

# Green Hypocrisy

## Introduction

I have explained many times that the Green revolution currently underway in the Western world is nothing to do with saving the planet. In fact, all the political agendas based upon environmentalism are really methods of control to take over the world's resources, make trillions of dollars for corporations and take control over populations through social restrictions. Indeed, this was planned since 1956 by the Rockefellers as part of a bid for world domination by an elite cabal.

Apart from being a Trojan Horse for domination and rape of resources, the strategies are all useless. In this paper I seek to prove that when you analyse the various Green agendas they are all based on sheer hypocrisy; they all do more damage to the planet than doing nothing. They all have a negative benefit. However, the corporatists in control make \$1.5 trillion per year from this industry.

## Basic principles of climate alarmism refuted

### Demonising CO2

CO<sub>2</sub> is only 0.04% of the atmosphere. It does not have the capacity to drive global temperatures. In terms of greenhouse gases, water vapour is much more plentiful and has more potential to affect climate. However, no scientist has proved the greenhouse gas theory, that this drives global warming. In fact some scientists claim to have proved that greenhouse gases do no such thing but their research is censored.<sup>1</sup> Furthermore, ice-core and soil-core samples of the earth's past demonstrate that rises in CO<sub>2</sub> followed (not preceded) warming in global temperatures.

Carbon dioxide is vital to sustaining life on Earth. It is used as food by plants in photosynthesis, which produces oxygen as a by-product. Without adequate CO<sub>2</sub> plants will die and then all life on Earth dies.

CO<sub>2</sub> is also breathed-in by the earth and this contributes to rock formation (limestone). CO<sub>2</sub> is breathed-out by the earth in volcanic eruptions; the single greatest natural source of CO<sub>2</sub>. One big volcanic eruption pushes out more CO<sub>2</sub> than all of human history.

CO<sub>2</sub> is absorbed by water and is taken in by aquatic life forms, such as shellfish. Coral reefs depend upon CO<sub>2</sub>. Plankton depends upon CO<sub>2</sub>. CO<sub>2</sub> is vital for the oceans.

In historic terms CO<sub>2</sub> levels are very low; currently about 420ppm, slightly raised from about 300ppm in the 90s. This increase added about a third of green plants to the globe. Polar ice caps indicate that the earth is still in the remains of an ice age. In warm periods

---

<sup>1</sup> Such as the research by Michael and Ronan Connolly. Their findings include: Greenhouse gases do not warm the planet. There are six different, contradictory theories about what the Greenhouse Effect is. The popular 'blanket effect' (the basis of climate change fear-mongering) is now proven to be wrong. [ronanconnollyscience.orgpress.com]. There is no Greenhouse effect. If these gases absorb radiated heat they also emit heat (Einstein's law). They only hold heat for less than a second. The current average for the Northern Hemisphere is about the same as that in the 1940s when CO<sub>2</sub> was virtually at pre-industrial levels. CO<sub>2</sub> does not cause climate change.

even Antarctica was covered in trees and green plants. If levels reach 180ppm the Earth dies. In historic warm periods levels reached as high as 700ppm when the world was lush with green plants and dinosaurs.

So the panic to rush to net zero emissions to drive CO<sub>2</sub> world levels down is stupid. It makes zero sense.

### **Climate is not weather**

Weather is local. You cannot extrapolate from local weather events to a global climatic problem. This is done by the BBC and climate alarmists all the time but it is a pointless exercise.

Reports of a hot summer's day result in fanatical claims that the Earth is burning up or boiling.<sup>2</sup> This is ridiculous. Hotter days than recent recorded events have been recorded many times in the past going back over 100 years. This is a statistical fact. In the late 1800s it once was so hot that birds dropped dead out of the sky. Furthermore, reports of sudden cold weather that are often experienced never result in claims of global cooling or a coming ice age.

Weather, being local, is subject to extremes and is highly variable. Little can be discerned to suggest patterns or trends except by long-term recording. Patterns in general are related to seasons, but even these are variable. July/August where I am this year have been relatively cold and wet.

