

Advertisement - Opinion

Global Warming - Science or Politics?


Action Needed or Canadians Will Pay Billions

by Bill Bell

I write as one who has spent countless hours reading and writing on the subject of global warming. My first full page article entitled "The Scam of Our Lifetime" appeared in the December 8, 2009 edition of the Calgary Herald and the second "Let us Debate the Scientific Facts" appeared in the Calgary Herald and National Post on November 23, 2011.

Geology – My Profession, My Passion, My Evidence

I write as one who has spent a lifetime working in geology, studying, understanding, exploring and seeing the actual history of this earth. Consequently, when you look at this graph of the last 10,000 years of history, you see that the current talk of global warming is nonsense, though the phrase 'climate change' is accurate. Climate does change – but certainly not much because of humans. Humans didn't start using fossil fuels on any scale until after the Little Ice Age.



Donna Laframboise's book, "The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert" is a masterful expose of the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change), an organization effectively set up by Maurice Strong (who I will talk about in the "Politics" section) to do the bidding of the Club of Rome and the United Nations. The purpose was to make governments follow their dictates; arguing that if the people of the world don't embrace the IPCC approach to manage 'global warming' (allegedly occurring due to the use of hydrocarbons and release of CO₂) that mankind will bring an end to the world. John McLean in an independent review of the IPCC by SPPI (Science & Public Policy Institute) entitled "We Have Been Conned" of August 18, 2010 states the IPCC is a disgrace to the world of science in its desire to fit the square peg of science into the round hole of politics. The IPCC's Summary for Policy Makers (the section your government relies on to set climate change policy) John says, "it is not an honest assessment, but is simply personal opinions. His research shows that the peer review system is a travesty and omits or distorts information to suit its agenda.

Powerful Men with Personal Missions – They never ask you!

In my mind this is the story of a group of men prepared to stop at nothing to accomplish their ends. I can only hope that in condensing this article to fit the space available in the Calgary Herald that I can summarize an almost unbelievable story. I hope it will still convince the Canadian public and key politicians Prime Minister Stephen Harper and Alberta Premier Alison Redford that not one further nickel should be spent on this global warming scam that is far greater than Madoff could ever have envisioned. Far too many Canadians remain oblivious to this crucial issue and have been let down by the deafening silence of our university science professors. Global warming has stopped for 16 years now. I am afraid if the world had experienced another five years of warming the Club of Rome, the United Nations and IPCC might well have pulled off the heist of the century.

The Big Lie of Global Warming

Friends, for years you've been told that the world is warming... supposedly caused by humans using fossil fuels and the attendant emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂). Now "environmentalism," masquerading as a way to "save the planet," is being used as a weapon against fossil fuel rich and industrialized nations and everyone is being forced to comply with the wishes of the UN.

The Facts of Life on Earth

The world is 4.5 billion years old and humans have been around for about 250,000 of those years. It is unconscionable to say that there is catastrophic global warming now or that it is anthropogenic (human caused). Let us go back briefly in the history of the earth. Paleontology is the study of fossils which provide a living record of the past eons. This and similar sciences like astrophysics have allowed us to study the forces involved and how the climate has always been driven by the receipt and distribution of solar energy. Yet global warming believers discount the role of the sun – they dismiss geologist evidence. When discussing global warming they focus only on carbon dioxide (CO₂) as an alleged warming agent, when CO₂ in the atmosphere makes up only 0.001% of the total CO₂ held in the oceans, surface rocks, air, soil and life.

Copenhagen – About to Suck Money from Your Taxpayer's Pockets

Starting in 2020 certain countries, including Canada, are expected to jointly contribute US \$100 billion dollars per year. The so-called richest nations will be forced to contribute the most. If the United Nations can tell us what to do with our money and productivity, we will have lost our sovereignty.

Our time to protest is limited.

Should we be forced to go back to the horse and buggy days?



Resign from the UNFCCC

As I see it, the only possibility is for Canada to resign from the UNFCCC and suffer the consequences. This may be the only way to possibly free Canada from the UN's climate change obligations.

