climate change ... if the entire Greenland ice sheet were to melt it would raise global sea levels by 20 feet. ... Ice loss increased four fold between 2003 and 2012.<sup>9</sup>

The entire ice mass of Greenland will disappear from the world map if temperatures rise by as little as 2C ... Sometime in the next decade (i.e. by 2020) ... unleashing global sea level rise of 23 feet.<sup>10</sup>

### Fact

Greenland is so named because when the Viking Norsemen discovered it they found a verdant, fertile island. It was discovered and named by the Norse explorer Eric the Red in 986 and settled in coastal pockets by Norse colonists. There were large birch woodlands then, providing timber and fuel in the Medieval Warm Period (aka 'Medieval Climatic Anomaly').

As the climate cooled, at a later period, it became covered with much more ice and the Vikings abandoned large parts of it; about 16% is ice-free now. So Greenland used to be far warmer than it is today. This warmer period had nothing to do with the activity of man as it was before the industrial age.

The Jakobshavn glacier in Greenland (used by climate change activists to demonstrate global warning) is now growing back due to unusually cold ocean currents.<sup>11</sup> Even NASA has admitted this, though they affirm that overall Greenland is losing ice.<sup>12</sup>

Claims that ice loss in 2012 was greater than in 2003 were based on one year's exceptional weather and not the long-term trend. The temperature charts for SW Greenland, with the exception of 2012, are not different to those in the 1920s to the 1940s. There is no evidence that Greenland's climate is getting warmer. It simply goes through slightly warm phases in a cycle.<sup>13</sup>

The media had always been scaremongering about melting glaciers.

- The Medford Mail Tribune (Medford, Oregon), '*Glacier Park melting ...*' 29 December 1923.
- The Post-Standard (Syracuse, New York), '*Glaciers melting*', 5 March 1952.
- National Geographic, '*No more glaciers...*', 2 March 2009.
- New York Times, '*Climate change threatens to strip the identity of Glacier National Park*', 22 November 2014.

---

<sup>9</sup> Vox, 'Greenland's ice is melting ...', 22 January 2019.

<sup>10</sup> The Guardian, 'Greenland ice sheet faces tipping point in ten years', 10 August 2010.

<sup>11</sup> *Newsmax*, Larry Bell, 'Greenland's glacier grows alarming climate hysteries', 22 April 2019.

<sup>12</sup> National Geographic, 'A Greenland glacier is growing ...', 25 March 2019.

<sup>13</sup> Not a lot of people know that, 'Latest fake claims about Greenland ice loss', 22 January 2019.

## Sea levels are not rising abnormally

### Lie

Sea levels around the world are rapidly rising and threaten to overwhelm all coastal cities.

15-25 foot rise in ocean levels [before the year 2000].<sup>14</sup>

Sea levels will rise higher and faster than previously predicted ... A new IPCC report says inaction on climate change will likely result in sea level rise of 1.1 metres by 2100. ... Without action the seas will be five metres higher by 2300. ... Low-lying coastal communities face regular extreme flooding by mid-century with some islands and coastal settlements to made uninhabitable.<sup>15</sup>

### Facts

Sea levels have been stable for 150 years, rising very slowly. However, for thousands of years before that they rose dramatically; this is why anthropologists believe that mankind could travel from Siberia to North America becoming the Native American Indian population. Thus sea level rises have dramatically slowed down. Man has made no impact on this whatsoever.

After the last ice-age (the current post-glacial period) the sea levels rose dramatically for thousands of years and then slowed down. For 150 years sea levels have only risen by 2.84mm per year.

Graphs<sup>16</sup> of the tide gauge in Sydney harbour show no significant rise in sea level. Photographs of Fort Denison 120 years ago also show no demonstrable rise in sea levels, close to the offices of the Sydney Morning Herald.

Graphs of the tide bay in San Francisco show no significant rise at all since 1940.<sup>17</sup>

Graphs of the Stockholm sea levels show a significant decline of sea level since 1890 (in fact this is due to a rise in the landmass) from an average of 7.05mm to 6.60mm.<sup>18</sup> This is where Greta Thunberg comes from so she has no need to fear.

80% of the tidal measurements show less than normal global average rises or even no rise at all.<sup>19</sup> There is no evidence of acceleration.

## Tuvalu is not sinking into the ocean

### Lie

Tuvalu has long been used as an example of coming doom with statements that rising sea levels will make it uninhabitable soon.

Will Tuvalu disappear beneath the sea? Global warming threatens to swamp a small island nation.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>14</sup> Palm Beach Post, 8 January 1979.

<sup>15</sup> Sydney Morning Herald, 'Hotter oceans, wilder weather, less ice: the IPCC upgrades projections to catastrophic', 25 September 2019.

<sup>16</sup> PSMSL 196, NOAA, 680-140, Mean sea level at Sydney, Fort Denison, 1 and 2 Australia.

<sup>17</sup> NOAA, Extreme water levels, 9414750, Alameda, California.

<sup>18</sup> NOAA, Mean sea level trend, 050-141, Stockholm, Sweden.

<sup>19</sup> PSMSL (Permanent Service for Mean Sea Level), Alameda (Naval Air Station).

One day we'll disappear: Tuvalu's sinking islands.<sup>21</sup>

### Facts

Tuvalu is not one single island; it is a scattered archipelago of small islands between Kiribati and Fiji in the South Seas.

Tuvalu is not sinking. Its total land area has increased by nearly 3% in three-quarters of the islands in the last 40 years. 43% of the islands are growing; 43% are stable.<sup>22</sup>

'Sinking' Pacific nation Tuvalu is actually getting bigger, new research reveals.<sup>23</sup>

Local sea level has risen at twice the global average. Results highlight a net increase in land area of 73.5ha (2.9%) despite sea level rise and land area increase in eight of nine atolls. Island change has lacked uniformity with 74% increasing and 27% decreasing in size. Results challenge perceptions of island loss, showing islands are dynamic features that will persist as sites for habitation over the next century.<sup>24</sup>

## The Maldives are not sinking into the ocean

### Lie

The Maldives will be completely underwater.

A gradual rise in average sea level is threatening to completely cover this Indian Ocean nation of 1196 small islands within the next 30 years according to authorities. The Environmental Affairs Director, Mr Hussein Shihab, said an estimated rise of 20 to 30 centimetres in the next 20 to 40 years could be catastrophic for most of the islands which were no more than a metre above sea level. ... But the end of the Maldives and its 200,000 people could come sooner if drinking water supplies dry up by 1992 as predicted.<sup>25</sup>

Note other headlines:

- The Guardian, 26 September 2013: '*The Maldives is the extreme test case for climate change action*'.
- Seeker, 20 May 2015: '*Which country will be under water in our lifetime?*'.
- The Independent, 6 December 2014: '*Is it too late to save the Maldives from climate change?*'.
- The Independent, 25 April 2018: '*Rising sea levels could make thousands of islands from the Maldives to Hawaii uninhabitable within decades*'.

---

<sup>20</sup> Smithsonian.com, 'Will Tuvalu disappear beneath the sea?', August 2004.

<sup>21</sup> The Guardian, 'One day we'll disappear: Tuvalu's sinking islands', 16 May 2019.

<sup>22</sup> Auckland University study by Professor Paul S Kench, Murray R Ford & Susan D Owen, 'Patterns of island change and persistence offer alternative adaptation pathways for atoll nations', published in Nature Communications, volume 9, Art. 605 (2018)

<sup>23</sup> Daily Mail, 'Sinking' Pacific nation Tuvalu is actually getting bigger, new research reveals', 9 February 2018.

<sup>24</sup> Kench, op.cit.

<sup>25</sup> The Canberra Times, 'Threat to islands', 26 September 1988.

**Fact**

The Maldives are not sinking into the ocean;<sup>26</sup> the population is increasing; tourism is thriving on fine beaches, and Saudi investors have poured billions into the infrastructure.<sup>27</sup>

The predicted doom meant that the islands should have disappeared by last year. This embarrassing prediction made by the UN IPCC meant that its website declaring the end of the Maldives had to be taken down from its website in ignominy.

## **Florida is not sinking into the sea**

**Lie**

Florida is about to be wiped off the map. ... The IPCC expects roughly two feet of rise by the century's end. The UN predicts three feet. And the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration estimates an upper limit of six and a half feet. ... James Hansen believes that ... we would have 205 feet of sea level rise by 2095 ... we do have to take seriously the possibility that we could have something like 15 feet by then.<sup>28</sup>

**Fact**

Photographs of Miami Beach, over decades, show that there has been no rise of sea level whatsoever.

It is interesting that Barack Obama, who so avidly promoted the dangers of a rise in sea levels when in office, has recently bought a large house just above sea level in Martha's Vineyard.<sup>29</sup> He clearly doesn't believe what he promoted.

## **Oceans are not turning into acid**

**Lie**

Man-made CO<sub>2</sub> is gradually turning the oceans into acid as surface ocean pH increases.

The oceans will be as dead as lake Erie in less than a decade. ... America will be subject to water rationing by 1974 and food rationing by 1980.<sup>30</sup>

**Fact**

The oceans are alkali. You cannot make an alkali more acidic because it is not acidic at all. CO<sub>2</sub> does not warm up the oceans; in fact, as the oceans naturally warm up they release CO<sub>2</sub>.

Carbon Dioxide in the past was very much higher than it is now (see elsewhere in this paper). In the 'Cambrian' era CO<sub>2</sub> was twenty times higher than today, but corals and shells 'evolved' in this period. There was abundant life in the seas. However, if there were ocean acidification there would not have been any life in the seas.

---

<sup>26</sup> See live webcam of Kuredu Island beach resort.

<sup>27</sup> New York Times, 26 March 2017, 'Inhabitants of Maldives Atoll fear a flood of Saudi Money'.

<sup>28</sup> The Guardian, 26 June 2018: 'Rising seas: Florida is about to be wiped off the map'.

<sup>29</sup> New York Post, 22 August 2019, 'Barack and Michelle Obama are buying a \$14.85m estate in Martha's Vineyard'.

<sup>30</sup> Daily Facts, Redlands, California, 'Dr Ehrlich, outspoken ecologist, to speak', 6 October 1970.

This burst of life marked the start of a period of earth's history called the Cambrian. It was so dramatic and so fast that scientists call it the Cambrian Explosion. ... The biggest diversification in animals in the history of life. ... The oceans suddenly teemed with creatures. Some had hard shells. ... 90% of the animal phyla that exist today appeared in that short window of time.<sup>31</sup>

This historical fact shows that CO<sub>2</sub> is massively beneficial to life. The more CO<sub>2</sub>, the bigger and better life forms develop, especially plant life. Animals benefit from higher oxygen content in the air due to increased numbers of bigger plants.

The oceans are underlain by alkali rock called basalt. This rock balances the pH of the waters. If a lot of acid entered the oceans, it would react with the basalt rock and be neutralised. The big factor in sea pH is the base rock, not the atmospheric content. [I show later that the atmosphere and Greenhouse Gases do not warm the oceans at all.]

Bleaching or degradation of coral reefs around the world has been attributed by alarmists to ocean acidification caused by CO<sub>2</sub>. There are various actual causes of this; they include: hurricane damage, human interference (e.g. dredging or careless tourism), earthquakes and pollution.

It is a fact that damage to coral reefs is localised not global. You can see bleached coral reefs in an area but thriving coral reefs only a few miles away.<sup>32</sup> If coral damage were caused by CO<sub>2</sub> in the air dropping into the oceans the damage would be everywhere.

## **Cyclones are not increasing**

### **Lie**

More people are dying from climate change related catastrophes like cyclones, which are increasing in number and severity.

Hurricanes are getting worse.<sup>33</sup>

The frequency of severe hurricanes in the Atlantic Ocean has roughly doubled over the last two decades and climate change appears to be the reason.<sup>34</sup>

### **Facts**

Fewer people than ever are dying from cyclones; it is the safest time to live in this respect. Deaths have dropped 99% over last decade.<sup>35</sup>

Hurricane frequency goes up and down. Records since accurate satellite data in 1970 show no upward trend at all.<sup>36</sup> If anything in recent years the trend is slightly down in the US.<sup>37</sup> This is despite an increase in atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. Even the IPCC had to admit this.<sup>38</sup> Charts

---

<sup>31</sup> Science News for Students, 13 November 2014, 'When life exploded'.

<sup>32</sup> See photographic evidence of this in Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Ocean stupidification', 27 September 2019.

<sup>33</sup> New York Times, 'Hurricanes are getting worse', 3 September 2019.

<sup>34</sup> Ibid.

<sup>35</sup> International Disaster Database; Global death risk from climate and non-climate catastrophes, 1920-2018.

<sup>36</sup> Thomas Knutson et. al. Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society, 'Global TC and Hurricane frequency', and 'Global TC landfalls (1970-2017)', 12 June 2019.

<sup>37</sup> NOAA, Landfalling hurricanes – US (2016).

<sup>38</sup> IPCC, 'Climate change 2013: The physical science basis', Stocker TF et. al.

by hurricane expert Dr Ryan Maue have demonstrated that the number of tropical storms and hurricanes (cyclones) worldwide show a clear decrease over 40 years.

The data for tornadoes since 1954 show that numbers are decreasing, not increasing; recent years have seen the fewest in recorded history.<sup>39</sup> There were far more tornadoes experienced in 1955, 1965 and 1974.<sup>40</sup>

Rising temperatures do not produce more extreme weather conditions.

Multiple climate models project that rising atmospheric carbon dioxide concentrations will increase the frequency and/or severity of a number of extreme weather events. ... Such claims, however, often fail to stand up against appropriate scientific scrutiny. ... The model presentations are consistently seen to conflict with real-world observations, indicating it is highly unlikely that increasing temperatures – whether or not they are driven by rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> – will increase the frequency and/or magnitude of severe weather events. In fact, most evidence to date suggests an opposite effect, where rising temperatures would produce less frequent and less severe extreme weather.<sup>41</sup>

## There are not more wildfires

### Lie

Wildfires are occurring in greater numbers and severity today due to man-made warming of the planet.

James Hansen (father of global warming) presented a famous graph showing that forest fire numbers were rapidly increasing showing data from 1960 to around 2017.<sup>42</sup>

Katherine Hayhoe Tweeted: '*Climate change is not increasing the NUMBER of fires but the AREA BURNED*'.<sup>43</sup>

### Facts

Fewer people are dying in forest fires than ever before. Mortality per acreage was over 50 in 1930 but reduced to ten in 2006. Burn acreage is down 80% since the 1930s (when it was much hotter than today).<sup>44</sup>

Hansen's graph deliberately omitted the earlier data showing that fires were far more abundant before 1960. The 2017 numbers were 20% of the record numbers in the 1930s. This was a fraudulent use of data to give the opposite impression of the truth.

Hayhoe's comments, also referring to the National Climate Assessment graph, also starts at about 1983/4 ignoring nearly a hundred years of data. This short timescale shows a

---

<sup>39</sup> NOAA, 'Strong and violent tornadoes (F3+) in the US, 1954-2018'.

<sup>40</sup> NOAA, severe weather, 'Number of strong to violent (F3-F5) Tornadoes US (March – August)' from 1950 to 2005.

<sup>41</sup> Craig D Idso Ph.D, Centre for the study of Carbon Dioxide and global change, 'Extreme weather events: are they influenced by rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>?', 2014.

<sup>42</sup> Graph (widely reprinted) from 4<sup>th</sup> National Climate Assessment, Overview and first chapter, 23 November 2018; based on cherry-picked data from National Interagency Fire Centre, 'Total Wildland Acres Burned in US, 1960-1999 and 2000-2018'.

<sup>43</sup> Tweet 9 October 2019. Referring to National Climate Assessment, which she was one of the authors of: [nca2018globalchange.gov/chapter/25/](https://nca2018globalchange.gov/chapter/25/).