### **Climate is varied and dynamic**

Climate is dynamic and constantly changing. The several climatic zones in the world are not static but change constantly and interact to form an overall ecosystem. There is no such thing as an 'Earth climate'.

Within the climatic zones are sub-zones of atmospheric movement which create weather patterns. Climate is therefore highly complex.

There is no scientific proof whatsoever of anthropogenic climate change; that is that mankind's behaviour is directly changing the world's climate to be more extreme. In fact, by many measurements the climate systems in the Earth are no more extreme today that at many other historic times. I repeatedly mention the much warmer Medieval Warm Period and the Roman Warm Period. Today (in the Holocene Epoch) the earth is actually in a relatively cold period.

Despite these scientific facts, governments in the West are pushing all sorts of anti-CO<sub>2</sub> climate alarmism and Net-Zero policies that damage society. Here are some examples of why they also damage the planet.

## **Killing cattle**

Currently cows are being demonised as a source of climate change. Their breathing, flatulence and dung are all said to threaten life on Earth by creating methane which is claimed to be a deadly greenhouse gas like CO<sub>2</sub>. Thus King Charles demanded that cows have facemasks put on them while culling operations in America have killed millions of

---

<sup>2</sup> Antonio Guterres, (Secretary General of the UN), 'The era of global warming has ended, the era of global boiling has arrived'.

cows and The Netherlands is removing most of its cattle farms. This is hysteria based on nothing.

Methane is almost non-existent in the atmosphere despite natural production of it. The reaction of methane with oxygen upon ignition produces water vapour and CO<sub>2</sub> just as the combustion of any material will create water vapour and CO<sub>2</sub>.

Cattle are, therefore, no threat to the planet; rather cattle add value to the ecosystem. Cattle eat grass with needs to be kept in control. Cow manure fertilises the soil, which causes green plants to grow, which absorb CO<sub>2</sub> and produce oxygen. Cows benefit the planet, to say nothing of food and milk production.

The attack on cattle is insane and has nothing to do with Green issues. It has to do with creating food scarcity.

## Solar panels

### **Raw materials**

As well as rare earth metals they require silver.

#### *Silver*

A vital component of most electrical systems and flat screen appliances. The current huge demand means that prices are high and demand outstrips mining. This leads to increased mining activity and environmental damage.

#### *Cobalt*

One necessary ingredient is cobalt. Cobalt oxide is obtained mainly as a by-product in the extraction of nickel, copper, and iron ores.

Cobalt mining in Africa mostly uses forced child labour in labour camps surrounded by razor wire. There are no safety precautions, risk analysis, suitable clothing or safety training. The children breathe in hazardous quartz particles, results in lung fibrosis caused by the inhalation of dust containing silica (silicosis).

This mining process also leads to increased environmental damage.

#### *Lithium*

This is the most damaging mining and environmental destruction.

A lithium open cast mine creates millions of tons of waste spoil, which contains sulphuric acid and uranium. This waste pollutes the local water supply for hundreds of years.

#### *Summary*

All the mining process for the extraction of vital raw materials causes environmental damage.

### **Construction and installation**

Manufacture is very expensive. Solar panel fields take up huge amounts of farmland which today is foolish as food production is becoming hazardous. Countries should be looking at maximising their farmland for food production, not getting rid of it.

This is also environmental damage.

### **Weather effects**

Energy generation is very intermittent in temperate climates; without even moderate sunshine solar panels do nothing. However, in extreme weather they are vulnerable. Heavy hailstorms completely destroy the solar panels. They also stop working when it is too sunny.

### **Costs**

- Cost to install solar panels on a house: about £5,500.
- Savings expected per year: around £610.
- Time to recoup costs: nine years. By this time the panels are nearing the end of their life.

### **Recycling**

Solar panel recycling costs more than manufacturing a new panel and it is causing an environmental nightmare.

The first generation of solar panels are nearing the end of their life and the result is millions of tonnes of waste with no clue what to do about it. This is going to cause an environmental disaster.

