

Occasional Thoughts

2. November 15

Philanthropy, social breakdown, ghost Christians, killer bacon, boys will be girls, the basis of politics, the UN and world government.

Where are the Christian philanthropists?

Throughout history, in all sorts of social conditions, godly Christians have risen up to deal with social problems. Many laid out great sums of money while others worked tirelessly to establish institutions to provide various resources. Individuals and churches together worked to develop educational systems (schools, colleges, universities, apprenticeships), orphanages, hospitals, homes for the poor, jobs for the unemployed, hospices for abandoned women, prison reforms, slavery reforms, employment legislation and so on.

Even pastors sometimes had sufficient finances (if they had a large congregation) to develop philanthropic schemes, such as orphanages, colportage¹ ventures, or sponsoring Bible colleges. Spurgeon did all of those things.

In every church age we see examples of men and women working hard to bring about a better social order and to help the poor and needy. This was especially true in Victorian times where there were gentry with a surplus of money and a society that was desperately hard for poor people. Such pious people went against the spirit of the age that was noted for entrepreneurial opportunities and increasing numbers amassing great wealth. These godly people gave money away hand over fist and left legacies that still stand today.

This is no longer the case.

As a result of government measures that are directed by the global elite, Britain is fast becoming Dickensian in the suffering of the poor and needy. Do I really need to prove this?

I maintain that the impoverishing of 99% of society is a strategy to re-introduce feudalism. Whether you believe that or not, it is a fact that recent decades have seen the top 0.01% of society get fabulously wealthy. The top 1% has also vastly increased their riches while the top 10% have become considerably richer. In the UK a mere five families own 20% of the country's wealth. At the same time the poor have become very much poorer while the middle class have seen their wages frozen to 1980s levels, their costs rise dramatically and their standard of living collapse.

Study after study shows that it is the young people in society that are having the hardest time, struck by lack of employment opportunities and often being forced to work part-time on zero hours contracts. Those fortunate enough to get to university are saddled with debts of up to £50,000. Such folk find it impossible to buy a house and almost as impossible to rent anything worthwhile; so they are forced to live in shared accommodation, sometimes

¹ Selling books.

with total strangers and often in very poor conditions. Flats have been advertised recently in London that, in one case turned out to be a cupboard under the stairs and another was a garden shed behind the sofa in a lounge.

Austerity has slashed council budgets, closed libraries, closed care homes, removed the support of the aged at home, cancelled meals on wheels, and much more. Woe betides anyone that gets sick. The NHS is now in dire trouble due to savage government cuts (over £30 billion and counting), reductions of nursing training posts, attacks on doctors' contracts forcing many to leave the country, closing of hospitals and removal of hospital beds. In mental health care alone we now have a situation where there is growing demand for mental health care beds (due to austerity measures) and a total lack of them, despite the legal obligation to provide them for sectioned people. London now has the situation where there are no NHS beds and soon there will be no private health care beds (the stopgap option for the NHS at cost) either. Already mentally sick people are being sent into the community or in police jails because there is nowhere else for them to go.

No wonder the suicide rate is going through the roof; a situation that has been proved to be linked to austerity measures.

All these conditions have been brought about by government policies, based on bad dogma and pursued for ideological reasons.

So we have an increasingly sad, tragic, Dickensian, underworld to society that most people do not understand is there and it is getting worse. Poverty is increasing; there are more children starving than ever before, homelessness is increasing, sickness is increasing, suicides are on the rise, home repossessions are rising, hopelessness is increasing. There are parts of London that have Tuberculosis levels worse than Third World countries.

Now such a social mess is an ideal opportunity for Christians to, a) do good and help people and, b) preach the Gospel to willing ears who seek hope. However, we see that Christian philanthropy and church altruism have massively declined in recent decades. Not only that, as churches have become more worldly and superficial, they are not only not giving their money to the poor, but they are asking the poor for money.

This is shocking and it is sin.