<sup>44</sup> USDA Forest Service, figure 16.1, Total Acreage Burned and US Forest Area Burned 1926-2017.



small rise of US wildfires. The US Forest Service shows data going back to 1916. Between 1922 and 1958 there was far more burn acreage than today and wildfire damage steadily decreased from 1962.

Burn acreage from the National Interagency Fire Centre, shows about 4.4 million acres burned this year (2019), the third lowest in the last decade and well below the ten-year average of 6.6 million acres. Most of this occurred in Alaska and the rest of the US had a very low year; one with the fewest fires on record.<sup>45</sup> The average number of fires over ten years is 51,698 while 2019 had 41,942.

In 1937 there was a forest fire every three minutes, 21,980,500 acres were burned.<sup>46</sup> Thus there was about ten times the burn acreage in 1937 than in 2019. However, apparently 1936 was even worse.

In the pre-Industrial age (1500-1800) when atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> was 28ppm, there were far more forest fires.<sup>47</sup> There were an average 145 million acres burned annually; today less than 14 million acres burn annually. Therefore, burn acreage is down over 90%; this year is down 99%.

Larger studies of the Northern Hemisphere also show a decreasing number of wildfires. *'Despite increasing temperatures since the end of the Little Ice Age (c. 1850), wildfire frequency has decreased, as shown in many field studies.'*<sup>48</sup> *'Global area burned appears to have overall declined over past decades.'*<sup>49</sup> *'Our results suggest a notable declining rate of burned area globally.'*<sup>50</sup> It appears that the decline is due to increasing soil moisture content owing to warming temperatures and lesser need to water for plants due to increased CO<sub>2</sub>.

Hansen, Hayhoe and the National Climate Assessment have all acted fraudulently by cherry picking and compressing data.

### **The Amazon: Lies**

- *'Amazon rainforest burning at record rate.'* [CNN, 22 August 2019.]
- *'The Amazon rainforest is burning. Be afraid.'* [New York Daily News; website not available in EU.]
- *'Our house is burning. Literally. The Amazon rainforest – the lungs which produces 20% of our planets oxygen – is on fire.'* [Emanuel Macron, Tweet, 22 August 2019 (direct access now hindered, see archive sites).]

### **The Amazon: facts**

- Brazil has seen a massive drop in deforestation since 2000. It declined 70% from 2004 to 2012.<sup>51</sup>
- Only 3% of the Amazon is suitable for soy farming.

---

<sup>45</sup> National Interagency Fire Centre, Year-to-date statistics, 9 October 2019.

<sup>46</sup> New York Times 2 October 1937.

<sup>47</sup> Review and update of the 1995 Federal Wildland fire management policy, January 2001.

<sup>48</sup> Canadian Fire Service, 'Future wildfire in circumboreal forests in relation to global arming', Flannigan et. al., 24 February 1998.

<sup>49</sup> The Royal Society, Stefan H Doerr & Christina Santin, 'Global trends in wildfire and its impacts: perceptions versus realities in a changing world', 2018.

<sup>50</sup> AGU100, JGR Biogeosciences, 'Spatial and temporal; patterns of global burned area ....', Yang et. al., 14 February 2014.

<sup>51</sup> Andrew Revkin, New York Times, and Initiative on Communication & Sustainability (Earth Institute, Columbia Univ.), quoted in Forbes, 'Why everything they say about the Amazon ... is wrong', 26 August 2019.

- The number of fires in September (the peak) 2019 were higher than 2018 but only 7% higher than the ten-year average. The situation is not exceptional.
- The fires are not predominantly of forests but fires of dry scrub and trees cut down for cattle ranching. It is difficult to set fire to a wet rainforest. Fire of dry scrub replaces soil nutrients.
- Activity is above average in the states of Amazonas and Rondonia but below average in Mato Grosso and Para. It is about average or less compared to records back to 2003. Over the season fires are down. NASA states: '*Fire detections [1 May to 1 October] in 2019 have fallen below cumulative levels of fire activity detected in 2012*'.<sup>52</sup>
- 80% of the Amazonian rainforest is still standing.
- When Brazil was led by Leftist Lula it had the highest numbers of fires but no one made a fuss.
- The current government is protecting the forests with strict legislation; federal law protects half.
- The real threat is accidental fires during drought years.
- The Amazon is not 'the lungs of the world' producing 20% of earth's oxygen. It produces a lot of oxygen but also uses the same amount through respiration. Plants use respiration to convert soil nutrients into energy. Farms and cattle pastures also produce oxygen.
- The photos shared by Madonna, Jaden Smith, Leonardo DiCaprio, Cristiano Ronaldo and Emanuel Macron, stating that the Amazon was on fire, were not even of the Amazon and were not recent either. The photo shared by Madonna and Smith is over 30 years old.
- The furore has caused deep resentment amongst the Brazilian people and especially the farmers who need to be allies in proper environmental protection. Outrage is especially directed at Macron who expressed sympathy regarding the Californian wildfires but accusations at Brazil.
- Nobody is outraged by the situation in Bolivia, which is much worse.

## Arctic sea ice is not melting faster than historically

### Lie

Arctic sea ice is melting very rapidly today. This will contribute to rising sea levels and cause catastrophes.

Al Gore in his Nobel Peace Prize speech on 10 December 2007, said that melting Arctic ice was '*a planetary emergency and a threat to the survival of our civilisation*'.

[Al Gore] Earth has a fever ... The North Polar icecap is falling off a cliff. ... It could be completely gone during summer in less than 22 years ... it could happen in as little as seven years.<sup>53</sup>

### Facts

Arctic ice depth and area rises and falls naturally. The true data shows that there was much less ice in the Arctic between 1972-1975.<sup>54</sup> There is more ice today than the early 1970s. In

---

<sup>52</sup> NASA, Global Fire Emissions Database, 2019 Fires Season Updates, 7 October 2019.

<sup>53</sup> CNS News, 13 September 2013: 'Wrong: Al Gore predicted Arctic Summer ice could disappear in 2013'.

<sup>54</sup> IPCC report based on NOAA; Observed Climate Variation and Change, Fig 7.20.

2014 the ice grew; in this period the Great Lakes also had record ice levels. There were also media fears that Arctic ice was melting fast in 1922,<sup>55</sup> 1939,<sup>56</sup> 1947,<sup>57</sup> 1954<sup>58</sup> and 1955.<sup>59</sup>

Satellite photographs of the Arctic (NASA) on 26 August 2012 and 15 August 2013 showed a 60% increase in the polar ice sheet. 2014 saw record snowfall in many areas as well as record cold temperatures (the Polar Vortex).

## Antarctic ice is actually growing

### Lie

Antarctic ice is melting very fast.

Antarctica melting faster than ever before posing significant threat to coastal cities.<sup>60</sup>

Antarctica's sheets of ice are melting at a rate faster than ever before and raising global sea levels by almost a centimetre.<sup>61</sup>

### Fact

Sea ice and ice sheets are different. Sea ice does not have any effect on sea level – it grows and melts seasonally. The Antarctic ice shelves are huge land-based sheets and glaciers, which flow toward the sea. Antarctic sea ice has grown and reached a record high between 2012 and 2014. Since the late 1970s the Antarctic has gained an annual average of over 7,300 square miles. In January 1976 there was almost no sea ice around Antarctica.<sup>62</sup> This freezing trend was not predicted by climate computer models.

It is a fact of normal climate that Antarctic ice always grows in some areas and melts in others; but over time the ice coverage is relatively stable. However, observations in recent years have shown that ice coverage is increasing. Even NASA had to admit this.<sup>63</sup>

In 2014 there was record sea ice in Antarctica. Ironically, a global warming research ship got stuck in ice.

The study<sup>64</sup> that provoked international headlines and fear contradicted all previous research,<sup>65</sup> which shows steadily growing ice volume since the 1970s.

The good news is that Antarctica is not currently contributing to sea level rise, but is taking 0.23 millimetres per year away.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>55</sup> The Great Bend Tribune, 2 November 1922.

<sup>56</sup> The Wodonga Sentinel, 29 September 1939. Rochester Democrat, 17 December 1939.

<sup>57</sup> The Age, 31 May 1947.

<sup>58</sup> The Queensland Times, 2 March 1954.

<sup>59</sup> Democrat and Chronicle, Rochester, NY, 10 March 1955, p3.

<sup>60</sup> The Independent, 'Antarctica melting faster than ever before posing significant threat to coastal cities ...', 13 June 2018.

<sup>61</sup> Mother Jones, 'New study shows the devastating effect climate change is having on Antarctica', 14 June 2018.

<sup>62</sup> National Geographic Archive, November 1976, page 1.

<sup>63</sup> NASA, 7 October 2014, 'Antarctic sea ice reaches new record maximum.

<sup>64</sup> Nature, 'Trends and connections across the Antarctic cryosphere', Shepherd et. al. 668, 223-232 (2018).

<sup>65</sup> For example, 'NASA study: mass gains of Antarctic ice sheet greater than losses', Jay Zwally, 30 October 2015.

<sup>66</sup> Ibid.

A graph by geologist Gregory Wrightstone shows gradual increase of sea ice since 1980.<sup>67</sup>

The National Snow and Ice Data Centre reports an increase of 1.8% of sea ice extent per decade.<sup>68</sup> The monthly data at May 2018 showed that sea ice increased by 47,000 square miles per day.<sup>69</sup>

## **It's not getting hotter but colder**

### **Lie**

Scientific data shows a 'hockey stick' graph of record rising temperatures caused by man since 1000 AD.

The end of snow?<sup>70</sup>

Global warming – 'of an almost unprecedented magnitude'.<sup>71</sup>

### **Fact**

This is just a plain lie. The graph<sup>72</sup> supplied by Michael Mann et. al. is false since it omits the 'Medieval Warm Period' when it was very much hotter than recent years. It also omits the recorded peak temperatures of the late 1800s. In fact it was much hotter in the 1930s and has cooled since then. The true graph does not show a rise since 1000 but a steep decline after the 13<sup>th</sup> century.<sup>73</sup>

Many scientists opposed this graph and associated report, but they get no publicity. These include: Pat Michaels, Fred Singer, Tom Bell, the George C Marshall Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Willie Soon, Salie Baliuna, Hans von Storch, Steve McIntyre, Ross McKittrick etc.

### **Lie**

It is much hotter today than in the past and getting hotter all the time. Within 12 years the world is going to burn up and kill everyone.

Extreme heat is poised to rise steeply in frequency and severity over the coming decades bringing unprecedented health risks.<sup>74</sup>

### **Facts**

It was more than twice as hot in the late 1930s. It was slightly hotter in the late 1950s and significantly hotter in 1900. For 60 years (e.g. in America) the temperature has been falling not rising and 2014 was the coldest year on record. On 26 July 1934 temperature reached

---

<sup>67</sup> Gregory Wrightstone, 'Southern hemisphere sea ice anomaly (km<sup>2</sup>) Anomaly from 1979-2008 mean', Inconvenient Facts, Univ. of Illinois, 2017.

<sup>68</sup> National Snow and Ice Data Centre, 'All about sea ice', Arctic vs. Antarctic'.

<sup>69</sup> National Snow and Ice Data Centre, 'Sea ice index'.

<sup>70</sup> New York Times, 7 February 2014.

<sup>71</sup> New York Times, 1981.

<sup>72</sup> Michael Mann, Raymond Bradley & Malcolm Hughes, 1998, MBH99. Climate field reconstruction. Featured in the 2001 IPCC Third Assessment Report.

<sup>73</sup> Graph by Dr Tim Ball. See example in Humans are free, 'Hockey stick climate change graph is evidence-free'.

<sup>74</sup> Union of Concerned Scientists, 'Killer heat in the US: ... dangerously hot days (2019)', 16 July 2019.

100 degrees F in Alaska; it reached 109 degrees in Chicago on 24 July, its highest ever record.<sup>75</sup> Even NOAA graphs show a decline in US temperature.<sup>76</sup>

Note the facts regarding America:

Unprecedented summer heat of the 1930s. ...

Reduced summer temperatures in the Northeast and Southwest from the early 1950s to the mid-1970s. ...

Since the mid-1960s there has been only a very slight increase in the warmest daily temperature of the year, ...

Heatwaves increased in frequency until the mid-1930s became considerably less common through the mid-1960s. ...

Heat wave magnitude reached a maximum in the 1930s.<sup>77</sup>

It was much hotter in the Roman period when the Romans were able to grow grapes in York and even further north. It was hotter still in the Medieval Warm Period, which was a time of great prosperity leading to the building of cathedrals. [Hotter weather enables growing more crops. This leads to surpluses that are used for trade and this leads to growth of financial capital. Extra money leads to ability to spend on infrastructure and projects.]

The chart of historical warm / cold periods follows:

| Warm Time Period   | Cold Time Period       | Date   | Effects   |
|--|------------------------|--|---|
| Warm Holocene Climate Optimum.<br>Atlantis Warm Period 1 and 2.<br>Sahara Warm period 1 and 2. |                        | c.7,000-c3,000 BC.                                   | Retreat of the ice age. 'Holocene' is the epochal term for the current post-glacial period. |
| Egyptian Warm Period.  |                        | c.3000 BC.   |   |
| Sumerian Warm Period.  |                        | c.2000 BC.   | Rise of Sumerian civilisations, Old Babylonia.  |
|  |                        |  |   |
| Minoan Warm Period.  |                        | c.1500 BC.   | Rise of Cretan Minoan civilisation.<br>Earliest civilisation in Europe.                     |
|  |                        | c.1600-1100 BC.                                      | Mycenaean Palatial Civilisation.  |
|  | Greek Dark Ages.       | c.1100-c.800 BC.                                     | Collapse of Bronze Age civilisations (Mycenae, Hittite, Egypt New Kingdom).                 |
| Roman Warm Period.   |                        | c.250 BC – c400 AD.                                  | Rise of Roman Empire, Pax Romana.   |
|  | Dark Ages Cold Period. | c.400-950  | Decline of western civilisation; rise in mortality.   |
| The Medieval Warm Period.  |                        | c.950-1250 AD.                                       | Rise of medieval prosperity.  |
|  | Little Ice Age.        | 16 <sup>th</sup> - early 19 <sup>th</sup> centuries. | Famines, low life expectancy. One third of the earth's population died.                     |
|  |                        |  |   |

It is important to note that all warming periods produced prosperity and the rise of new civilisations due to increased food production and higher life expectancy. Global warming is a very good thing. Secondly, the current temperatures are far colder than historic warm periods by nearly 50%. There is no danger of earth burning up due to climate change (but there is of divine judgment).

<sup>75</sup> See Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Rewriting America's history', 25 September 20.

<sup>76</sup> NOAA, 'Average mean temperature Vs year 1918-2018 at all US historical climatology network stations'. NOAA 'Average maximum temperature Vs year 1918-2018 at all US historical climatology network stations'.

<sup>77</sup> Climate Science Special report, 4<sup>th</sup> National Climate Assessment (NCA4), volume 1, Heat Wave Magnitude Index Daily: [science2017.globalchange.gov/chapter6](https://science2017.globalchange.gov/chapter6), Temperature changes in the United States, 6.1.2 Temperature extremes. See particularly figure 6.3 'warmest temperature'.

A chart by Professor John R Christie, University of Alabama, '*The occurrence of record high temperatures is not increasing*', shows that accurate temperature records since 1895 reveal that temperature goes up and down according to a rough ten-year cycle. Temperature today is far below record highs in the mid-1930s, the mid-1920s, and 1910.

There was a slight warming from 1980 to about 1992 and then it flattened out.<sup>78</sup> CO<sub>2</sub> is rising but global temperatures are flat and have been since the early 90s. The graphs recently published by NASA showing a rise are false based on faulty surface readings.

The climate change scientists cannot predict even seasonal temperatures. Comparisons with actual observed data show that computer predictions utterly failed in every case.<sup>79</sup> They cannot predict a seasonal cycle.

