

Prince Charles and the Globalists Set Meeting for September to Plot How to Accelerate Goals of U.N. Agenda 2030 and the Complete Digitization of Humanity

Part 3




Just 0.3% of Scientists Agree Humans Are Causing 'Climate Change'

[PSYOP-CLIMATE-CHANGE: The Absurd CO2 Scam](#)
[2ND SMARTEST GUY IN THE WORLD](#) · JULY 16, 2022

The below chart should in a sane world put an end to all “climate change” arguments. The current atmospheric CO2 level is around 420ppm, which is critically too low. We actually need more CO2, not less. 2nd Smartest Guy in the World is a reader-supported publication.

600 million years of CO₂ data reveals current CO₂ starvation



Berner RA, Kothavala Z (2001) GEOCARB III: A revised model of atmospheric CO₂ over Phanerozoic time, IGBP PAGES and World Data Center for Paleoclimatology, Data Contribution Series # 2002-051. NOAA/NGDC Paleoclimatology Program, Boulder CO, USA.

Read full story

[The Great Reset: Klaus Schwab's WEF has plans to implement a 'Carbon Allowance' that will restrict what you do, buy and eat](#)

[2ND SMARTEST GUY IN THE WORLD](#) · OCTOBER 13, 2022

by The Exposé In his 2020 book "THE DENIAL" journalist Ross Clark describes a dystopian future in which everything we buy or do has a carbon (CO₂) value and each household or individual has a carbon allowance which is the maximum amount of CO₂ they are allowed to use each month.



Read full story

[PSYOP-CLIMATE-CHANGE: 300 Years of Global Warming With or Without Industrial CO2](#)

[2ND SMARTEST GUY IN THE WORLD](#) · FEB 23



The same cabal that invented the laughable term “fossil fuels” for their fraudulent “peak oil” narrative in order to extract ever more profits for their energy companies through false scarcity is now escalating their “climate change” con to impose their electric vehicle (EV) takeover.

Read full story

The latest climate data further proves that the One World Government and their criminal nodes in the UN, WEF, WHO, CFR, Club of Rome, et al. as well as their various captured government partners-in-crime are perpetrating total fraud ahead of their technocratic Great Reset eugenics endgame.

by Frank Bergman



New data has emerged that directly conflicts with claims by the United Nations about so-called “climate change.”

The globalist UN claims that “97 percent” of scientists agree that climate change is caused by humanity.

According to the UN and its allies, the remaining three percent of scientists who don’t support that “climate crisis” narrative are “science deniers.”

However, according to Gregory Wrightstone, the executive director of the CO₂ Coalition, a lot more than 3% of scientists are skeptical of the party line on global warming.

The many scientists, engineers, and energy experts that comprise the CO₂ Coalition are often asked where they “believe in climate change.”

“Yes, of course we do: it has been happening for hundreds of millions of years,” Wrightstone explains.

“The real question of serious importance is, ‘Is climate change now driven primarily by human actions?’

“That question should be followed up by ‘is our changing climate beneficial or harmful to ecosystems and humanity?’”

There are some scientific truths that are quantifiable and easily proven.

It is, therefore, possible that at least 97% of scientists agree with such statements as:

- Carbon dioxide concentration has been increasing in recent years.
- Temperatures, as measured by thermometers and satellites, have been generally increasing in fits and starts for more than 150 years.

However, it is impossible to quantify the actual percentage of warming that is attributable to increased anthropogenic (human-caused) CO₂.

There is no scientific evidence or method that can determine how much of the warming we’ve had since 1900 was directly caused by humans.

We know that temperature has varied greatly over the millennia.

We also know that for virtually all of that time, global warming and cooling were driven entirely by natural forces, which did not cease to operate at the beginning of the 20th century.

The claim that most modern warming is attributable to human activities is scientifically insupportable, Wrightstone asserts.

