Questions for climate change advocates

The whole climate change agenda is a lie based upon globalist companies making trillions and providing a means for elites to establish social control over nations. Its claims have no basis in science.

Climate

Previous warm periods

WHY ARE YOU CREATING FEAR ABOUT GLOBAL WARMING KILLING THE EARTH?

This panic is groundless since: a) it was much hotter many times in the historical past;[1] b) global temperature ceased to increase after 1988 (apart from some temporary blips), largely levelled off after 2000 and for the last seven years has been in decline? It is getting colder!!!

WHY DO CLIMATE CHANGE REPORTS LIE ABOUT HISTORICAL FACTS?

For example, the IPCC AR6 SPM credibility was destroyed by ignoring historical data such as the Medieval Warm Period. The *Climate Intelligence Foundation* catalogued significant errors in a recent IPCC climate report AR6 'Summary For Policy Makers' and reported this to world leaders and the IPCC chairman.

WHY ARE YOU CLAIMING THAT THERE IS A CLIMATE GLOBAL WARMING CATASTROPHE UNFOLDING WHEN, IN EPOCHAL TERMS, IT IS A COLD PERIOD?

The global temperature in previous eras was much warmer and there were no polar ice caps; such as: the equatorial Pangea, the Cretaceous Hot Greenhouse, the Paleocene Eocene Thermal Maximum. [See the graph produced by the *Smithsonian Institute*, 'Estimated global temperature over the last 500 million years'.]

Overstated surface temperature records

WHY DO YOU USE IMPERFECT GROUND-BASED STATIONS FOR SUPPORTING DATA WHEN IT IS KNOWN THAT THESE PRODUCE FALSE DATA DUE TO LOCAL HEAT AMPLIFICATION?

Such as Heathrow Airport, where airplane activity over concrete gives distorted high readings. Why have you removed accurate data supplied by satellites that contradict your claims?

WHY IGNORE DATA THAT SHOWS NO WARMING FOR 34 YEARS?

Both Ireland and Sweden show no January warming since 1988. [Japan Meteorological Agency.]

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT UNDERSTANDING THE CLIMATE IS EXTREMELY COMPLICATED?

It cannot be reduced to computer models due to its complexity.

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT THERE IS NO SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE OF ANTHROPOGENIC GLOBAL WARMING?

The effect of mankind on climate is puny in comparison to natural processes, like the sun or the oceans or low cloud cover or magnetic field changes.

A series of new research papers revealed that human activity can account for no more than a 0.01 degree C rise in global temperatures. In other words, man has no measurable impact

[1] E.g. in the 1930s, in the late 1800s; in the medieval 'Warm Period' or in the Roman occupation of Britain.

on climate change. [E.g.: University of Turku (Finland), Dept. of Physics and Astronomy, J Kauppinen & P Malmi, 'No experimental evidence for the significant anthropogenic climate change'.]

Failed predictions

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT EVERY CLIMATE CHANGE PREDICTION OF DOOM SINCE THE 1970S HAS UTTERLY FAILED TO HAPPEN?

Not one of the scores made has occurred. Why should anyone trust you? For example,

- In 1970 George Wald in *Harvard Biology* said, '*Civilisation will end within 15 or 30 years unless immediate action is taken against problems facing mankind*'.
- In 1970 Denis Hayes, Chief organiser for Earth Day, said, '*It is already too late to avoid mass starvation'*.
- According to the UN, the Maldives was supposed to be underwater by 2000.
- In May 2008 Prince Charles said that we had, '*just 18 months to stop climate change*'.
- In July 2008 Al Gore said that there was only ten years to ensure '*the survival of the USA*'.
- In July 2008 Srgjan Kerim, President of the UN General Assembly stated that there would be between 50 and 200 million environmental migrants by 2010.

Simulation models

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT THE CLIMATE CHANGE COMPUTER MODELS USED TO PROMOTE GLOBAL WARMING ARE DEEPLY FLAWED AND MAGNIFY TEMPERATURE INCREASES EXPONENTIALLY?

This has been proved by scientific analysis. Prof. Nicola Scafetta (Univ. of Naples) analysed 38 key models[2] and found that most had overestimated global warming over the last 40 years. Many should be completely '*dismissed and not used by policy makers*'. In 2019 48 Italian science professors, led by nuclear antimatter discoverer Antonino Zichichi, wrote an open letter[3] affirming that catastrophic predictions of climate models were '*not realistic*'. The facts suggested that the models overestimated the human contribution to climate changes and underestimated the natural climatic variability, especially that induced by the sun, the moon and oceanic oscillations.

