

THE DEWEESE REPORT

Volume 21 - Issue 5

May 2015

The Agenda 21 “Conspiracy” “It’s Easier to Fool People Than to Convince Them That They’ve Been Fooled”

By
Tom DeWeese

ED Note: Recently I traveled to Florida to make two presentations on Agenda 21. As I’ve reported several times over the past few months, Agenda 21 proponents have stepped up their attacks to paint me and our Stop Agenda 21 movement as nothing more than a great conspiracy theory with no basis in fact. Frankly I have grown weary of those attacks and so, in the Florida presentations, armed with the documentation, decided to take the accusations head on. I know that my readers have seen much of this many times, but it’s always good to go over it all again. So, here is that presentation. TAD

OK. Let’s get right to it. I know there are those here who have heard of Agenda 21 and accept it as a threat. And of course there are those who really don’t know what it’s all about and want to learn.

And then there are those who want to fold their arms over their chests, roll their eyes, and stick their tongues out at me for spreading silly conspiracies.

So, let me get that part out of the way right now, so we can have a serious talk on this very dangerous situation! As Mark Twain once said, “It’s easier to fool people than to convince them that they’ve been fooled!”

“Fringe radical,” “Wing nut” and “conspiracy theory” are the charges used to discredit me and others who talk about Agenda 21.

The Southern Poverty Law Centers says, “*Agenda 21 is not a treaty. It has no force of law, no enforcement mechanisms, no penalties, and no significant funding. It is not even a top-down recommendation, seeking instead to encourage communities around the world to come up with their own solutions to overpopulation, pollution, poverty and resource depletion. It is a feel good guide that cannot force anyone, anywhere to do anything at all.*”

And that is exactly what planners, non-governmental organizations and federal officials tell your city councilmen and county commissioners every day. Pay no attention to those crazy conspiracy theorists – our plans are all local and have nothing to

do with an innocuous 20 year old document called Agenda 21 - that means nothing.

Twenty years ago THEY said it was a “Comprehensive Blueprint”

But it’s funny to learn that in 1992, 50,000 delegates made up of 179 heads of state, diplomats, business leaders, government bureaucrats and members of thousands of non-governmental organizations converged on Rio de Janeiro, to introduce to the world a document they called a “Comprehensive Blueprint” for reorganizing human society. Obviously, they thought it was pretty serious stuff.

Then Nancy Pelosi introduced the idea to the US Congress that fall, calling it a Comprehensive Blueprint. (I’ve got the Cspan video on my website).

In 1994, the American Planning Association (one of the largest and respecting planning groups in the nation) put out a newsletter calling Agenda 21 a Comprehensive Blueprint.

The UN, in a 1993 publication, described Agenda 21 like this: “*Agenda 21 proposes an array of actions which are intended to be implemented by EVERY person on Earth...it calls for specific changes in the activities of ALL people... Effective execution of Agenda 21 will REQUIRE a profound reorientation of ALL humans, unlike anything the world has ever experienced.*”

In 1997 the United States issued a 70 page report to the United Nations on the progress the US was making to implement Agenda 21. The title of the report was "Implementation of Agenda 21: Review of Progress Made Since the United Nation's Conference on Environment and Development, 1992. Somebody in our government spent a lot of hours and tax dollars preparing a report on a policy that they now deny exists.

In 1998, the Federal Register issued a report on the EPA's Challenge Grant Program. That report says, "The EPA's Challenge Grant Program is also implementation of Agenda 21." All of those grants coming for EPA are the Trojan Horse.

And on and on it went about Agenda 21. The blueprint. The plan. The consensus. The direction for changing how people live. Here was the plan for the 21st Century!

And they were quite proud of it. In fact, it wasn't until the early 2000s that such pride started to change to denial and charges of conspiracy theories. Why? What happened?

That's when I and others started to reveal the truth about Agenda 21 and sound the alarm bells. And a few years later, thousands of concerned Americans started to ask questions.

The "Gruberization" of Agenda 21

Suddenly, the Sustainable Development movement became hard pressed to remember anything like that. Never heard of it, went the cry. In fact, the entire environmental movement, officials in government, planning groups, and NGOs went suddenly dumb.