The earliest attempt to document a “consensus” on climate change was a 2004 paper cited by Al Gore in his “non-fiction” book, “An Inconvenient Truth.”

While Gore attended a natural science class at Harvard, he got a D grade for it.

The author of the cited paper, Naomi Oreskes, asserted that 75% of nearly 1,000 papers she had reviewed on the question of climate change agreed with the “consensus” proposition favored by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (“IPCC”).

The IPCC states: *“Most of the observed warming over the last 50 years is likely to have been due to the increase in greenhouse gas concentrations.”*

None, she maintained, dissented from this line of reasoning.

The primary paper that is often trotted out in support of the notion of “97% consensus” was written by John Cook and several other climate extremists.

Published in 2013, it is the most widely referenced work on the subject of climate consensus and has been downloaded more than 1.3 million times.

Cook runs a climate website that promotes climate fear rhetoric.

The website specializes in attacks against those who have provided evidence that refutes the dogma of impending climate doom.

The project was self-described as “a ‘citizen science’ project by volunteers contributing to the website.”

The non-scientific team consisted of radical 12 climate activists who did not put their prejudices aside.

These volunteers, many of whom had no training in the sciences, said they had “reviewed” abstracts from 11,944 peer-reviewed papers related to climate change or global warming, published over the 21 years 1991 – 2011, to assess the extent to which they supported the “consensus view” on climate change.

As Cook’s paper said:

We analyzed a large sample of the scientific literature on global CC [climate change], published over a 21-year period, in order to determine the level of scientific consensus that human activity is very likely causing most of the current GW (anthropogenic global warming, or AGW).

The paper concluded:

Among abstracts that expressed a position on AGW [anthropogenic global warming], 97.1% endorsed the scientific consensus. ...

Among papers expressing a position on AGW, an overwhelming percentage (97.2% based on self-ratings, 97.1% based on abstract ratings) endorses the scientific consensus on AGW.

The paper asserted – falsely, as it turned out – that 97% of the papers the reviewers examined had explicitly endorsed the opinion that humans are causing the majority of the warming of the last 150 years.

However, a closer look at the data shows that 7,930 of the papers took no position at all on the subject and were arbitrarily excluded from the count on this ground.

When all of the papers reviewed are included, the 97% claimed by Cook and his co-authors falls to 32.6%.

A closer look at the paper reveals that the so-called “97%” included three categories of endorsement of human-caused climate change.

Only the first category amounted to an explicit statement that humans are the primary cause of recent warming.

The second and third categories would include most skeptics of catastrophic anthropogenic warming, including the scientists of the CO₂ Coalition.

CO₂ Coalition scientists accept that increasing CO₂ is probably causing some, probably modest, amount of warming.

However, they argue that the amount is likely rendered insignificant by natural causes of warmer weather.

Cook could only conclude that there is any type of “consensus” by casting a wide net.

Agnotology is defined as “the study of how ignorance arises via circulation of misinformation calculated to mislead.”

This is how David Legates and his co-authors (2015) describe the Cook paper and similar attempts falsely to promote the notion of broad scientific consensus surrounding the subject of a looming, man-made, climate apocalypse.

0.3% consensus, not 97.1%	
“The scientific consensus that human activity is very likely causing <u>most</u> of the <u>current</u> GW (global warming)” – Cook et al (2013)	
11,944 abstracts (1991-2011) reviewed	100%
7,930 were arbitrarily excluded for expressing <u>no opinion</u>	66.4%
3,896 were marked as agreeing we cause <u>some</u> warming	32.6%
64 were marked as stating we caused most of the warming	0.5%
41 actually stated we caused most warming since 1950	0.3%
0 were marked as endorsing man-made catastrophe	0.0%
<i>Legates et al 2015 (after Monckton)</i>	

They reviewed the actual papers used by Cook and **found that only 0.3%** of the 11,944 abstracts and 1.6% of the smaller sample that excluded those papers expressing no opinion endorsed man-made global warming as they defined it.

