



# *Infowar School*

**ENVIRONMENT COURSE**

**LEVEL 1**

**THE N.W.O.  
ENVIRONMENTAL  
STRATEGY**

**FREE**

*Shaun Almeida*

**2024  
VERSION 2.1**

# Environment Course Level 1 The N.W.O. Environmental Strategy

Infowar School

*By Shaun Almeida*

This is a free publication from Infowar School created to raise awareness about the New World Order. Please share this book with everyone.



Published online by [Infowarschool.com](http://Infowarschool.com)  
2024  
Version 2.1

<b>THE N.W.O. ADMIT THEIR PLAN IS TO USE CLIMATE CHANGE AGAINST THE HUMAN RACE TO CONTROL YOU.....</b>	<b>4</b>
THE CLUB OF ROME.....	4
<i>Who Are The Club Of Rome?</i> .....	4
<i>The Club of Rome Have Designated Humanity as Their Enemy</i> .....	4
<i>The N.W.O. Justify Their Actions with the Climate Change Lie</i> .....	5
<b>THE ENVIRONMENTAL ASPECT OF THEIR TECHNOCRACY.....</b>	<b>8</b>
THE N.W.O. TECHNOCRACY WILL PERSECUTE ANYONE WHO RESISTS THEM.....	9
EXAMPLES OF THE N.W.O. ENVIRONMENT PLAN AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNMENT LEVEL.....	11
<i>Promoting Dictatorial Government Using Climate</i> .....	11
<i>Shutting Down Industries and Food Production</i> .....	13
<i>Destroying the Wealth and Security We Already Created</i> .....	16
<b>THE U.N. AND THE IPCC LIED TO US ABOUT THE FUTURE CLIMATE.....</b>	<b>18</b>
THE IPCC AND THE UN HIDE STATEMENTS FROM SCIENTISTS WHO SAY THERE IS NO EVIDENCE OF GREENHOUSE GASSES OR HUMAN EMISSIONS CAUSING CLIMATE CHANGES.....	19
<i>Proof of a Conspiracy Involving UN Scientists to Change Temperature Data</i> .....	20
THE UNITED NATIONS AND THE IPCC LIED ABOUT HISTORY TO SUPPORT THEIR INCORRECT THEORIES.....	25
<b>IS THERE REALLY A CONSENSUS?.....</b>	<b>28</b>
<i>An Example of Trying To Produce a Fake Consensus by Using Faulty Statistics</i> .....	31

## **The N.W.O. Admit Their Plan Is To Use Climate Change against the Human Race to Control You**

Let's look at which one of the N.W.O. organizations is in charge of this part of their Main Strategy and how they admit it is their lie.

### **The Club of Rome**

The N.W.O. is divided into many groups working together on different areas of their Main Strategy. One group is called the Club of Rome. This is one of the groups that lie about global warming or climate change being caused by carbon dioxide (CO2). First we will look at who the Club of Rome are and then their admission of what they are doing.

#### **Who Are The Club Of Rome?**

##### **Club of Rome**

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Club\\_of\\_Rome](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Club_of_Rome)

*Wikipedia:*

*19 April 2021*

Founded in 1968 at Accademia dei Lincei in Rome, Italy, the Club of Rome consists of current and former **heads of state, UN bureaucrats, high-level politicians and government officials, diplomats, scientists, economists, and business leaders from around the globe.**

##### **The Conspirators Heirarchy: The Committee Of 300**

<https://archive.org/details/committee300>

*Dr. John Coleman.*

*Page 10*

It came as a revelation to them that the Club of Rome and its financiers under the title of the German Marshall Fund were two highly-organized conspiratorial bodies operating under cover of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and that the **majority of Club of Rome executives were drawn from NATO.**

#### **The Club of Rome Have Designated Humanity as Their Enemy**

They admit to creating the lie that CO2 is controlling the weather and is dangerous. CO2 is part of the lifecycle of this planet. Increasing it will not harm the planet. Increasing CO2 will have tremendous benefits as you will see in level 3 of the environment course.

The Club of Rome also admits they have chosen to unite against humanity using their deception of global warming. The quote below from their own book tells us that they were looking for an enemy to unite against and the enemy is humanity. They tell us that they "came up with the idea" that global warming would be the reason to unite against humanity. Today the N.W.O. tell us CO2 is causing climate change so they can blame all of the weather and not just warming on CO2.

[https://ia801702.us.archive.org/34/items/the-first-global-revolution-a-report-by-the-council-of-the-club-of-rome-alexande/The%20First%20Global%20Revolution\\_%20A%20Report%20by%20the%20Council%20of%20the%20Club%20of%20Rome%20-%20Alexander%20King%2C%20Bertrand%20Schneider%20-%20%20Random%20House%2C%20Inc.%20\\_%20Pantheon%20Books%20%281991%29.pdf](https://ia801702.us.archive.org/34/items/the-first-global-revolution-a-report-by-the-council-of-the-club-of-rome-alexande/The%20First%20Global%20Revolution_%20A%20Report%20by%20the%20Council%20of%20the%20Club%20of%20Rome%20-%20Alexander%20King%2C%20Bertrand%20Schneider%20-%20%20Random%20House%2C%20Inc.%20_%20Pantheon%20Books%20%281991%29.pdf)

[The First Global Revolution A Report By The Council Of The Club Of Rome](#)

*Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider.*

*Page 115.*

In searching for a **common enemy against whom we can unite, we came up with the idea** that pollution, **the threat of global warming**, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill. In their totality and their interactions these phenomena do constitute a common threat which must be confronted by everyone together. But in designating these dangers as the enemy, we fall into the trap, which we have already warned readers about, namely mistaking symptoms for causes.

All these dangers are caused by human intervention in natural processes, and it is only through **changed attitudes and behaviour** that they can be overcome. The real **enemy then is humanity itself.**

They are saying that they decided to use threats of global warming, famine and water shortages to make us think that we have to stop using certain types of energy. They are saying the human race is the enemy of itself and of the Earth. They even point out that they want people to fall into the trap of 'mistaking symptoms for causes' which is exactly what they do when they tell us CO2 causes temperature to rise. CO2 is not the cause of temperature rise. CO2 is the symptom of temperature rise. The CO2 trend follows the temperature trend. After the average temperature rises the average CO2 rises.

Notice also how they say attitudes and behaviors have to be changed and that is exactly what is happening with UNESCO and Agenda 21 and Agenda 30 in our school systems.

[The N.W.O. Justify Their Actions with the Climate Change Lie](#)

Here you will see that they call for a N.W.O. and they say that the N.W.O. will save us from climate change. But climate change is normal and any unnatural climate change is caused by their geoengineering program and not by human CO2 output.

But first, this statement is from a former Australian government member who tells us that the N.W.O. is deceiving us.

[Climate change is UN-led hoax to create 'new world order' – Australian PM's adviser](#)

<https://www.rt.com/news/256861-climate-change-un-hoax/>

*8 May, 2015*

The Australian prime minister's chief business adviser says that climate change is a ruse **led by the United Nations to create a new world order under the agency's control.** The statement coincided with a visit from the UN's top climate negotiator.

Maurice Newman, chairman of Prime Minister Tony Abbott's business advisory council, said **the UN is using false models which show sustained temperature increases** because it wants to end democracy and impose authoritarian rule.

"It's a well-kept secret, but 95 percent of the climate models we are told prove the link between human CO2 emissions and catastrophic global warming have been found, after nearly two decades of temperature stasis, **to be in error**," he wrote in an opinion piece published in The Australian newspaper on Friday, without providing evidence.

"The real agenda is **concentrated political authority**. Global warming is the hook," he said, adding that **the UN is against capitalism and freedom** and wants to create a "**new world order**."

