

The Global Warming Hoax

by Neil Hamley (updated Feb. 2020, www.spiritualityandsoul.com)

Introduction

The idea of global warming caused by increased emissions of carbon dioxide from human activity is a hoax which gains strength from drawing on both some of the worst in human nature, our gullibility and fears, and some of the best, our love and compassion for the planet, for each other, and life generally. It is a malevolent deception perpetrated by those who wish to gain increasing control and power over this beautiful world. The deception is really twofold: create a false problem, namely that the world is in an acute environmental crisis due to man-made or anthropogenic global warming; and then, create a false solution, namely, a whole range of international, national and sub-national measures to ‘rescue’ the planet and its inhabitants, but which actually brings the world under the increasing control of those who have instigated and who perpetrate the deception. Who are these people? The answer begins by appreciating that the countries of the world have a collective debt estimated to be around \$240 trillion dollars; the US alone has a debt of \$22 trillion. Ultimately, this debt is owed to mega, transnational private banks, more specifically, to the owners of these banks. When people are in debt, if they care about their survival and quality of life, they are under the control of those to whom the debt is owed and who, at any time, may close off the supply of money or credit. Exactly the same principle operates for countries or national governments. This is to say that most of the senior politicians throughout the world are more or less knowingly servants, sycophants and slaves of the world bankers who control the economies of their countries through debt. At the economic level, the world is largely controlled or enslaved to the mega-bankers, and it is these people and their dark associates who are ultimately perpetrating the man-made global warming hoax and its attendant ‘solutions’ to further their various agendas in the vain attempt to satiate their insatiable lust for power. One reason why many of us are fooled by the global warming hoax is that we simply do not have the time (or energy) to devote to studying the issue of global warming in any depth, and so our default position is to rely upon so-called authorities—governments, scientists and academics. Many, perhaps most of us have known for some time that most senior politicians (government) are more or less corrupt, but we may not suspect that a great deal of corruption has also entered into our scientific and educational institutions. This corruption, but also, as stated, our fears and our love for life help drive the great global warming hoax. This paper then is offered to assist those who are time deficient and need a concise and insightful overview of the truth about the global warming hoax.

1. A Scientific Consensus?

It is often said that 97% of scientists believe in anthropogenic or man-made global warming. But where is the evidence? At times two studies have been adduced as evidence. The first is a 2009 study conducted by Kendall Zimmerman, a Master of Science student at the University of Illinois, and her supervisor Peter Doran. The data used for this study was from a two-part on-line questionnaire. The first point of note is that only about 5% or 160 of the 3,200 or so scientists surveyed were *climate* scientists. Second, based on the responses to the survey, only a very small subset of 79 scientists was used in the final analysis—something which violates any sound and integrous methodology and, no doubt, which radically skewed the conclusion of the study. Answers/responses from *all* of the scientists should have been included in the study. It was this *small* and *selected* group of 79 scientists which agreed that global temperatures had generally risen since 1800, and that human activity is a “significant *contributing* factor.” (My italics.) Another study which is often used to justify the figure of a 97% consensus of scientists was that conducted by John Cook, Climate Communications Fellow from the Global Change Institute, at the University of Queensland. It was published in the *Journal of Environmental Research Letters* in May 2013. This study was based on a review of the abstracts of some 12,000 articles related to global warming. The original data and related methodology of the study were later attained and *independently* scrutinised—they were both shown to be deeply flawed. For example, David Legates, a professor at the University of Delaware, who formerly headed the university’s Center for Climatic Research, found that only 41 of the 11,944 abstracts actually and *explicitly* stated that

humans were the cause of at least 50% of the increase in global warming. This meant that of all the scientists associated with the writing of these articles only 0.3% believed—based on the review of the abstracts—that global warming was at least 50% manmade! Other serious flaws in the research included: the sample of 12,000 papers was selected without trying to be representative of the area of climate change; 675 articles were reviewed in just 72 hours—not something that is possible to do in any thorough way; and papers where the authors had no position on global warming were *omitted* from the final results. Cook himself later admitted that his data was not good. [9; 20].

A peer-reviewed study entitled *Science or Science Fiction? Professionals' Discursive Construction of Climate Change*, and published in November 2012 in the academic journal *Organisation Studies*, showed that only 36% of geo-scientists and geo-engineers believed that global warming is due to man, and that ‘a strong majority of the 1,077 participants said that “nature is the primary cause of recent warming and/or that future global warming will not be a very serious problem.” [21].

The main agencies concerned with collecting and analysing world temperature data are the North American Space Agency (NASA), the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) which is part of NASA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the UK Met Office's Hadley Centre along with the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) of University of East Anglia. In 2012, 49 former NASA scientists sent a letter to NASA and the Goddard Institute for Space Studies (GISS) which stated that these two organisations should *not* be saying that increased carbon causes global warming while ignoring the empirical evidence to the contrary. The group, which included seven Apollo astronauts and two former directors of NASA's Johnson Space centre in Houston, also part of NASA, were dismayed over the failure of NASA, and specifically GISS, to make an objective assessment of all the available scientific data on climate change. They charged that NASA was relying too heavily on complex climate models that have proven scientifically *inadequate* in predicting climate only one or two decades in advance. [5]. In due course we shall see just how wrong these models have repeatedly been.

There are many prestigious organisations around the world which support the position that most of the global warming in recent decades is manmade, including NASA, NOAA, the Australian Bureau of Meteorology, CSIRO, and the Australian Meteorological and Oceanographic Society (the Australian Geological Society has withdrawn from this position). But it is important to remember that the positions of these organisations are not necessarily based on the expert views of the scientists within them but on the views of the executives on their boards. That is to say, that we have what is primarily a *political* or *administrative* consensus and not a scientific consensus. Furthermore, we shall see in due course irrefutable evidence that many of these institutions, at least as far as global warming is concerned, have become corrupted.

A final point: science is not determined by consensus. The foundation of science is not consensus but conclusions founded on empirical evidence, in particular the evidence attained through controlled, repeatable experiments. Even if there were a consensus among scientists that global warming is being caused through increased carbon dioxide emissions from human activity, and even if this were based on the empirical evidence to date, this would not be the end of the research or the final scientific position. Science has no end, no final; it is an open-ended endeavour; the conclusions of science are always subject to change based on further experimentation and evidence. As Einstein stated: “No amount of experimentation can ever prove me right; a single experiment at any time may prove me wrong.” And those who wish to shut down debate on the issue of global warming on the basis that there is now no more time for debate are simply and *already assuming* that recent global warming is due to human activity and is a fact, and also that the warming is so extreme that we no longer have any time left for debate.

2. The History of Climate Change

Historical data shows that the Earth's temperature has fluctuated greatly over its long history, where this evidently could not be man-made. Geological research, in particular, the evidence attained from ice and

earth cores, shows conclusively that the Earth's climate including carbon dioxide levels have fluctuated greatly during the 4.25 million years when there has been life on this planet. I will return to the ancient past later in this paper, but for now I would like to focus on more recent history.

In 2007 Craig Loehle produced a research paper entitled *A 2000-Year Global Temperature Reconstruction Based On Non-treeing Proxies*. The study used climate data relating to 18 different indicators of climate change, other than tree rings, to map the Earth's temperature over the last 2000 years. (Tree rings tend to be a poor barometer of climate change.) This data came from 752 scientists working in 442 separate research institutions in 41 countries. The data showed that the Earth's temperature has fluctuated greatly over time. In particular, from around 950/1000AD to 1250/1300AD temperatures across the world were much warmer than now—between 0.15 and 3.2 degrees Celsius warmer depending on the region. This is known as the Medieval Warm Period. This period was followed by a mini-ice age from around 1550-1700 AD—known as the Maunder Minimum. Since then, there has been a significant *and gradual* warming, or re-warming of the planet. The estimates vary between 0.5 to 0.9 degrees Celsius. [26, 25].

