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Springboard sources of information

Jacob Nordangård, former member of the Swedish Green Party, started research on the Rockefeller family activities in the frame of his PhD thesis “Ordo ab Chao: The Political History of Biofuels in the European Union” (2012), which he continued producing the book shown.

Bernie Lewin is historian and philosopher of science, and founding director of the Platonic Academy of Melbourne, Australia. His recent interest in the corruption of post-WWII state-funded natural science led to his first published book shown.

Brendan O'Malley is Foreign Editor of the Times Educational Supplement. Ian Craig is Political Editor of the Manchester Evening News. Their interest about the Cyprus crisis was triggered by Callaghan’s (British Foreign Secretary in 1974) statement: “It was the most frightening moment of my career”.
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Part 1:
Kissinger’s labours and the establishment of IPCC
USA 1973-74: Dramatis personae

- Nixon and Agnew were the elected US President and Vice President and were in office since January 1969.
- In 1973-74 they were both **forced to resign because of scandals**.
- Ford is the only person to have served as both US Vice President and President **without being elected to either office**.
- Rockefeller was appointed to the position of Vice President by Ford – not elected.
- **Kissinger** is referred to as a politician but it appears that he **was never elected in any position**. He was appointed to critical positions by Nixon.

Timeline of Kissinger’s labours

- On 3 September 1973, the US Secretary of State William Rogers resigned, most probably because of repeated clashes with Kissinger, who won most of the battles (Coffey, 2015). [Note: the resignation letter is dated 22 August; https://www.presidency.ucsb.edu/documents/letter-accepting-the-resignation-william-p-rogers-secretary-state]

- The Vice President and President, who were investigated for scandals, would both resign months after (10 Oct. 1973 and 9 Aug. 1974, respectively).

- For an entire year, Kissinger, as the only person in history to have the dual role of Secretary of State and National Security Advisor, was the absolute master of US and perhaps of the entire earth; we will see his “labours” in next slides.

- Even in the most critical situation of issuing a nuclear alert (see labour ② below), this was decided by Kissinger and not by Nixon, who had given full authority to Kissinger.
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Milestones in Kissinger’s career

1923 (27 May) Born in Bavaria as Heinz Alfred Kissinger.
1938 Leaves Germany for America.
1947 Enrolls in Harvard.
1955 Begins work for Council of Foreign Affairs.
1956 Project Leader and Organizer of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund’s Special Studies Project, which aimed to define the major problems and opportunities facing the United States and to “clarify national purposes and objectives.”
1957 Receives Bülent Ecevit as a student in Harvard (among other later country leaders).
1959 Promoted to Associate Professor in Harvard.
1962 Promoted to full Professor in Harvard.
1968 Becomes Special Assistant for National Security to President Nixon.
1969 Becomes the United States National Security Advisor (NSA).
1973 Becomes the United States Secretary of State (SoS).
1975 Is stripped of role as National Security Advisor by President Ford.
1977 Leaves office as Secretary of State when Jimmy Carter begins presidency.
2002 (27 November) Head of the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States (the 9/11 Commission); resigns two weeks after because of potential conflict of interest.

Main source: Wagner (2007)
Labour ①: Involvement in Chile military coup

- In 1970, Kissinger tried to prevent the first democratic election of a communist-socialist government in the West by funding the opponents of Allende before the vote.
- When Allende won, CIA was ordered to stage a coup.
- That having failed, a home-grown coup was encouraged by the CIA, led by the Chilean Army Commander-in-Chief Pinochet, in which President Allende died (11 Sep. 1973; O’Malley and Craig, 2001).

Kissinger's labour

| US President | Richard Nixon (amid Watergate scandal) | Gerald Ford |
| US Vice President | | | | | | Nelson Rockefeller |
| US Secretary of State | Henry Kissinger | Henry Kissinger | | | | | |
| US National Security Advisor | | | | | | | |
Labour ②: Yom Kippur War and the Nuclear Threat

- The Yom Kippur War, aka the 1973 Arab–Israeli War, was fought by a coalition of Arab states, led by Egypt and Syria, against Israel. The war took place from 6 to 25 October 1973 mostly in Sinai and the Golan—occupied by Israel during the 1967 Six-Day War.


- At 21:50 Kissinger called Nixon who was sleeping; Alexander Haig, the White House Chief of Staff, refused to wake him up (Kissinger, 2011).

- Kissinger, after presiding a National Security Council meeting (US President absent and Vice President nonexistent) issued a Nuclear Alert (DEFCON 3), the first one after the Cuban Missile Crisis (DEFCON 2); troops were placed on standby worldwide, awaiting orders to attack.

- Soviets observed the US military activity but Brezhnev decided to cool down the Americans: “What about not giving any response to the American nuclear alert?” (Israelian, 1993).

---

Kissinger's labour

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>US President</th>
<th>US Vice President</th>
<th>US Secretary of State</th>
<th>US National Security Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>03/11/1973</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03/01/1974</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/03/1974</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/05/1974</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05/07/1974</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/09/1974</td>
<td>Gerald Ford</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Labour ③: The Nobel Peace Prize

- On 10 December 1973 Thomas Bryne, the **American ambassador to Norway**, amid anti-Kissinger demonstrators, received the 1973 Peace Nobel Prize on behalf of **Kissinger** and read Kissinger’s acceptance speech (Wagner, 2007).

- The prize was jointly awarded to him and the North **Vietnamese Politburo Member Le Duc Tho** for their efforts in negotiating the Vietnam peace agreement (Paris Peace Accords; Nobel Committee decision: 16 October 1973).

- However, Tho **declined to accept the award**, claiming that peace had not yet been established, and that the US and the South Vietnamese governments were in violation of the Accords.

- The **ceasefire** was prepared by secret negotiations between the two men since 1969 but **would not last**, with the war ending when **Saigon fell in 1975** and North Vietnam captured South Vietnam. After that, Kissinger tried unsuccessfully to return the Prize.
Labour ⑤: Turkey’s invasion to Cyprus

- On 15 July 1974 the Greek junta, encouraged by CIA, staged a coup in Cyprus. Thus, as we will show, during the Cyprus crisis, publicly Kissinger called for stability in NATO’s south-eastern front, but privately the United States tacitly encouraged the Greeks to lead a coup on the island and gave an implicit green light to the ensuing Turkish invasion (see Appendix).

- On 20 July and then on 14 August, the Turkish prime minister Ecevit, having been in regular contact with his former Harvard tutor Kissinger, materialized the first and the second (full-scale) invasion in Cyprus; the Turkish occupation remains to date.

This book argues that the Cyprus crisis was no failure of American diplomacy, but a deliberate Cold War plot to divide the island and save the top secret spying and defence facilities from the twin threats of a communist takeover or British withdrawal.

See details in O’Malley and Craig, (2001), from where the quotes are taken.
Labour ④: Launching the Climate Change Agenda

- Labours ①, ②, ③ and ⑤ triggered hatred by the left-oriented groups.
- Labour ④ would be loved by left-wing, green and activist groups, which soon took over its promotion.
- Hence, it is the most successful.

The poorest nations, already beset by man-made disasters, have been threatened by a natural one: the possibility of climatic changes in the monsoon belt and perhaps throughout the world. The implications for global food and population policies are ominous. The United States proposes that the International Council of Scientific Unions and the World Meteorological Organization, urgently investigate this problem and offer guidelines for immediate international action.

