

Introducing a series of original essays on "climate change"

January 2, 2020

I feel moved to write about climate change, because there appears to be much confusion on the subject "out there." I have been questioning the mainstream narrative on the subject for a number of years, motivated first (probably in 2013) by the sister of my then-girlfriend and her husband laughing scornfully at the idea of anthropogenic global warming, and sallying forth with at least a few points of rebuttal to the narrative that made me think that perhaps, by reading only the mainstream viewpoint and allowing myself to be cowed by the infamous "climate science denier" epithet applied to skeptics, questioners, and people who opposed the narrative on what they claimed were scientific and rational grounds, I wasn't acting in my own best interests. Up to that point, I had been quietly and politely skeptical (because I can't predict the future - can you? And it seemed to me that scientists, politicians and others who seemed to be claiming that ability were guilty of hubris), saying "Whether or not it is true, perhaps we'd better prepare for the possibility that the world is getting warmer." (At that time, I had no idea how expensive and life-changing - not in positive ways, for the majority of earth's population - the proposed preparation and preventative measures would be.)

Over the ensuing years until today, I have read approximately one article per day on the subject of climate change. Maybe that's a high estimate, so let's say I have read three articles per week. And let's say as well that I became particularly interested in climate skepticism four years ago, not 5 1/2. Based on those conservative estimates, I must have read at least 600 articles. Does that make me an expert? I'm not a scientist, but I do understand argumentation and debate, genuine facts versus proven deception, careful and solid versus sloppy and fallacious reasoning, and I have reached an extremely high level of confidence in my conclusions on the basis of my investigations; so I feel qualified to share my views and some of the reasons for them. I hope to "be persuasive" by laying out what I clearly see as the truth from the most fundamental data to the ultimate conclusions based on data.

This is a Very Big Subject with many "moving parts," so I think it would be good to organize my exposition before I start writing it. I propose to address the following questions in basically the order I will be writing them down here.

First, why does it matter? What do the "greenies" who are pushing the AGW agenda, people on the American political left like AOC, people like Al Gore (who started beating the warmist alarmism drum in a big way shortly after losing the presidential election to George W. Bush, as I recall) and people like Greta Thunberg, say is required of us if we are to avert a mega-disaster on a world scale? Are their plans practicable? If the underlying premise that industrial civilization adding CO₂ to the atmosphere will cause "runaway" global warming is correct, would implementing their plans have any substantial benefit? What is the price tag, both in dollars and in human suffering and death, of implementing such plans? Would the relatively certain price tag (likely, if anything, to be larger than estimated) be justified by results?

Is media reporting, which repeatedly alleges, year after year, that the planet has just experienced "the hottest year ever," on that point and many others, factual or biased,

distorted, ... simply lying? Who do the media represent, is there are reason why they would display a particular bias, and is there a reason why they would push a false narrative and try to drown out all opposition to it? And what is their underlying aim? Having that information in hand, would it give a reasoning person cause to be very dubious regarding MSM reporting on the climate issue?

And what about climate scientists? Are they necessarily objective and do the procedures by which studies, models and projections that alarmists attempt to use to keep the fear level high stand up under scrutiny? Also, contrary to the "97% consensus" myth propagated by Barack Obama, there are many climate scientists, and those with other specializations, who take exception to the alarmist view. Are their objections well-supported?

What are the scientific points that are claimed to support warmist alarmism? How do they hold up under examination? Is there anything to be concerned about in terms of potentially or definitely flawed reasoning? Do contra-alarmism arguments hold up any better?

Is adding more CO₂ to the atmosphere a harmful and dangerous thing, or could it be just what the biosphere needs, on balance actively beneficial? If it is actually beneficial, why is it demonized? What are the effects of focusing so much attention on CO₂ as an alleged problem? Whose, and what, agendas, could that focus be serving?

If the planet is not warming catastrophically, what is the actual global climatic trend? Is there a chance that the global thermostat might drop dramatically, ushering in a "little ice age?" If the little ice age scenario is supported by the best scientific data and reasoning, why is all of the media attention on preparing for and preventing the opposite, and absolutely none on preparing for global cooling?

That is quite a lot to cover, and the answers to many of those questions should be multi-part in order to have some adequacy and persuasiveness. So, what I will try to do is develop a complete series of emailed essays addressing the subject, one question at a time. (And I may think of additional questions.) Take heart because I don't think I will need to cite, quote and provide links to anywhere near 600 articles (and a few books), but I do plan to provide some thought-provoking and cogent references.

One might wonder exactly what this has to do with Sophianic Animism, and "What does JLL think about the subject?" The answers to those questions are pretty simple. The issue has to do with what Sophia is doing - not what humans are doing, although of course She has been known to tolerate quite a bit of human meddling with her body the physical planet, including the mass extraction of "fossil fuels" and other mineral substances. Also, SA is the PREligion that points toward the future, and it is important not to be laboring under misconceptions about what the future is likely to hold, and burdened with false fears; it's especially important not to let ourselves be manipulated by liars who don't have our interests, or humanity's, at heart. As for what John Lamb Lash thinks, I doubt that I will express anything in the forthcoming emails that he would substantially disagree with, and certainly it won't be my intention to do so nor will I do so knowingly.

Expanding abbreviations

January 7, 2020

In response to requests from readers, here are the expansions of a couple of abbreviations used in the previous message.

AGW = anthropogenic global warming. I will use that abbreviation a lot.
Anthropogenic = of human origin or creation

(Note, later in this compilation you will encounter CAGW, which stands for Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming.)

AOC = (US Congresswoman) Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez, who heavily promoted a "Green New Deal" plan to "save the planet."

Definitions and examination of the claimed scientific consensus

January 7, 2020

It's usually best to start with definitions so that the writer and his readers are assured to be on the same page in terms of what is being discussed.

So, there is an area of human endeavor called "**climate science**," which should encompass the efforts by humans to learn about how the climate works by using the scientific method.

Climate: "The meteorological conditions, including temperature, precipitation, and wind, that characteristically prevail in a particular region."

Scientific method: "A method of research in which a problem is identified, relevant data are gathered, a hypothesis is formulated from these data, and the hypothesis is empirically tested."

"**Climate change**" in its simplest definition refers to trends of change in climate over time, and what drives those changes. As specified above, climate by definition concerns a particular region. The most ambitious definitions of climate and climate change would involve the entire planet, and would be focused on prediction so that humans can be prepared for changes. They also focus on global climate drivers and questions like, "Are near-term, predictable changes likely to be problematic, and are any of the significant drivers of human origin, so that by modifying human behavior we can influence the degree, and perhaps direction, of climate change in the near future?"

The media tell us that there is a "**scientific consensus**," meaning that most climate scientists agree, to the effect that the planet is getting warmer, that the increase in temperature is likely to be problematic (is already problematic!), and that human activity, especially that of industrialized society, is largely responsible for this. Further, we can - and it's alleged that we "must" - change our behavior and by doing so we can mitigate the effects that human activity is having on the global climate. Specifically, it's alleged that we humans are adding CO₂ to the atmosphere, and CO₂ is acting as a "greenhouse gas," trapping heat and causing global warming; and we need to somehow stop adding CO₂ to the atmosphere by burning combustibles.

That entire theory is seriously flawed and can and should be systematically dismantled, which I intend to attempt to do in this series of essays. Any effort to examine the whole story must take it one piece at a time and examine it carefully. For example, is there a warming trend? If so, how rapidly has the temperature been increasing? Is it currently problematic on balance, and is it likely to become more so in the future? Can we expect that trend to continue, or to reverse itself? Is the next decade or so likely to be warmer, or cooler? How much effect does CO₂ have? How much effect may other factors be having, and how much effect are they likely to have going forward? Well, there are a lot of questions, and they can be, and should be, taken one at a time and examined carefully, as I mentioned, and I'll do my best to do exactly that.

Let us start with the reported "consensus." Just how real is it? Barack Obama tweeted about a few years ago, and as a result, many people sat up and took notice. His endorsement of the idea was trumpeted far and wide by the media.