Where have we seen such a unified dumbness in recent times?

Remember, late last year, when some videos suddenly appeared showing an arrogant little twerp named Jonathan Gruber telling his audience that the way they got Obamacare through Congress was because of the stupidity of the American people? "Lack of transparency," he smugly stated, "is a huge political advantage."

And when those videos caused a sensation, remember the response from Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid and Barrack Obama? "Never heard of him." "He had no official capacity," they claimed. Yet he had been to the White House numerous times. Pelosi introduced him as the key expert on the Obamacare plan. And they paid him seven figures to guide it through.

That same tactic has been used by the Agenda 21 crowd for years. There is no plan, they say. Just some old ideas from a meaningless document.

So, as we began to score victories against it, the other side panicked. They launched attacks against us. The American Planning Association worked to retrain its planners in how to deal with us, removing the use of common words to describe it – and established a "Myths and Facts" section to their web site, boldly claiming the APA has no connection with Agenda 21.

J. Gary Lawrence, a planner and an advisor to Bill Clinton's Council on Sustainable Development told his fellow planners: "*Participating in a UN advocated planning process would very likely bring out many...right wing conspiracy groups...who would actively work to defeat any elected official...undertaking local Agenda 21. So, we will call our process something else, such as comprehensive planning, growth management or smart growth.*"

And so they have. If you look into the local planning documents here at home those are the words you will find.

In the most recent SPLC attack it scolds local officials for paying any attention to people like me. In complete exasperation the SPLC demanded that the business community, the Chamber of Commerce, local governments and the news media "*stop reporting on Agenda 21 as if it were a bona fide controversy.*"

Further, it demanded, that communities "*need to be encouraged to return to or start to develop such plans in tandem with responsible groups like the American Planning Association.*" In other words, stop questioning these plans and just shut up and do it!!

Ask yourself, what "plan" is the SPLC talking about, and why is it so important that communities participate? Remember - they said there is no plan.

The real threat of Agenda 21 – changing our form of government

The fact is Agenda 21 certainly does exist. And it is being enforced at every level of government. And I'm very weary of being called names because I study it and know it. So, unfold your arms and get ready to receive some knowledge!

DeWeese Report

Vol. 21, No. 5
May 2015

Published by
The American Policy
Center

Editor
Tom DeWeese

Correspondence/
Fulfillment
Lola Jane Craig
Eve Craig

Graphics/Layout
CJ Scrofani
Jeff Craig

DeWeese Report
PO Box 129
Remington, VA
22734

Web Page:
www.deweese-report.com

Copyright 2015
The American Policy
Center
Issn 1086-7937
All Rights Reserved

Permission to photocopy,
Reprint and quote articles
from the DeWeese Report
is
hereby granted, provided
full acknowledgment is
included. All reprinted
articles must say:
Written
by Tom DeWeese, Editor
of DeWeese Report
(unless
another author is listed).
All reprints must carry the
DeWeese Report address
and phone number.
Samples of the reprint
must be provided to the
DeWeese Report

It is true that Agenda 21 is not a treaty. It is true that the plan in itself has no enforcement capability. And it is true that there are no Blue helmeted troops at city hall. Agenda 21 is not a law.

So why is it a threat? And how did it get into your community? Agenda 21 is a threat to our nation, to our local community, to you – because it is specifically designed to change our way of life and our form of government.

To understand the threat of Agenda 21, you must first understand that it is NOT an environmental policy or just a good idea for planning future development for communities.

Agenda 21 is, in their words, a comprehensive blueprint for restructuring human society. To do that it must change our form of government. Do you find that to be a radical statement?

Well, how about if I let proponents of this transformation of our society tell it to you themselves:

“Only socialism and the global solidarity of all working peoples can free both humanity and the earth from the fatal threat of global capitalism.” **Third Annual Conference of the World Association from Political Economy) Langfang, China, May 23 – 25 – 2008**

“Individual rights will have to take a back seat to the collective.”
Harvey Ruvin (Vice Chairman, ICLEI)

“We call for “Zero Economic Growth.” Speaker at the UN’s Rio+20 Summit, June, 2012.