What has been happening recently? The average global temperature is now constructed from three main data sets: two data sets are from satellite systems, namely, the RSS or Remote Sensing Systems data set produced by a private research firm in California, and also the UAH data set from the University of Alabama, Huntsville; while the third data set is from NASA and GISS using data collected from *ground-based* sites. Satellites measure an average temperature over a fairly deep layer of the atmosphere, from the surface up to ten kilometres in altitude. Satellites are probably the most accurate for assessing global and regional trends in temperature because their readings require less adjustment than surface readings—such as the GISS data set—and the ground-based or surface readings are affected by what is called the Urban Heating Island effect (UHI). This is where city infrastructure (metal and concrete etc.) releases heat during the night to distort temperature measurements. UHI cannot yet be properly separated from temperature readings. [28 p. 186]. In a warming world the deeper layer of the atmosphere which satellites are measuring is predicted to warm faster than the lower atmosphere. However, *the satellite data reveals that global temperature has almost plateaued since 1997/8*. [4; 2; 28 p. 181]. Based on this data, in October 2012 the UK Met Office's Hadley Centre reported that there had been *no* global warming since 1997. [25]. This plateau in temperature was briefly broken during 2015-16 with the arrival of an El Nino warm event, but then rapidly cooled again. During this period—1997 to 2015—there was not exactly a plateau but an increase in temperature by 0.14 degree Celsius. [28 p. 181-2]. British journalist and science writer Matt Ridley stated that based on the satellite data sets, the most accurate, there has been an increase in temperature of 0.12 degrees Celsius *per decade* up to 2019. [17]. (Satellite data began in 1979.) It is this lack of actual global warming which has in part prompted the shift in nomenclature from 'global warming' to 'climate change', a more, in fact, all-embracing term. In his paper *The Advantages of Satellite-Based Regional and Global Temperature Modelling*, Dr Roy Spencer—Principal Research Scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville—shows that since 1998 there has been a progressive divergence, on the one hand, between the temperature trend based on the raw/actual satellite data, and on the other hand, the predicted temperature trend averaged from 102 climate models. 95 to 97% of the models *overestimate* the warming trend. This divergence he believes might be due to feedback processes in the models which “are included in the models in rather crude and approximate ways.” [28 p. 182]. Whereas the satellite data shows and predicts an approximately 0.3-degree temperature rise between 1979 and 2025, the climate models, on average, predict an approximately 0.9-degree temperature rise for the same period. [28 p. 183]. We shall see shortly that this divergence between the climate models and the actual climate, reality, as recorded by the satellites, is not merely due to the inadequacy of the models but also to deliberate manipulation of the data to give the appearance of global warming—in short, corruption.

3. The Deceitful Manipulation of the Climate Data

As noted, the main agencies concerned with collecting and analysing the data on global warming are NASA, GISS, which is part of NASA, NOAA, and the UK Met Office's Hadley Centre along with the Climatic Research Unit (CRU) of University of East Anglica. In particular, analysed weather data from these

agencies informs the International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the United Nation's peak body on climate change information and advice. Unfortunately, in recent years these institutions have *consistently* provided *misleading* information on global warming. In short, they have taken the raw data of the RSS, UAH and GISS data sets, which show virtually no global warming over the last two decades, and using various models, consistently *revised* and *adjusted* this data, retrospectively, to show a cooler past and a warmer recent period. This misleading manipulation of the data is exposed in some detail by James Corbett in his video entitled *Orwell's Nightmare: Temperature Adjustment and Climate Change*. In particular, Corbett focuses on the manipulation of the RSS satellite data set from 1980 to 2016. He points out that the adjustments by NASA, NOAA and Hadley-CRU to this data set prior to 1998 were minimal but, after 1998 significant adjustments were made. He asks why did the raw data of the satellites need so much adjusting by NASA, NOAA and Hadley-CRU after, but not before, 1998? Did something go wrong with the satellites after 1998? Prior to these adjustments there was no little or no temperature rise between 1998 and 2016, and overall from 1980 to 2016 only a slight temperature increase. But, after the adjustments to the RSS data set by NASA, NOAA and Hadley-CRU there was *now* a 2.4 times larger increase in temperature (or 140% faster rise in temperature) *after* 1998 than *before* 1998, and overall, there was *now* a *significant* increase in temperature from 1980 to 2016. [2]. 'Incidentally', Neither NOAA or NASA publish charts showing actual measured temperatures; all have been adjusted in some way. [28 p. 98]. Some adjustments to data always have to be made to account for errors in collection. (Some of the types of adjustment are discussed a little later.) The question is, 'Are the adjustments by NASA, NOAA and Hadley-CRU, deriving from the models that these agencies are using, a valid representation of reality?'

In June 2017 meteorologist Joe D'Aleo, climate scientist Craig Idso, and statistician James Wallace completed a study entitled *On the Validity of NOAA, NASA and Hadley CRU Global Average Surface Temperature Data and the Validity of Hadley CRU CO2 Endangerment Findings*. This peer-reviewed study was signed off by a number of scientists, university bodies, and various officials including the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in the US. This study looked at the official adjustments in various studies made by NOAA, NASA and Hadley-CRU to the global average surface temperature (GAST). The researchers found that the temperatures had been consistently adjusted to always make the past appear cooler and the present warmer to thereby 'show' global warming. Further, they found that these adjustments accounted for *nearly all* the claimed warming trend. The researchers summarised their conclusions: 'Nearly all of the warming they are now showing is in the adjustments.... The conclusive findings of this research are that the three GAST sets [i.e. the adjusted data on global average surface temperature from NOAA, NASA and Hadley CRU] are not a valid representation of reality. In fact, the magnitude of their historical data adjustments, that removed the cyclical temperature patterns, are totally inconsistent with the published and credible U.S. and other temperature data.' (My interpolation.) [23]. In short, some people in NOAA, NASA and Hadley-CRU are massaging the data to make it appear as though global warming is occurring when the main sets of data are showing that this is not the case.

How these agencies adjust the temperature and climate data is a big topic, but we may gain some appreciation of it by looking at the work of NOAA and GISS in their calculation of surface temperature in the US. In his paper *Creating a False Warming Signal in the US Temperature Record*, Anthony Watts—a certified television meteorologist, and founder of the world's most viewed climate website, *Watts Up With That*—explains how NOAA and GISS adjust surface temperature data collected across the US in a way which *artificially raises* the collective surface temperature readings. [28 pp. 75-91]. The three types of temperature adjustment he focuses upon are homogenisation of the data, infilling data gaps, and what is actually a non-adjustment where a phenomenon called urban heating island effect (UHI) is effectively ignored. These three adjustments work together to artificially raise the collective surface temperature readings. The essential problem is as follows. The concrete, brick and metal structures characteristic of the urban landscape retain heat and then release it, especially at night, to raise local air temperatures. This is called the urban heating island effect (UHI). About 90% of the locations where surface temperature data in the US is collected have now become surrounded by urban landscapes and so, the temperature readings they are now recording are *artificially higher* due to UHI. However, this artificial warming is *not* being adjusted *out* of the temperature readings, but rather, neglected by both GISS and NOAA. Now, there are some

temperature stations which are not affected by the UHI effect and which give accurate temperature readings, and Watts states that we should look to these to give accurate temperature readings, especially over time. However, here further adjustment problems enter. Overall, there are some gaps in the data collected which need to be infilled. Also, there are non-climatic discontinuities to data caused by things such as changes to weather/temperature collection stations or equipment. These two problems—infill and discontinuities—are dealt with by a process called data homogenisation. In this process the missing or faulty or suspect data from a collection location i.e. weather station, is homogenised with the temperature data from 40 surrounding data collection locations/stations to give an overall or homogenised temperature for all 41 stations. However, we must remember that in this process the artificially high temperature readings from the majority (90%) of collection stations, caused by the urban heating island effect, are being merged with the lesser number of accurate readings from the collection locations/stations which are not affected by the urban heating island effect; and the consequence is that the higher and artificial temperatures from the majority of locations affected by the urban heating island effect are homogenised with the far fewer accurate readings to thereby give higher collective surface temperatures for the US.