The "consensus" issue has been tackled in various ways by a variety of people, some supporting and defending it and others exposing its history and denying its validity. Do feel free to look at articles written by people on both sides of the fence, but I would like to cut to the chase by citing and discussing the points made by a climate scientist who I think performs a definitive and decisive takedown of the notion that a "97% consensus" among climate scientists exists, supporting the notion that global warming is seriously problematic and/or that it is caused by humans to a significant degree.

Here is the article:

97% Consensus... What consensus?

<https://inconvenientfacts.xyz/97%25-consensus>

Just please read it, as it says everything that needs to be said, and very eloquently at that. I will provide a quick summary, however.

The "97% consensus" notion originated with two scientists, Oreskes (2004) and Cook (2013).

The Oreskes paper was found to be deceptive when reviewed by an eminent surgeon who took an interest in it, with the result that he came out publicly in opposition to its conclusions.

Cook's "study" is significantly more deplorable, and evidently was not merely sloppy but represented a deliberate effort to engage in gross deception. Whereas Cook and his band of idiot/liars claimed that "97% of the papers [Cook's review team] examined had explicitly

endorsed the opinion that humans are causing the majority of the warming of the last 150 years," a later methodical review of their work concluded that "only 0.3% of the [relevant abstracts and papers that Cook's team claimed to have examined] endorsed man-made global warming as [Cook's team] defined it." So, the claimed result was 97% but a valid and honest attempt to replicate the result showed that the actual result was only 0.3%.

So, if anyone mentions the "97% consensus" to you, you can say, "You mean the 0.3% extreme-negative 'consensus,' because the 97% number has been shown to be an absurd, evidence-free fabrication and the actual level of consensus based on the relevant data set is 0.3%." Of course, that response will lose you long-standing friendships and so on, but people who won't budge from belief in baseless dogma were never really your friends, were they?

Note that establishing the falsity of the alleged consensus renders articles like this one completely discardable:

Those 3% of scientific papers that deny climate change? A review found them all flawed <https://qz.com/1069298/the-3-of-scientific-papers-that-deny-climate-change-are-all-flawed/amp/>

The chance that such an article will have anything useful to offer is negligible, because it is based on a fundamentally false premise. Hence, one can simply decline to read such articles (I decline to read this one, for example), which saves time for more useful pursuits. What would be the point in filling one's head with garbage? And the article's title bears the signature of a deliberate attempt to deceive and to reinforce an existing deception, which has been exposed and debunked (at least, if the prior article convinced you).

A few more comments on the alleged climate consensus

January 7, 2020

Here is another good article on the subject that can be found on the Internet, with links to almost 100 additional articles refuting the "consensus" claim found within it.

The 97% "consensus" study, Cook et al. (2013) has been thoroughly refuted in scholarly peer-reviewed journals, by major news media, public policy organizations and think tanks, highly credentialed scientists and extensively in the climate blogosphere. The shoddy methodology of Cook's study has been shown to be so fatally flawed that well known climate scientists have publicly spoken out against it.

[For example,] "The '97% consensus' article is poorly conceived, poorly designed and poorly executed. It obscures the complexities of the climate issue and it is a sign of the desperately poor level of public and policy debate in this country [UK] that the energy

minister should cite it." - Mike Hulme, Ph.D. Professor of Climate Change, University of East Anglia (UEA)

The following is a list of 97 articles that refute Cook's (poorly conceived, poorly designed and poorly executed) 97% "consensus" study. The fact that anyone continues to bring up such soundly debunked nonsense like Cook's study is an embarrassment to science.

97 Articles Refuting The "97% Consensus"

<https://climatechangedispatch.com/97-articles-refuting-the-97-consensus/>

And, to reiterate: In my view, any article that refers to this false "consensus" or the correlated "3% of dissenting studies," or whatever, is just disingenuous nonsense, and one can know that the instant the numbers - whether 97 or 3 - are mentioned. So, one needn't bother to give such articles any attention, since working from those numbers as if they were factual reveals the authors to be either liars or ignoramuses, and who has the time for such?

Pray to Saint Greta....

January 8, 2020

Pray to Greta, Saint of Climate Change, for \$18 Plus Shipping

<https://pjmedia.com/trending/pray-to-greta-saint-of-climate-change-for-18-plus-shipping/amp/>

Who is this person, you might ask? Well, her parents are celebrities — an actor and an opera singer. Standpoint magazine's Dominic Green revealed just how orchestrated Thunberg's big breakout was, and just who stands to gain from it.

"The Greta phenomenon has also involved green lobbyists, PR hustlers, eco-academics, and a think-tank founded by a wealthy ex-minister in Sweden's Social Democratic government with links to the country's energy companies. These companies are preparing for the biggest bonanza of government contracts in history: the greening of the Western economies. Greta, whether she and her parents know it or not, is the face of their political strategy," he wrote. "For Sweden's energy titans, saving the planet means government contracts to print the green stuff."

"Green energy lobbyists use populist scare tactics and a children's crusade to bypass elected representatives, but their goal is technocracy not democracy, profit not redistribution. Greta, a child of woke capitalism, is being used to ease the transition to green corporatism," Green explained.

This is just a wee parenthetical interlude in my series of essays on climate change.

Sophianic Animism repudiates and refutes the climate change agenda

January 10, 2020

This is a repetition of a Facebook post I issued earlier this morning. It isn't part of my originally-planned series on topic, but it fits in rather well. have no fear, I will be further addressing aspects of the narrative in detail.

Planetary Vision, Perverted

A Challenge to Current Exposés of the New World Order (2009)

Some time ago I was alarmed by something I heard on the internet documentary, "Esoteric Agenda." Recent developments on the global scale, such as the climate conference in Copenhagen, have increased my concern about a mistaken view of the emergent planetary vision proposed on this site. In this essay I will specify what I mean by planetary vision and indicate what I call the global psychosis, including efforts to coopt and pervert that vision or even turn it to sinister ends.

This essay will also serve as a DISCLAIMER to refute any claim that the Gaian/Sophianic material developed on this site may be cited to support a genocidal social control agenda framed in a deceiving appeal to save the earth from the human species.

§ Since I posted this essay on metahistory.org, the climate con has been driven into a frenzy that has been compared to religious mania. With the figure of Greta Thunberg, children have been introduced to enforce the lie that carbon dioxide, an essential component of life, is a toxin and a pollutant.

What I Wasn't Told About Climate Change with Luca Rossi

<https://youtu.be/nkoRm9A7xr8> [Video three minutes and two seconds in length, well worth watching. It may be the shortest and most succinct demolition of the global warming lie that you are likely to find. - GH]

...

- author: John Lamb Lash

[Join Nemeta.org to read the rest of the article. See <https://nemeta.org/unit/2-100-1-planetary-vision-perverted/>]

Given that there is a religious opposition between climate change "faith" - a false and harmful religious / political and faux-scientific agenda - and genuine devotion to the earth as the divine entity as which She can be experienced, the reader might suspect that my strenuous opposition to the anthropogenic warmist alarmist agenda is "religious" in nature.

I claim otherwise. It is ANTI-religious, and based on clear thinking combined with assiduous effort in self-education, based on intense interest in the subject and the sense that it is crucial

for humanity to reject the false agenda and all of the political and economic efforts associated with it.

As with JLL and Sophianic Animism, this is NOT on my part a rejection of genuine environmentalism or ecological concern; quite the opposite. It's pointing out a clear distinction between perversion of environmentalism and ecology and genuine concern and personal commitment in those areas, reflected in personal choices and manifest concern and action based on the same.

Is the global climate really warming, and what about scientific models that predict warming?

January 10, 2020

This morning, one of you sent me a link to this article by NASA:

Study Confirms Climate Models are Getting Future Warming Projections Right
<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2943/study-confirms-climate-models-are-getting-future-warming-projections-right/>

NASA is saying that "climate models" are making accurate predictions, according to a study apparently designed to question and reassess the models. Is this something to be concerned about?

More generally and more bluntly, is NASA generally a source of truth or a source of lies? If NASA can be shown to be a consistent source of misdirection, then we can safely ignore NASA's pronouncements, whatever they may be.

I didn't, and don't intend to, read the article posted above, but would put up against their study this scientist's comments, and make a few observations about scientific models generally.

