

Climate Change: The Global Media Presents an Apocalyptic Scenario

By [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)
Global Research, December 07, 2009
7 December 2009

Theme: [Environment](#), [Media Disinformation](#), [United Nations](#)
In-depth Report: [Climate Change](#)

The following text (in annex) was published simultaneously by major Newspapers around the World. It constitutes a Worldwide public relations initiative, intended to sway public opinion into unreservedly accepting the "Global Warming consensus". The text of the editorial was prepared by The Guardian team.

The editorial presents an apocalyptic scenario, with global warming ravaging the planet.

While it rightly points to the need to reduce toxic manmade emissions, as an environmental clean air objective in its own right, it accepts the Global Warming Consensus, outright, without debate or discussion, as an absolute truth as outlined by the UN Panel on Climate Change.

It fails to acknowledge the broader scientific debate on climate change. It also fails to address the controversy behind the data base on climate change and greenhouse gas emissions.

The evidence that CO2 is the sole cause of Global Warming is questionable, as revealed by numerous scientific studies. (See [Global Research's Climate Change Dossier: Archive of more than 100 articles](#))

There has been, in this regard, a persistent attempt to silence the critics as conveyed in the writings of MIT meteorologist Richard S. Lindzen (See Richard Lindzen, [Climate of Fear: Global-warming alarmists intimidate dissenting scientists into silence.](#), Global Research, 7 April 2007)

Scientists who dissent from the alarmism have seen their grant funds disappear, their work derided, and themselves labelled as industry stooges, scientific hacks or worse. Consequently, lies about climate change gain credence even when they fly in the face of the science that supposedly is their basis. (Ibid)

CO2 emissions are heralded in the editorial as the single and most important threat to the future of humanity.

The authors of the editorial believe that "the politicians in Copenhagen *have the power to shape history's judgment on this generation*".

Our understanding is that the politicians from NATO countries, who will be attending the

Copenhagen Venue, invariably act on behalf of the interests of the financial establishment, the oil companies and the defense contractors.

In this regard, it is worth noting that key decisions and orientations on COP15 have already been wrapped up at the **World Business Summit on Climate Change (WBSCC)** held in May in Copenhagen, six months ahead of COP15.

The WBSCC brought together some of the World's most prominent business executives and World leaders including Al Gore and UN Secretary General Ban Ki Moon. ([The World Business Summit on Climate Change](#), includes webcast)

The results of these high level consultations are contained in a "summary report for policymakers" drafted by PricewaterhouseCoopers LLP, on behalf the corporate executives participating in the event. This report, which has been forwarded to the participating governments, has very little to do with environmental protection. It largely consists in a profit driven agenda, which uses the global warming consensus as a justification. (For details see [Climate Council: The World Business Summit on Climate Change](#))

"The underlying ambition of the [WBSCC] Summit was to address the twin challenges of climate change and the economic crisis. Participants at the Summit considered how these risks can be turned into opportunity if business and governments work together, and what policies, incentives, and investments will most effectively stimulate low-carbon growth." ([Copenhagen Climate Council](#))

What is the hidden agenda behind the Copenhagen CO15 Summit?

The Global Warming consensus is being used to justify a lucrative multibillion carbon trading scheme which seeks to enrich corporations and financial institutions to the detriment of the developing countries.

According to the editorial: "Social justice demands that the industrialised world digs deep into its pockets and pledges cash to help poorer countries adapt to climate change, and clean technologies to enable them to grow economically without growing their emissions".

This carbon trading scheme does not serve the interests of social justice. Quite the opposite. What is now being contemplated is a multibillion trade in Carbon Derivatives: the banks are slated "to make a killing" on carbon trading, with ... a very high probability of massive fraud and insider trading in the carbon trading markets." (See [Copenhagen's Hidden Agenda: The Multibillion Trade in Carbon Derivatives](#), Global Research, December 8, 2009). In a bitter irony, the architect of Credit Default Swaps at JP Morgan is behind the development of a trading system in "Carbon Derivatives".

While we share the concerns of the environmentalists, there is no reason to uphold something which is untrue or questionable to reach stated environmental goals.