Remarkably, they found that Cook and his assistants had themselves marked only 64 papers – or 0.5% of the 11,944 they said they had reviewed – as explicitly stating that recent warming was mostly man-made.

Yet they stated both in the paper itself and subsequently, that they had found a “97% consensus” explicitly stating that recent warming was mostly man-made.

It appears that Cook and his activist co-authors manipulated the data to present an altogether untrue narrative of overwhelming support for catastrophic human-caused warming.

Note that the official “consensus” position – supported though it was by just 0.3% of the 11,944 papers reviewed – says nothing more than recent warming was mostly man-made.

Even if that were the case – and the overwhelming majority of scientists take no view on that question, for it is beyond our present knowledge to answer – it would not indicate that global warming is dangerous.

From the information we have just reviewed, the percentage of scientists who agree with the notion of man-made catastrophic global warming is significantly less than advertised.

Several unbiased attempts have been made to assess what the actual number might be. One of the largest petitions concerning climate change was the Oregon Petition, signed by more than 31,000 American scientists, including 9,029 holding PhDs, disputing the notion of anthropogenic climate alarmism.

More recently, in 2016, George Mason University (Maibach 2016) surveyed more than 4,000 members of the American Meteorological Society and found that 33% believed that climate change was not occurring, was at most half man-made, was mostly natural, or they did not know.

Significantly, only 18% believed that a large amount – or all – of additional climate change could be averted.

Science does not advance through consensus, and the claim of consensus has no place in any rational scientific debate.

If those promoting man-made climate fear need to resort to an obviously flawed consensus opinion, rather than argue the merits of the science, haven't they already conceded that their argument cannot be won through open debate?

“Cook’s 97% nonsense [sic] paper shows that the climate community still has a long way to go in weeding out bad research and bad behavior,” Professor Richard Tol said of the data.

“If you want to believe that climate researchers are incompetent, biased, and secretive, Cook’s paper is an excellent case in point.”

It is rather late in the game to challenge the kind of animal tripe of Prince Charles of Wales. A brother Christian Steve Coerper had this answer to a recent government hearing in which those testifying could not answer the basic question.

ALL of this discussion on climate change and CO² and "greenhouse gasses" that will allegedly lead to global warming and kill everyone - then one guy steps up and asks a question no one else is asking, and apparently even the power players running this "climate change" panic theater don't know the answer to:

["What percent of our atmosphere is CO2?"](#)

This is a six-minute video. I knew the answer - learned this maybe in 4th grade and never forgot. "Close" is probably close enough, but these professionals had no realistic idea.

It's four-tenths of 1%. God designed it that way. Plants need CO². So do we. Take half of the CO² out of the atmosphere and plants begin to die. Air is 78% nitrogen and 21% oxygen.

God bless Doug LaMalfa but he asked the question last month. Should have pushed it back in 1980 when this Chicken-Little "Climate change" game began. Sadly, "climate change" is now big business - a political and commercial agenda that has nothing to do with the climate and everything to do with profits, panic, and political control.

Tell your friends, forego the panic - break out the bubbly! **We're NOT all going to die from too much carbon dioxide.** It's safe to breathe and it's okay to use renewable petroleum-based fuels to travel and cook. God knew what He was doing when He created this planet.

The Bible was explicitly right when God told Hosea, **“My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, that thou shalt be no priest to me: seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I will also forget thy children.”** -(Hosea 4:6)

In a related report about the coronation of Prince Charles on May 6th it has leaked out that “sausage fingers” was also coronated the King of Israel in a private moment during the coronation services.

Prince Charles was secretly crowned the King of Israel in last week’s coronation event. He was taken into a private area during the anointing service and was declared the King of Israel. This is huge news and clearly prophetic and it was reported on by Monte Judah in his May 12th news report.