Another Climate Scientist with Impeccable Credentials Breaks Ranks: "Our models are Mickey-Mouse Mockeries of the Real World"
<https://electroverse.net/another-climate-scientist-with-impeccable-credentials-breaks-ranks/>

In general, I agree with the latter scientist: models are "mockeries of the real world."

Good models, which is to say models that take into account a sufficient number of factors and are based on accurate assumptions, may make valid predictions, more-or-less accurate ones. But the predictions of models are never to be taken as "gospel," i.e. reality has NO obligation to follow predictions of models, and generally it does so only up to a point.

I well remember the article in Scientific American, in the year during which I subscribed to it and endeavored to read as many of its articles as I could, about parachute design. What this has to do with scientific models is that when designers are working on a new parachute that is desired to have specific characteristics and behaviors, the first step is to use computer models. The

second step is to build prototypes and test them in wind tunnels. The third step is to build working prototypes and deploy them from airplanes. It takes a long process with many revision and refinement steps to get a new parachute design into production. Why is that? Because although computer models serve as an initial guide to point the designers in the right general direction, the computer models DO NOT predict how a design will behave in real life with anywhere near enough accuracy that the design would actually work as desired. It just doesn't happen. The same would be true of climate models. In spite of NASA's indulgence in fantasy and effective prevarication, there is no way their climate models could be as accurate as they apparently want their readers to believe.

The article linked at the beginning of this essay in itself provides some indication that the space agency is being dishonest about climate science. Are there other indicators? I'm sure there are many, but this one in particular crossed my radar recently:

NASA Confirms their Own "Conspiracy Theory"
<https://youtu.be/xMc1o2tUBds>

If you care to watch the video, the indication of flagrant and deliberate dishonesty, and of pressure being put on others to adopt dishonest positions in support of NASA, is very obvious.

I wrote this in partial response to the NASA article and questions related to it:

No matter how authoritative certain scientists try to sound, there is no consensus, their work is always in doubt, etc. And this is especially so in the climate arena because ... it is a religion and the globalists (Jews, Communists, Rothschilds...) will never let the warming, let alone anthropogenic warming, narrative be wrong, no matter how many good reasons to doubt it are assembled.

It doesn't matter that cold temperature records outnumber hot temperature records month after month (often by 2:1 or more), the planet is always "warming."

It doesn't matter by how many billions of tons the Greenland and Antarctic ice sheets are growing year after year, the planet is always "warming."

It doesn't matter that the lowest temperature ever recorded in Greenland was registered recently; the planet is still "warming."

It doesn't matter that we are entering a Grand Solar Minimum with less radiation coming from our star, and that volcanic activity is shooting unprecedented (in recent times) amounts of dust and soot into the stratosphere, having an immediate and direct cooling effect, the planet is always "warming."

I could go on in a similar vein. I think massive lying to support a deceptive agenda is going on.

The degree to which deliberate deception is occurring is reflected by the placement of new thermometers to measure the alleged warming. They are not placed out in the forest under green, living trees. They are placed in cities, surrounded by asphalt. Of course, given that kind

of selectivity, the global temperature will appear to be rising over time. I am not making this up! I've seen articles that expose it as a modus operandi aimed at deliberately substituting misleading readings for genuinely representative ones.

Which touches, in part, on what and who are really behind the climate change agenda, which is why it is Very Important to be on the right side of the issue. We don't want to be supporting humanity's enemies and their agendas for us. But that is a topic in itself that I hope to treat in more detail a little later on.

Here's another assertion, a more direct one, that the earth is warming:

2019 second warmest year on record, ends hottest decade yet, says EU observatory
<https://www.climatechangenews.com/2020/01/08/2019-second-warmest-year-record-ends-hottest-decade-yet-says-eu-observatory/>

The observatory is also concerned with the "global picture of CO2 concentration," which has nothing to do with global temperature, regardless of the propaganda that says it does - as I plan to conclusively show, or rather, I will refer to articles that do so, in an upcoming essay in this series.

But let us examine the basic honesty of the cited EU observatory. Was 2019 really the second hottest year on record, or is that a blatant lie? The above article cites a few examples of possibly-accurate regional incidental or short-term warming, such as in Alaska. It is to be acknowledged that - as would be expected under the current solar minimum conditions - the jet stream has been behaving strangely, pushing Arctic air farther southward and causing parts of the Arctic to be unusually warm. But it is very important to focus on what is going on globally and not to be distracted or deceived by regional and local warmth anomalies.

This is what is really going on, looking at the global picture:

Earth [Is] Cooling at the Fastest Rate on Record
<https://realclimatescience.com/2017/01/earth-cooling-at-the-fastest-rate-on-record/>

I saw a similar temperature graph recently, that went much farther into the past but ended up with basically the same "falling off a cliff" drop at the end; however, the wags who had assembled that graph added to it the warming projected by models like NASA's, showing an abrupt and "catastrophic" reversal with the temperature shooting up off the chart in a classic Michael Mann "hockey stick" manner - just to illustrate how contrary to the actual trend those kinds of predictions are.

I love the above article's comments about "climate science:"

There is no climate science, period. Just a group of criminals who are terrified that their global warming scam is about to end. Climate scientists make Enron accountants look like saints.

So, there you have it. We are not dealing with politicians and scientists, much less the contemptible media, who have any shred of honesty or conscience. We're dealing instead with a gang of crooks and liars who want to harm millions and probably billions of people for their own narrow, limited and special benefit, and/or that of the extremely evil people who have corrupted them and/or are paying their salaries.

What do you think will happen with everyone who is allowing himself or herself to be pointed by the liars-in-charge toward preparing for a warming world or trying to prevent alleged runaway global warming, when the global temperature plunges and crop failures and food shortages become the order of the day? Certainly at some point the warmists will be exposed to pretty much everyone - and here's hoping they will all be hanged, beheaded or starved and frozen to death (the latter being punishments befitting their crimes) - speaking of the deliberate liars; I don't wish such upon their dupes, many of whom are people with good hearts and intentions who are just unfortunately very gullible or simply poorly-informed. (If anyone reading this has been poorly-informed, I hope my essays and the articles and videos to which I refer are helping you see a different side of the story than merely casual attention and exposure to a steady mainstream media diet has provided.) In any case, without proper organized preparation for the cold times that are very likely coming, millions and perhaps billions of people will die unnecessarily, and many more will suffer.

We know that the elite want population reduction, which they are seeking and promoting by many means and mechanisms. Lying about climate change is evidently one of them.

I will not be surprised if the predicted economic meltdown and correlated economic times more severe than the Great Depression will be deliberately timed to coincide with the planet's descent into a cold period such as perhaps haven't been seen in the past 200 years or more. From the elite's perspective, that probably would be ideal, as it will cause the greatest number of people to starve to death.

So, what is to be done? STOP worrying about global warming and START preparing for global cooling. That's about as simple a pointed set of suggestions as I can articulate.

As far as *specifically* what to do is concerned, we will all do well to become as self-sufficient and/or as interdependent with other like-minded people as we possibly can. There is a good book by a retired Canadian attorney, entitled *A New Little Ice Age Has Started*, that includes some specific suggestions.

<https://www.amazon.com/new-little-ice-age-started/dp/1515158519/>

[Correlated subject: alleged sea level rise]

I don't want to leave this subject ("Is She getting warmer?") without addressing the allegation that sea levels are rising, which would be a secondary indicator of warming (melting polar ice caps and glaciers). I performed an exercise a few months ago, searching YouTube for videos debunking this idea. Not surprisingly, probably 19 out of 20 videos are promoting the idea that is definitely happening, and that of course it is due to climate change. But is this true? In spite of

local evidence of sea level rise in some places, it is good to keep in mind that land is rising and falling in various places, and there are other factors in play, so local changes do not correlate with global ones, any more than this is true of temperature changes and trends. So, what is going on, on the global scale?

Sea levels have been very gradually and steadily rising globally since the end of the last ice age, but the rise is generally negligible and not a reason to panic because (one might imagine) major cities will be flooded in the near future on account of this general sea level rise. If the global temperature falls in the immediate future, this will likely produce a hiatus in the general sea level increase. But is anything at all unusual happening with the sea level?