Churches should never ever ask for money, and in fact Biblical churches do not need any money anyway. Paul never made a request for money to help expand 'the ministry'. He only ever asked for money to aid the hungry suffering folk in a famine in Judaea. Most of the time, despite having needs, he either trusted God or worked with his own hands. He did sometimes receive gifts but never asked for them; neither did he teach us to ever ask for money.

However, with the advent of the Charismatic Movement, and the policies of multiple salaried workers / leaders and big church buildings, there has been a parallel focusing on money and growing demands for it. You can chart a graph of the decline in giving to missionary societies that parallels the growth of giving to large churches. I would propose that studies could show a similar collapse in giving to the poor.

As giving to large church has increased, and the means of giving have multiplied,² so the giving to the poor and the development of schemes to assist the poor have collapsed.

At the same time the Charismatic Movement has taught church members to be self-focused. The thrust of teaching and example is me, me, me. Counselling centres upon developing self-esteem, which is just selfishness and self-centredness; Christ taught self-denial. Worship is all about fulfilling the emotional desires of the congregation; i.e. self-centredness. It is not really about worship (complete submission to God) at all but me having an emotional tingly feeling and being entertained. Much teaching is either directly about money, or about me getting what I want; presuming that God's blessing is about supplying everything I need to be happy and prosperous. Paul explained that his life was full of suffering, affliction, persecution and tribulation.

The contradiction between all aspects of apostolic church life and modern church life is blatant at every level, but none so much as in the matter of giving. The apostles taught giving away to help the poor; modern false apostles teach giving money to their church and ministry even if you are poor.

Now there are some worthwhile church charities that do good to the poor, such as certain food banks. I applaud such ventures (and indeed support them). However, these are mainly run by non-evangelical groups, such as Anglicans, Catholics or Methodists. There are a few evangelical soup kitchens but these are a drop in the ocean.

It is a scandal that in times of austerity and real hardship affecting millions of poor people forming a sub-strata of society, there has not been a commensurable rising of Christian ventures to meet the need head on. In fact, most large churches have become greedy, money-sucking pits of affluence.

Ironically, non-Christian enterprises are springing up everywhere to help ameliorate the lot of the poor; this even includes celebrities and entertainers, such as comedians Josie Long and Russell Brand who have been active in generating local self-help / education groups and campaigning for social justice. These shame churches who are nowhere to be seen.

I put it to you that God is angry with this situation. It is a disgrace.

The church should, firstly, be concerned about the poor and doing all it can to help them; but it should secondly see this as a fantastic opportunity to preach the Gospel on the back of doing good to all. While the modern church sucks people's money, often on false pretences, church numbers in the UK decline at a fast rate of knots; so fast that some pundits are predicting the complete extinction of Christianity in Britain in a few decades – but then that was the elite's plan all long.

Social infrastructure collapse; an example

Bobbies on the beat

I just learned on the radio that a certain UK village has been forced to employ its own security service in the lack of any formal policing. This is hot on the heels of reports that

² No longer by giving money to a collection box at church but paying for church resources (DVDs etc.), attending expensive conferences and celebrations, paying via television channels etc.

the Police Force is in such financial strictures that Bobbies on the beat (the original cornerstone of Peels' policing)³ are to be a thing of the past.

Sir Robert Peel's intentions, with the institution of urban policing, was that not only were there local policemen, personally known to the residents, patrolling every street but, in the days before radios, they could come to each other's aid at the sound of a mere whistle. This means that each Bobby was within earshot (a few hundred yards).

It was the mere presence of a police officer (even though unarmed) that proved to be a deterrent to criminals. Such officers were not only patrolling and visible through the day, often becoming friends with locals, but patrolled at night. I can remember when Bobbies tested everybody's front door in the evening and told you if it was unlocked (1950s).

In rural areas there were Bobbies on bicycles⁴; incredibly, they were effective. Even small villages had a dedicated police station. In urban areas distant from a police station there were blue police boxes (as in Dr Who) that had direct line telephones. There were also larger blue boxes that acted as a small office (and somewhere to make a cup of tea). Thus it was ensured that a Bobby could be on the beat everywhere.

