

WEBSITE: www.ronthomsonshuntingbooks.co.za

This article was first published in the “African Outfitter” magazine. 2013

The Global Warming Swindle

By Ron Thomson

So much has been written and said about global warming in recent years, and about how societies throughout the world must cut down on industrial extravagancies to reduce carbon dioxide emissions - IF MANKIND IS TO SURVIVE - that I find it very difficult to know where to begin to debunk this perfidious fabrication.

As someone who has a scientific bent, I have questioned this dogma from the very beginning and now, happily, I believe the truth is starting to emerge. The negligent scientific basis for the theory – that carbon dioxide is the driving force behind global warming – is beginning to crumble. Indeed, I have now gained sufficient confidence from the information that I have gathered to now challenge what I sincerely believe to be a myth.

This article is not a hoax. There is nothing funny about the way world society has been indoctrinated and led astray. What we have been told is fraudulent because it promotes a so-called scientific truth that is a lie.

I still have the problem, however, of translating a lot of technical information into layman’s language in a manner that everybody will understand.

I am NOT an experienced climatologist. I am an ordinary layman trying to interpret, for public consumption, a number of complex scientific principles. I know of only one way to do this: by taking the bull by the horns.

I do not doubt that our climate is changing. It is, in fact, changing all the time. Back *and* forth! Cold-to-hot and hot-to-cold! And it has been doing this since time began. I do not, therefore, challenge the truth that our climate is in a state of constant flux. What I do challenge is the popular dogma about what drives these changes.

There IS, *definitely*, a very close linkage between the levels of CO₂ in the atmosphere and the state of the earth's ambient temperatures. They go hand in glove. When carbon dioxide levels are high, the temperature is high; and they decline in perfect unison, too. What we have to understand, however, is the reason why.

The bulk of mankind has been led to believe that increasing levels of CO₂ in our atmosphere is actually *causing* global warming. People throughout the world have been convinced that this is so because of the '*obvious fact*' that there is a close relationship between CO₂ levels in the atmosphere and temperature.

The fact of this close relationship has, apparently, no detractors! It might be called, therefore, a scientific truth – but for one or two exceptions.

Global warming has been projected to world society as being a '*bad thing*'. It will lead, so we have been told, to desertification and the destruction of life as we know it. Thus, reversing the global warming trend has been projected as a '*good thing*'.

Once society had swallowed the assumption that increasing levels of CO₂ was the *cause* of global warming, therefore, it was very easy to lead it into believing that IF we *reduce* CO₂ levels, temperatures will fall – and the world will be saved!

These very simple interpretations of the CO₂/temperature equation have duped the whole world.

Surprise! Surprise! The relationship between CO₂ and temperature actually works the other way round? Carbon dioxide levels in our atmosphere increase in volume *whenever the earth's temperature rises!* And CO₂ levels decline when temperatures fall.

THIS IS THE SCIENTIFIC TRUTH! Now society is going to have to accept a massive turn around; and many errant scientists and politicians will have very red faces!

The big question is: Where does this counter-evident revelation leave those heads of state whose dogmatic belief has reached fanatical proportions? How will they extract themselves from such a political predicament? How will they dismember the false monster that they have so carefully constructed in the public mind?

The juxtaposed idea, that increasing temperature *causes a rise in the levels of atmospheric CO₂*, is supported by most international climate scientists. Furthermore, they have been endorsing this philosophy from the very beginning; and NASA's weathermen head the list of those scientists who believe this.

What comes first, the chicken or the egg? The warming or the carbon dioxide? The world's leading climatologists all concur that temperature rise comes first. And they have carried out exhaustive scientific research - going back 600 million years in geological time in some cases - to prove it.

They agree that an increase in atmospheric CO₂ levels occur *in direct proportion* to a rise in atmospheric temperature; and the reverse happens when temperatures fall. This comes about, they say, because the biomass of living organisms on earth increases when temperatures rise - especially in the oceans; and because CO₂ is a natural biological by-product of their metabolisms.

