

# COP27: Understanding Climate Change and the UN's Hidden Agenda Behind "Catastrophic Global Warming"

We must differentiate between real climate change and the UN's theory of "man-made global warming."

By [David Skripac](#)

Theme: [Environment](#), [Intelligence](#)

Global Research, December 26, 2022

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the Translate Website button below the author's name.

To receive Global Research's Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Follow us on [Instagram](#) and [Twitter](#) and subscribe to our [Telegram Channel](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

\*\*\*

First published on December 22, 2022

*Another United Nations climate conference has come and gone. The twenty-seventh, to be exact.*

*Its forgettable full name is the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Or COP27, for short.*

*COP27, like all of the UN's previous annual climate summits (COP1 through COP26), addressed none of the actual existential issues facing humanity. Instead, its delegates, gathered in Sharm El Sheikh, Egypt, bombarded the rest of us with endless chatter about how human-induced climate change will spell the end of humanity if trillions of dollars aren't thrown at this alleged catastrophe.*

*There was the usual call to action made by the same old summit attendees, who implored nations to reduce carbon dioxide greenhouse gas emissions before it's too late to save "Mother Earth." To that familiar refrain they added a new note: a proclamation of "climate justice" that focused on the need for rich countries to scale up "investment for climate and development" to the lofty tune of \$2 trillion a year.*

*But could all that blather about climate catastrophe and climate justice be nothing more than a smoke screen covering up a nefarious scheme—a scheme designed to monopolise the world’s resources for the benefit of a select few?*

*Before we answer that question, let’s first go over some true facts about climate change and cover the variables that contribute to it. (Note: Natural climate cycles shouldn’t be confused with deliberate weather modification—a separate topic we will discuss further down in this article.)*

## Is Climate Change Real?

First, the question that is probably on everyone’s mind: Is climate change real? Yes, it is. It has been a natural, normal, nonstop phenomenon ever since Earth was formed.


Second, the corollary question: Is it occurring as a result of human activity? No, it is not.

To date, not a single scientific study has positively attributed all or part of observed climate change to anthropogenic (man-made) causes.

Granted, there are numerous computer models spewing out doom-and-gloom predictions. But, like all computer models, their outcomes can be manipulated by the variables entered into the algorithms. That is, the programmer can input certain parameters that will enable a specific desired outcome. The sole purpose of these computer models is to present a polished veneer that appears to be credible science. In actuality, these models are hiding the truth and keeping the deception called the “climate crisis” alive.

A case in point is the infamous “hockey stick” computer-generated temperature graph produced by the equally infamous Michael Mann, a Penn State University professor of atmospheric science. After its initial sensational release in 1998, Mann’s graph was incorporated into the UN’s highly influential [Third Assessment Report](#) on climate change in 2001. Since then, the persuasive illustration has been used by the UN’s Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) to deceive the public into believing the theory of man-made global warming.

Professor Mann’s graph purports to show the average global temperature over the past 1,000 years. For the first 900 years the graph portrays very little variation in global temperatures. They trend in as straight a line as the shaft on an ice hockey stick lying horizontally on its back side (see below). Then suddenly, in the twentieth century, the graph displays a precipitous rise in global temperature, looking like the hockey stick’s curved blade.



Michael Mann's 1998 "hockey stick" temperature model. [Source.](#)

Mann suggests that this sudden rise in temperature is all due to a dramatic increase in carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) in the atmosphere.

There is, however, a major problem with the hockey stick diagram: It's utter fiction.

In reality, there have been numerous quantifiable stages of cooling and warming of the earth's climate spanning the millennia. Here are a few notable examples:

- Fourteenth-century Europe was in a mini-ice age, as revealed by [this article](#) in *Climate in Arts & History*. During the Little Ice Age (1300 CE–1850 CE) global temperatures were significantly cooler—by as much as 2°C (3.6°F), particularly in North America and Europe.
- Going back further, between 1000 CE and 1350 CE, identified as the Medieval Warming Period, temperatures were significantly warmer than current ones—and that was long before the industrial period. More than 700 scientists from 400 institutions in forty countries have contributed peer-reviewed [papers](#) providing evidence that the Medieval Warming Period was as hot or hotter than at present and was a global phenomenon, not just a European regional climate condition, as the IPCC wrongly speculates.
- Going back further still, there were more warm spells, including a prolonged period during the Bronze Age, known to geologists as the Holocene Maximum (5000 BCE–8000 BCE). During this period, temperatures were significantly warmer than they are today. In fact, a [fascinating study](#) conducted by Myers et al. and published in *The Cryosphere Discussions* in 2020 concludes that average temperatures, especially in East Antarctica, were a full 5°C (9°F) warmer than at present.