1878

Worse still bodies like NASA are deleting past accurate temperature records and posting fraudulent new ones. It now cools past temperatures and warms recent temperatures. Tony Heller has exposed this time after time.<sup>80</sup> In fact the hottest period in historical records occurred before mass industrialisation in 19<sup>th</sup> century. NASA temperature records used to show that March 1878 was the hottest month on record around the world. There was a global heatwave and drought, which killed 50 million people.<sup>81</sup> NASA has now made that record disappear.

The Australian Bureau of Meteorology acts in a similar fashion. In Australia the hottest temperature ever recorded, 122 degrees F, occurred in January 1878.<sup>82</sup> The New York Times reported that Adelaide reached 127 degrees F in the shade quoting readings from Sydney newspapers for 23 January 1896.<sup>83</sup> In January 1878 Bourke, Australia, had 18 days over 110F and two days over 120F.<sup>84</sup> In January 1878 temperature at Bathurst, NSW, reached 112 on 12 January.<sup>85</sup> In Yarrawonga 123F in shade, 158F in the sun. A graph of the peak temperatures in Australia for January 1878 show almost every day was over 100F, several days were over 120F.<sup>86</sup>

In Spain birds dropped dead out of the trees.<sup>87</sup> Minnesota did not have a winter 1877-1878.<sup>88</sup> In Vermont in early March 1878, where there would normally be snow, it was so hot that grasshoppers hatched in large numbers in meadows.<sup>89</sup> In North Carolina fruit trees began to fruit in March.<sup>90</sup> In Ohio the temperature ran up to 120F and the thermometer of a certain Jason Case exploded.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>78</sup> Song et. al. Scientific Reports vol. 6, 'A Hiatus of the Greenhouse Effect', Figure a) Globe, 12 September 2016. Also Gleisner et. al. (2015) Geophysical Research Letters, vol. 42, 510-517.

<sup>79</sup> Song et. al. (2009) Nature vol. 457, 435-440.

<sup>80</sup> E.g. YouTube, 'Hiding the hottest month on record', 28 September 2019.

<sup>81</sup> American Meteorological Society, Singh et. al., 'Climate and the global famine of 1876-78', 1 December 2018.

<sup>82</sup> 'Maximum temperature at Deniliquin, NSW, January 8, 1878.'

<sup>83</sup> New York Times, 'Hottest of hot waves on record', 18 August 1896.

<sup>84</sup> 1/18/1878 112.82 TMAX Bourke Post Office, 'Bourke, NSW January 1878 Daily Maximum Temperatures'.

<sup>85</sup> TMAX Bathurst Gaol ASN0063004, 'Temperatures at Bathurst, NSW January 1878'.

<sup>86</sup> 'Peak temperatures in Australia during January, 1878'.

<sup>87</sup> The Wellington Times, 'Great heat in Europe', 18 July 1896.

<sup>88</sup> Minneapolis Tribune, 'A wonderful winter', 19 March 1878.

<sup>89</sup> Burlington Free Press and Times, 6 March 1878.

<sup>90</sup> The People's Press, 'The warm weather', 8 March 1878.

<sup>91</sup> The Richmond Gazette, 18 July 1878.

Temperature graphs show a definite cooling since the 1930s. 2018 was the third coolest year since 1918, about 5 degrees F cooler than 1934.<sup>92</sup> Recent years have been much cooler than the 1930s and the 1950s.<sup>93</sup> In January 31 of 2019 Illinois set its record coldest temperature of minus 38 degrees F.<sup>94</sup> Montana also set its record coldest temperature, minus 46F.<sup>95</sup> NOAA records show that 2019 was the coolest ever year in the north USA.<sup>96</sup>

In fact, the global annual death rate from natural disasters shows a steep decline in the last 100 years.<sup>97</sup> In 1936 a heat wave killed over 12,000 people in one week in the USA; this does not happen today.

Yet climate alarmists constantly spew out propaganda that the world is burning, enough to scare children.

They claim that a rise of 3 degrees C in the next 100 years will cause devastation. Yet cities experience daily variations of up to 11 degrees C. Los Angeles has a daily variation of 10.7 C. Middle East desert areas are extremely hot in the day and very cold at night.

### *Summary*

Global temperature is not increasing exponentially threatening life on earth. In fact, life is potentially threatened by a coming mini ice-age of the sort experienced when the Thames froze over and fairs were held on it in the 17<sup>th</sup>-18<sup>th</sup> centuries ('Frost-Fairs').

Climate alarmists don't want you to know earth's history because it ruins their claims. This is a key elite propaganda strategy.

The most effective way to destroy people is to deny and obliterate their own understanding of their history.

George Orwell.

## **Climate change alarmists formerly warned of a coming ice age**

Headlines include:

- The Washington Post: '*US Scientist sees new ice age coming*', 9 July 1971.
- Science News, '*Ice age cometh*', 1 March 1975.
- TIME, '*Another ice age*', 24 July 1974.

---

<sup>92</sup> NOAA, 'Average maximum temperature Vs year 1918-2018 at all US historical climatology network stations'.

<sup>93</sup> NOAA, 'October 1 to September 31 average daily temperature range versus year 1895-2018, at all US historical climatology network stations'.

<sup>94</sup> The Times, 'Ask the Times: coldest temperature recorded in Mount Carroll?', 1 February 2019. The Weather Channel, 'It's official: Illinois set a new all-time record low ...' 7 March 2019.

<sup>95</sup> Montana Standard, '46 below zero in Elk Park, Montana ...', 4 March 2019. Website now blocked in EU.

<sup>96</sup> NOAA, 'October 1 to September 31 average maximum temperatures versus year, 1895-2019. At all MT WY ND SD NE MN IA WI USHCN stations.

<sup>97</sup> Oxford University, The world in data, 'Global annual death rate from natural disasters, by decade ...'.

## Global warming does not cause droughts

### Fact

Rain is produced as the sea is warmed and evaporates, forming clouds and then rain. If you cool the oceans less evaporation happens. Global cooling is what produces more droughts.

## Polar bears are thriving

### Lie

Polar bears are dying out due to growing heat and lack of ice.

Climate change is the biggest killer of polar bears.<sup>98</sup>

Without action on climate change, say goodbye to polar bears.<sup>99</sup>

Climate change the biggest threat to the survival of the polar bear.<sup>100</sup>

The impact climate change is having on polar bears ... showing an emaciated bear clinging to life as it scrounged for food on iceless land.<sup>101</sup>

### Facts

Far from becoming extinct, polar bear numbers are at their highest in living memory. In fact some are calling for a cull. A US Fish and Wildlife Service survey in 2012 found that numbers were higher than they had been in a decade.

What happened was that global warming scientists took a statistically insignificant decline from 2001-2006 and formulated a new computer model that suggested that the decline was very severe. In fact there was a marked recovery of the population by 2007 and the population recovered by 2010.<sup>102</sup>

Polar bear researchers found that there was no correlation between the decline of summer ice and decline of numbers.

The video of a sick polar bear, dying from natural causes, was melodramatically used by climate alarmists to blame rising temperatures but this was entirely false and cynical. The area where the sick bear was wandering (Baffin Island) is always short of ice at that time of year – summer! According to data collected by the Canadian government, polar bear numbers on the west coast of Baffin island are stable; on the eastern side there is an increase.<sup>103</sup> The idea that one video of a polar bear proves climate change hysteria is unscientific and stupid.

---

<sup>98</sup> BuzzFeed News, 'Climate change is the biggest killer of polar bears', 9 January 2017.

<sup>99</sup> Washington Post, 'Without action on climate change, say goodbye to polar bears', 9 January 2017.

<sup>100</sup> New York Times, 'Video of starving polar bear 'rips your heart out of your chest', (cannot access date).

<sup>101</sup> The Guardian, 'Soul-crushing video of starving polar bear exposes climate crisis, experts say', 8 December 2017.

<sup>102</sup> Polar Bear Science, 19 November 2014, 'Polar bear researchers knew S Beaufort population continued to increase up to 2012'.

<sup>103</sup> Government of Canada, 'Maps of subpopulations of polar bears and protected areas', Circumpolar polar bear subpopulation and status map 2018.



In fact polar bears in Norway and Russia are increasing significantly. On Svalbard Island the population rose 42% between 2004 and 2015.<sup>104</sup>

## **Moose are not dying out because of global warming**

### **Lie**

20 years ago Minnesota had two geographically separate moose populations. One of them has virtually disappeared since the 1990s, declining to fewer than 100 from 4,000. .... One specific cause for the decline, most of the evidence suggests climate change is playing a significant role.<sup>105</sup>

Moose populations are in steep decline. ... A common thread in most hypotheses is climate change.<sup>106</sup>

### **Fact**

The truth is that it was wolves that were reducing the population as their numbers had increased. After wolves were taken off the endangered species list and hunted, the moose numbers increased.<sup>107</sup> The years when the moose declined were some very cold ones.

## **Climate change is not making walrus jump off cliffs**

### **Lie**

Global arming has forced walrus to gather in hordes on beaches because the sea ice is melting. This is abnormal. As a result of overcrowding on beaches, some walrus scale higher areas and hundreds then fall off to their deaths.<sup>108</sup>

### **Facts**

- The area in question in Siberia has often had ice-free periods in early autumn going back to the earliest records. This is nothing new.
- This led to 'haulouts' (crowding) of walrus in their thousands on beaches. In October-November 1978 537 walrus died in two areas on St Lawrence Island and 400 carcasses washed onshore. 40 were examined and the cause of death was cerebrospinal haemorrhage, believed then to be traumatisation by other walrus, but that could have included falls.<sup>109</sup>
- Local residents reported that huge herds of walrus gathered on the Punik Islands between 1930 and 1932.<sup>110</sup> This happens when the walrus population has grown to a very large size.
- Thus haulouts on land are natural events that have nothing to do with climate change. Pacific walrus have a cyclical rise and fall of populations. Increase continues until they have exhausted the food supplies on the sea floor.

<sup>104</sup> Norwegian Polar Institute.

<sup>105</sup> Treehugger, 15 October 2013, 'Climate change is killing the moose'.

<sup>106</sup> New York Times, 14 October 2013, 'Moose die-off alarms scientists'.

<sup>107</sup> Journal of Wildlife Management (The Wildlife Society), 26 August 2014, 'Re-evaluating the north-eastern Minnesota moose decline and the role of wolves'.

<sup>108</sup> Netflix, 'Our Planet', episode two, narrated by David Attenborough. Co-produced by the World Wildlife Fund which then promoted walrus as a symbol for activism.

<sup>109</sup> Arctic, Francis H Fay and Brendan P Kelly, 'Mass natural mortality of walrus at St Lawrence Island, Bering Sea, Autumn, 1978', Vol 33, No. 2, June 1980, p226-245.

<sup>110</sup> Ibid.

- The current walrus population was much larger in the late 80s than it was in 1960 until it crashed. Then the population expanded by 2017 to 283,213, larger than it was in the 1970s.<sup>111</sup> Authorities stated that the walrus population was not experiencing problems caused by sea ice loss.<sup>112</sup>
- The Netflix documentary used two locations in Siberia but edited the film to appear as one place making it seem like the cliff falls were part of a huge haulout. In fact it was hundreds of kilometres to the west.
- Sometimes walruses fall off the cliffs as a result of overcrowding, as the filmmaker herself admitted.<sup>113</sup> She chose that location in order to get film of such dramatic falls. There were polar bears in the area at the time causing falls days earlier.
- There are records going back to at least 2007 showing that polar bears have chased walruses over cliffs to their death in this very location.<sup>114</sup> The scientific advisor to the documentary had previously written a paper stating that polar bears were the chief cause of cliff falls.<sup>115</sup>
- Walruses are very easily frightened into panic and can be stampeded by overhead aircraft. In this documentary a cameraman was on the beach close to the cliffs in question and may have scared the animals. Drones are clearly also used in the film flying over the walruses. Both these human interventions could have caused the filmed cliff falls.
- Conclusion 1: large populations of walruses on beaches are not a sign of problems caused by global warming but a sign that the species is prospering.
- Conclusion 2: the cause of cliff falls can be attributed naturally to fear of polar bear attack but also intervention by man in the form of overhead planes, filmmaker drones and other disturbances.
- Conclusion 3: Netflix is responsible for stating inaccuracies and suppositions, hiding critical evidence, and affirming barefaced lies to pursue an agenda. Attenborough's comments at the end blaming climate change for this 'unusual' behaviour is a blatant lie.

## The consensus of scientists is opposed to the man-made climate change argument

### Lie

Global warming alarmists constantly state that the consensus is in favour of anthropogenic climate change, some even state that 97% support this hypothesis.

97% of published papers agree global warming is happening and we are the cause.<sup>116</sup>

### Facts

In fact the reverse is true.

---

<sup>111</sup> Federal Register, Vol. 82, No 192, October 2017.

<sup>112</sup> United States Fish and Wildlife Service, Press Release, October 2017.

<sup>113</sup> Sophie Lanfear, director, 'Our Planet'.

<sup>114</sup> The Siberian Times, 'Village besieged by polar bears as hundreds of terrorised walruses fall 38 metres to their deaths', 19 October 2017.

<sup>115</sup> Anatoly Kochnev, ChukotTINRO, Wrangel Island Nature Reserve, 'Factors causing Pacific walrus mortality on the coastal haulouts of Wrangel Island', (2009).

<sup>116</sup> The Consensus Project.

### *The origin of the false 97% claim*

The original claim arose after a study showed that 75% of scientists believed in man-made global warming.<sup>117</sup> In opposition to this over 31,000 scientists signed a petition stating that they do not believe in catastrophic man-made global warming.<sup>118</sup>

Klaus-Martin Schulte, a top London surgeon, checked this paper and found that only 45% of several hundred papers endorsed the consensus position. He said, ‘*There appears to be little basis in the peer-reviewed scientific literature for the degree of alarm on the issue of climate change which is being expressed in the media and by politicians*’.<sup>119</sup> His reasons for checking were the bad effects of this alarm on his patients.

The primary paper cited to support the 97% consensus was written by John Cook, et. al., in 2013.<sup>120</sup> The untrained team of non-scientists falsely claimed to review abstracts from 11,944 peer-reviewed papers related to climate change between 1991 and 2011. They concluded that 97.1% endorsed the scientific consensus. In fact, 7,930 of the papers took no position and were excluded from the count. If these are replaced the figure falls to 32.6%.

The paper also included three categories of endorsement<sup>121</sup> of man-made climate change but only the first category is an explicit statement affirming this. The other two would include sceptics. This paper was therefore described as misleading by David Legates et. al. in 2015.<sup>122</sup> They found that only 0.3% of the 11,944 abstracts and 1.6% of the smaller sample endorsed man-made climate change since 1950. In fact Cook and his colleagues had only marked 64 papers of the 11,944 they said they reviewed. The 97% consensus claim is a complete lie.

Cook’s 97% nonsense [sic] paper shows that the climate community still has a long way to go in weeding out bad research and bad behaviour. If you want to believe that climate researchers are incompetent, biased and secretive, Cook’s paper is an excellent case in point.<sup>123</sup>

| Consensus that climate change is driven by man   | Scientists that do not affirm anthropogenic global warming  |
|--|---|
| The mainstream media.<br>Greta Thunberg.<br>Extinction Rebellion.<br>The UN IPCC.<br>Global corporations.<br>Investment companies.<br>Most western politicians.<br>Education systems.<br>University lecturers. | <b>99.7%</b> of 11,944 peer reviewed papers do not agree that global warming since 1950 is driven by man. |

<sup>117</sup> Naomi Oreskes (2004), ‘The Scientific consensus on climate change’, *Science* 306, 1686; paper cited by Al Gore in ‘An Inconvenient Truth’.

<sup>118</sup> *The Oregon Petition*, Global warming petition project, ‘31,487 American scientists have signed this petition’.