World Leading Ocean Expert Calls Sea Level Rise Claims By Climate Scientists “Anti-Scientific Nonsense”

<https://notrickszone.com/2019/02/13/world-leading-ocean-expert-calls-sea-level-rise-claims-by-climate-scientists-anti-scientific-nonsense/>

That seems pretty clear, doesn't it?

One might wonder what is going on with the "data" that is said to "prove" that sea levels are rising. As with temperature data (did you watch the NASA "conspiracy theory" video above?), the liars depend on "adjusted" data; they simply change the data to match their assumptions and to prove what they wish to prove. That's really excellent scientific practice, isn't it? And a good bit of other anti-scientific fudging goes on, too - whatever is needed to show the results desired by their globalist masters.

Sea level data ALTERED by scientists to create false impression of rising oceans

<https://www.newstarget.com/2019-02-18-sea-level-data-altered-by-scientists-to-create-false-impression-of-rising-oceans.html>

Based on my research over the past several years, I wrote earlier today:

"Adjusting" data is something they CONSTANTLY do. If the data do not fit the theory, they come up with some excuse to change the data so that it appears to support the theory, meaning the lies they are being paid to propagate.

Some people might think I am just a very cynical elderly person, but if so, my cynicism is well-justified. I read a lot, I consider carefully what I read and how it correlates with whatever other info is out there, of which I AM aware. And I reach conclusions. I believe my conclusions to be correct because they continue to hold up over time, and in fact I find more and more reasons to maintain those conclusions.

Concerning CO2 – Should We Be Concerned?

January 11, 2020

CO2 is supposed to be The Problem in the world of the anthropogenic climate change hypothesis. Hence, we hear (and have heard for many years) about "carbon footprint" and "carbon tax," etc.

Is the injection of increasing amounts of CO2 into the atmosphere via the simple act of burning stuff a problematic thing that humans do? Well, that depends - doesn't it? - on the effects of CO2 as a gas in the atmosphere.

CO2 is a tiny fraction of the gas that constitutes the planetary atmosphere that we all breathe. The current concentration is about 400 parts per million (ppm).

What happens when humans add more carbon dioxide to the atmosphere? The allegation is that it traps heat and causes the lower atmosphere - and by extension, the land and water in contact with the lower atmosphere - to get warmer and warmer. This is the explanation of the term "greenhouse gas" - CO2 supposedly causes a "greenhouse effect," meaning that it traps heat. But does it? Has this been scientifically proved?

Articles found on the Internet are "all over the map" on this issue.

Carbon Dioxide: The No. 1 Greenhouse Gas

<https://www.thoughtco.com/carbon-dioxide-greenhouse-gas-4118337>

It's Water Vapor, Not the CO2

<https://www.acs.org/content/acs/en/climatescience/climatesciencenarratives/its-water-vapor-not-the-co2.html>

Tim Ball: The Evidence Proves That CO2 is Not a Greenhouse Gas

<https://www.technocracy.news/tim-ball-the-evidence-proves-that-co2-is-not-a-greenhouse-gas/>

Carbon Dioxide is a Cooling Gas According to NASA

<https://coldclimatechange.com/carbon-dioxide-is-a-cooling-gas-according-to-nasa/>

Those are just some articles that come up in the first page of a DuckDuckGo search, not articles I intended to, or was inclined to, specifically reference in formulating this essay. My purpose in citing them is simply to show that the "take" on what the effects of CO2 are varies wildly. One could say, "there is no scientific consensus."

Yes, of course, "our science is better than their science" - everyone claims that, so the reader is forced to read the various expositions and decide who is right and who is wrong, and "perhaps" who is deliberately lying.

I have read the various assertions and reasonings, and I agree with parts of the latter three articles above. The first article cited merely presents the mainstream status quo view, which is deliberately deceptive and scientifically null and void. The article is nothing more than a (tired and boring) propaganda piece.

I can work with the last two articles cited above. Let's take a high-level look at some of the authors' main points.

According to Dr. Tim Ball (author of the book *The Deliberate Corruption of Climate Science* <https://www.amazon.com/Deliberate-Corruption-Climate-Science/dp/0988877740>):

The most important assumption behind the AGW theory is that an increase in global atmospheric CO₂ will cause an increase in the average annual global temperature. The problem is that in every record of temperature and CO₂, the temperature changes first. Think about what I am saying. The basic assumption on which the entire theory that human activity is causing global warming or climate change is wrong.

What one would want in formulating a scientific hypothesis would be a demonstrable cause-and-effect relationship. What is seen in the records that scientists can consult is a correlation between temperature and CO₂ levels, but temperature change has historically preceded, not followed, changes in CO₂ levels. This not only fails to demonstrate that increasing CO₂ causes increasing temperatures, but it strongly suggests that temperatures increasing for other reasons leads to higher CO₂ levels via natural processes. (The case of CO₂ released into the atmosphere by industrial processes and machines doesn't follow the pattern, but in any case, there is no empirical evidence that increasing atmospheric CO₂ levels cause higher global temperatures.)

Thomas Huxley said, "The great tragedy of science – the slaying of a lovely hypothesis by an ugly fact." The most recent ugly fact was that after 1998 CO₂ levels continued to increase but global temperatures stopped increasing. Other ugly facts included the return of cold, snowy winters....

... CO₂ is not a greenhouse gas. There is a greenhouse effect, and it is due to the water vapour. The entire claim that [human-generated CO₂ causes warming] is absolutely wrong, yet these so-called scientists convinced the world to waste trillions on reducing CO₂.

Those are Dr. Ball's statements, which I think he has handily proved in the article. (He also explains the history of the "CO₂ is a greenhouse gas" mistake / lie.)

The article titled "Carbon Dioxide is a Cooling Gas..." cites and quotes several scientists with excellent credentials who take strong exception to the view that CO₂ has a warming effect. For example,

[Even if CO₂ were shown to have a warming effect, which is the opposite of what evidence indicates,] "Solar activity has overpowered any effect that CO₂ has had," reports Dr. R. Timothy Patterson. World temperatures have been generally declining for about 10 years while CO₂ is rising rapidly," writes famous weatherman Piers Corbyn, who is an astrophysicist.

"Carbon dioxide does not drive climate," says Piers flatly. "The idea CO₂ controls climate, and that man's CO₂ particularly, controls climate, is actually delusional

nonsense." "There is no evidence for this in real data. Temperature changes in the oceans, in the long run, drive carbon dioxide levels, so they tend to move together."

[A graph is shown that contrasts the predictions of CO₂-based climate models with what has happened in the real world. The models have been grossly inaccurate.]

Prof. Don J. Easterbrook said, "Global warming (i.e, the warming since 1977) is over. The minute increase of anthropogenic CO₂ in the atmosphere (0.008%) was not the cause of the warming—it was a continuation of natural cycles that occurred over the past 500 years. The PDO cool mode has replaced the warm mode in the Pacific Ocean, virtually assuring us of about 30 years of global cooling, perhaps much deeper than the global cooling from about 1945 to 1977. Just how much cooler the global climate will be during this cool cycle is uncertain. Recent solar changes suggest that it could be fairly severe, perhaps more like the 1880 to 1915 cool cycle than the more moderate 1945-1977 cool cycles. A more drastic cooling, similar to that during the Dalton and Maunder minimums, could plunge the Earth into another Little Ice Age, but only time will tell if that is likely."

Dr. Willie Soon, astrophysicist and geoscientist at the Solar and Stellar Physics Division of the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics, said, "Saying the climate system is completely dominated by how much carbon dioxide we have in the system is crazy – completely wrong. Carbon dioxide is not the major driver for the earth/climate system. Temperatures are going down, but CO₂ levels are still going up. It's close to being insane to try to keep insisting these changes in carbon dioxide are going to create all of the disasters that politicians and doomsayers are trying to tell us. Climate is totally, completely dependent on what the sun is doing to the system. The sun is the major driver of the earth's climate system."

Carbon dioxide is NOT a pollutant. It is NOT harmful to life on earth. CO₂ is a truly wondrous chemical substance absolutely essential for life.

I am absolutely convinced that all of the statements made above are true.