There are 25 million solar panels in the UK and 2.5 billion globally. In the next few years these will need to be destroyed somehow and the only current plan is landfill sites. There is no proper global infrastructure to deal with them.

There is no active recycling plant for solar panels in the UK. There is one small operation in Scunthorpe stockpiling them with hopes to eventually recycle them when equipment and technology become available.

The only large scale recycling plant in the world is one in France, which was due to open last month. Whether this labour intensive plant succeeds only time will tell.

Professor Chris Sansom of the University of Derby says that by 2050 there could be 300 million tonnes of scrap panels globally. This compares to the global amount of plastic waste.

A senior Chinese solar research expert with the Stuttgart Institute for Photovoltaics stated that solar panels, *'will explode with full force in two or three decades and wreck the environment'*.<sup>3</sup>

### **Summary**

Solar panels are expensive to make, use many items that cause environmental destruction, do not provide large amounts of power, do not last long (typically a maximum of 10-20 years) and are an environmental nightmare to get rid of once finished. It is hypocritical to claim that these are a Green solution to power needs.

## **Wind turbines**

### **Manufacture**

- Huge amounts of energy created by 'fossil fuels'<sup>4</sup> are required to make a wind turbine.

---

<sup>3</sup> This is Money, Matt Drake, 'How long will your solar panels last? ...', 5 August 2023.

<sup>4</sup> A misnomer since these fuels do not come from fossils.

- Some aspects of manufacture are not sustainable, such as rare earth minerals used, masses of concrete for the base, steel production etc. All of these are targets for Green activists and are to be eradicated by 2050. Therefore turbines are hypocritical.
- The concrete bases are CO<sub>2</sub> intensive. Huge concrete foundations covering vast amounts of countryside are hardly Green. Each onshore turbine foundation is a slab of concrete the size of a large swimming pool. The concrete will never be ripped up even after the lifetime of the turbine has ended (too expensive). The ingredients of concrete have to be dug out of the earth in mining operations, scarring the landscape and denuding the topography. Huge amounts of cement dust are created in this production, which is toxic to humans and animals. It is Green policy to terminate cement production.
- The steel manufacture is CO<sub>2</sub> intensive. It is also Green policy to terminate steel production.
- The mining for minerals is CO<sub>2</sub> intensive. See earlier; open cast mining is highly destructive of the environment.
- The electrical components are CO<sub>2</sub> intensive (copper, silver, plastic, tin). This requires further mining and environmental destruction.
- Transport of turbines uses huge amounts of 'fossil fuels'.
- Taken in its entirety of supply, manufacture and installation, a wind turbine creates far more CO<sub>2</sub> than a nuclear power station or a properly filtered coal-fired power station.
- One gas-fired power station, compared to coal-fired one, saves more CO<sub>2</sub> than all the turbines in England added together.
- The unsubsidised cost of supply, manufacture, installation, maintenance and eventual removal is far greater, per kilowatt-hour of energy produced, than any other form of energy production.

### **Summary of CO<sub>2</sub> costs**

If you take into account the whole lifespan of a wind turbine, including every detail, they contribute more CO<sub>2</sub> than many other types of traditional energy production. This includes:

- The concrete foundation.
- The construction of the base unit and all the components therein.
- The transport required in getting all these base unit components to the site.
- The construction of the main unit, including steel works.
- The transportation of all these materials to the factory.
- The construction of the nacelles.
- The transportation of the materials to the factory, including shipping and road transport.
- The transportation of the assembled unit to the site.
- The electricity and gas used in the construction, installation, operation and maintenance of all items.
- The construction of the grid system (cabling etc.) across country to a power station. The transport and electricity used in the huge operation that covers many miles.
- The human costs involved – transport to work etc.
- The costs of continual maintenance, including travel.

### **Maintenance**

The cost of maintenance alone is prohibitive and huge. Offshore maintenance costs are even greater.