In accord with the global warming hoax, agencies like NOAA and GISS are adjusting data to show a significant increase in US temperature, particularly in recent decades, but what is the truth? In their paper *It was Hot in the US—in the 1930s*, published in 2017, Tony Heller and Jennifer Marohasy looked at the raw, non-adjusted, temperature data for the US. They found that since the 1930s the average percent of days reaching 35 degrees Celsius has nearly halved; the area of the US affected by hot weather has decreased, whereas during the 1930s almost 90% of weather stations would reach 35 degrees Celsius this was down to just over 70% in 2016; that 1936 was the hottest US summer on record; and that the 1930s was the hottest decade in the US in recent history. James Hansen was a former director of GISS. In 1999 an article of which he was the main author reported that from the mid-1930s to 1998 the US *cooled* by 0.5 degree Celsius. Regarding this latter trend the article stated: “in the U.S. there has been little temperature change in the past 50 years, the time of rapidly increasing greenhouse gases—in fact there was a slight cooling throughout much of the country.” [28 p. 92-100].

Unfortunately, the massaging of temperature data also appears to be occurring in Australia, this time by the Australian Bureau of Meteorology (BOM). As previously stated, before surface air temperatures for a country can be calculated, various adjustments need to be made in an attempt to correct any factors, such as a change of location of weather station or a change of equipment, that would give incorrect results. In 2011 an independent team, in conjunction with then Senator, Cory Bernardi, requested an independent audit by the Australian National Audit Office of the BOM’s long-standing (from 1910) temperature data set. This was prompted by the independent team finding many unusual, unaccountable, and apparently or clearly false adjustments to the temperature data which had been made by the BOM. For example, it was found that overall adjustments had increased the warming trend by 40%. In response to the looming threat of an independent audit of its historical dataset the BOM announced they had completed a major new revision of their data called the Australian Climate Observations Reference Network—Surface Air Temperature (ACORN—SAT). This move effectively sidestepped the audit which would have applied to the old data set. The ACORN—SAT data set considers data from 1910 over 112 sites across Australia, and it showed a one-degree Celsius increase to Australia’s surface air temperature since 1910. But subsequently, more ‘adjustments’ were then made to the ACORN-SAT dataset. For example, the hottest ever day in Australia according to the ACORN-SAT was in Albany, WA, in 1933—51 degrees Celsius. But to get this figure the 44-degree Celsius day at Albany had to be ‘adjusted’ i.e. increased by 7 degrees! Further, newspaper archives from the mid to late 1800s show that there have been many recorded temperatures of 52 degrees Celsius/125 degrees Fahrenheit or more. (Thermometers had been around for 400 years by then and were quite advanced.) Another example, for the weather station at Carnarvon, WA—which covers a huge area and thus impacts significantly on surface air temperature calculations—the *raw* data shows an upward and overall increase of 0.2 degrees Celsius over a century, whereas the BOM’s adjusted figure was 2.2 degrees Celsius per century. A similar pattern was found for five other influential sites across Australia. A third example: one of the most bizarre findings of the independent team was that in one weather zone in the Gibson Desert, the BOM data showed *exactly* the same repeating weather patterns from 1911, each year,

through to 1956! Further, these ‘records’ begin when there were *no* measuring thermometers in the area! In 2014 *The Australian* newspaper published reports of unexplained major adjustments to the ACORN—SAT dataset and another audit was proposed. This time the audit was sidestepped by a conducting a one-day forum in 2015 which produced a report on statistical analysis but which largely ignored the suspect adjustments which had been identified by the independent team. Further, the BOM admitted that they would *not* publish a method, (presumably of analysing the data) that anyone outside of the BOM could follow. [28 pp. 119-127, 145, 130]. Clearly the BOM did not want anyone outside the organisation to know *how* they were making their adjustments to data—that, it seems, would be self-incriminating evidence. Another major adjustment to the ACORN—SAT occurred in 2018 which resulted in a massive 23% increase in the rate of warming since 1910. Due to homogenisation of the data—which occurs for 109 of the 112 sites—temperature adjustments (upward) of as much as 6.4 degrees Celsius had been made for a one day reading. This second round of adjustments took the supposed increase in temperature in Australia over the last 100 years, as reported by ACORN—SAT, to 1.23 degrees Celsius. [13]. An independent assessment of the increase in Australia’s surface air temperature—using sites unaffected by the urban heating island effect—showed a rise of just 0.3 degrees Celsius for south-east Australia between 1887 to 2013, and 0.8 degrees Celsius when the record begins from 1910. [28 p. 159]. Both lower than the BOM’s ACORN—SAT figure of 1.23 degrees Celsius for Australia. Another independent assessment found that Melbourne’s temperature rose just 0.03 degrees per decade (or 0.3 degrees per century—for summer maximum temperature—from 1856 to 2015. [28 p. 116]. One further point should be added. The ACORN—SAT begins from 1910 and thus excludes the very hot Federation Drought period of 1895-1902; if this period of high temperatures could have been included in the data set then the overall increase in Australia’s temperature would naturally be lower.

There is another reason for being sceptical about the temperature findings of the BOM, NOAA and GISS. As previously discussed, Dr Roy Spencer is Principal Research Scientist at the University of Alabama in Huntsville. It is worth reiterating that Dr Spencer notes that “no one has yet found a way to remove the very local UHI warming effect from the thermometer and thermistor data. For the most part, such spurious warming effects are indistinguishable from [any] human-based global warming...” (My interpolation.) [28 p. 186]. He continues: “While the UHI effects have been claimed to have been handled by statistical adjustment schemes that match rural to urban data, it has never been demonstrated that the contaminated urban data have been corrected to match the rural data, rather than the other way around.” [28 p. 188]. And, we may add, it is the rural temperature data/readings which are unaffected by UHI and thus generally more accurate than the urban data/readings.

4. Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide is not Correlated with, and Causative of, Increasing Global Warming

Global warming theory asserts that global average surface temperature has increased due to increased carbon dioxide levels trapping heat in the atmosphere—the greenhouse effect. In particular, the theory asserts that it is increasing industrialisation which has produced this increased atmospheric carbon. Unfortunately for this theory, the data again does not validate it. Before turning to the more recent picture, let’s cast an eye backward over Earth’s geological history. Relying in particular on earth and ice cores, geologists know that the Earth’s climate, including carbon dioxide levels, have fluctuated greatly during the 4.25 billion years in which life is believed to have existed on this planet. Dr Ian Pilmer is Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences at the University of Melbourne, and perhaps Australia’s most well-known geologist. He dismisses the notion that increases in temperature are due to carbon dioxide produced through human activity. In particular he adduces the incontestable fact that during most of this 4.25-billion-year period the volume of carbon dioxide has been much higher than to today, overall, gradually reducing from at least five percent, and as much as 20 percent, of the Earth’s atmosphere, to its current level of just 0.04 percent of the atmosphere. Yet, during this period, also incontestable, there were a number of long-lived ice ages—the Pangolian, Huronian and Cryogenian—where in at least two, ice was up to the equator. Yet, during these ice ages carbon dioxide levels were much higher than today, showing that carbon dioxide does not cause any significant global warming. In particular, during the Phanerozoic period, stretching over almost the last 600 million years,

there have been four ice ages, yet during this period carbon dioxide levels were up to at least *ten times* that of the present level—no catastrophic warming, just the opposite. His overall conclusions are “Geology shows us that there is no relationship between atmospheric CO₂ and climate” and “Because the hypothesis that human emissions of CO₂ drive global warming is not accord with what the geological record has revealed, then the hypothesis is invalid.” [28 pp.297-305].