I have read very convincing articles arguing that the levels of CO₂ have been too low in recent centuries, that if they had become much lower the integrity of the biosphere would have been endangered, and that human activity adding CO₂ to the atmosphere has been nothing but a boon to the planet. As far as CO₂ levels are concerned, humans are busily and beneficially engaged in curing a deficiency.

CO₂ emissions actually have a greening effect on the planet. They are benefiting Her, not harming Her.

NASA Says Earth Is Greener Today Than 20 Years Ago Thanks To China, India
<https://www.forbes.com/sites/trevornace/2019/02/28/nasa-says-earth-is-greener-today-than-20-years-ago-thanks-to-china-india/>

The Chinese and Indian economies are major sources of CO₂ "pollution."

It is undeniable that industrial processes can create serious pollution problems, but production of CO₂ is not one of them. The completely wrong focus on CO₂ as an alleged pollutant serves to cover up real pollution and cause it to be ignored, effectively "swept under the rug" as far as public attention is concerned. While enormous unwarranted negative focus is on an innocuous and beneficial gas, real existential pollution crises exist (such as plastics choking the ecosystem, particularly in the oceans) that are being largely ignored. This is one of the detrimental effects - by design - of the alleged "climate crisis" with its insane demonization of the most beneficial of all of the products of industrial processes (except perhaps for oxygen and water vapor).

Justin of the Facebook page and Website *I Love Carbon Dioxide* presents the following video by Patrick Moore, a genuine environmentalist:

The Truth About CO₂

<https://youtu.be/WDWEjSDYfxc>

I question Moore's assertions about "fossil fuels," as he fails to acknowledge the abiotic theory concerning the origins of substances like petroleum. Also, reading the comments on the video is entertaining. There are so many people who are laboring under the delusions implanted by the mainstream climate alarmists that they fail to see Moore's points or go into knee-jerk reaction mode - "I *must* find *something* wrong with this man's arguments!" resulting in a spewing of poorly-thought out, spurious and idiotic counterarguments. His arguments aren't perfect and they deserve close scrutiny, but I don't think they are as easily dismissed as many of the warmist alarmism dogmatist commenters imagine.

In any case, what is really happening, "in real life?" This is what's really happening as a result of adding more CO₂ to the atmosphere:

Rejoice, the Earth Is Becoming Greener

<https://humanprogress.org/article.php?p=2018>

And, contrary to the intense concern of the fear-addicted "CO₂ = warming" false equivalence crowd, we are a very long way from adding so much CO₂ to the atmosphere that it can be any kind of a problem. It is the utterly false assumption that CO₂ is a greenhouse gas that lies at the root of their terror(ism); and strangely, once a person has had that lie take root in his or her consciousness, it is often ridiculously difficult to root it out.

Dr. Mark Sircus's Website is not primarily about climate, but he discusses the impact of CO₂ deficiency on human health in an interesting article:

CO₂ Deficiency and Symptoms in Humans

<https://drsircus.com/respiratory-disease/co2-deficiency-symptoms-humans/>

The main issue with CO₂ is not global warming - it's health and life itself. Carbon dioxide like air, water and oxygen is essential for life and health in general and specifically it

holds the key to resolving asthma, cancer and many other chronic diseases. Carbon dioxide is an essential constituent of tissue fluids and as such should be maintained at an optimum level in the blood.

...

Carbon dioxide is a nutrient as well as a product of respiration and energy production in the cells and its lack or deficiency is of itself a starting point for different disturbances in the body. It is very interesting to note that in comparison with most of the Earth's geological history we live today in a world that is in a state of relative carbon dioxide starvation, especially for optimal plant growth....

Researchers at the Max Planck Institute for Solar Research in Germany report the sun has been burning more brightly over the last 60 years, accounting for the 1 degree Celsius increase in Earth's temperature over the last 100 years. Dr. Timothy Patterson, professor of geology and director of the Ottawa-Carleton Geoscience Center of Canada's Carleton University, says that "CO₂ variations show little correlation with our planet's climate on long, medium and even short time scales."

...

So now that we know something about carbon dioxide, it's not something we need to be afraid of and certainly we don't want anyone putting a tax on it, for the trees, at least, are loving that there is more of it in the air. If there is any truth in the fact that more CO₂ in the air has a warming effect then perhaps in the end we will be thankful when it gets really cold that it is not as cold as it might be if we had not filled the air with so much of it due to human activity.

Dr. Sircus continues on to discuss pollution and to point out that mercury is the biggest pollution threat to human health - which is interesting given the deliberate introduction into human bodies of highly toxic mercury via vaccinations, but that is another subject.

The main point from Dr. Sircus's article that's relevant to this discussion is that carbon dioxide is necessary and beneficial for humans too, and we are all suffering from varying degrees of CO₂ *starvation*, similarly to our biological collaborators in the plant kingdom. So, contrary to the sick paranoid delusions of the climate dupes who think that CO₂ is toxic, we really do need more of it, not just for plants but for people too, and we're many centuries away, at least, from injecting enough of it into the atmosphere to constitute a problem.

A YouTube commenter attacking Patrick Moore's video expressed concern that one cannot breathe pure CO₂ - true enough, but it's a ridiculously idiotic point to bring up in connection with a gas that constitutes a very tiny trace amount of the total atmosphere, and will continue to be a tiny trace amount even if humanity and/or natural processes add ten or fifteen times the total amount currently present in the air.

And speaking of natural processes, it turns out that vulcanism, which has been on the increase lately, adds far more CO₂ to the atmosphere than had been previously assumed, and it is impossible to distinguish between the CO₂ added by vulcanism and that added by humans, so we actually have no idea how much of the total CO₂ has been contributed by humans via our many activities and their side effects, including industrialization, automobiles and cow farts. (The

human penchant for keeping domestic cattle, eating meat and consuming dairy products, has also been attacked as a source of "excessive" contributions to atmospheric levels of CO2.)

Discovery of Massive Volcanic CO2 Emissions Puts Damper on Global Warming Theory
<https://climatechangedispatch.com/massive-volcano-emissions-warming/>

Who would have thought there would be so much to say about CO2? I would not have thought there would be quite so much, as recently as when I began writing this essay - and I still haven't mentioned the main article I had in mind when I began - but that's OK because I think I have covered most of that article's main points. In any case, I will end the essay at this point, unless anyone has specific questions that I can address separately. If you have such questions, about this or any of the subtopics that I have treated or will treat, please send them and I will do my best to answer them.

Roots and Aims of the Climate Agenda

January 19, 2020

What is behind the climate agenda, what is its goal, and why does it matter to you and me?

Global warming
https://youtu.be/4PHWr0k_-KQ

The Club of Rome asserts that the real enemy of humanity is humanity itself. No, it isn't. It is the Xenosh (the archons' proxies who subvert humanity's inherently good tendencies). Yes, we are part of a global civilization that appears driven to excess in a senseless manner, but on reflection, are we not encouraged in consumerism and materialism by the commerce and trade specialists via incessant advertising?

Our enemies (enemies of life) have created an inverted funnel that sucks money out of our pockets via excessive taxation to which we never agreed - our "representatives" agreed on our behalf, just as they agreed for us (or our immediate ancestors) to establish central banks owned by foreigners and permit them to fleece us, and to borrow heavily from the usurious international bankers, pledging us and our economic activity as surety for the insane debts - a disproportionate portion of the money having been borrowed to finance "endless war," a portion of the world domination agenda of the Xenosh. The enemies of humanity are also the major investors who own the wholesale and retail sales companies via which we must consume "to support the economy" and its "growth," which in the end somehow seems to inevitably devolve into more poverty and more economic inequality (by design).

The oil companies frequently take the hit for causing the majority of CO2 emissions, which are falsely identified as causing global warming. so, we are told, we must switch to "renewables" like solar and wind as means of generating energy. There are in fact rather terrible, and apparently insoluble, problems with solar and wind energy. (That can be subject of a different essay.) It's essentially the same group of investors who profit from "renewables" as profit from oil, coal and natural gas, the so-called "fossil fuels." They are merely trying to open up new

markets so that they can expand their profits; and no, they do not have anyone's best interest at heart in doing so except their own. And they too are part of the inverted funnel system.