Where it all began...Sweden 1972 & Svante Arrhenius

In 1972 the Swedes were concerned about a 1 degree C rise in temperature that they felt forecast global catastrophe. They based this on the work of a prominent Swedish scientist named Svante Arrhenius. In the 1880's, he and others had developed a theory that more CO₂ would lead to more heat on earth – effectively the 'greenhouse effect'.


Many powerful world figures had already been meeting privately through the Club of Rome. They had developed theories that the earth was running out of energy and resources and that 'someone' should be 'in charge'. The idea that carbon dioxide (CO₂), a gas that each of us breathes out every few seconds, could be a risk to all mankind, was the perfect 'global' reason to interfere in every country's sovereignty. The idea of 'doing good' to 'save the planet' from 'human-caused global warming' was born.

These powerful men, some perhaps true believers in a fearful fate, created the UNFCCC-UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, which then created the IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) – all to study the human-made causes of global warming. Note – natural factors are not their concern!

Some years later as the observed temperatures failed to show the world was warming; the term was slowly shifted to be 'climate change'. Since climate has changed throughout all time, thus they could never be wrong!

Let's see how that benefited the people of Europe who jumped into the climate change 'low carbon' game first. Here's what their electrical rates are today.

Electricity prices Rebased (2005 = 100)



The EU has heavily relied on 'free' wind energy. Look at what it's cost them.

Windmills are noisy, bespoil our landscape, inefficient (need backup when the wind doesn't blow), kill thousands of song birds and based on experience in Europe are a very bad investment without significant subsidization. CO₂ is necessary for life on earth and not harmful. Solar panels certainly have advocates especially where fossil fuels are not readily available, but they are far from an easy answer. Ontario has just added a global adjustment of 8.72 /kWh and wind power now costs 11.5\$/kWh. (FOS Extracts, Sept. 2013)

Was Svante Arrhenius right about Carbon Dioxide – CO₂? No!

After Arrhenius wrote up his first theory, he reviewed it in 1906 and amended it in a paper only book published in Germany wherein he showed that his original calculations were wrong, warming – if any – would be nominal...and pleasant!

A bit of science...

Svante Arrhenius was a true scientist and stated what he knew in his 1896 paper allowing later scientists to scrutinize his work for errors when new information became available. http://www.rsc.org/images/Arrhenius_tcm18-173546.pdf

At the bottom of page 248 in this paper Arrhenius states that there are no measurements made for λ (wavelengths) greater than 9.5µ. CO₂ only has an effect on wavelengths in the band centered on 14.7µ that only ranges from 13µ to 17µ so measurements made up to 9.5µ never included the effect from CO₂ and were entirely due to the effect of water vapour which Arrhenius mistakenly believed to be in part due to CO₂. (GeoCanada 2010 Conference, "The Effect of a doubling of the Concentration of CO₂ in the Atmosphere as Depicted by Quantum Physics", N. Kalmanovich, F.Geoph.)

What about the Scientific Consensus – don't 97% of scientists agree?

No. In 2006, according to AAAS, there were 5.8 million science and engineering researchers. The '97% consensus' studies cite large survey figures like '12,000 scientists surveyed'...but when you drill down you find that they selectively choose 65 scientists and claim 97% of those 65 (1...or 76 out of 79...explicitly agree with the UN definition of 'climate change'. Out of 12,000 surveyed...65 are not 97%...and so on.

Global Warming Whoppers from the Alleged Experts at the IPCC

I quote from the book by Donna Laframboise, an expose of the IPCC ("The Delinquent Teenager Who Was Mistaken for the World's Top Climate Expert") The IPCC compiles the "Climate Bible," which is cited by governments around the world to set policy on matters of global warming and climate change.

The IPCC looks and sounds very professional; thousands of real scientists participate, but what they write is not reflected in the policy reports. Donna found out these are mostly written by agenda driven green activists.

