



# Global Warming Swindle: A Scheme To Redistribute Wealth

This is a non-US view and analysis of global warming as being a swindle to redistribute wealth on a global scale. Globalization and global warming are intricately linked, driving the world into the new economic system of Sustainable Development, aka Technocracy. □ TN Editor

As the “science” behind man-made global warming has been increasingly discredited, the story has changed. Now it’s not about saving the environment but about redistributing wealth, says a leading member of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Ottmar Edenhofer, a co-chair of the IPCC’s Working Group III and a lead author of the IPCC’s Fourth Assessment Report, 2007 (its latest), recently said, “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.”

Edenhofer told a German news outlet (NZZ AM Sonntag): “Basically, it’s a big mistake to discuss climate policy separately from the major themes of globalization. The climate summit in Cancun at the end of the month


is not a climate conference but one of the largest economic conferences since the Second World War.”

“First of all, developed countries have basically expropriated the atmosphere of the world community,” said Edenhofer. Thus the developers of coal and oil should pay reparations in the form of global carbon emission rights and taxes. Investors Business Daily commented “U.N. Warm-mongers are seeking to impose a global climate reparations tax on everything from airline flights and international shipping, to fuel and financial transactions.”

The Cancun agreement set up a “Green Climate Fund” to administer assistance to poor nations suffering from floods and drought due to global warming. The European Union, Japan and the United States have led pledges of \$100 billion per year for poor nations up to 2020, plus \$30 billion in immediate assistance.

The agreement says it “recognizes that deep cuts in global greenhouse gas emissions are required according to science” and calls for “urgent action” to cap temperature rises. But this chart gives lie to such claims. You can clearly see that on a multimillion-year scale global temperatures have been confined to a steady band unrelated to even huge changes in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Does this graph reveal any need for “urgent action” “according to science?” Yet at the Cancun conference, UN Secretary-General Ban Ki-moon warned, “Nature will not wait....Science warns that the window of opportunity to prevent uncontrolled climate change will soon close.”



The window of opportunity that is going to close is not a scientific one but a political one—because more and more people are realizing that global warming alarmism is based on phony science and outright lies.



Dr. Fred Singer

Foremost in the struggle to bring essential scientific truths to light on this issue is the Nongovernmental International Panel on Climate Change (NIPCC) founded and directed by the distinguished atmospheric physicist S. Fred Singer. With assistance from climate experts in 16 countries—who donated their time and efforts—the NIPCC produced a massive, extensively-illustrated 880-page report “out of concern that the IPCC was provoking irrational fear of anthropogenic global warming,” in the words of Dr. Singer. The report references 4,000 (!) research papers in *peer-reviewed* scientific journals that contradict IPCC conclusions but were not used by the IPCC though it claims to be the definitive source of climate research. The entire report can be downloaded free from the Heartland Institute website.

I shall discuss only one item from the NIPCC report, but it is fundamental to the whole carbon dioxide/greenhouse hypothesis of global warming. Worldwide, there are 20-some GCMs (General Circulation Models) for computer modeling of global climate change. They all agree—for sound theoretical reasons—that greenhouse gases cannot warm the earth directly. They must first warm the atmosphere, which in turn warms the surface of the earth. So the atmosphere must be warmer than the earth’s surface. The NIPCC Summary Report explains: “Climate models all predict that, if GH gases are driving

climate change, there will be a unique fingerprint in the form of a warming trend increasing with altitude in the tropical troposphere, the region of the atmosphere up to about 15 kilometers. Climate changes due to solar variability or other known natural factors will not yield this characteristic pattern; only sustained greenhouse warming will do so.” The models show this “hot spot” perfectly—but it is missing in actual observations, which show instead this area to be *cooler* than the earth’s surface. The Summary Report states—in boldface type: **“This mismatch of observed and calculated fingerprints clearly falsifies the hypothesis of anthropogenic global warming.”**

The Summary Report also notes, “The IPCC has been disingenuous about solar influences on the climate....The demonstration of solar influence on climate is now overwhelming....There now is little doubt that solar-wind variability is a primary cause of climate change on a decadal time scale.”