Here's a clue about wind energy, if you aren't already aware of it: It would not be profitable without government subsidies, so it makes the cost of energy increase, and/or the money to prop up the industry and ensure the investors make profits from it comes not from its (non-existent) economic viability but from taxation - governmental theft of a portion (any portion; it happens to be enormous, and has tended to grow over time) of the financial fruits of the working person's labor. Aside from the general assertion, with which I agree fully, that "taxation is theft," the taxes that support government subsidies for the wind industry are definitely and doubly theft because the public gets absolutely nothing for it except lies and a giant scam.

Subsidy Farming: Wind Power Could Never Make a Profit Without Massive Subsidies
<https://stopthesethings.com/2019/08/14/subsidy-farming-wind-power-could-never-make-a-profit-without-massive-subsidies/>

The story of wind energy therefore is: The global warming lie is used as a manipulation tool by Xenosh investors, and others who admire them and want to be like them, to help corrupt those politicians who can't be deceived, and deceive those who can't be corrupted, into representing THEM, not US, by arranging to steal from the pockets of working people to enrich the wealthy.

That's ALL it is. And similar dynamics will be found at work in parallel initiatives, such as expanding the use of solar energy.

It would be fine to get off of fossil fuels or greatly reduce their use, because while CO2 is not a pollutant, a lot of real pollution is generated in the process of extracting and refining the underlying resources. The problem with "renewables" is that they convey no real overall advantage. Development of "disruptive technology" that could make energy production much cheaper, cleaner and less dangerous is pointedly NOT invested in - in fact, people who have tried to develop it have been murdered in some cases, Stanley Meyer evidently having been a case in point.

The Mysterious Death of Stanley Meyer and His Water-Powered Car
<https://www.gaia.com/article/the-mysterious-death-of-stanley-meyer-and-his-water-powered-car>

(I was shown a video once by a couple of secretive characters, one of whom I had encountered through social networking, that they told me showed water being ignited by a spark plug. The conversation was a bit testy and they never contacted me again. Perhaps that was for the best.)

Meyer was not trying to replace the way we obtain electricity for our homes, but merely to render petroleum-based fuel for automobiles obsolete. Evidently there were those who didn't appreciate his efforts and felt that the easiest and best way to put an end to them was to murder him.

I attended a lecture in Canada and a follow-up workshop in 2014. In the workshop, the subject of experimentation in alternative energy generation was raised and a member of the audience advised secrecy, saying that it is illegal to attempt to develop "disruptive technology" in Canada.

So, if someone devised a cheap way to power his home or automobile that avoided the use of the grid or fuel purchased from an oil company, he or she could (and doubtless, would) be arrested and prosecuted for doing so. And if that didn't stop him there is always the fate of Stanley Meyer to consider, as it might be duplicated in his case.

Because of the people who control it, "the system" is designed to prevent real progress in energy generation. If it is cheap and clean, you won't see it developed. If, however, you can be lied to and scammed to ensure that wealthy investors, primarily Xenosh, make big profits, the technology connected with that approach will be promoted.

Back to what is directly behind the "climate crisis" agenda, when agendas based on lies attempt to dominate the narrative or create a narrative and force people to believe in it and support it, what is the underlying motivation? It's always domination, control and MONEY. And at this stage of the global game, it's killing as many people as possible (depopulation) as opposed to saving lives. Further, the globalist bankers are not content to just print plenty of money for themselves (which they can certainly do, as they control the creation of money in almost every country in the world). The perverse creatures have defined money as debt, which is slavery. They have turned the definition of money into "ownership and control of others." Quite literally. That includes controlling when and how people will die and exercising as much control as possible over how they live their lives, which lives the haters of humankind prefer to be miserable, of course. They want us all to be like most of the inhabitants of Mississippi (the poorest and most backward American state), or the Palestinians.

Pope Francis Calls For 'One World Government' To 'Save Humanity'
<https://newspunch.com/pope-francis-one-world-government/>

The Pope, whoever and whatever he may be (much of it quite shockingly bad, I'm sure - not getting into the Catholic Church's child rapist clergy problem here, or all of the suggestions of wickedness in Bergoglio's past), is not humanity's friend. He has allied himself with others who it's most reasonable to view as enemies of the human species, and his pronouncements and actions have consistently supported the predatory agenda of the international banksters and their minions - which is to say, the Xenosh, proxies of the archons.

From the article:

... what is raising eyebrows is the Pope's call for a new global political authority. Here is more from the Guardian:

« Pope Francis will this week call for changes in lifestyles and energy consumption to avert the "unprecedented destruction of the ecosystem" before the end of this century, according to a leaked draft of a papal encyclical. In a document released by an Italian magazine on Monday, the pontiff will warn that failure to act would have "grave consequences for all of us".

Francis also called for a new global political authority tasked with "tackling ... the reduction of pollution and the development of poor countries and regions". His appeal echoed that of his predecessor, pope Benedict XVI, who in a 2009 encyclical proposed a

kind of super-UN to deal with the world's economic problems and injustices. »

The word "globalization" means exactly what it says. It is the process of transitioning the world into a global government. Religious leaders are playing their part in this great deception.

David Rockefeller famously said that a "global crisis" would have to occur before the people of the world would be willing to accept a New World Order. When the world economy suffered a dramatic crash in 2008, world leaders again proclaimed the need for a New World Order with global financial control.

As demonstrated by Pope Francis, climate change and the global warming hoax is now the global elite's preferred method of scaremongering, as they attempt to shepherd humanity closer to unified totalitarian rule.

Don't forget that ranting about "globalism" is anti-Semitic, because the term is 'code for "Jews."' I wonder why.

Is Ranting Against Globalism Anti-Semitic? (by Jewish rabbi Rachel Barenblat)
<https://forward.com/subscribe/412627/globalism-anti-semitism/>

Predictably, the world's religious leaders are starting to form a unitary front in support of humanity's enemies, promoting a hell-on-earth scenario in which duty will be not to one's family and community but to a centralized bureaucracy, and freedom as heretofore conceived and valued basically will not exist. (That is a paraphrase from the article on Pope Francis.) In other words, the "Final Stage: Communist Vassalage" of which author Gerard Menuhin warns.


It is hard not to hate them for destroying ancient regions I would have liked to visit: Lebanon, Syria, Libya; or for their rootlessness, for their parasitism, for their inhumanity, for their perpetual lies, for their lack of a credible culture; for ruining my world, a world of natural and man-made beauty, through wars and endless avariciousness—for absolutely no reason at all except to gain control of it, through a so-called New World Order, leading to a Jewish World Government. "We will have world government, whether or not we like it. The question is only whether world government will be achieved by consent or by conquest." (James Paul Warburg, son of Paul Warburg (the co-founder of the Federal Reserve), member of the Council on Foreign Relations, February 17, 1950)

That quote is from Menuhin's book *Tell the Truth and Shame the Devil*. Menuhin is a European of Jewish ancestry, or a man with a foot in each world, that of the Jews and that of the Goyim. Menuhin obviously takes exception to the dominant Jewish view, finding traditional Goy civilization enjoyable and preferable to the alternative designed and intended by Jews such as Paul Warburg and his peers and their descendants. The particular relevance of the quote here is that it demonstrates, via the embedded quote - and many more can be lined up alongside it that similarly confirm the existence of the world domination agenda of Jews of Influence and Power - that it is that "elite" group most especially who are at the root of all the lies and of what the lies are dragging us all into.

And make no mistake, a great genocide is on their minds and in their hearts, part of their purpose. What is science pointing toward as far as climate change is concerned, which they are determined humanity will do absolutely nothing in a large-scale, organized way to prepare for or to counter in any way?

A "Random" Rebuttal of the Climate Change Agenda

January 22, 2020



I obtained the above graph from the blog of author Elizabeth Nickson, whose books *The Monkey Puzzle Tree* and *Eco-Fascists* look worthwhile to me. (Consider assessing them for your own potential benefit; the former book is truth so difficult to absorb that Nickson determined the story should be told as fiction.)

Herewith, her comments accompanying the graph. I believe I will adopt the same strategy regarding the "climate change" issue, once I have completed this series of essays.