Yet, despite his having flattened nine centuries of climate variation with his flawed computer program, Michael Mann's fraudulent temperature model is *still* being used by the UN's IPCC.

Why? Why won't the IPCC acknowledge that the climate has always changed, as the above

three examples demonstrate—and changed, mind you, without *any help* from us humans?

We'll touch on possible motives for the IPCC's misinformation at the end.

For now, let's stick to *how* the powers-that-be have gone about blaming human activity for natural climate cycles and *how* they have hyped a made-up climate catastrophe reminiscent of the fairy-tale emperor's imaginary clothes.

Enter, in the decade of the 1960s, the theory of “anthropogenic global warming” or “man-made global warming.” The false notion was first adopted in 1968 by the [Club of Rome](#) in its efforts to promote the supposed need for population reduction. It has since been used to great effect by the UN and by other intergovernmental organizations as well as national governments around the world.

The anthropogenic warming theorists claim that the CO<sub>2</sub> produced by human activity at the start of the twentieth century should have caused the earth's temperature to rise. They insist there is a direct correlation between CO<sub>2</sub> and global temperature. As CO<sub>2</sub> increases, global temperature, they allege, increases in lock step.

But is that actually true? Well, if we accept the [findings](#) presented by George S. Benton in the *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (October 1970), a startlingly different picture emerges.

This intrepid scientist found that, in the 60 years between 1880 and 1940, the earth's temperature rose approximately 0.6°C (1.0°F). That warming trend took place long before cars and aircraft were invented. Moreover, in the same period, industrial development was relatively insignificant.

Then, during the post-WW2 economic boom in the 1950s and 1960s, industries were expanding and human production of CO<sub>2</sub> was soaring to new levels. Per the man-made warming theory, global temperature should have increased in those decades. But it didn't. Instead, it fell significantly—some 0.3°C to 0.4°C—for three decades.

These facts certainly do *not* correlate with the global warming theory.

In reality, the earth's atmosphere didn't start to warm in the twenty-first century until 1975. This warming trend continued until 2016, when global temperatures were at their peak; they have been declining ever since.

The proof? All satellite [datasets](#) collected from the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Goddard Institute for Space Studies (NASA GISS), the UK Meteorological Office, Remote Sensing Systems (RSS), and the University of Alabama (UAH) show global temperatures have been declining since 2016, despite increasing amounts of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>.

If we look hard enough, we can find scientific articles laying out these hard facts. For instance, a [report](#) from Chris Morrison in *The Daily Sceptic* informs us that temperatures in the South Pole are now the coldest they have been since records began in 1957 and that Arctic sea ice is making a silent comeback.

And yet, all of these data have, inexplicably, escaped the attention of mainstream media

reporters.

In the meantime, numerous climate change alarmists, notably former US Vice President Al Gore, desperately cling to the notion that there is a clear correlation between CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature.

These climate cultists often refer to evidence collected from ice core samples to substantiate their claims.

To wit: In the 1990s, the classic Vostok ice core sample taken in East Antarctica appeared to show temperature and carbon fluctuations moving in unison. Based on that sample, man-made climate change believers tried to make the case that as CO<sub>2</sub> increased, so, too, did temperature, with no lag time between the two variables. They convinced the scientifically illiterate masses that CO<sub>2</sub> influences temperature.

But by the early 2000s, new scientific data—this 2001 [report](#) by Manfred Mudelsee in the *Quaternary Science Reviews* (QSR), for instance—made it clear that *the exact inverse* is true: CO<sub>2</sub> *lags* temperature. Put another way, temperature changes always *precede* CO<sub>2</sub> changes.