Here are the admissions from members of the N.W.O. that they are using the deception of climate change to justify building their N.W.O. They say they want a N.W.O. to stop climate change. They also say they want a N.W.O. to stop many other problems they created.

[Remarks of Under-Secretary-General Rosemary DiCarlo at Yale University's Macmillan Center on "United Nations and a New World Order: Multilateralism vs Regionalism and Unilateralism"](https://dppa.un.org/en/remarks-of-under-secretary-general-rosemary-dicarlo-yale-universitys-macmillan-center-united-nations)

<https://dppa.un.org/en/remarks-of-under-secretary-general-rosemary-dicarlo-yale-universitys-macmillan-center-united-nations>

We are having this conversation at a difficult time. Far from a "**new world order**", what we see is unease and uncertainty across the globe; intensified competition amongst major powers; and a perception that we face threats more serious than we have seen in a generation: persistent **conflict, accelerating climate change, and new forms of warfare** deriving from technological change and without **international governance**.

[Pushing for a green economy & clean energy](https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/august-november-2019/pushing-green-economy-clean-energy)

—Joyce Msuya, United Nations Environment Programme's Deputy Executive Director

<https://www.un.org/africarenewal/magazine/august-november-2019/pushing-green-economy-clean-energy>

If countries deliver on all that was agreed here and implement the resolutions, we could **take a big step towards a new world order** where we **no longer grow at the expense of nature** but instead see people and planet thrive together.

[Climate Change and Conflict: The Tail Wagging the Dog or New, Cascading Tensions and Inequalities?](https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/climate-change-and-conflict-tail-wagging-dog-or-new-cascading-tensions-and-inequalities)

<https://www.un.org/en/chronicle/article/climate-change-and-conflict-tail-wagging-dog-or-new-cascading-tensions-and-inequalities>

*Fatima Denton is Director of the Special Initiatives Division and Coordinator of the African Climate Policy Centre at the United Nations Economic Commission for Africa*

The Paris Agreement adopted at the 21st Conference of the Parties (COP 21) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, held in December 2015, heralds a new dawn in the evolution of our efforts to mitigate the adverse consequences of **climate change**. In many ways, it clearly indicates how climate change-related policies have shifted from the narrow prism of environmental concerns to a **new world order** where the transition to a **low carbon development** is replete with economic, social and cultural ramifications.

From the last quote we can see that they specifically blame carbon (CO<sub>2</sub>) for climate change so they can then shut down our energy use by limiting carbon use.

The next quote from The Sydney Morning Herald tells us that the Pope is calling for a global government that will force all nations into compliance. Protecting the environment is one of the reasons the Pope is using to justify a global government.

[Pope calls for a new world order](https://www.smh.com.au/world/pope-calls-for-a-new-world-order-20090709-ddic.html)

<https://www.smh.com.au/world/pope-calls-for-a-new-world-order-20090709-ddic.html>

*The Sydney Morning Herald*

*By Barney Swartz*

*July 9, 2009*

**POPE Benedict XVI has proposed a new world political authority "with real teeth",.....**

His suggested political authority would manage **globalisation**, revive economies, stop the crisis deepening, **protect the environment** and regulate worldwide migration. It would need to be universally recognised and given **power to ensure compliance from all countries.**

The next article shows even more clearly how the Pope is trying to justify a N.W.O. to stop the destruction of the environment but as we will see later it is the N.W.O. destroying the environment. The Pope says that there is "no future" and "no alternative" but the N.W.O. The article also tells us that the worlds financial institutions that are owned and controlled by the N.W.O. will deny "access to finance in the future" to anyone opposed to the N.W.O. The Pope has also called for a global financial order.

[Pope calls for 'new world order,' says 'wasting' COVID crisis would be worse than pandemic](https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/pope-calls-for-new-world-order-says-wasting-covid-crisis-would-be-worse-than-pandemic/)

<https://www.lifesitenews.com/news/pope-calls-for-new-world-order-says-wasting-covid-crisis-would-be-worse-than-pandemic/>

*LifeSiteNews*

*Michael Haynes*

*Mon Mar 15, 2021*

In fact, the Pope even linked the theological aspect of salvation, to the promotion of a **new world order in line with globalist policies**, suggesting that **salvation was dependent upon their success.** "We can no longer blithely accept inequalities and disruptions to **the environment.** The path to humanity's salvation passes through the creation of a new model of development, which unquestionably focuses on coexistence among **peoples in harmony with Creation.**"

Should his words be ignored, the Pope warned, there could be **"no future for anyone,"** and thus the world must "prepare for tomorrow under the banner of human fraternity," since there is **"no alternative."**

The Pope then expressed his support for **businesses and industries only continuing if they align themselves with the globalist green agenda.** He talked of "conditions" to bring about "ethical and responsible" financial investing, which would "obtain the result of limiting support to companies that are **harmful to the environment** and to peace.

LifeSiteNews recently reported on how this very proposal is currently being **prepared by the world's major financial institutions and globalist leaders**, with **adherence to the green agenda** and the United Nations' pro-abortion Sustainable Development Goals (SDG's) possibly determining **whether or not one has access to finance in the future**.

### **The Environmental Aspect of Their Technocracy**

This article explains some of the terrible details of their N.W.O. technocracy that their environment strategy is helping to build. They will control your purchases and activities according to how much carbon you are allowed to use.

#### **Technocrats Want “Mandatory” Carbon Credit Cards to Control Every Facet of Your Life**

<https://www.infowars.com/posts/technocrats-want-mandatory-carbon-credit-cards-to-control-every-facet-of-your-life/>

*Paul Joseph Watson*

*Infowars.com*

*September 14th 2021*

Technocrats are preparing “mandatory” personal carbon allowances that would **introduce rationing into every area of your life via an app** that would **record** your travel, heating expenses and even the food you eat.

Everyone would be **issued with a ‘carbon allowance card’** “that would entail all adults receiving an equal tradable **carbon allowance that reduces over time** in line with national [carbon] targets.”

The authors make it clear that the program would be a “**national mandatory policy.**”

**Carbon units would be “deducted from the personal budget** with every payment of transport fuel, home-heating fuels and electricity bills,” and anyone going over the limit would be **forced to purchase additional units in the personal carbon market from those with excess to sell.**”

The proposal makes clear that the means of measuring a person’s uptake of carbon units for travel would function “**on the basis of the tracking the user’s movement history.**”

The authors note how the normalization of contact tracing via COVID-19 apps will ensure a similar system could be used for keeping track of carbon credits with minimum fuss.

**“Recent studies show how COVID-19 contact tracing apps were successfully implemented with mandatory schemes in several East Asian countries such as China, Taiwan, and South Korea,”** states the article.

This is the study shown in the above article.

#### **Personal carbon allowances revisited**

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-021-00756-w>

or

<https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-021-00756-w.pdf>

*Francesco Fuso Nerini, Tina Fawcett, Yael Parag and Paul Ekins*

*16 August 2021*



### The N.W.O. Technocracy Will Persecute Anyone Who Resists Them

The N.W.O. does not play to loose. And you will be forced to follow their plan through any type of manipulation or even through physical force and violence. They call us climate change deniers because we know that CO2 will not cause the destruction of the planet and because we expose their evil plans. If you try to expose the N.W.O. plan or defy their actions they may try to put you in jail as you can see in the article below.