<sup>119</sup> Gregory Wrightstone, ‘Inconvenient Facts’, op. cit.

<sup>120</sup> Cook J, Nuccitelli D, Green SA et. al. (2013) ‘Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the scientific literature’. *Environ Res. Lett* 8(2):024024.

<sup>121</sup> 1) Explicit endorsement with quantification; 2) explicit endorsement without quantification; 3) Implicit endorsement.

<sup>122</sup> Legates DR, Soon W, Briggs WM et. al. (2015), ‘Climate consensus and misinformation: a rejoinder to Agnotology, scientific consensus and the teaching and learning of climate change’. *Sci Edu.* 24:299-318, doi: 10.1007/s11191-013-9647-9.

<sup>123</sup> Professor Richard Tol.

|  |  |
|--|--|
| Socialists.<br>The Green Movement.<br>0.3% of 11,944 scientific papers reviewed.<br>The global elite (George Soros, Bill Gates et. al.). |  |
|  |  |

### *The letter of 500+ scientists to the UN*

On 23 September 2019 over 500 scientists, mostly from EU nations, wrote to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Antonio Guterres, denying all the claims of climate alarmists and Greta Thunberg. The title was ‘*There is no climate emergency*’. It is known as ‘*The European Climate Declaration*’.

The Secretary-General was urged to, ‘*follow a climate policy based on sound science, realistic economics and genuine concern for those harmed by costly but unnecessary attempts at mitigation*’. ... *Climate science should be less political, while climate policies should be more scientific.*’

Signatories of the ambassadors of this declaration included: Guus Berkhout (Netherlands), Prof. Richard Lindzen (USA), Prof. Fritz Vahrenholt (Germany) and Lord Monckton of Brenchley (UK).

The heads of the points raised are as follows:

- Natural as well as anthropogenic factors cause warming.
- Warming is far slower than predicted.
- Climate policy relies on inadequate models.
- CO<sub>2</sub> is plant food, the basis of all life on Earth.
- Global warming has not increased natural disasters.
- Climate policy must respect scientific and economic realities.

Similar declarations and petitions from thousands of scientists have protested climate alarmism, yet the media ignores them completely, while non-scientists like Greta Thunberg and David Attenborough are allowed global publicity to state blatant lies and spread fear.

### *True science is not based on consensus*

The idea of a ‘scientific consensus’ is a fraud. In fact it is an oxymoron. Science does not progress by consensus but by measurable observable data and repeatable experiments. Consensus means popularity, general agreement, or a democratic vote to establish a majority group view. That is not science. Science is based on data, evidence.

### *NASA astronauts and scientists oppose climate alarmism*

NASA’s stance on climate change has actually been challenged by 49 former astronauts and other scientists.<sup>124</sup> They included Michael Collins and six other Apollo astronauts who sent a letter to the administrator for making unwarranted claims about the role of carbon dioxide in global warming.

We believe the claims by NASA and GISS that man-made carbon dioxide is having a catastrophic impact on global climate change are not substantiated, especially when considering thousands of years of empirical data ... With hundreds of well-known

---

<sup>124</sup> HuffPost, ‘NASA global warming stance blasted by 49 astronauts, scientists who once worked at agency’, 6 December 2017.

climate scientists and tens of thousands of other scientists publicly declaring their disbelief in the catastrophic forecasts, coming particularly from the GISS leadership, it is clear that the science is NOT settled.

This statement included the signatures of Apollo astronauts Michael Collins, Walter Cunningham and others.

### *Fraudulent actions of notable climate alarmists*

It is perhaps worth noting the record of one of the chief climate alarmists, Michael Mann, who:

- Falsely claimed that he was a Nobel Prize winner and forged a certificate in support.
- Falsified temperature data in order to provide the famous 'hockey-stick' graph that is so widely used by climate hysterics. He omitted all the warm periods before the 20<sup>th</sup> century.
- He was involved in the East Anglia University email scandal ('climategate') where data was falsified to support global warming but emails were hacked and leaked.
- He was held in contempt of court in a case versus Tim Ball because he refused to give the court the data for his hockey-stick graph.

### *Failed predictions of notable climate alarmists*

Furthermore, the climate alarmists have been totally wrong in their predictions in every decade. James Hansen in particular has been proved wrong in virtually all his forecasts. Why should anyone trust them?

Hansen gave his first testimony to Congress about the greenhouse effect in 1986. He made multiple predictions in detail.<sup>125</sup> He predicted that a number of American cities would have a certain number of days over 90 and 100 degrees F in the year 2030. In every case the cities have become much cooler not hotter. Notwithstanding, The Guardian lauded Hansen for his, '*amazing predictions*'.<sup>126</sup>

In fact, alarmists are often wrong on historical data as well. For example The New York Times stated that, '*Extraordinary hot summers – the kind that were virtually unheard of in the 1950s – have become commonplace*'.<sup>127</sup> This is nonsense. The 1950s and 1960s saw record high temperatures in New York.<sup>128</sup> Current temperatures are way below these heights.

This is why no sane scientists trusts what the alarmists say. They exaggerate with no evidence.

## **Climate alarmists have repeatedly falsified data**

It has now got to the point where you can no longer trust official sources of temperature data because they are being tampered with. This includes modern data from NASA and NOAA.

There are contradictions in the data between surface rural and urban weather stations (rural being more accurate but urban being used by alarmists). There are contradictions

---

<sup>125</sup> Lancaster Eagle-Gazette, 13 April 1987, p15.

<sup>126</sup> The Guardian, '30 years later deniers are still lying about Hansen's amazing global warming prediction', 25 June 2018.

<sup>127</sup> New York Times, 'It's not your imagination. Summers are getting hotter', 28 July 2017.

<sup>128</sup> NOAA, 'Number of days above 100F, New York CNTRL PK TWR, NY'.

between surface and satellite data. There are contradictions between historic data from NASA and NOAA and modern data about historic data from NASA and NOAA. There are also contradictions between historic reports of temperature in newspapers, journals, documentaries etc. and modern sources covering those periods.

Alarmists cherry-pick data and ignore what opposes their view. They compress graphs to give a reverse picture of temperature changes. They even blatantly falsify data. I have already mentioned some of these, but to summarise:

- Michael Mann's hockey-stick graph, widely published to this day, is utterly false as it ignores the Medieval Warm Period and compresses other smaller warm periods (e.g late 1800s, 1940s).
- Current NASA data contradicts historic NASA data.
- Urban data differs from rural data. Firstly, urban areas retain heat due to the concrete factor<sup>129</sup> ['urban heat island effect'] this can increase urban temperature by 4 degrees C. Secondly, many historic surface weather data collection sites have now been affected by town construction. For example, a data point that was once in a field is now next to the air-conditioning exhaust of a large building and gives false readings. Climate change advocates largely use urban data. Over half of the 7,000 weather station data readings used by the IPCC are situated in urban areas, yet only about 1% of the planet is urban.
- The data from satellites contradicts data from surface points.
- The data supplied by the IPCC is based upon computer simulations making predictions based on false weather data and assumptions that were never checked (now proven to be false).
- Multiple current 'official' government temperature graphs contradict historic graphs and known empirical data. The 1974 National Centre for Atmospheric Research [NCAR] shows a distinct warming from just before 1900 to 1940 and then rapid cooling from 1950. In 1975 the National Academy of Sciences published a similar graph showing rising temperatures from 1880 to 1940 and then cooling. Multiple newspaper reports during those periods told a corresponding story.<sup>130</sup> However, the current NASA temperature graph shows steady warming from 1880 to the present. This is incorrect as it completely ignores the cooling period from 1950 when scientists began to warn of an impending ice-age. This current NASA graph contradicts previous graphs and empirical historic data. It shows a cooling when glaciers were collapsing and a warming when glaciers were expanding. It shows a cooling at a time when the world was warming in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century. Other alarmists follow the NASA graphs telling the same lies.<sup>131</sup>
- 'Climate-gate' of 2009 (see earlier footnote) shows how scientific alarmists falsified data to make temperature readings what they wanted them to say.
- In February 2018 NOAA was again caught altering temperature data to exaggerate global warming.<sup>132</sup> They tried to erase a cold snap in the US that broke records. Local records from New York conflicted with the NOAA charts. For example, the mean temperatures for January 2014 were 2.7 degrees F less than those of January 1943, but

---

<sup>129</sup> Concrete absorbs heat; grass absorbs water and cools it.

<sup>130</sup> See data in Tony Heller, YouTube, 'The knockout punch', 13 October.

<sup>131</sup> The claims that NASA now uses many more stations is misleading. These many added weather stations are of low-quality data whereas the stations used by NCAR were of high quality. A lot of poor data does not outweigh a smaller amount of good data. In any case we have the historic testimony (evidence) of human experience and press backing up the NCAR data.

<sup>132</sup> Climate Science News, 'NOAA caught again altering temperature data to exaggerate global warming hoax', 22 February 2018.

NOAA stated the difference was 0.9 degrees. The same thing happened in 2012, 2014, and 2018.

- In 2015 there was a contradiction between NASA temperature data and remote satellite sensors which showed no warming. Climate alarmist deniers, like Tony Heller, warned that the satellite data would soon be massaged to comply with corrupt surface readings. This is exactly what happened.<sup>133</sup>

This means that you cannot trust temperature data published by official channels today unless it can be verified.

## Climate alarmists have failed in all their predictions

In fact, climate alarmists cannot even get short-term weather predictions right while climate hysteria deniers, like Piers Corbyn, can be constantly accurate on long-range weather forecasts based on solar activity. Businesses pay handsomely for his accurate data.

We have already seen that predictions of the Maldives and Tuvalu sinking into the sea are wildly wrong, they are both prospering and even growing in landmass.

Climate alarmists predict a coming ice-age and then a coming heat-wave in constant repetition (see examples later). Their predictions are all over the place.

However, time after time alarmists have predicted impending doom for the world, only for the forecast to be proved utterly false. See earlier on James Hansen for example. I have outlined many examples of this in other papers but here I will offer just a sample.

- 1970: *Civilisation will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind.* George Wald, Harvard Biology, 1970.
- 1970: *It is already too late to avoid mass starvation.* Denis Hayes, Chief organiser for Earth Day 1970.
- 1981: James Hansen warned that melting ice would cause a worldwide sea level rise of 15 to 20 feet. James Hansen, NASA scientist, *New York Times*, 'Study finds warming trend that could raise sea levels', 22 August 1981.
- 1987: *'It is possible that carbon dioxide climate change induced famines could kill as many as a billion people before the year 2020.'* Paul Ehrlich citing John Holdren (director of the Office of Science and technology Policy for Obama and professor at UC Berkeley); Ehrlich, *The Machinery of Nature*, Touchstone Books, (1987).
- 1989: Entire nations could be wiped off the Earth by rising sea levels if the global warming trend is not reversed by 2000. Ocean levels will rise up to three feet and will cover the Maldives. Noel Brown, director of the UN Environmental Program. *AP News*, 'UN predicts disaster...', 30 June 1989.
- 2004: *'Global Warming to Kill Off 1 Million Species'. ...1 in 10 animals and plants extinct by 2050, Climate change over the next 50 years is expected to drive a quarter of land animals and plants into extinction.'* The Guardian, Paul Brown, 8 January 2004.
- 2005: *'50 million environmental refugees by the end of the decade [i.e. 2015], UN warns.'* The Guardian, David Adam, 12 October 2005, quoting Janos Bogardi, director of the Institute for Environmental and Human Security at the UN University in Bonn.

---

<sup>133</sup> See Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Corruption of the satellite record', 16 October 2019.

- ‘Billions will die as human civilisation flees the cracked and broken earth to the Arctic, the last temperate spot, where a few breeding couples will survive.’ *The Independent*, 16 January 2006.
- 2007: ‘Scientists say eight years left to avoid worst effects.’ IPCC report, *The Guardian*, ‘UN scientists warn time is running out to tackle global warming’, 5 May 2007.
- 2007: Andrew Simms said that we had, ‘only 100 months to avoid disaster’.
- 2009: Prince Charles stated that there are only 100 months left to prevent irretrievable climate collapse. *The Spectator*, 1 May 2017. This failed in June 2017; in 2015 he then extended this threat to 35 years.
- 2017: ‘Four years to save the Earth: 2020 is the deadline to save climate catastrophe.’ *Daily Mail*, 29 June 2017.

In the case of every hysterical prediction, the opposite occurred:

- Hunger was cut by 42% between 1990 and 2014. Per capita food production increased from 2,220 kcal/person/day in the early 1960s to 2,790 kcal/person/day in 2008.
- The earth has increased green vegetation by over a third.
- Rising temperature stopped around 1995. Since 2000 the world has cooled and is now getting much colder. American grain production is down 20% due to snow and inclement weather last spring and early summer.
- Wildfires have plummeted.
- Antarctic ice is growing. Arctic sea ice has been stable since 2007.

You get the picture.

## **Man does not provide most of the CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere**

### **Lie**

Climate change arises from man-made CO<sub>2</sub> arising from industrialisation in the last 120 years.

### **Fact**

Nature provides far more CO<sub>2</sub> than man ever can.

- One big volcanic eruption provides more CO<sub>2</sub> than all mankind’s history.
- Termites provide more CO<sub>2</sub> and methane than mankind – 50 billion tons per annum.<sup>134</sup> This is 10 times more than the present world production of CO<sub>2</sub> from burning fossil fuel.
- Animal flatulence provides more greenhouse gases (methane) than mankind.
- The rainforests (e.g. Amazon, Africa) provide more CO<sub>2</sub> than mankind.

## **CO<sub>2</sub> is beneficial to the earth**

### **Lie**

CO<sub>2</sub> is the cause of global warming.

---

<sup>134</sup> Dr Dixie Lee Ray, ‘Trashing the Planet: How science can help us deal with acid rain, depletion of the Ozone, and nuclear waste’, Blackstone Audiobooks, November 2011.



One major contributing factor in the occurrence of global warming is the emission of carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) into the atmosphere.<sup>135</sup>

CO<sub>2</sub> – the major cause of global warming.<sup>136</sup>

### Fact

During the most industrial growth between 1950 to 1980 the atmosphere cooled. In fact adding CO<sub>2</sub> is helping the planet. This is because CO<sub>2</sub> is a miracle molecule that benefits life on earth.

All life forms are made of carbon. CO<sub>2</sub> (Carbon Dioxide) is vital to the development of plants, which need water, sunlight and CO<sub>2</sub> to develop. Plants then produce oxygen. The more CO<sub>2</sub>, the better plants will grow.

Scientists tell us that in the age of giantism of plants and animals (dinosaurs etc.) there was very much more CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere than today; as much as 3,000-7,000ppm whereas today there is about 440ppm. We gained about 130ppm since the Industrial Revolution. The oceans did not turn into acid (as claimed by alarmists). More than 99% of earth's free CO<sub>2</sub> is already in the oceans.

Scientific studies by Dr Crag D Idso have shown that a 300ppm increase in CO<sub>2</sub> produces a 46% increase in plant bulk. A 155ppm increase in CO<sub>2</sub> improved rice grain yield from 16.9 to 26.1% (depending on nitrogen supply).<sup>137</sup> Thus more CO<sub>2</sub> would give earth better crop produce. In fact with increased CO<sub>2</sub> plants also use less water – which would benefit countries where water supply is problematic. This leads to an increase of water in the soil which lessens droughts. Increased warming also leads to increased precipitation (rain) as the oceans warm up. There is no downside.

In general increased CO<sub>2</sub> results in:<sup>138</sup>

- Enhanced plant photosynthesis and growth.
- Increase of plant water use efficiency.
- Potential for atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> to reduce the growth-retarding effects of environmental stresses.