Thus, the entire ice core theory was turned on its head by data proving that CO<sub>2</sub> increases as a *result* of temperature rising, not the other way around. After the temperature rises, it takes, on average, 800 years before CO<sub>2</sub> starts to inch up. This lag is sometimes as much as 2,300 years, other times as little as 300 years.

The extraordinary thing is that the CO<sub>2</sub> lag is well accepted by climatologists yet is virtually unknown outside these circles. And it is this very same lag that climate charlatans like Al Gore fail to mention when presenting evidence obtained from ice core data.

Therefore, from the evidence presented above, we can conclude that CO<sub>2</sub>, like other greenhouse gases, does *not* drive the earth's climate.

And that brings us to our next climate-related topic—greenhouse gases.

## Greenhouse Gases

Gases that trap the sun's heat in the atmosphere are called greenhouse gases (GHG). These are naturally occurring gases that absorb and release infrared radiation within the thermal infrared spectrum. The absorption and release of radiation reduces heat loss from the earth, which in turn causes an increase in atmospheric temperature.

This reaction is what is commonly referred to as the greenhouse effect. Without these important gases, the earth would be a very cold and uninhabitable place—up to 32°C (57°F) colder, on average.

By far the most important greenhouse gas is water vapor. It constitutes 95 percent of the greenhouse gases by volume and has a dominant effect on our climate.

Other natural greenhouse gases, such as methane (CH<sub>4</sub>) and nitrous oxide, (N<sub>2</sub>O) are present but make up only a tiny fraction of the greenhouse gases. Methane, for example,

constitutes as little as 0.000175 percent of all atmospheric gases and 0.036 percent of all greenhouse gases. And nitrous oxide's concentration in the atmosphere is even lower, at 0.000034 percent.

The second most abundant greenhouse gas is carbon dioxide. Although CO<sub>2</sub> is a greenhouse gas, it is a natural gas, *not* a pollutant. It is a key component of the biosphere's life cycle, without which all vegetation on earth would die. [Natural levels of CO<sub>2</sub>](#) are approximately 0.04 percent of the total atmosphere.

Of the 0.04 percent that is CO<sub>2</sub>, 95 percent comes from a combination of volcanic activity, decomposing vegetation, bacteria, and the [earth's oceans](#).

Therefore, the human contribution to the overall CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is only 0.0016 percent. And yet it is this miniscule, insignificant percentage that we are supposed to believe is, in some miraculous way, driving humanity toward a climate catastrophe.

What an illogical and unsupportable conclusion. Even if all human fossil fuel-burning activity were to cease tomorrow, the world's oceans and volcanoes would continue to produce the vast majority of all CO<sub>2</sub> found in the atmosphere.

And even if humans *could* drastically reduce the level of CO<sub>2</sub>, there would be no significant effect on the climate, as we have already seen from the scientific data presented above. Thus, the belief that CO<sub>2</sub> or any other GHG gas (i.e., N<sub>2</sub>O) is the prime driver of all climate in the world is preposterous.

The notion that carbon dioxide is "bad" is equally preposterous. CO<sub>2</sub> is *the* essential nutrient that generates all life on earth—and has only beneficial effects.

For instance, plants are so improved by more CO<sub>2</sub> that greenhouse operators often increase the CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations by factors of three or four to get better growth. This should be no surprise, since plants and animals evolved when CO<sub>2</sub> concentrations were about 10 times larger than they are today. Granted, chemical fertilizers and agricultural management contributed to the great increase in agricultural yields over the past century, but part of the increase almost certainly came from additional CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere.

In addition, [research](#) provided by author, public speaker, and climatologist Timothy F. Ball from the University of Winnipeg reveals "current levels of 392 parts per million (ppm) are approximately one third the optimum for most plants. Empirical evidence from CO<sub>2</sub> levels injected into commercial greenhouses indicate optimum yields at levels between 1000 and 1200 ppm. Interestingly, this is the average level of the last 300 million years."