It was after 1965 when Panda cars⁴ appeared on the scene that the presence of Bobbies began to disappear, or certainly thin out. Of course, as in all political speak,⁵ we were told that having Coppers in cars would mean that they were more effective and more ubiquitous. In fact, the reverse was the case, though it meant that they could reduce the number of Bobbles.

We have now got to the point where a rural area has no effective policing at all and a village has been forced to appoint private security officers. This is likely to increase under a Tory government which envisions private enterprise as the cornucopia of all good (tell that to South-East rail commuters!).

The strategy

You have to bear in mind that the strategy of the global elite is to ruin Britain's social infrastructure. Every aspect of the social order is to be devastated. The NHS is already close to ruin; the education system has become a dumbed-down propaganda vehicle to brainwash and demoralise kids; the justice system has been utterly corrupted and now local security is being jeopardised.

The government will tell you that crime has gone down and their dramatic reduction of police staff has not altered the crime rate. However, whistleblowers, even high level officers, have gone on record affirming that these figures have been cooked and are completely inaccurate. Indeed, there have been a few scandals where the cooking of the books has come to light formally.

How can the crime rate be reduced if at the same time there are so many burglaries now that police have stated they will only respond to 50% of the calls (depending on whether your house is an odd or even number)? There are so many car crimes that police have stated that they will no longer respond unless there are unusual circumstances. In any case, knife crime and gang violence in London is up by many percentage points.

³ Robert Peel [1788–1850]; British Conservative statesman; Prime Minister, 1834–5, 1841–6.

⁴ So called because of their block colour livery. In my area (then West Midlands) they were Austin A40s but other forces (e.g. Lancashire) used Ford Anglias or Hillman Imps (Dunbartonshire).

⁵ The art of politics, certainly modern politics, is to say you intend to do one thing, but actually really plan to achieve the complete opposite. Some call this lying.

Personal experience all over the country is that police response times are shocking, and have been for many years. Just one example: an old man was attacked in a Brighton chip shop (half a mile from the main police station) and beaten nearly to death and his wallet stolen by two drugged up youths. The attack was so bad that the old lady behind the counter had to quit working and retire sick. The other lady staff member phoned the police and ambulance service. The ambulance came within minutes. The police eventually came – 24 hours later!!! Such a ridiculous response time is not unusual; I have heard of other examples from around the UK.

Now whether the police are corrupt, useless or just severely understaffed is another argument for another day. The point is that the elite wants policing to be ineffective so that social order breaks down.

To see how ineffective they are in a serious problem, just look at film of the London, Birmingham, Manchester riots. Relatively small groups of rioters (say a couple of dozen) held police at bay whilst they continued to riot and loot. The police were too scared to act, despite being in significant numbers (say twenty or thirty) in full riot gear and shields. The police only act when they outnumber opponents. Thus we also saw groups of police officers chase down single men and then beat them with batons when they were down. In fact there is film of other officers appearing who then join in beating him.

This unnecessary over-presence of police is quite obscene. When a pensioner is being mugged they can't care less for a whole day. When there is a certain type of event they turn up in dozens of police cars, block the roads and cause unnecessary chaos. After a recent road rage murder near me, and despite having the car registration of the murderer's vehicle and knowing the local felon, the police blocked the main arterial north-south road to Worthing (the A24) with multiple police cars for three days, causing absolute chaos to the local roads. This required commuters, fire engines and ambulances to take a diversion on the only other arterial road that would have cost at least an hour in peak traffic times morning and evening.

How often have you seen film of police raiding a house with over a dozen swat team officers with MP5 machine guns just to arrest a single man. More than once I have seen multiple police vans and cars block main arterial roads in connection with a single man threatening someone (not involving guns) in a flat quite distant from the blocked roads. Woe betides any poor person having a heart attack in such circumstances. In fact I once saw an ambulance blocked in the traffic queue caused by such police activity. What about the multiple officers and cars to investigate Cliff Richard's apartment when he hadn't even been charged and there was no formal evidence of wrongdoing.

So we have this weird situation where there are dozens of police officers and cars available for things that are unnecessary, while certain areas of the population have no policing of any sort and are employing private security services.