In recent decades there has been a very small rise in CO<sub>2</sub> from about 330ppm to just over 400ppm, far short of the 7,000ppm the planet had when it was more verdant. IEA data suggests that global CO<sub>2</sub> emissions rose by 60% from 2017 compared to 1990 and 80% higher in 2017 than in 1985.<sup>139</sup> In this period temperatures have either stabilised from the late 90s or started to fall slightly (depending on various readings). The IPCC failed to predict the slowdown of global warming. In fact all its predictions have been wrong and exaggerated for 35 years. They have no argument to explain this since 35 years is long enough to measure temperature on a climatic time scale.

This rise in CO<sub>2</sub> led to an expansion of green plant life on earth. Even NASA admits that the rise in CO<sub>2</sub> in the last 35 years, *'represents an increase in leaves on plants and trees*

---

<sup>135</sup> Help Save Nature, 'How does Carbon dioxide cause global warming?', 10 March 2018.

<sup>136</sup> Time for Change, 'CO<sub>2</sub> – the major cause of global warming'.

<sup>137</sup> Twitter, Craig Idso, @co2science, 27 July 2019.

<sup>138</sup> SAGE Journals, Energy and Environment, Craig D Idso, 'Earth's rising atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> concentration: impacts on the biosphere', 1 July 2001.

<sup>139</sup> Ruth Lea, Conservative Woman, 'Global warming: the UK's expensive and futile gesture politics – part 3', 16 September 2019.

*equivalent in area to two times the continental United States*.<sup>140</sup> In other words, the recent small rise in CO<sub>2</sub> gave us more forests not fewer. Yet the BBC tells us on the news that CO<sub>2</sub> is causing the degradation of forests. Thousands of kilometres of arid desert in the Sahara, India and China have turned into lush vegetation with an influx of multiple life forms.

The fact is that we need more CO<sub>2</sub> not less. The planet has been degassing stored CO<sub>2</sub> (in limestone, chalk, shells and life) since it was created and the current levels are dangerously low. In geologic history the average CO<sub>2</sub> levels stood at around 2500ppm and we are currently dangerously low.<sup>141</sup>

Scientists used to proudly announce the benefits of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Global warming, caused by man heating the planet with carbon dioxide, 'is likely to prove beneficial to mankind in several ways, besides the provision of heat and power'.<sup>142</sup>

## **CO<sub>2</sub> is not the most important Greenhouse Gas**

### **Lie**

By changing the level of CO<sub>2</sub> in the air, man has made the global climate much warmer and will gradually burn up the earth.

### **Fact**

The suggestion that global climate can be changed by such a simple mechanism as increased CO<sub>2</sub> is facile. Understanding the complexities of climate requires more knowledge of physics and chemistry than any other discipline;<sup>143</sup> it is an incredibly complicated science.

CO<sub>2</sub> is not the most important Greenhouse Gas at all; that would be water vapour. The global energy balance is determined far more by water vapour than anything else.

Changing CO<sub>2</sub> is not going to change climate.

The true correlation between a Greenhouse Gas and temperature is actually water vapour,<sup>144</sup> and man's contribution to this is insignificant compared to natural water vapour.

## **Greenhouse gases do not warm the planet**

### **Lie**

CO<sub>2</sub> and other greenhouse gases create a blanket-type effect around the planet causing it to get hotter and hotter. In 12 years the planet will burn up.

---

<sup>140</sup> NASA, Samson Reiny, 'Carbon Dioxide Fertilisation Greening Earth, study finds'

<sup>141</sup> Gregory Wrightstone. See bibliography.

<sup>142</sup> Royal Meteorological Society, Quarterly Journal, 1938.

<sup>143</sup> A few would include: astronomy, solar physics, geology, geochronology, geochemistry, sedimentology, tectonics, palaeontology, glaciology, climatology, meteorology, oceanography, ecology and history (there are more).

<sup>144</sup> 'Global temperature and atmospheric water vapour content are closely locked', lecture graph by Willie Soon.

The basic claim is that CO<sub>2</sub> traps heat that has been irradiated by the oceans and this warms the oceans, which then melts the polar ice caps.

### Fact

It is now an established scientific fact based on statistical, hypothetical and empirical research that Greenhouse Gases do not warm the planet at all. In fact, CO<sub>2</sub> levels follow temperature spikes and do not cause them.

There are multiple scientific reasons for this that have been ignored.<sup>145</sup>

- No one knows what the ideal average mean global temperature is. This is ignored by the IPCC. Yet without this knowledge how can anyone claim to know what is a dangerous rise in temperature? This is basic science.
- Man's influence on climate is minuscule. The climatic system is huge and complicated involving the sun, the oceans and clouds.
- To heat the oceans you need a staggering amount of energy. To heat them by 1 degree C you would need, 6,000,000,000,000,000,000,000,000, joules of energy. In other words, if you used the power plants of all mankind to heat the oceans it would take 32,000 years to reach 1 degree C.
- To heat the ocean by 1 degree C you would need to heat the air by 4,000 degrees C.
- How would hot air above the water heat the deep ocean? The warmed surface would just sit above the cold water.
- The air does not contain enough energy to heat the oceans.
- Only the sun has the power to heat the surface of the oceans in summer.
- Physical laws demand that if CO<sub>2</sub> absorbs heat, it also emits heat. It loses this heat before it rises into the atmosphere.

See my papers '*The end of climate change doom (1 and 2)*' for a summary of the empirical data and research by Michael and Ronan Connolly that prove this beyond any doubt based upon real data from weather balloons instead of the false climate computer model assumptions of the IPCC. Their conclusion, proved beyond any scintilla of doubt, is that Greenhouse Gases do not warm the planet. The whole basis of climate change hysteria is an absolute lie.

Climate alarmists state that CO<sub>2</sub> is a 'well-mixed gas' that resides high in the atmosphere and causes warming. This is false. CO<sub>2</sub> is a heavy gas, which struggles to rise and soon falls to earth due to its Specific Gravity. The same principle applies to heat transfer. The Specific Heat of air is 1.0 but CO<sub>2</sub> is 0.8, so CO<sub>2</sub> warms and cools faster. Heavy CO<sub>2</sub> warms faster and rises faster but then rapidly cools and falls. Once it falls it has no climate impact at all.<sup>146</sup>

Lord Christopher Monckton and his team have produced a paper, currently being peer-reviewed demonstrating mathematically that the assumptions and conclusions of climate change alarmists are utterly wrong. They ignore the fact that the sun itself causes feedback response (added temperature), among many other things. The net result of the complex maths and empirical data is that, at the very most, a doubling of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> can only

---

<sup>145</sup> I acknowledge a partial debt here to Dr Mark Imisides, Principia Scientific International, 'Chemistry expert: Carbon Dioxide can't cause global warming', 9 February 2017.

<sup>146</sup> Principia Scientific International, John O'Sullivan, 30. January 2017, 'Climate fraud exposed: CO<sub>2</sub> doesn't rise up, trap and retain heat'.

raise temperatures by a maximum of 1.5 degrees C over about 150 years. In other words, the statements of doom are utterly wrong. This paper alone destroys climate alarmism.<sup>147</sup>

The actual vital feature regarding global temperature is the effect of the sun in the upper atmosphere and its effect on clouds. Graphs show a direct correlation between solar activity and temperature changes.

## **‘Green’ power supply alternatives do not work, damage the environment and are very expensive**

### **Wind Turbines**

It is ironic that Green activists scream for more wind turbines in the name of saving the planet while ignoring the fact that these machines kill thousands of animals each. Apart from the fact that a wind turbine occupies 50 acres of land, takes 900 tons of steel and 2,500 tons of concrete and millions of these are required by Green policies, one turbine kills thousands of bats, birds<sup>148</sup> and insects, as well as damaging peat bogs. Worse, the birds that are killed include many rare protected species, such as eagles, while turbines kill a million bats every year.<sup>149</sup> The steel requires iron ore and carbon heated to very high temperatures only achievable through burning gas or coal. This also means digging up vast swathes of earth for mining.

In some areas governments are clearing forests to create wind farms, such as in Cherry Creek USA for the Cassadaga Wind Project (37 turbines). How can this be Green?

The huge turbine field (Rampion Wind Farm costing £1.3 billion) off the coast close to my house in Worthing required digging up land to house cables all the way to a 2,000 tonne power sub-station near Bolney. Vast swathes of farmland and protected land were damaged and fenced off. After government gave approval E.ON reduced the proposed capacity by 40%.

The intermittent nature of wind power cannot generate a sustained output, which is generally a quarter of what the wind farm companies claim. Inland wind sites at New York have an effective capacity of only 10% of what was claimed. The 2,400 turbines in Britain at the moment only provide 1.3% of our national needs, less than the output of even one medium conventional power station. Claims of supplying 50% of national power usually occur after gale force winds rather than windless days. The turbine close to the M4 near Reading produced only 15% of its capacity. The £130,000 government subsidy was more than the £100,000 worth of electricity produced in 2010. In periods of high demand, such as Christmas, turbine electricity production has historically been minuscule due to no winds. The large wind farm off the coast of Kent cost £800 million and promised a capacity of 300 megawatts, in fact it produced an average of 80. Yet it receives a subsidy of £60 million per year over 25 years.

Turbines cannot generate enough power to significantly reduce CO<sub>2</sub> to any meaningful degree. Savings in CO<sub>2</sub> claimed by turbine developers are greatly exaggerated. One gas-fired power station, compared to coal-fired one, saves more CO<sub>2</sub> than all the turbines in

---

<sup>147</sup> See lecture on its findings at YouTube, ‘Viscount Christopher Monckton speech - climate change: debunking the myths’, UKIP Official Channel.

<sup>148</sup> See photos of dead birds at the foot of the wind farm at Ingbirchworth, West Yorkshire, Daily Mail, ‘Why the £250bn wind power industry could be the greatest scam of our age ....’, 28 February 2011.

<sup>149</sup> YouTube, Thoughty2, ‘Renewable energy is a scam’, 4 August 2019.

England added together. One large wind farm saves less CO<sub>2</sub> in a year than that given off by a single jumbo jet flying daily to America. However, this ignores the construction of turbines, which create huge amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> (smelting metals, mining, carbon-intensive cement, building roads and infrastructure etc.).

Wind farm turbines cost twice as much to provide energy as normal power stations. The only reason for developers to build them is the large government subsidy granted, often 100% of costs. This is gained through customer electricity bills, which are greatly inflated by Green policies. Thus Green initiatives always hurt the poor the most. Wind power is being excessively financed by taxpayers without their consent, despite the industry not being cost inefficient.

Coal fired and gas generated power back up plants are required because the wind is not always present.

There is the assault on natural beauty of the land by multiple turbines up to 600ft tall, higher than the spire of Salisbury Cathedral (the largest in Britain). Whole habitats in areas of natural beauty, such as Welsh Parks, are ruined by an array of turbines.

There is also now evidence that the droning sounds and ‘flicker’ causes damage to the health of residents nearby. This is now known as ‘Infrasound’ and the medical effects are serious.

Denmark had more wind turbines than any other EU nation but is now cutting back on their use. They did not produce much electricity and what they did produce was the most expensive in Europe. In Spain the rush for wind and solar power produced a disaster. Germany, which built more turbines than any other country is now building coal-fired power stations. Holland has slashed all its renewable subsidies.<sup>150</sup>

Turbines pose a major radar problem. They appear as aircraft on radar screens and compromise both military and civil air traffic control. Military aeronautical firms are working on stealth technology to overcome this. Even if successful, the cost of replacing all turbine blades is astronomical and every subsequent turbine will cost far more to be radar friendly – at taxpayers’ expense. This must put them beyond any practical use at all.<sup>151</sup>

In summary:

- Wind turbines are inefficient and require back up fossil fuel plants.
- They are hugely expensive.
- They kill birds, bats and insects.
- They occupy vast swathes of land.
- They do not cut CO<sub>2</sub> levels in their life cycle.

Wind farms only produce 2.5 watts per square metre; nuclear power stations provide 1,000 watts per square metre. Nuclear is also statistically the safest form of energy available and can have zero carbon emissions. Their carbon footprint in terms of life-cycle is about the same as a wind farm.<sup>152</sup> France’s nuclear power-plants provide about 80% of its energy requirements. Germany has invested in renewables. France’s energy costs half of that of

---

<sup>150</sup> Daily Mail, ‘Why the £250bn wind power industry could be the greatest scam of our age ....’, 28 February 2011.

<sup>151</sup> For further information see: Country Guardian website of Angela Kelly; Dr John Etherington, *The Wind Farm Scam*.

<sup>152</sup> Thoughty2, op. cit.

Germany and its CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are far less. German utility bills vastly increased during the push for renewables.

Thorium power plants (60 are being planned for 2025 in India) produce 1,000 times less waste than uranium plants and is a far safer process. This could be a better way forward.

### **Solar power**

Domestic solar panels rarely work effectively and many suppliers have gone out of business. Homeowners that invested heavily in them have found that the profits did not arrive and they are left with debts arising from the capital cost of installation.<sup>153</sup> *‘Most solar panels on people’s houses ... are fairly inefficient. Less than 14% of the energy that reaches them will be converted to electricity.’*<sup>154</sup>

The current power blackouts in California (due to wrong energy policies) also shut down domestic solar panels because they are tied in to the national power grid. This makes them useless in power cuts.

Solar power only works effectively if there is enough sunlight, and this is rarely practical in Britain. Some areas where there are solar farms only have the required sunlight 10% of the time.<sup>155</sup> Claims that any amount of light can charge the panel may be technically true but low light levels are not enough to produce a reasonable amount of electricity for practical use.

Panels also use high amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> and fossil fuels in their construction and transportation. They are not as Green as activists claim.

Here is a summary of reasons why solar power is not the answer to human energy requirements.

- The nature of earth’s tilt and orbit means that any position obtains different amounts of light during the day and throughout the year. Solar cannot provide consistent energy supply.
- Man’s appliances require a huge array of big surface panels in order to collect even a small amount of energy.
- Solar energy is very expensive. It does not compare well with fossil fuel.
- It is extremely inefficient. Method a) photovoltaic cells – are very inefficient and expensive; method b) heating fluids to drive turbines, are also ineffective.
- Solar energy harms the environment. The materials used and the methods of construction damage the environment. The huge panels required also damage the environment wasting green spaces. It is estimated that if Britain relied only on renewables, turbines and solar panels would need to occupy 25% of the country. There is also the danger of reflecting too much heat from the sun out and causing global cooling. Millions of large panels could cause serious climate problems.
- Solar panels’ efficiency are affected by: available sunlight, the angle of the panels, shade, how clean the panels are.
- Solar panels cannot produce electricity at night or in cloudy weather. This requires fossil fuel back up stations.

---

<sup>153</sup> E.g. MRC News Busters, ‘USA Today finds home solar panels not cost-effective’, 15 August 2013.

<sup>154</sup> Northwetsern University, Power System, ‘How efficient are solar panels’.

<sup>155</sup> Thoughty2, op. cit.

- Both wind and solar systems require a grid interconnection and an industrial battery system storage system – both of which are prohibitively expensive.
- As with wind systems, solar also fails when subsidies are removed and have to compete in the free market.
- Solar panels contain many highly toxic and carcinogen substances, such as cadmium, lead and chromium, that never deteriorate. No one has shown how millions of these will be disposed of. Cheap Chinese solar panels only last about 5 years and the toxins are a big problem. Better made panels only last about 20-25 years.

Wind and solar power, two of the most heavily subsidised energy sources, are also two of the most unreliable.<sup>156</sup>

## Electric cars are not Green

### Lie

Everyone needs to scrap their diesel car and get an electric one to save the planet. Electric cars are clean, Green and do not create deadly CO<sub>2</sub>.

### Fact

Electric cars are only as clean as the energy source they use to charge up. Currently, most electric cars are charged from fossil fuel power supplies, so they are not Green at all.

Construction of electric cars requires huge amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> and are damaging to the environment. The cars also emit CO<sub>2</sub> from things like brake dust and tyre wear.