## A Word on Nitrous Oxide

Recently, nitrous oxide (N<sub>2</sub>O) has made headlines by joining carbon dioxide and methane in the climate cultists' pantheon of dreaded anthropogenic gases. In their view, increasing concentrations of N<sub>2</sub>O, like CO<sub>2</sub>, will lead to unusual and unprecedented warming and thus result in disastrous consequences for humanity.

Based on this egregious lie, countries around the world are in the process of destroying

conventional farming by reducing or eliminating the use of nitrogen fertilizer and its byproduct, N<sub>2</sub>O.

In Canada, for example, the Liberal regime is determined to reduce the use of nitrogen fertilizers in agriculture. According to [Climate Depot](#), Liberal Party leaders “want Canadian farmers to reduce their emissions from fertilizer, specifically nitrous oxide emissions, to 30 percent below 2020 levels by 2030.”

In the Netherlands, meanwhile, the government plans to shut down 3,000 farms for the supposed purpose of preventing catastrophic warming from N<sub>2</sub>O emissions.

That unsubstantiated claim is effectively refuted by the 2022 research [paper](#) *Nitrous Oxide and Climate* by physicist C. A. de Lange et al. In their detailed analysis, Professor de Lange and his team prove that restricting N<sub>2</sub>O emissions is not only completely unnecessary but dangerous as well.

Under the guise of saving the planet, the vilification of N<sub>2</sub>O is nothing more than a ploy by the [Agenda 2030](#) conspirators to intentionally create food scarcity. Clearly the UN’s agenda is not about “ending hunger and achieving food security,” as it claims, but about achieving food *insecurity* worldwide.

We may conclude from all the scientific evidence presented above—ice core data, satellite data, and field research—that none of the climate changes over the past several millennia can be explained by CO<sub>2</sub> or by any other greenhouse gas. Therefore, the fundamental principle that climate change is occurring due to human activity is absolutely false.

So, you may be asking, how, then, is the earth’s climate changing? If CO<sub>2</sub> and N<sub>2</sub>O are not causing climate change, what is?

## What *Does* Drive the Earth’s Climate?

For over two decades, scientists have known that solar activity is the primary driver of climate change.

In 2011, several leading scientists in Canada set out to prove this cause-and-effect relationship. In a first-of-its-kind event, they appeared before the Canadian Senate Standing Committee on Energy to challenge the anthropogenic global warming theory. Of the four scientists who appeared at the [hearing](#), three were specialists in the field of climatology.

Professor of Earth Sciences Ian Clark from the University of Ottawa was the first of the three to address the committee. Here is what he had to say:

We have not really seen any global warming for the past 10 years. . . . This is in stark contrast with the IPCC forecast of an increase of some 0.2 degrees per decade.”

Clark explained that twentieth-century warming is merely one of a series of warm periods over the past 10,000 years. During these intervals, he noted, carbon dioxide in the atmosphere held relatively steady and, what is more, “CO<sub>2</sub> had nothing to do with these warming periods.”

He demonstrated that in the past 500 million years there has been no indication of a

correlation between temperature and CO<sub>2</sub>—despite the proven lag factor. How could this be? Water vapor, he related, is responsible for the majority of the greenhouse effect—not CO<sub>2</sub> or any other GHG.

Most importantly, Clark said that “unlike CO<sub>2</sub> [correlations], we have very good correlations between various measures of solar activity and temperature.” He then showed the Senate committee some graphs illustrating the effects of increased solar activity on temperature: as solar activity increased, so, too, did global temperature, and vice versa.

University of Ottawa Distinguished Professor Jan Veizer spoke next:

Many people think the science of climate change is settled. It is not. . . . [The sun] drives the water cycle; the water cycle then generates climate, and climate decides how much jungle, how much tundra and so on we will have, and therefore drives around the carbon cycle. . . . The sun also warms the oceans that emit CO<sub>2</sub> into the atmosphere. Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is thus the product and not the cause of the climate.

Got that? “Atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> is thus the product and not the cause of the climate.”

The third scientist to speak at the hearing was Carleton University Professor of Geology Timothy Patterson. He discussed how his field research in the fjords of British Columbia has revealed consistent correlations between solar cycles and climate over the past 5,000 years:

Hundreds of other studies have shown exactly the same thing. . . . The sun, and not variations in carbon dioxide, appears to be the most important driver of climate change. . . . Solar scientists predict that by later in this decade the sun will be starting into its weakest solar cycle of the past two centuries, and this will likely lead to unusually cool conditions on earth, which may persist for decades. . . . It is global cooling, not warming, that is the major climate threat to the world.”