Kissinger's labours

US President
- Richard Nixon (amid Watergate scandal)
- Gerald Ford
- Nelson Rockefeller

US Vice President
- Spiro Agnew (amid scandals)

US Secretary of State
- Henry Kissinger

US National Security Advisor
- Henry Kissinger

Immediate reaction by WMO

Implications of possible climatic changes

5.6.25 The Executive Committee discussed a request from the Government of the United States of America to consider certain problems of climatic change in relation to the current and planned activities of WMO. This request had stemmed from a statement made by the Secretary-of-State at the sixth special session of the United Nations General Assembly in which he had called attention to the possibility of climatic changes which could have serious implications for global food and population policies. In this connexion, the Committee also noted the decision of the second session of the Governing Council of UNEP that the Executive Director should continue his activities relating to "outer limits", particularly climatic change.

5.6.26 The Committee agreed that the question of climatic change was of great importance and that WMO should take the initiative in formulating a coherent programme for international action in this field. This programme could include studies of the following items:

(a) The probabilities of occurrence of various types of climatic change;

(b) The implications of such possible climatic changes on world food production, taking into account the meteorological aspects;

(c) The causes of climatic changes;

(d) The systematic observations of meteorological and other geophysical parameters which are necessary for detecting climatic changes;

(e) The possibilities of predicting climatic changes on various time scales;

(f) The effects of man’s activities on the climate.

References:
1. Resolution 7 (CAS-VI) - Working Group on Problems of Climatic Fluctuation
2. Resolution 15 (CAMS-VI) - Working Group on Climatic Fluctuations and Man
4. EC-XXVI/Doc. 51 - United Nations Environment Programme
5. EC-XXVI/Doc. 66 - WMO drought project.

Lewin (2017)

World Meteorological Organization (WMO, 1974)
Immediate reaction by CIA, August 1974 (a global cooling alert)

PREFACE

This document was originally prepared as a classified working paper, and to make it available to interested persons without the proper clearances, certain portions have been edited. An attempt has been made not to diminish the document’s technical content.

SUMMARY

The western world’s leading climatologists have confirmed recent reports of a detrimental global climatic change. The stability of most nations is based upon a dependable source of food, but this stability will not be possible under the new climatic era. A forecast by the University of Wisconsin projects that the earth’s climate is returning to that of the neo-boreal era (1600-1850)—an era of drought, famine, and political unrest in the western world.

As an example, Europe presently, with an annual mean temperature of 12°C. (about 53°F.), supports three persons per arable hectare. If, however, the temperature declines 1°C. only a little over two persons per hectare could be supported and more than 20 percent of the population could not be fed from domestic sources. China now supports over seven persons per arable hectare; a shift of 1°C. would mean it could only support four persons per hectare—a drop of over 43 percent.

A unique aspect of the Wisconsin analysis was their estimate of the duration of this climatic change. An analysis by Dr. J. E. Kutzbach (Wisconsin) on the rate of climatic changes during the preceding 1600 years indicates an ominous consistency in the rate of which the change takes place. The maximum temperature drop normally occurred within 40 years of inception. The earliest return occurred within 70 years. (Figure 8). The longest period noted was 180 years.
Immediate reaction by scientists: NOAA, October 1974

- Was the climate alert about global cooling or global warming?
- The answer was not categorical and in fact did not matter.
- What did matter was the alert per se.
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Hughes (1974)
Reaction by US Department of Energy: The Carbon Dioxide Program

- The US Department of Energy organized a workshop held in Miami Beach in March 1977 to develop a plan for research on energy, carbon dioxide and climate (Slade, 1980).
- In 1978, the US Department of Energy launched the Carbon Dioxide Program on research of the carbon dioxide and climate (Slade, 1980).
- $12 million were allocated in the first three years for the Program, of which almost three quarters had gone to universities. (Lewin, 2017).
- A National Carbon Dioxide Program conference was held in Washington in 1980 (Slade, 1980).

Extract from Lewin (2017)

This support for warming research arrived in the late 1970s against a background of continuing funding cuts in many other programs. Early in 1978, DoE had decided to double that year's climate research budget of $1.5 million for the US 1979 fiscal year. By the time of the World Climate Conference, hundreds of scientists had a career interest in the topic through involvement in dozens of new research projects that were already underway in the USA and abroad. However, the direct influence of those scientists...
Concerted reaction by WMO, UNEP, FAO and UNESCO: The First World Climate Conference in 1979

The First World Climate Conference (WMO, 1979), issued a declaration calling on the governments to act, and concludes with a plea for endorsing a World Climate Programme (WCP).

Having regard to the all-pervading influence of climate on human society and on many fields of human activity and endeavour, the Conference finds that it is now urgently necessary for the nations of the world:

(a) To take full advantage of man's present knowledge of climate;
(b) To take steps to improve significantly that knowledge;
(c) To foresee and to prevent potential man-made changes in climate that might be adverse to the well-being of humanity.

Nevertheless, we can say with some confidence that the burning of fossil fuels, deforestation, and changes of land use have increased the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere by about 15 per cent during the last century and it is at present increasing by about 0.4 per cent per year. It is likely that an increase will continue in the future. Carbon dioxide plays a fundamental role in determining the temperature of the earth's atmosphere, and it appears plausible that an increased amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere can contribute to a gradual warming of the lower atmosphere, especially at high latitudes. Patterns of change would be likely to affect the distribution of temperature, rainfall and other meteorological parameters, but the details of the changes are still poorly understood.

It is possible that some effects on a regional and global scale may be detectable before the end of this century and become significant before the middle of the next century. This time scale is similar to that required to redirect, if necessary, the operation of many aspects of the world economy, including agriculture and the production of energy. Since changes in climate may prove to be beneficial in some parts of the world and adverse in others, significant social and technological readjustments may be required.

The World Climate Programme proposed by the World Meteorological Organization deserves the strongest support of all nations.
Fourteen years after Kissinger’s talk: The establishment of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

This is part of the Resolution 43/57 of the UN General Assembly (1988).

Trivial note: Even though scientists participate in IPCC, as an Intergovernmental Panel it is a political organization.
Climategate: Insights into the IPCC scientists’ behaviour

A CA reader has provided a link to an extremely interesting presentation by dendro Brian Luckman of U of Western Ontario (Rob Wilson’s thesis supervisor) at the 2008 Canadian Society of Petroleum Geologists. Reader Erasmus de Frigid draws attention to the inhomogeneity in the tree ring record created when the tree was scarred by a glacier, evidenced by a terrifically interesting cross-section picture of the results of glacier scarring on ring widths. It sure looks to me like the net result of glacier scarring resulted in strip bark – something that’s obviously an important issue.

The link in “RC” points to the file with the hacked emails posted on the hacked “RealClimate” blog

Climategate: IPCC scientists behave like political activists

10 years after: “Climategate mattered because it offered the first solid proof that the scientific establishment wasn’t being altogether honest about man-made global warming. [...] These were men behaving more like political activists than dispassionate seekers after truth”. James Delingpole

https://www.spectator.co.uk/2019/11/my-finest-hour/
Part 2
The climate politics as seen through the Time Magazine
TIME 1970s: Terror mostly from freeze

In Africa, drought continues for the sixth consecutive year, adding terribly to the toll of famine victims. During 1972 record rains in parts of the U.S., Pakistan and Japan caused some of the worst flooding in centuries. In Canada’s wheat belt, a particularly chilly and rainy spring has delayed planting and may well bring a disappointingly small harvest. Rainy Britain, on the other hand, has suffered from uncharacteristic dry spells the past few springs. A series of unusually cold winters has gripped the American Far West, while New England and northern Europe have recently experienced the mildest winters within anyone’s recollection.