MIT's Trancik Lab produced a report affirming that electric cars are not Green at all and pollute more than petrol cars.<sup>157</sup> Specifically, a Tesla Model S P100D saloon produces more CO<sub>2</sub> (225g per kilometre) than a petrol-driven Mitsubishi Mirage (192g per kilometre). Other studies have found similar results.<sup>158</sup> Yet Oxford City Council has announced that petrol and diesel vehicles will be banned from some streets by 2020 and the whole city by 2035. Macron wants an end to petrol cars by 2040.

But the biggest problem with electric cars is the battery.

There are a host of problems for Green activists in the construction of the batteries. I will summarise these as follows:

- They require very rare elements, which are mined; these include nickel, cobalt and lithium. Cobalt is largely mined by child slave labour in Africa. Nickel is the eighth worst metal to mine in terms of pollution. It causes respiratory diseases in nearby villages in Colombia. Lithium extracted from South American deserts results in one ton of carbon dioxide per ton of lithium carbonate produced (considering transport and processing).
- How do you safely get rid of these batteries once they fail? Only 5% of lithium batteries can be recycled.
- The mines for these materials scar the planet and create waste.
- The production of these batteries creates huge amounts of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions.

<sup>156</sup> The Hill, 'The hard truths about renewable energy and subsidies', 15 December 2015.

<sup>157</sup> Anonymous Independent & Investigative News, 'MIT admits: electric cars are not Green, pollute more than petrol cars', 23 November 2017.

<sup>158</sup> E.g. Norway's University of Science and Technology.

- If millions of electric cars were purchased, there would be a massive drain on the current power stations, which are already near breaking point in Britain.

Furthermore, electric cars are simply not efficient for long journeys. Currently the limit is about 150 miles.<sup>159</sup> There are insufficient charging stations in this country and who can wait for hours to charge up a battery half way through a long journey, even if he could find a power point free?

The Green electric car is just another climate change myth.

## **‘Green’ light bulbs are not Green but are highly toxic**

### **Lie**

Traditional incandescent light bulbs were damaging to the environment and used too much energy so new Green alternatives were introduced to be more environmentally friendly.

### **Facts**

The new light bulbs are a disaster and a threat to the environment.

I will summarise this as follows:

- There are two types: LEDS (light emitting diodes) and compact fluorescent light bulbs (CFLs).
- The new bulbs are a cold, blue light that damages the eyes and are not as ‘warm’ on the spectrum as traditional bulbs. Neither were properly tested before being placed in the market.
- CFLs contain mercury and are extremely toxic. They can poison people who break them and are very difficult to dispose of and are not recyclable.
- LEDs contain arsenic, lead and nickel. These are also highly toxic and difficult to get rid of. Some red LEDs contained 8 times the amount of lead allowed under California law.<sup>160</sup>
- Scientists have stated that if a bulb breaks it should be swept up with a special broom using gloves and a facemask. Crews dispatched to fix broken traffic lights need protective gear and must treat the situation as if it were hazardous waste.<sup>161</sup>
- CFLs emit a level of ultraviolet radiation that poses health risks.
- LEDs also cause significant health risks, especially to the eyes.<sup>162</sup> *‘Low-intensity red LEDs exhibit significant cancer and noncancer potentials due to the high content of arsenic and lead’.*<sup>163</sup>
- Both types worsen resource depletion since they contain aluminium, copper, gold, lead, silver and zinc.
- 95% of the rare earth minerals used come from China, which has lax environmental standards.

---

<sup>159</sup> Data provided by EV Volumes.

<sup>160</sup> UCI (Univ. of California) News, ‘LEDs contain lead and other toxics’, 10 February 2011.

<sup>161</sup> Environmental Science & Technology, January 2011.

<sup>162</sup> Live Science, ‘LED lights may damage eyes’, 13 May 2013 (Complutense University, Madrid).

<sup>163</sup> UCI News, ‘LEDs contain lead and other toxics’, 10 February 2011. Environmental Science & Technology, January 2011.



- The new bulbs do not last a long time compared to old ones. I have an old bulb in my house that has been there for nearly 20 years, is used every day and works fine. I have new bulbs that break within months. One CFL bulb lasted only a few days.
- The cost of the new bulbs is far higher than traditional bulbs.

This is just another scam to boost the sales of big corporations. The LED / CFL policy was based upon lies and is damaging the planet far more than traditional bulbs.

## **CO2 scaremongering is trapping millions of people in poverty**

An estimated 4 billion people are living in generational poverty. Stopping them using plentiful fossil fuels (which prospered the West for centuries) are stopping them from making developments to lift nations out of generational poverty. In particular African states, that have huge resources of fossil fuels, are stopped by refusing investment into making strides to advance prosperity.

China and India are making rapid progress in increasing prosperity and national wealth by building roughly one coal-powered power station every day. Nothing the West does on limiting CO2 emissions will dent the CO2 being created by China and India.

Meanwhile, stupid CO2 policies in Australia have created a power crisis in another nation that is rich in fossil fuels. By closing coal-powered stations and switching to renewables (solar and wind turbine) they have now achieved two things. 1) Energy prices are now the highest in the world, having damaging effects on poor people. 2) Various Australian states are having regular power cuts because there is no longer enough energy to match requirements. Many Aussies are even installing generators in their home to supply power to keep their appliance going because of government shutdowns.

This is because both solar and wind-turbines are ineffective and expensive. They just do not live up to Green promises. Note the large number of complaints and litigation by purchasers of solar panels in the UK (and the solar companies that have gone out of business). After being promised that they would make thousands in profits, customers find that they are making huge losses and racking up debts.

The wind does not blow all the time and sunlight is rarely strong enough to charge the panels, therefore, gas-power stations have to take up the slack. Renewables are not: affordable, reliable or abundant. Furthermore, wind turbines are death machines; they kill thousands of bats, birds and insects as well as damaging the health of nearby residents. They make no sense at all as their only profits stem from government subsidies and set up costs and not power generation.

But developing nations have no coal, nuclear or gas powered power stations to fall back on. Many people cook inside a hut on a wood / dung fire, with all the consequent health hazards, responsible for 4 million deaths a year. Since renewables do not work, the West is cursing these countries with energy starvation so that they cannot develop.

Green policies make the poor in the West poorer, the rich richer, and commit poverty stricken people in developing nations to continual abject poverty and hunger.

## **Man is not causing rising temperatures**

### **Lie**

Global warming is caused by man's industrialisation through burning fossil fuels and thus causing rising levels of CO<sub>2</sub>.

The vast majority of scientists around the world agree that our climate is changing at a faster rate than ever recorded in human history because of our use of fuels such as coal and oil, so-called fossil fuels.<sup>164</sup>

Industrial activity is responsible for the rapidly increasing levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.<sup>165</sup>

### **Facts**

There is no scientific evidence or method to determine how much warming man has caused since say 1900. It is impossible to prove by any scientific method. Speculations that rising temperature is caused by man is only a hypothesis with no evidence.

The fact that much warmer periods occurred in earth's history proves that natural processes cause the rise and fall of temperatures, not mankind.

The claim that most modern warming is attributable to human activities is scientifically insupportable.<sup>166</sup>

The appeal to any consensus by climate alarmists is a sign that there is no evidence to support it. Science is not based on a scientist's beliefs but on observable data.

Furthermore, as I explain elsewhere, the earth has seen atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> levels at a far higher rate in past history before mankind had any kind of industrial revolution, as much as 7,000ppm as opposed to the roughly 400ppm today.<sup>167</sup> These levels brought luxuriant plant growth and increased oxygen.

## **A million species are not going to go extinct in the next few decades**

### **Lie**

The UN put out a report stating that a million species will go extinct in the next few decades. The WWF estimates that the annual extinction rate is 100,000 species.

Human actions threaten more species with global extinction now than ever before ... around 1 million species already face extinction, many within decades.<sup>168</sup>

Entire ecosystems are collapsing. We are in the beginning of a mass extinction.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> State of the Planet, 'The science of Carbon Dioxide and climate', 20 March 2017.

<sup>165</sup> NASA (and IPCC), Features, 'Carbon dioxide controls earth's temperature'.

<sup>166</sup> Gregory Wrightstone, Inconvenient facts website, '97% consensus – what consensus?', 8 June 2019.

<sup>167</sup> People dispute exactly what the figure is but it is around 400ppm, some say 450.

<sup>168</sup> UN report on biodiversity: 'IPBES global assessment summary for policy makers', 6 May 2019.

<sup>169</sup> Greta Thunberg, speech to the UN

**Fact**

For this to happen, 25-30,000 species would have to go extinct every year. There is no data to support this. In the last 40 years the average annual extinction rate has been just two. In fact, extinctions have been in decline since the late 1800s.<sup>170</sup> People are trying to preserve animals all over the world.

Establishing the background extinction rate (necessary to compare to the situation today) is actually very difficult. It is part of the normal cycle of life that some animals go extinct naturally for various reasons; the fossil record proves this.

The species currently alive on the earth survived much hotter periods in earth's history, during the various warm periods. It is more likely that some species died off during the cold periods. In fact the ice age after the global flood is the most probable reason for the extinction of the dinosaurs.<sup>171</sup>

Thus the claimed current warming (which stopped by 2000, or earlier, and which is much cooler than the great warm periods) cannot be a reason for any mass extinction. Extinction of insect species, for example, is much more likely to be due to Big-Agriculture farming methods using herbicides, insecticides, crop spraying, hedge uprooting, and GM crops. Insect die-off then effects predators of insects, such as birds.

The methods used by Green activists to estimate extinction rates are flawed and overestimate wildly. A Smithsonian professor, Stephen Hubbell, affirms that they overestimate by a factor of 160%.<sup>172</sup>

There were predictions in the early 1990s that as many as half the species on Earth would be lost by 2000. Nothing like that happened.<sup>173</sup>

The reality is that species are dying out probably faster than historically but it has nothing to do with Climate Change politics but the greed of the very corporations that are investing in Green politics.

For example, if you cut down Virginia hardwood forests to make biomass pellets to be burned in Britain instead of using our own cheap coal supplies, you kill millions of insects, destroy the habitat of birds and small mammals and badly affect the whole ecological system. Yet this is done in the name of Climate Change. Therefore, Climate Change politics, in this and many other cases, is actually worsening extinction rates and threatening species.

**The false implications of the UN report**

The UN report, which sparked this outrage, is seriously flawed. In particular, a chart showing a rapid rise of extinctions since 1500 was engineered to accentuate the increase. Gregory Wrightstone used the same base data as the UN but analysed it in more detail. This showed that extinctions peaked in the late 19<sup>th</sup> century and were now in significant decline. The average species extinction per year is about two annually and fewer than 900

---

<sup>170</sup> Gregory Wrightstone interview, see bibliography.

<sup>171</sup> There is no evidence, only speculation, that it was caused by a meteorite.

<sup>172</sup> Smithsonian Insider, Research News, Science and Nature, 'Methods for calculating species extinction rates overestimate extinction, says Smithsonian scientist', 18 May 2011.

<sup>173</sup> Hubbell, *ibid.*

extinctions have been documented since 1500.<sup>174</sup> Instead of a rising graph, we are in a period marked by a falling graph.

The report also claims that there are about 8 millions species on earth. Dr Patrick Moore explained to the US Congress that there are only 1.8 million species currently identified.

The UN identifies loss of habitat as the greatest problem contributing to species threat. Yet the Green Movement wants to cover the earth with wind turbines that kill various animals, and solar panels that destroy habitats. If America were to replace all of its electricity generators with wind it would need 14 million turbines at 50 acres per turbine (700 million acres).<sup>175</sup>

### **Conclusion**

The hysteria about massive species extinction caused by mankind is not supported by any credible evidence.

## **Climate change activists are not an organic, grassroots revolution**

The use of children to promote and publicise a certain message is an old technique that alarmists have been using since the 1992 Rio Summit. As well as making it difficult to criticise, it also gives the appearance of being a spontaneous, people's rebellion. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The current climate change agenda is a top down, globalist, corporatist strategy to achieve the aims I mentioned in the introduction. It is a global elite operation run by super-rich evil people to further a Socialist agenda that culminates in them ruling the world.

These people want to destroy western Christian society in order to prepare the way for world domination. Thus climate change policies are used to ruin western industrialised nations.

### **Geo-political effects**

The east is not buying into the melodramatic, anti-scientific nonsense and is getting stronger and stronger. China is building a new coal-fired power station virtually every day. Prime Minister Modi of India has declared that he is putting his citizen's welfare first and is using coal and nuclear plants to uplift the nation's prosperity and take millions out of poverty. This is turning India into a new superpower. Russia never bought the demonisation of CO<sub>2</sub> because it is rubbish, and Putin is ensuring that Russia is also prospering and rapidly developing new technologies that require large amounts of cheap, fossil fuel power, which they have in abundance.

The demands of climate idiots is to make Britain free of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2025 (which is impossible), or 2030, or 2050 at the latest. This is blatant infrastructure suicide. If achieved it will make Britain subservient to the eastern bloc, which will overtake us in technology and make us weak. But that is what the elite want; Britain strapped of political power and global influence.

---

<sup>174</sup> Gregory Wrightsone, Inconvenient Blog, 929 September 2019.

<sup>175</sup> CFACT, Paul Driessen, 'Dousing candidates and Green new dealers with icy cold reality', 12 September 2019.

### **Domestic effects**

But ordinary folk have no clue (even the protestors) about what this all means for families. It means changing from fossil fuels to some sort of renewables (which are ineffective). The results include:

- Far less available energy.
- Products that require far less energy, such as vacuum cleaners with far less suction power.
- Continual power cuts. This is already happening in Australia.
- Rationing of power within the home.
- Changing to a new form of heating your home that is far less efficient.
- Capital costs in the house to change to new types of boiler.
- Either having no car or buying a very expensive and less efficient electric vehicle.
- Driving will be restricted by the limitations of batteries.
- Very high energy costs, much higher than today's already outrageous prices.
- Very high food costs due to the on-cost of using trucks on renewable-sourced power.
- Abolition of all air travel – no cheap foreign holidays anymore.
- Normal food will be replaced (or added to) by insects (this is already happening in America).
- Having children will be restricted to a quota.

These are just a few of the implications. People have no idea what eliminating CO<sub>2</sub> emission means for them. Worse, the Theresa May government committed us to this nonsense (zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2050) at a cost of over a trillion pounds of wasted money. 104 members of the American Congress supported the 'Green New Deal' calling for abolition of fossil fuels by 2050; an earlier draft called for the elimination of air travel.<sup>176</sup>

The net effect will hit the poorest the hardest.

### **Corporatist involvement**

However, this scenario being played out means that there are massive business opportunities to corporations that can tag onto Green, renewable products. And this is what is driving the Green activist movements, such as Extinction Rebellion. In another paper<sup>177</sup> I have listed many companies and hedge fund managers that are supporting and funding this alarmist movement because they stand to make money. Some examples include: WHEB investments, Global Impact Investing Network, Tribe Impact Capital LLP, Volans Ventures Ltd, Solarcentury Ltd, Zouk Capital LLP, NextEnergy Capital, Project Heather, Heliotropy Ltd, Corporate Impact X, Multilateral Investment Fund, Inclusive Business Action Network and even Exxon Mobil.

Global corporations do not support movements out of charity – they intend to make money. Their support of Extinction Rebellion and others is a business opportunity not an altruistic urge.

### **Elite control**

Worse still, the hands of global elite leaders, such as Bill gates and George Soros are directly and indirectly involved. Greta Thunberg herself has a handler (Luisa Marie Neubauer) tied to Soros and receives funding from groups tied to him. You can see pictures

---

<sup>176</sup> RT, 'Let them sail yachts: why Great Thunberg and the environmental elite hate you', 31 July 2019.