The increase in CO₂, following an increase in temperature, has been happening since time began; and this has been recently proven by scientists from their studies of very deep ice-core samples from the Arctic - which have revealed the history of our climate spanning back several millennia. Furthermore, because there is a significant and consistent time lag between temperature change and CO₂'s reaction to it, this proves beyond doubt that CO₂ is NOT the '*driver*' of climate change.

So, if CO₂ is not responsible for global warming, what is it that causes our climate temperatures to change?

Our climate temperatures are controlled and driven by the sun - the source of ALL the earth's energy since the beginning of the universe. Quite simply: an increase in temperature occurs during those periods when sunspot activity is high; and temperatures decrease when sunspot activity is low.

The sun, the climatology scientists say, is "*an incredibly violent beast*". Sunspots are intense magnetic fields - gigantic storms on its surface - that throw out into space huge bursts of energy in the form of '*cosmic rays*'; and it is the strength or the weakness of these cosmic rays that affects our climate.

Sunspots were assiduously counted and recorded by many ancient astronomers. The ancient Greeks used to predict the earth's atmospheric temperature regimes simply by studying

and counting the numbers of sunspots. This is a simple science, therefore, that has been known and practiced by man from time immemorial.

Today the world's top climatology scientists will tell you that solar activity and earth temperatures correlate exactly on a decade by decade basis; and that this can be proved as far back in history as the written word takes us.

It is the sun that is driving temperature change! Carbon dioxide levels are irrelevant.

Yet, in blind pursuance of the modern myth, environmental '*scientists*' and political leaders have discarded this ancient wisdom.

Proven scientific fact tells us that, during the massive volcanic eruptions in Iceland just a few short years ago - the volcanic cloud from which closed European airports for weeks - more carbon dioxide was released into the atmosphere in just four days than all man's collective industries produce in a whole year. And there are over 200 volcanoes all over the world, all the time, spewing out CO₂ in similarly gigantic quantities.

Contributions of CO₂ to the atmosphere, from Australia's massive annual bushfires, also exceed carbon emission levels from all of man's industrialisation, every year!

The earth has gone through several periods in its history when CO₂ concentrations in our atmosphere were 10 times what they are today - despite our modern industrialisation - and they caused no change to the climate during those times. This is because the amount of CO₂ in our atmosphere is minuscule.

There are much more important green house gases than CO₂ - by far the biggest of which is water vapour.

Water vapour comes mostly from our oceans and its atmospheric mass increases when the air is warm. Its propensity for increasing the temperature of our planet is, therefore, many times greater than CO₂ – but nobody suggests that we should try to interfere with the earth's water cycles!

The oceans are the largest reservoirs of CO₂. When they are warming they physically release copious volumes of it. When they are cooling they absorb it. They are so huge and so deep, however, that it takes 800 years for the oceans to show any measurable change in the trend of their physical status.

During the last 1000 years the earth has seen several major swings of temperature. In Mediaeval times global temperatures were relatively warm. In England vineyards thrived north of London and, for 400 years, crop harvests were good. It was a period of great prosperity. This was the era when all the big churches and cathedrals in Europe were built – at a time when, because agriculture thrived, societies were affluent.

After this warm period there followed a prolonged mini-ice-age. During the 14th Century, the canals in Holland froze over every winter; and British historians record that huge annual ice festivals were held in London on top of the frozen River Thames.

There is an old story - which many people believe to be a myth - which tells us that a Swedish army invaded Denmark by marching over the sea when it had frozen over.

The biggest industrial expansion of our time occurred during the four decades following World War II. Due to a massive increase in coal-burning power stations, and the production of more and more vehicles burning fossil fuels, there were huge increases in the volumes of atmospheric carbon dioxide. For

the first time in our history acid rain, caused by industrial air pollution, destroyed entire forests downwind of the factories. Yet, during those forty years the world's temperature actually and consistently cooled. This does not fit the computer presumptions of the modern self-serving scientists, politicians and administrators who still support and promote the current global warming dogma!

During the last 16 years (1997 – 2012) the earth's temperature has actually remained static – despite the crescendo of shrill voices still calling for a reduction in '*carbon emissions*'!

Climate scientists claim that never in the history of the world has there ever been a situation in which CO₂ has '*driven*' the earth's climate. So why, now, is the world in a state of frenzy and panic over a global warming theory that has no common sense merit or scientific substance?