So there we have it. Everything that happens in earth’s atmosphere comes down to the sun. It is the driving force behind climate change and has been since the beginning of time. CO<sub>2</sub> is irrelevant—especially CO<sub>2</sub> stemming from human activity.

That said, there is, however, one aspect of the earth’s atmosphere that *is* being manipulated by intentionally disruptive human actions. One of the terms for this manipulation is “weather modification.”

## Weather Modification

Since the differences between “weather” and “climate” are often misunderstood, let us first look at what differentiates weather from climate before we delve into the topic of weather modification—also referred to as Environmental Modification Techniques (ENMOD).

Unlike climate, which describes the prevailing weather conditions in a vast area of the globe over a long period of time, weather describes the state of the atmosphere at a specific location and at a specific time. Weather refers to certain characteristics of the atmosphere—temperature, wind, precipitation, and humidity.

It is in the arena of weather that some scientists employed by various government agencies have found ways to alter—even weaponize—local weather phenomena to their advantage.



Judging by reports posted on CNN recently, one could be excused for thinking that weather modification—through either “[cloud seeding](#)” or [Stratospheric Aerosol Injection](#)(SAI) geoengineering—is a newfangled notion. In reality, the origins of this cloud-seeding technology date back to the 1940s.

In the late 1940s, for example, American mathematician John von Neumann, in liaison with the US Department of Defense, was researching weather modification through cloud seeding and its [potential uses in climatic warfare](#).

By the 1960s, atmospheric scientist Bernard Vonnegut (and, yes, brother of famed novelist Kurt Vonnegut) had vastly [improved the cloud-seeding techniques](#) then in use. While at General Electric Research Laboratory, he employed a solid solution of silver iodide crystals and silver bromide in the cloud-seeding mixture. Silver iodide’s hygroscopic qualities insure that water particles quickly bond with silver iodide’s solid crystalline structure.

Unsurprisingly, the technology discovered by Vonnegut was put to active military use by the American Empire in its war against Vietnam. From 1967 to 1972, the US Air Force ran [Operation Popeye](#), a highly classified rainmaking program deployed in Southeast Asia. The objective of the operation was to hamper the movement of North Vietnamese troops and supplies along the Ho Chi Minh trail network by prolonging the monsoon season.

From then on, the potential military benefits of wartime deployment of weather modification technologies were self-evident. So self-evident, in fact, that by 1977 the UN was compelled to introduce [a convention](#) prohibiting the use of environmental modification technology in warfare. Both the US and the Soviet Union ratified that convention in 1980.

Nevertheless, in August 1996, a [report commissioned by the US Air Force](#) revealed that the US military was still considering and potentially developing “weather warfare”—specifically, ENMOD systems that would offer “the war fighter a wide-range of possible options” (like generating precipitation or fog or storms) in order to defeat or coerce an adversary.

Since then, it appears that the Pentagon’s Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) has also been actively involved in ENMOD research, as *this* [March 2009 report in Science magazine informs us](#).

However, out of all the weather modification techniques we have briefly examined, none could wreak more potentially devastating effects on the planet than the aforementioned SAI geoengineering. Using this technology, scientists are attempting to play God by interfering with the natural, interconnected climatic life cycle between the sun and the earth.

I’m speaking now of the insane scheme [outlined](#) in *The Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* (PNAS, January 2019 edition), which proposes to inject aerosols into the stratosphere for a prolonged period of time as a means of mitigating the “significant impacts from climate change.”

What do the authors mean by “impacts”? They’re borrowing the standard propaganda line from the global warming gospel, which infers or outright states that severe weather events—tropical cyclones, hurricanes, and tornados—are all on the rise because of global warming.

But beware believing them! A quick search on Marc Morano’s [Climate Depot](#) reveals numerous studies presented by scientists from around the world—[USA](#), [Norway](#), [Germany](#),

and [elsewhere](#)—providing evidence to the contrary. Their data refutes the absurd, politically motivated concept being pushed by President Biden, his fellow Democrats, and other climate alarmists—the flawed concept that the world is currently experiencing a “climate emergency” aka “climate crisis.”