Understand that turbines in the sea need constant maintenance by boats going to the site. Blades are subject to rust, damage from salt, damage caused by high winds or powerful waves, damage by bird strike as well as normal maintenance. Specialist engineers are needed that are comfortable working from boats in waves. Maintenance is very difficult in these circumstances and highly expensive; but these costs do not seem to be appreciated in government propaganda.

Huge amounts of oil are used to make the turbines work, especially in lubricating the massive gearbox. Green activists are opposed to oil production but without oil turbines don't work.

Failure and downtime rates for offshore farms are higher than onshore due to the environmental factors, such as salt in sea spray and wind and loading variation of the winds. This affects all the sub-assemblies, including electrical control system, gearbox, generator, blades, hub and pitch systems. In onshore systems the yaw system and sensors have a higher failure rate. Offshore farms break down about twice as often as onshore.

For example, it is common that the gearbox will be down for roughly 200 hours per year. To this must be added the stop time for: the rotor, shafts and bearings, brakes, generator, hydraulics, yaw, control system, electrical, sensors, nacelle, structure, and other things. Generators, for example, commonly break for about 180 hours a year. Add these together and you have the turbine broken for large periods of time. The expense of repairs must also be taken into account.

### **The turbine mechanism**

Wind turbines are not windmills that create energy just from the wind; they are turbines. They require electricity from the national grid (using 'fossil fuels') to make them work. Some also need diesel engines to start them up and all require masses of oil to lubricate the gear systems.

The turbine usually requires electric power from the national grid to start up and be balanced. Power cannot go to the grid in spurts and falls (appliances would be fried) so it has to be balanced. Excess power, when the turbines actually create energy ('cut-in' speed), has to be 'burned off' as steam in power stations and is not captured. Thus turbines do not actually work at all. Grid power is necessary to start them up, balance the power output, keep the systems running and shut them off.

Turbines contain rechargeable batteries or ultra-capacitors to power their own electrical systems. When these get depleted the power must come from the grid. This is used for:

- Running yaw mechanisms that keeps the blades turned into the wind.
- Blade-pitch controls that meter the spinning rotor.
- Aircraft lights.
- Data collection electronics.
- Oil heaters.
- Heaters in the nacelles.
- Blade heaters to prevent icing. These effect up to 20% of a turbine's rated power.
- Pumps.
- De-humidifiers.
- Coolers for the multi-ton gearbox.
- Hydraulic brakes for locking down blades in high winds.
- Induction generators to create magnetic fields.

The huge amount of power from the grid to keep turbines operative is kept a state secret. It is never discussed. Wind turbines run off 'fossil fuel' or nuclear power stations.

### **Subsidies**

Green activists claim that wind turbines are a cheap form of energy production; this is a barefaced lie. Without government subsidies, paid for by energy customers in their bills, there would be no turbines at all as they are not cost-effective for investment. 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.

In Australia each turbine is subsidised at a cost of \$600-900,000 per year. In Britain the cost is up to £1 million. In a typical field of 50 turbines this annual cost is £50 million. Before any energy is produced (if any) it has cost you £50 million. The offshore Rampion Wind Farm opposite my hometown consists of 116 turbines.

Onshore fields typically pay the landlord or farmer a small lease fee for locating the wind farm. However, the landlord usually carries the risk for damage (e.g. a turbine catching fire and burning a neighbour's property). In Australia farmers are paid \$12,000. In Australia wind subsidies cost the taxpayer \$40 billion per year. This is insanity.

### **Costs<sup>5</sup>**

In 2021 the initial cost of a single wind turbine was up to \$4 million for an averaged sized model.

The 2020 government document detailing the cost of generating electricity from different sources was analysed by specialists and called 'absurd'; especially regarding wind power.

The claim that by 2025 a megawatt of offshore wind capacity would only cost £1.5 million is half of what recent wind farms have cost. Dogger Bank A, due to be commissioned in 2025, has already spent £1.1 million per megawatt in 2023 and it hasn't even finished its foundations. The latest document<sup>6</sup> mysteriously doubled the figure to £3 million. More mysteriously the overall offshore wind cost is lower than the previous edition! This is implausible. Furthermore the claimed output is far lower in actuality than government predictions.