“What is occurring here, not just in this (conference,) but in the whole climate change process, is the complete transformation of the economic structure of the world.” **Christiana Figueres (Executive Secretary, UN Framework Convention on Climate Change, November, 2012)**

Just recently she said, *“This is the first time in the history of mankind that we are setting ourselves the task of intentionally within a defined period of time to change the economic development model that has been reigning for at least 150 years, since the industrial revolution...”*

Naomi Klein (writing in The Nation Magazine, 11/28/11) said, *“So when (people like Tom DeWeese) react to... Climate Change as if capitalism itself were coming under threat, it’s not because they are paranoid... It’s because they are paying attention.”*

Killing Capitalism is the real goal of Agenda 21.

So, Marxism is all the rage in the international circles, but local proponents, planning groups, planning departments and elected officials deny any such connections to their planning programs.

But, is there one?

Let’s let an avowed Marxist, author Ted Trainer, explain how and why to impose the local process as he described it in his book, “Transition to a Sustainable and Just World.”

“Consumer society cannot be reformed to make it sustainable or just; it must be largely replaced by a society with fundamentally different structures. Local planning focuses on curtailing energy and natural resource and land use.”

*“What then is the most effective transition strategy? The essential aim is not to fight against consumer- capitalist society, but to build the **alternative** to it.”*

“Nothing of lasting significance will be achieved unless it is clearly understood that our efforts in these local initiatives are the first steps to the eventual replacement of the present society by one which is not driven by market forces, profit, competition, growth or affluence.”

How Agenda 21 got to your town

And so, how do they implement it? There are three main plans of attack:

- Destroy private property ownership and control.
- Feed the plan with federal grant money.
- Impose regional councils and government, taking government further away from the people.

Here is the exact course that brought Agenda 21 to America, through Congress, through your state legislature, through your local county and city government, and into your back yard.

After over 50,000 world leaders, Non-governmental organizations, government bureaucrats, and 179 heads of state signed agreement to Agenda 21, the policy then gained huge momentum when, in 1993, President Bill Clinton, issued Executive Order 12852 to create the President’s Council on Sustainable Development and made it official US policy.

Then, those same NGOs who wrote Agenda 21 at the international level, converged on our government and helped to write the federal policies.

Most importantly they helped to create grant programs. The grants, through HUD, the EPA and nearly every other agency in the Federal Government are the Kool Aid used to spread the policy across the nation. They tell you the grants are voluntary, and in a sense they are. But they come with very specific strings attached that are, in fact, Sustainable policy.

A few examples include restrictions on energy use, development, building codes, and water controls. The rules impose guidelines created on the international level for building materials, plumbing codes, electric codes; installing bike lanes; building apartment buildings with no parking lots, and establishment of public transportation, including light rail trains.

If a community takes the grant they accept the restrictions. In short, they must implement the guidelines of Agenda 21.

After creating such programs, the same NGOs headed to your state legislature and lobbied for legislation that forced every community to impose comprehensive development plans.

Then, as the local communities were faced with the task of writing such plans, the same NGOs appeared at the door of your county commissioners and city councils – conveniently armed with plans and “grants” to help them write and pay for their development programs.

In the back rooms of city hall and the state legislature, your government officials work hand in hand to write policy with the very NGOs which created Agenda 21. These groups wield power only because your local elected officials give it to them.

That is the secret they are hiding from you under all the pretty words about livable communities and smart growth.

And what are the results of this internationally-created, federally-funded, and state-enforced assault on your local community and your own home?

Private property rights are disappearing; energy costs are sky-rocketing; jobs are disappearing; community development means pack and stack high rise housing; and bike paths are replacing roads.

Wetlands, conservation easements, water sheds, view sheds, rails - to- trails, biosphere reserves, greenways, carbon footprints, partnerships, preservation, stakeholders, land use, environmental protection, development, diversity, visioning, open space, heritage areas, comprehensive planning, and walkable communities are all part of the new language of government.

The function of legitimate elected government within the Sustainablist system is fast becoming little more than the rubber stamp to create and enforce the dictates of something called Stakeholder Councils – run by – you guessed it – the same NGO organizations that wrote Agenda 21 in the first place. It’s the demise of representative government.