IPCC Climate Bible is driven by green agenda activists, not objective scientists:

- "After a few days of searching, cross-checking, and tabulating here are my findings with respect to the IPCC's 2007 report:
 - 28 out of 44 chapters (two-thirds) included at least one individual affiliated with the WFP
 - 100% of the chapters in Working Group 2 – all 20 of them – included at least 1 WWF-affiliated scientist
 - 15 out of 44 chapters (one-third) were led by WWF-affiliated scientists – their coordinating lead authors belong to the panel
 - in three instances, chapters were led by two WWF-affiliated coordinating lead authors"

WWF (World Wildlife Fund)

The WWF claim to seek solutions to what they believe are our most pressing environmental problems such as saving the polar bears and preventing oil and gas exploration. They, along with Pollution Probe, were in the camp of the influential Maurice Strong at the Stockholm Conference and the Rio Summit and the WWF contributed millions from raised donations.

Global Warming Whopper # 1 – IPCC forgets to verify temperature data

John Holden, Club of Rome member and the science czar to president Obama and apparently retired when he appeared on CBC on Aug. 6, 2013, had already informed all potential readers "The IPCC conclusions are the result of the most thorough review of a scientific topic ever conducted" but Donna says, "The IPCC hadn't even bothered to verify temperature data on which so much of the climate science rests."

Global Warming Whopper #2 – The Hockey Stick graph inexplicably excludes historic warming and cooling periods

The hockey stick was one of the main profs of global warming put forward by the IPCC. Steve McIntyre and Ross McKittrick, two Canadians, reran the statistical simulations and exposed the fact that the highs of the Medieval Warm Period, and the lows of the Little Ice Age, had been left out! Once included...the sharp uptick of the "hockey stick" disappeared. And so did the IPCC's main pillar of 'catastrophic' anthropogenic (human-caused) global warming.

Global Warming Whopper #3 – Islands Drowning...Oh really?

Yes, and the IPCC maintained entire islands were in danger of disappearing below the sea. Dr. Morner, former head of the geodynamics at the University of Stockholm organized five international meetings to show sea level unlikely to increase by more than 10cm by the year 2100 and IPCC claims were simply untrue.

Global Warming Whopper #4 – Vanishing Himalayan Glacier...oops, they just made that up

I will touch on the IPCC with one last example, the Himalayan glacier. The IPCC had it vanishing by 2035, but they could cite only a single source, The World Wildlife Fund. The WWF got its information from the magazine New Scientist. New Scientist said it got its information from a single glacial expert Syed Iqbal Hasmain, a little known Indian scientist "who said he pulled the number out of the air."

Ice

The IPCC argues the decrease of ice mass and decreasing snow cover especially north of 65° correlate with the rising surface air temperature but a second organization, the Non Governmental Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) (Idso and Stringer 2009) contend many of the findings of the IPCC were incorrect as the result of cherry picking and misrepresentation (Climate Change Reconsidered, 2011 Interim Report 89). In fact arctic ice mass has rebounded 60%.

Can you believe your governments in Alberta and Canada rely on the IPCC "Climate Bible" when deciding to spend billions of dollars of YOUR money on climate change measures, while undertaking no independent due diligence

So - Why does anyone listen to the likes of Al Gore, David Suzuki and James Hansen?

People have been scared by claims that the earth will heat up and we will all die. Many scientists have tried to give a more balanced picture of climate science, but they were publicly mocked, run out of their jobs, or had their research funding cut off. Yet a few still speak up.

I am thick skinned, but have a long memory. I recall Dr. David Mayne Reid, a professor of biology at the U of Calgary asks in a Calgary Herald article (July 20, 2009) "Why do so many not accept climate change data?" Then he wrote, "We are blocked by fear, by genetics, selfishness, ignorance, misinformation and we are listening to propaganda paid for by oil companies." Next time maybe he will really tell us what he thinks.

