


Report Sheds Light On The Rockefeller Family's Covert "Climate Change" Plan

by

Arjun Walia

on

[Collective Evolution](#)



1. The Facts: In the 1980s, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund became the authority of global warming. Why would they do this? Are these people really concerned about our planet or simply profiting and justifying heightened states of security for ulterior motives?
2. Reflect On: Why are there so many brilliant scientists publishing papers and making points but are never given any attention? Why are they ridiculed and character assassinated by the mainstream? What is going on here?

The climate is changing, and it has been changing for a very long time. In fact, the climate has always been changing, and there are a myriad of factors that influence climate change like solar activity and much more. If you're not educated on climate science, it's easy to adopt the "doomsday" perspective that's often dished out by mainstream media. However, when you look at what actual climate scientists are saying, it doesn't seem like anyone on either side agrees with the media's "climate hysteria" narrative.

The main argument among those who ascribe to the hysteria perspective is that CO2 levels are



the highest they've ever been since we started to record them, currently sitting at approximately 415 parts per million (ppm). It's not like climate scientists disagree on the idea that CO2 causes some warming of our atmosphere, that seems to be a fact that's firmly established in scientific literature. But what's never mentioned is the fact that CO2 levels have been significantly higher than what they are now; in fact, CO2 levels have been in thousands ppm and Earth's temperature has been much warmer than it is now. The idea that human CO2 emissions are responsible for shifts and changes in the climate is not scientifically valid, yet policy initiatives that do nothing for our environment are being produced and put forward, putting large sums of money in the pockets of some very powerful people.

Our crop plants evolved about 400 million years ago, when CO2 in the atmosphere was about 5000 parts per million! Our evergreen trees and shrubs evolved about 360 million years ago, with CO2 levels at about 4,000 ppm. When our deciduous trees evolved about 160 million years ago, the CO2 level was about 2,200 ppm – still five times the current level. – Dennis T. Avery, agricultural and environmental economist, senior fellow for the Center for Global Food Issues in Virginia, and formerly a senior analyst for the U.S. Department of State ([source](#))

CO2 causing a temperature increase is the backbone of the global warming argument, but does CO2 even cause the temperature to increase, or does an increase in temperature cause a rise in CO2?

"The question is how does the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) determine that an increase in atmospheric CO2 causes an increase in global temperature? The answer is they assumed it was the case and confirmed it by increasing CO2 levels in their computer climate models and the temperature went up. Science must overlook the fact that they wrote the computer code that told the computer to increase temperature with a CO2 increase. Science must ask if that sequence is confirmed by empirical evidence? Some scientists did that and found the empirical evidence showed it was not true. Why isn't this central to all debate about anthropogenic global warming?" – Dr. Tim Ball, ([source](#)) former professor in the Department of Geography at the University of Winnipeg

William Happer, American physicist and the Cyrus Fogg Brackett Professor of Physics, Emeritus, at Princeton University, is one of what seems to be thousands of academics to go unheard by the mainstream media who shares the same perspective:

In every careful study, the temperature first rises and then CO2 rises, and the temperature first falls and then CO2 falls, temperature is causing changes of CO2 at least for the last million years, there's no question about that. ([source](#))

He also pointed out the major ice ages in Earth's past when CO2 levels were also extremely high, much higher than they are now, and did so to show how the correlation between CO2 and temperature is "not all that good."

In their paper on the [Vostok Ice Core, Petit et al \(1999\)](#), they show how CO2 lags temperature during the onset of glaciations by several thousands of years, but offer no explanation. They also observe that CH4 and CO2 are not perfectly aligned with each other, but offer no explanation. The significance is that temperature may influence CO2 amounts. At the onset of glaciations, temperature drops to glacial values before CO2 begins to fall, suggesting that CO2 has little influence on temperature modulation at these times as well.

In 1988, the NASA scientist James Hansen told the US Senate that the summer's warmth reflected increased carbon dioxide levels. Even Science magazine reported that the climatologists were skeptical.