I would say that this is an example of social order being upside down. It is partly caused by austerity cuts but also by sheer bad organisation and protocols in the police forces.

Ghost Christians

Yes, I made this term up! What is a ghost? It is something supposedly seen but has no material reality; it is a phantom that pretends to be something but is not really there. Thus

‘ghost Christians’ is an apt term to superficial, professing believers who are not really saved.

For many years I have put on record that I believe that very many people in the modern evangelical churches are not saved. As each year passes I believe that the true number of Christians is getting smaller and smaller.

Evangelicals would affirm that most people in the old institutional churches (Anglican, Roman Catholic, Methodist) are unlikely to be regenerate people. It is impossible that churches that teach a heretical or liberal gospel can produce true converts. However, there are some genuine Christians that, for one reason or another, have gravitated to one of these apostate churches. So, perhaps 95% of members of these churches are unsaved.

True evangelicals would also affirm that many congregants of denominations that have apostatised in the last 50-100 years are also likely to be full of superficial Christians. These are churches that once had a name for orthodoxy but have completely lost it having become modernist or liberal. Such would include, pretty much all of the United Reformed churches, most of the Baptist Union churches and many independent Baptists, as well as other independent evangelicals.

I have affirmed many times that huge numbers in the Charismatic churches cannot be true Christians and that this is proved by their bad fruit as well as their false teachings. Some are better than others, but the worst ones probably have fewer than 10% genuine believers.

It is impossible for churches that teach a completely false Gospel to produce completely true converts. It can be demonstrated that church after church, denomination after denomination, has taught a false Gospel for decades.

This is the content of the Gospel teaching of various churches:

- Pure liberalism and modernism: these deny the authenticity of the Bible, the problem of sin, the belief in the supernatural and the concept of a personal God. Examples would include many Methodist, Anglican and United Reform churches.
- Sacramentalism: these teach that certain material things are necessary in order for a person to be saved, such as the church sacraments and priesthood. Romanism is an example of this.
- Pelagianism: this affirms the ability of man to save himself and obey God’s law. Some Baptists and Charismatics are Pelagian; especially those that follow Charles Finney’s ideas or the defunct Celtic Spirituality.
- Socinianism: this also teaches that man can save himself by moral good and also denies the value of the cross of Christ or reduces it to a mere moral example. There is no punishment for sin; men repent from their own power. It also denies the Trinity, the divinity of Christ and the sovereignty of God over mankind. Few modern churches formally accept this but many churches and church leaders have adopted a form of it, such as those espousing Open Theism.
- Universalism: this teaches that all men are saved automatically; there is no hell. Socinianism is a form of universalism, as is Quakerism and the Unitarians.
- Arminianism: this denies the sovereignty of God in salvation and denies the inability of man to do any spiritual good. It is the triumph of human will power over God’s sovereignty. Most modern evangelical churches teach a form of Arminianism in their Gospel message.
- Amyraldism: this is a sort of combination of Calvinism and Arminianism. It teaches that God loves everybody and desires to save everybody but, in the end, only saves the

elect. It is merely hypothetical and self-contradictory. Nevertheless, very many supposed Calvinists teach this Gospel.

- The Alpha Course: essentially based on weak Arminianism (no emphasis on sin or repentance) but defined by centring upon the need to be baptised in the Spirit after being softened up by communal meals and love-bombing. It produces conversions that are entirely emotional and without substance.

None of these contain the true Gospel and, while God can sovereignly save someone through them despite their errors, they are not a means of teaching the truth that saves.

So we can say that all the churches that teach such Gospels are unlikely to have many (if any) genuine converts. Now the above covers virtually 98% of British churches. This means that most people in those churches are unlikely to be saved.

Apart from this subjective analysis, objective observation confirms the truth of it. The quality of character and behaviour (fruit) of the members of these churches demonstrate a complete lack of godliness and submission to God's law. For example, members of such churches lie, swear, fornicate, are angry, are homosexual, commit fraud, slander, gossip, and so on without any qualms at all. This simply proves that the gospel preached does not bear spiritual fruit; therefore these people are not attached to the vine that is Christ.