It is clear, however, that there are divergent views on the subject of global warming. I reference a group at the U of C called ISEEE (Institute for Sustainable Energy and Environment) which specializes in the capture of CO₂. They refuse to debate or explain their presence on the University of Calgary campus. Dr. David Keith, their leader in 2009, stressed, "Carbon emissions from burning fossil fuels are heating the planet." I was hoping to see a scientific debate on this at the U of C while Kevin Trenberth, a lead author of the IPCC was visiting the ISEEE, but to me, he along with Keith made it clear they believe debating is only an advantage to the opposing side. (Email, Climategate Keeping Collection, Trenberth to McIntyre, Dec. 22, 2009)

Then a pamphlet arrives in the mail telling me Mr. Keith has been made president of a new company to develop the technology to capture CO₂ and with a three million dollar angel investment. The pamphlet stated the market for carbon capture technology could reach one billion dollars per year in twenty years.

This is an oil and gas province, but the U of C seems oblivious to the billions generated and distributed by the oil industry which allows Alberta to be a strong participant in the provincial funds equalization system. From my knowledge the IPCC and ISEEE remain very closely involved.

I find it very hard to accept that Alberta's CCEMC (Climate Change and Emissions Management Fund) is already spending billions of dollars and getting ready to spend another 6.9 billion on the advice of the IPCC without apparent due diligence by any other science group.

I look in the mirror and wonder why I want to contribute well over 100 hours to try to enlighten people on global warming with no pay when not a single paid person from the CCEMC, the ISEEE or apparently other university science professors from across Canada put a pen to paper.


Friends we don't really know what it will cost Canada on an annual basis to participate in the UN proposed anthropogenic global warming exercise, but we can be sure it will cost each of us far more than we expected to make in our lifetime.

The alarming predictions persisted, and on November 9, 2012 the current Secretary General of the United Nations, Ban Ki-Moon, stated to the General Assembly, "Extreme weather due to climate change is the new normal - our challenge remains clear and urgent: to reduce greenhouse gas emissions - we should waste no more time on this debate."

Scientists Speak Up – No Global Warming in 16 years

Fortunately some scientists of the world responded and 125 scientists, including Canadian scientist Tim Ball, in an open letter to Ban Ki-Moon on November 29, 2012 stated, "We the undersigned, qualified in climate and related matters, wish to state that current scientific knowledge does not substantiate your assertions." (National Post, November 30, 2012 FP11.) As further proof they reference the UK Met office, "There has been no statistically significant global warming for almost 16 years." At the same time the NOAA (the United States National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration) stated, "CO₂ concentrations rose by nearly 9% to now constitute 0.039% of the atmosphere," and further states, "Global warming has not occurred and cannot have caused the extreme weather of the past few years." Climate changes naturally all the time, sometimes dramatically, but the incidence and severity of extreme weather has not increased."

Global Surface Temperature & Climate Model Projection



The NOAA goes on to admit no warming has occurred for 16 years and most importantly states, "the reduction of CO₂ emissions are unlikely to exercise any significant influence on future climate" (Financial Post article of Nov. 29, 2013).

The Natural Science of Climate Change

Let us talk very briefly about true science as the cause of global climate change, and not something that requires fear mongering to sell it to the public who have been frightened to death. Much discussion continues with a suite of real world natural phenomenon receiving consideration which involve ocean - atmosphere - land interactions. The heat store of the oceans is undergoing new study especially with the inception of the ARGO global network in 2004 which involves more than 3,000 drifting and drifting robotic ocean probes providing data. Much work is also being carried out on ENSO (El Niño Southern Oscillation) and on LaNiña events and their effect on climate. The earth's tilt is important for the rotation around the tilt results in our seasons with increased tilt giving warmer summers and colder winters. Important too is the earth's wobble, which places the earth at varying distances from the sun.

It's The Sun!

Most importantly, it's the sun and cosmic influences, not CO₂. The sun has provided the energy for everything on earth since life began, including being the greater influence modifying its climate. Humans using hydrocarbons have advanced our way of life, transporting us from the cave and spear to comfortable homes where we can cook our food over reliable fires and travel with ease.