Since 1800AD there has been a mean or average increase in carbon dioxide concentration from 280 parts per million (ppm) to 405 ppm. [28 p. 189]. As previously mentioned, since the ‘mini-ice age’ or Maunder Minimum, ending in the 1700s there has been an *overall* rise in global average surface temperature of around 0.75 to 0.9 degrees Celsius. However, in this period we find that there is no close correlation between increasing CO₂ and increasing temperature. First, most of this temperature rise since the late 1700s occurred before 1940, that is, *prior* to greatest expansion of industry, and carbon dioxide emissions, post 1940. Thus, increased carbon dioxide from increased industry did not cause the increased temperature. Second, in the post-war economic and industrial boom between the 1940s and 1970s carbon dioxide increased by some 10% while global surface temperature *declined* for some 35 years. [7]. Again, in this period there was no correlation between increasing carbon and increasing global warming. From 1812 to 1958 some 90,000 direct measurements of atmospheric carbon were taken in Antarctica. These results were published in 175 different papers including some by Nobel Prize winning scientists. This data, when collated, showed greatly fluctuating levels of atmospheric carbon in this period. In particular for our purposes, this data showed that atmospheric carbon in 1812 was around 380 parts per million (ppm) and in 1950 much less, around 315 ppm. [4]. Thus again, increasing carbon dioxide levels were not correlated with increasing industrialisation nor with increasing atmospheric temperature. Other data shows that in 1891, in the predominantly *pre-industrial* period, there was actually a *higher* level of carbon concentration in the atmosphere at 330 ppm than in the *post-industrial* period of 1958 when there was 310 ppm. [4]. Once again: atmospheric carbon dioxide rose about 10% between 1995 and 2012 but global average surface temperatures did not rise at all. [22 p. 644].

It is not surprising that man’s activity does not significantly influence the carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere. First, carbon accounts for only 0.04% of the atmosphere—something which in itself is almost quite clearly fatal to global warming theory. Further, of this 0.04%, human activity only produces 4%. [12]. Professor Leslie Woodcock, Emeritus Professor (chemical engineering) at the University of Manchester, with these figures in mind said that ‘Global warming is nonsense.’ [23 p. 561-2]. Carbon dioxide accounts for only 0.117 percent of greenhouse gas—by volume the greatest greenhouse gas is water vapour at 2% of the atmosphere—and all but a fraction of atmospheric carbon is *naturally* occurring; the portion that humans are adding is minute. Each year volcanoes produce more carbon dioxide than humans. More still is produced by animals and bacteria which produce 150 gigatons of carbon as compared to 6.5 gigatons from humans. (A gigaton is one billion tons.) By far the biggest source of carbon is the oceans. [7]. Even termites produce more carbon dioxide than humans—around 10 gigatons. [12].

Over a *longer* time scale, we do find that there is a close correlation between global temperature and atmospheric carbon. However, ice core samples show that carbon dioxide increases *follow* increases in temperature—and not the other way around as the global warming theorists assert. Carbon levels follow temperature levels with a time lag of about 800 years. Increasing temperature produces more carbon dioxide because the oceans, the biggest emitters of carbon dioxide, release more of it when they heat up. The lag of several hundred years is because the oceans are so big they take this amount of time to warm up or cool down. In short, *increased carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is not the cause of increased global temperature, but the result of increased global temperature, and so, the most fundamental assumption of the anthropogenic global warming theory is wrong.* [7].

5. The Natural Cause of Climate Change

What has driven the large cyclical changes in the Earth’s temperature that we have seen? To state the obvious, this is a complex question and there are no doubt a number of factors of more or less importance.

However, research has shown that the degree of sunspot activity and its effect on cosmic rays and in turn cloud formation is a major factor. Since 1600 a very close correspondence between sunspot activity and temperature change has been measured, *showing that it is the sun, in particular sunspot activity, which drives the Earth's temperature*. Sunspots are intense magnetic fields. A study by scientists of the Danish National Space Centre, and headed by Professor Eigil Friss-Christensen, showed that sunspot activity has been *strictly correlated* with climate change on Earth over the last 400 years. [7; 23 p. 568-9]. The European Centre for Nuclear Research (CERN) has shown a near perfect inverse correlation between temperature increase and decreased penetration of cosmic rays into the Earth's atmosphere. The basic relation between sunspot activity, cosmic rays, clouds and temperature is as follows: greater sunspot activity means less cosmic rays reach Earth, in turn, there is less cloud formation and, in turn, the Earth's atmosphere heats up because sunlight is not being deflected by the clouds. Sunspot activity is driving temperature. Accordingly, data collected by both NASA and NOAA show that temperature changes in the arctic since 1880 correlate almost perfectly with solar activity changes. [7]. Accordingly, during the Little Ice Age (1550-1700 AD) there was barely any sunspot activity. The sun is the major force driving Earth's temperature changes—not that surprising. However, the climate change models used to predict future global warming, in particular those of the UN's International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), do *not* take into account the sun and its activity. [14].

6. More Fraud and Deception About Global Warming

We have already seen how NASA, NOAA, Hadley-CRU and apparently the Australian Bureau of Meteorology have manipulated the raw data to give exaggerated and misleading reports of global warming. This is only part of the fraud and deception. One particularly egregious fraud—exposed in 2003—was what became known as the Hockey Stick graph, which was later used by the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Contrary to the fluctuating cycles of temperature change in the world over the past 2,000 years, this graph showed *stable* temperatures throughout most of this period followed by an increasingly rapid rise from the mid-18th century. The IPCC used this graph despite the IPCC *themselves* having previously affirmed the cyclical and natural fluctuations in global temperatures over the last 2000 years! The data for the graph was based on air bubbles trapped in Antarctic ice and, from 1958, measurements recorded at a laboratory in Mauna Loa, Hawaii, using the technique of infra-red absorption. If such a graph, showing an increase in atmospheric carbon along with increased industrialisation from the mid-18th century, was accurate, it would support the position that increasing atmospheric carbon, and in turn increasing atmospheric temperature, is due to human activity. However, when the data was *properly* scrutinized it did *not* show, as the IPCC would have liked it to show, a steady increase in carbon concentration from 1744 with a significant increase in recent times. Instead, *fluctuating* atmospheric carbon levels are revealed. In particular, the data shows that in 1891, in the predominantly *pre-industrial* period, there was actually a *higher* level of carbon concentration in the atmosphere, 330 ppm (parts per million), than in the *post-industrial* period of 1958 when there was 310 ppm. The *amended* graph showed that there is *not* a positive correlation between increasing industrialisation and increasing atmospheric carbon. The IPCC's use of the data was shown to be *fraudulent*. The smooth curve of increasing atmospheric carbon (since 1744) with a sudden increase in recent times, which the IPCC's graph showed, was fraudulently achieved by moving up by 83 years, and as a whole, all the measurements of Antarctica ice core readings prior to 1958. This gave the *wrong* impression of a smooth and upward curve of increasing carbon with a significant rise in recent times, and where these increases could be positively correlated with increasing industrial activity. But, as Dr Martin Hertzberg exposes in his 2010 presentation, it was all false. [4]. Another version of the Hockey Stick graph, also used by the IPCC, came from a very selective and limited use of data related to tree rings which are one indicator, albeit a poor one, of climate. [4].

Let us take a closer look at the IPCC. The IPCC was set up in 1988 “to provide the world with a clear scientific view on the current state of knowledge in climate change and its potential environmental and socio-economic impacts.” The IPCC does *not* look into the natural causes of climate change or warming; its mandate is to look at any man-made or anthropogenic contribution to climate change. In particular, the IPCC does not look at the role of the sun and its activity in its climate change modelling. Indeed, the IPCC does

not do its own scientific research but is dependent on the combined data given to it by the Climate Research Unit of the University of East Anglia and the UK Met Offices Hadley Centre, and also the GISS data set. The standard of the former data—called the HadCURT4 data set—has been examined and described by an independent researcher from Australia, John McLean, to be “very careless and amateur. About the standard of a first-year university student.” [14]. The IPCC’s reports are in fact written largely by political appointees, graduate students and non-credentialed laymen. The IPCC members are appointed by governments, and include only a few token scientists. [15].