When King Charles went behind the screens to be anointed with the 'holy' oil, he was also anointed "King of Israel". (King Charles was anointed in secret behind a screen - "The Anointing Screen".)

"The anointing, which is the peak of the service, is not filmed," explained Mr. Hart. "The Queen had a canopy but the King wanted three screens." Mr. Hart was the designer of the anointing screen. "That is, spiritually speaking, when the King becomes king."

Monte Judah said that the Antichrist is *"to be an imitator. He's to be a supplanter of the true Messiah of Israel...This man comes with ego. He is those themes of the anti-Messiah..and he's now received the anointing to be the King of Israel. Very soon he's gonna want to be the king of kings of all nations. We're watching him get ready to come to power."*

Monte Judah mentions that from the date of the state funeral of Queen Elizabeth II to King Charles III coronation was 6 months, 6 weeks and 6 days. This was a trick play on words as you know “6 weeks” is a month and 2 weeks. There is more to this story that

we do not know and unlikely to know. It was the Queen's personal physician who said "foul play" was involved in the death of the Queen. Her personal physician stated that there were bruises on her hands and wrists, suggestion of a struggle occurred.

During the secret ceremony that took place behind The Anointing Screen, the choir sang Handel's coronation anthem 'Zadok the Priest'. 1st Kings 1:34 *"And let Zadok the priest and Nathan the prophet anoint him (Solomon) king over Israel: and blow ye with the trumpet, and say, God save king Solomon."*

The text to this song is: *"Zadok the Priest and Nathan the Prophet anointed Solomon King. And all the people rejoiced, and said: God save the King! Long live the King! May the King live for ever, Amen, Alleluia."*

The BBC said an average of 18 million people in the UK viewed the coronation event according to the BBC. Maybe the number 18 was sending a Masonic hidden 6 + 6 + 6 coded message. I'm not being facetious as Satan's Masonic worshippers drop their presence through coded signs and numbers!

Things continue to accelerate on the global stage now and we are seeing further evidence the fog of skepticism lifting along with the sharpness and clarity of events occurring almost daily. When Prince Charles asked the people of the UK and the world to pledge allegiance to him that pledge included these words: *"I swear I will pay true allegiance to your majesty and to your heirs and successors according to law, so help me God"*! Those words satisfy the requirements of Revelation 13:15 bowing down and worshipping the Antichrist.

The Antichrist will demand worship from all humanity and will execute any who do not bow down and worship him -(cf. Revelation 13:15). It is at this point that the true Creator responds to the challenge and begins to decimate the Antichrist, his kingdom, and all who follow him. This will be the period referred to by Christ as the Great Tribulation (cf. Matthew 24:21).

Monte Judah stated two weeks ago that Prince Charles asking the allegiance of the world meets the definition requirements of the prophecy of Revelation 13:15-16, or at least the first portion of the passage. The coronation, liturgy, symbolism, pledge of allegiance, pomp and ceremony have prefaced the beginning of the Seventy Week Prophecy of Daniel for us; [before May 6th we were anticipating prophecy [history being told in advance]; and today on May 7th we have witnessed a portion of [history told in advance] become reality!] May 6th was larger than life than most folks can comprehend. Of the roughly 40 prophecies concerning the Beast, twenty have been fulfilled and there are another twenty to be fulfilled in relatively quick succession.

The Antichrist's destiny is fixed and certain, as is every person who chooses to follow a false messiah instead of the True One. Because each new day brings humanity closer to the time when the Antichrist will be set loose upon the earth, it is critical that those

who have not yet put their faith in Jesus Christ do so and escape the time of the Antichrist's rule: "now is the day of salvation" -(2nd Corinthians 6:2).

Be wary of King Charles III's dangerous ambition to 'reset' society in the name of climate change activism – King Charles explains why we need a Great Reset and some kind of **martial law** to fix climate change so life on earth is not destroyed by pollution. Efforts to fix the ecological crisis curtailed since Ukraine war. **The 'Great Reset' initiative, which was launched by the now-King Charles himself in June 2020, seeks to change society into a worrying form of neo-feudalism.** One big question about King Charles III's accession to the throne is whether he will finally put aside his politicking on climate change. While he was Prince of Wales, the King largely ignored the convention that royals must remain apolitical.

He did, however, intimate in his speech following the late Queen Elizabeth's passing that as King, he would put aside his advocacy. Opposition Leader Peter Dutton and Prime Minister Anthony Albanese have differing views on this. *"As the King, he will have a responsibility to dispense his duties fairly as the Queen did... I think as the Queen conducted her business, he is there now as an impartial person,"* Mr. Dutton said on the ABC's Insiders on Sunday. The Prime Minister disagreed, saying it would be *"appropriate"* for King Charles to remain outspoken: *"Dealing with the challenge of climate change shouldn't be seen as a political issue, it should be seen as an issue that is about humanity and about our very quality of life and survival as a world."*

Prophetic Implications of Charles Authority

This past week, Charles was crowned King of the United Kingdom and the other 14 Commonwealth realms. But that is not all. He has also become head of the British Commonwealth, head of the Anglican Church, and spokesman for a program dubbed "Global Britain." It sounds as if the "ceremonial" king has greater plans!

Since 1833, Global Britain has been managed by a pseudo-private system of Crown Agents today named 'Crown Agents for Overseas Government and Administration'. This vast body exists as a semi-official status and describes itself as "an emanation of the crown." The agency is partnered with the World Bank, United Nations and the Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation. It acts as a giant holding company with one shareholder called the Crown Agents Foundation based in Southwark London.

The idea of Global Britain has always had at its heart the concept of an integrated British Commonwealth with the Five Eyes at the head of intelligence, City of London at the head of finance and the hereditary structures of power centered around the Crown through which all branches of the international deep state derive their powers. The fact is that the British Empire continues to exert a vast top-down influence over world affairs.

Having been set up in the 1930s as the new face of the British Empire, today's British Commonwealth occupies 12.2 million square miles of territory, holds 2.4 billion people and represents 21% of the world's land area. Britain continues to exert vast control

over the mining concessions of Africa, for example, with over \$1 trillion of direct mining interests controlled by British and/or British Commonwealth-based corporations.

Britain is the creator and central command structure of the Five Eyes intelligence apparatus and has also been dubbed “Londonistan” for having provided safe havens for international terrorist groups who have found sanctuary under the ideology of tolerant Britain.

The City of London – dubbed the “Square Mile” and a separate legal entity from the UK as enshrined in the Magna Carta of 1214 – is the nerve center of world finance, with the Bank of England and Commonwealth offshore tax havens directing trillions of dollars of drug money laundering, terrorist financing and other corrupt practices globally.

Global Britain – being an institution organized entirely around hereditary institutions, the centerpiece for the continuity of this reform – is hinged upon a ruling family occupying the position of official *Prima inter pares* (first among equals) around which the entire structure of controls can exert its influence. This role has now fallen onto Charles “The Great Reset” King.

Related: The Black Nobility, a New World Order and Charles “The Great Reset” King

During Charles coronation, pledges of allegiance to the monarch were read by elected officials across every other Commonwealth Five Eyes member state. And, for the first time, British and Commonwealth citizens around the globe were also invited to recite a pledge of allegiance to the new monarch and his “heirs and successors” but this didn’t go down well with the public. In an online poll for ITV’s Good Morning Britain, 86.5% of more than 164,000 respondents said they would not recite the pledge.

Good Morning Britain on Twitter, 30 April 2023

After describing all of the above in more detail in an essay, Matthew Ehret then asks: Is this institution of hereditary powers which Charles has inherited just a ceremonial gig with no real substance or influence behind it?

The following are a few excerpts from ‘*Global Britain and King Charles’ Great Reset*’ written by Matthew Ehret. It confirms Charles is not concerned about what his actions and policies may bring to his subjects.

