

Are Environmentalism and Global Warming Effectively Religious Socialism?

By Dr. Tim Ball, 23 February 2016

An interesting pattern developed early in the official involvement in global warming. If a person challenged the claim that humans were causing global warming (AGW), it was assumed they were on the political right. If you supported AGW, then you were on the left. This categorization is not related to the science, but to the political nature of the science involved. This occurred in two major parts. The original objective of those using global warming for their political agenda and the marginalizing of those who questioned the science by linking them to industries and their wealthy owners. The author believes the evidence shows that human CO₂ is not causing AGW, that the hypothesis is not proved. This article is not written to pick political sides. Rather, it is an attempt to help understand the battles waged and the confusion this created for the public, the politicians, the media, and a majority of scientists.

The world needed the new paradigm of environmentalism

The problem is that a few grabbed it for a political agenda. They used it as a vehicle to take the moral high ground, to claim only they cared about the environment. They argued that everyone else was guilty of environmental destruction because of their avarice and wasteful ways. The debate about global warming is a subset of environmentalism that was also hijacked using the same themes.

At the first Heartland Conference in New York in 2004 Vaclav Klaus twice Prime Minister of the Czech Republic was the keynote speaker. His opening remark that we have just gone through 70 years of communism so why the hell would you want to go back to that brought a standing ovation. It supports the fact that environmentalism and AGW is a political agenda pushed by extremely wealthy and powerful left wing people most of who made their money exploiting the environment. The psychology of that is beyond the discussion here, but consider the hypocrisy of George Soros, [Maurice Strong](#), Bill Gates, the Rockefeller's, Leonardo DiCaprio, and Ted Turner among many others.

Maurice Strong described himself as "a socialist in ideology, a capitalist in methodology".

This description appears to apply to them all.

The confusion for the public that wealthy people are also socialists is similar to that about another person. Most people think Adolf Hitler was a right wing fascist, but he was a socialist who also promoted a form of environmentalism. The word "Nazi" stands for National Socialism.

Collectively, most of these wealthy socialists acted through their privileged group called the Club of Rome. The Club was formed in 1968 at David Rockefeller's estate in Bellagio, Italy. In their 1994 book *The First Global Revolution* Alexander King and Bertrand Schneider wrote.

“The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy to unite us, we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like would fit the bill. All these dangers are caused by human intervention, and it is only through changed attitudes and behavior that they can be overcome. The real enemy then, is humanity itself.”

List of enemies is designed to unite people

They claim the list of enemies is designed to unite people. In fact, it is needed to overcome what they see as the divisiveness of nation-states and to justify the establishment of one-world government or global socialism. They believe that global warming is a global problem that national governments cannot resolve. The changed behavior they want is for all to become socialists.

They finally settled on global warming as the environmental issue best suited for their goal. Of course, the plan was just the beginning. One of my favorite cartoons from the *New Yorker* showed Moses on the mountain with the Ten Commandments. The caption read “*Great idea, who is going to fund it?*” Global warming and the identification of human produced CO₂ as the problem suited all the political, financial, and pseudo-religious controls a socialist group could desire.

The Kyoto Protocol was presented as a solution to the problem of human-caused global warming. Those who created the Protocol also created the problem. Through the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) they produced the science required to support their claim. It is a well-thought out, well-planned, classic circular argument. One of the early examples occurred in the book *Ecoscience: Population, Resources, Environment* co-authored by Paul and Anne Ehrlich and President Obama’s current Science Advisor John Holdren. While discussing the non-existent problem of overpopulation they wrote,

Indeed, it has been concluded that compulsory population-control laws, even including laws requiring compulsory abortion, could be sustained under the existing Constitution if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger the society.

The question is who “*concluded that compulsory population-control*” could be sustained? The answer is the authors did. The next question is who decides “*if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger the society?*” Again, it is the authors. So, they claim there is a problem, then they decide when it is severe enough to warrant complete suspension of legal controls against such totalitarianism.