Carbon dioxide

WHY DO YOU NOT UNDERSTAND THAT CARBON DIOXIDE IS AN AMAZING MOLECULE THAT PROVIDES OXYGEN THROUGH PLANT RESPIRATION AND THAT MORE CO2 IS DESIRABLE?

The more CO2, the more green things. Current levels of around 400 ppm are far less than levels of 7,000 ppm in the time of the dinosaurs. We need more CO2.

WHY DO YOU IGNORE ICE-CORE AND DEEP SEA SAMPLES?

These show regular periods of warming and cooling as part of a natural cycle. Raised CO2 levels follow natural global warming; they do not cause warming.

WHY IGNORE THE FACT THAT THE PLANET HAS MANY CAUSES OF ATMOSPHERIC CO2?

These include:

- Volcanic activity. One big volcano eruption produces more CO2 than that produced by mankind's entire history.
- Naturally occurring bush-fires.
- Cement production.
- Natural decay of organic matter.
- Acidification of carbonates.

---

[2] MDPI, Climate, Nicola Scafetta, 'Testing the CMIP6 GCM simulations versus surface temperature records from 1980-1990 to 2011-2021; high ECS is not supported', 29 October 2021 (Climate 2021, 9(11), 161).

[3] 'Petition on anthropogenic global warming'.

- Animals.
- Termites produce ten times as much CO2 as all the fossil fuels burned by man in a year. Termites release approximately 150 million tons of methane gas annually. This reacts to form CO2 and ozone. For every human being there are probably 1000 pounds of termites. There are 2,600 different species of termites and there are over a million billion on the Earth. They are responsible for 2-4% of global CO2, These produce gas composed of 59% nitrogen, 21% hydrogen, 9% CO2, 7% methane and 4% oxygen.

WHY IGNORE ATMOSPHERIC SCIENCE?

Doubling atmospheric CO2 does not double global warming. Natural processes balance out any excesses in the atmosphere, such as of CO2. CO2 is part of the Carbon Cycle whereby carbon is exchanged between the oceans, soil, rocks and the biosphere. Marine organisms absorb CO2 in seawater. This process is complex.

Greenhouse gases do not warm the planet; this theory is now proven to be false. There is no Greenhouse effect. If these gases absorb radiated heat they also emit heat (Einstein's law). They only hold heat for less than a second.

If the greenhouse gas is not an 'ideal gas' and if the atmosphere is not in thermodynamic equilibrium, then there is some warming. But this warming is very small; it is about 1 Celsius degree for every doubling of CO2 concentration in the atmosphere (referent sensitivity). Yet man has only added 40% of CO2 since 1850.

There is no 'direct warming' by CO2. The 'feedback response' is also minimal. The science of this is very complicated involving the science of gases and molar density but the net result is that Greenhouse gases do not cause global warming because the atmosphere is in thermodynamic equilibrium, based on Einstein's paper of 1919.

Fuel

HOW CAN YOU CLAIM THAT BIOMASS PELLETS ARE SUSTAINABLE AND GREEN?

This process cuts down 300-year old trees in Virginia; mashes them into pellets; transports them across the Atlantic and then burns them in power plants. The CO2 expended in this process is far more than if Britain burned local coal.

WHY OPPOSE COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS

Britain has plenty of coal and could provide cheap power. Modern filter systems can cut CO2 (though not necessary) to lower levels than burning biomass pellets.

WHY ARE YOU PUTTING AN EXTRA 25% ON THE ENERGY BILLS OF POOR PEOPLE WHO DID NOT VOTE FOR YOUR POLICIES?

All Green schemes cost the poor proportionally more than the rich.

The total cost of environmental levies is £11.2 billion in 2022 rising to £14.1 billion in 2026. Furthermore there is the Emissions Trading Scheme which charges major energy users for their carbon outputs (the 'cap and trade tax'). This raised nearly £1 billion in 2022 but will increase five-fold in 2023. This is passed on to consumers.

Energy schemes

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT WIND FARMS ARE AN UTTER FAILURE?

The establishment cost is huge; only profitable by government subsidies. The Co2 and environmental damage expended in manufacture is huge. They don't work when there is

no wind but then fall over when the wind is too strong.[4] They kill bats, birds and insects. In every country that depended on them there was a failure of energy production and power cuts during cold weather spikes (e.g. Texas, Germany). It is unlikely that the lifespan of a turbine will offset the environmental cost of manufacture.

Worse, when the wind is too strong and electricity demand is low, taxpayers pay for turbines to be switched off. Three large wind farms in Scotland were paid £24.5 million to not produce half of their energy.