Reducing toxic manmade emissions, preserving biodiversity, protecting wildlife, developing sustainable agriculture and preventing deforestation need not be viewed as subordinate and instrumental to reducing greenhouse gas emissions. These are environmental objectives in their own right.

The implementation of an environmental program geared explicitly towards reducing environmental contamination and pollution at the national and international levels requires neither the Global Warming Consensus, nor a profit driven carbon trading system.

Michel Chossudovsky, December 7, 2009

ANNEX

Copenhagen climate change conference: 'Fourteen days to seal history's judgment on this generation'

The Guardian, December 7, 2009

This editorial calling for action from world leaders on climate change is published today by 56 newspapers around the world in 20 languages [Copenhagen climate change summit - opening day liveblog](#)

Today 56 [newspapers](#) in 45 countries take the [unprecedented step of speaking with one voice through a common editorial](#). We do so because humanity faces a profound emergency.

Unless we combine to take decisive action, [climate change](#) will ravage our planet, and with it our prosperity and security. The dangers have been becoming apparent for a generation. Now the facts have started to speak: 11 of the past 14 years have been the warmest on record, the Arctic ice-cap is melting and last year's inflated oil and food prices provide a foretaste of future havoc. In scientific journals the question is no longer whether humans are to blame, but how little time we have got left to limit the damage. Yet so far the world's response has been feeble and half-hearted.

Climate change has been caused over centuries, has consequences that will endure for all time and our prospects of taming it will be determined in the next 14 days. We call on the representatives of the [192 countries gathered in Copenhagen](#) not to hesitate, not to fall into dispute, not to blame each other but to seize opportunity from the greatest modern failure of politics. This should not be a fight between the rich world and the poor world, or between east and west. Climate change affects everyone, and must be solved by everyone.

The science is complex but the facts are clear. The world needs to take steps to limit temperature rises to 2C, an aim that will require global emissions to peak and begin falling within the next 5-10 years. A bigger rise of 3-4C — the smallest increase we can prudently expect to follow inaction — would parch continents, turning farmland into desert. Half of all species could become extinct, untold millions of people would be displaced, whole nations drowned by the sea. The controversy over emails by British researchers that suggest they tried to suppress inconvenient data has muddied the waters but failed to dent the mass of evidence on which these predictions are based.

Few believe that Copenhagen can any longer produce a fully polished treaty; real progress towards one could only begin with the arrival of President Obama in the White House and the reversal of years of US obstructionism. Even now the world finds itself at the mercy of American domestic politics, for the president cannot fully commit to the action required until the US Congress has done so.

But the politicians in Copenhagen can and must agree the essential elements of a fair and effective deal and, crucially, a firm timetable for turning it into a treaty. Next June's UN climate meeting in Bonn should be their deadline. As one negotiator put it: "We can go into extra time but we can't afford a replay."

At the deal's heart must be a settlement between the rich world and the developing world covering how the burden of fighting climate change will be divided — and how we will share a newly precious resource: the trillion or so tonnes of carbon that we can emit before the mercury rises to dangerous levels.

Rich nations like to point to the arithmetic truth that there can be no solution until developing giants such as China take more radical steps than they have so far. But the rich world is responsible for most of the accumulated carbon in the atmosphere — three-quarters of all carbon dioxide emitted since 1850. It must now take a lead, and every developed country must commit to deep cuts which will reduce their emissions within a decade to very substantially less than their 1990 level.

Developing countries can point out they did not cause the bulk of the problem, and also that the poorest regions of the world will be hardest hit. But they will increasingly contribute to warming, and must thus pledge meaningful and quantifiable action of their own. Though both fell short of what some had hoped for, the [recent commitments to emissions targets](#) by the world's biggest polluters, the [United States](#) and [China](#), were important steps in the right direction.

Social justice demands that the industrialised world digs deep into its pockets and pledges cash to help poorer countries adapt to climate change, and clean technologies to enable them to grow economically without growing their emissions. The architecture of a future treaty must also be pinned down — with rigorous multilateral monitoring, fair rewards for protecting forests, and the credible assessment of "exported emissions" so that the burden can eventually be more equitably shared between those who produce polluting products and those who consume them. And fairness requires that the burden placed on individual developed countries should take into account their ability to bear it; for instance newer EU members, often much poorer than "old Europe", must not suffer more than their richer partners.