As they review the bizarre and unpredictable weather pattern of the past several years, a growing number of scientists are beginning to suspect that many seemingly contradictory meteorological fluctuations are actually part of a global climatic upheaval. However widely the weather varies from place to place and time to time, when meteorologists take an average of temperatures around the globe they find that the atmosphere has been growing gradually cooler for the past three decades. The trend shows no indication of reversing. Climatological Cassandras are becoming increasingly apprehensive, for the weather aberrations they are studying may be the harbinger of another ice age.

http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,944914,00.html
http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,910467,00.html
http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,914494,00.html
See more info in: https://www.johnlocke.org/update/climate-experts-believe-the-next-ice-age-is-on-its-way-within-a-lifetime/
TIME 1980s: Terror turns to heat but with the wrong gas ($O_3$)

19 Oct. 1987
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19871019,00.html

http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,965776,00.html
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TIME 1989: At last the right terror gas (CO₂)

2 Jan. 1989
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19890102,00.html

Planet Of The Year: What on EARTH Are We Doing?
By Thomas A. Sancton | Monday, Jan. 02, 1989

What would happen if nothing were done about the earth’s imperiled state? According to computer projections, the accumulation of CO₂ in the atmosphere could drive up the planet’s average temperature 3 degrees F to 9 degrees F by the middle of the next century. That could cause the oceans to rise by several feet, flooding coastal areas and ruining huge tracts of farmland through salinization. Changing weather patterns could make huge areas infertile or uninhabitable, touching off refugee movements unprecedented in history.

Environment: Fishing For Leadership
By Dick Thompson | Monday, May 22, 1989

"I am an environmentalist," proclaimed President Bush during his campaign for the White House. Citing his love of the great outdoors and the pleasure he takes in hunting and fishing, the candidate made it clear that protecting the environment and wildlife from the ravages of pollution would be one of his top priorities. That stance raised great expectations among environmentalists, who had been suffering for eight years while President Reagan’s neglect of conservation issues allowed many problems, from acid rain to toxic waste, to fester dangerously. But just four months into the Bush Administration, impatient nature lovers have begun to doubt...
TIME 1992: Earth salvation begins (Rio)

1 June 1992
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19920601,00.html

Summit to Save the Earth: Rich vs. Poor

North and South will meet in Rio to confront the planet's most pressing ills. The event could change the world -- or be a disaster of global proportions.

By Philip Elmer-DeWitt  |  Monday, June 01, 1992

THE LINEUP OF WORLD LEADERS
WILL include Prime Minister John Major, Chancellor Helmut Kohl, Prime Minister Kichi Miyazawa and, now that he has finally made up his mind to go, President George Bush. The Dalai Lama will join a delegation of clerics, artists and green-minded parliamentarians. Hundreds of native leaders, from American Indians to Malaysian tribesmen, will represent the interests of the world's indigenous peoples. Tens of thousands of diplomats, scientists, ecologists, theorists, feminists, journalists, tourists and assorted hangers-on are expected to gather in dozens of auditoriums and outdoor sites for nearly 400 official and unofficial events, among them an environmental technology fair, a scientific symposium and a meeting of mayors. Peter Max's art will appear on special postage stamps. A Robert Rauschenberg poster will be slapped up on walls. Placido Domingo will headline a star-studded musical tribute to the planet. And a full-size replica of a 9th century Viking ship will sail in from Norway carrying messages of goodwill from children all over the world.

http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,975656,00.html
TIME 1997: Earth salvation as business (Kyoto)

15 Dec. 1997

http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9263,7601971215,00.html

---

CLIMATE CHANGE SUMMIT: IS THIS CLEAN MACHINE FOR REAL?

ELECTRIC CARS HUM DOWN THE ROAD BEAUTIFULLY BUT FACE OBSTACLES OF HIGH COST, LIMITED RANGE AND UNLIMITED POLITICS

By Margot Hornblower/Los Angeles | Monday, Dec. 15, 1997

View Subscriber content preview. or Log-In

How does it go, you ask yourself: and then you will ask how could we have possibly gone so long without it? --General Motors ad for EV1

---

CLIMATE CHANGE SUMMIT: CLEAN AS A BREEZE

IF THE NEGOTIATORS IN KYOTO ARE LOOKING FOR A SOLUTION, THEY'LL FIND IT IN THE SUN AND THE WIND

By Christopher Flavin | Monday, Dec. 15, 1997

View Subscriber content preview. or Log-In

Over the past five years, a new crop has sprouted across the broad, fertile plains of northern Germany. Sprinkled among the barns and silos are thousands of 100-ft.-tall towers topped by sleek, fiber-glass blades that whirl slowly in the breeze. Functioning as clean, trim powerhouses, these modern windmills turn even gentle currents of air into strong currents of electricity, energizing the region’s businesses and homes without hurting the environment.
TIME 2000-01: Polar bears hired for the salvation of Earth, as it is fried as an egg

4 Sep. 2000
http://content.time.com/time/covers/europe/0,16641,20000904,00.html

9 Apr. 2001
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20010409,00.html
TIME 2006-08: Survival guide for the very worried and a guide to win the war

3 Apr 2006
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20060403,00.html

9 Apr 2007
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20070409,00.html

28 Apr 2008
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,20080428,00.html
TIME 2019: Planning Earth Survival in 2050 and helping immigration

23 Sep.2019

Angelina Jolie: Climate Change Is Already Displacing Millions of People. It’s Our Responsibility to Help Them

Angelina Jolie | Sept. 12, 2019

Jolie, a TIME contributing editor, is an Academy Award–winning actor and Special Envoy of the U.N. High Commissioner for Refugees

The technological sophistication of modern life masks a simple reality: we all need oxygen, water and food to survive. But the divide between those who have the resources they need to exist and those who don’t only continues to grow. And with the growing specter of climate change, people who live in vulnerable regions like Oceania—the countries and territories within the southwest Pacific Ocean—face the loss of their livelihoods, homes and future.

Twenty-four million people globally are displaced within their countries each year on average because of climate- and disaster-related causes, and it’s only getting worse: the likelihood of any of us being displaced in this way is twice what it was in the 1970s. This comes on top of unprecedented levels of forced displacement worldwide because of conflict and persecution.

https://time.com/5669024/angelina-jolie-climate-refugees/
Current TIME: Coronavirus (SARS-CoV-2). But what was TIME saying about the 2003 coronavirus (SARS-CoV)?

30 Mar. 2020

Forget SARS. What About the Weather?

By Eugene Linden | Friday, May 02, 2003

When it comes to evaluating risks, both ordinary people and policymakers tend to be wildly inefficient. Remember that in the 1970s, intelligence officials, preoccupied with communism, discounted the threat posed by Islamic fundamentalism. The lesson: Ignored threats often pose more serious threats to global stability than the fears du jour. So with SARS and terrorism now dominating headlines and our worry space, it's worth pondering what threats have been squeezed out. The recent bad winter suggests one strong candidate for consideration: the threat of rapid climate change.

An important consideration in evaluating a threat is whether it is more likely to do its damage through uncertainty or by bringing about instability. Uncertainty is bad for an economy, but instability is a killer.

http://content.time.com/time/nation/article/0,8599,449225,00.html
Flashback: The “CO2 menace” known to TIME since 1950s

17 Dec. 1956
http://content.time.com/time/covers/0,16641,19561217,00.html
http://content.time.com/time/subscriber/article/0,33009,867447-8,00.html

Science: Invisible Blanket
Monday, May 25, 1953

In the hungry fires of industry, modern man burns nearly 2 billion tons of coal and oil each year. Along with the smoke and soot of commerce, his furnaces belch some 6 billion tons of unseen carbon dioxide into the already tainted air. By conservative estimate, the earth’s atmosphere, in the next 127 years, will contain 50% more CO\textsubscript{2}.