Churches full of ghost Christians produce leaders that are not true converts. Many of the leaders of churches, denominations and movements today, including some very famous names, cannot be Christians because they teach lies and heresy and live in ways that deny righteousness. The worst of these live in absolute riches, having fleeced the flock of millions of dollars; but they are but the tip of the iceberg. Many less rich leaders are just as superficial.

So we have churches full of professing Christians and leaders that are not true converts. This is truly the blind leading the blind.

They are blind leaders of the blind. And if the blind leads the blind, both will fall into a ditch. Matt 15:14

Killer bacon

The thought police are at it again; this time its focus is processed meats. According to a new study, eating such things as sausages, bacon, ham and processed meat will give you cancer.

This is such a generalised, indiscriminate statement that it is stupid. It draws no distinction between a local farmer's sausage made of organic meat and stuffed with herbs and spices as compared to a processed, highly manufactured sausage made of all sorts of rubbish ground together in a swill and formed into meat. One sausage will do you good while the other will do you harm.

To make such generalised statements is ridiculous.

Now many people throughout history have eaten large quantities of bacon, sausages of various sorts and hams but did not get cancer. In fact, cancer was a rare form of disease until the highly modernised processing food industries of the 20th century. Some countries, like Germany and some Mediterranean nations, virtually live on sausages but are healthy.

Everything is determined by what it consists of and how it is made.

There are certain processes that increase dangerous components in food and should be avoided or reduced in the diet. The curing processes of some hams and sausages fall into this category, especially those that are highly salted or smoked. They are not going to kill you but they should be consumed with wisdom and restraint. Often, people do not know what is in their food.

For example, corned beef has nothing to do with corn. 'Corned' refers to a process whereby a huge amount of salt covers the beef, which is then stored and cured. Corned beef is, therefore, very, very salty. This should be considered if you have a problem with salt (as I do).

Now sausages can be made into extremely healthy, good food and there is a resurgence of small businesses trying to bring back old fashioned organic sausage making methods. This recent news will do such small business no good at all.

These folk are taking good quality, organic, local pork and beef and making high quality sausages with various recipes that include vegetables, herbs and spices. They are a meal in themselves and very nutritious. People should not fear eating such sausages.

Bacon, however, due to the way it is cured is not particularly healthy; however, eaten in small quantities is not dangerous. A 'full-English' fried breakfast every day is not a good idea as it is full of transfats.⁶

What is disgraceful in matters like this is that the real culprits in dangerous food are the big processing companies that are pouring high levels of salt and sugar into foods without the public knowing, or that are putting extremely dangerous chemicals into drinks (such as Aspartame in fizzy drinks) that really do cause cancer.

If there is one product that has caused more cancer than anything else in food it is processed sugar. People should be educated about the dangers of this because it is put into foods by stealth. For example: tests on products have shown that a small pot of yoghurt had 5 teaspoons of sugar in it. A bag of peanuts with a honey glaze had 7.5 teaspoons of sugar, while a strawberry and banana milkshake had 9 teaspoons of sugar. Often supposedly healthy 'low-fat' products are packed full with sugar and do much more harm than the full-fat varieties.

But what does this government do at exactly the same time as the announcement? It rejects Jamie Oliver's programme to reduce sugar in foods and make manufacturers pay some sort of sugar tax.

This shows that the government does not really care about your kid's health but about protecting the profits of big companies.

Boys will be girls

This story is an example of just how far the brainwashing of the younger generation has taken hold. We have reached the point where social conditioning has caused kids to crusade to claim that black is white.

⁶ Transfats are very bad for you but they should be distinguished from saturated fats, which are good for you.

The odd thing is the irony in this story. It concerns the original 60s-wave feminist Germaine Greer who championed women issues for decades. However, she is now being vilified as a misogynist because of her statements about transgender people.