The Sun's Magnetic Flux

The sun's magnetic flux operates in cycles. Evidence of solar activity is seen in sunspots that have been observed for over 400 years. The measure of the sun's energy as total irradiance (TSI) has only been recorded for thirty years. Earth's climate is affected by solar cycles. Low sunspot activity historically predicts cooling periods as from 1645-1715 (The Maunder Minimum or Little Ice Age) or from 1800-1830 (The Dalton Minimum, another very cold period). The warming of the last half of the 20th century showed much higher sunspot activity than the previous 200 years reaching a maximum of 162 in 1980, since when it has declined progressively to 153 in 1990, 112 in 2010 and is now at an unprecedented low of 60, a very strong indication that the climate will cool in coming decades. Such a solar minimum has not been seen since the Dalton Minimum in the early 19th Century. Rather than global warming, we should be concerned about global cooling for we could have crop failure, famine and starvation! ("Here Comes the Sun", Dr. Neil Hutton, one of ten articles, May 2000) <http://solarscience.msfc.nasa.gov/predict.shtml>

Researchers into solar effects on climate receive less funding than that of 'climate change' – so this has created a funding 'hand-gang' in science – \$\$\$ only if your topic is human-caused 'climate change'.

Cosmic Rays, Not Humans or CO₂, Have a Greater Influence on Climate Svensmark and other solar researchers, especially CERN (European Organization for Solar Research) under Dr. Jasper Kirby with 62 researchers, persisted in the laboratory and showed the nucleation of clouds by cosmic rays increases cloud cover. Cosmic rays have a dramatic effect on climate change. Added to this is the explosion of supernovae every 50 years in the Milky Way galaxy. Work continues by Berner, Geocarball, Kathvala, Streif, Rothman and others that indicated that CO₂ cannot have a significant role in climate variability over geologic time scales.

Alberta fell for "Climate Change" – fell...or was pushed!

It seems that in 2007 the Alberta government passed regulations which they say were to encourage a "lower carbon" future. Apparently all Alberta companies that annually produce more than 100,000 tonnes of greenhouse gas emissions are legally required to reduce their greenhouse gas intensity by 12% so that Alberta could reach its provincial emission reductions goals. Companies have three options to meet their reduction target: improve efficiency of their operations, buy carbon credits in the Alberta based offset system, or pay \$15.00 into the Climate Change and Emissions Management Fund (CCEMC) for every tonne over the reduction limit. The CCEMC supposedly invests the money in technology. It apparently is in its fourth year and is now involved in close to \$1 billion dollars of active projects. CCEMC proclaims it supports Alberta's energy future.

Carbon is a novel commodity – "...one whose value resides entirely in the promise of its absence." Mark Schapiro, Harper's Feb. 2010

Fellow Albertans, if the \$1 billion dollars of current projects doesn't bother you, you may choke a little when I tell you that Kirk Andries, managing director of the CCEMC, says, "56.9 billion dollars will be spent in Alberta between 2010 and 2014 on clean technology", during which time Andries says, "the province is going to be pushing regulation for major industry." (Calgary Herald, June 6, 2012.)

The Cost of Hot Air Goes Up – when Unaccountable, Unelected ENGOs Interfere

Unbelievably an environment coalition consisting of the Sierra Club, the Athabasca Chipewyan First Nations, and the Council of Canadians, and Greenpeace in a letter to our Premier Alison Redford requested that she put in place a carbon price of \$150 per tonne by 2020. (Calgary Herald, April 19, 2013 - A7)

Friends, I ask all Canadians to write your Member of Parliament asking they join with the 125 scientists who protested this "Junk Science" of 'global warming' to Ban Ki-Moon. Let's use Canadian influence to have all proposals of Kyoto and Copenhagen abandoned.

In Alberta I ask that you write your elected representative in Edmonton to immediately abandon all references to the reduction of CO₂ (other than for secondary or tertiary recovery of oil) Let the oil and gas industry move on to producing oil and gas, without the impediment of unnecessary CO₂ penalties.