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THE WEAKNESSES OF SOLAR POWER?

Large-scale production to provide energy on a national scale is impossible. They don't work when there is poor sunlight due to cloud cover and are inappropriate in places like Britain. The manufacture cost is very high and many of the panels fail after a few years.

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT DOMESTIC HEAT PUMPS WILL NOT PROVIDE THE NECESSARY ENERGY FOR USERS AND COST TOO MUCH?

These cost up to £20,000 to install plus £30,000 for insulation. Necessary ground works for 'Ground Source heat pumps' means that they are useless for flats and offices. 'Air Source heat pumps' don't work well in cold temperatures (less than 5 degrees C). They are 50% as efficient as a gas boiler. They take 24-hours to get up to maximum temperature, so people would be cold in that time. They do not heat above 19 degrees C. They often fail in very cold areas. They use chemicals, such as refrigerants, that cause problems to the environment.

WHEN WILL YOU ADMIT THAT HYDROGEN BOILERS ARE NOT THE ANSWER

Some propose that using Green hydrogen is the answer to heating homes. This is made from water and emits no CO2, However, large amounts of electricity are required in this process. Also hydrogen is a greenhouse gas.

Electric cars

HOW CAN YOU CLAIM THAT ELECTRIC VEHICLES (EV) WILL BE EFFECTIVE AND SUSTAINABLE?

The power grid could not cope if every car was electric and the running costs would be huge. Batteries do not last but a few years and replacements cost over £20,000. The raw material for batteries (e.g. lithium) are mined by virtual slaves and child labour in developing countries. Getting rid of these batteries is an environmental hazard.

Practical problems

- A family size EV will cost between £30-35,000 (such as Hyundai, Kia and Renault).
- Petrol cars can cover up to 450 miles between refuelling stops. The best EV for range (Renault's Zoe) has a stated range of 234 miles; others only 180. In practice, the stated range can rarely be achieved; especially in cold weather.
- You cannot charge an EV if there is no parking on your property. Many people park their car hundreds of yards away from their house.
- Even if you can park on your property, charging from a 13-amp socket takes 30 hours. 'Fast' chargers, which charge overnight, cost about £800 fitted.
- Many public chargers are out of action. The equipment is complicated and breaks down.
- Chargers can be AC or DC. Not all cars can take the rapid charging. There are six different types of connectors. [See, The Critic, Brian Clegg, 'The EV delusion', February 2022.]
- It is impossible to produce effective electric HGVs.

---

[4] For example at the Pant Y Wal wind farm. MailOnline, 15 February 2022.

According to the report headed by Christoph Buchal of the IFO Institute in Germany EVs do not produce zero emissions. Taking into account their manufacture, they actually produce a carbon footprint worse than diesel cars by 11-28%. One issue is the huge energy requirement to extract the lithium-cobalt and manganese for the batteries. One Tesla model 3 battery needs up to 15 tonnes of C02 to manufacture.

Environment issues

WHY DO YOU IGNORE SCIENTIFIC EVIDENCE THAT CORAL REEFS ARE NOT BEING DAMAGED BY ANTHROPOGENIC GLOBAL WARMING?

A comparison of recent data by Dr Bill Johnson with an 1871 database of temperature taken by the SS Governor Blackall steamship across the Great Barrier Reef shows no difference. Professor Peter Ridd, who spent 40 years observing the reef, stated that it was in good health showing that the claims by the BBC in October 2020 that half had been lost was a lie. In fact coral growth rates had increased over the last 100 years. Bleaching of reefs occurs naturally based on weather oscillations. [The Daily Sceptic, Christ Morrison, 'Sea temperatures at the Great Barrier Reef haven't increased in 150 years, newly uncovered data show'. Australian Institute of Marine Science records.]

WHY DO YOU IGNORE THE DAMAGE TO REEFS CAUSED BY GLOBAL CORPORATIONS EXPLODING THEM WITH DYNAMITE TO HARVEST RESOURCES?

Reefs are used for building materials, jewellery, calcium health supplements and aquarium decorations. This trade is worth $375 billion a year. Are these corporations the same one's that fund climate change activism? Australia permits the mining of 200 tonnes of coral from the reef every year.

WHY DO YOU IGNORE DATA THAT SHOWS NO SEA ICE CHANGE SINCE 1978?

E.g. Antarctic sea ice extent has been stable for over 40 years. [European Institute for Climate Change and Energy.]

WHY IGNORE UNSTOPPABLE NATURAL PROCESSES THAT CAUSE MORE GREENHOUSE GASES THAN MANKIND?