What became known as ‘Climategate’ occurred in 2009 when thousands of emails exchanged between climate scientists were leaked. Scientists from The Climatic Research Unit (CRU) at UK’s University of East Anglia were centrally involved. In particular, the head of this unit Phil Jones was involved. These emails *explicitly* revealed how these scientists were involved in the following forms of deceit and malpractice: 1) Some of the emails discussed how they could delete the Medieval Warm Period when temperatures between 950 AD to 1300 AD were much warmer than today. 2) There was knowledge of and efforts to suppress the plateau of global temperatures beginning in the late 1990s. For example, in 2005 Phil Jones stated in one email: “The scientific community would come down on me in no uncertain terms if I said the world had cooled from 1998. OK it has but it is only 7 years of data and it isn’t statistically significant.” 3) In another email it said that they will, if needed, redefine the term ‘peer-review literature’ to keep studies with differing viewpoints (contrary to man-made global warming) out of the next IPCC report. 4) That they planned to oust a suspected greenhouse sceptic from his editorial position in a key scientific journal. 5) When it was impossible to tell what data had come from what sources they would simply invent which weather stations it had come from 6) That data temperatures had been and would be manipulated to align with climate change/warming theory. The CRU was later forced to admit they had *thrown away* most of the data on which their global temperature calculations were based. (Who throws away their valuable data? Don’t they have computers?!) Regarding the Climategate scientists, the UK Information Commissioner found them guilty of breaking the law by hiding data from the public. [3; 4; 23 p.567-8].

There was another scandal in 2017. America’s National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), described as the world’s premier data climate agency, was exposed by the whistle-blower, Dr John Bates. Bates had a distinguished forty-year career with NOAA. Indeed, and relevant to the situation at hand, he was given an award by the Obama Administration in 2014 for developing the standards for the production and preservation of climate-change data. The scandal related to a landmark paper (or report) released just before the 2015 United Nations Climate Conference in Paris. The paper was deliberately misleading. The paper falsely claimed that the slowdown in global warming since 1998, and confirmed by UN scientists in 2013, had in fact *not* happened and that temperatures were in fact rising faster than expected. Bates revealed that the report had used misleading and unverified data which was also a preliminary and unpublished data set; that the paper had never been subjected to NOAA’s own internal evaluation process (which Bates had in part designed); that none of the data was properly archived, in fact, it went missing!; and that NOAA had silenced objections raised regarding the paper, including his own. NOAA later refused Congressional subpoenas to produce the data on which the paper was based; indeed NOAA stated that the computer in which it was stored had suffered a complete failure and was inaccessible!; and they stated that no-one was saying the study was problematic (yet Bates at least clearly was saying just this). Later, the paper by NOAA had to be revised and the increased rates of temperatures had to be lowered. [23 p. 565-6].

7. What is Actually Happening with the Climate—Some Facts

As stated, journalist and science writer Matt Ridley stated that based on the satellite data sets, the most accurate, there is an increase in temperature of 0.12 degrees Celsius *per decade* up to 2019. [17]. In 1990 the IPCC predicted that temperature would be rising by 0.3 degrees Celsius per decade. Just one the many failed predictions of the IPCC and other global warming advocates. [18].

Views on the rate of sea level change vary but overall the estimates are low. Dr Niklas Morner, former president of the International Commission on Sea Level Change, said that in relation to the Maldives (one of

the flat-island nations), ‘In 40 years of study I have found no sea level rise at all.’ [23 p. 560]. Tide gauges referenced by global positioning systems at 12 locations in the South Pacific reported variable trends of sea level from -1 to +3 mm/year for the 1992 to 2010 period. In fact, the Funafuti Atoll has experienced a 7.3% *increase* in net island area over the past century. [18]. A 2010 study by Webb and Kench of 27 coral atolls in the central Pacific over several decades found that most increased in size despite some sea level rise, for it is the nature of atolls to rise with sea level due to coral growth and sand accumulation. [28 p. 213]. The Deltares Research Institute in the Netherlands even found the Earth’s land mass to have increased by some 22,000 square miles/58,000 square kilometres over the last 30 years. Another estimate is that sea levels are rising at a level of around 15 centimetres per century. [16]. The meteorologist Piers Corbyn states that sea levels have been rising *very slowly* for about 200 years. [12]. Matt Ridley, the science writer states, that there has been sea rise of about three millimetres per year or 34 centimetres over the last century. [17; 28 p. 212].

Arctic sea ice has normal fluctuations over time. Data and related graphs extending back to 1925 show there have been cyclical fluctuations in the arctic ice cap. The arctic ice cap was significantly less in the 1940s and 1950s than it is today; and that the arctic ice cap is the same size today as it was in the 1920s. (See <https://realclimatescience.com/government-arctic-sea-ice-fraud/> for details.) In 1421, in the Medieval Warm Period, there was no ice in the Arctic. Despite many predictions from various professors that Arctic ice would have completely disappeared by now—the ‘prophetic’ Al Gore said in 2007 it was “falling off a cliff” and would be gone by 2014—there has been no decline in Arctic ice between 2007 and 2017. [16, 18]. Records from early explorers of Antarctica show that the sea ice there has hardly changed in 100 years. [23]. There is no overall scientific consensus that Antarctic sea ice is melting. Others state that ice in the Antarctica and Greenland have been increasing for the last 30 years. [16]. According to a 2017 NASA study, published in the *Journal of Glaciology*, satellite data shows the Antarctic ice sheet featured a net gain of 112 billion tons of ice a year from 1992 to 2001. Between 2003 and 2008 Antarctica gained some 82 billion tons of ice annually. [19]. Most glaciers are in retreat, but this has been occurring since 1850, that is, before any man-made climate change. [28 p. 213].

Hurricanes are not increasing due to global warming. US data from 1900 to 2012 shows that hurricanes are at their lowest intensity since the beginning of the century. After 40 years of gentle global warming no increase in hurricanes has been detected. Recently, the IPCC, revising earlier and failed predictions, stated “No robust trends in annual numbers of tropical storms, hurricanes and major hurricane counts have been identified over the past 100 years in the North Atlantic Basin.” The IPCC also stated, “In summary, there continues to be a lack of evidence and thus low confidence regarding the sign of trend in the magnitude and/or frequency of floods on a global scale.” [18]. In 2001 the IPCC predicted that milder winters would see a decrease in heavy snow storms due to milder winters. However, Northern Hemisphere snow falls show remarkably little change from 1967. The 2012-3 Northern Hemisphere winter snow coverage was the fourth largest on record. [18].

The peer-reviewed science shows that up until 2019 there has been no overall increase in droughts. [17]. Matt Ridley states that in a recent (? 2016) report that the IPCC stated “New results also indicate that the AR4 conclusions regarding global increasing trends in droughts since the 1970s are no longer supported. There is low confidence in a global scale observed trend in drought or dryness (lack of rainfall), owing to lack of direct observations...and geographical inconsistencies in trends.” [28 p. 212]. In 2001 the IPCC predicted increased frequency of forest fires and an increased area burned. However, NASA’s analyses of satellite data collected between 1998 and 2012 show that the total area of land burned each year has declined by 24 percent. [18].

As of 2017 only one person has claimed climate change refugee status: Ioane Teitiota from Kiribati. His claim was dismissed by a court in New Zealand in 2014. [18].

