

The Climate Con

- by **Dave Ball, American Thinker,**
Nov 27, 2019, [LINK](#)

Beware Global Warming! Not because it will consume our planet in fire but rather because it is a Trojan horse concealing a much more real threat, one that will consume our economy, our democracy and our way of life.

Ever since Michael Mann's fantasy "hockey stick" temperature graph was thoroughly discredited and since Climategate outed institutional scale phony climate data a decade ago, the existence of actual global warming has been rendered null. The same is true for the impact of CO2 on climate. No experiment can confirm its impact, models can't predict its influence and collateral data (sea level, animal populations etc.) do not confirm a correlation.

The conclusion must be that man-made climate change and the need to eliminate carbon emissions to avoid climate change simply do not exist. None of the narrative is based on objective science. It is a massive hoax and maybe the biggest con job in history. All the classic elements of a con job are present; the victim (mostly liberals and other virtue signalers), the play (appeal to environmental issues), the rope (emotional foundation and persuasion – the world is coming to an end), the convincer (the way it will work to your benefit – eliminate carbon and all is well) and so on. The dangled payoff is saving the world. As in all con jobs, the con artist gets what he wants and the mark gets nothing.

Like all cons, this one looks good to the rubes. Who doesn't want to save the world and breathe clean air? The basic problem, even if the basic mechanism of eliminating CO2 to stop increasing temperatures were real, is that it would not achieve what its adherents think it would. Let's look at some facts.

What if we could reduce CO2 emissions? The U.S. produces only 15 percent of the carbon emissions in the world. The rest we have no control over. That leaves 85 percent of emissions in place after spending trillions of dollars.

Most, if not all, of the big proposals for reduction of Carbon emissions by reducing CO2 are simply impossible, impractical or ineffective. Eliminating coal fired electrical generating plants in the US is just one example. The cost of shutting down the US coal industry with the attendant loss of jobs and downstream business would be astronomical. What impact would it have globally? Seventy three percent of India's electricity is generated from coal fired power plants. India has no plans to reduce its production and consumption of coal. Coal India Ltd. will produce 660 million tons of coal next year, increasing to one billion tons by 2022 - 2023.

In other words, if the U.S. destroyed its economy and eliminated all coal fired electricity production, whatever CO2 reduction that might net would be offset by the increase in coal consumption by India alone. The Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, the largest civil engineering project in the world, will include 700 new coal fired power stations. When they are all in operation, these plants could consume an incredible 1.8 billion tons of coal a year. So why are the US and the UK risking catastrophe in their economies when whatever they eliminate will be more than replaced elsewhere?

This, then, brings us to the final piece of the global warming con – what role do the Green New Deal and related decarbonization programs play?

The components of the GND are staggering in

magnitude, cost and audacity. They include such "modest" proposals as shutting down the entire coal, oil and natural gas industry, requiring all housing and buildings to be rebuilt and reinsulated, eliminating all gasoline cars and trucks, forcing populations to relocate to urban areas, controlling population by selective abortion and it just goes on.

The reality of many variants of the Green New Deal and all the other absolutely preposterous proposals is that they are not even intended to address environmental issues. Note how often you see the word "justice" associated with certain proposals. Social justice, environmental justice, economic justice and racial justice to name a few. These are code words that lead one back to One World Government socialist theology and redistributive economics. The idea, in a nutshell, is to transfer enormous sums of money and other resources from first world countries in the West to third world and developing nations. Rest assured that a significant portion will find its way into the pockets of the charlatans promoting this con through choking the energy needs of the industrialized nations and transferring that wealth to developing nations. This is done by socialist redistribution in the name of the nebulous concept of sustainable development.

It was, and is, necessary to create the "existential crisis" of global warming in order to scare the multitudes into following the socialist elites blindly down the path of economic destruction to global governance.

Only in the recent round of hysteria have the concepts of Marxist redistribution been introduced and the whole concept of environmental concern been taken over by a political agenda.

If one is to examine the GND closely, it speaks of five goals and three of them are solely focused on some type of social or economic "justice" rather than an environmental outcome. The two environmental goals use language quoted from UN literature. Much of the current virulently Marxist bent of the GND is related directly to the 1992 UN Earth Summit from which came the infamous Agenda 21 that pledged "to change the way people live, eat, learn and communicate, all in the name of saving the earth from mankind's mistakes, particularly global warming." So, tying all of what we have said together let's see what we have.

- There is no demonstrable or provable pattern of net temperature change over a millennium so it cannot be said that we're confronted by catastrophic global warming or cooling.
- While CO2 may have some impact on global temperature, its exact influence is not known and cannot be accurately modeled. In any case, CO2 is not the sole or dominant driver of global temperature so that controlling CO2, if it could be done, would have little predictable impact on temperature.
- No accurate predictive model of global temperature exists because the system is too complex and too many variables are either unknown or their influences and relationships are not understood.
- If spending untold trillions of dollars on reducing CO2 in this country actually did reduce CO2 output, that reduction would be offset many times over by increases from developing nations such as China and India that have every intention of dramatically increasing their CO2 output.
- Reliable engineering calculations show very

convincingly that the chance of replacing carbon energy sources with renewable energy is exactly zero.

- The current global warming narrative has been hijacked by Marxist One World Order extremists to press their revolution to destroy industrialized nations and to redistribute wealth to developing nations and create a world government.

Within the above context, we can see much more clearly that powerful Marxist forces are using the construct of a manufactured climate crisis, populist environmental language, and public fear to prosecute their political agenda which is to destroy the Western world and create a One World Order, nirvana to a Marxist, where a group of elites run the world. That's the con.