The current global warming theory, paradoxically, took shape towards the end of the four decades of massive industrial growth after World War II. It was then mooted, in fact - with some alarm - that the trend of constantly falling annual temperatures might be the herald of another mini-ice-age.

A Swedish scientist, Bert Bolan, however, suggested that that might not happen. He postulated that, because there had been forty years of heavy industrial activity all around the world, there must have been a concomitant rise in CO₂ levels in the atmosphere. And he stated that, because CO₂ was known to be a '*hot-house gas*', that fact might just counteract the natural temperature declines.

This innocuous opinion is what generated all the '*hot air*' that, over time, developed into the CO₂/global warming scare.

Bolan had let the cat out of the bag; and fanatical environmental activists took hold of it. It wasn't long before they had persuaded the sensation-seeking media to believe that CO₂ was actually *causing* the sudden upswing in global warming - that became manifest during the fifth decade after World War II.

In all the excitement that was generated over global warming, there was a total disregard of conventional climate science. All consideration of the influence of the sun was peremptorily abandoned.

The '*environmental movement*' loved the new religion. CO₂ became their emblem – the symbol of their unremitting antagonism towards industrialisation. They now had a socially acceptable weapon to fight what they believed to be the excesses of the civilised First World. They were immediately and virulently anti-car; anti-growth; anti-industrialisation; anti-capitalism; anti the USA; and anti-civilisation.

The majority of ordinary people were persuaded to agree with the new '*green*' crusade – because '*the scientific facts*' were presented to the public in such a plausible manner. Many one-time responsible citizens were so taken in (and concerned) by the new global warming theories, that they turned a blind eye to all manners of irrational extremism.

The environmental fanatics, with the media's whole-hearted support, used sensational '*green language*' to attack capitalism. Amazing alliances blossomed. Funding for research into '*the problem*' increased beyond reason. A multitude of new jobs were created.

Almost overnight, in fact, tens of billions of dollars were allocated to fight the new war: the war to '*save the world from man himself*'.

Hundreds of so-called scientific computer models, depicting different perceptions of global warming, were created – and impossible predictions were '*tweaked*' into them in order to construct the illusions that the scientists wanted to create.

Computer models, however, are only as good as the material that is put into them; and the basic foundation information they were fed totally ignored the influence of the sun. In every case, the programmes included the assumption that global warming was *caused* by an increase in atmospheric CO₂. Every single one of those models from the start, therefore, was severely flawed; their predictions were all highly imaginative – and different; and the data was constantly manipulated.

To the honest climatologists this was a professional nightmare; and nobody listened to their contrary advice.

Computer models look impressive and the media love them. Many new-style environmental journalists, however, had come to realise that IF the CO₂ '*causal effect*' idea was proved to be false - as many climatologists were saying - they would be out of a job.

Progressively, therefore, as more and more of these journalists began to recognise that there were considerable flaws in the original theory, they started to publicise blind support for the idea - to save their jobs. Their reporting became ever more flamboyant; their predictions ever more apocalyptic; and their explanations ever more exaggerated in the public domain. Thus was the myth constructed and thus has it been perpetuated.

The media, generally, doesn't like the growing scientific trend towards debunking the false theory that CO₂ *causes* global warming. This trend is also not supported by the IPCC – the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in the United Nations. All these bodies continue to reinforce the myth because that is the only way they can get their projects funded. In other words, they have become pariahs.

Everybody involved in the scam - everywhere - has become the puppet of his paymaster; saying what his benefactor wants to hear; making sure that their research funds and salaries keep flowing in their direction.

There is a huge contingency of people whose livelihoods now depend entirely on keeping this bandwagon mobile. Heretics are ostracized. Scientists holding contrary views are publicly attacked and vilified. Some have had death threats. The environmentalists have today, in fact, become enrolled into what has become a political activist movement.

Margaret Thatcher is purported to have been the first senior world leader to become involved. She was a great nuclear power advocate and she saw in the embryonic '*man-induced global warming argument*' an opportunity to promote her belief that nuclear power was the future. She understood that if society disapproved of coal-burning power-stations - because their smoke emissions released huge volumes of CO₂ into the atmosphere - that fact could be used to support her proposal to replace them with nuclear power stations.