The government's claim that operating costs are £56,000 per lifetime average is preposterous. Recent wind-farms in deep water start at well over £100,000/MW/year. Operating costs also rise steadily as the turbines age. Dogger Bank A is expected to cost £200,000/MW/year.

So, turbines cost millions to manufacture and install. They cost a million each per year in subsidies. They have huge operating costs. The true cost per Megawatt is enormous. Why would any government sponsor such ridiculous projects?

### **Energy production**

- Energy production of all wind farms can be as low as 3% of the national power requirement. Claims of 40% or 50% are just lies.
- Turbines do not work when it is too windy (there is a shut down mechanism to stop the turbine collapsing under pressure) or not windy enough. To get going they require electricity from the grid.

---

<sup>5</sup> NetZeroWatch, Andrew Montford, 'A fairy story about offshore wind costs.', 7 August 2023.

<sup>6</sup> Dept. for Energy Security and Net Zero, Electricity Generation Costs 2023.

- Wind turbines don't work well when it is too cold or too hot – just the times when more electricity is required for cooling or heating.
- In winter, frost covers the blades and the turbine's efficiency levels collapse.
- 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.
- Comparison: 5.5 million turbines are required to equate to one nuclear power station.
- Countries and states that have heavily invested in wind turbines have faced blackouts in a severe winter, such as Texas in 2019 and Germany in 2022.
- People claim that battery back-ups can supply power when turbines do not function. This is preposterous. To provide the necessary battery back-ups to serve when turbines cannot function has a cost equal to the national GDP. Furthermore, there is not enough lithium and cobalt in the world to provide batteries for every country.

### **Aesthetics**

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). They literally form a blight on the landscape.

### **Military**

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.

### **Cost to the ecosystem**

The ecological cost is huge and never discussed by Green activists.

#### *The killing of animals*

The fact is that turbines kill millions of birds, bats and insects. You can find photos of piles of dead birds at the foot of turbines. Worst of all it is the rare raptors<sup>7</sup> that most often fall victim to these killers.

In offshore wind farms, which cover a huge area the base units destroy large areas of the seabed, one of the very things that Green activists protest about.

Offshore wind farms kill and injure cetaceans, that is, whales, dolphins and porpoises. The maiming of cetaceans results from the noise and vibrations underwater caused by the mechanism which damages the highly sensitive sonar and hearing of cetaceans.

#### *Damaging human health*

Turbines create a hum at a frequency that is hazardous for human health. People in the vicinity of turbines have developed insomnia, nosebleeds, headaches, fatigue, nerve damage, migraines, nausea and depression.

#### *The killing of environments*

Just to give but one example of this:

In Scotland the SNP government felled 15.7 million trees to accommodate wind farms since 2000.<sup>8</sup> This was 1,700 trees per day felled by Forestry and Land Scotland. This was

---

<sup>7</sup> A bird of prey, e.g. an eagle, hawk, falcon, or owl.



part of Scotland's Net-Zero plan. The death of a single tree also kills numerous creatures that live on that tree from insects, to bats, to birds, to pine martens.

### **Failures**

- Many turbines have collapsed in strong winds and fell to the ground.
- Turbines have rusted away and fallen apart.
- Some have exploded and caught fire.
- Some have been bent double by high winds.

### **Recycling**

- Turbines only last for as little as ten years. It is claimed they last for 20-25 years but this is hopeful.
- It is very difficult to recycle turbines. They are usually buried in landfill sites. This carries a huge cost of dismantling and transportation.
- Just imagine that in the coming years tens of thousands of turbines need to be hacked to pieces and buried in landfills.

### **Summary**

Wind turbines are a joke; they are a global confidence trick. More fool the nations that adopt them and then find themselves in an energy crisis (such as Germany). 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.

Turbines require huge amounts of national grid power from coal, gas or nuclear power stations in order to function. This is kept secret from the public. When all is taken into account you can make the case that they do not produce any energy at all, or if they do it is only very small amounts. Turbines cannot be the prime source of power for the national grid.