The disclosure of thousands of emails from climate scientists in November 2009 became known as the “climategate” scandal. It raised concerns about the validity of global warming predictions and the integrity and professional misconduct of some of the world’s leading climate scientists. But even before “climategate,” some important scientists tried to alert the public to the unscientific nature of IPCC procedures and conclusions. These scientists were generally derided as “deniers” by the news media and opinion makers.

The IPCC regularly submits its reports to its Expert Reviewers Panel. As you might expect, most of its appointments to this panel have been supporters of global warming. A few nonbelievers have been included to give the appearance of balance, but their comments and questions have been routinely ignored as the IPCC focuses on what it claims to be the “consensus” view.

Only one person has been on every IPCC Expert Reviewers Panel. That man is Dr. Vincent Gray. He submitted a very large number of comments to IPCC drafts, including 1,898 for the Final Draft of the 2007 Report. Here are some of his comments from a letter he wrote on March 9, 2008:

*Over the period I have made an intensive study of the data and procedures used by IPCC contributors throughout their whole study range....Right from the beginning I have had difficulty with this procedure. Penetrating questions often ended without any answer. Comments on the IPCC drafts were rejected without explanation, and attempts to pursue the matter were frustrated indefinitely.*

*Over the years, as I have learned more about the data and procedures of the IPCC I have found increasing opposition by them to providing explanations, until I have been forced to the conclusion that for significant parts of the work of the IPCC, the data collection and scientific methods employed are unsound. Resistance to all efforts to try and discuss or rectify these problems has convinced me that normal scientific procedures are not only rejected by the IPCC, but that this practice is endemic, and was part of the organization from the very beginning. I therefore consider that the IPCC is fundamentally corrupt. The only "reform" I could envisage, would be its abolition.*

*The flagship set of data promoted by the IPCC are the figures showing the increase in atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide. They have manipulated the data in such a way to persuade us (including most scientists) that this concentration is constant throughout the atmosphere.*

The models are so full of inaccurately known parameters and equations that it is comparatively easy to "fudge" an approximate fit to the few climate sequences that might respond. This sort of evidence is the main feature of most of the current promotional lectures.

By drawing attention to these obvious facts I have now found myself *persona non grata* with most of my local professional associations, Surely, I am questioning the integrity of these award-winning scientific leaders of the local science establishment. When you get down to it, that is what is involved....

Yes, we have to face it. The whole process is a swindle. The IPCC from the beginning was given the license to use whatever methods would be



necessary to provide “evidence” that carbon dioxide increases are harming the climate, even if this involves manipulation of dubious data and using peoples’ opinions instead of science to “prove” their case.

The disappearance of the IPCC in disgrace is not only desirable but inevitable....Sooner or later all of us will come to realize that this organization, and the thinking behind it, is phony. Unfortunately severe economic damage is likely to be done by its influence before that happens.

[Read full story here...](#)

---



**China Now Requires  
Mandatory Face Scans For All**

# Phone Users

As a Technocracy, China will turn the screws on data collection until they possess every conceivable piece of information on every citizen, including DNA and psychographic/behavioral profile. This is the “science of social engineering.” □ TN Editor

China will require telecom operators to collect face scans when registering new phone users at offline outlets starting Sunday, according to the country’s information technology authority, as Beijing continues to tighten cyberspace controls.

In September, China’s industry and information technology ministry issued a notice on “safeguarding the legitimate rights and interests of citizens online”, which laid out rules for enforcing real-name registration.

The notice said telecom operators should use “artificial intelligence and other technical means” to verify people’s identities when they take a new phone number.

A China Unicom customer service representative told AFP that the December 1 “portrait matching” requirement means customers registering for a new phone number may have to record themselves turning their head and blinking.

“In next steps, our ministry will continue to...increase supervision and inspection...and strictly promote the management of real-name registration for phone users,” said the September notice.