A person that has a penis, called Caitlyn Jenner, has been named Glamour magazine's 'Woman of the Year'. But Greer, who has previously belittled 'trans-women', said this week, *'Just because you lop off your penis and then wear a dress, doesn't make you a ... woman. I've asked my doctor to give me long ears and liver spots and I'm going to wear a brown coat, but that won't turn me into a ... cocker spaniel.'*

Greer had been invited to lecture at Cardiff University on 'Women and Power: the lessons of the 20th century', but a group of feminists demanded she be 'no-platformed' (barred from speaking), since she *'continually misgenders trans women'*. She was about to be awarded an honorary doctorate, but this has now been rejected.

The worst thing in all this is that the problem is with students and universities, the very places where exchange of ideas and openly debating polemical issues ought to be happening. Instead we now have a world where brainwashed kids, having come through the propaganda-ridden education system, deny even academics the right to free speech.

The only outcome from all this is going to be enforced ignorance and sterility of expression.

It is also odd that the centre of this crusade is a person that has male genitalia and claims to be a woman, not a true transgender that has undergone an operation to remove them. Defending a true transgender would perhaps make some sort of worldly sense but this makes no sense whatsoever.

If having a penis does not prove that you are male, what does?


The basis of politics

Most people, and especially journalists, in discussing anything political, centre upon the fundamental basis of a left-wing socialism versus a right-wing capitalism. For a hundred years in the west this has been the basis of any sort of demarcation in national politics. However, this is not the fundamental basis of politics when properly analysed.

In recent years this misunderstanding has increasingly failed to identify the proper analysis of politics, and it is something that I have previously pointed out in another paper.

In early imperial China philosophers analysed and debated what formed the fundamental basis of politics. They determined that the division between people in politics was between the totalitarians on the one hand and the libertarians on the other. They called these the legalists (authoritarian) and Confucians ('live and let live') according to the particular parties of their time.

As politics changed in Britain over the last fifty years, it became necessary to include an analysis of totalitarian and libertarian policies in addition to left and right wing ones. This has been described thus:



The various UK political parties occupy a circular space around the centre point according to an analysis of their policies. Thus they are not only left or right but also totalitarian or libertarian. Until the last election most major parties were right of centre and veering towards totalitarianism. Very few parties have ever been truly libertarian, which some view as drifting towards anarchy. [Anarchy does not mean violence in the streets but a total lack of governmental controls.]

The danger facing society at the moment is not capitalism (right) or pure socialism (left) but totalitarianism. The policies of both socialists and capitalists have recently become focused upon totalitarian policies. When capitalist governments bail out failing banks with taxpayer's money, that is actually an act of socialism (e.g. USA Republicans).⁷ When socialist governments deregulate the banking and financial industries that is an act of capitalism (e.g. UK Labour Party).⁸ Both were working towards totalitarianism.

It is the fight between control freaks absolutely ruling over the people and libertarians who want people to live and let live that is the real basis of politics. You must judge politicians and political parties by how far they are working towards authoritarianism or despotism to really understand what is going on today. In fact, pretty much all the political parties are doing this.

Definitions:

- **Totalitarianism:** relating to a system of government that is centralised, dictatorial and requires complete subservience to the state
- **Authoritarianism:** favouring or enforcing strict obedience to authority, especially that of the state, at the expense of personal freedom.
- **Despotism:** the exercise of absolute power, especially in a cruel and oppressive way.
- **Libertarianism:** an extreme laissez-faire political philosophy advocating only minimal state intervention in the lives of citizens.
- **Laissez-faire:** a policy or attitude of leaving things to take their own course, without interfering. Originally French; literally 'allow to do'.
- **Capitalism:** an economic and political system in which a country's trade and industry are controlled by private owners for profit, rather than by the state. It is the opposite of Socialism.

⁷ Pure capitalism would let the failing banks collapse under market pressures.

⁸ Pure Socialism would strongly regulate and control the banks, or even provide a government-based banking system and get rid of private banks.

- **Socialism:** a political and economic theory of social organisation which advocates that all the means of production, distribution, and exchange should be owned or regulated by the community / state as a whole. It is the opposite of Capitalism. In practice, when this has been fully carried out (e.g. Soviet or Chinese Communism), it has always led to totalitarianism because the State becomes too big and powerful, and thus oppressive.