Prince Charles: World’s Largest Property Owner

This may surprise you, but the British Crown happens to be the world’s largest property owner clocking in possessions amounting to 6.6 billion acres across Australia, New Zealand, Northern Ireland, Canada, Great Britain and the Falkland Islands.

On top of the “*Crown Lands*” and “*Crown Corporations*” which are legally owned by the monarch of Britain, an organization called ‘The Crown Estate’ is one of the world’s largest property groups. Describing the institution which sends 25% of its earnings directly into the Monarch’s purse every year, Die Welt Business had this to say:

“The Crown Estate owns property all across the UK, from castles and cottages to agricultural land and forests plus retail parks and shopping centers. It owns more than half the UK’s entire seashore, giving it hugely valuable auction rights for offshore commercial activity, such as wind farms.”

In my research on **5G** technologies, I regularly see postings of cell towers owned by the Crown Corporation here in the U.S. They have a significant ownership of cell towers throughout the world as well.

The Crown controls nearly the entire seabed (and half the seashore) around the UK with any business wishing to build offshore windmills as part of the Green New Deal forced to rent their sea beds from the Crown Estate. It was noted by *Byline Times* that the Crown will stand to become *“the biggest beneficiary of UK’s Green Agenda”* who recently unveiled a 10 point plan for a *“green revolution”* and full decarbonization by 2050. For anyone confused about the exploding prices of inefficient energy sources across England, they wouldn’t get far without appreciating the tax-payer subsidized boondoggle of windmill farms.

Related: Netherlands’ Land Grab: What is driving the Dutch nation to attack itself and destroy the bedrock of its society?

Prince Charles himself has demonstrated that he certainly doesn’t see the Crown as a symbolic entity and was accused of *“incontinent lobbying”* in 2013 when dozens of personal letters – dubbed the *“Black Spider Memos”* – to Members of Parliament and the Prime Minister were made public after an intense legal fight to keep them secret. Charles’ official biographer Jonathan Dimbleby even wrote in 2013 that upon Charles’ succession to the Crown that things would become much more hands on, and *“that a quiet constitutional revolution is afoot.”*

Prerogative Powers are Real

Although much effort goes into portraying the Crown’s prerogative powers as merely symbolic, they cover nearly every branch of governance and have occasionally been used ... although those British spheres of influence where they must apply are usually so self-regulating that they require very little input from such external influence to keep them in line.

These powers were first revealed publicly in 2003 and in an article titled ‘Mystery Lifted on the Prerogative Powers’, the *London Guardian* noted that these powers include, but are not limited to:

Domestic Affairs, the appointment and dismissal of ministers, the summoning, prorogation and dissolution of Parliament, Royal assent to bills, the appointment and regulation of the civil service, the commissioning of officers in the armed forces, directing the disposition of the armed forces in the UK (and other Commonwealth nations), appointment of Queen’s Counsel, Issue and withdrawal of passports, Prerogative of mercy. (Used to apply in capital punishment cases. Still used, e.g., to

remedy errors in sentence calculation), granting honors, creation of corporations by Charter, foreign Affairs, the making of treaties, declaration of war, deployment of armed forces overseas, recognition of foreign states, and accreditation and reception of diplomats.

When a 2009 bill was introduced into parliament proposing that these powers be limited, a Privy Council-led Justice Ministry review concluded that such limitations would “dangerously weaken” the state’s ability to respond to a crisis and the bill was promptly killed.

King Charles and the Great Reset

Charles demonstrated this “*more hands on*” approach to governance on 3 June 2020 when he became the official patron of the World Economic Forum’s Great Reset and even officially launched the project Tweeting out #TheGreatReset.

On his official website, the Prince launched the project saying: “*Today, through HRH’s Sustainable Markets Initiative and the World Economic Forum, The Prince of Wales launched a new global initiative, The Great Reset*”.