Contrary to what the US Environmental Agency state, carbon dioxide is *not* a pollution. Instead, Dr Craig Idso, an expert on carbon dioxide states that it “is the basis of almost all life on Earth. It is the primary raw

material used by plants during the process of photosynthesis to produce the organic matter out of which they construct their tissues.” [28 p. 189-90]. At present we are in an historically low carbon era; for most of the history of life on this planet the CO₂ levels have been much higher. For example, during the Jurassic and Triassic periods when life flourished on Earth, CO₂ levels were between 7,000-9,000 ppm! [9; 16]. Dr Patrick Moore, co-founder of Greenpeace, stated “they [i.e. those against carbon dioxide] should recognize that CO₂ is lower today than it has been through most of the history of life on earth.” (My interpolation.) [22 p. 647]. In the short video *The Truth About CO₂* Dr Patrick Moore states that the optimum level of CO₂ for plant life is four to five times *above* the present level of 400 ppm. CO₂ he states is at a level just above what is needed to sustain plant life, and nations should be increasing CO₂. [8]. Craig Idso goes on to say that “literally thousands of laboratory and field experiments conducted over the past several decades have demonstrated that the more CO₂ there is in the air, the better the plants will grow.” [28 p. 190]. He goes on to say that an increase of CO₂ by 300 ppm raises the productivity of herbaceous plants by about one third, and the increase is even greater for woody plants. This increase in productivity is not only due to increased plant photosynthesis but also increased water efficiency and drought resistance, and greater resistance to pollution and stress. Furthermore, the positive effects of CO₂ increase along with increased air temperature. [28 p. 190, 193-4]. Satellite data is showing increased *greening* of the Earth as atmospheric CO₂ rises. Despite deforestation, there has been an increased greening of the Earth by about 20% during the last 30 years due to rising CO₂—the CO₂ fertilisation effect. [8; 10; 11; 28 pp. 202-3]. Matt Ridley, citing a 2016 study by Zaichun et al. entitled *Greening of the Earth and Its Drivers*, states that satellite data shows global greening, enough to cover the US mainland twice (18 million square kilometres), has occurred over the last 30 years. An estimated 70% of this is due to increasing atmospheric carbon. As Ridley notes, this means more food, more biodiversity, less drought, lower food prices, richer forests, less desert and less starvation. [17; 28 p. 203]. In particular, Idso calculated that increasing carbon dioxide, due to increased crop production, “will likely bestow an additional US\$9.8 trillion on global food production between 2012 and 2050.” [28 p. 197.]

8. The Climate Change Hoax

Ultimately, the global warming hoax, and its more recent metamorphosis, climate change, is being used to justify the *related* agendas of world-wide centralisation of government and political control, increased transfer of wealth from the general population to the private bankers, population control, servitude and reduction, and, selective de-industrialisation. What we see here is a hijacking or co-opting of the environmental movement for these purposes. In part, the video *Climategate II Explained - NOAA Whistleblower - Data Manipulation - Global Warming Hoax* is concerned with this deeper and darker side of climate change. This video shows how the founders of the modern environmental movement were Julius Huxley, Prince Phillip and Prince Bernard, all of whom were both pro-Nazi and pro-eugenics, that is, pro-population control. They were also staunch Malthusians who believed that over-population would lead to catastrophe; and all were united in the belief that human population needed to be reduced. [1]. These people and others of their ilk belong or belonged to an organisation called the Club of Rome. The Club of Rome is a highly influential think tank founded by the Rockerfellers in 1968. Its ostensible purpose is environmental protection but it is actually working to co-opt the environmental movement in order to realise the related agendas listed above of world-wide centralisation of government and political control, etc. Thus we have the following statement by Aurelio Peccei, a cofounder of this organisation, in its publication *The First Global Revolution*: “The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behaviour that they can be overcome. *The real enemy then is humanity itself.* We believe humanity requires a common motivation, namely a common adversary in order to realise world government. *It does not matter if this common enemy is a real one or one invented for the purpose.*” (My italics.) [14]. In short, he is saying: we regard humanity as the enemy; and we will target this enemy, under the guise of environmental causes such as global warming, to realise world government.

One of the first notable events where global warming first came into *public* view was a conference held in 1975 called ‘The Atmosphere: Endangered and Endangering’. Notable participants were Margaret Mead—a radical proponent of population reduction—John Holdren, later Obama’s chief science advisor and also a proponent of reduced population, and Stephen Schneider, another proponent. (Incidentally, in the 1970s Holdren was warning the world of global *cooling*!) Mead’s key note address included the following statement: “What we need from scientists are estimates, presented with sufficient conservatism and plausibility, but at the same time as free as possible from internal disagreements, that can be *exploited by political interests* that will allow us to start building a system of *artificial* but effective warnings, warnings which will parallel the instincts of animals who flee before the hurricane...” (My italics.) In short, what *they* want are fabricated studies regarding global warming which can be exploited for the political interests by terrifying the population i.e. the fleeing animals.

The previously listed and related global warming agendas were on display at The Copenhagen Climate Summit in 2009. It descended into disarray after a Danish leak showed proposals that first world countries would be allowed to emit twice as much carbon as third world or developing countries, something which would effectively prevent the latter from developing; and also that Kyoto Protocol carbon tax collections would *not* go to developing nations but to the World Bank (WB) and International Monetary Fund (IMF)—both privately owned—so that developing countries would be forced to take out green loans from these bodies and thus go further into debt. The proposals would also sideline the UN’s role in all future climate negotiations and give it to first world countries. Further, money collected by the WB and IMF would go to big companies conducting projects of dubious value such as the damming of the Amazon Basin. In short, supposed climate change/warming is being used for political and financial manipulation. Here is a quotation from Ottmar Edenhofer, former co-chairman of the IPCC’s third working group: “One must clearly say, this is the first time we redistribute *de facto* the world’s wealth by climate change policy. One has to free oneself from the illusion that international climate policy is environmental policy. This has almost nothing to do with environmental policy anymore.”

A key figure in the development of the real agenda behind global warming was the environmentalist fraud Maurice Strong. [14]. In the 1970s he was an early propagator of *speculation* about man-made global warming, the need to reduce population, and to lower our polluting living standards to save the environment. Strong was later named assistant secretary to the UN and chief policy advisor to Kofi Annan, the UN director. Strong was a key architect of the 1997-2005 Kyoto Protocol that declared man-made global warming according to a consensus was real and predominantly caused by manmade CO2 emissions. In 1988 Strong was also key in the creation of the UN’s IPCC and later the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) at the Rio de Janeiro in 1992—also known as the Earth Summit—which he chaired. (The UNFCCC, like the IPCC which informs it, does *not* take natural causes of global warming or climate change into account.) [14]. Also, Agenda 21, supposedly to establish an ecologically sustainable and socially and economically just planet, was one product of the Earth Summit—a point whose relevance will become clear in due course. What a curriculum vitae! Sounds like a really caring man. Strong was a billionaire Canadian oil man—a major player in one of the world’s most environmentally damaging, most carbon ‘polluting’, and socially unjust industries in human history. He was also a long-time friend of fellow billionaire oil man David Rockefeller. Rockefeller himself poured millions into the Green movement. Shouldn’t we be suspicious of the motives of these major environmental pillagers and polluters when they guide and push the global warming movement, advocate for carbon dioxide reduction with all the restrictions upon the world’s population that this implies, and who want to impose carbon and industry taxes which go to private banks like the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund? What Strong and his ilk really want is to control the planet and subjugate the human race; and they are using the global warming hoax to realise this dark agenda. Here are some quotes from Strong which reveal something of his true nature and motivation: “Isn’t the only hope for this planet that the industrialised civilization collapse? Isn’t it our responsibility to bring this about?”; “Either we reduce the world's population voluntarily or nature will do this for us, but brutally.”; “Developed and benefited from the unsustainable patterns of production and consumption which have produced our present dilemma. It is clear that current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class—involving high meat intake, consumption of large amounts of frozen

and convenience foods, use of fossil fuels, appliances, home and work-place air-conditioning, and suburban housing—are not sustainable. A shift is necessary toward lifestyles less geared to environmentally damaging consumption patterns.” [41]. Not surprisingly, Maurice never adopted any of the reforms which he proposed—they were for the rest of us. Not surprisingly also, Strong was involved in a series of scandals over the years and the last one, the UN Oil-For-Food scandal in 2005 saw him flee to China where he expired. [42; 22 pp. 619-20].