And the councils appear and grow almost overnight. You’ll find Watershed Councils that regulate human action near every trickling stream, river, or lake. Meters are put on wells. Special “action” councils – control home size, tree pruning, or removal, even the color you can paint your home or the height of your grass. Historic preservation councils –control development in downtown areas, disallowing expansion and new building.

Once the councils are established, it becomes much more

difficult to discuss issues with your elected representatives. Instead they will automatically refer you to the proper council or administration or department, run by unresponsive appointed hacks armed with their own political agenda.

Regional governments are driven by the NGOs who serve on the self-appointed Stakeholder councils. These are run by non-elected bureaucrats that don’t answer to the people. As I said, elected officials become little more than a rubber stamp to provide official “approval” to the regional bureaucracy.

One of the most popular tools now to control energy use is the energy audit and building review. They establish quotas for electrical use, and for heating and cooling pumps, and water use. That means that government bureaucrats will come into your home or office building and determine the amount of potential energy use you should have.

You will be given a list of “recommendations” necessary to bring your home into compliance. These may include the need for a new roof; new energy efficient appliances; new windows, etc. And to comply may cost you thousands of dollars.

As groups like ICLEI and the American Planning Association guide the process, voluntary guidelines announced to reduce energy use quickly become mandatory regulations, as dictated through the grant programs.

Smart Growth/2050/Density

In Florida, as many of you well know, there are a number of plans working their way through the legislature or in multiple counties and communities. Amendment One, designed to tax land for the government to take more land. The Southeast Regional Partnership. And 7/50

In fact, almost every state, and every region of the states have some similar plan in process, usually ending with numbers like 20/50. I did a search recently and found such plans as Jamaica 20/50 and Dubai 20/50. They are all the same plan, no matter where they are in the world. One thing they all have in common – none of them are LOCAL!

That’s by design, because most are being implemented by the same planners nationwide, fueled by the same grant programs, and aided by the same NGO private groups. Smart Growth is the term.

Smart growth planners promote their schemes by insisting that Americans live the wrong way. And they use land use regulations to impose on others what they insist is the right way to live.

In Omaha, Nebraska, government and NGO forces are working hard to sell the community on a grand plan for the future called Heartland 2050. Of course, as usual, it’s not just for Omaha – but for eight full counties in the surrounding area, all combined into the same plan. And the plan openly says it is Sustainable Development.

Listen to the sales pitch. The Goal of Heartland 2050, according to its promoters, is to develop a strategic “vision” for the region’s development over the next 30 years to assure “proper growth?” “The Metro area is always changing,” say proponents, “but is it moving in the right direction?”

Stop right there! You must ask – in the right direction according to whom?

This massive plan will lay the ground rules for transportation, housing, jobs, property/land use, education, and even health care.

What does all of that mean? It means they intend to put a line around the communities involved and declare little or no growth outside that line. That means the focus for future housing will be for high density neighborhoods living in high rise housing. It means, the use of private cars will be discouraged in favor of public transportation.

How is that done? Several ways. Higher taxes on cars and on gasoline – and there is now a plan inside the Obama Administration to tax the miles you drive.

Heartland 2050 includes the program called the “Complete Street.” That is an edict that cars must share the road with bicycles. It calls for “Traffic Calming,” which means large speed bumps placed in the center of residential streets that make it very unpleasant to drive over.

In San Francisco they are now building residential apartment building without parking lots. It’s all designed to reduce your ability to drive so that you use bikes for short trips and public transportation including light rail trains.

The Smart Growth “Poster Child”

So, how will all of this affect you? Are you going to be happy? Will life in the community improve? Well, the best evidence I can give you to predict the future is to look where all of this has already been tried.

Portland, Oregon was announced as the poster child for Smart Growth policy. There it was fully implemented.

You can take an airplane over Portland and actually see the smart growth line around the city. On one side is vast, dense development. On the other side is nothing but open land.

Your local planners assure the community that they want your input -- that you will have a say in every aspect of the plan. Well, surveys show that all but about 15% of Americans want to live in single-family homes with a yard and a drive way. Have any of the planners asked that question of the residents? Have they bothered to include those desires in their plans? I bet not.