Alberta's crisis flooding precludes this waste of money on a non-existing problem

Now with Canada's energy capital, Calgary, burdened by recovery from severe flooding and other communities in need of disaster relief, can we justify spending a penny on carbon reduction schemes or carbon capture?

Be Global Leaders on Common Sense and Qualitative Science

We do believe if Canada cuts off funding as agreed at Copenhagen then other countries would follow. It makes no sense to spend billions of dollars on a non-existent problem.

Politics

A brief look at the political side of global warming is essential to understand the enormity of the problem. We start with the Club of Rome formed in 1968 as an elite think-tank by people claiming they shared a common concern for the future of humanity and included names such as Ehrlich, Bolin, Holden, Strong and many others. These were socialist dreamers worried about increasing pollution, malnutrition and depletion of non renewable resources. However, it seems they were more concerned about eliminating people than increasing productivity. We pay special attention to Mr. Maurice Strong, a Canadian known best to us as the point man for Prime Minister Trudeau at the time of our National Energy crisis. Strong served as undersecretary general of the UN to U. Thant in 1972 and ran the Stockholm Conference where a one degree increase in temperature provided the excuse to allow Strong to gather environmentalists, climatologists and political activists to form what later became known as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change or IPCC. These were people already involved with the UN through associated organizations WMO (World Meteorological Organization), United Nations Environmental Programme) and ICSU (International Conference of Scientific Unions).

Mr. Strong, with only a grade 11 education, had spent his entire life working himself into a position of power and thus achieved the infrastructure and the power to move toward his dream of a World Government at the United Nations. Strong served as president of Petro Canada, YMCA Canada and Power Corporation. He created CIDA (The Canadian Development Agency) and he helped Pearson form the Company of Young Canadians. He was a director of the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation (Dewar, p.275-277), generated wealth by participating in several public and private companies, raised much charitable money, helped save the lives of thousands starving in Africa (Dewar p.293) and along the way earned 35 honorary degrees. Strong and other Club of Rome members had a vision of solving world problems through the United Nations, but if one expects all humanity to contribute billions to solve a questionable global warming problem surely better evidence must be found than just to blame it on burning fossil fuels. At the time of the Rio Conference Strong met with his own group in Geneva and they concluded that, to get underdeveloped countries side to put the world on course for sustainable development, they would need technology transfers, improved terms of trade, forgiveness of debt, funds transfer, etc. requiring \$125 billion dollars per year moving from the more developed to less developed countries. (Cloak of Green, Elaine Dewar, p.178-184.)

No, the IPCC was not put in place to find a cause of the one degree temperature increase, but rather to prove the increase was anthropogenic. The UN needed a cause they could tax. They immediately chose the burning of hydrocarbons with the release of CO₂ emissions. Strong had tied up many of the available scientists. The universities with their unions showed little interest in other climate science studies especially with much of the funding already committed. "Low-carbon" became an international catch word.

The Stockholm Conference was followed by the Villach Conference, a series of meetings chaired by the fifth Club of Rome member Mr. Bolin. Bolin followed up with a 500 page report using the communicative logic of the military trenches with the verbiage such as "our last chance to save humanity and prevent global climate catastrophe." (Mike Hulme, "Why we disagree about climate change" pg.1-392.) Then we have Gro Harlem Brundtland, the UN special envoy on climate change and former Prime Minister of Norway, who in a 2007 speech before the UN, "The report by the IPCC is clear. It is irresponsibly reckless and deeply immoral to question the seriousness of the situation" (Sintef, Emily Roykriv pg.1-82.)

Sorry Prime Minister, but you are wrong. Scepticism is fundamental to science and the suppression of contrary ideas is probably more dangerous to society than global warming.

The Rio Declaration

Next on the agenda was the UN Earth Summit in June of 1992. It was again chaired by Maurice Strong (known as the Rio Declaration) with the message "Agenda 21." This summit reflected the views of Maurice Strong namely, "that poverty as well as excessive consumption by affluent populations places damaging stress on the environment. (Mike Hulme, "Why we disagree about climate change" pg.1-392.) Strong took the platform to sell a global environmental crisis and global government agenda. His argument was "that to have clean air and stable climate environment then we would have to accept diminishment of national sovereignty to get the causes cured."