This spreading envelope of gas around the earth, says Johns Hopkins Physicist Gilbert N. Plass, serves as a great greenhouse. Transparent to the radiant heat from the sun, it blocks the longer wave lengths of heat that bounce back from the earth. At...

http://content.time.com/time/magazine/article/0,9171,890597,00.html

CO\textsubscript{2} Menace. Another atmospheric variable is carbon dioxide. CO\textsubscript{2} is comparatively plentiful downwind from industrial areas such as the Ruhr, and there is a good possibility that man's fires and engines are adding so much of it to the atmosphere that the world's climate may be changed drastically by the solar heat that it traps. Rossby wants to find out about this little matter too.
Part 3
Political elites and world saviours
Kissinger and Luce were Project Leader and Board Member, respectively, of the Rockefeller Brothers Fund’s Special Studies Project (1956-60); that was the seed for a tree whose main fruit has been the climate change agenda.

Many other politicians – e.g. Bush(s), Clintons(s), Gore, Obama – have connections with Rockefellers.

Rossby had been professor of the Rockefeller-founded University of Chicago and Bolin was the Editor of the first publication of the Rockefeller Institute Press, which was a memorial volume about Rossby (Bolin, 1959).
The geography of the Rockefeller Center

Rockefeller Center in New York
Some of the buildings and places
The common roots of Big Oil and Big Green: Rockefellers

THE EVOLUTION OF STANDARD OIL
Following the remnants of John D. Rockefeller's oil juggernaut

1870: Founded by Industrialist John D. Rockefeller in 1870

1900:
- Standard Oil of Kentucky
- Standard Oil of California
- Standard Oil of New York
- Standard Oil of New Jersey

1901:
- Uses Chevron logo in 1901

1911: In 1911, the US Supreme Court ruled that Standard Oil Trust must be dissolved under the Sherman Antitrust Act and split into 34 companies.

1911:
- Standard Oil of Indiana
- The Standard Oil Company (Ohio)
- The Ohio Oil Company

1925:
- Renamed in 1925

1930:
- Renamed in 1930

1931:
- Merged in 1931

1961:
- Acquired in 1961

2000:
- Acquired by BP in 1998

2005:
- Acquired in 2005

2010:
- Acquired by BP in 1987
- Marathon Petroleum (spin-off in 2011)


visualcapitalist.com
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Source:
https://www.theinvestorispodcast.com/blog/evolution-standard-oil/
Three examples of the several tens of vehicles of Rockefellers’ “philanthropy”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The ROCKEFELLER FOUNDATION</th>
<th>Rockefeller Brothers Fund</th>
<th>ROCKEFELLER FAMILY FUND</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="https://www.rockefellerfoundation.org/about-us/" alt="Rockefeller Foundation Logo" /></td>
<td><img src="https://www.rbf.org/about" alt="Rockefeller Brothers Fund Logo" /></td>
<td><img src="https://www.rffund.org/about" alt="Rockefeller Family Fund Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>See also: <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_Foundation">https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_Foundation</a></td>
<td>See also: <a href="http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_Brothers_Fund">Rockefeller Brothers Fund</a></td>
<td>See also: <a href="https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rockefeller_family">Rockefeller Family</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Established: 1913</th>
<th>Established: 1940</th>
<th>Established: 1967</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Founding president: John D. Rockefeller, Jr.</td>
<td>Founding president: Nelson Rockefeller</td>
<td>Founders: Rockefeller Family members</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stated mission: to advance social change that contributes to a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world</td>
<td>Stated objective: to advance social change that contributes to a more just, sustainable, and peaceful world</td>
<td>Stated mission: Family-led public charity that initiates, cultivates, and funds strategic efforts to promote a sustainable, just, free, and participatory society</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See details and full coverage of activities in Nordangård (2019)
## Two examples with Rockefellers being on both sides

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Global Climate Coalition</strong></th>
<th><strong>The °C Climate Group</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="http://web.archive.org/web/20020811064836/http://www.globalclimate.org/aboutus.htm" alt="GCC Logo" /></td>
<td><img src="https://www.theclimategroup.org/about" alt="°C Logo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Established:</strong> 1989</td>
<td><strong>Established:</strong> 2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Founder:</strong> Exxon, Mobil, Chevron, Shell</td>
<td><strong>Founder:</strong> Rockefeller Brothers Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Involved:</strong> William O’Keefe</td>
<td><strong>Involved:</strong> Steve Howard, Tony Blair</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Objective:** to coordinate business participation in the international policy debate on the issue of global climate change and global warming (e.g. involved in opposition to the Kyoto Protocol) | **Stated mission:** Accelerating climate action  
**Stated goal:** A world of no more than 1.5°C of global warming and greater prosperity for all |

See details and full coverage of activities in Nordangård (2019)
Six Oil Majors Say: We Will Act Faster with Stronger Carbon Pricing

Open Letter to UN and Governments

BG Group, BP, Eni, Royal Dutch Shell, Statoil and Total sent the letter to France's Foreign Minister Laurent Fabius and Christiana Figueres, Executive Secretary of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)

The letter said:

"Our companies are already taking a number of actions to help limit emissions ... For us to do more, we need governments across the world to provide us with clear, stable, long-term, ambitious policy frameworks. We believe that a price on carbon should be a key element of these frameworks."

Rockefeller Brothers Fund awards grants for climate change since 1984 including for IPCC creation and Rio

ROCKEFELLER BROTHERS FUND
SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM
Program Review, 2005–2010
Michael Northrop, program director, and Jessica Bailey, program officer
November 2010

History of the Sustainable Development Program’s Work on Climate

The RBF began grantmaking on climate change in 1984 and has consistently maintained an interest in climate change through this entire period. The RBF’s work on climate change can be thought of in four phases, which we briefly describe here.

The first phase, stretching from 1984 to 1992, focused on basic research on science and policy. Two strategies underpinned this phase of grantmaking: 1) distilling consensus on climate science and, 2) moving the discussion of climate change from the scientific community into the policy arena. Much of this early work involved convening experts. The RBF organized and funded some of the earliest meetings of advocates addressing climate change. It was also during this period that the U.N. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was created in 1988 and formal international negotiations on a climate treaty began in 1991; these culminated in Rio de Janeiro in June 1992 with a U.N. Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) that the first President Bush and the U.S. Congress ratified. A review of correspondence between then-RBF president Bill Dietel and program staff clearly indicates that the Rio negotiation and treaty, and the creation of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, were specific aspirations of the RBF program at the time. Total RBF funding committed during this eight-year period was under $1,000,000. A handful of other foundations made modest grants for these purposes during this period.
Rockefeller Brothers Fund becomes very serious about climate “naysayers”

Solutions to Global Warming

A National Conversation
We Desperately Need to Have

**Earth is running a fever. We have measured it. We know the cause: the carbon dioxide and other heat-trapping gases that we are pumping into the atmosphere. We also know if nothing changes, Earth’s fever will continue to rise and things will get much worse. And yet there is a cure; in fact, there is an array of real and executable remedies, and there are many physicians poised to tackle this most consequential challenge of our time.**

From our vantage point as a philanthropy that has been supporting work on climate change for more than 20 years, it is clear to us that the scientific certainty of global warming is no longer worth debating.¹ The naysayers have been revealed to be few, well paid, and partisan—self-serving ideologues on a premeditated mission to distract us from properly tending to the burning issue of our time.² From now on let’s just supply them with a toga and a fiddle and pack them off to Rome. We have no time to waste in shoudering the burden of

Note: The poetic phrase highlighted in the text is in fact a cliché, going back to Mead (1975). Original: “modern equivalent of fiddling while Rome burns”).
The full transformation from Big Oil to Big Green

RFF's Decision to Divest

The Rockefeller Family Fund is proud to announce its intent to divest from fossil fuels. The process will be completed as quickly as possible, as we work around the complications of modern finance, which is increasingly dominated by alternative investments and hedge funds.