The common sense approach is to avoid extremes of anything. Thus commerce should be supported by genuine capitalism but the population should be protected by necessary regulations and regulatory bodies to rein in unscrupulous capitalists. Vital public services should be state controlled for national security, such as the utilities and railways. However, central government should be as small as possible and laissez-faire whenever suitable, and decentralised wherever possible.

The UN's plans for world government by stealth on the basis of climate change

[I am indebted to a speech by Lord Christopher Monckton, 'Our last year of freedom' for motivating and informing this piece.]

The climate change scare is not being driven by actual weather conditions or by climatologists; it is driven by radical left-wing politicians seeking a global government.⁹ These left-wing activists and politicians have taken over institution after institution, encompassing the media, publishing, education, the UN, national governments and supra-national institutions (e.g. the EU) which have become socialist structures energised by a despotic global agenda. So the poor layman is overwhelmed with everybody shouting 'climate change' at him and using it as the basis for raising taxes and implementing political plans.

The fallacy of man-made climate change arguments can be seen at a technical level by a multitude of professional, academic, climatologists, such as Ian Plimer and many others, who have fully debunked the whole theory and exposed it as a fraud. However, it is important to understand what the political strategy behind this is. It is a tool to help implement a global totalitarian government, or to use the popular phrase, a new world order.

The UN is at the forefront of using climate change to drive a new world government and uses what it calls 'transparent impenetrability' in treaties to do it. Year by year it strives to get world leaders to sign up for new measures to slowly implement a global government on the back of climate change.

Note that Ban Ki Moon, Secretary General of the UN, has marched with communist activists in New York protesting about climate change, which is actually a serious renunciation of his legal impartial status.

Lord Monckton explains, in his speech, the totalitarian strategy behind a series of recent UN climate change conferences.

⁹ Behind this radical socialism dominating all aspects of media, banking and politics is a Zionist Neocon agenda, seen most obviously in the political landscape of the USA. This is why America dominates the UN, which is based in New York. The UN is actually but one arm of the despotic Zionist global agenda.

Copenhagen 2009

The initial UN globalists' plan failed at the COP¹⁰ conference in Copenhagen in 2009. Here a draft treaty was presented to be agreed by world governments to directly facilitate a new world government.¹¹ Unusually this was stopped by a veto from China after a pleading from Obama for nearly an hour. Climate change was the basis for this proposed new world government; note:

The government will be ruled by the COP with the support of a new subsidiary body on adaptation, and of an Executive Board responsible for the management of the new funds and the related facilitative processes and bodies.¹²

The results of this were to include:

- No more free markets and public policies were to be subjected to the UN.¹³
- Taxes would be massively increased. Wealthy nations taxed at 2% of GDP pa.
- Financial transactions taxed at 2% (a huge amount, where profits are measured in 100ths of a %).
- More than 300 new bureaucracies were to be established.
- Power was to be given to the UN to interfere in national state's affairs.
- There would be unlimited fines for non-compliance.

All this would have destroyed current democracies.

When Lord Monckton tried to warn the world about all this, hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent by someone to relegate his web presence, despite a YouTube video already having 2.7 million hits.

Cancun 2010

At Cancun in 2010 the UN tried more stealthily to avoid the word 'government' and try to set up the necessary frameworks for it by stages. These included an 'Adaptation Framework Body', an 'Adaptation Committee', a 'Body to clarify assumptions and conditions in national greenhouse gas emission reductions pledges' and so on. There were nearly 1,000 new institutions listed in the Cancun agreement, which was voted in. None of this was made clear to the public. None of the journalists reported that these bodies had been created.

Durban 2011

At the Durban conference in 2011, Lord Monckton was initially banned from attending, for uncomfortable questioning, but literally dropped in by parachute. The draft chairman's conclusions, which were not reported by journalists, included:

- Rights of legal personality to 'Mother earth'.
- An international 'climate court' for western nations where nations would be held accountable for the 'climate debt'.
- Western nations must cut their greenhouse emissions by more than 100%!
- CO₂ to be cut from 400 to 210 ppmv, which would all kill trees and plants, and thus animals.
- Western inventor's patent rights in third-world countries to be scrapped.