#### [Attorney General Lynch Looks Into Prosecuting 'Climate Change Deniers'](https://www.dailysignal.com/2016/03/10/attorney-general-lynch-looking-into-prosecuting-climate-change-deniers/)

<https://www.dailysignal.com/2016/03/10/attorney-general-lynch-looking-into-prosecuting-climate-change-deniers/>

*Hans von Spakovsky*

*dailysignal.com*

*March 10, 2016*

In news that should shock and anger Americans, **U.S. Attorney General Loretta Lynch** told the Senate Judiciary Committee on Wednesday that not only has she discussed internally **the possibility of pursuing civil actions against so-called "climate change deniers," but she has "referred it to the FBI to consider whether or not it meets the criteria for which we could take action."**

Lynch was responding to a question from Sen. Sheldon Whitehouse, D-R.I., who urged Lynch to prosecute those who **"pretend that the science of carbon emissions' dangers is unsettled,"** particularly those in the "fossil fuel industry" who supposedly have constructed a "climate denial apparatus."

Look at the statements in the article below. It is accusing the people who are telling the truth about the climate of telling lies. As you study the N.W.O. you will notice they always accuse others of doing exactly what they are doing. They are lying about CO2 and the climate but they accuse us of lying when we expose them and their lies. And they want to put us in jail for it.

#### [Is misinformation about the climate criminally negligent?](https://theconversation.com/is-misinformation-about-the-climate-criminally-negligent-23111)

<https://theconversation.com/is-misinformation-about-the-climate-criminally-negligent-23111>

*Lawrence Torcello*

*theconversation.com*

*13 March 2014*

When it comes to global warming, much of the public remains in denial about a set of facts that the majority of scientists clearly agree on. With such high stakes, an organised campaign funding misinformation ought to be considered criminally negligent.

**We have good reason to consider the funding of climate denial to be criminally and morally negligent.** The charge of criminal and moral negligence ought to extend to all activities of the climate deniers who receive funding as part of a sustained campaign to undermine the public's understanding of scientific consensus.

What are we to make of those behind the well documented corporate funding of global warming denial? Those who purposefully strive to make sure "inexact, incomplete and contradictory information" is given to the public? I believe we understand them correctly when we know them to be not only corrupt and deceitful, but criminally negligent in their willful disregard for human life. **It is time for modern societies to interpret and update their legal systems accordingly.**

This is one example of the N.W.O. putting people in jail.

[Mom of 3 Arrested, Jailed for Putting Recycling in Wrong Color Bag](https://archives.infowars.com/mom-of-3-arrested-jailed-for-putting-recycling-in-wrong-color-bag/)

<https://archives.infowars.com/mom-of-3-arrested-jailed-for-putting-recycling-in-wrong-color-bag/>

*Adan Salazar*

*Infowars.com*

*August 19, 2019*

Webb was cited for four separate violations of the Environmental Protection Act, but when she failed to show up to an April court hearing she was **arrested and detained in a holding cell.**

She was also ordered to pay a **fine of £50**, as prosecutors argued the new changes had been widely publicized, and was “given a six-month conditional discharge,” according to The Daily Mail.

Webb’s lawyer, Jeremy Kendall, contended she’d **received permission to continue to use black bags for her recycling**, as she’d requested the new color bags but they never arrived.

**“The black bags chucked out by Lindsey were flagged by a passing warden, who saw 10 bags dumped on the pavement.”** Metro reports, adding her address was found during a search of the bags and she’d additionally been identified through surveillance footage.

Kendall argued Webb failed to appear in court because she never received the court summons.

Making us criminals is not even good enough. They want to make us think we are going to hell too. The pope who calls himself the king of the Earth and claims to hold the keys to heaven and hell says acts against the environment should be a sin.

[Pope Proposes Making ‘Acts Against The Environment’ A Sin](https://archives.infowars.com/pope-proposes-making-acts-against-the-environment-a-sin/)

<https://archives.infowars.com/pope-proposes-making-acts-against-the-environment-a-sin/>

*Steve Watson*

*Infowars.com*

*November 18, 2019*

Pope Francis declared Friday that he is considering making it a sin to be un-environmentally friendly, continuing his brand of eco-popey that he has been pushing since becoming the Pontiff in 2013.

“We must introduce—we are thinking—into the Catechism of the Catholic Church **the sin against ecology, the ecological sin** against the common home, because it’s a duty,” **the pope said at the Vatican Friday.**

He noted that ecological sin would be defined as an “action or omission against God, against others, the community and the environment. **It is a sin against future generations** and is manifested in the acts and habits of pollution and destruction of the harmony of the environment.”

“Global financial capital is at the origin of serious crimes not only against property but also against people and the environment,” Francis said, **comparing capitalism to “organized crime”** committing “ecocide.” Francis added that such crimes committed by corporations should be punished.

In June this year, the **pope declared a global “climate emergency,”** warning of the dangers of ‘global heating’ and said that a failure to act urgently to reduce

**greenhouse gases** would be “a brutal act of injustice toward the poor and future generations”.

He followed up in September urging governments around the world to take “drastic measures” to combat global warming and **reduce the use of fossil fuels**, again saying the world was experiencing a climate emergency.

### Examples of the N.W.O. Environment Plan at the National Government Level

In this topic we will look at three tactics of the N.W.O. environmental strategy which they are using to bring the individual nations under the control of their UN world government. They are shutting down industries, limiting food production and making people poor. This makes people vulnerable and easier to control. It destroys nations.

### Promoting Dictatorial Government Using Climate

The following article is very revealing. It shows us several ways the N.W.O. are deceiving us. We will look at a quote from the United Nations Climate Chief Christina Figueres. This is a very good N.W.O. source since the UN is their world government and the climate change agenda is their strategy and we are hearing from their climate chief. First she tells us that they prefer communism over democracy which is no surprise since the N.W.O. created communism and it is a form of dictatorship.

Then she tells us china is "doing it right" when it comes to fighting global warming. Except china is the world leader in producing CO2 so what are they doing right if CO2 is so bad and china is the leading producer? The UN and N.W.O. don't care about CO2 they care about having a dictatorship or else they would not say china is the best model. She also tells us that what ever china is doing for the environment is for their own national interest and not the world's interest. The UN who demonizes independent nations will praise nationalism when it suits them to make a dictatorship look good by trying to make China look good. And the UN who claims to want to save the world by stopping CO2 says their best model China doesn't even care about the rest of the world when they do something about CO2.

So in the end the only thing the UN is praising as their "best model" is a dictatorship. And it's no wonder since all their climate claims are a deception to create a world dictatorship. China is already very technocratic with its social credit score and surveillance and oppression.

### [UN climate chief: Communism is best to fight global warming](http://dailycaller.com/2014/01/15/un-climate-chief-communism-is-best-to-fight-global-warming/)

<http://dailycaller.com/2014/01/15/un-climate-chief-communism-is-best-to-fight-global-warming/>

*Daily Caller News Foundation*

*Michael Bastasch*

*01/15/2014*

**United Nations climate chief Christiana Figueres said that democracy is a poor political system for fighting global warming. Communist China, she says, is the best model.**

China may be the world's top emitter of carbon dioxide and struggling with major pollution problems of their own, but the country is **"doing it right"** when it comes to fighting global warming says Figueres.

**"They actually want to breathe air that they don't have to look at," she said. "They're not doing this because they want to save the planet. They're doing it because it's in their national interest."**

Figueres added that the deep partisan divide in the **U.S. Congress is "very detrimental"** to passing any sort of legislation to fight global warming. **The Chinese Communist Party, on the other hand,** can push key policies and reforms all on its own. The country's national legislature largely **enforces the decisions made by the party's Central Committee and other executive offices.**

Communism was responsible for the **deaths of about 94 million people in China,** the Soviet Union, North Korea, Afghanistan and Eastern Europe in the 20th Century. China alone was responsible for 65 million of those deaths under communist rule.

However, the country **still gets 90 percent of its power from fossil fuels, mostly from coal.** In fact, Chinese coal demand is expected to explode as the country continues to develop. **China has approved 100 million metric tons of new coal production** capacity in 2013 as part of the government's plan to bring 860 million metric tons of coal production online by 2015.