While the global community works to eliminate the use of fossil fuels, it makes little sense—financially or ethically—to continue holding investments in these companies. There is no sane rationale for companies to continue to explore for new sources of hydrocarbons. The science and intent enunciated by the Paris agreement cannot be more clear: far from finding additional sources of fossil fuels, we must keep most of the already discovered reserves in the ground if there is any hope for human and natural ecosystems to survive and thrive in the decades ahead.

(23 March 2016; https://www.rffund.org/divestment)

Notes: In 2008 Rockefellers lost control on Exxon and in 2014 they sold their shares:
Rockefeller Foundation fuels climate and immigrant agendas, and political correctness

The Rockefeller Foundation Awards Grants to Organizations Supporting and Defending Refugees and Immigrants
February 13, 2017

$1.5 million in three grants to ACLU, International Rescue Committee, and Anti-Defamation League


The Rockefeller Foundation Launches New Climate and Resilience Initiative; Commits An Initial $8 Million To Continue Supporting Global Network Of Cities And Chief Resilience Officers
July 8, 2019

Brings Total Commitments Made in 2019 for Climate And Resilience To $40 Million


The Rockefeller Foundation Announces Grants to Organizations Supporting and Defending LGBTQ Community
June 22, 2017

$300,000 in three grants to NYC LGBT Center, Sylvia Rivera Law Project and Campaign for Southern Equality

Strategic philanthropy in the post-Cap-and-Trade years: Reviewing U.S. climate and energy foundation funding
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For several decades, philanthropists in the United States have played a behind-the-scenes role in framing climate change as a social problem. These foundations have defined climate change primarily as a pollution problem solvable by enacting a price on carbon and by shifting markets in the direction of renewable energy technologies and energy efficiency practices. Funding has favored “insider” groups that push for policy action by way of negotiation, coalition building, and compromise, rather than “outsider” groups that specialize in grassroots organizing. Philanthropists have also placed less priority on funding for other low-carbon energy sources such as nuclear power, carbon capture and storage, or natural gas, nor have they invested in actions intended to boost societal resilience, protect public health, or to address questions of equity and justice. But in the years following the failure of the 2010 Federal cap and trade bill, a review of available grants from 19 major foundations indicates that philanthropists responded to calls for new directions. Funding shifted to focus on state- or municipal-level mitigation and adaptation actions and to the needs of low-income/minority communities. Significant funding was also devoted to mobilizing public opinion and to opposing the fossil fuel industry. Nearly a quarter of all funding, however, remained dedicated to promoting renewable energy and efficiency-related actions with comparatively little funding devoted to other low-carbon energy technologies. The review of past funding trends provides implications for assessing philanthropic strategy during the Donald J. Trump presidency and beyond.
There are many more Big Green “philanthropists”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Foundation</th>
<th>Amount distributed</th>
<th>Number of grants distributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Foundation</td>
<td>95,843,220</td>
<td>823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>70,217,842</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kresge Foundation</td>
<td>69,491,663</td>
<td>227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>53,325,347</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doris Duke Foundation</td>
<td>42,034,795</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Brothers Fund</td>
<td>28,286,279</td>
<td>263</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmidt Family Foundation</td>
<td>28,200,000</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skoll Global Threats Fund</td>
<td>26,356,722</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg Family Foundation</td>
<td>23,705,000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packard Foundation</td>
<td>23,466,033</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ClimateWorks</td>
<td>18,395,266</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surdna Foundation</td>
<td>16,155,000</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heinz Endowments</td>
<td>14,953,411</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKnight Foundation</td>
<td>14,382,170</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moore Foundation</td>
<td>9,284,394</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Foundation</td>
<td>8,246,729</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Foundation</td>
<td>7,226,570</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wallace Global Fund</td>
<td>3,833,500</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford Foundation</td>
<td>3,274,528</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>556,678,469</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,502</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Nisbet (2018)
Where does the money go?

Nisbet (2018)

FIGURE 1  Major focus areas for U.S. Climate and Energy Funding, 2011–2015 Note. Based on analysis of 2,502 publicly reported grants available as of Spring/Summer 2016 which were distributed between 2011 and 2015 by 19 major environmental grantmakers totaling $556,678,469. *Low-carbon energy technologies include funding to make natural gas generation cleaner/safer ($8.4 million); to evaluate carbon capture and storage ($1.3 million); to promote R&D spending ($573,000), and the role of government in fostering innovation ($100,000). No grants were focused on promoting nuclear energy, though $175,000 in grants were devoted to opposing nuclear energy for cost and safety reasons.
The example of ClimateWorks Foundation: Wikileaks helps acquire insights for its structure and activity

https://wikileaks.org/podesta-emails/fileid/57594/16165
Hi everyone - wanted to share the latest from the Clinton Foundation after the first full day of the CGI Annual Meeting wraps up. Clinton Global Initiative Annual Meeting (Sept. 26-29)

President Clinton and Chelsea Clinton will be joined by leaders such Newly re-elected Prime Minister Tsipras of Greece; His Majesty King Abdullah II ibn Al Hussein of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan; Ellen Johnson Sirleaf, President, Republic of Liberia; Petro Poroshenko, President of Ukraine; Matteo Renzi, Prime Minister of the Italian Republic; Sir Richard Branson, Founder, Virgin Group and Virgin Unite; Ursula Burns, Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, Xerox Corporation; John Chambers, Executive Chairman of the Board, Cisco; Bill Gates, Co-chair and Trustee, Bill & Melinda Gates Foundation; Anita Goel, Chairman and CEO, Nanobiosym Diagnostics; Elizabeth Holmes, Founder and CEO, Theranos; Michel Liès, Group CEO, Swiss Reinsurance Company; Jack Ma, Executive Chairman, Alibaba Group; John McFarlane, Chairman, Barclays; Carolyn Miles, President and CEO, Save the Children; Jacqueline Novogratz, Founder and CEO, Acumen; Art Peck, Chief Executive Officer, Gap Inc.; Paul Polman, Chief Executive Officer, Unilever; Sheikha Lubna bint Khalid Al Qasimi, Minister of Foreign Trade, United Arab Emirates; Megan Smith, Chief Technology Officer of the United States; George Soros, Founder and Chairman, Soros Fund Management and Open Society Foundations; and Jim Yong Kim, President, World Bank Group, Charlize Theron, Neil Degrasse Tyson among the 1000 participants.