Bullshit

I am never ever going to write about global warming which is bullshit and is not happening. I am just going to publish this chart every time there is new propaganda like this week's report from NOAA and NASA, screaming that this past decade is the warmest in living history. Yeah, by a few hundredths of a percent since the Little Ice Age. And frankly, I even doubt that.

I posted the graph presented by Nickson on Facebook and am, for now, using it as my account's cover photo. I want to enlist help to counter the nonsense, so I wrote:

Friends on the sane and humane side of this issue may want to download this so you can show it to any of your associates who may have been successfully duped, and use it to chase away people who want to convince you that "global warming" is worthy of your time and attention except to intensively oppose it, or at least get them to quiet down and

start thinking and/or leave you alone.

Be sure to print a few copies. You might even have them laminated. Post one over your desk at work and another beside the door to your home.

Icecaps are melting, and (therefore) "We're all gonna die?!"

February 10, 2020

The information correlated to these comments is from 2015 but still applicable. I'm referring back to it here and now because there was recently much media hoopla over a temperature reading of 65 degrees Fahrenheit registered in Antarctica, and various reactions to that point.

Should we be concerned about the potential for melting of the Antarctic ice cap - an evidently non-happening (and not about to happen) event?

What global warming? Antarctic ice is INCREASING by 135 billion tonnes a year, says NASA <https://www.express.co.uk/news/science/616356/What-global-warming-Nasa-Antarctic-ice-INCREASING-135BILLION-TONNES-year>

Short-term high temperature anomalies, in Antarctica and/or anywhere else, aren't going to change the overall trend, and are part of a global scenario (think global) in which record highs are counterbalanced many-to-one by record lows, and cold-related anomalies generally predominate. * The deliberately deceiving, agenda-driven news media aren't generally encouraging anyone to look at the true bigger picture, however. (Their self-defined role is not to help people "connect the dots," anyway.)

To see the bigger picture more clearly, reference for example NASA's 2015 study of Antarctic ice attrition and accumulation, discussed in the article below.

The ice volume decrease (melting) in some areas has been shown to be due to volcanic activity and resultant warming from beneath. The recent, evidently short-term, global warming trend has affected Antarctica by merely slowing down the positive accumulation of more and more ice, according to the NASA study.

And so that we can check the Express article against direct sources, here are a couple of links to NASA articles on the study.

Yes, I am often critical of NASA and will reiterate here that one need not believe a word they say or print. Make of all of this whatever you will, therefore.

<https://climate.nasa.gov/news/2361/study-mass-gains-of-antarctic-ice-sheet-greater-than-losses/>

<https://www.nasa.gov/feature/goddard/nasa-study-mass-gains-of-antarctic-ice-sheet-greater-than-losses>

* Reference <http://electroverse.net> - just scroll through recent articles for a counterbalance to the mainstream media's tendency to print news about record highs and to ignore all of the record (in recent times) cold sweeping the planet. Or look at specific articles on the site that highlight months in which low-temperature records greatly outnumbered high-temperature records.

Explanation of "how they do it" (cook temperature data to deceive us into thinking the earth is warming)

February 13, 2020

The article to which I have linked below explains exactly HOW data that, in their natural state, undermine and falsify the global warming theory, are "cooked" to appear to support it. So, what we are looking at whenever someone presents temperature data that appear to support the warming theory, is FALSE data loosely based on actual (true) data and "derived from it" via a deceptive process that has no valid scientific justification.

The article alleges, methinks accurately, that the "justification" for the "adjusting" of data is simply to produce "facts" that align with the politically-correct (which means, serving the interests of the Xenosh* world-domination agenda) anthropogenic global warming theory.

What the true facts reveal, however, is that there isn't even any global warming worthy of note occurring, anthropogenic or otherwise.

And the net result is neutral in all respects except one: The takeaway is that there are despicable liars at the head and genesis of an enormous and highly-consequential fraud that must be exposed and implacably resisted in every way, all of the time.

(As a secondary theme, I suggest looking into the evidence for global cooling, and the damage it will cause to an unprepared world, and considering how to individually prepare or it.)

Far from legitimately "adjusting" anything, it appears they are cooking the data to show a politically correct trend toward global warming. Not by coincidence, that has been part and parcel of the government's underlying policies for the better part of two decades.

What NOAA does aren't niggling little changes, either.

As Tony Heller at the Real Climate Science web site notes, "Pre-2000 temperatures are progressively cooled, and post-2000 temperatures are warmed. This year has been a particularly spectacular episode of data tampering by NOAA, as they introduce nearly 2.5 degrees of fake warming since 1895."

So, the global warming scare is basically a hoax.

This winter, for instance, as measured by temperature in city after city and by snow-storm severity, has been one of the coldest on record in the Northeast.

But after the NOAA's wizards finished with the data, it was merely about average.

The Stunning Statistical Fraud Behind the Global Warming Scare
<https://www.investors.com/politics/editorials/the-stunning-statistical-fraud-behind-the-global-warming-scare>

* Xenosh: anti-human humans, humanity's enemies, a "fifth column" group that insert themselves into human societies, externally human but internally inhuman in the way their minds and hearts function, whose agenda is to undermine and ultimately destroy all that is sane and beneficial, and who act as proxies of the archons. That is my definition in my own words, not that of JLL who originated the term; I'm sure the syntax of his definition is more succinct, although essentially equivalent to mine. I am describing the same group that he had in mind.

Don't Be Fooled

March 13, 2020

The title I am giving this quick review reminds me that April 1, 2020 isn't far away.

It's Easy to be Fooled by a Climate Alarmist


<https://wattsupwiththat.com/2020/03/11/its-easy-to-be-fooled-by-a-climate-alarmist/>

This article linked above concerns the author's book and a climate alarmist who attempted to debunk it under the title "It's Easy to be Tricked by a Climate Denier." (Which is prima facie a foolish title. What is a "climate denier?" Someone who denies the existence of climate? I could go on for a while in similar vein. Anyone who uses the pejorative "denier" is almost certainly a liar with an agenda, who has no factual and logical leg to stand on, so he or she unleashes the dreaded - or more accurately, dreadful - "denier" accusation / ad hominem attack. Avoiding giving such people time and attention is usually the best way to deal with them.)

The author quite accurately and eloquently makes one of my favorite points about CO2:

Placing [atmospheric CO2 increase] data into an even longer geologic picture ... provides an eye-opening perspective to the modern 130-ppm increase. It reveals that the Earth has been in a 140 million-year dangerous decline in carbon dioxide. The decrease from 2,500 ppm to the dangerously low level of less than 180 ppm at the end of the last ice age put the Earth perilously close to a true climate apocalypse. Why would such a low level be dangerous? It is because it came terrifyingly close to the minimum threshold for most plant life to exist at about 150 ppm. Had that line-of-death been crossed, it would have resulted in a true climate apocalypse.

Viewed in this perspective, it becomes obvious that our recent increase of 130 ppm is exceedingly small and barely registers as a blip on the chart of Earth's CO2 history.



140 Million Years of Dangerous Decline in CO2


The people who would have us "fight climate change" by reducing CO2 emissions are essentially taking an anti-life, pro-catastrophe stance. How about them apples?

The ensuing discussion of CO2 versus temperature is potentially more dicey because the writer seems content to use temperature charts that are probably semi-fraudulent, given the tendency of the alarmists in control of such data to stack the cards to show a false data-driven perspective indicating recent warming. (See the immediately-prior essay in this compilation; data are very commonly "adjusted" and "zombie data" are added based on the assumptions and preferences of the "scientists" who prepare the data for publication and use. This appears to be completely unjustified by genuinely scientific criteria and 100% dishonest, to use a rather frank and straightforward term. Transparency surrounding such issues on the part of those responsible for them evidently doesn't exist; only attempts to hide and obscure what is going on.) In any case, these are his conclusions:

Our last chart on temperature ... shows 10,000 years of temperature fluctuations with a gradual decrease in temperature over the last 6,000 years and that the Current Warm Period is likely nothing more than another cycle of warming very similar to the nine previous cycles that were all 100% naturally driven. Another common talking point is that the rate of warming is also unprecedented, yet five of the nine other warming trends had higher rates of warming.