The Wall Street Journal notes that **China's air quality was so bad that** about "1.2 million people died prematurely in China in 2010 as a result of air pollution" and Chinese government figures show that **"lung cancer is now the leading cause of death from malignant tumors. Many of those dying are nonsmokers."**

The Soviet bloc's environmental track record was similarly dismal.

Here you can see how china is not only the leader in CO2 production but it is also responsible for much of the plastic pollution that is going into the ocean. Ninety percent of plastic waste polluting earth's oceans comes from Asia and Africa.

### **90 Per Cent of Plastic Waste Polluting Earth's Oceans Comes From Asia and Africa**

<https://archives.infowars.com/90-per-cent-of-plastic-waste-polluting-earths-oceans-comes-from-asia-and-africa/>

*Paul Joseph Watson*

*Infowars.com*

*September 18, 2019*

Despite westerners being lectured by climate activists like Greta Thunberg, a study has found that around **90 per cent of plastic waste polluting earth's oceans comes from Asia and Africa.**

During her U.S. tour, Thunberg cited "horrifying pictures of plastic in the oceans," as one of the primary reasons why Americans should listen to her.

However, researchers at Germany's Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research discovered that a small number of rivers account for the vast majority of plastic pollution and **none of them are located in western countries.**

"The 10 top-ranked rivers transport 88-95 percent of the global load into the sea," Dr. Christian Schmidt, a hydrogeologist who led the study, told the Daily Mail. "The rivers with the highest estimated plastic loads are characterized by high population – for instance the Yangtze with over half a billion people."

**Out of the top ten rivers that produce the most pollution, eight are in Asia and two are in Africa.** The Yangtze River in China and the Ganges River in India were responsible for the most plastic pollution.

**While westerners are being told to alter their lifestyles and have fewer children to save the planet, virtually nothing is being said about or to the people in the countries responsible for the vast majority of pollution.**

This is probably one of the main reasons why many in the west remain skeptical about the true motives of the environmentalist movement.

In the next article you can see some N.W.O. propaganda. Here they are trying to convince Americans that it is bigger government that will save them from harmless CO2.

**[The Science Guy: Big Government the Cure for Climate Change](https://archives.infowars.com/the-science-guy-big-government-the-cure-for-climate-change/)**

<https://archives.infowars.com/the-science-guy-big-government-the-cure-for-climate-change/>

*Trey Sanchez*

*Truth Revolt*

*February 17, 2014*

On NBC's *Meet the Press* Sunday, David Gregory hosted a climate change panel with Bill Nye "The Science Guy" and Rep. Marsha Blackburn (R-TN) to discuss the government's role in fighting "climate change." **Nye said the solution lies in the U.S. Government doing more in order to "lead the world" in the fight.....**

And so **we all get into this thing that big governments are bad.** I know that's a very strong claim that for me, as a voter and taxpayer, is somehow tied to climate change. **But what we want to do is not just less. We want to do more with less.**

Notice also how they say 'do more with less' which sounds a lot like the effects of inflation caused in part by a reduced energy supply and higher energy costs which leave you with less money.

**Shutting Down Industries and Food Production**

The N.W.O. want to keep the third world from rising out of poverty and they want to lower the first world into poverty. The first world is largely the western world. In the following articles we will see their environment strategy is being used to shut down industry and limit our food. They are actually attacking all of our food production in various different ways and methane production from farm animals is an easy fit into their environment strategy because methane is a green house gas. In this next article you can see the UN and their IPCC want us to eat less meat. Why less meat? Meat is a complete protein that helps humans grow big strong muscles which is not good for the N.W.O. since they don't want you to resist them in any way at all. Meat is very nutritious for humans and you can be very productive and build prosperity when you are well nourished.

**[UN body to look at meat and climate link](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8583308.stm)**

<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/8583308.stm>

*By Richard Black*

*Environment correspondent, BBC News*

*Wednesday, 24 March 2010*

A 2006 report concluded **meat production** was responsible for 18% of greenhouse gas emissions - more than transport.

**The report has been cited by people campaigning for a more vegetable-based diet, including Sir Paul McCartney.**

Sir Paul was one of the figures launching a campaign late last year centred on the slogan "**Less meat = less heat**".

Leading figures in the climate change establishment, such as Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) chairman Rajendra Pachauri and Lord (Nicholas) Stern, have also quoted the 18% figure as a reason why people should consider eating less meat.

**"Smarter animal farming, not less farming, will equal less heat,"** he told delegates to the American Chemical Society (ACS) meeting in San Francisco.

Below is the study from the UN that was part of the above article. It says there must be "drastic changes" to "human diets".

[Eat less meat: UN climate-change report calls for change to human diet](https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02409-7)

<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02409-7>

*08 August 2019*

*Quirin Schiermeier*

*nature.com*

Efforts to curb **greenhouse-gas emissions** and the impacts of **global warming** will fall significantly short without **drastic changes** in global land use, agriculture and **human diets**, leading researchers warn in a high-level report commissioned by the United Nations.

The special report on climate change and land by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) describes plant-based diets as a major opportunity for mitigating and adapting to climate change — and includes a **policy** recommendation to **reduce meat consumption**.

National governments are told what to do by the UN which is what the N.W.O. want. They want their UN world government in control of the world and changing diets is not the only thing the UN tells nations to do. They want to force you to comply with whatever the UN says. Notice how it says at the end 'tough to impose democratically'. That's why they want a dictatorship.

[British Government Will Have to Force People to Eat Less Red Meat to Meet Climate Change Targets](https://www.infowars.com/posts/british-government-will-have-to-force-people-to-eat-less-red-meat-to-meet-climate-change-targets)

<https://www.infowars.com/posts/british-government-will-have-to-force-people-to-eat-less-red-meat-to-meet-climate-change-targets>

*infowars.com*

*Paul Joseph Watson*

*July 12th 2021*

Christopher Snowden of the Institute for Economic Affairs warns that the British government will only achieve its climate change targets **by forcing people to eat less red meat**.

"In principle, there could be a justification for government action...Boris Johnson has made some extremely ambitious climate change targets...and to do that,

if he's serious about doing it, at some point he's going to have to **stop advising people** to fly less and eat less red meat **and find ways of forcing people,**" said Snowden, adding that this would be **tough to impose democratically.**

The next article shows two more countries following the UN and forcing citizens to accept the N.W.O. environmental goals. They use high taxes so we can't afford meat.

**Germany, Sweden Mull 'Climate Change' Meat Tax**

<https://europe.infowars.com/germany-sweden-mulling-climate-change-meat-tax/>

*Dan Lyman*

*europe.infowars.com*

*August 08, 2019*

Officials in Sweden and Germany are discussing imposing a tax on consumable meat to combat 'climate change' following a new IPCC report encouraging a plant-based diet, according to local media.

Politicians claim they hope **to reduce CO2 emissions** and improve animal welfare with a **forced reduction in meat consumption.**

"The decision makers want to **raise the tax to the standard VAT, or 19 percent, up from the current seven percent that consumers are required to pay for meat products.**"

Here is another example of the N.W.O. members in national government pushing forward the N.W.O. environment strategy. This is another attempt to raise the price of meat so you or the farmers can't afford to eat or produce meat.

The Supreme Court in the US designated greenhouse gases as air pollution. It's not pollution. It's harmless and natural. Now the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) can make farmers pay for having cows and pigs. The taxes are so high that it will put the farmers out of business. This is how they force you to accept their goals.