Because as I read the comments of the planners for Heartland 2050, I read about how important high density housing is to the future population growth. So, concerns about the desire for suburban housing seem to have been batted away.

And here’s an important point to consider. Once the ban on

suburban development (urban sprawl, the call it disdainfully) is in place, there is now a controlled living area. It doesn’t grow. What happens when the population of the community does grow? It gets crowded. More densely populated.

In Portland, the planners kept upping the density requirements for housing. To increase urban densities, the planners turned dozens of neighborhoods of single-family homes into apartments and condos.

If you owned a vacant lot, you could not build a single-family house on it – you would have to build a row house or apartment. In some cases, the restrictions were so strict that if your house burned down, you could not rebuild a single family home on the property.

Eventually, Portland planners decided that row houses and low-rise apartments were not enough. They changed the rules to enforce the building of high rise apartment buildings. Pack and Stack, we call them.

They call them livable, walkable communities. Then they gave tax breaks, below-market land sales and other subsidies to developers who built the high rises. That meant that traditional neighborhoods were invaded by high rise developments.

The center of the plan was the light rail train system. The desirable homes (according to the planners) were those built along the rail line. This would assure ridership, they claimed.

Whoops. Independent studies reveal that the people living in them don’t ride transit any more than residents in single family neighborhoods.

In Atlanta, Georgia, the push was on to build a light rail transportation system. One resident studied the plan, took the official estimated construction cost and overlaid that with the number of predicted riders of the system and found that he could buy every single rider their own limo and even throw in a driver.

The result of Portland’s grand plan is that increased density destroyed the small town atmosphere. Congestion is worse, Housing and consumer costs are higher and urban services such as fire, police, and schools have declined as the city took money from these programs to subsidize high-density developers.

Above all, the planners of Heartland 2050 are excited that it is receiving grants for the federal department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD was one of the major participants in the UN Habitat Meetings and in the implementation of Agenda 21.

Moreover, just this year, Obama announced that through a HUD program, neighborhoods would now be tested for diversity and if there weren’t enough minorities or low income residents living

in them, they would force the input of more in such neighborhoods. What do you think the grants from HUD will require your local planners to do with that money?

Agenda 21 has been spread throughout the nation by the strings attached to HUD and EPA and other federal grants. It’s the Kool Aid. The EPA is one of the founding members of the Smart Growth Network.

The Consequences of Living in Smart Growth

And what is it like living in these controlled habitats? The EPA's drive to control water across the West threatens to destroy ranching and make that entire half of the United States unlivable. Worse, the EPA is now working on regulations to define every mud puddle as a navigatable waterway, giving the federal government complete control of every drop of water in the US. They are now even taxing the rain as they place fees on rain water runoff on churches and stores that have large parking lots.

In Orem, Utah, Betty Perry was arrested, handcuffed, and put in a holding tank because the grass in her front yard was dying. Violation – said the local zoning enforcement officer.

Julie Bass, in Oak Park, Michigan, wanted to plant an organic garden in her yard. She even asked the Mayor and the City Council if it was OK. Both said yes. But as she went to work on it she too was arrested by the local zoning enforcement officer and faced 90 days in jail.

Power companies, in partnership with government, are now installing smart meters on private homes. These meters give the power company control over the temperature in your home. They will control the thermostat as a means to “cut your carbon footprint” under the excuse of stopping global warming.

Across the nation, the FDA is swarming over producers of unprocessed milk, confiscating products and shutting down plants, arresting producers and buyers alike – even though there have been no reports of sickness or deaths. Not even a complaint.

In Montgomery County, Ohio, Jennie Granato and her family are the victims of the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission as they are forcing a bike highway across their property. That path runs within 7 feet of their front door. Their entire front yard has been bulldozed. The house has become unlivable. And they've been offered virtually no compensation from the government for the taking.

This is a major danger of regional government. Regional governments, councils and departments are unelected. They are not dependent on the citizens and therefore not responsive to your complaints.