The combined aims of the people behind the global warming, and now climate change, hoax, namely, world-wide centralisation of government and political control, increased transfer of wealth from the general population to the private bankers, population control, servitude and reduction, and selective de-industrialisation, are aims which are also in agreement with, and being furthered by the UN Agendas 21 and 30. Most of us have never heard of Agenda 21 or its successor Agenda 30, and yet they are the blueprints for a new political, economic, ecological and social world order being rollout out on a global scale. The basic relation between Agendas 21 and Agendas 30 is as follows. The central message of Agendas 21 and 30 is that the world is in an environmental crisis, in particular, heading toward catastrophic global warming, and thus we must take drastic world-wide action to remedy this situation. Agendas 21 and 30 purport to provide the solution to this crisis. Agendas 21 and 30 ride largely on the back of the global warming hoax—this is their justification. The truth is that global warming is a hoax which is being used to justify the rollout of a seemingly benevolent new world order which is, in actuality, a global system of centralised, totalitarian-fascist control of all the world’s resources and activities including all human activity. The same people, who are behind the ‘problem’ or ‘crisis’, global warming, are also behind the proposed ‘solution’, Agendas 21 and 30. Some of these people and the groups and organisations to which they belong have already been identified in this paper: The Club of Rome, the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, dark actors in organisations such as the UN, IPCC, NASA, NOAA and Hadley-CRU, and people such as Maurice Strong and the Rockerfellers. These groups and people are either part of, or more or less conscious servants of, the mega-wealthy owners of huge corporations and banks to whom all governments around the world at present are in debt—collectively to the tune of an estimated \$240 trillion—and thus economically controlled, and to whom most senior politicians in governments around the world have become more or less conscious servants, sycophants and slaves. It is these people who are attempting to get as much control over our world, and the people in it, as they possibly can—power hungry, parasitic and quite often psycho- and sociopathic. Sad, but true.

For those who are interested, what follows is a very brief overview of Agendas 21 and 30. It provides the wider context for the global warming hoax; but knowledge of Agendas 21 and 30 are not necessary to see through the fallacy of anthropogenic global warming. Hence, the following may be regarded as supplementary and not essential reading.

At the outside it is necessary to say that Agendas 21 and 30, in particular, an analysis of their real nature and intent is a *complex* topic, and one which will require considerable effort before conclusions are reached. In this paper I will only *touch* upon this topic. For those would like a detailed and fully referenced analysis of Agendas 21 and 30, especially in the Australian context, you may read my paper *The Dark Agenda: Agendas 21 and 30, the Trojan Horse for Global, Centralised and Totalitarian-Fascist Control of All the World’s Resources and Activities—Including You*.

Agenda 21: United Nations Sustainable Development, commonly known as Agenda 21, is an approximately 350-page policy document which was prepared for, and which was the culmination of, the UN Conference on Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992—also known as the Earth Summit. Commitment to its implementation was signed-off by 179 countries including Australia by the then prime minister Paul Keating. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development*, commonly known as Agenda 30, is a much smaller document of 41 pages which does *not* replace Agenda 21. Agenda 30 explicitly states—in section 11—that it builds on the solid foundation of former UN summits including the UN Conference of Environment and Development held in Rio de Janeiro in 1992 which, we may add, produced Agenda 21. The essential defining feature of Agenda 30 is that it adds a series of 17 specific goals,

called Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), along with 169 related targets, to facilitate the implementation of Agenda 21. Agenda 30 was signed off in 2015 by 193 countries, including Australia by the then Foreign Minister Julie Bishop. Both Agendas are pledges and not legally binding treaties, however, through a variety of means, including legislation, they are being progressively implemented and enforced in the signatory countries.

Agenda 21 and more recently Agenda 30 have been progressively implemented in Australia for around three decades. Perhaps the best starting point to become informed about the extensive implementation of these UN Agendas in the Australian context are a series of papers written by Graham Williamson and which can still be found at the websites galileomovement.com.au and also catallaxyfiles.com. [29; 30; 31; 32; 33; 34; 35; 36]. To provide a quick *indication* of the extensive rollout of these Agendas we may note that by 2012 Agenda 21 was already operating in 600 towns and cities across the US. [22 p. 622]. Then Prime Minister Tony Blair told the UN General Assembly Special Session on the Environment in 1997 “I want all local authorities in the UK to adopt local Agenda 21 strategies by the year 2000.” [22 p. 623]. The non-governmental organisation ICLEI, or the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives—now renamed Local Governments for Sustainability—has had a major role in the local implementation of Agenda 21. In their document *Preparing for Tomorrow 2010 – 2015 Strategy* ICLEI boasts that it “has achieved results that the planet notices. Over the last 20 years: We have built a global sustainability network of 1,200 local governments of all sizes in 70 countries. We have instigated a movement of about 10,000 local governments that have engaged their citizens in Local Agenda 21...” As ICLEI reported on their website (iclei.org) in 2019, this number has now increased to more than 1,750 local and regional governments active in 100 plus countries. *Wikipedia* states that at present some 88 Australian councils are involved with ICLEI. ICLEI’s own website (icleioceania.org) shows that these councils include the cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Brisbane, Adelaide, Hobart and Perth. I’m fairly sure we can add the new smart city, Darwin, to this list.

Despite this extensive and progressive rollout, most Australians, indeed I would say most people, have never heard of Agendas 21 and 30. In part this is because their principles, policies and processes assume various names, many of which will be familiar, including : “sustainability”, “STAR sustainable communities”, “consensus” and “participatory” decision making, “facilitators” (for such decision making), “resiliency”, “resilient cities”, “smart cities”, “smart growth”, “regional visioning projects”, “local visioning”, “green jobs”, “green building codes”, “going green”, “alternative energy”, “regional planning”, “comprehensive planning”, “historic preservation”, “conservation easements”, and “growth management.” There is a second and related reason why most people haven’t heard of Agendas 21 and 30: fear of opposition to their rollout has resulted in deliberately renaming them. Here is a quote from J. Gary Lawrence, an advisor to President Clinton’s Council on Sustainable Development, which confirms this point: “Participating in a UN advocated planning process would very likely bring out many of the conspiracy-fixated groups and individuals in our society.... This segment of our society who fear ‘one-world government’ and a UN invasion of the United States through which our individual freedoms would be stripped away would actively work to defeat any elected official who joined ‘the conspiracy’ by undertaking LA21. *So, we call our process something else, such as comprehensive planning, growth management or smart growth.*” (My italics). [37]. Lawrence’s fear was well-founded, for there is now widespread opposition to Agendas 21 and 30 in the US due to their fundamentally undemocratic nature and the threat they pose to basic human rights, especially property rights. So far, resolutions opposing Agenda 21 have been proposed or passed in the states of Wyoming, Montana, Minnesota, Washington, Oklahoma, Iowa, Texas, South Dakota, Wisconsin and Arkansas. [35].

Agendas 21 and 30 are apparently benevolent UN policy documents which serve as the guiding basis or blueprints for the establishment of economically and ecologically sustainable and socially just communities throughout the world. [39; 40]. The central message of these documents is this: through human mismanagement and over consumption we now have a world in crisis characterised by scarce or rapidly diminishing resources, increasing environmental degradation and dangers—in particular manmade or anthropogenic global warming (now re-badged as climate change)—and great economic and social inequity and inequality, therefore, we need to implement a new and global political, economic, social and ecological system which will insure both economic and environmental and sustainability as well as economic and

social equity or justice and equality. In actuality, Agendas 21 and 30 are a trojan horse for: the progressive rollout of a world-wide monitoring and measuring system of *all* of the world's resources and activities, including people and their activities; the progressive ownership and control of all resources and activities by governments in collusion with mega-corporations and, as always, the mega-banks behind these corporations; and the progressive centralisation of political power and control over the world through the United Nations (UN) or, much more specifically, the mega-wealthy individuals and groups which have *always* more or less controlled the UN from within the shadows. Rather than providing the foundation for a promised utopian future—a healthy environment, a prosperous economy, the end of poverty and scarcity, equal distribution of the world's wealth and resources, social justice for women, children and indigenous groups, peace, and partnership—beneath the high-sounding language and nice-looking facade Agendas 21 and 30 contain more or less hidden principles, policies, plans and programs for the progressive and insidious rollout of a dystopian, global, centralised, fascist and totalitarian regime run through an incestuous alliance of government and mega- or transnational-corporations and banks. This *is* the dark agenda hidden behind and within Agendas 21 and 30. “Sustainable Development is a Trojan Horse that looks good on the outside but is filled with highly toxic and militant policies on the inside.”—Patrick Wood, *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation*. [38 p. 97].