**Tax cows, hogs for passing gas, burping?**

<https://www.nbcnews.com/id/wbna28070487>

*nbcnews.com*

*Source: The Associated Press*

*Dec. 5, 2008*

Farmers so far are turning their noses up at the notion, which they contend is a possible consequence of an Environmental Protection Agency report after the **U.S. Supreme Court ruled in 2007 that greenhouse gases amount to air pollution.** Livestock emit methane, a key greenhouse gas tied to global warming.

**EPA officials insisted Friday that the lengthy, highly technical report,** which mostly focuses on other sources of air pollution, does not include a proposal to tax livestock.

But the American Farm Bureau Federation said, based on federal agriculture department figures, it would require **farms or ranches with more than 25 dairy cows, 50 beef cattle or 200 hogs to pay an annual fee of about \$175 for each dairy cow, \$87.50 per head of beef cattle and \$20 for each hog.**

The executive vice president of the Wyoming Farm Bureau Federation, Ken Hamilton, estimated the fee would cost owners of a modest-sized cattle ranch \$30,000

to \$40,000 a year. He said he has talked to a number of livestock owners about the proposals, and **"all have said if the fees were carried out, it would bankrupt them."**

The farm groups say the fee would apply to farms with livestock operations that emit more than 100 tons of carbon emissions in a year and fall under federal Clean Air Act provisions.

EPA officials said the agency has not taken a position on any of the matters discussed in its response to the Supreme Court ruling. And **John Millett, a spokesman for EPA's air and radiation division, said there has been an oversimplification of the EPA's document "to the point of distortion."**

### Destroying the Wealth and Security We Already Created

The World Wildlife Fund says the human race needs to become poor to save the Earth. But they disguise their true intentions with double speak and creative language. In one of their reports, the WWF accuses the developed nations of abusing their ecological footprint and overusing their biomass. They are talking about the first world which is mostly the western world. Who decided the size of anyone's ecological footprint? Was it the N.W.O.?

Their phrase "drastically shrinking the ecological footprint of high income populations" means making you poor. We know this because they say they don't want economic development and they do want "inequality adjusted human development" which means making the first world equal to the third world by lowering the standard of living in the first world.

### WWF Calls For Global Poverty To Save The Planet

<https://archives.infowars.com/wwf-calls-for-global-poverty-to-save-the-planet/>

*Paul Joseph Watson*

*Prison Planet.com*

*Wednesday, May 16, 2012*

The World Wildlife Fund has released a report which calls for **all carbon emissions to be banned by 2050 and for the entire human population to live in a state of poverty in the name of preserving rare species and saving the planet.**

According to the WWF, humans in developed nations are abusing their "**ecological footprint**" and using more "**biocapacity**" than they have.

The only people operating within their allotted "biocapacity" are **poor people in impoverished countries.**

The solution? The organization wants to see "**inequality adjusted human development**" rather than economic development. Or put another way, the answer is focused around "**drastically shrinking the ecological footprint of high income populations**".

This is the WWF report from the above article.

### [Living Planet Report 2012 Biodiversity, biocapacity and better choices](https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/lpr_living_planet_report_2012.pdf)

[https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/lpr\\_living\\_planet\\_report\\_2012.pdf](https://wwfint.awsassets.panda.org/downloads/lpr_living_planet_report_2012.pdf)



ISBN 978-2-940443-37-6

2012

WWF International

[www.panda.org](http://www.panda.org)

page 114

"drastically shrinking the ecological footprint of high income populations".

This article tells us how the UN wants to make the western nations poor. They call it 'trillions of dollars of wealth transfer'. Whose money is being transferred where? It is your money in the form of carbon taxes and other fees for using carbon. They say they want millions of job losses. They also say most of the worlds electricity will have to be decarbonized which means only wind or solar power and maybe hydro power. But this will never be enough to support a high standard of clean living which is why they tell us we need to do "more with less" and "shrink our ecological footprint". It's all about destroying our hard work that built a better world so they can have their N.W.O.

### U.N. 'CLIMATE CHANGE' PLAN WOULD LIKELY SHIFT TRILLIONS TO FORM NEW WORLD ECONOMY

<https://www.foxnews.com/story/u-n-climate-change-plan-would-likely-shift-trillions-to-form-new-world-economy>

Friday, March 27, 2009

By George Russell

A United Nations document on "**climate change**" that will be distributed to a major environmental conclave next week envisions a huge reordering of the world economy, likely involving **trillions of dollars in wealth transfer, millions of job losses** and gains, **new taxes, industrial relocations, new tariffs and subsidies, and complicated payments for greenhouse gas abatement schemes and carbon taxes — all under the supervision of the world body.**

In an influential but highly controversial paper called "Key Elements of a Global Deal on Climate Change," British economist Nicholas Lord Stern, formerly a high British Treasury official, has declared that industrial economies would need to cut their per capita carbon dioxide emissions by "at least **80% by 2050,**" while the biggest economies, like the U.S.'s, would have to make cuts of 90 percent.

Stern also calls for "immediate and binding" reduction targets for developed nations of 20 percent to 40 percent by 2020.

To meet Stern's 2050 goals, he says, among other things, "**most of the world's electricity production will need to have been decarbonized.**"

Here is an organization called the International Monetary Fund. When they have the word "world" or "international" in their name it's an indication that they might be a N.W.O. organization but the real proof comes when you see them working towards the N.W.O. goals. Here the IMF says they want to discourage driving which is another way to destroy our progress but they claim it's to save the Earth. They want to use a gas tax to do this which will also make you poor and ruin the economy and limit our ability to create prosperity. We already have clean automobile technology and all we have to do is use it.

[Top House Republican Pushes Back at IMF Gas Tax Study](http://www.foxbusiness.com/industries/2013/03/28/top-house-republican-pushes-back-at-imf-gas-tax-study/)

<http://www.foxbusiness.com/industries/2013/03/28/top-house-republican-pushes-back-at-imf-gas-tax-study/>

Peter Barnes

Published March 28, 2013

FOXBusiness

In a new study on **global energy and climate change** Wednesday, the **IMF** suggested the U.S. consider **\$1.40 a gallon in higher gas taxes**. If adopted, the increase would triple gas taxes in the U.S. – local, state and federal combined -- and send the price of gas higher than \$5 a gallon.....

"Drivers across the country are already struggling to pay up to \$4.00 a gallon for gas, and further price increases at the pump could be devastating to low and middle-class families and disastrous to our economic recovery. Instead of finding way to make gas more expensive, our focus needs to be on finding solutions to keep energy prices affordable." Rep. Fred Upton (R-MI).

**"The time has come for subsidy reform and carbon taxation," the IMF's deputy director, David Lipton, said** in a speech Wednesday. "The IMF will draw attention to the issue and help those who want to go forward."

The IMF said higher gas prices could help reduce traffic jams and accidents by **discouraging driving**.

This article is a clear admission that the N.W.O. are only using the environment as a deception to take over the economy. Notice the part where it says "it wasn't originally a climate thing at all".

[AOC's top aide admits Green New Deal about the economy, not climate](https://www.foxnews.com/politics/aocs-top-aide-admits-green-new-deal-about-the-economy-not-the-climate)

<https://www.foxnews.com/politics/aocs-top-aide-admits-green-new-deal-about-the-economy-not-the-climate>

Adam Shaw

foxnews.com

2019-07-12

Rep. Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez's chief of staff recently admitted that the Green New Deal was not conceived as an effort to deal with climate change, but instead a "how-do-you-change-the-entire economy thing"

**"The interesting thing about the Green New Deal is it wasn't originally a climate thing at all,"** Saikat Chakrabarti said in May, according to The Washington Post.

"Do you guys think of it as a climate thing?" Chakrabarti then asked. **"Because we really think of it as a how-do-you-change-the-entire-economy thing."**

Ocasio-Cortez has called the deal "a wartime-level, just economic mobilization plan to get to 100% renewable energy." The plan, which would cost trillions, sees the U.S. taking a "leading role in reducing emissions through economic transformation."