Your local officials, whom you elected to represent you – shrug their shoulders and say, gee I can't help you. You need to talk to the regional planners. And in that way, government is spiraling out of control.

It's interesting to note that the UN Commission on Global Governance said this: *“Regionalism must precede globalism. We foresee a seamless system of governance from local communities, individual states, regional unions and up through the United Nations itself.”*

In King County, Washington 17,000 residents have petitioned their local government to change land use policies that have resulted in a loss of 65% of their property.

In Fauquier County, VA, organic farmer Martha Boneta faced fines of \$15,000 a day as her small farm store was closed down.

All for holding a children's birthday party on her own land without the proper permit.

These are not the actions of a free society. Americans are guaranteed the right through the Fourth Amendment to the Constitution to be secure in our homes.

The problem is not traditional zoning and planning. The problem is the emergence of raw government power that is unchecked and out of control as it ignores individual liberty and private property rights.

Further, we see more and more governments imposing arbitrary rules that try to enforce a one-size fits all straightjacket on everyone, regardless of individual situations. And more government power leads to more government corruption.

Even if you believe there needs to be changes in our society to protect the environment, surely any honest America would admit that such actions by government are out of line.

Yet, as Americans are being forced to live this way, all under the excuse of environmental protection – here is the kicker - the little known fact- that none of it is necessary – because it doesn't work.

A couple of years ago, the American Planning Association did a study to see if all of their efforts to enforce Smart Growth worked. The APA's won study reported that Smart Growth does not work!

Here is the final concluding paragraph of that APA-sponsored study:

“The current planning policy strategies for land use and transportation have virtually no impact on the major long term increases in resource and energy consumption. They generally tend to increase costs and reduce economic competitiveness...In many cases, the socioeconomic consequences of less housing choices, crowding, and congestion may outweigh the very modest co2 reduction benefits.”

But, does the APA plan to chance its planning policies? Not on your life. Why? Money. The grant money it lives on would dry up if they ever decided to take their foot off our throats and let people and local communities decide for themselves – as we did when we build the richest, freest nation in history.

And that's why I and thousands of other Americans are so concerned. Nameless, faceless bureaucrats wielding power in the backrooms, untouchable and unseen, is not freedom.

Agenda 21 proposes a global regime that will monitor, oversee, and strictly regulate our planet's oceans, lakes, streams, rivers, aquifers, sea beds, coastlands, wetlands, forests, jungles, grasslands, farmland, deserts, tundra, and mountains. It even has a whole section on regulating and “protecting” the atmosphere. It proposes plans for cities, towns, suburbs, villages, and rural areas. It envisions a global scheme for healthcare, education, nutrition, agriculture, labor, production, and consumption – in short everything.

There is nothing on, in, over, or under the Earth that doesn't fall within the purview of some part of Agenda 21.

But we who oppose it frankly don't accept the premise that we must destroy our human civilization in order to protect the environment.

We believe in free markets and free societies where people make their own decisions, and develop their own property. And we fully believe that the true path to a strong protection of the environment is through private property ownership and limited government.

Private property ownership is the reason the United States has been the richest, freest nation in the world. Isn't it significant to see that as private property comes under attack through Sustainable Development, that our country is also becoming less wealthy and less free!

It's time that we had a government that treats property owners like OWNERS – not chattel to be pushed around at their whim. It's time to treat property owners like adults.

Those who promote Agenda 21 do not believe in those ideals. And so, we will not agree on the path to the future. In short, our fight is a clash of the age-old philosophy of life -- Freedom to live as you choose -- or control by an unseen few. There is very little room for middle ground.

The United States has never been part of a global village

in which the rules for life have been handed down by some self-appointed village elders. We are a nation of laws that were designed to protect our right to our property and our individual life choices, while keeping government reined in. We oppose Agenda 21 precisely because it is an agenda to transform our nation into the exact opposite view of government control.

I know many of you are discouraged. Feeling hopeless. Believing we have lost our precious Republic. But in cities and towns across the nation real opposition is beginning to stir.

Americans are beginning to learn the tyranny of Sustainable policy. And they have started to fight back.

They are challenging the planners. Legislators are starting to write laws against it. In fact, for the first time I'm starting to hear from elected officials asking for ideas on how to oppose it.