Coinciding with the United Nations' new Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), members of the CGI [Clinton Development Initiative] community will explore how to take action on timely issues such as climate change, women's equality, and global health at this pivotal time in philanthropy and international development.
### Some of the Big Green “philanthropist” projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor</th>
<th>Details</th>
<th>Recipient (NGO)</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount, $M</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bill &amp; Melinda Gates Foundation</td>
<td>Help several organizations to develop new climate-resilient crop varieties and promote delivery to small holders, especially women</td>
<td>International Crops Research Institute…</td>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Fund a challenge awarding 20 of the 100 most populous cities in America with funding and technical assistance to address climate change</td>
<td>American Cities Climate Challenge</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Support the Beyond Coal campaign, to retire 60 percent of US coal-fired power plants by the end of 2020</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Support the international Beyond Coal campaign, to shift European economies from coal-dependent power to renewable energy sources</td>
<td>European Climate Foundation</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bloomberg Philanthropies</td>
<td>Support the Beyond Coal campaign, to replace half the nation’s coal fleet by 2017 with clean energy</td>
<td>Sierra Club</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>For general support of the foundation’s efforts on climate change</td>
<td>ClimateWorks Foundation</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David &amp; Lucile Packard Foundation</td>
<td>For general support of the foundation’s efforts on climate change</td>
<td>ClimateWorks Foundation</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation</td>
<td>Help curb global climate disruption by significantly reducing greenhouse gas emissions</td>
<td>Climate Change Mitigation</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint effort (19 foundations)</td>
<td>Improve energy efficiency in developing countries while phasing out hydrofluorocarbons and transitioning to more efficient cooling systems</td>
<td>High Ambition Climate Fund</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint effort (ClimateWorks, Packard, Ford, Moore, Cargill)</td>
<td>Support the protection, restoration, and expansion of forests around the world (part of a $459 million commitment to global climate action)</td>
<td>Climate and Land Use Alliance</td>
<td>Global</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint effort (Bloomberg, Heising, and Simons)</td>
<td>Accelerate the transition to clean energy at the state level</td>
<td>Clean energy efforts</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>Fund partner cities to establish and implement a strategy that equips them to withstand shocks and stresses, specifically urbanization, globalization, and climate change</td>
<td>100 Resilient Cities</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>Expand the European Union’s climate ambitions through the development and implementation of its 2030 framework</td>
<td>European Climate Foundation</td>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William and Flora Hewlett Foundation</td>
<td>Develop strategies, make grants, and monitor and evaluate progress toward cleaner energy in the United States</td>
<td>Energy Foundation</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Period 2015-18; Individual project amount > $25M each; **Total amount of the above: $794M**
Part 4
The political aim of climate salvation
Just before COVID19 outbreak: New EU Commission President wants 3 trillion Euro for climate protection

Google translation: According to an internal paper of the EU Commission, more than half of the EU budget could go into climate protection by 2030. Would the Member States support this drastic increase?


Two days after: climate emergency (and opposition)

Literally our countries live now under a state of emergency.

Should we be scared for the climate or for the emergency state?

I am one of the signatories on opposition


https://clintel.org/world-climate-declaration/
https://clintel.org/greece-wcd/
Google translation

$1,000 per capita is the cost of fighting global warming

August 26, 2019, by François Lapierre

The fight against global warming is expensive. Far from the multi-billion abstract figures, Bruno Le Maire said that this fight would cost $1,000 per year and per capita.

$1,000 per capita is the cost of fighting global warming

It was after a meeting with economic actors that the Minister of the Economy gave a clear idea of the cost of the fight against global warming. "The assessment that is ours if we want to meet the objectives of the Paris agreement is $1,000 per year, per capita, in the coming years," said Bruno Le Maire. It is impossible to take this sum from every inhabitant of the planet, which is why the tenant of Bercy calls for a mobilization for the Green Climate Fund: "all the international organizations, of the World Bank, the European Bank of investment "must put in the pot. Including the most advanced countries who found themselves at the G7 Biarritz.

https://www.journaldeleconomie.fr/1%C2%A0000%C2%A0dollars-par-et-par-habitant-c-est-le-cout-de-la-lutte-contre-le-rechauffement-climatique_a7709.html
Global warming, global governance and US leadership authority of Rockefellers

Expanded Efforts to Combat Global Warming

We made 328 new grants in 2005 and disbursed a total of $23,400,000, with the largest share—just over 20%—going to grantees in the sustainable development field. (For further details, see page 35). This reflects the decision of our Board of Trustees to make our work on global warming a key priority during the critical decade ahead, as described in the cover story of this report. Over 60% of the Sustainable Development grants budget was directed to this work in 2005, and we anticipate that as our resources permit, we will allocate additional funds to this portfolio of grantmaking in the coming years under the exceptional leadership of Michael Northrop.

Our commitment to this work also finds expression in efforts to expand cross-programmatic collaboration, and we made several grants in the Peace and Security and Democratic Practice programs that are designed to promote constructive U.S. action on climate change as a global challenge requiring U.S. leadership through multilateral cooperation and to explore how existing systems and institutions of global governance, including global civil society, might respond more urgently and effectively to the challenge of global warming.

A second cross-programmatic focus is a growing commitment by the RBF to working with young people as key agents of constructive social change. During 2005, the RBF provided support for a diverse cluster of organizations, many of them founded and led by youth, that are working to harness the energy, creativity, and collective power of young people in support of goals we are pursuing in our New York City, Democratic Practice, Sustainable Development, and Peace and Security grantmaking.
Climate change has trespassed the boundaries of environmental politics to become the subject of the global political, economic and security debate and a new focus of multilateral cooperation cutting across these and other domains.
Is it a scientific action to “call for stronger global governance”?

In a podcast accompanying the article, lead author Frank Biermann, an environmental policy specialists from VU University in Amsterdam, cites climate change as the most prominent example of the failure of global governance to meet the needs of global society:

"It just takes a long time normally to get new agreements in place," Biermann says. "One example is climate change where the first Framework Convention has been negotiated in 1992. And since then, there is no change in the emissions trends of major countries.

"I mean the current state of global climate governance is surely not effective in dealing with the challenge of global warming that we see today."

https://science.sciencemag.org/content/335/6074/1306.summary

D. Koutsoyiannis, The political origin of the climate change agenda 56
Based on current research and with the assistance of risk assessment, we have come to the conclusion that the four mega-problems can be catastrophic for large parts of mankind, if not all mankind. And when it comes to the climate threat and political violence we must agree that mankind is already in a dangerous risk zone – and that those risks increase day by day.

In order for mankind to emerge safe and sound from these problems we must not only take suitable measures but also have a bit of luck. And the later the measures are taken, the greater role luck will play in mankind’s future. Right now, the outlook is everything but bright because:

- global problems can only be solved through global action,
- but global action requires global decisions,
- and global decisions can only be made by a supranational body,
- but no effective, supranational, decision-making body exists today.

It would be ideal if the world’s political leaders could succeed in creating a supranational, generally-accepted decision-making body for global questions. But this would first require having some kind of global legal system. However, creating such a global legal system would take many years, even if there were a desire by all national states to do so – and there is obviously no general consensus whatsoever for this today.
Climate Change and the New Global Empire (NGE): An exposing analysis of the necessity of NGE by Harari

Since around 200 BC, most humans have lived in empires. It seems likely that in the future, too, most humans will live in one. But this time the empire will be truly global. The imperial vision of dominion over the entire world could be imminent.

As the twenty-first century unfolds, nationalism is fast losing ground. More and more people believe that all of humankind is the legitimate source of political authority, rather than the members of a particular nationality, and that safeguarding human rights and protecting the interests of the entire human species should be the guiding light of politics. If so, having close to 200 independent states is a hindrance rather than a help. Since Swedes, Indonesians and Nigerians deserve the same human rights, wouldn’t it be simpler for a single global government to safeguard them?