Human carbon dioxide (CO2) emissions began ramping up in earnest in the post-World War II era of the mid-twentieth century. If the temperature increases over the last 70 or so years were historically unusual and unprecedented over the scale of thousands and millions of years, then that would be strong evidence that man's increase in CO2 is the primary driver of that temperature change. On the other hand, if scientific and historical records confirm that our recent temperature changes are very similar to those of previous periods, it would be supportive of those who say that our modern changes are nothing more than a continuation of natural cycles of warm and cold are probably correct. This last chart on temperature (Figure 6) does just that.

Unprecedented? Unusual? No and no.



10,000 Years of Temperature

What's Wrong with the Term "Climate Change' Denier?"

March 13, 2020

I'm including this essay because it may be of more general benefit, even outside the realm of discussion of climate change. It was occasioned by encountering the following article, or more specifically, its headline.

46 "Climate Change" Denying Statements Made by Former IPCC Experts
<https://electroverse.net/46-climate-change-denying-statements-made-by-former-ipcc-experts/>

Originally posted by grumpydenier.wordpress.com and reposted by climatism.blog on March 7, 2020 comes this enlightening list of comments from former IPCC contributors once they've eventually left the political organization and are no longer subject to any bullying and financial repercussions....

My objection to all uses of the word "deny" with reference to lies ...

- of course, any sane and humane person will "deny" whatever he sincerely believes to be a lie, a fraud, a scam, a hoax, etc.; contradicting and debunking nonsense is the only right way to behave with reference to it -

... is enhanced by the (yet again) abuse of the term "climate change."

Yes, the climate is changing, just as it always has done over any reasonable period of time. A very valid objection to the terminology as used by ALARMISTS is the false equivalence between the term "climate change" and Catastrophic Anthropogenic Global Warming (CAGW), when none of the latter concepts, allegations and their implications are applicable to the real world.

- Global Warming is not happening - rather, global cooling is happening (no "GW")
- If the climate were warming, there would be no proof that the cause was Anthropogenic (no "A")

- And if global warming were happening and human activity had any influence on it, it would not be Catastrophic by any stretch of the imagination (no "C")

Those are the only conclusions possible from a careful and balanced, agenda-free and (as far as possible) deception-free assessment of the real (not fabricated and/or "adjusted" to fit a deceptive theory) data that are applicable.

So, why not eradicate « "Climate Change" Denying » from the title of the Electroverse article and replace it with honest and forthright syntax that doesn't cater in any way whatsoever to the globalist liars?

I am a *denier* only if someone accuses me of something and I say the accuser is fabricating the charge. (That would include unintended / mistaken fabrication, which can still be called fabrication.)

One cannot "deny" a proposition that bears debate. The underhanded intention of the people who came up with the clever, devious and scurrilous ad hominem attack of calling someone who disagrees with them a "denier" is to imply that the proposition under discussion does not bear debate. It's the intellectual equivalent of the childish and immature "technique" of grabbing all the cards or dumping all the chess pieces off the board and declaring "game over." Anyone who deploys such nonsense is not worth having a discussion with and any conversation with such a person should be summarily concluded.

Debate is worthwhile only if one's opponent is fair-minded, which is to say rational and willing to consider facts and cogent arguments, not exclusively focused on "winning" the debate at all costs. Otherwise, one ends up in a situation that resembles Adolf Hitler's description of his attempts to debate Jews:

The more I debated with them the more familiar I became with their argumentative tactics. At the outset they counted upon the stupidity of their opponents, but when they got so entangled that they could not find a way out they played the trick of acting as innocent simpletons.

Should they fail, in spite of their tricks of logic, they acted as if they could not understand the counter arguments and bolted away to another field of discussion.

They would lay down truisms and platitudes; and, if you accepted these, then they were applied to other problems and matters of an essentially different nature from the original theme.

If you faced them with this point, they would escape again, and you could not bring them to make any precise statement.

Whenever one tried to get a firm grip on any of these apostles, one's hand grasped only jelly and slime which slipped through the fingers and combined again into a solid mass a moment afterwards.

If your adversary felt forced to give in to your argument, on account of the observers present, and if you then thought that at last you had gained ground, a surprise was in store for you on the following day.

The Jew would be utterly oblivious to what had happened the day before, and he would start once again by repeating his former absurdities, as if nothing had happened.

Should you become indignant and remind him of yesterday's defeat, he pretended astonishment and could not remember anything, except that on the previous day he had proved that his statements were correct.

Sometimes I was dumbfounded. I do not know what amazed me the more--the abundance of their verbiage or the artful way in which they dressed up their falsehoods. I gradually came to hate them.

Conclusion

Although I'm aware that I have failed to answer some of the questions raised in the initial essay, I think that many of them have been effectively answered in this series of essays and commentaries. I hope I have provided the reader with not only some cogent arguments and food for thought, but with strong stimulus to continue doing his or her own research into the subject, using online and offline resources.

"Think for yourself and question authority," as Timothy Leary famously said. In my view, as a general rule, the currently constituted "authorities" do not represent the majority of people and they do not work for us, but for our enemies. This is probably true almost without regard to what country one lives in, because the ultimate authorities, representative of the enemies of life, are the international bankers, and what countries are not under their thumb? Only a few – Cuba, North Korea, and Iran are included, all countries with other problems, it might be said; Syria has a central bank but it is owned by the government. (Life in Syria probably would be fine in the absence of outside interference and agitation.) Whatever the authorities want for us is not likely to be for our benefit, and if it is, it's only incidentally so, or part of a planned bridge to something we will enjoy less than what we had previously.

The agenda of the "elite" appears to include significant depopulation of the planet, bringing the total human population down to 120 to 500 million people, with the remaining population tightly controlled and essentially in abject slavery to the elite, in perpetuity.

At some point, effective resistance to this agenda must and evidently will be organized. The consciousness of the living Earth itself is aware of what is going on, and has promised that humanity's enemies will be defeated, whether they be terrestrial or extra-terrestrial. Gnostic shamans write the following about Her (called Pistis in the text), and about the eventual confrontation of true humans with the inhuman archons and their proxies in human form acting in their behalf:

§ Recall Sophia's invocation of "that luminous child" (Rhome, Anthropos) who will crush the archons "at the consummation of their works."

On the Origin of the World (II, 5.25) (103.15-30)

"When Pistis [Sophia] saw the impiety of the Lord Archon she was filled with anger. Acting in her invisible form, she spoke in this way: 'You are mistaken, blind one — false deity who cannot see. There is an immortal luminous child, the Anthropos, who came into existence before you and who will appear among your spectral forms (*plasmata*). This luminous child will trample you in scorn just as a potter's clay is pounded (into a lump). And you will sink away to your proper zone, the abyss (of gravity), along with those who belong to your legion. For at the consummation of your work, the entire defect [of Archontic illusion] exposed in the light of truth will be abolished, and [that illusion] will be as if it never had been.'"

The above text identifies Yaldabaoth, the chief Archon, as the ultimate source of humanity's current existential plight, including the propagation of deceptions and harmful agendas, including the one to which this document is principally devoted. There is no "Satan" who is responsible for such deception; that entity is an invention of the archons, onto which (or whom) all of the erroneous and deceptive nonsense for which they themselves are responsible, and which they incite, can be projected, so that they can maintain their pretense of being "righteous" and filled with love for the human species, when the reality could not be further from the truth.

Certainly, we must be living in the time of the consummation of the work of the archons, and it is in this period of time, although at the present moment yet in the future, when "the entire defect of Archontic illusion," including ALL of their deceptions, will be exposed to the light of truth and they and their earthly proxies will be finally decisively defeated.

Thomas Fuller wrote in 1650, "It is always darkest just before the Day dawneth." That's the picture as far as the fate and destiny of humanity (the Anthropos) goes. Meanwhile, Sophia's correction, to which the above-quoted Gnostic text refers, can and must begin to take place *within individual humans*. My intention in assembling this document has been to provide a basis for adding some impetus to that process for the reader. May it hasten and expand individual awakening, whatever that looks like for you.