The reason we now take this position as dogma is due to political actors and others seeking to exploit the opportunities that abound in the multi-trillion dollar energy sector. One person who benefited from this was Maurice Strong, a global bureaucrat and wheeler-dealer (who spent his final years in China apparently trying to avoid prosecution for his role in the UN's Oil for Food program scandals). Strong is frequently credited with initiating the global warming



movement in the early 1980s, and he subsequently helped to engineer the Rio Conference that produced the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change. Others like Olaf Palme and his friend, Bert Bolin, who was the first chairman of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, were also involved as early as the 1970s. – Dr. Richard Lindzen ([source](#))

Since 1999, this theory has been discussed in numerous scientific papers, but not one shred of evidence exists to confirm that a CO₂ increase causes "extreme warming".

Doubling CO₂ involves a 2% perturbation to this budget. So do minor changes in clouds and other features, and such changes are common. In this complex multifactor system, what is the likelihood of the climate (which, itself, consists in many variables and not just globally averaged temperature anomaly) is controlled by this 2% perturbation in a single variable? Believing this is pretty close to believing in magic. Instead, you are told that it is believing in "science". Such a claim should be a tip-off that something is amiss. After all, science is a mode of inquiry rather than a belief structure. The accumulation of false and/or misleading claims is often referred to as the "overwhelming evidence" for forthcoming catastrophe. Without these claims, one might legitimately ask whether there is any evidence at all. Lindzen ([source](#))

Another quote stressing this point:

Now here is the currently popular narrative concerning this system. The climate, a complex multifactor system, can be summarized in just one variable, the globally averaged temperature change, and is primarily controlled by the 1-2% perturbation in the energy budget due to a single variable – carbon dioxide – among many variables of comparable importance. This is an extraordinary pair of claims based on reasoning that borders on magical thinking. It is, however, the narrative that has been widely accepted, even among many sceptics. This acceptance is a strong indicator of the problem Snow identified. Many politicians and learned societies go even further: They endorse carbon dioxide as the controlling variable, and although mankind's CO₂ contributions are small compared to the much larger but uncertain natural exchanges with both the oceans and the biosphere, they are confident that they know precisely what policies to implement in order to control. Lindzen ([source](#))

The quotes above comes from Richard Lindzen, an atmospheric physicist who has published more than 200 scientific papers and books. He was the Alfred P. Sloan Professor of Meteorology at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and he is actually the lead author of Chapter 7, "Physical Climate Processes and Feedbacks," of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change's Third Assessment Report on climate change (the organization that's pushing the global warming and climate change agenda).

A number of times, Lindzen and many others have been quite outspoken regarding the conclusions of this document that are drawn by politicians, not scientists. There will be more on that later in the article.

According to Dr. Leslie Woodcock, emeritus professor at the University of Manchester (UK) School of Chemical Engineering and Analytical Science, is a former NASA scientist:

The term "climate change" is meaningless. The Earth's climate has been changing since time immemorial, that is since the Earth was formed 1,000 million years ago. The theory of "man-made climate change" is an unsubstantiated hypothesis [about] our climate [which says it] has been adversely affected by the burning of fossil fuels in the last 100 years, causing the average temperature on the earth's surface to increase very slightly but with disastrous environmental consequences. The theory is that the CO₂ emitted by burning fossil fuel is the "greenhouse gas" causing "global warming" — in fact, water is a much more powerful greenhouse gas and there is 20 times more of it in our atmosphere (around one per cent of the atmosphere) whereas CO₂ is only 0.04 per cent. There is no reproducible scientific evidence CO₂ has significantly increased in the last 100 years. Anecdotal evidence doesn't



mean anything in science, it's not significant... ([source](#))

In the IPCC documents, we can see how tenuous the link between climate change and CO2 emissions are, specifically in their findings titled "[Climate Change 2001: The Scientific Basis](#)". Here was one of their recommendations:

Explore more fully the probabilistic character of future climate states by developing multiple ensembles of model calculations. The climate system is a coupled non-linear chaotic system, and therefore the long-term prediction of future exact climate states is not possible. Rather the focus must be upon the prediction of the probability distribution of the system's future possible states by the generation of ensembles of model solutions.

If we go back to the [1995 2nd Assessment Report](#) of the UN IPCC, we can see how much the agenda overshadowed and muted the actual science. The scientists included these three statements in the draft:

1. "None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases."
2. "No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic (i.e. man-made) causes."
3. "Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the natural variability of the climate system are reduced."

The "Summary" and conclusion statement of the IPCC report was written by politicians, not scientists. The rules force the "scientists" to change their reports to match the politicians' final "Summary". Those three statements by "scientists" above were replaced with this:

1. "The balance of evidence suggests a discernible human influence on global climate."

Here's another great point made by Lindzen:

How did we get to this point where the science seized to be interested in the fascinating question of accounting for the remarkable history of the Earth's climate for an understanding of how climate actually works and instead devoted itself to a component of political correctness. Perhaps one should take a broader view of what's going on. ([source](#))

Below are some more comments by him regarding the politics of climate science. It's something I compare to the politicization of medical science and the corporate takeover of medical science by big pharma. Medicine is another area where we see brilliant minds creating awareness and publishing papers that, for some reason, get ridiculed and the authors are subjected to character assassination.

[MIT Professor Richard Lindzen On the Corruption of Climate Science](#)

The 97 Percent Claim

The mainstream media and people who support the idea that humans are warming the planet often quote the fact that "97 percent of scientists agree with them". First of all, this is not true, and again, we don't know if humans are warming the planet.

This claim is actually a come-down from the 1988 claim on the cover of Newsweek that all scientists agree. In either case, the claim is meant to satisfy the non-expert that he or she has no need to understand the science. Mere agreement with the 97% will indicate that one is a supporter of science and superior to anyone denying disaster. This actually satisfies a psychological need for many people. The claim is made by a number of individuals and there are a number of ways in which the claim is presented. A thorough [debunking has been given in the Wall Street Journal](#) by Bast and Spencer. One of the dodges is to poll scientists as to whether they agree that CO2 levels in the atmosphere have increased, that the Earth



has been warming (albeit only a little) and that man has played some part. This is, indeed, something almost all of us can agree on, but which has no obvious implication of danger. Nonetheless this is portrayed as support for catastrophism. Other dodges involve looking at a large number of abstracts where only a few actually deal with danger. If among these few, 97% support catastrophism, the 97% is presented as pertaining to the much larger totality of abstracts. One of my favorites is the [recent claim](#) in the Christian Science Monitor (a once respected and influential newspaper): "For the record, of the nearly 70,000 peer-reviewed articles on global warming published in 2013 and 2014, four authors rejected the idea that humans are the main drivers of climate change." I don't think that it takes an expert to recognize that this claim is a bizarre fantasy for many obvious reasons. – Richard Lindzen, from his paper ["Straight Talk About Climate Change"](#), where he goes into greater detail.

This is a deep topic and there are many points to make. [Here's](#) a great video by Alex Epstein, founder of the Center for Industrial Progress for Prager University, explaining the 97 percent myth and where it came from.

Below is a video from Lindzen that sums up the issue quite well.

[Climate Change: What Do Physicists Say?](#)

The Other Side of The Coin

A 2013 study in [Environmental Research Letters](#) claimed that 97% of climate scientists agreed with the "humans changing the climate" narrative in 12,000 academic papers that contained the words "global warming" or "global climate change" from 1991 to 2011. Not long ago, that paper [hit 1m downloads](#), making it the most accessed paper ever among the 80+ journals published by the Institute of Physics (as Lindzen mentions above, many of these papers are being published by scientists outside of climate physics), according to the authors.

A recent article that presents more scientific studies was published [in the Guardian](#), titled "No Doubt Left About Scientific Consensus on Global Warming, say experts".

Why So Much Conflicting Information?

Obviously, there is an ongoing debate surrounding climate change, and many people still think something fishy is going on here. It's similar to the vaccines argument, or a host of other issues that never receive any attention from the mainstream media. Instead of presenting the concerns of scientists from the other side, or the side often labelled "skeptics", these scientists are often heavily ridiculed by mainstream media.

A great example is [this](#) dialogue, which is quite old now, between Lindzen and Bill Nye. It's not hard to see that Nye has no idea what he is talking about, and he's simply being used because, at that time, he had a large following.

The reason why so many people are unaware of the arguments made by climate "skeptics" is because their points are never presented by mainstream media in the same way the other side's are. The media controls the minds of the masses, but thankfully this is changing.

We Here At CE Care Deeply For The Planet

We here at CE care deeply about our planet and creating harmony on it. Since we were founded in 2009, we've been creating massive amounts of awareness regarding clean energy technologies and the harmful industries polluting and destroying our planet. The issue is not with finding solutions, we already have those for the most part, the issue is with the systems we have that prevent these solutions from ever seeing the light of day. In fact, we have been heavily involved with multiple clean energy projects and assisting them in coming into fruition.

Opposing the "doom and gloom" global warming narrative does not mean we do not care for our

environment; in fact, it's quite the opposite. We feel that politicians meeting every single year for the past few decades have done absolutely nothing to clean up our planet, and instead have been coming up with ways to simply make money off of green technology that cuts CO2 emissions.

If the people in power, with all of their resources, really wanted to change the planet, it would have happened by now.

While our focus is on CO2, not nearly enough attention and resources are going into re-planting our planet, cleaning up our fresh water lakes and oceans, and changing our manufacturing habits to cause less waste and less pollution. If anything, this should be our main focus, especially when it's not really clear that CO2 is an issue.

Environmental and species protection should be our first priority, but it's not. I believe this green revolution is a distraction and, in many ways, further harms our environment by taking our focus off of what's really important and putting it on something that is not impacting our planet in a negative way.

The Rockefeller Report

In the 1980s, the Rockefeller Brothers Fund became the sole authority of the global warming agenda. The fund boasts of being one of the first major global activists by citing its strong advocacy for both the 1988 formation of the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the 1992 creation of the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change.

The global elite have always benefited in some way shape or form from crises, we've seen it over and over again with war.

What is important, however, is to acknowledge the role of the Rockefeller family –which historically was the architect of "Big Oil"– in supporting the Climate Change debate as well as the funding of scientists, environmentalists and NGOs involved in grassroots activism against "Big Oil" and the fossil fuel industry.

Debate on the world's climate is of crucial importance. But who controls that debate?

There is an obvious contradictory relationship: Whereas "Big Oil" is the target of Global Warming activism, "Big Oil" through the Rockefeller Family and Rockefeller Brothers Trusts generously finance the Worldwide climate protest movement. Ask yourself Why? – Michel Chossudovsky, Canadian economist and Professor Emeritus of Economics at the University of Ottawa

You can access the full report [here](#). It was published by the Energy & Environmental Legal Institute in 2016.

An Example of Other Factors Influencing The Climate - A Coming Ice Age?

[Nils-Axel Mörner](#) from the Paleogeophysics and Geodynamics Institute states,

By about 2030-2040, the Sun will experience a new grand solar minimum. This is evident from multiple studies of quite different characteristics: the phasing of sunspot cycles, the cyclic observations of North Atlantic behaviour over the past millennium, the cyclic pattern of cosmogenic ra-dionuclides in natural terrestrial archives, the motions of the Sun with respect to the centre of mass, the planetary spin-orbit coupling, the planetary conjunction history and the general planetary solar terrestrial interaction. During the previous grand solar minima—i.e. the Spörer Minimum (ca 1440-1460), the Maunder Minimum (ca 1687-1703) and the Dalton Minimum (ca 1809-1821)—the climatic conditions deteriorated into Little Ice Age periods.



The idea that solar activity is not affecting Earth's climate is extremely fishy and doesn't make much sense when you go through the literature, but it seems to be brushed off within mainstream academia, and hardly studied. It definitely made me scratch my head when IFL Science, for example, [put out a statement](#) saying "The Sun simply does not have that large an effect on our climate compared to human activity." This is a very ridiculous and irresponsible statement. It's also important that readers recognize there isn't even any course to back up such a false claim.

Don't believe what is written, research what is written. What's worse is the ridicule factor, the way mainstream publications attack any narrative that presents an explanation for climate change that is not human induced. Something is very wrong with this picture, regardless of your stance on the "global warming" phenomenon. There is more on this later in the article.

The paper by Morner goes on to make some very important points:

Several of the papers in the Special Issue of PRP [1] addressed the question of an approaching new Solar Minimum. The conclusions [21] were quite straightforward: Obviously we are on our way into a new grand solar minimum. This sheds serious doubts on the issue of a continued, even accelerated, warming as proposed by the IPCC project.

This quite innocent—and very true—conclusion [21] made the publisher take the quite remarkable step to close down the entire scientific journal [32].

This closing down gave rise to turbulence and objections within the scientific community [31] [33]-[39]. It even became the incitement to a new book [2].

In this paper, I will review some of the leading facts for the proposition of an approaching Grand Solar Minimum and a related climatic deterioration of Little Ice Age type, in analogy with what happened during the last three solar minima, viz. the Dalton, Maunder and Spörer Minima.

2. The Claim of Priority

With respect to all the authors having claimed that we are approaching a solar minimum and/or a new Little Ice Age [1] [2] [5]-[31], there is hard, even meaningless, to try to identify a paper of priority (maybe [8]). Apparently, several authors had the same idea based on a verity of different data; heliomagnetic cyclicity, atmospheric production of radionuclides, planetary beat, history and cyclicity of various terrestrial variables.

What we can say, however, is that paper [25] by no means is a candidate for such a priority although this was claimed by media and some blogs [40]. There are many "pioneer" papers before that paper.

I am well aware of the saying: the true pioneers never (or at least seldom) get credit for the discovery.

We leave this discussion with references to a number of preceding papers [1] [5] [6]-[21].

So as you can see, the comment from IFL science quoted above, again, is simply not true. I've provided one of many sources available here, and I encourage other writers to do the same.

The author goes on to conclude:

During the last three grand solar minima...global climate experienced Little Ice Age conditions. Arctic water penetrated to the south all the way down to Mid-Portugal, and Europe experienced severe climatic conditions... The Arctic ice over expanded significantly... By 2030-2040, we will be in a New Grand Solar Minimum, which by analogy to past minima must be assumed to lead to significant climatic deterioration with ice expansion in the Arctic...We now seem to be in possession of quite convergent data...This precludes a continual warming as claimed by the IPCC project, instead of this, we are likely to face a new Little Ice Age.

According to the Royal Astronomical Society (RAS,

A new model of the Sun's solar cycle is producing unprecedentedly accurate predictions of irregularities within the Sun's 11-year heartbeat. The model draws on dynamo effects in two layers of the Sun, one close to the surface and one deep within its convection zone. Predictions from the model suggest that solar activity will fall by 60 per cent during the 2030s to conditions last seen during the "mini ice age" that began in 1645. ([source](#))



A few years ago, the National Astronomy Meeting in Wales was held, where Valentina Zharkova, a mathematics professor from Northumbria University (UK), presented a model that can predict what solar cycles will look like far more accurately than was previously possible. She states that the model can predict their influence with an accuracy of 97 percent, and says it is showing that Earth is heading for a "mini ice age" in approximately fifteen years.

Zharkova and her team came up with the model using a method called "principal component analysis" of the magnetic field observations, from the Wilcox Solar Observatory in California. Looking forward to the next few solar cycles, her model predicts that from 2030 to 2040 there will be cause for a significant reduction in solar activity, which again, will lead to a mini ice age. According to Zharkova. You can read more about that [here](#).

Again, these are just a few examples of multiple scientists pointing to these facts.

Is There An Agenda At Play Here?

In a recent episode of "The Collective Evolution Show" on CETV, Joe and CE team member [Richard Enos](#) dig deep into the science and break down the agenda behind the carbon tax and the related carbon emissions trading scheme. What becomes clear in our overall discussion is that the conclusions of scientists are not really getting out to the general public. All efforts are geared to try to make people believe that human activity through the burning of fossil fuels is the main cause of global warming, and that the science behind this is solid and well-established, even though it isn't. If you haven't signed up already for CETV, [go here](#) so you can get access to the full discussion.

CETV is a platform we created to combat internet censorship, which is another topic. Why are they silencing and ridiculing certain narratives? Why not just oppose them with information and evidence?

[How Politics Overtook The Global Warming Discussion](#)

The Takeaway

Many things in our world, including science, have become extremely corrupted. We see it with medical science and the influence from big pharma, and we see it with regards to federal health regulatory agencies like the CDC and FDA being compromised by corporations. Climate science is no different, which is why we see the mass ridicule of those who oppose the agenda by mainstream media.

Our Earth needs help, it needs to be cleaned up, and deforestation must halt as we are experiencing massive species extinction. None of this has anything, in my opinion, to do with human CO2 output.