The appearance of essentially global problems, such as melting ice caps, nibbles away at whatever legitimacy remains to the independent nation states. No sovereign state will be able to overcome global warming on its own. The Chinese Mandate of Heaven was given by Heaven to solve the problems of humankind. The modern Mandate of Heaven will be given by humankind to solve the problems of heaven, such as the hole in the ozone layer and the accumulation of greenhouse gases. The colour of the global empire may well be green.
Harari’s idea of the New Global Empire is not even his own: The true mother

**Barbara Ward**, British economist and writer; also mother of the concept of **sustainable development** ([https://www.iied.org/iied-founder-barbara-ward](https://www.iied.org/iied-founder-barbara-ward))

---

**Ward (1966)**

But this is by the way. The important fact about the traditional Chinese system was the fact that for over two millennia—the longest endurance of a state system in human history—a quarter of the human race lived, with only relatively brief interruptions, under common institutions. The starting point was the abandonment of anarchic, competitive feudalism and the setting up, some centuries before Christ, of a centralized government under the Han dynasty. The old states became prov-

Now, if common institutions held together a quarter of the human race for over two thousand years, we can hardly argue that the task of government becomes *a priori* impossible simply because the remaining three-quarters are added. If fairly minimal safeguards of security and order and minimum interventions to enhance welfare—coupled, of course, with a certain sense of common purpose and loyalty—have been enough to give an orderly civil society to a quarter of all the globe’s inhabitants, we cannot be sure, especially in the light of modern transport and communication, that multiplying the number of citizens by four rules out the hope of a wider experiment.
An example of current global governance

Top 100 influencers of the UN Climate Change Conference - COP21 Paris (2015)
How many of these individuals and organizations, whose lobbying activities influence the legislation of all countries, have any democratic legitimacy?

https://onalytica.com/blog/posts/climate-change-top-100-influencers-and-brands/
Graph based on Twitter exchanges
New Global Empire or New Global Fascism?

By Dirk Helbing

Thursday, 21 September 2017

A new, global fascism, based on mass surveillance is on the rise

Helbing was the Principal Investigator of the EU project FuturICT, a computing system working on big datasets (notably, supported by George Soros)

The signs are clear. We are faced with the emergence of a new kind of totalitarianism of global dimensions that must be stopped immediately. “An emergency operation is inevitable, if we want to save democracy, freedom, and human dignity,” I warned. “Arguments such as terrorism, cyber threats and climate change have been used to undermine our privacy, our rights, and our democracy.”

The emergence of mass surveillance after 9/11, enabled by the Patriot Act and other laws, has led to the incremental erosion of liberties and human rights. Since the Snowden revelations, we know that there is mass surveillance of billions of people around the world. But most of us still have no idea how pervasive it is, and how it may influence their lives in future. Billions of dollars have been spent on mass surveillance tools of secret services to hack our computers, smartphones, smart TVs and smart cars. The estimated amount of data collected about us every day ranges from millions of numbers to Gigabytes of data. As a result, we have ended up with the digital tools for a data-driven, AI-based so-called “benevolent” dictatorship, where big businesses and the state determine “what is best for us.” Moreover, we have seen that democracies in Hungary, Poland, Turkey, and elsewhere have already undergone transformations towards more autocratic regimes.
Part 5
An historical analogy: eugenics
Underlying the close working relationship between America and Germany was the extensive financial support of American foundations for the establishment of eugenic research in Germany. The main supporter was the Rockefeller Foundation in New York. It financed the research of German racial hygienist Agnes Bluhm on heredity and alcoholism in early 1920. Following a European tour by a Rockefeller official in December 1926, the Foundation began supporting other German eugenicists, including Hermann Poll, Alfred Grotjahn, and Hans Nachtsheim. The Rockefeller Foundation played the central role in establishing and sponsoring major eugenic institutes in Germany, including the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Psychiatry and the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Anthropology, Eugenics, and Human Heredity.  

International eugenics movement. The Institute concentrated on a comprehensive project on racial variation as indicated by blood groups, and on twin studies, coordinated by Otmar Freiherr von Verschuer.  

When severe financial problems threatened to close the Institute during the early years of the Depression, the Rockefeller Foundation kept it afloat. At several points, the Institute director, Eugen Fischer, met with representatives of the Foundation. In March 1932, he wrote to the European bureau of the Foundation in Paris, requesting support for six additional research projects. Two months later, the Rockefeller Foundation answered affirmatively. The Foundation continued to support German eugenicists even after the National Socialists had gained control over German science.
Eugenics: The (consensus?) scientific theory a century ago, which enabled Nazis’ death camps

Eugenics was practiced in the United States many years before eugenics programs in Nazi Germany which were largely inspired by the previous American work. Stefan Kühl has documented the consensus between Nazi race policies and those of eugenicists in other countries, including the United States, and points out that eugenicists understood Nazi policies and measures as the realization of their goals and demands.

[...]
By 1928, there were 376 separate university courses in some of the United States' leading schools, enrolling more than 20,000 students, which included eugenics in the curriculum.

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics
https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eugenics_in_the_United_States
(see also references there)
Some science heroes who pioneered eugenics

Sir Francis Galton (1822-1911): English statistician, inventor, meteorologist, geneticist, and eugenicist; founder of the statistical concept of correlation. He coined the widely popular misnomer regression (toward the mean). Follower of biological determinism. He coined the term eugenics. He intended for eugenics to become a religion that could lead to a perfect, happy and successful human race.

Svante Arrhenius (1859 – 1927): Swedish physicist, one of the (co-)founder of physical chemistry; Nobel Prize for Chemistry, 1903. Father of the hypothesis that CO₂ will increase Earth's temperature through the greenhouse effect. Also board member for the Swedish Society for Racial Hygiene.

Lord John Maynard Keynes (1883 –1946): influential British economist, founder of Keynesian economics. Also served as treasurer of the University of Cambridge Eugenics Society upon its creation and Director of the British Eugenics Society (1937-1944).

Linus Pauling (1901-1994): American chemist; the only person to have been awarded two unshared Nobel Prizes, one in Chemistry (1954) and one in Peace (1963). According to him, individuals with genetic disorders should have an obvious mark (i.e. a tattoo on the forehead) denoting their disease, which would allow carriers to identify others with the same affliction and avoid marrying them.

https://eugenicsarchive.ca/database/documents/ (also biographies in Wikipedia)
### Political leaders who supported or applied eugenics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leader</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Policies and Actions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Woodrow Wilson</strong> (1856 – 1924), the 28th US president (1913 – 1921).&lt;br&gt;He supported eugenics, including <em>policies that would result in eugenic reform</em>.&lt;br&gt;In 1911, as governor of New Jersey, he signed a eugenic sexual sterilization bill into legislation (for criminals or those considered ‘feeble-minded’).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theodore Roosevelt</strong> (1858-1919), the 26th US president (1901 – 1909); recipient of the 1906 Nobel Peace Prize.&lt;br&gt;He <em>encouraged sexual sterilization for criminals and individuals with certain cognitive disabilities</em>. He feared that if eugenic actions were not taken, the United States would be committing ‘race suicide’.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sir Winston Churchill</strong> (1874 –1965): UK Prime Minister (1940 – 1945; 1951 – 1955) and UK leader during WWII.&lt;br&gt;Also, <em>honorary vice president of the British Eugenics Society</em>. He believed that eugenics could solve &quot;race deterioration&quot; and reduce crime and poverty.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adolf Hitler</strong> (1889-1945) leader of the Nazi Party; Chancellor of Germany and Führer (since 1934); initiator of WWII.&lt;br&gt;Under his rule Germany became greatly engaged in <em>racial hygiene</em>. He <em>targeted Jews, gypsies, Slavs, and Social Democrats for segregation and &quot;elimination&quot;</em>.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[https://eugenicsarchive.ca/database/documents/](https://eugenicsarchive.ca/database/documents/) (also biographies in Wikipedia)
Scientists first, politicians after—no need for conspiracy theories.