Though the Chinese government has pushed for real-name registration for phone users since at least 2013 — meaning ID cards are linked to new phone numbers — the move to leverage AI comes as facial recognition technology gains traction across China where the tech is used for everything from supermarket checkouts to surveillance.

Online, Chinese social media users reacted with a mix of support and worry over the December 1 facial verification notice, with some voicing concerns their biometric data could be leaked or sold.

“This is a bit too much,” wrote one user on Twitter-like Weibo, commenting under an article about the new rules.

“Control, and then more control,” posted another.

While researchers have warned of the privacy risks associated with gathering facial recognition data, consumers have widely embraced the technology — though China saw one of its first lawsuits on facial recognition last month.

[Read full story here...](#)

---



## **World's First Human Composting Facility Coming To Seattle In 2021**

Earth worship is complete by offering your dead body back to nature as compost in the 'death-care revolution.'. All that's missing is the euthanasia center to hasten the process, as in the 1973 cult movie,



In a move hailed as a positive step by environmentalists, Washington became the first U.S. state to [legalize the composting of human bodies](#) in May of this year.

And now, the Evergreen State will become home to the world's first human composting facility in 2021 thanks to Katrina Spade, founder and CEO of Recompose, after the legislation she helped enact goes into effect in May 2020.

[According to](#) its website, Spade founded the revolutionary company with the goal of offering “*natural organic reduction to the public*,” a system that converts human remains into soil as an alternative to cremation or burial.

Recompose's website explains the benefits of natural organic reduction:

*“By converting human remains into soil, we minimize waste, avoid polluting groundwater with embalming fluid, and prevent the emissions of CO2 from cremation and from the manufacturing of caskets, headstones, and grave liners.*

*By allowing organic processes to transform our bodies and those of our loved ones into a useful soil amendment, we help to strengthen our relationship to the natural cycles while enriching the earth.”*

In November, around 75 people attended what was [described by](#) the *Seattle Times* as “*a housewarming party for a funeral home where bodies would not be burned or buried, but laid in individual vessels to become clean, usable compost.*”

Spade told the crowd, made up of investors, doctors, architects, funeral directors, legislators, and lawyers:

*“You are all members of the death-care revolution.”*

When all is said and done, the process will yield about a cubic yard of soil per person. The soil can be taken home by friends or family and used to grow a tree or a garden. Remaining soil will be used on 640 acres of conservation land in southern Washington that will one day become an

ecologically sustainable village.

In contrast, those who have opted to be cremated as a means to save money or take up less space geographically, have inadvertently left a burden on their family members. Spade explained:

*“These days, some families regard even ashes from cremation as a burden, not a joy. As in, ‘we’ve had these ashes in the garage for six years.’ And we’re creating a cubic yard of soil.”*

While Recompose is not yet up and running, the company is aiming for a \$5,500 price tag for its natural organic reduction services while a green burial in the state of Washington averages around \$6,000, cremation can range anywhere from \$1,000-\$7,000, and a conventional burial in a cemetery can set you back at least \$8,000.

The idea may seem outlandish or uncomfortable to some, but Recompose is more than just a pipe dream. As an architecture student, Spade first became interested in the funeral industry back in 2012. She quickly delved into the idea of *“environmentally sustainable, urban-focused method of disposition of the dead,”* after seeing a lack of environmental ethic in both the cremation and burial industries.

In 2014 Spade’s idea took a turn toward reality when she received the Echoing Green Climate Fellowship. With the funding that followed she founded the non-profit Urban Death Project (UDP) and began working with soil science researchers, law professionals, and those in the funeral industry to lay the groundwork for a revolutionary system of death care the world had never seen.

Over the next few years Spade continued to work on UDP before securing over \$90,000 via a Kickstarter campaign. Her idea also reached wide audiences through worldwide media coverage.

Then in 2017 Spade founded Recompose, a public benefit corporation, to bring her idea to reality—a reality now taking shape in a warehouse in SoDo, where the company is ready to live out their mission to *“offer a new form of death care that honors both our loved ones and the planet earth.”*

[Read full story here...](#)