Both termites and volcanoes produce more CO2 and greenhouse gases than the history of mankind.

WILL YOU BE HONEST ABOUT WINTER FLOODS?

There is no evidence that winter rainfall is more extreme than in the past. The European Climate Assessment and Dataset provides detailed information about rainfall. An analysis of the long-running stations in England from 1900 to 2020 show that trends are either flat or even decreasing.

WHY DO YOU CLAIM THAT RISING SEA LEVELS WILL SUBMERGE ENTIRE NATIONS IN A FEW DECADES?

Observed sea level trends do not support this. Rises are at or below NOAA's lowest projections. To get to the 1-foot rise in 30 years predicted by NASA and NOAA models (others predict 18-inches or even 2-foot), sea level rise would have to accelerate beyond what has been observed in all the data so far.

Global sea level has been rising at a steady rate of one foot per century or less since the mid-1880s or earlier. Coastal cities manage this just fine. As with many other doomsday claims, the models fall far short of actual observed measurements. In previous history, such as the Roman Warm Period, sea levels rose significantly but caused no catastrophes.

WHY TELL SO MANY LIES ABOUT THE ENVIRONMENT AND WILDLIFE?

- The polar ice caps are not melting inordinately.
- Greenland glaciers are not disappearing fast.

- Certain islands, such as the Maldives or Tuvalu, have not been under threat of submersion by the oceans but have grown.
- Polar bears are not facing extinction but are thriving.
- Walruses do not dive off cliffs due to global warming but panic when chased by polar bears.
- Storms are not increasing in number and severity.
- Wildfires have decreased in number.

Political issues

WHY FOCUS ON BRITAIN TO SUFFER TO GET TO NET ZERO AT A COST OF TRILLIONS WHEN INDIA AND CHINA HAVE NO INTENTION OF CLOSING COAL-FIRED POWER STATIONS?

Reducing Britain's CO2 emissions won't even make a dent on world CO2 emissions. Why not attack India and China?

WHY ARE ESTABLISHMENT CLIMATE CHANGE ACTIVISTS ALL HYPOCRITES?

Over and over again celebrities lecture the public on Green issues and sustainability, demanding that the poor dump their cars and stop eating meat, only to fly on private jets to environment conferences, in chauffeur driven limousines from airports, eating banquets. More than 400 private jets landed in Scotland where 1,000 billionaires and staff were shuttled to the Glasgow Climate Change summit COP26. Private aircraft are 14 times as polluting as commercial planes and 50 times more polluting than trains.

WHY ARE ALL THE MOUTHPIECES PUSHING CLIMATE CHANGE PAID FOR BY THE ELITE?

There is no balance in media stories about climate change. Dissenting voices (even esteemed climatologists) are censored, suppressed, deleted and not given publicity. Even hard data (such as satellite temperature data) is deleted when it diverges from the Green narrative.

Those corporatists who stand to profit from the climate change agenda, such as Bill Gates and the Rockefellers, give millions of pounds to organisations which push the Green agenda, such as the BBC, The Guardian, Associated Press,[5] Reuters, education establishments and so on. Social media and search engines then censor dissent and therefore online searches only find one voice pushing climate change. This brainwashes the public with lies.

WHEN WILL YOU REALISE THAT YOU HAVE DAMAGED BRITAIN'S ENERGY SECURITY?

Britain is currently on the verge of war with Russia. It has threatened such and has already issued economic sanctions, plus it has sent troops to the Ukraine.

Yet Britain is somewhat dependent upon the Nord Stream 1 gas pipeline from Russia through Europe.[6] Without this supply Britain's energy supply would be in dire straits. The reason for this is because we have foolishly invested billions in Green energy strategies that don't work and we have very few gas storage facilities. We also ran down North Sea oil/gas production. Instead of increasing coal-fired power stations, we are phasing them out and have established wind farms that only produce 3% of our energy needs when they actually function. This required importing gas from Russia for domestic and power station use.

---

[5] For example: AP announced that it received $8 million in grants to fund climate change reporting. It thus assigned over two dozen new journalists to cover climate change issues. Some of the donations came from entities tied to the Rockefellers and Bill Gates.

[6] Theoretically only 5% via ships, with other supplies coming from pipelines via Norway and The Netherlands plus some from the North Sea. However, the European grid depends heavily on Nord Stream which feeds through to us. We also import electricity from The Netherlands, which in turn depends upon gas from Russia. If Putin pulled the plug North Sea gas could not supply our needs.