The transformation will be costly, but many times less than the bill for bailing out global finance — and far less costly than the consequences of doing nothing.

Many of us, particularly in the developed world, will have to change our lifestyles. The era of flights that cost less than the taxi ride to the airport is drawing to a close. We will have to shop, eat and travel more intelligently. We will have to pay more for our energy, and use less of it.

But the shift to a low-carbon society holds out the prospect of more opportunity than sacrifice. Already some countries have recognized that embracing the transformation can bring growth, jobs and better quality lives. The flow of capital tells its own story: last year for the first time more was invested in renewable forms of energy than producing electricity from fossil fuels.

Kicking our carbon habit within a few short decades will require a feat of engineering and innovation to match anything in our history. But whereas putting a man on the moon or

splitting the atom were born of conflict and competition, the coming carbon race must be driven by a collaborative effort to achieve collective salvation.

Overcoming climate change will take a triumph of optimism over pessimism, of vision over short-sightedness, of what Abraham Lincoln called “the better angels of our nature”.

It is in that spirit that 56 newspapers from around the world have united behind this editorial. If we, with such different national and political perspectives, can agree on what must be done then surely our leaders can too.

The politicians in Copenhagen have the power to shape history’s judgment on this generation: one that saw a challenge and rose to it, or one so stupid that we saw calamity coming but did nothing to avert it. We implore them to make the right choice.

This editorial will be published tomorrow by 56 newspapers around the world in 20 languages including Chinese, Arabic and Russian. The text was drafted by a Guardian team during more than a month of consultations with editors from more than 20 of the papers involved. Like [the Guardian](#) most of the newspapers have taken the unusual step of featuring the editorial on their front page.


Copyright The Guardian. December 2009

AMERICA’S “WAR ON TERRORISM”

by Michel Chossudovsky

CLICK TO ORDER

[America’s “War on Terrorism”](#)

 In this new and expanded edition of Michel Chossudovsky’s 2002 best seller, the author blows away the smokescreen put up by the mainstream media, that 9/11 was an attack on America by “Islamic terrorists”. Through meticulous research, the author uncovers a military-intelligence ploy behind the September 11 attacks, and the cover-up and complicity of key members of the Bush Administration.

The expanded edition, which includes twelve new chapters focuses on the use of 9/11 as a pretext for the invasion and illegal occupation of Iraq, the militarisation of justice and law enforcement and the repeal of democracy.

According to Chossudovsky, the “war on terrorism” is a complete fabrication based on the illusion that one man, Osama bin Laden, outwitted the \$40 billion-a-year American intelligence apparatus. The “war on terrorism” is a war of conquest. Globalisation is the final march to the “New World Order”, dominated by Wall Street and the U.S. military-industrial complex.

September 11, 2001 provides a justification for waging a war without borders. Washington’s agenda consists in extending the frontiers of the American Empire to facilitate complete U.S. corporate control, while installing within America the institutions of the Homeland Security

State.



Chossudovsky peels back layers of rhetoric to reveal a complex web of deceit aimed at luring the American people and the rest of the world into accepting a military solution which threatens the future of humanity.

The last chapter includes an analysis of the London 7/7 Bomb Attacks.

CLICK TO ORDER (mail order or online order)

[America's "War on Terrorism"](#)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#), Global Research, 2009

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Prof Michel Chossudovsky](#)

About the author:

Michel Chossudovsky is an award-winning author, Professor of Economics (emeritus) at the University of Ottawa, Founder and Director of the Centre for Research on Globalization (CRG), Montreal, Editor of Global Research. He has taught as visiting professor in Western Europe, Southeast Asia, the Pacific and Latin America. He has served as economic adviser to governments of developing countries and has acted as a consultant for several international organizations. He is the author of 13 books. He is a contributor to the Encyclopaedia Britannica. His writings have been published in more than twenty languages. In 2014, he was awarded the Gold Medal for Merit of the Republic of Serbia for his writings on NATO's war of aggression against Yugoslavia. He can be reached at crgeditor@yahoo.com

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the

copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca