

Chapter 13: Global Warming

Many people, at least in France, are concerned about global warming. Some think that, because of this warming, the planet is in danger. As I am also convinced that the planet is in danger, I cannot remain indifferent to their fear, even if I point out other causes of danger. The golden rule is that I take these concerns into consideration. I would like to take this opportunity to invite those who want us to be concerned about the climate, to also be concerned about peace.

First of all, we have to make a determination. Is global warming real? It would seem that in many places where temperatures are monitored, there is a significant increase. It also seems that in some places the temperature has dropped. But it seems that this is much more rare. Finally, as far as I'm concerned, I can say that snow is less and less present in France. I have been able to observe that the glaciers are shrinking. Does this mean that life on Earth is in danger or even just humanity? I don't think so, at least for the moment. Where I live, in a temperate climate, temperatures can rise by about ten degrees without requiring me to leave my region. I don't feel my life and my children's lives are in peril from which to escape. However, in some regions in the tropics, it could become unlivable for humans... if the climate increased by a dozen degrees. So the consideration of global warming is first the consideration that some other inhabitants of the Earth far away from me are going to have very great difficulties to live. I understand this perfectly, and it is in accordance with the golden rule. I would not want to live in this situation, so I must not behave in a way that causes it. I draw attention to the fact that it is in the same register to want peace on Earth. The first security is not to have war and violence at home. And in terms of respect and consideration for people, making sure that my country cannot militarily coerce other countries to take their wealth and exploit it is a priority. So, I'm fine to pay attention to global warming. But the necessary counterpart is that we must not forget that this does not concern everyone and that any action that might be taken must be carried out in a spirit of consideration for others and peace. This is very important, because you have my support, and the support of many people due to consideration for others, not because I want a lower temperature around me. To go and force or even slaughter or exploit someone for a lower temperature does not have my support. Some people cannot be allowed to do this for global warming reasons. Secondly, I would like to know why the problem of a peril is focused on global warming. Besides the problem of the danger of wars, there are other environmental problems that concern me directly, such as the pollution of the air, water, oceans, our

food, radio waves, radiation, deforestation, ... I would not want to support a fight against global warming that would aggravate these other problems. So the goal is admissible, but it is essential to pay attention to the means and the way to proceed.

To act on global warming, we must know the causes. We are talking about a global phenomenon. It is reasonable to think that the problem is multiple and complex. What would be the causes of global warming? I am trying to understand what preoccupies people and governments so much around the climate and everything leads to the IPCC. The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). Unfortunately, we must remember that this group is at the initiative and within the framework of the UN. Yes, I say unfortunately, because this organization has behaved so grotesquely with Libya, as explained in the chapter on the peace plan, that its activities are discredited. If my explanations are not enough for you, please refer to Patrick Mbeko's book "Objectif Kadhafi". I therefore call on those who believe that the activities of the IPCC should be taken seriously, to understand and repair the dysfunctions in the management of the Libyan crisis at the UN. As I mentioned in the peace plan, it seems that the madmen have taken over the madhouse. But in the madhouse, there is the IPCC. One cannot do anything without consequences.

You may consider the work of the IPCC, but you should be very wary about it, especially about the true intentions of this group. And as long as there has been no reparation for the management of the Libyan crisis at the UN, elementary morality forbids you to use the work of this UN group to assert certainties to someone other than yourself. You should also know that the publications of this group are a synthesis between scientists and politicians. This is not a problem in itself, but it should be kept in mind. What is advocated by this group is thus a consensus negotiated with politicians, in no case it is a "scientific truth". It is a compromise where Science is compromised.

With these precautions in mind, now, reader, you have to take action. Not inviting to action, but acting yourself for your environment. Go and see by yourself what the IPCC says, as I did for CETA and UN Resolution 1970 in other chapters. Make sure that the reality you get about ecology is what the IPCC says and what it recommends for political leaders. It is important that you do this because you will find that these people are not aware of the limiting principle of science number 4, that the statistical model is limiting. Statistics can be interesting, but they will put you in a bind if you don't make the effort to understand and validate your understanding. Since this point is important, I'll tell you an imaginary story, which highlights the fact that not understanding a simple problem and relying on statistical studies leads to big trouble.

Once upon a time, a family had a partially blocked toilet drain. I should point out that this family had very poor lighting in their toilet and that the toilet was adjacent to the living area and not outside. The consequence of this partial blockage was that an odor spread through the house from the toilet without

the partial failure of the drain being identified. The family wondered and felt somewhat ashamed that it was their production that was making the odor. During a medical consultation, routine questions about stool were asked and the father reported that he found the smell of his stool unbearable. The doctor ordered humiliating and painful tests but did not identify the problem. However, the doctor had noticed that his patients often ate unbalanced meals, which he believed was the cause of many diseases. Rather than admit his ignorance, he told him that it was probably a food problem. So he suggested that he eat better and less. That's common sense, isn't it? The father reduced his food intake and invited his family to do the same. But with the drainage problem still present, the odor problem persisted and pests began to arrive. Opportunists seized the opportunity to sell whatever they could to this embarrassed family. Each opportunistic seller had his product and his supporting statistical study. All the technologies to kill all types of pests were sold to them. And once a vendor had made his sale, he would sell the family's address to other opportunistic vendors. It was then that a drug dealer, well aware of their problems, presented the family with the closest studies to an effective solution: cocaine. It was thus justified that the cocaine user kept his energy without eating and therefore without excrements for long periods of time, provided he took enough. Thus, the family would have no more food, no more excrement and therefore no more odor problems and in compliance with the doctor's prescription to eat less. Then, one day, a delivery man came to drop off a package and smelled the odor. He spontaneously told them to unclog their toilet. They did so and the odor problem disappeared. But the family still had the problem of cocaine and drug dealers for a while.

To explain the correspondence with global warming, the family represents the peoples of the earth, the provider of statistical studies is the IPCC, the dealer represents our political leaders, the opportunistic pest killers are the industrial lobbies, the excrement is CO₂, the odor is global warming, the insufficient evacuation corresponds to the absorption of CO₂ by the environment and the unclogging of the evacuation could be the reconstitution of the forests.

Go and read the IPCC reports and see that not everything that is said is in the direction of understanding. First, CO₂ is not toxic or polluting. Yes, it is an essential element for life. If you remove it, there will be no life on Earth. Life is a cycle, the waste of some is the raw material or food of others. Plants, and in particular trees, are the evacuation of our CO₂. Our CO₂ evacuator, plants and forests in particular, are attacked, plundered. It is common sense and essential to respect and restore this evacuator before speculating on something else.

Yet the IPCC recommends the development of CO₂ absorption technologies. While we already have trees at our disposal for free. The IPCC recommends to use the biomass as energy. Therefore to burn them. It does not alert that a third of the excess of CO₂ emission is due to deforestation. A

basic understanding is that trees allow an ecosystem to develop and trees allow water to penetrate the soil. You don't have to make statistical correlations with CO₂ to say that we will have floods or water shortages if water does not penetrate the soil. This is an inevitable consequence of deforestation. Deforestation is a major problem for ecology as a whole, including excess of CO₂, if you think CO₂ is a problem. Did you know that planting trees is as easy as doing an internet search? Someone had the brilliant idea to tap into the mass of money generated by search engines to plant trees. Are you aware that this can completely solve the problem of excess of CO₂? Why don't you know about this idea? Are you using it? Then, if you listen to what the IPCC or its sponsors say, they only talk about acting on CO₂, which has gone from 0.03% to 0.04% in the atmosphere. However, there are other greenhouse gases, whose effect is more marked and in much larger quantities, such as water, in the form of vapor or clouds. And the warmer it is, the more water vapor there is. So the gain in CO₂ that we can make is already negligible compared to all the extra water vapor that has appeared due to the warming that has already occurred. The IPCC has therefore also found its limit with water, it does not advocate eliminating water on Earth, perhaps that was a little big to pass. But in their logic of greenhouse gases, we are like in a combustion engine where there was a spark plug that causes a spark and fuel. Once the explosion has started, putting out the spark doesn't change anything. Wouldn't it make more sense to have a water vapor model, rather than a CO₂ model? Well, there is one, but not at the IPCC, and it is based on water vapor and clouds, cosmic rays and solar magnetic activity. According to this model, human activity has no impact. And their model is much more accurate and consistent than those of the IPCC. The IPCC, rather than questioning itself, prefers to draw our attention to the fact that the significant decrease in fish in the oceans and CO₂ are linked. It locks itself into statistics and does not mention overfishing. It is unaware of limiting principle number 4: the use of statistics is limiting. Scientists worthy of the title disengage from this group. With the IPCC, we are typically in the misleading principle number 10: submission to the authority figure. But you may still think that something should be done, because you are in doubt. You are also subject to the misleading principle number 15: the frustration that you want to evacuate and you only have in mind the solutions that are hammered into you by repetition according to the misleading principle number 3. Yes, there is a significant ecological problem, but it is not the problem that the IPCC is raising and the solutions they are advocating will not help. If you want to do something, you have to do something first by yourself. You can follow the IPCC's prescriptions, you, and for you, before trying to impose them on others. Reduce your CO₂ production, see what your limit is. The more you try, the more questions you will have. The IPCC has no limits and it is more and more sure of itself. Some people believe that the solution is zero carbon. Eventually, you will have to find a way to stop breathing because it is very

likely that you will emit CO₂ when you breathe. You can also go to Fukushima and Chernobyl to see by yourself what a nuclear plant can do. If you still think that you should follow the IPCC's recommendation to multiply by 5 the number of nuclear power plants, talk to your neighbors to find out what they think about having a nuclear power plant near you, because by asking to follow what the IPCC says, you must be ready to have it for yourself, and therefore impose it on your neighbors. Your salvation lies in concrete action.

Thus, the recommendations of the IPCC are strangely similar to the recommendations that John Perkins was paid to make in order to get countries into debt or to recommend the construction of a nuclear power plant, which he now describes as the work of a financial hitman. You have to look at the fact that these climate experts are recommending investments of 2400 billion dollars a year to make the energy transition. And I believe that this is only the energy part, not the car, nor the insulation for example.

Although the IPCC denies it, it is economic policy. Especially since possible alternatives are not considered, such as the reduction of economic activity or a tax on products imported over a long distance. It's just that it's incompatible with the politics of free trade and usury necessitating growth. Do you remember that the production of the IPCC is a compromise between scientists and political leaders? So it does not seem that it is the scientists who are asking leaders to do something as it is presented to us, but that it is the political leaders who are trying to justify economic policy by scientists. Among these scientists, how many receive money from public funds driven by political leaders? Who pays for their climate research, their specialty, when they are not working for the IPCC? Wouldn't there be a conflict of interest from some members of this IPCC? You should thus come to the conclusion that the IPCC is a tool of political propaganda. The only alternatives the IPCC offers to help the planet are different amounts of indebtedness for more or less of the same solution. The only thing that is left in the public debate is to think about what to tax. It creates dissension, but giving your opinion on who should pay is not acting. In France, we are already fiscally mowed everywhere and in great deficit.

Changing the infernal spiral of debt is much more useful for the ecology. We will always run to more debts to repay others. This means more activity and according to the IPCC, always more CO₂. It is incomprehensible that the IPCC does not mention the path of degrowth if it is independent of political leaders. However, peace and a basic income will cause this usurious system to be abandoned. There will no longer be guns pointed at someone's head to force them to pay, therefore to force them to find a remunerative activity. I know it seems utopian and far to you, but it is above all the number of persons saying stop that counts. One of the major causes of the ecological problem, wars, violence is common: the exponential of interest bearing. Choose peace to settle this.

Now, if you want to act and still force others to act according to the recommendations of the IPCC, because you believe it is a good cause, make sure before you want to do good, not to do harm. Has your country participated directly or indirectly in the war in Libya? It is important to understand that the governments had the consent of the people to do this. I invite you to ask yourself if the system in place is not trying to obtain your consent to do something unhealthy. It is necessary that you understand what happened to obtain consent and carry out massacres in Libya.

Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) and associations have flourished with very reassuring names about their intentions to denounce imaginary abuses by Gaddafi and demand military intervention. These organizations are the relay that gives the moral backing to these lies and abuses. Check what is behind these organizations with reassuring names. They are wolves in sheep's clothing. When you learn about the IPCC, you will see an impressive panel of this type of associations and NGOs claiming to be sensitive to our planet and very alarmist. They explain what there is to understand in the recommendations of the IPCC, and want your support to solve the problem.

Often, these associations rely on the IPCC as an authority figure, and ask for full powers to constrain the skeptics because "they put us in danger by not wanting to do anything", these associations ask for the right to punish, the right to indebt the country even more, they are asking for a state of ecological emergency. What they are asking for is a dictatorship, but what they are doing for the planet is nothing. Their action is limited to frustration and claim. This is the principle of misguidance number 15. They can claim that it takes money to act. But we do not need the government to act. If it is relevant for the planet or economically interesting, entrepreneurial people act. Look at what Gunter Pauli is doing, it's extraordinary. He is inspired by Nature and has federated a network to implement his ideas inspired by Nature, where the waste of some are the raw materials of others. He called it the blue economy. These are just local solutions. Maybe you don't know it because it places the producer and the consumer in direct contact, avoiding the big intermediaries who control the market and usurp profits. Why don't all these associations talk about it? You will discover that many solutions exist in the field where you decide to act concretely. Finally, you are deluding yourself if you believe that industrial research will find you an improving solution. There are already some in Nature, but what the big industries do, which will receive research credits from your taxes and debts from your country, is to develop binding alternatives, to associate a permanent rent for them and to make prohibit the solutions of Nature. One of the most glaring cases are seeds. For one seed planted, Nature gives dozens of seeds in the fruits, even many more. Today, you can only recover in commerce or from commercial fruits sterile seeds resulting from crosses, these are hybrid plants or Genetically Modified Organisms (GMOs). The seed companies' lobby has established marketing criteria such that reproducible traditional peasant seeds cannot meet them. They prosecute

those who try to save or sell these traditional seeds. The few big seed companies make people work, even very young people, to manually cross the species in miserable conditions. All this so that we buy their seeds endlessly. If you think low-carbon is the answer, then it makes sense to think that cocaine is the answer for the family with a voiding problem. This IPCC, these associations and their messages will allow you to understand that you are in the cave of Socrates, with puppeteers, chains and shadows. The society is in the process of following and submitting to the equivalents of the dealers of the previous story.

Finally, there are some associations that ask to move to another scale in the solutions, without specifying what. This is another way to apply for massive research or funding credits. But this need to grow ever more is the mark of wear and tear, which is exponential. Do you believe that we and the environment could bear to operate in this way, on a larger scale? I think there is a much more important point to develop than technology, it is the consciousness of people living on this planet. Our technology is too advanced compared to our evolution of morals or conscience. In general, we are not aware of the consequences of our actions. As technology is now powerful, we do a lot of damage without taking it on. I place my action at this level, before technology, to already make sure to evolve positively. I hope you will understand the need for it. The problem with the planet is that we pollute it, destroy it and do not respect these operating principles. Let's act on it. But that is not the path we are taking at all, especially following the IPCC. If we make a connection with the chapters on usury and CETA, then we can conclude that debt interest is being transferred to financial costs indexed to CO2. After having taxed and taken control of our exchanges, high finance wants to tax and take control of our activities, including that of breathing. You will have to pay the right to exhale your CO2. The ultimate tax. The usurer is thus hidden behind ecological pretexts and it becomes very difficult to understand our enslavements. But relying on the dealer to solve the problems will kill us and damage the Earth even more. It is even conceivable that the powerful interests that have implemented this vast manipulation, in order to give themselves every chance of success, have also used the principles of misdirection 12 and 15; manipulating the input data and creating a problem to arouse your frustration. How could this be done? By using secret geoengineering technologies to actively influence the climate, especially in the most monitored areas. This could explain the extreme temperature drops in other places at certain times. Because the laws of equilibrium say that if you bring heat to one place, you have to take it from somewhere else... This is just a hypothesis, as a personal opinion, but I have no doubt that if these technologies exist, they are using them on purpose and to the detriment of environmental ecosystems.

Inventing technologies inspired by Nature is a good thing, but it is not enough, we must also use them in the spirit of Nature. To wage war on plastic

by replacing it at the cost of cutting down trees is not a good thing. Finding opportunities for discarded plastics is more in the spirit of nature. So to act, you can't avoid raising your consciousness. The elementary elevation of consciousness is to seek peace with your fellows. This is in the spirit of Nature, and you will avoid a lot of pollution with direct and indirect destruction from wars. The way of collaboration will be opened, making possible great and beautiful actions for the planet, for humanity.

If you don't want to work on raising your consciousness, you will be again and again the prey of opportunists who know how to use your weakness of consciousness to manipulate you and get everything from you.

It is now appropriate to assess the action of the politicians in front of the problems of the ecology. I remind you that it is very important, because today, it is on them that rests the management of a problem even more important, namely, the risk of a cataclysmic war.

First of all, the process is dishonest by making people believe that they are basing their decisions on scientific data. Because their "scientific" data is already a political compromise. Second, they impose an economic policy under this pretext. Finally, they organize a racket for its financing. And of course, they do not solve anything. Our problems are for them opportunities to impose their choices without any relation to our concerns. This is what caste we rely on to manage the immediate danger of self-destruction. We are not reasonable if we leave this responsibility to them. The peace plan is designed to correct this.

Preventing them from being able to wage war will limit their power to act in many other ways. It will thus limit their ability to harm us and the environment.