It must be noted, though, that biologists—botanists, zoologists, and geneticists—played an important role in initiating and propagating eugenic and racial-hygienic concepts within the racial-hygienic movement (which had already begun in the last century). Paul Weindling, among others, pointed this out in his detailed study (1989), in which he called attention to the growing scientification and professionalization in the racial-hygienic movement and practice in Germany after 1870. However, his thesis that great efforts were made to create a National Socialist “action-oriented new biology” (p. 506), either to furnish scientific evidence for the racial ideology or to legitimate the racial-hygienic policy of removing “useless elements” from human society, has not been confirmed by my findings. Even if there were a number of biologists who supported the racial ideology, we must note that at no time was there a National Socialist biology with a uniform ideological objective. The work of most biologists remained committed to scientific criteria; in those cases where it was aimed at confirming the racial doctrine, for example in the work of Gerhard Heberer, no external pressure can be documented. Weindling’s approach of seeing every professional biological activity at the time as supportive of the racial ideology bears the danger of leveling the significant political differences of opinion among scientists and the differing consequences of biomedical research and its application. It lets those off the hook whose research under Hitler was indeed murderous or profited from the murder of others.
On politically applied science

In 1934: “But the German biologist demands emphatically that when it comes to shaping our Volk, we use the weapons that biology offers . . . The work is about the preservation and, if necessary, the advancement of the great races of our people, so that they—by eliminating everything foreign—shall lead in noble harmony to a Volks-biological wholeness” (1934b, p. 142).

In 1937: “National Socialism has put into effect the insights of the laws of life” (1937, p. 340).

In 1935: “However, we German biologists, in addition to agreement with the greater picture, feel a harmony in a more particular way. ‘National Socialism is politically applied biology,’ Schemm said when the paths were being charted on which our German Association of Biologists could be affiliated with the NSLB. These are words that enable us to realize how Schemm conceived of biology as the core of National Socialist education. And so biological thinking gave rise for him to the racial idea as the self-evident foundation of National Socialist ideology.”

Notes and explanations:
The quotations are from Ernst Lehmann, professor of botany and genetics at the University of Tubingen and from 1931 chairman of the German Association of Biologists. Hans Schemm was a one of the leaders of the Nazi Party. National Socialism is the official name of Nazi. Volk means People (cf. “Ein Volk, ein Reich, ein Führer”, meaning “One People, One Nation, One Leader”.)

Extracts from Deichmann (1996)
Part 6
Epilogue
In 1972, the report by Meadows et al. (1972), written for the Club of Rome (which was connected with Rockefellers; Nordangård, 2018, p. 89) warned that the world would run out of gold by 1981, mercury (and silver) by 1985, tin by 1987 and petroleum, copper, lead and natural gas by 1992.
We predict, God laughs; I wish we too laugh rather than be scared.

For further laughter, see lots of unfulfilled predictions of catastrophes by environmentalists in Koutsoyiannis (2017).

https://twitter.com/_craigmarshall/status/1184505044869304320
Popular fun at the COVID19 era

'We're meant to die from climate change!' Grumpy Greta Thunberg meme goes viral as social media users tackle coronavirus with dark humour


The new Kissinger’s article – 10 days ago in The Wall Street Journal:
Politics, philosophy and fun altogether

THE WALL STREET JOURNAL.

OPINION | COMMENTARY

The Coronavirus Pandemic Will Forever Alter the World Order

The U.S. must protect its citizens from disease while starting the urgent work of planning for a epoch.

By Henry A. Kissinger
April 3, 2020 6:30 pm ET

The surreal atmosphere of the Covid-19 pandemic calls to mind how I felt as a young man in the 84th Infantry Division during the Battle of the Bulge. Now, as in late 1944, there is a sense of inchoate danger, aimed not at any particular person, but striking randomly and with devastation. But there is an important difference between that faraway time and ours. American endurance then was fortified by an ultimate national purpose. Now, in a divided country, efficient and farsighted government is necessary to overcome obstacles unprecedented in magnitude and global scope. Sustaining the

Kissinger (2020)
About Kissinger’s World Order, which The Coronavirus Pandemic Will Forever Alter

According to Google Scholar, the phrase “world order” appears in 22 Kissinger’s texts, of which Kissinger (2009; below) is the most popular.

[http://scholar.google.com/scholar?hl=en&num=20&as_sd t=0%2C5&q=author%3Aha-kissinger+%22world+order%22]

The figure shows the frequency of appearances of the phrases “world order” and “new world order” in books.

[http://books.google.com/ngrams/graph?content=world+order%2Cnew+world+order&case_insensitive=on]

The variant “new world order” used by Kissinger (2009) has become infamous. Naturally, Kissinger changed it in his new article (Kissinger, 2020) to “liberal world order” using it for first time but borrowing it from other authors.
Extracts from Kissinger (2020) and some comments

- [...] safeguard the principles of the liberal world order. The founding legend of modern government is a walled city protected by powerful rulers, sometimes despotic, other times benevolent, yet always strong enough to protect the people from an external enemy. [...] The pandemic has prompted an anachronism, a revival of the walled city in an age when prosperity depends on global trade and movement of people.

  Comment: World Order remains Kissinger’s beloved theme. He clarifies that global trade and movement of people are the pillars of his globalization project dream.

- Leaders are dealing with the crisis on a largely national basis, but the virus’s society-dissolving effects do not recognize borders. [...] No country, not even the U.S., can in a purely national effort overcome the virus. Addressing the necessities of the moment must ultimately be coupled with a global collaborative vision and program. If we cannot do both in tandem, we will face the worst of each.

  Comment: He provides further clarification of his dream of an America-centric imperium ruled by establishment elites, which he calls global collaborative vision and program. He uses the virus as the vehicle for promoting the global empire vision. It seems he tacitly admits that the earlier vehicle of climate change has failed, as there is no mention of it in the article.
Extracts from Kissinger (2020) and some comments (2)

- To argue now about the past only makes it harder to do what has to be done.
  - Comments: Really? Is anything inconvenient in the past? For instance the investment on climate change as the main weapon to establish the global empire?

- Drawing lessons from the development of the Marshall Plan and the Manhattan Project, the U.S. is obliged to undertake a major effort in three domains.
  - Why mention Manhattan Project (cost ~$23 billion in 2018 dollars; Wikipedia) and not the Climate Change project (cost >$166 billion in 2012 dollars only in the US and only for 1993-2004; Haapala, 2017)? Short reply: because Manhattan project had a real-world objective, albeit repugnant for its killing potential, which was achieved and for which the participating scientists were selected on the basis of excellence; the Climate Change projects was based on just the opposite principles.

- The historic challenge for leaders is to manage the crisis while building the future. Failure could set the world on fire.
  - Comment: It is ironic that Kissinger speaks about setting “the world on fire”, given his labours including issuing a nuclear alert in 1973. It is also ironic that this time the world on fire is not related to global warming.
Final remarks

- **World salvation from climate threats** through global governance is the garment dressing the monster of totalitarian world control.
- We do not need saviours, who claim that they will save the planet, the humankind or the human race.
- **History teaches that what we really need is to save ourselves (and our societies) from these anti-humanist saviours.**
- Also, we need to protect freedom, democracy and education, which are currently under (unprecedented?) global attack.
- **It took World War 2 to get rid of eugenics and human species salvation; will the COVID 19 crisis suffice to get rid of climate salvation?**

The revolutionary relationship between truth and freedom

καὶ γνώσεσθε τὴν ἀλήθειαν, καὶ ἡ ἀλήθεια ἐλευθερώσει ύμᾶς

*Then you will know the truth, and the truth will set you free*

Jesus Christ, quoted by John, 8:32
Disclaimer

Till now I have received zero funding for my climate research 😢😢😢

Any sponsoring offers? 😼😼😼
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