This puts Britain into a very dangerous position when our supposed enemy could cut off our power overnight.

The UK's 'low-carbon and renewable energy economy' has not grown significantly between 2014 and 2020. [ONS, 'Low carbon and renewable energy economy, UK: 2020'.] This is a collapse of the promised 'Green industrial revolution', such as the 400,000 new Green jobs promised by Gordon Brown in 2009 or the Green economy being worth £122 billion. It was a lie. A low-carbon economy does not work.

As a result Britain is not self-sufficient in energy production (despite huge coal deposits) and has insufficient energy reserves. We are at the mercy of foreign imports in a time of geo-political instability.

WILL YOU ADMIT THAT THE CLIMATE CHANGE POWER-MONGERS ARE GLOBALIST ELITES SEEKING PROFITS AND CONTROL?

They include:

- The UN.
- The World Economic Forum (Davos).
- The World Bank.
- Bill Gates.
- George Soros.
- The Rothschilds.
- The WWF.
- The Rockefeller Foundation.
- Energy corporations.
- Blackrock.
- Unilever.
- General Motors.
- Banks.
- Vanguard.
- Big Oil.
- Prince Charles.

For example: Greta Thunberg is sponsored by George Soros. Extinction Rebellion is linked to XR Business (its leaders are linked to Tomorrow's Capitalism Inquiry, backed by AVIVA and Unilever amongst others), NextEnergy Capital, Global Impact Investing Network (a multi-million dollar investment firm) and Tribe Impact Capital LLP. Exxon Mobil is on the committee of Citizens Online, the group that initiated XR.

The 1992 Earth Summit in Rio secured the World Conservation Bank and the Global Environment Facility (GEF). This now funds many development projects and five UN agencies. Its partners include the Rothschilds, the IUCN, the UNEP, and the WWF.

In 2006 the Big Oil oligarchy (including BP, ConocoPhillips and General Motors) formed the US Climate Action Partnership calling for action to reduce carbon emissions. It's *Blueprint for Legislative Action* became the basis of America's Clean Energy and Security Act to create a carbon-trading regime like the EU version.

The people profiting from climate change policies are the rich. Green projects are identified as being potentially worth $19 trillion. Meanwhile the poor get poorer and poorer due to these same policies.

Scientific consensus

WHY DO YOU CLAIM SCIENTIFIC CONSENSUS?

Science does not advance by consensus but by discoveries and testable, repeatable observations. Science often moved forward when one maverick stood against the scientific consensus (e.g. Galileo). '*The work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics*.' [Michael Crichton, PhD, MD.]

In fact, the climate change 'consensus' is a tiny fraction of global scientific opinion. Most qualified climatologists are opposed to the global warming agenda. The claim that 97% of

scientists believe that man causes global warming appeared in 2013 from a Green activist called John Crook. In fact, of the 12,000 abstracts he referred to, only 0.5% (65 papers) suggested that humans caused 50% of global warming. His claim was widely ridiculed by real scientists but it was repeated by President Obama, the BBC and many others. They all lied. Other activists, such as Mark Lynas, have gone even further in their lies (99%).[7] Lynas is funded by Bill Gates.

The cost of net zero carbon emissions to the poor

- Zero choice.
- Zero car.
- Zero central heating.
- Zero wood burners or wood/coal fires by 2025.
- Zero oil-based boilers by 2025.
- Zero cooker.
- Zero ventilation in the house.
- Zero foreign holidays.
- Zero affordable energy bills.
- Zero electric power when the grid is stressed.
- Zero meat.[8]
- Zero freedom from inflation.
- Zero freedom of speech.
- Zero economic stability since the cost is trillions.

Conclusion

The climate change agenda is a pack of lies promoted by the global elite, government puppets, sycophantic educators and the media. It is part of the UN's *Agenda 2030* and the World Economic Forum's (Davos) *Great Reset* Socialist programmes to develop a totalitarian world government and a population of serfs cramped into large urban areas where they are totally controlled in a technocratic system.

The financial backers of the climate change narrative care nothing about people or nature. Many of the Green projects are actually destroying the environment (e.g. biomass pellets; EV batteries) and wildlife (e.g. wind turbines). The whole project is evil.

[7] His study [IOP Science, Environmental Research, Letters, 'Greater than 99% consensus on human caused climate change in the peer-reviewed scientific literature', 19 October 2021] actually showed that 99% of scientists reviewed did not explicitly quantify the effect humans have on climate.

[8] Green activists claim that meat production and animal flatulence causes more greenhouse gases than cars. Some are advocating that people eat insects instead.