Even if turbines were successful, the huge costs are prohibitive, the environmental damage is highly destructive, the effects on public health are a disgrace, and the killing of animals is a major crime.

The strategy of wind turbines to save the planet is pure hypocrisy. Wind turbines are not free, clean or green.

## **Motoring restricting schemes**

These incorporate various systems such as:

- London's ULEZ (ultra low emission zone) scheme. [Fines levied on older cars that are considered not Green enough. This is most cars on the road.]
- 15-minute cities. [Assigning drivers to certain zones and denying them access to adjacent local zones on pain of a fine. Access is by going out of town, around a circular road system and back into the required zone.]
- Low Traffic Network (LTN) schemes. [Blocking certain roads with huge planters to prevent car access.]

---

<sup>8</sup> The Express, Richard Ashmore, 'Nigel Farage accuses SNP of hypocrisy after 16 million trees felled for wind farms', 6 August 2023.

What these have in common is firstly, targeting motorists for attack, such as by penalising them with fines or secondly, restricting them from access to certain roads. All this is done in the name of sustainability and protecting the planet.

The net result of this is that motorists drive even further to get to their destinations. This creates more fuel use and more pollution. In some cases (as in Oxford) it creates huge traffic jams on the only alternative road systems, which creates huge amounts of extra pollution. In Oxford's Cowley Road, which has road restrictions created by huge planters, the local business which thrived for decades are now closing since drivers cannot get to them.

Thus it can be clearly seen that this hypocrisy proves that the agenda is nothing to do with saving the planet but is all about attacking motorists and driving them to despair. It is also driving small businesses into bankruptcy. The powers that be desire the elimination of public mobility.

This is hypocrisy on a grand scale.

## Electric vehicles<sup>9</sup>

The hypocrisy of the EV dogma is off the scale.

### Construction

- Taken as a whole, the creation of an EV creates more CO<sub>2</sub> emissions than an ordinary car.
- The batteries require the usual rare earth minerals that have a deleterious effect on the environment to mine (see earlier and next).

### EV batteries

- The batteries require child slave labour in developing nations. The open cast mining for lithium and cobalt demands huge amounts of water and removes many tons of toxic waste earth and leaves deep scars in the local geography. The mining for cobalt and lithium requires massive dumping of waste on land areas. [See earlier.]
- The batteries only last a maximum of ten years, often less and cost over £20,000 to replace. They are a Green nightmare.
- The batteries routinely explode due to 'thermal runaway' whereby batteries release temperatures up to 400 degrees C. Insurance companies will not insure your car if it has a ding, because this triggers a later explosion. EV explosions have killed many people worldwide and have even sunk a cargo ship and burned down whole buildings.<sup>10</sup> Any slight damage to the battery housing or battery (e.g. from mounting a kerb) will result in a later explosion. Repairs to these require quarantine of the vehicle 15 metres away from anything and special technical expertise, according to government guidelines. This will increase insurance payments. Battery fires cannot be extinguished by water or foam and continue ejecting flammable material like rockets. All lithium appliances (cell-phones, lap-tops, tablets) have the propensity to explode if the battery is overcharged or damaged and should never be left unattended.

---

<sup>9</sup> Adapted from my paper, 'The Prevailing Insanity'.

<sup>10</sup> Two weeks ago a second cargo container ship was destroyed (but not sunk) by an EV explosion killing a sailor and burning 27 others who jumped into the sea. 3,000 cars were destroyed.

### **EV usage**

- EVs are very expensive.
- The range of EVs is very poor and less than advertised. In cold weather the range is shortened. With a heavy load the range is shortened.
- With rising energy costs supplying the electricity to charge an EV is no longer cost effective.
- EVs cost more to repair, and take longer to repair, than petrol cars.
- EVs have a much greater reduction of re-sale value (depreciation) than petrol cars. For a two-year old Volkswagen mid-range EV the depreciation is over 50%.
- Batteries are so heavy that they damage bridges, car parks and roads.
- The heavy batteries cause EV tyres to create far more pollution than the tyres of petrol cars.