Thatcher, therefore, went to those of her scientists who had a leaning towards the new global warming ideology and she threw an enormous amount of money on the table. She told them to provide her with scientific evidence in support of their beliefs. And they did just that!

Always short of research funding, Thatcher's carefully selected scientists were given, on a plate, the goose that laid the golden eggs.

Today, what started in this innocent manner has become a scientific juggernaut. Tens of thousands of scientists, technicians, civil servants and politicians, are currently employed within the multi-trillion dollar global warming swindle; and they continue to keep proving it's '*authenticity*' to keep themselves in fat cat employment.

Billions upon billions of dollars now annually feed this ravenous beast.

Massive industries - from motor vehicle production lines to ladies underwear - embrace the global warming theme. Huge subsidies are paid out by governments to those industries that comply with the new anti-global warming legislation. Carbon taxes are now being applied to people in all walks of life.

The media avidly remain on the bandwagon. And the shriller their news reports become, the more damning are their predictions. Life on earth will only be possible, they insist, **IF** carbon emissions from man's industries can be brought under control.

There is, today, a massive intolerance of dissenting voices and both scientists and politicians dare not doubt the so-called truths contained within the new climate-change doctrine. The most politically incorrect thing that they can do is to express doubt about the new orthodoxy.

Global warming, many very concerned and honest scientists say, has gone beyond politics. It is a new morality.

The heretical scientists - those who don't believe that CO₂ causes global warming - on the other hand, rejoice in the knowledge that the scientific foundation for the theory is crumbling fast. They are still dumb-founded, however, by the fact that the science of climatology is now driven entirely by politics. Within government departments, universities and the United Nations itself, censorship and intimidation of the non-believers is rife.

The principal culprit of global warming, the pundits say, is industry. Yet the industrial revolution is the very factor that created the greatest advancements of science and technology - for the benefit of mankind - the world has ever known.

The truth is, the CO₂-related global warming theory is a political lie. Yet, its blind acceptance by society-at-large, has vitally important negative implications for the well-being of mankind - everywhere; and, if perpetuated, will have a huge negative impact on the development of Africa.

There are now international agreements in force to cut down on industrial carbon emissions – which, in Africa, will eliminate any chance of proper industrial development. Furthermore, many terms of these agreements are underhandedly and passively coercive: Unless you do *'that'*... *'this'* (adverse thing) will happen!

Impositions on the construction of coal-burning power stations in Africa are a major issue. Lack of electricity impinges on a whole range of desirable civilised necessities: home-lighting at night; security; education; cooking; heating; hygiene; health; industry; business; and a whole lot more.

Africa is being encouraged (press-ganged) by very influential First-World-based environmentalists, to develop environment-

friendly electricity - such as wind and solar power – which, I am told, have very serious limitations. The concept sounds good but green energy is notoriously unreliable and three times the cost. Furthermore, solar and wind generated electricity cannot develop the type of industrialisation that is needed in Africa. And ‘*poor*’ Africa is beginning to express its repugnance at being denied the right to develop its potentials.

But let us get one thing straight. Smoke emissions from power stations and factories do not do our environment any good. Industrial smoke causes acid rain that has killed whole forests; and it produces smog that kills people. So there are serious detractions from irresponsible industrialisation; and there is a lot of good sense in developing environment friendly power supplies (to augment conventional power grids). As with everything else, there are consequences to everything that we do; or don’t do!

What smoke emissions from power stations and industry do NOT do, however, is to increase the threat of global warming.

The global warming scare is now totally beyond reason.

Author’s note:

An honest resolution of the global warming controversy is vitally important to Africa; and to the world. I have presented you here with some stunning - and I hope convincing - facts about the global warming debate but I must ask you not to glibly accept what I have had to say. Instead, I would recommend that you watch the YouTube video that I introduce to you below. It is over an hour long and it contains the individual opinions of some of the world’s top climatology scientists on the subject of climate change. I am sold on their arguments. If, after being

exposed to this video, you are not equally convinced, you never will be.

Recommended internet viewing:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=YtevF4B4RtQ>

Ron Thomson