Already more than 150 cities have ended their memberships in ICLEI. At least 10 state legislatures have passed anti-Sustainable legislation, and even the Republican Party has included anti-Agenda 21 language in its platform.

A revolution has begun. The fight starts on the local level. And if we can maintain freedom in our own community – we can do it as a nation.

And so, for the first time since I started down the road to expose Agenda 21 more than 20 years ago, I can clearly see that, if we stay vigilant and vigorous – if we refuse to hang our heads in despair – if we take the offensive -- we will succeed in crushing it. ●

Jihad *Continued from Page 7*

It fits a depressing pattern: of the White House, Democrats and liberals shutting down debate, permitting no amendments, conducting business behind closed doors, not allowing anyone to read proposed laws and regulations, rarely even recognizing that there are differing views – on ObamaCare, ObamaNetCare, IRS harassment of conservative donors and groups, PM Netanyahu's speech to Congress, or climate change.

The Climate Crisis industry thrives on *tens of billions of dollars annually*, for one-sided climate research, drilling and fracking studies, renewable energy projects and other programs, all based on dubious claims that carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gas emissions threaten climate stability and planetary survival.

Businesses, job holders and consumers pay the huge costs of complying with the resultant regulations and soaring energy costs. Taxpayers pay for much of the research and propaganda that drives the rulemaking. Russia and hard-left foundations have also contributed billions to the process; and government unions, environmental pressure groups and renewable energy companies give generously to researchers and to politicians who keep the alarmist research programs, regulatory processes, mandates and subsidies alive.

All of this raises another elephantine issue. If a couple million dollars over a decade's time creates near-criminal conflict-of-interest and disclosure problems for skeptic/realist scientists, what effects do billions of dollars in research money have on alarmist researchers and their universities and institutions?

Few, if any, alarmist researchers have disclosed that their work was funded by government agencies, companies, foundations and others with *enormous financial, policy, political and other interests* in their work, ensuring that their conclusions support manmade factors and debunk natural causes. Many of those researchers have signed statements that their research and papers involved no conflicts, knowing they would not get these grants, if their outcomes did not reflect the sponsors' interests and perspectives.

Moreover, ClimateGate, IPCC revelations and other investigations have revealed extensive and troubling incidents of manipulated data, faulty models, wild exaggerations, broken hockey sticks, and completely baseless claims about hottest years, disappearing glaciers, coastal flooding and other "crises." And those claims severely impact our energy costs, jobs, living standards, economic growth and freedoms.

We need to end the double standards – and investigate the alarmist researchers and institutions.

Or perhaps better yet, let us instead have that all-out, open, robust debate that climate realists have long sought – and alarmists have refused to join. Equal government and other money for all research. All cards and evidence on the table. No more hiding data and codes. Answer all questions, no matter how tough or inconvenient. And let honest science decide what our energy and economic futures will be.

Paul Driessen is senior policy analyst for the Committee For A Constructive Tomorrow (www.CFACT.org), author of [Eco-Imperialism: Green power - Black death](#), and coauthor of [Cracking Big Green: Saving the world from the Save-the-Earth money machine](#).

Climatist Jihad?

Climate Crisis extremists attack experts who challenge claims of imminent climate Armageddon

By Paul Driessen

ISIL and other Islamist jihad movements continue to round up and silence all who oppose them or refuse to convert to their extreme religious tenets. They are inspiring thousands to join them. Their intolerance, vicious tactics and growing power seem to have inspired others, as well.

After years of claiming the science is settled and unprecedented manmade catastrophes are occurring right now, Climate Crisis, Inc. is increasingly desperate. Polls put climate change at the bottom of every list of public concerns. China and India refuse to cut energy production or emissions. Real-world weather and climate totally contradict their dire models and forecasts. Expensive, subsidized, environmentally harmful renewable energy makes little sense in world freshly awash in cheap, accessible oil, gas and coal.

Perhaps worse, Congress is in Republican control, and in 23 months the White House and Executive Branch could also shift dramatically away from the Freezing-Jobless-in-the-Dark Side of the Force.