**The U.N. And The IPCC Lied To Us about the Future Climate**

We have seen that the members of the N.W.O. are using the false threat of CO2 to justify their creation of a N.W.O. We have also seen that one of their organizations called the Club of Rome admits they are using threats they create that are common to all the nations of the world to try and unite us in fear under a world government. Does this

sound like people you can trust to give you accurate information about the environment or the climate? Let's look at some more deceptions from the N.W.O. and their members and organizations.

The IPCC And The UN Hide Statements From Scientists Who Say There Is No Evidence of Greenhouse Gasses or Human Emissions Causing Climate Changes.

This is another example of the IPCC and the UN simply telling us whatever they want whether it is true or not and putting the scientists names on their deceptions to make it sound important. They erase anything that disagrees with their deception and they even add lies to their reports. In the documentary "the great global warming swindle" you can listen to scientists that were part of the IPCC tell us that information was removed from the reports.

[The Great Global Warming Swindle - Full Documentary HD](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYhCQv5tNsQ)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYhCQv5tNsQ>

*producer Martin Durkin*

*youtube channel: Wisdom Land*

*at time 57:00 of this documentary you can see how the IPCC deleted information provided by their own scientists that humans are not the cause for global warming.*

I was horrified to read the second and the third assessment reports because there was so much misinformation without any kind of recourse or virtually **without mention of the scientific literature the truly scientific literature the literature by specialists in those fields.**

- professor Paul Reiter IPCC and Pasteur Institute Paris in a letter to The Wall Street Journal professor Frederick Seitz former president of America's National Academy of Sciences revealed that **IPCC officials had censored the comments of scientists he said that 'this report is not the version that was approved by the contributing scientists' at least 15 key sections of the science chapter had been deleted** these included statements like **'none of the studies cited have shown clear evidence that we can attribute climate changes to increases in greenhouse gases no study to date has positively attributed all or part of the observed climate changes to man-made causes.'**

professor Seitz concluded 'I have never witnessed a more disturbing **corruption of the peer-review process** than the events that led to this IPCC report' in its reply **the IPCC did not deny making these deletions** but it said there was no dishonesty or bias in the report and that uncertainties about the cause of global warming had been included. **The changes had been made it said in response to comments from governments individual scientists and non-governmental organizations**

You can also read about the above missing statements on page 24 of the study:

[LACK OF CONSISTENCY BETWEEN MODELED AND OBSERVED TEMPERATURE TRENDS](https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1260/0958-305X.22.4.375)

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1260/0958-305X.22.4.375>

and

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43735016>

*S Fred Singer*

*Energy & Environment*

*Vol. 22, No. 4 (2011), pp. 375-406 (32 pages)*  
*Sage Publications, Inc.*

In this video Lord Monckton tells us that on five occasions scientists submitted an assessment report to the IPCC which said:

[Lord Christopher Monckton presents "Fallacies about Global Warming".](#)

*Youtube channel: Shannon Grove*

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FNvV1eqTppI>

*Apr 10, 2012*

*Time: 31:05*

**"when will an anthropogenic effect on climate be identified? It's not surprising that the best answer to this question is 'we do not know'."**

He also tells us that in the 1995 IPCC assessment on climate change the statement was altered to read:

**"The body of evidence now points to a decernable human influence on global climate".**

You can also read about the above added false statements on page 24 of the study:

[LACK OF CONSISTENCY BETWEEN MODELED AND OBSERVED TEMPERATURE TRENDS](#)

<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1260/0958-305X.22.4.375>  
and

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/43735016>

*S Fred Singer*

*Energy & Environment*

*Vol. 22, No. 4 (2011), pp. 375-406 (32 pages)*

*Published By: Sage Publications, Inc.*

[Proof of a Conspiracy Involving UN Scientists to Change Temperature Data](#)


The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is an agency of the United Nations. They promote international cooperation regarding climate science and contribute to the IPCC reports on what they call human caused climate change. They tell us that human caused CO<sub>2</sub> must be reduced to save the Earth. The WMO used tree rings to construct a temperature graph but tree ring data alone is not reliable since many factors can make tree rings change. You can't just say warmer temperatures make bigger tree rings. More water, sunlight, CO<sub>2</sub>, better soil nutrition or a mixed combination of these factors can cause tree rings to get bigger. These UN scientists from the WMO used tree rings to reconstruct temperatures of the past because in the past there were no thermometers that were accurate or standardized. Thermometers with numbered scales started being invented only four hundred years ago. They also used tree rings to create their temperature graphs for our times even though we have records created by thermometers. Their graphs of past temperatures based on tree rings are crucial for supporting their theories about human caused climate change.

Because tree rings are affected by so many factors it is easier to use tree rings to produce graphs that are not accurate to trick people. The temperature can be exactly the same in two places that are close together but one place received more water from a river or rain so the tree rings are bigger. By simply choosing the bigger tree rings you can create the graphs you want instead of graphs that show what really happened. Imagine growing two plants side by side in your home. You can drastically change the way the two plants grow without changing the temperature. Just put one plant behind the other so it gets more shade and give it less water and nutrients and that plant will be smaller without changing temperature.

There was a group of trees used by the WMO to create a graph. Some of the tree rings were from our time when accurate temperatures were recorded using thermometers and the tree rings said the temperatures dropped while the thermometers said the temperatures really increased and this showed how unreliable the tree rings are. If everyone knew how unreliable tree ring data alone is they would not trust the theories of climate change that come from the WMO and the IPCC.

The scientists discussed this difference in data and decided to hide the tree ring data and replace it with data from the thermometers so that they could show temperatures rising and justify their human caused global warming theories. You can see what they did in the picture below of their graphs.

In the graph with the white background you can see the tree ring data before it was changed at the far right where the years are labeled 1960 to 1995. The green line moves downward because the tree rings were smaller. But remember tree rings alone can't tell you if temperatures went up or down just because they get bigger and smaller. Those scientists from the WMO removed the data from the tree rings and replaced that data with temperature measurements from thermometers that showed the temperatures rising. You can see the changed graph with the blue background with the green line changed and the temperature rising instead of dropping.



These scientists also wrote emails to each other describing the problem they had with their theories on past temperatures not being supported by facts and how they would change the data to support their theories instead of doing what they should have done which is change their theories. Below is a copy of their email with some commentary. There are also descriptions of the people involved in this data manipulation and the organizations they were part of.

### [The Climategate Emails](#)

<https://www.lavoisier.com.au/articles/greenhouse-science/climate-change/climategate-emails.pdf>

*edited and annotated by John Costella*

*The Lavoisier Group*

*March 2010*

[Page 13-17 tells the story with some more background]

November 16, 1999: email 0942777075

That background now paves the way to our understanding the historic email which generations of schoolchildren to come will study as the 33 words which summarize one of the most serious scientific frauds in the history of Western science.

Phil Jones to Ray Bradley, Mike Mann, Malcolm Hughes, Keith Briffa, and Tim Osborn, regarding a diagram for a World Meteorological Organization Statement:

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

This email was sent less than two months after the one analysed above. Clearly, Mike Mann's problems with Keith Briffa's data—that it didn't agree with the real temperature measurements from 1961 onwards—had by this time spread to the data for the other "temperature proxies", albeit only from 1981 onwards. Jones reveals that Mann did not address this problem by making an honest note of it in the paper that he and his co-authors published in Nature, but rather by **fraudulently substituting the real temperature data into the graphs**, for the past 20 or 40 years as required.