Therefore, since there really are *no* significant impacts from human-induced climate change, the entire SAI geoengineering concept must be based on a false premise. Obviously, operating on the basis of a false premise can be dangerous. This technology is still in its infancy, but if allowed to proceed to its full development stage, it could have devastating consequences for the environment on a global scale.

If the UN sponsors and delegates at the COP27 summit were actually concerned for humanity’s well-being, at the very least they should have discussed the possible impacts that weather modification is having on the environment. Also, they should have dealt with the two *real* existential crises threatening humankind’s survival: the reduction in male sperm counts and soil degradation around the globe.

To wit: The world population recently hit eight billion, but birth rates across the world are consistently declining. Shanna Swan, an epidemiologist at Mount Sinai Medical Center in New York and a leading scholar of reproductive health, [projects](#) that sperm counts of the median male are set to hit zero by 2045.

With the introduction in the 1970s of endocrine-disrupting chemicals (EDCs) in plastics, male sperm counts have dropped 50 percent to 60 percent—an average of 1 percent to 2 percent per year—between 1973 and 2011. A recent [study](#) from Israel has found that sperm counts worldwide have plunged 62 percent in under fifty years—a decades-long trend that is still accelerating.

COP27 delegates also never discussed the damaging effects GMO crops are having on the environment. (That topic hasn’t been broached at *any* UN conference, come to think of it.) GMO crops are sprayed with herbicides, such as Bayer’s Roundup, which contain the active ingredient glyphosate, the most ubiquitous cancer-causing herbicide/antibiotic on the planet. Moreover, the devastating effects chemical farming is having on the air we breathe and on the erosion of arable land is also never mentioned at any UN gathering.

I repeat: If the governments represented at the COP27 summit were actually concerned about saving humanity and wildlife and the environment from all manner of toxins and pollutants, the aforementioned crises would have been at the top of their agenda.

But, then again, COP has *never* been about saving the planet or humanity.

## The Real Agenda behind the Man-Made Climate Change Narrative

Since the inception of the aforementioned Club of Rome, a neo-Malthusian think tank founded by David Rockefeller in 1968, the technocrats who seek to rule the planet have been steadily moving humanity toward a neo-feudal dystopian nightmare. For proof, see [here](#) and [here](#) and [here](#).

In addition to working in or with the UN and its affiliated organs—the World Health Organization (WHO), the IPCC, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the World Economic Forum (WEF), and the World Wildlife Fund (WWF), to name a few—these social engineers have been busy harnessing the power of central banks,

investment banks, non-governmental organizations (NGOs), labor unions, philanthropic foundations, and billionaires in their bid to eliminate what little remains of national sovereignty and to slowly privatize everything on earth (including “natural assets” such as water and entire ecosystems).

And, although that conquest by the supranational oligarchy and their social engineers has been in the works for years, their timeline for achieving their goals has been greatly accelerated since 2019 with the launch of the COVID plandemic.

The kickoff of the COVID-19 threat represented the first “COVID” chapter of the cabal’s global takeover playbook. The fear that was created by the introduction of an alleged deadly virus provided the perfect pretext for governments around the world, under the direction of the WHO, to suspend the rule of law and implement draconian measures such as curfews, lockdowns, physical separation, biometric surveillance, and mask wearing—steps that normally would never be accepted by the public but that under the guise of “public safety” were implemented virtually unchecked around the world.

With the successful completion of the COVID chapter, the second “save the planet from catastrophic climate change” chapter in the cabal’s playbook is proceeding as planned. For almost thirty years, the UN and its satellite organizations—the IPCC being the one most tied to this article—have been manipulating the temperature record, utilizing flawed computer climate models, and lying with unverifiable statistics in their bid to fool the world’s population into believing there is a coming climate apocalypse.

I cannot overemphasize the fact that both the “COVID” chapter and the “save the planet from catastrophic climate change” chapter are from the same playbook. Meaning, they are not isolated agendas. The COVID narrative was the test run for what we can expect to see roll out in the very near future with regard to the climate swindle.