<sup>177</sup> *Climate Change, Eugenics, Oil and Tyranny*.

of her constantly at Thunberg's side.<sup>178</sup> The yacht she used recently, (of which the whole operation used more CO<sub>2</sub> than if she just got in a plane)<sup>179</sup> was made for the Rothschilds.<sup>180</sup>

The elite support nothing that does not further their goal of a new world order and their support of Climate Change policies is just another strand of their strategies to achieve that goal.

The elite care nothing about the planet (or they wouldn't pollute the air, water and soil with chemtrails, GM products, bio-sludge, insecticides, herbicides etc.) and they don't care about you (other than becoming a slave). They care about power. The Climate Change agenda is about dismantling western nations and furthering global aims.

It is not a people's movement; the people demonstrating (which tend to be middle class students, rich people and people that don't work in the main) have been totally manipulated and brainwashed by constant global elite propaganda. Neither do ordinary working people support them. 53% oppose the movement and 33% strongly oppose it. Only 12% strongly support it.<sup>181</sup>

## **Climate change activist hypocrisy**

Climate change activism is today most prominently illustrated by Extinction Rebellion, which is currently in the middle of a two week protest movement snarling up London streets, stopping people getting to work and to hospital and ruining small businesses.

Meat market operators in Smithfield Market have been badly damaged by 500 protestors and one said it was putting him out of business. Some of the demonstrators were later filmed in McDonalds. Protestors stopping people on London bridges prevented a person from getting to his dying father at St Thomas hospital. Another person, a cancer patient, had to walk a long way for treatment when barely capable because his car could not get through. An old man from Vauxhall (not far) with a broken ankle took two hours to get to hospital to get treatment. Activists on TV stated that they would deliberately prevent people getting to hospital unless THEY deemed it important.

Hundreds of demonstrators have been arrested because they are causing criminal damage, harassing the public, blocking the streets, breaching the peace and resisting arrest. The massive police presence in corralling demonstrators stopped them from fighting crime and violence elsewhere. One fool stood in the cabin of a passenger aircraft to protest and stopped it taking off, until he was escorted off the plane by police. All he did was create more pollution. Cars idling for hours in the streets, unable to cross London, have created a massive increase in pollution.

The activists, and especially their spokespeople and leaders, continually demonstrate sheer hypocrisy over and over again. It is so blatant as to be astonishing.<sup>182</sup> At one event

---

<sup>178</sup> Neubauer is tied to One Foundation, which is funded by Gates and Soros. Free West Media, 8 October 2019.

<sup>179</sup> The yacht was made of carbon fibre derived from the fossil fuels Great wants to ban. Four overseas flights were required to transport crewmembers to and from England.

<sup>180</sup> The 4 Million Euros yacht (Malizia II) was originally called, 'The Edmond de Rothschild'.

<sup>181</sup> YouGov poll, 'Do you support the actions of climate change activists?', 7 October 2019.

<sup>182</sup> See one (Zion Lights) interviewed by Andrew Neil on BBC's The Andrew Neil Show and another (Skeena Rather) by Piers Morgan on Good Morning Britain.

demonstrators used a diesel generator but tried to hide it behind two pallets. At the ER camp calor-gas canisters can be clearly seen outside the cooking tent.

Bear in mind that they want to get rid of all cars, all diesel, all trains, all buses, all passenger flying and reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to zero by 2025, which will mean no central heating and no cookers and little available electricity.

Yet hundreds of the protestors turned up to cause trouble in London travelling by car and train. You can see videos of them blissfully being hypocrites in their own social media posts. Those camping in London streets have asked the public for heated water to wash with and free food and drinking water. Some were pictured in McDonalds's (an enemy of climate alarmists). A group blocking a London bridge did yoga on PVC mats (a petroleum product).

Leaders have been outed for taking their kids to school in cars, travelling to meetings in cars, using public transport like the Underground trains. Greta used more CO<sub>2</sub> in her recent carbon fibre yacht stunt than if she flew in a plane (see next). Leaders use battery driven loudhailers for their speeches or electrically-driven PA systems.

Activists constantly use social media powered by electricity, as well as computers, and Smartphones. Most watch television and use multiple household appliances.

Rich alarmists seem to have no problem flying across the world to get to climate change demonstrations, like Emma Thompson. Some use multiple private jets within several days, like Harry and Megan (it doesn't matter who paid for them). Several celebrities<sup>183</sup> support ER while taking money from British Airways and Heathrow Airport. Leonardo di Caprio took a private jet to pick up an environmental award.

Activists that break shop windows, aerosol spray paint government stone buildings and leave tons of litter around the streets after marches, are all contributing to energy loss and pollution.

Stopping people getting to work and shops from opening all have an effect in diminishing national GDP. Yet they need increased economic prosperity to provide the massive taxes they are demanding to effect their strategies.

Many of the protestors are students who are actually benefiting from the hard work of others that have enabled their education to exist, which was based on fossil fuels. Many others are schoolchildren that are enjoying the benefits of a society that has paid for their education through using fossil fuels.

They don't seem to realise that their clothes, their food, their water, their homes, their lighting, their transport, their appliances all require the fossil fuels that they want banned because they supposedly produce CO<sub>2</sub> and heat the planet.

The leaders include dangerous people that have threatened to bring to down the government and kill people in the process. Co-founder of ER Stuart Basden stated<sup>184</sup> that it isn't about climate but dismantling governments, European civilisation, ending the patriarchy and ending 600 years of European colonialism. *'Europeans spread their toxicity around the world, they brought torture, genocide, carnage and suffering to the ends of the earth ... the delusion of white supremacy ... the delusion of hetero-sexism ... we're a rebellion'*.

---

<sup>183</sup> Stephen Fry, Olivia Coleman, Asim Chabuddy.

<sup>184</sup> Medium.com, Stuart Basden, 'Extinction rebellion isn't about the climate', 10 January 2019.

Statements such as these reveal the real Cultural Marxism of the Green movement and show how dangerous it is.

Funders of climate change policies profiting from climate credits climate opportunities and CO2 swaps include: Blackrock Capital, HSBC, JP Morgan Chase, Citi, the Rothschilds, E3 International, Ford, BP & Unilever.

These spoiled, gullible people are either ignorant or extremely uncaring and arrogant. They are certainly all hypocrites. In fact, watching their protests it appears to me that they are acting like deluded members of a deranged religious cult. Fortunately, polls show that they are alienating the public, of which about a third supports them and two-thirds are opposed to them.

### **Self disclosure**

Climate activists blame my generation for a pending climate catastrophe and denounce us as evil white people who stole their future by reckless, selfish activity which raised CO2 levels.

In the interests of self-disclosure:

I am opposed to climate alarmism and I am therefore not restricted by their false policies; yet I am a lifetime naturalist and passionate about real environmental issues. I support genuine re-wilding policies.<sup>185</sup> I have been an avid student of birds, mammals, rodents, ungulates, amphibians, fish, reptiles, insects, trees, wildflowers, Bushcraft, survival skills and astronomy all my life.

While growing up I either walked or cycled to school, which was over 3 miles away, and my first term involved walking through knee-high snowdrifts in the coldest winter of the century. We also did cross country runs through fields, with snow up to waist-high, in a singlet and shorts. We played rugby on frosty pitches, which cut your legs when you fell. No one complained. We drank from pop bottles, which we returned for recycling to gain a penny refund. We drank milk from bottles, which were then sterilised and reused. I almost always ate homemade sandwiches for lunch. The school had an outside swimming pool that was not heated. Computers did not exist and neither did calculators. The only aid we had was a log-table book.

Until I was eight we had to use an outside toilet 50 yards away and had no washing machine, no tumble dryer, no dishwasher, no fridge and no heating apart from a coal fire. I walked to school, about 500 yards away, on my own from the age of five. Shopping had to be fetched by walking, quite some distance, to individual small shops (butcher, baker, grocery store) using paper bags. For greengroceries we were fortunate enough to have a man deliver to the street a selection on a horse and cart. For waste items, these were recycled by a rag and bone man who also used a horse and cart. People would follow the horse with a brush and pan to collect droppings for rosebushes.

We then moved to a house with a bathroom. We had the luxury of a basic washing machine but no tumble dryer, and never a dishwasher. There was only one television in the house and one radio (other than the radiogram – a record player and a combined radio piece of furniture). To listen in my bedroom I made a crystal set, which didn't even need a battery. There was no central heating and I could see my breath in my bedroom in winter. Ice

---

<sup>185</sup> Farming that takes the land back to its original natural characteristics and puts compatible fauna and flora in place.



formed inside the single paned window. More than once we had to dig our way out of the front door in a snowdrift up to the roof.

We walked to nearby grocery stores, in all weathers, and carried items back in paper carrier bags. For a time I delivered groceries, to people that couldn't carry them, on a special bicycle. We ate fruit from our own apple trees and mowed the lawn with a mechanical hand-powered mower. We never had a car and always used public transport. We never went on a plane but had holidays inland. As a teenager most of my vacations were spent camping in ordinary fields with only rivers for a bathroom and a pit and spade for a toilet.

I left home aged 18 for art-college in Nottingham. That year I hitchhiked 3,000 miles. The next year I hitchhiked with just a rucksack and three pounds and headed for college in Brighton with nowhere to stay, knowing no one. It all worked out OK. Within weeks I got a one-bedroom flat that had no bathroom for my wife and child, who moved down from Birmingham. We lived there about eight years quite happily. My first house was a Victorian terraced accommodation which I completely rebuilt alone. I even made my own floors, ceilings, walls, doors and windows and re-wired up to the loft. To do this I mainly used recycled wood obtained from the local tip (this was in the 70s-80s). I even made my own two-way cat-flap out of wood. I cut my own glass (much of it recycled) and even refurbished Victorian electric fittings.

With my own family we spent most of our vacations staying with friends around the country. We never had a foreign family holiday and never flew on a plane as a family. Days out were spent walking through the countryside. In this way I got to know most of Britain firsthand. My kids were brought up to do good, respect nature and other people and all have had respectable successful jobs managing others. I have tried to teach my grandchildren the same ethos. So far, one is about to lecture in university, another has just completed a degree. My 16-year old grandson is already a qualified football referee before he has completed his education. Two other granddaughters have completed respectively GCSEs and A-levels with flying colours. One plays netball for England.

I stopped using my car several years ago and sold it. I have given bicycles to others. I recycle conscientiously and conserve water. I have planted six trees in my very small garden in recent years and I am a lifetime member of the Woodland Trust. I eat organic food and avoid processed food wherever possible. I eat very small amounts of white meat and no processed meat. I grow my own herbs. I encourage others to eat healthily. I do not drink alcohol and mostly drink water.

I rarely switch the television on before 9pm or later. I never travel by aeroplane, my passport has been expired for many years, and very rarely travel by train and then only for short distances. I do not own a Smartphone and I have never been on social media of any kind. I support the Trussell Trust and other charities that feed the poor and help the needy. I run a folk club that celebrates local, live, acoustic music, which operates like a community and gives pleasure to many locals. I have also spent my life counselling other people that are in need and continue to do so.

Perhaps climate activists should act similarly before they condemn me as a white old man who stole their future by living extravagantly.

## Greta's false scenario

The terrible picture of doom painted by elite spokesperson Greta Thunberg is enough to scare both herself and children in general. She really thinks that she will burn up on a scorched earth in 12 years and it is the fault of old white people.

Now I write many analyses showing the negative effects of the establishment on our life, and this is necessary to show people what is going on and perhaps how to avoid certain ramifications. Despite this, a broad view of the last 120 years does not show the increasing doom and gloom painted by poor Greta. In fact, humanity has prospered on all metrics. To summarise:

- Longer life expectancy.
- Lower child mortality.
- Less disease in children.
- Better sanitation.
- Better and more widespread healthcare.
- More comfortable transportation methods.
- Better communication systems.
- Better quality housing.
- Better heating methods.
- The species extinction rate slowed down.
- Much greater food production and a wider choice. Food production has outpaced population growth.
- Rivers and streams generally became much cleaner. Fish now swim in the Thames that used to be an open sewer.
- British air became much cleaner after the 1950s.
- Droughts are in decline.
- Wildfires are in decline.

The use of children to blackmail people with emotional pressure is a disgrace. But Greta Thunberg is just the latest in a long line of such poster children going back decades. This is a cynical and deplorable act by the Green establishment amounting to child abuse.

### Lies in Greta's recent ghost-written speech to the UN

*People are suffering, people are dying, entire ecosystems are collapsing.*

Where? I have already explained that it is false to say that entire ecosystems are collapsing, species are better protected than ever in history.

Many people die in poor countries through lack of energy and technology that the privileged West enjoys and which Greta wants to destroy to make people suffer. De-industrialising would make the West a Third World set of nations.

Human-caused CO<sub>2</sub> is not killing anybody.

*All you can talk about is money and fairy tales of eternal economic growth. How dare you.*

Clearly written by a Socialist, possibly her Antifa father or her Soros paid handler. I note that Labour's John McDonnell warmly applauded Greta's speech and committed a Labour government to fulfilling her demands, which would ruin the country.

Well it takes huge amounts of money (taxpayers' money) to pay for the Green initiatives that Greta wants enacted. The British commitment to zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by 2050 will cost a trillion pounds and do not a bit of good. Without economic growth there is no prosperity and no money to pay for Green initiatives.

*For more than 30 years the science has been crystal clear.*

In fact thirty years ago the Green claims were all over the place: too much snow, a coming ice age, too many floods, too many droughts, too much heat, the Maldives would sink – and so on (see examples next).

The actual science has been crystal clear but complex; that global climate changes in cycles primarily based on solar activity and earth's progression in orbit (Milankovitch Cycles). Most decent scientists appear to deny man-made climate change (see earlier). So Greta is wrong that her position is clear and proven – it has consistently been shown to be false. Man-made climate change advocates have been proved to be wrong every single time; their doom-laden predictions have failed hundreds of times.

How dare you continue to look away and come here saying that you're doing enough when the politics and solutions needed are still nowhere in sight.

This is really bad script-writing. If the solutions are not in sight, then what does she expect politicians to actually do?

Cutting our emissions in half in 10 years only gives us a 50% chance of staying below 1.5 degrees and the risk of setting off irreversible chain reactions. ... They also rely on my generation sucking hundreds of billions of tons of CO<sub>2</sub> out of the air with technologies that barely exist.

Well, Greta can calm down now because Michael and Ronan Connolly have proved beyond any doubt, based on empirical data and good science, that Greenhouse Gases do not warm the planet at all. So Co<sub>2</sub> is not threat to her generation. In any case, previous warm periods in history, which were even higher in temperature, were all times of great prosperity for civilisation.

There's no point analysing the rest of her speech to the UN; it is largely emotional gibberish and often self-contradictory. The real cause of astonishment is that politicians the world over are taking this seriously.

## Examples of deliberate false alarmism

Newspapers and the media thrive on promoting fear, and this serves the elite policies. It is always the coldest time, the warmest time, the wettest time, the driest time, in an endless repetitive spiral of deceit. Here are some examples.<sup>186</sup>

Prospects of another glacial period; Geologists think the world may be frozen up again.  
New York Times, 24 February 1895.

Disappearing glaciers ... deteriorating slowly, with a persistency that means their final annihilation ... scientific fact ... surely disappearing.  
Los Angeles Times, 1902.

Professor Schmidt warns us of an encroaching ice age.

---

<sup>186</sup> I acknowledge a partial debt here to *American Thinker*, Thomas Lifson, '120 years of climate scares', 4 August 2014.

New York Times, 7 October 1912.

Scientist says Arctic ice will wipe out Canada.  
Chicago Tribune, 1923.

Most geologists think the world is growing warmer and that it will continue to get warmer.  
Los Angeles Times, 1929.

We have learned that the world has been getting warmer in the last half century.  
New York Times, 10 August 1962.

The Arctic pack ice is thinning and that the ocean at the North Pole may become an open sea within a decade.  
New York Times, 20 February 1969.

England will not exist in the year 2000.  
Paul Ehrlich, 1969.

The oceans will be dead as Lake Erie in less than a decade.  
Redlands Daily Facts, 6 October 1970.

Global cooling for the past forty-years.  
Time Magazine, 1974.

The harbinger of another ice age.  
Washington Post, 1974.

The present cooling trend ... is very bad news indeed.  
Fortune Magazine, 1974.

The facts of the present climate change are such that the most optimistic experts would assign near certainty to major crop failures ... mass deaths by starvation, and probably anarchy and violence.  
New York Times, 1974.

The threat of a new ice age must now stand alongside nuclear war as a likely source of wholesale death and misery for mankind.  
Nigel Calder, New Scientist, 1975.

15-25 foot rise in ocean levels [before the year 2000].  
Palm Beach Post, 8 January 1979.

Global warming – ‘of an almost unprecedented magnitude’.  
New York Times, 1981.

Over next several decades ... world sea level ... could reach heights unprecedented in the history of civilisation. ... more than 10 feet. ... Florida would be underwater.  
The Sun, 1 May 1983.

Threat to Islands - ... Maldives: A gradual rise in average sea level is threatening to completely cover this Indian Ocean nation of 1196 small islands within the next 30 years. [I.e. by 2018.]  
Canberra Times, 26 September 1988.

Snowfalls are now just a thing of the past.

The Independent, 20 March 2000.

Why Antarctica will soon be the only place to live, literally.  
The Independent, 2 May 2004.

Now the Pentagon tells Bush climate change will destroy us ... Britain will be Siberia by the year 2020.  
The Guardian, 21 February 2004.

This drought may never break.  
Sydney Morning Herald, 4 January 2008.

Climate change study predicts refugees fleeing into Antarctica.  
The Telegraph, 13 October 2008.

Arctic summers ice-free by 2013.  
BBC, December 2007.

The end of snow?  
New York Times, 7 February 2014.

Four years to save the Earth: 2020 is the deadline to save climate catastrophe.  
Daily Mail, 29 June 2017.

Enjoy snow now ... by 2020 it'll be gone.  
Weekend Australian, 17 May 2019.

Australian floods of 2010 and 2011 caused global sea levels to drop.  
The Guardian,

Drought maybe the new norm for UK.  
The Guardian, 12 February 2012.

For example: Glacier National Park has been continually stated to be snow / ice free within years.

- Within 25 years of 1923 (i.e. 1948). Medford Mail Tribune, 29 December 1923.
- Within 50 years of 1952 (i.e. 2002). The Post-Standard (Syracuse, New York) 5 March 1952.
- Ice free by 2020. National Geographic News, 2 March 2009.
- Ice free in 30 years. New York Times, 22 November 2014.

Glacier Park is still full of ice and snow. It had one of the coldest winters on record in 2018 and winter started very early in 2019.

## **The descent into insanity**

Climate alarmism has now reached hysterical proportions and is leading to insanity. This is not just the madness exhibited by climate activists in the streets but the irrationality demonstrated by those in power.

The establishment commitments to the demonising of CO<sub>2</sub> is going to destroy western society – but that is the goal all along of the Cultural Marxists behind the narrative. ER leaders have openly affirmed this. If climate change policies are carried out, Britain will be utterly ruined and plunged into a new dark age.

The fact that basic school biology is completely ignored and the beneficial effects of CO<sub>2</sub> suddenly forgotten and twisted into threats is proof of irrationality on the part of all climate hysterics. But it gets worse every day.

Here are some examples of complete insanity evidenced by climate alarmists.

- Greta Thunberg claims to be able to see invisible CO<sub>2</sub> and her grown mother champions this ability with pride.
- Britain is chopping down ancient trees in Virginia to be made into biomass pellets and transports them over the Atlantic Ocean to be burned, a process that creates far more CO<sub>2</sub> than burning local coal.
- Britain is committed to zero CO<sub>2</sub> emissions at a cost of a trillion pounds in the next few decades – but that would involve killing every person and every animal in the country since humans exhale 40,000ppm when they breathe (more than hundred times what climate alarmists consider to be safe levels).
- America is committed to reducing CO<sub>2</sub> but President Obama agreed to China vastly increasing its coal-powered stations at the same time.<sup>187</sup> This was called, ‘*fighting the climate change*’!
- Minnesota judges have refused permission to allow a mega-dairy farm from operating due to the effects of the cows on the climate.<sup>188</sup>
- Climate treaties (such as Montreal, Kyoto, Copenhagen, Paris) have done absolutely nothing to halt the rise of CO<sub>2</sub> emissions (mainly due to China and India increasing their emissions). Therefore, the real goal is not the climate but geo-political manoeuvring. The aim is to hobble the west.
- The eradication of CO<sub>2</sub>, the goal of climate alarmists, would create mass famine and death.
- Climate activists’ goals include stopping or vastly reducing air travel, deleting the internal combustion engine, stopping diesel trains, terminating fossil fuel consumption in dwellings (no cookers or central heating) and so on. This would plunge the West into being primitive nations. The irony is that if that happened a primitive society would be reduced to cooking on open fires burning wood, which would create more CO<sub>2</sub> and particulates than now.
- A supporter of Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez<sup>189</sup> shouted in a town-hall meeting in Corona, New York, ‘*We have to start eating babies. We don’t have enough time ,,, we have to get rid of the babies ... we need to eat the babies.*’<sup>190</sup> She wore a T-short saying, ‘Save the planet – Eat the children’. In fact, this idea of cannibalism is being promoted by the Stockholm School of Economics professor Magnus Soderlund. It was considered at the Gastro Summit.
- Climate alarmists also want you to eat insects.<sup>191</sup> This idea was based upon a study published in the journal *Global Food Security* (22 April 2017). The scheme intends to reduce the amount of domestic animals on the land.

---

<sup>187</sup> The White House, ‘US-China joint announcement on climate change’, 12 November 2014.

<sup>188</sup> Star Tribune, ‘Minnesota appeals court says MPCA should have considered mega-dairy’s climate change effects’, 15 October 2019.

<sup>189</sup> Representative Democrat for New York.

<sup>190</sup> Ron Paul Forums, ‘Unhinged climate alarmist and Cortez supporter ...’, 3 October 2019.

<sup>191</sup> The Goldwater, ‘Climate change insanity: alarmists want you to eat insects to stop global warming’, 9 May 2017.

Alarmists are literally becoming insane in the panic about impending doom caused by the delusion that CO<sub>2</sub> is a poison. These people have lost their minds.

## **Dangerous implications**

### **Damage to science**

The global hysteria about climate change, which now dominates politics and global infrastructure agendas based on bad science and faulty data, is now so serious that it threatens epistemology.<sup>192</sup>

Very eminent scientists, like Willie Soon, have expressed grave concerns about the long-term effects of climate change alarmism on science itself. The very basic principles of scientific theory are being undermined. So-called scientists are committing fraud to justify climate change propaganda. They falsify data and produce graphs that lie. They give speeches, which are full of errors. They refuse to allow questioning of their conclusions. They refuse to supply base data so that others can reproduce their experiments. They teach children in schools and universities packs of hysteric scenarios based on fraud. All this is damaging science itself.

When multiple governments can introduce massive domestic programmes costing many billions of taxpayers money based on utter lies and no science, then things have already got out of control. But in the long term, the result may be that people no longer trust any science at all. Climate hysterics are playing with fire.

### **Persecution of true scientists**

Over and over again scientists who speak out against the nonsense of climate alarmism are shut down. They have their media platforms deleted, journals refuse to publish their papers, the media blacks-out their message, they are discredited as nut—jobs, they fail to get research grants with no reasons given, and they are dismissed from their teaching jobs. This is a witch-hunt of truth-tellers perpetrated by vested interests and the science Mafia.

If the climate change fear-mongering were true, why persecute opponents? Just prove your position with facts and data; it should be easy if the claims you make are true. The fact that the opponent's arguments are not debated but rather they are persecuted proves the lie of the alarmists.

Here are some examples:

- The VP of the University of Alabama, Jacqui Tam, was pressurised into resigning for a notice that promoted the benefits of climate change.<sup>193</sup>
- David Legates, the Delaware State climatologist, was fired for telling the truth. He was also Prof. of Geography at the University of Delaware and former director of the Centre for Climatic Research. He was also placed on a 'Do not fund' list and could not get research grants – but no reasons were ever given.
- An Oregon State climatologist was also fired for telling the truth. George Taylor was forced out of his job by Governor Ted Kulongoski for being a climate sceptic.<sup>194</sup>

---

<sup>192</sup> The philosophical theory of knowledge. It is generally assumed that the difference between a belief which makes a genuine claim to knowledge, and one which is a mere statement of opinion, is that the former can somehow be justified. Epistemology can be regarded as the investigation of what constitutes that justification, and how, or whether, it can be attained. [Oxford Dictionary.]

<sup>193</sup> Global News, 'Univ. Of Alberta resigns following controversial climate change billboard', 29 September 2019.

- Roger Pielke Jnr. was placed under investigation by the Democrats in Congress for telling the truth, along with six others. His personal correspondence was sequestered from his university.<sup>195</sup>
- Nicholas Drapela was sacked from Oregon State University for denying climate alarmism.<sup>196</sup>
- In 1993 Bill Gray, the world's leading tropical meteorologist, had his funding cut off by Al Gore.
- Professor Peter Ridd was fired for telling the truth but was later awarded compensation by a court for unfair dismissal.<sup>197</sup>
- Seven shots were fired into the office of the Alabama State Climatologist Roy Spencer at the National Space Science and Technology Centre.<sup>198</sup>

## The world is going to burn - but not because of climate change

While the world around us cools and threatens food production, there is a coming global catastrophe when it will burn up.

It will burn ferociously with great heat, melting elements and destroying all the works of man. This will result, not from climate change, but from man's moral pollution. The long awaited repercussions of man's rebellion to God over millennia will finally result in divine condemnation for man and destruction of all his works on earth.

This has been the clear teaching of God's word over many centuries and well expressed by the apostle Peter:

The heavens and the earth *which* are now preserved by the same word, are reserved for fire until the day of judgment and perdition of ungodly men. ... the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night, in which the heavens will pass away with a great noise, and the elements will melt with fervent heat; both the earth and the works that are in it will be burned up. Therefore, since all these things will be dissolved, what manner *of persons* ought you to be in holy conduct and godliness. 2 Pt 3:7, 10-11

This warning should make everyone consider their position and change their ways. Instead of panicking about global warming caused by CO<sub>2</sub>, which is absolute nonsense, folk should worry about their eternal future ruined by moral pollution.

God will require an account for every sinful thought, word and deed and every iniquitous act on the Day of Judgment, which fast approaches. There is no escape.

However, there is a Saviour who can rescue those who trust in him – Jesus Christ the righteous, the Son of God, the Lord of creation. There is only one way out of doom and that is by believing in the Gospel of Jesus Christ as expressed in the Bible and especially the New Testament.

---

<sup>194</sup> The Oregonian, 'Controversial head of Oregon Climate Service steps aside', 27 May 2019.

<sup>195</sup> The Climate Fix, 'I am under investigation', 25 February 2015.

<sup>196</sup> Oval Pike, 'Climate change skeptic, Nicholas Drapela, fired from Oregon State University, 2019.

<sup>197</sup> The Guardian, 'Peter Ridd awarded 41.2m in unfair dismissal case against James Cook University', 6 September 2019.

<sup>198</sup> Roy Spencer Ph.D., Blog 24 April 2017.



For those who submit to Christ and trust in his Gospel, there is also a better world and future. God will restore the earth to its former purity and glory and all those who believe in Jesus will inhabit a perfect world with no sin, no tears and a glorious existence. This is the hope of the Christian Gospel.

Don't listen to the lies of climate alarmists, but do listen to the voice of God commanding you to repent of your evil ways and trust in Christ.

## Conclusion

The hype about global warming or Climate Change caused by mankind is a complete fraud. It is a political strategy used to terrify people to make them comply with elite aims and pay more taxes and achieve a Socialist Trotskyite agenda. Worse, elite corporations are making potentially trillions based on these lies.

The 'science' behind anthropogenic climate change is fake and is based on all sorts of fraudulent practices. These include: falsifying data, exaggerating data, taking temperature measurements in cities (which are hotter than rural areas) but only account for 7% of the earth; and even then using many weather stations situated next to heat sources (such as air conditioning exhausts). Many spokesmen for climate change alarmism (such as Al Gore) are not only blatant liars but are utter hypocrites in their lifestyle, using private jets, multiple homes and cars etc.

Neither is this science Green. When Britain uses chopped down old trees from Virginian forests to form 'biomass energy' (which is supposed to be renewable) it creates 8% more CO<sub>2</sub> than using a coal-powered power station. The processing and transport of these wood pellets is also a huge CO<sub>2</sub> creating exercise. The £1bn cost of this is paid for by taxpayers on utility bills. This is Green science gone mad; burning hardwood foreign trees instead of coal, which we have plenty of locally.

The claim that electric cars are Green is also a lie. The production of the cobalt batteries, a rare element, not only uses child slave labour in Africa but altogether results in the production of more CO<sub>2</sub> than a diesel car. The hypocrisy just goes on and on.

The science opposing the climate change alarmists is gathering apace and is now overwhelming but at the same time the massive promotion of climate hysteria in the media is overwhelming society while the true science is completely ignored.

People need to wake up and ignore the alarmism but study the facts.

What historians will definitely wonder about in future centuries is how deeply flawed logic, obscured by shrewd and unrelenting propaganda, actually enabled a coalition of powerful special interests to convince nearly everyone in the world that CO<sub>2</sub> from human industry was a dangerous, planet destroying toxin. It will be remembered as the greatest mass delusion in the history of the world that CO<sub>2</sub>, the life of plants, was considered for a time to be a deadly poison.

Prof. Richard Lindzen (esteemed American atmospheric physicist, formerly Professor of Meteorology at MIT).

Global warming is the greatest deception in history.  
Climatologist Dr Tim Ball (former professor at the University of Winnipeg, Canada).

Climate change alarmism has nothing to do with science and is a complete fraud. It is a scam that is based upon a Marxist political agenda to damage western societies and is exploited by globalist corporations to take money from the poor and enrich the top 1%. People need to wake up.

## Select bibliography

- Paul Fahy, The fabrications behind climate change.
- Paul Fahy, Synopsis against global warming.
- Paul Fahy, Climate change, eugenics, oil and tyranny.
- Paul Fahy, The end of climate change doom (1 and 2).
- Tony Heller (Computer scientist, Geologist, Electrical Engineer), YouTube, 'Is the Global temperature record credible', 5 November 2018.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Rewriting America's history', 25 September 20.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'The climate cynicism crisis', 26 September 2019.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Ocean stupidification', 27 September 2019.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Hiding the hottest month on record', 28 September 2019.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'One of the coolest years on record in the US', 3 October 2019.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'Scientists say', 1 October 2019.
- Tony Heller, YouTube, 'World's second worst scientist?', 10 October 2019.
- Dr Wei-Hock ('Willie') Soon (Astrophysicist), YouTube, 'Dr Willie Soon demolishes the extreme weather panic and other hysterical arguments'; lecture.
- Gregory Wrightstone (Geologist), Phyllis Schlafly's Gateway Eagle Council XLVIII, The Epoch Times, Sept 13-15 2019; interview.
- Gregory Wrightstone, Inconvenient facts website, Blog.
- Craig D Idso, (Ph.D in Geography & lecturer in Meteorology), Centre for the study of Carbon Dioxide and global change: research.
- GWPF (Global Warming Policy Foundation), YouTube, Dr Susan Crockford (Zoologist), 'Netflix, Attenborough and cliff-falling walruses, the making of a false climate icon', 17 May 2019.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) website.
- NASA website.

Scripture quotations are from The New King James Version  
© Thomas Nelson 1982

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2019**

**Understanding Ministries**

<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>