The Rio Conference led to the Kyoto Protocol being signed in 1997. The US, China and India did not commit to any greenhouse gas reductions. Canada had a target, but compliance was weak. Copenhagen was initiated in 2004 and chaired by Bjorn Lomborg who argued it would be better to invest in health care and poverty than mitigating climate change. Canada signed onto the Copenhagen Consensus by the end of 2009 and by January 2010 had set our greenhouse gas emissions target at a 17% reduction from 2005 to be in place by 2020. I must remind you that just before the 2009 signing Gordon Brown, Prime Minister of the UK, told the Guardian magazine, "We know what we must do", while his environment Minister Ed Milliband describes sceptics as saboteurs. The pressure was maintained.

Your Money Committed to a Dubious Cause - \$3.6 BILLION

By various agreements between 2010 and 2012 Canada pledged a total of \$ 3.6 billion towards various greenhouse gas reductions and at COP18 (18th meeting of the conference of parties) at Qatar in 2012 focused on negotiations toward a COP19 meeting where all parties would agree to major commitments where Canada and other countries from the public, private and alternative sources would work toward further meetings and pathways for mobilizing \$100US billion per year by 2020. (Canada Action, January 23, 2013)

Mr. Strong made sure his voice was constantly being heard and agenda persisted. I quote from the opening speech of the 1993 Rio Earth Summit, "Isn't the only hope of the planet that the industrialized nations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring this about?" Readers, there has ever been a more socialistic statement and never did we hear the UN ask for a retraction! The words of Strong were questioned by Elaine Dewar as she interviewed him for her book, "Cloak of Green" (1995). Dewar asked Strong during the interview how he was going to collapse the industrial nations; was he going into politics? He replied, "Politics won't do it. I will go to the United Nations where I can raise my own money from whomever I like, appoint everyone we wanted, and control the agenda." He told her, "I have more unfettered power than a cabinet minister in Ottawa." (Elaine Dewar, "Cloak of Green" pg.278.) He told Dewar he wanted a tax on the movement of every barrel of oil with funds to create a large UN bureaucracy. (pg.279) He also said we recommend there be a kind of tax in dealing with climate change. The tax would be levied in the cause of world government, but in not too long a time world government would definitely happen. (pg.294) The Maurice Strong quote can be examined from many blogs searchable on the internet suggesting fear is being used to make people subservient to government.

Brave New World of Climate Change Fear

These thoughts first emanated from Aldous Huxley, Brave New World, 1946, with his plan to depopulate the planet - a Higelaean Dialect - create a problem - cause a reaction - offer a solution. This was picked up by the Club of Rome with pollution used as the unifying force, the threat of global warming, water shortage and famine. It seems pretty clear that global warming was fabricated by human intervention. The fear apparently was population growth. They did not choose a practical route like by increasing food production and re-establishing a balance between birth rate and death. A search using Google shows that many well known people proposed a new world order of depopulation with some wishing the wrong people would be prevented from breeding such as degenerates while others promoted planned parenthood. Agenda 21 of Maurice Strong was, among other things, a new world order also with a plan to depopulate the planet.

Clearly all freedom loving people of this world must take every action possible to defy this idea of anthropogenic climate change for it appears to be little more than a tool of the UN to push through a left-leaning world government. This will cause the loss of our sovereignty and cost us billions of dollars, not to mention creating a mechanism to interfere with world population and the carbon cycle.

China – Global Polluter can Choose Coal or Shale Gas

China in various articles has been accused of being a major contributor to global warming because of the emission of CO₂ from burning coal, but that would require a belief in global warming. Yes the use of coal has increased dramatically and the pollutants associated with CO₂, such as carbon monoxide, nitric oxide, nitrogen dioxide, sulphur dioxide and especially PM-10 (particulate matter) have resulted in many deaths, but unfortunately much of Chinese coal is of poor quality emitting much sulph