For example, the plandemic lockdowns, which were so instrumental in destroying the global economy while simultaneously enriching the billionaire class, are once again being gradually unleashed on an unsuspecting public, but this time in the form of “climate lockdowns.”

Here’s one illustration of what I mean. The unelected officials at the [UN](#) and [WEF](#) are introducing the concept of the “15-minute city” as a way to “save the planet” from global warming.

Under this new control grid scheme, cities will be divided into 15-minute districts. Residents will be confined to their respective district to conduct daily business through a series of electronic gates located at key roads leading in and out of the city. After a resident registers his motor vehicle details, every movement his vehicle makes will be tracked and traced via smart cameras. The totalitarians will grant passes to people who need—or how about simply *want*—to travel to adjacent zones. If, however, a driver exceeds his maximum allotment of crosses between zones, he will be fined.

Already, on November 29, 2022, the UK’s Oxfordshire County approved plans to lock residents into one of six zones—and that’s only the beginning. Similar plans are being drawn up for the cities of [Paris](#), [Brisbane](#), [Melbourne](#), Portland, Barcelona, and Buenos Aires.

It’s also worth emphasizing that all of the measures implemented by the ruling oligarchy in both chapters of the playbook have *absolutely nothing* to do with the stated intent of either

ensuring public safety or saving the planet from harm.

Not convinced? One need only look at the *Finance for climate action: Scaling up investment for climate and development* [document](#) released at the COP27 summit to see what is really at play. The document is filled with the usual globalist predatory institutions—Global Public-Private Partnerships ([G3P](#)) working in tandem with central banks and international asset management corporations.

On page 44, for instance, we find the Glasgow Financial Alliance for Net Zero ([GFANZ](#)), launched at COP26 in 2021. GFANZ, along with its slew of over 550 major financial institutions, including HSBC, BlackRock, State Street, Citibank, Goldman Sachs, and Deutsche Bank, to name but a few, is apparently leading the charge to facilitate “the decarbonization of the economy.” But, as Whitney Webb explains in her detailed [article](#), GFANZ’s “plans ultimately amount to a corporate-led coup that will make the global financial system even more corrupt and predatory and further reduce the sovereignty of national governments in the developing world.”

And on page 9 of the document, there’s even the clause about “expanding the use debt/climate/nature swaps”—a euphemism used by the predator class to conceal the theft of a nation’s land and natural resources.

Slogans such as “sustainable agriculture” or “global net zero greenhouse gas emissions” (read: the de-industrialisation of the developing world) used in the document are still more thinly veiled attempts to obfuscate their true agenda.

In conclusion: The climate change “threat” has no more to do with saving the environment than the propaganda about the scandemic has to do with keeping people “safe and healthy.” Instead, the real scheme behind the man-made climate change/saving Mother Earth narrative is simply a debt-based scam to monopolize the world’s resources for the benefit of the ruling oligarchy, while simultaneously expanding the framework that will, if allowed to come to fruition, manipulate, regulate, and control every single aspect of our lives.

Is that really the kind of world we want to live in?


It’s time to lift the veil and expose the lie behind the UN’s catastrophic climate change narrative.

\*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above. Follow us on Instagram and Twitter and subscribe to our Telegram Channel. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

*David Skripac has a Bachelor of Technology degree in Aerospace Engineering. He served as a Captain in the Canadian Forces for nine years. During his two tours of duty in the Air Force, he flew extensively in the former Yugoslavia as well as in Somalia, Rwanda, Ethiopia, and Djibouti.*

*He is the author of a recently published e-book, [“Our Species Is Being Genetically Modified,”](#) and a regular contributor to Global Research.*



## Our Species Is Being Genetically Modified. Are We Witnessing Humanity's March Toward Extinction? Viruses Are Our Friends, Not Our Foes

Author: David Skripac

[Click here to read the e-Book.](#)

The original source of this article is Global Research  
Copyright © [David Skripac](#), Global Research, 2022

---

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [David Skripac](#)

**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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)

[www.globalresearch.ca](http://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](mailto:publications@globalresearch.ca)