### **Charging**

- There is not enough power in the grid to charge EVs for the whole population.
- Many people cannot charge EVs from their house.
- There are insufficient charging posts on the road system and these are now diminishing due to energy costs.

### **Summary**

The establishment attack on cars and mobility is insane; it makes no sense. The promotion of EVs as the answer to Green problems with cars is utter folly.

This policy worsens civilisation. It makes life worse for the poor. It costs more money. It requires more energy. It causes more pollution. It requires child slave labour. It creates more CO<sub>2</sub>. It causes more threats to life through explosions. The policy is insane and deeply hypocritical.

## **Biomass pellets**

Biomass pellets are processed chunks of wood that are burned for energy production. They are considered sustainable by Green politicians because replacement trees can be grown, This is insane. Instead of burning coal, of which there are plentiful supplies in Britain, trees are cut down and burned and this is supposed to be Green!

Even more insane is that the trees used for biomass pellets are in America. Old trees are chopped down in ancient Virginian forests and then transported by large vehicles to processing plants. Lots of CO<sub>2</sub> expended in this.

At the processing centre the trees are cut into shorter lengths and then pulped to form pellet-sized wood. This is a CO<sub>2</sub> intensive process.

This pellets are packed up and transported on vehicles and taken to the coast. More CO<sub>2</sub>.

The pellets are then transported across the Atlantic Ocean and offloaded in a British port. Huge amounts of diesel expended and more CO<sub>2</sub>.

The pellets are then transported by vehicles to the power plant. More CO<sub>2</sub>.

The pellets are then burned to produce energy, creating masses of CO<sub>2</sub>.

It has been calculated that the amount of CO<sub>2</sub> expended in this crazy process is far more than burning coal to produce energy. No one considers that chopping down trees alone creates additional CO<sub>2</sub> because these trees would have normally been absorbing CO<sub>2</sub> from the air and turning it into oxygen.

This is Green hypocrisy of the highest level. It is literally insane.

## 5G

The rollout of 5G, considered a vital exercise by the same politicians and NGOs that dictate Green policies, have embarked on an anti-Green agenda.

Without analysing the EMF radiation effects of 5G at all, the problems of short distance transmission of 5G telecomm systems requires barriers to the signal to be eradicated. Just erecting lots of 5G antennae and boosters all over the pavements is not enough because thick leaves kill the transmission of high frequency non-ionising transmissions.

This means that thousands of street trees have to be chopped down in order for the 5G signal to penetrate from one mast to another. When 5G was being erected in Sheffield some years ago 5,000 street trees were chopped down to allow the signal chain to work. These were healthy beautiful trees. The council claimed that these trees were a danger to the public and had to be removed. How is it that suddenly 5,000 trees became unhealthy and had to be eradicated? Dying trees in streets are a fairly rare occurrence. Locals denied that these trees were dying. This was done without any consultation of residents. Other town councils began chopping down trees as well, such as Gateshead. Despite this even the Woodland Trust denied the problem and said that it was a conspiracy theory (I asked them personally).

How can Green activists, who claim to love trees, tolerate this tree genocide without a single murmur?

## Green agenda lies and exaggerations: example the BBC

On an almost daily basis the BBC tells sheer lies about climate change issues in order to promote fear of impending planetary doom. Despite having a fact checking, conspiracy theory confrontation, department ('Verify') there is no internal checking mechanism to confront the lies and deception spewing out of the BBC on a continual basis.

Here are some examples of climate alarmism false statements.<sup>11</sup>

- It reported that extreme weather linked to climate change had eroded the sand cliff rock in the Norfolk village of Happisburgh. The British Geological Society stated that these cliffs had been eroding at the present rate for the last 5,000 years.
- It stated that the 2021 Atlantic hurricane season was the third most active on record. Since 1851 there have been 32 years with a higher count of hurricanes.
- Verify stated that hurricanes were getting more powerful. NOAA stated that there is not strong evidence for an increase since the late 1800s.