¹⁰ UN's Convention on Climate Change.

¹¹ E.g. UNFCCC draft of the Copenhagen Treaty; Annex 1, Par. 38, (15 September 2009).

¹² Copenhagen Treaty Draft; Annex 1, par. 38.

¹³ Par 36.

- Shipping and aviation fuels to be taxed and regulated.
- Defence forces to be scrapped because they impact the climate.

These were dropped at the last minute. None of the media reported any of this but after Lord Monckton revealed these conclusions on the web, they were slashed by the chair.

Qatar 2012

After this was the Qatar conference in 2012. Here the chairman's draft conclusions were kept hidden after previous scandalous publications revealing the conference delegates' stupidity. When asked they denied there was any such document. By sheer fluke Lord Monckton was able to ask a question at the end of the conference and mentioned that there had been no global warming for 16 of the 18 years these conferences had been going on. This resulted in childish jeers and catcalls (edited from the UN video record) but several representatives checked and found that he was right. They then asked why they had not been told this salient fact.

In the Melbourne conference in 2013 it was admitted that global warming had not been occurring.

Lord Monckton was then banned from attending such UN conferences.

The entire decision making process has now been driven underground as a result of the exposes by Monckton and others. There are no records of the decisions made at these conferences on the UN websites.

Monckton explained, in September 2014, that the holdouts to world agreement on the UN's plans were Stephen Harper of Canada and Tony Abbott of Australia and mentioned that efforts would be made to get rid of them before the December 2015 conference. They have both now been removed.

The get out clause of the Kyoto Protocol (article 27) may be removed. [By the way, it has now been determined that if the original Kyoto targets had been complied with by all nations, it would have only made a difference today of 0.15 degrees Celsius over 100 years at a cost of many trillions.]

Refutations of UN climate change scaremongering

Monckton gave some simple refutations of the climate change scaremongering by the UN:

- The UN stated in 2005 that there would be 50 million climate refugees by 2010 (i.e. their homes underwater). This never happened.
- In 2007 the UN's IPCC said that the Himalayan glaciers would all melt in 25 years. However, Indian scientists have said that there had been no sign of reduction of Himalayan ice in 50 years. It turned out that the UN's statement was based upon a Green Communist journalist's pamphlet.
- The UN's claims about methane produced by cows have proved over time to be false. Methane from this cause is hardly rising at all.
- Statements about global temperatures have been false. Temperatures actually observed have been far less than all the UN predictions since 1990. In fact the rate of warming has halved without the man made changes required by the UN. The latest predictions of the UN are also false; scientific analysis of actual temperatures are well below the UN's statements. Temperature change measured in Boston over a century shows a change of just 0.7%. The UN's models have always been wrong.

- Temperatures in past history have often been much higher than today (proven by ice-core samples).
- Records show that hurricanes are not increasing at all.
- Global sea ice has not changed. Sea ice in the Antarctic is at its highest level in recorded history.
- Rainfall has hardly changed in recent centuries.
- There is no discernible increase in floods. The UN's IPCC eventually had to admit this.
- Droughts have reduced in the last 30 years.
- Sea level is not rising at all; in fact it recently fell.
- All countries are fiddling their CO₂ emissions reports.
- There has been no global warming for over 18 years (RSS satellite since Oct 1996).

Monckton (as others such as Stephen Goddard) also explains that local weather records have been falsified in order to comply with UN projections. Falls in temperature have been shown as increases. Piers Corbyn has also repeatedly affirmed that weather details are being fraudulently manipulated.

The UN claim that there is 97% consensus of scientists agreeing on man-made global warming is made up. There is no such consensus. One study (properly analysed) shows that the consensus is actually 0.3%. The paper supporting the UN position has been under investigation by the Queensland police for deception.

The UN is attempting to take away the democracy of national states and it is using climate change as a weapon to achieve this, with the connivance of the politically biased media and the governments of the western world. Be aware.

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

Paul Fahy Copyright © 2015
Understanding Ministries
<http://www.understanding-ministries.com>