When we bring out the principles, policies, plans and programs more or less hidden in Agendas 21 and 30, often by referring to related documents, and also look at how these Agendas have been and are actually being implemented in the signatory countries, we find that central features of Agendas 21 and 30 may be summarised as follows. These Agendas prescribe: 1) a global or world-wide system covering or affecting *all* resources, activities, countries, governments, organisations, people and aspects of society. 2) a global or world-wide system of government centred in the UN but actually controlled by the people who have always controlled the UN from the shadows, mainly, the mega-wealthy owners of the transnational banks and corporations 3) a system which replaces the current system of capitalism with a free market 4) a new system which will monitor, measure, regulate and control all resources and activities to supposedly attain economic and ecological sustainability and social justice and equality 5) the progressive implementation of a totalitarian and fascist regime where the latter is the collusive alliance between government and corporations 6) the progressive demise of democratically elected and accountable government 7) the progressive demise of private ownership of property and property rights, and more generally individual rights, in favour of so-called community rights which essentially equate to the rights of (centralised) government in collusion with big corporations and banks 8) that the population will be reduced to between one and three billion 9) that the population will be progressively encouraged, coerced and forced into smart cities or “human settlement” zones while the majority of land will be given over to what are called “wilderness areas “10) a massive world-wide expansion and development of a centralised data collection and analysis system to monitor, measure and audit all resources and activities, where the ostensible purpose of which will be for developing sustainable communities, but where the real purpose will be for the control and subjugation of the world and its people. This will occur most acutely in smart cities where the new 5G Network or Smart Grid or Internet of Things will enable the continuous monitoring, measuring and control of all people and their activities. This is the real and dark agenda of Agendas 21 and 30 which ride largely on the back of the global warming hoax. (This paragraph is a distilled product from many sources. Some good starting points are the aforementioned series of articles by Graham Williamson, and also the book by Rosa Koire entitled *Behind the Green Mask: UN Agenda 21*, and related YouTube presentations by this lady.)

I wish to emphasize that Agendas 21 and 30, in particular, an analysis of their real nature and intent is a *complex* topic, and one which will require considerable effort before conclusions are reached.

References

1. *Climategate II Explained - NOAA Whistleblower - Data Manipulation - Global Warming Hoax* (A one-hour video which begins with an overview that climate change is wrong. It also provides a reason for the global warming hoax related to a depopulation agenda.)
2. *Orwell's Nightmare: Temperature Adjustment and Climate Change* (A 23-minute video by James Corbett showing the manipulation of climate data by major agencies to support the climate change agenda.)
3. *Climategate is Still the Issue* (A short video exposing the Climategate scandal including some of the key and damning emails involved.)
4. *Climategate and Scientific Inquiry* (This is a one-hour video of a lecture and Q & A by Dr. Martin Hertzberg in 2010 which refutes climate change and shows the natural cause of climate change.)
5. *NASA Scientists Dispute Climate Change – Business Insider* (This article contains and discusses the letter written by former NASA scientists to NASA, which shows their opposition to the position that increased carbon has caused global warming.)
6. *10 Climate Myths Busted in 60 Seconds* (A short one a half minute video by the Corbett Report.)
7. *The Great Global Warming Swindle* (Video produced by Martin Durkin in 2007 giving a clear introduction into the flaws of manmade global warming theory and shows the real cause of climate fluctuations.)
8. *The Truth About CO2* (A short video by Patrick Moore, Co-founder of Greenpeace, on the *need* for CO2 and that greater levels of CO2 are in fact beneficial for the planet.)
9. *97 Percent Consensus? Global Warming Unmasked!* (Half hour video presentation by Stefan Molyneux found at *Free Domain Radio* and which provides a damning critique of the 2013 study by John Cook which arrives at the erroneous conclusion that 97% of scientists believe in manmade climate change.)
10. *Deserts Greening From Rising CO2*, CSIRO, 3 July 2013.
11. *Atmospheric CO2 Concentrations At 400 ppm Are Still Dangerously Low For Life On Earth* (Article by P. Gosselin, *NoTricksZone*, 17 May, 2013.
12. *AV9 Conference* talk given by meteorologist Piers Corbyn
13. *Homogenised Temperature Data From Australian Weather Bureau in Spotlight Again* (Article by Richard Szabo in *The Epoch Times* on 22/2/2019)
14. *The Dark Story Behind Global Warming* (Article by William Engdhal, 16/10/2018 on his website.)
15. *The IPCC Prepares to Release More Hot Air* (Article by James Corbett found on at ccorbettreport.com, 6/11/2018.)
16. *Interview With Istvan Marko For Breitbart News Network* (Transcript of a 2017 interview with a professor of organic chemistry from the Univeriste Catholique de Louvain. See www.gregoirecanlorbe.com)

17. *Julia Hartley Brewer Meets Matt Ridley* (Video of a science writer being interviewed about the lies in the official climate change/warming story, 21st October 2019.)
18. *Some Failed Climate Predictions* (Article, by Andy May at the website *What's Up With That* on 30/11/2017)
19. *Climate Alarmists Have Been Wrong About Virtually Everything* (Article, 2/6/2017, by Alex Newman)
20. *The 97 Percent Solution* (2015 article by Ian Tuttle in the *National Review* at www.nationalreview.com)
21. *New Peer Reviewed Paper Shows only 36% of Geo-Scientists and Engineers Believe in AGW* (2013 Article by Anthony Watts at *Watts Up With That* at www.wattsupwiththat.com).
22. *The Perception Deception*. (Book by David Icke, 2013).
23. *All You Need To Know And Have Never Been Told*. (Book by David Icke, 2017).
24. *Rosa Koire Speech on Agenda 21*. (YouTube Sept. 2012).
25. *Global Warming Stopped 16 Years Ago Reveals Met Office Report Quietly Released...and Here Is The Chart To Prove It*. (Article by David Rose in the *Daily Mail (Australia)*, Oct. 2012)
26. *A 2000-Year Global Temperature Reconstruction Based On Non-Treeing Proxies*. (Article by Craig Loehle, in *Energy and Environment*, Vol. 18 no. 7-8, 2007).
27. *Behind the Green Mask: UN Agenda 21*. (Book by Rosa Koire, 2011).
28. *Climate Change: The Facts 2017*. (Book of papers related to climate change, and edited by Jennifer Marohasy, 2017).
29. *An Introduction & Chronology of Agenda 21 in Australia* (Part 1). (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2017, located at the catallaxyfiles.com).
30. *An Introduction & Chronology of Agenda 21 in Australia* (Part 2). (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2017, located at the catallaxyfiles.com).
31. *UN Agenda 21 (AG21) In Brief*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Feb. 2013, located at galileomovement.com.au).
32. *Agenda 21 Facts & Quotes*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Feb. 2015 galileomovement.com.au).
33. *Checking the 'Fine Print' of the UN's Post-2015 Sustainability Agenda*. (Article by Graham Williamson, Oct. 2015, located at galileomovement.com.au).
34. *Agenda 21 in Australia: FAQ's About the UN Program the Politicians Prefer Not to Talk About*. (Article by Graham Williamson, March 2015, 2nd edition, located at galileomovement.com.au).
35. *Agenda 21: Ending the Deception & Moving Forward*. (Article by Graham Williamson, March 2013 (Revised), located at galileomovement.com.au).

36. ICLEI, *'Sustainability', & Agenda 21: Politicians Support UN AG21 Program, & Demonise Anyone Who Dares Question It.* (Article by Graham Williamson, August 2013, 3rd edition, located at galileomovement.com.au).
37. *Agenda 21 in One Easy Lesson.* (Article by Tom DeWeese, April 2011, located at newswithviews.com).
38. *Technocracy Rising: The Trojan Horse of Global Transformation.* (Book by Patrick Wood, 2015).
39. *Agenda 21: United Nations Sustainable Development*
40. *Transforming Our World: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.*
41. [www.azquotes.com/author/14256-Maurice Strong](http://www.azquotes.com/author/14256-Maurice%20Strong)
42. *Wikipedia*, Maurice Strong.