---

<sup>11</sup> The Daily Sceptic, Chris Morrison, 'A round-up of the BBC's climate howlers of the past 12 months', 6 August 2023. NetZero Watch, Paul Homewood, 'Tall climate tales from the BBC'.

- It reported that bee-eater birds in Norfolk was an unmissable sign that our climate is changing. Bee-eaters have frequently visited England. Between 1793 and 1957 there were 80 sightings.
- It said that city trees were at risk of drought due to climate change. The Met Office stated that there is no evidence that these areas were getting drier.
- It produced a picture of an empty reservoir labelled, '*water levels in rivers, reservoirs and groundwater levels were abnormally low in February (2023)*'. The photograph was actually taken in September 2021 when reservoirs are seasonally low.
- It claimed that heat pumps are much cheaper to run than gas boilers. This is untrue and the BBC's Executive Compliance Unit was finally forced to admit this.
- In summer 2022 it reported that the Pakistan flood submerged a third of the country. This is absurd, as most of Pakistan is mountainous and desert. A subsequent BBC programme, 'More or Less' admitted that the claim was false.

This is a shortlist of very many more howlers.

The BBC makes extreme climate alarmist claims without any challenges, without any evidence and without giving voice to scientists that disagree. Such bias relegates the BBC to an amateur propaganda institution that should be cancelled.

## Conclusion

The Green agenda is clearly hypocritical and irrational nonsense. It is not about sustainability or saving the planet. It is certainly not about improving the human condition since it makes many aspects of life worse; certainly it makes the poor poorer.

It is really about control (as are many other agendas).

The Green project began life as the plans of the Rockefellers in 1956 to gain control of two things:

- Control of the planet's resources.
- Control and reduction of human populations.

This was in order for the Elite cabal to be able to rule the world by introducing new systems of social control. Two key elements are climate alarmism to gain control of natural resources and pandemics to gain control over people and eliminate the undesirables.

The sad thing in these projects has been the ease with which the cabal has been able to get the public to partner with them in their own elimination. The masses are so stupid, so fearful and so open to propaganda that they willingly follow the herd into their own destruction.

It is time to wake up!

## Resources

I have not utilised these sources in this paper other than the Koops article in one section.

- Research, Usman Zafar (Bauhaus Universitat Weimer), 'Literature review of wind turbines', November 2018.
- The American Society of Mechanical Engineers, Ryoichi S Amano, 'Review of wind turbine research in 21<sup>st</sup> century', J Energy Resour, Technol, Sep 2017, 139(5).

- Wiley Online Library, Cuong Dao et. al., ‘Wind turbine reliability data review and impacts on levelised cost of energy’, 10 September 2019.
- Dr Roger W Koops, Brownstone Institute, ‘The rise and rhetoric of the climate Chicken Littles’, 4 August 2023.
- Dr John Etherington, ‘The Wind Farm Scam’ [book].
- James Delingpole, ‘Watermelon’, [book].<sup>12</sup>
- The Daily Sceptic, Chris Morrison, multiple articles on the climate agenda.
- Interview with an unnamed advisor on energy to an Australian Senator.
- YouTube, orlared: ‘Christopher Monckton: New Irish study shows greenhouse gas effect cannot cause global warming’, 25 August 2019.
- YouTube, orlared: ‘The Irish scientists who are debunking climate change alarmism’, 10 September 2019.
- Tony Heller, multiple YouTube videos.
- YouTube, Tony Heller, ‘Is the Global temperature record credible’, 5 November 2018.
- Paul Fahy, ‘Climate change, eugenics, oil and tyranny’.
- Paul Fahy, ‘Synopsis against global warming’.
- Paul Fahy, ‘The fabrications behind climate change’.
- Paul Fahy, ‘Climate change lies’.
- Paul Fahy, ‘The end of climate change doom’ (1 and 2).

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

**Paul Fahy Copyright © 2023**  
**Understanding Ministries**  
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>

---

<sup>12</sup> ‘Watermelon’ refers to climate change policies being green on the outside but Marxist (red) on the inside.