More succinctly, they created the problem, created the proof of the problem, then offered the solution. This is what was done with the AGW claim. They assumed, incorrectly, that a CO₂ increase causes a temperature increase. They then provided proof by programming computer models in which a CO₂ increase caused a temperature increase. They ran the model(s) by

doubling CO₂, *ceteris paribus*. The results showed a temperature increase, which proved their claim. Now they could use CO₂ as the lever for all their political objectives incorporated into the Kyoto Protocol. Science became the basis of blind faith.

Kyoto offered a penance

In Kyoto, nations who developed their economies and became wealthy using CO₂ were to pay for their sins by giving money to nations who suffered. It was a penance. Catholics paid penance for their sins which included a delay in their entrance to heaven. In the medieval Catholic church, you could buy Indulgences to bypass the punishment. Carbon Credits became the modern equivalent, and [Al Gore was the equivalent of The Pardoner](#) selling Indulgences as celebrated in Chaucer's *Canterbury Tales*. With Indulgences and Carbon Credits there was no reduction in the sins. In fact, they encouraged more sins because you simply bought a pass – a get-out-of jail-free card.

Kyoto provided the political basis for the agenda. It was a classic redistribution of wealth that is the goal of a socialist government. Money from successful developed nations was given to less successful developing nations. To collect and redistribute the money required a government that overarched all nation-states. A single world government that managed a world banking system was the ideal. Temporarily the United Nations and the International Monetary Fund would suffice.

Kyoto provided the basis for the financial agenda. Money needed to fund the single world government was a global carbon tax. Many notable people, [like Ralph Nader](#), claimed the tax was the best solution to stop climate change. Funding was part of the plan for the 2009 Copenhagen Conference of the Parties 15 (COP15). The COP can only act on the science provided by the IPCC. Apparently somebody knew the political agenda was based on false science and exposed it by leaking emails from the Climatic Research Unit (CRU). This worked because the scientists controlling the IPCC worked at, or with, the CRU. They controlled key chapters in IPCC Reports, including the instrumental data, the paleoclimate data, and the computer models. They also ensured their presence on the most influential document, the Summary for Policymakers (SPM). [The Wegman Report](#) that examined the dispute over the 'hockey stick' produced in the 2001 Report recognized the incestuous relationships of the research when they wrote,

Recommendation 1. Especially when massive amounts of public monies and human lives are at stake, academic work should have a more intense level of scrutiny and review. It is especially the case that authors of policy-related documents like the IPCC report, Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis, should not be the same people as those that constructed the academic papers.

The leaked information delayed the political process, but it was only temporary. The following year at COP16 in Durban they produced the replacement program called the [Green Climate Fund](#) (GCF). It was approved at COP21 in Paris in December 2015.

UN paralleled a left wing or socialist government

The process and method of setting up the AGW hypothesis through the UN paralleled those required to form a left wing or socialist government. It automatically identified those scientists who questioned the hypothesis as at least sympathetic to capitalism – guilt by association. It is part of today's view that if you are not with me, you must be against me. Over the years, a few scientists told me they agreed with the skeptics but would not say so publicly because they were socialists.

Vaclav Klaus was one of the few world political leaders to identify what was going on. He recognized that global warming was a subset of environmentalism. He recognized that it was a blind faith belief system based on no evidence or, at best, manufactured evidence. In his book *Blue Planet in Green Shackles*, he wrote,

“It should be clear by now to everyone that activist environmentalism (or environmental activism) is becoming a general ideology about humans, about their freedom, about the relationship between the individual and the state, and about the manipulation of people under the guise of a “noble” idea. It is not an honest pursuit of “sustainable development,” a matter of elementary environmental protection, or a search for rational mechanisms designed to achieve a healthy environment. Yet things do occur that make you shake your head and remind yourself that you live neither in Joseph Stalin’s Communist era, nor in the Orwellian utopia of 1984.”

The pattern of identifying those skeptical about the AGW hypothesis as right wing was an inevitable result of the political objective.