That Mann did so would, of itself, disqualify him and all of his research from any future consideration in the annals of science; but here we have the other leader of the field, Phil Jones, bragging that he admired the "trick" so much that he adopted it himself. Moreover, his **email was sent to the major players who dominated this field. It is their silence and collaboration over the following decade in "hiding the decline" which justifies the use of the word "conspiracy"; a conspiracy** which will rob the "discipline" of climate science of any credibility, and which will cast suspicion about the integrity of Western science for many decades to come.

Phil Jones admits to sending the emails.

[Head of 'Climategate' research unit admits sending 'pretty awful emails' to hide data](http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1254660/Climategate-professor-Phil-Jones-admits-sending-pretty-awful-emails.html#ixzz0h1GUmatW)  
<http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-1254660/Climategate-professor-Phil-Jones-admits-sending-pretty-awful-emails.html#ixzz0h1GUmatW>

*David Derbyshire*

*dailymail.co.uk*

*2 March 2010*

Looking pale and clasping his shaking hands in front of him, he told MPs: **'I have obviously written some pretty awful emails.'**

**He admitted withholding data about global temperatures** but said the information was publicly available from American websites.

And **he claimed it was not 'standard practice' to release data and computer models so other scientists could check and challenge research.**

'I don't think there is anything in those emails that really supports any view that I, or the CRU, have been trying to pervert the peer review process in any way,' he said.

The people involved and the institutions they were part of are shown below. They are all part of the UN and the IPCC.

[Michael E. Mann](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_E._Mann#IPCC_Third_Assessment_Report)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael\\_E.\\_Mann#IPCC\\_Third\\_Assessment\\_Report](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Michael_E._Mann#IPCC_Third_Assessment_Report)

*Wikipedia*

*14 August 2021*

Michael Evan Mann (born 1965) is an American climatologist and geophysicist. He was one of eight lead authors of the "Observed Climate Variability and Change" chapter of the **Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Third Scientific Assessment Report**.

#### Keith Briffa

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keith\\_Briffa](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Keith_Briffa)

*Wikipedia*

*19 July 2021*

Keith Raphael Briffa (27 December 1952 – 29 October 2017) was a climatologist and deputy director of the **Climatic Research Unit**. The Climatic Research Unit (CRU) is a component of the University of East Anglia and is one of the leading institutions concerned with the study of natural and **anthropogenic (human caused) climate change**. Briffa served as Lead Author on chapter 6 (Paleoclimatology) of working group I of the 2007 **IPCC Fourth Assessment Report** of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

#### Phil Jones (climatologist)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phil\\_Jones\\_\(climatologist\)](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Phil_Jones_(climatologist))

*Wikipedia*

*24 July 2021*

Philip Douglas Jones (born April 22, 1952) is a former **director of the Climatic Research Unit (CRU)** and a Professor in the School of Environmental Sciences at the University of East Anglia. He is known for maintaining a time series of the instrumental temperature record. This work was **featured prominently in both the 2001 and 2007 IPCC reports**, where he was a contributing author to Chapter 12, Detection of Climate Change and Attribution of Causes, of the Third Assessment Report and a Coordinating Lead Author of Chapter 3, Observations: Surface and Atmospheric Climate Change, of the AR4.

#### World Meteorological Organization

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World\\_Meteorological\\_Organization](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_Meteorological_Organization)

*Wikipedia*

*3 August 2021*

The World Meteorological Organization (WMO) is **a specialized agency of the United Nations** responsible for promoting international cooperation on atmospheric science, climatology, hydrology and geophysics.

The WMO originated from the International Meteorological Organization, a nongovernmental organization founded in 1873 as a forum for exchanging weather data and research. Proposals to reform the status and structure of the IMO culminated in the World Meteorological Convention of 1947, which formally established the World Meteorological Organization.

The Convention entered into force on 23 March 1950, and the following year **the WMO began operations as an intergovernmental organization within the UN system**.

#### Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

<https://www.ipcc.ch/>

*2021*



The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is the United Nations body for assessing the science related to climate change.

The United Nations and the IPCC Lied About History to Support Their Incorrect Theories

[Lord Christopher Monckton presents "Fallacies about Global Warming".](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FNvV1eqTppI)


<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=FNvV1eqTppI>

Youtube channel: Shannon Grove

Apr 10, 2012

Time: 20:00

In this video 'Fallacies about Global Warming', Lord Christopher Monckton describes how the scientists from the United Nations who contributed to the IPCC assessment report in 2001 removed a well known part of climate history called the Medieval Warm Period and also another part of climate history called the Little Ice Age. The resulting temperature graph was the famous "hockey stick" graph shown by Al Gore in his documentary An Inconvenient Truth. The graph below is from the IPCC with the Medieval Warm Period and the Little Ice Age removed.



The Medieval Warm Period was a time from about 900 to 1200 A.D. where temperatures were higher than they are today. It was a time of great prosperity where things flourished and there was no global catastrophe. We are told that if temperatures rise several degrees the world will just about end but for three hundred years during the Medieval Warm Period temperatures were several degrees higher and the higher temperatures caused life to become better. Also, during the Roman Warm Period from about 250 B.C. to about 500 A.D. temperatures were higher than they are today. These two time periods alone destroy their theory about climate catastrophe if the temperatures rise 4 degrees on average.

### 1,200 Papers Affirm Medieval Warm Period Was Global


<https://principia-scientific.org/1200-papers-affirm-medieval-warm-period-was-global/>

[principia-scientific.org](http://principia-scientific.org)


Pierre Gosselin

September 4, 2019


Below is the picture of the Mediaeval Warm Period showing temperatures much higher than today's temperatures. It is the picture that was **part of the IPCC report in 1990**. The small red hump on the far right is our time showing that temperatures are much lower compared to the Mediaeval Warm Period. In their following report they do not show these two temperature periods.



In the 1990 IPCC assessment report the Medieval Warm Period was shown but in the 2001 report it was gone. How did that happen? First they only used temperatures from the northern hemisphere which made the current temperatures look more exaggerated by 50 percent to produce the end of the hockey stick (the blade) which showed temperatures rising. Why didn't they call their theory northern hemisphere warming instead of global warming if they only used half the globe? Then they used tree ring data to fill in the historical part of the graph to make the long flat handle of the hockey stick. You can see their new graph below with the Medieval Warm Period and Little Ice Age gone.



### 2001 IPCC report



In his presentation Lord Christopher Monckton tells us the IPCC chose trees that gave them the results that they were looking for and gave them a factoring of 390 times greater than other trees when they created their computer model. This resulted in no Medieval Warm Period being shown on the graph which produced the long shaft part of the hockey stick graph. It was also found that if random noise data was entered into their United Nations computer model, the same hockey stick shape graph was produced 99 percent of the time. No matter what data was put into their model the same graph was produced which shows they are trying to trick us into believing their false theories. Then they said that temperatures were predicted to rise dangerously because at no other time were they so high. Since they removed the Medieval Warm Period from the graph no one could see that temperatures were even higher in the past than they are now and it created prosperity.

Does this sound like a group of people you can trust when they tell us we need to shut off our energy supplies and use only unreliable wind and solar power? Or when they tell us we need a global technocratic dictatorship of total control called the New World Order with themselves in control?

Their computer model was so faulty that if you took out twenty of their special trees that manipulated the results, the Medieval Warm Period showed up again. As Lord Christopher Monckton tells us in the video, they put the data from those twenty trees in a file called Censored\_Data.

### **Is There Really A Consensus?**

According to these wikipedia articles we are told that there is a 97.1 percent consensus among scientists in 2013 that humans caused global warming.