Climate Crisis industrialists are also fed up with constant carping, criticism and questions from growing numbers of experts who will not kowtow to their End of Days theology. Once seemingly near, their dream of ruling a hydrocarbon-free world of “sustainably” lower living standards become more remote every week. Extremist factions had dreamed of a global climatist caliphate and want vengeance.

So borrowing from Barack Obama and Hillary Clinton mentor Saul Alinsky’s book, *Rules for Radicals*, they have gone on the attack: Pick a target, freeze it, personalize it, and polarize it. A good tactic is one your people enjoy. A tactic that drags on too long becomes a drag. Keep the pressure on, with different tactics and actions. They’ve also borrowed from the Islamic State playbook: **Silence your enemies.**

Led by Greenpeace associate Kert Davies, this Climatist Jihad wing of the climate chaos movement has launched a well funded, carefully choreographed vendetta of character assassination and destruction, vilifying dangerous manmade climate change “deniers” and trying to destroy their careers. Their Big Green, Big Government and media allies are either actively complicit, rooting from the sidelines or silent.

Instead of bullets, bombs and beheadings, they use double standards, Greenpeace FOIA demands, letters from Senator Ed Markey and Congressman Raul Grijalva, threats of lost funding and jobs, and constant intimidation and harassment. Submit, recant, admit your guilt, renounce your nature-rules-climate faith, Climatist Jihadis tell climate realists. Or suffer the consequences, which might even include IRS, EPA and Fish & Wildlife Service SWAT teams bursting through your doors, as they did with Gibson Guitars.

Their first target was Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics scientist Wei-Hock “Willie” Soon. Working closely with Greenpeace’s Climate Investigations Center, the *Boston Globe* and *New York Times* alleged that Dr. Soon received \$1.25 million from the fossil fuel industry, but failed to disclose those funds when his scientific papers were published and falsely claimed he had no conflict of interest.

The charges are bogus. Harvard had full knowledge of Dr. Soon’s research financing and took 40% of the grant money off the top: some \$500,000! The details are all public records, and Dr. Soon has a solid track record of going where his careful and extensive research takes him – regardless of where the money comes from. Not a scrap of evidence suggests that he falsified or fabricated data or conclusions, or twisted his science to satisfy research sponsors, on any of the numerous topics he has studied.

He has received incredible flak from environmentalist pressure groups, media outlets and even his own university – and has courageously stood behind his research, analyses and findings, which continue to withstand intense scientific scrutiny. Harvard-Smithsonian recently said it “does not support Dr. Soon’s conclusions on climate change,” and Harvard Earth and Planetary Sciences Professor Daniel Schrag averred that Soon’s approach to finding global average temperatures was perhaps not “as honest as other approaches.” But they offer not a scintilla of evidence to support their allegations of inaccuracy and dishonesty, and give him no opportunity to respond.

Indeed, one of the most prominent aspects of the climate imbroglia is the steadfast refusal of alarmist scientists to discuss or debate their findings with experts who argue that extensive, powerful *natural* forces – not human carbon dioxide emissions – drive Earth’s climate and weather. “Manmade disaster” proponents also refuse to divulge raw data, computer codes and other secretive work that is often paid for with taxpayer money and is always used to justify laws, treaties, regulations, mandates and subsidies that stifle economic growth, kill jobs and reduce living standards.

Dr. Soon is not the only target. The Climate Jihadists are also going after Robert Balling, Matt Briggs, John Christy, Judith Curry, Tom Harris, Steven Hayward, David Legates, Richard Lindzen, and Roger Pielke, Jr. More are sure to follow, because their work eviscerates climate cataclysm claims and raises serious questions about the accuracy, credibility, integrity and sanctity of alarmist science.

Climate Crisis, Inc. wants a monopoly over the issue. Its members focus almost exclusively on alleged human causes of climate change and extreme weather events – and would love to see skeptics silenced. Crisis proponents will not even attend scientific conferences where skeptics discuss natural causes and alarmists have opportunities to defend their hypotheses, models and evidence. (Perhaps the FCC needs to investigate this monopoly and issue “climate neutrality” rules, to ensure honest and balanced discussion.)

Continued to Page 7