#### [Surveys of scientists' views on climate change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surveys_of_scientists'_views_on_climate_change)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surveys\\_of\\_scientists'\\_views\\_on\\_climate\\_change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Surveys_of_scientists'_views_on_climate_change)

*Wikipedia*

*31 July 2021*

Cook et al. examined 11,944 abstracts from the peer-reviewed scientific literature from 1991–2011 that matched the topics 'global climate change' or 'global warming'. They found that, while **66.4% of them expressed no position on anthropogenic global warming (AGW)**, of those that did, 97.1% endorsed the consensus position that humans are contributing to global warming.

This wikipedia article tells us exactly what that consensus is.

#### [Scientific consensus on climate change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_consensus_on_climate_change)

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific\\_consensus\\_on\\_climate\\_change](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific_consensus_on_climate_change)

*Wikipedia*

*19 August 2021*

The current scientific consensus is that:

1. Earth's climate has warmed significantly since the late 1800s.

2. **Human activities (primarily greenhouse gas emissions) are the primary cause.**
3. Continuing emissions will increase the likelihood and severity of global effects.
4. People and nations can act individually and collectively to slow the pace of global warming, while also preparing for unavoidable climate change and its consequences.

[Global Warming Propaganda Explained - Lord Christopher Monckton 2014 NIPCC Convention](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=MxRk-9o9Q0A>

*youtube user: jonital808*

*July 31, 2014.*

In the video listed above called 'Global Warming Propaganda Explained', Lord Christopher Monckton explains how the claim that there is almost 100 percent scientific consensus is made. He tells us that first there was a review of the abstracts of 11,944 papers on the topic of climate change. Then two thirds of those papers, which is the majority of them, were not considered in their calculation about consensus because they didn't comment at all on human caused global warming. But how could they know two thirds of the papers didn't agree with human caused global warming if they only read the abstracts? The abstract is only one paragraph at the beginning of the paper that serves as a brief introduction. It is not even the conclusion of the paper with the results of the study.

The study is also flawed because they said 97.1 percent of 32.6 percent said there was consensus.

That means that they started with 11,944 reports and to make the percentage of scientists who agreed with the IPCC look bigger they lowered the number of reports by two thirds.

Imagine if you wrote a test and your mark was 25 correct out of 100 questions. You would receive a grade of 25 out of 100 or 25 percent. That's not good. You failed the test by a lot. But you want a higher grade so you change the number of questions to 30 instead of 100 and then you say that you got 25 correct out of 30 which is 83 percent. And then you tell everyone you passed the test but it is a lie. That is what they did.

Lord Monckton and his colleagues looked at all the papers and published an article that showed that the original study on the consensus was misleading. They found that only 0.3 percent of the papers agreed with the definition of consensus as being 'humans being the primary reason for the warming'. The other 32 percent said that they believed humans caused 'some warming' which is very different from 'the primary reason' for warming.

Below is a link to the study by Lord Monckton and others on the non-consensus.

[Climate Consensus and 'Misinformation': A Rejoinder to Agnotology, Scientific Consensus, and the Teaching and Learning of Climate Change](#)

[https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279287725\\_Climate\\_Consensus\\_and\\_'Misinformation'\\_A\\_Rejoinder\\_to\\_Agnostology\\_Scientific\\_Consensus\\_and\\_the\\_Teaching\\_and\\_Learning\\_of\\_Climate\\_Change](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/279287725_Climate_Consensus_and_'Misinformation'_A_Rejoinder_to_Agnostology_Scientific_Consensus_and_the_Teaching_and_Learning_of_Climate_Change)

April 2015

Science & Education 24(3):299-318

DOI:10.1007/s11191-013-9647-9

David Legates, Willie Soon, William M. Briggs, Christopher Monckton of Brenchley

In the video the 'The Great Global Warming Swindle' listed below, several scientists who were part of the IPCC explain to us how the consensus is manipulated to make us think that human caused climate change from CO2 emissions is real. You can read their statements below.

### [The Great Global Warming Swindle - Full Documentary HD](#)

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=oYhCQv5tNsQ>

producer Martin Durkin

this claim that the IPCC is the world's top 1,500 or top 2,500 scientists, you look at the bibliographies of the people and it's simply not true. **there are quite a number of non scientists**

- professor Paul Reiter IPCC and Pasteur Institute Paris

**when I resigned from the IPCC** I thought that was the end of it but when I saw the final draft my name was still there so I asked for it to be removed well they told me that I had contributed so it would remain there so I said no **I haven't contributed because they haven't listened to anything I've said** so in the end it was quite a battle but finally **I threatened legal action against them and they removed my name** and I think this happens a great deal those people who are specialists but don't agree with the polemic and resign and there have been a number that I know of they are simply put on the author list and become part of this 2500 of the world's top scientists

those **people who are specialists** but don't agree with the polemic and **resign** and there have been a number that I know of **they are simply put on the author list and become part of this 2,500 of the world's top scientists**

- professor Paul Reiter IPCC and Pasteur Institute Paris

I've often heard it said that there is a consensus of thousands of scientists on the global warming issue and that humans are causing a catastrophic change to the climate system. **well I am one scientist and there are many that simply think that is not true.**

- professor John Christy Lead Author IPCC

and to build the number up to 2500 they have to start taking reviewers and government people and so on anyone who ever came close to them and none of them are asked to agree **many of them disagree.**

- professor Richard Lindzen IPCC MIT

Here is a link to a site that shows there are thousands of scientists from all disciplines of science that don't agree with the consensus. Not only climate scientists but many different types of scientists.

[Global Warming Petition Project](#)

<http://www.petitionproject.org/>

An Example of Trying To Produce a Fake Consensus by Using Faulty Statistics.

A survey was sent to 10,000 scientists and then only 79 scientists were used. They have to contact ten thousand scientists because if they only contacted 79 scientists it would be too obvious there is no consensus. Now they can say they contacted ten thousand scientists and make it sound like all of them are part of the 97 percent that agree when only 75 out of 10,000 agree. That is only 0.75 percent consensus. And if only climatologist's opinions matter why did they contact all those other scientists?

[Contrary to reports, global warming studies don't show 97% of scientists fear global warming](http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2013/09/contrary-to-reports-global-warming.html)

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2013/09/contrary-to-reports-global-warming.html>

*Andrew Montford*

*hockeyschtick.blogspot.com*

*September 19, 2013*

However, although the **survey was sent to over 10,000 scientists**, there were actually only 79 responses from climatologists, so the **97% figure represented just 75 individuals**. [The Hockey Schtick broke this news here]

And what was not reported in the paper or in any of the ensuing publicity was that **many participants were appalled by the survey and recorded their feelings at the time, calling it simplistic and biased**, and suggesting that it was an attempt to provide **support for a predetermined view**.

Thousands of studies don't get the attention they deserve because information is blocked by N.W.O. members in positions of power. The IPCC is not the world authority on climate change.

[UN IPCC Ignoring 1,000's of Studies Disproving CO2 Climate Influence | Principia](https://principia-scientific.org/un-ipcc-ignoring-1000s-of-studies-disproving-co2-climate-influence/)

<https://principia-scientific.org/un-ipcc-ignoring-1000s-of-studies-disproving-co2-climate-influence/>

*principia-scientific.org*

*Written by CCD Editor*

*February 2, 2021*

**Despite the thousands of scientific publications refuting alarmist climate change scenarios**, governments, activists and the IPCC continue to insist that we're headed for climate catastrophe when we clearly are not.

One major part of the science the IPCC ignores is the long lists of "skeptical" papers we've been publishing here at NoTricksZone over the past years

These listed papers go back to 2014 and undermine the claims our climate is headed for catastrophe. Included are **over 3,000 publications**. Unfortunately, **the IPCC refuses to acknowledge their significance and obstinately clings to its alarmist scenarios**.

There is also an **ongoing campaign aimed at preventing scientists from publishing** non-alarmist findings.