Eco-Warrior King of a New Crusade

Charles has demonstrated the sort of enthusiasm for decarbonization of the world which one tends to only find in a religious fanatic setting himself up as the eco-warrior of monarchs, a Crusader King of a new religion, except instead of Muslims in the Holy Land, our new Davos-connected eco-crusaders have targeted carbon dioxide and the industrial civilization, farming and useless eaters who cause it, to be the poisonous threat that must be destroyed. Charles appears to see himself walking in the footsteps of his World Wildlife Fund (“WWF”) founding father as the new leading spokesman for a total transformation of society under a WEF-green governance priesthood.

A July 2022 edition of Australia’s Spectator aptly characterized Charles’ misanthropic activism in the following terms:

The environmentalism that the Prince has decided to occupy himself with while he awaits to ascend the throne is not a harmless sort of apolitical tree-planting or rainforest-saving activity. He’s not hugging pandas or funding wildlife sanctuaries. Instead, he has engaged himself in a hybrid business and political uprising that threatens the survival of the political system which he is meant to oversee. In addition to being a betrayal of the ordinary citizen, his actions represent a failure to his sole duty as future king – to protect the constitutional monarchy from rising climate fascism and globalism.

Nazi Roots of the Windsor’s

The documentary ‘Edward VIII: Britain’s traitor King’ on Britain’s Channel 4 revealed that the fascist heart of the Crown was alive during the darkest years before and during World War II. Beyond the case of Edward VIII, there are many other embarrassing Nazi

connections to the house of Windsor – formerly Saxe-Coburg-Gotha – which the documentary failed to mention.

All of the Duke of Edinburgh's three sisters were married to Nazi princes, and the husband of one of them (Sophie) became a Waffen SS officer with the rank of Oberführer (senior leader).

Philip's sister Sophie's husband, Prince Christopher of Hesse-Cassel, was chief of the Forschungsamt (Directorate of Scientific Research), a special intelligence operation run by Hermann Göring, and he was also Standartenführer (colonel) of the SS on Heinrich Himmler's personal staff. Philip's four brothers-in-law, with whom he lived, all became high-ranking officials in the Nazi Party.

Philip himself maintained the family tradition, first having been educated under a Nazi curriculum centered on eugenics in the 1930s, and then going on to found the WWF with fellow one-time Nazi Party member Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, a lifelong eugenicist and Bilderberg Group founder, in 1961. Philip and Bernhard were joined by Sir Julian Huxley – then president of the Eugenics Society of Britain – as WWF co-founder.

It should be noted King Charles continued his fathers' legacy as president of the British World Wildlife Foundation which he has headed for over 30 years.

The Nazi pedigree of the royal family and its loyal managers raises the question: Why has their continuation of Nazi eugenics doctrine in the form of the euthanasia and zero-growth movements not become more widely known? What type of world do we live in, that such startling facts could not be general knowledge?

The true Empire has always been a financial oligarchy which is used by a vast network of power structures to advance the interests of the aristocracy of Europe. The current epicenter of power is the Anglo-Dutch monarchies. A key pillar in the control over colonies of Anglo-Dutch influence remains the Privy Council system, which is centered in Britain, but has secondary branches in select Commonwealth countries.

It is this power that controls the Bilderberg Group, its junior appendage the World Economic Forum, and steers American policy through the New York-based Council on Foreign Relations – the American version of Chatham House.

Related: The Names of The Bilderbergers Who've Played a Role in The Covid Event. It was to leading Chatham House member Lord Lothian in 1937 that Hitler laid out his concept for the Anglo-German New World Order saying:

Germany, England, France, Italy, America and Scandinavia... should arrive at some agreement whereby they would prevent their nationals from assisting in the industrializing of countries such as China, and India. It is suicidal to promote the establishment in the agricultural countries of Asia of manufacturing industries.

Any number of technocrats pushing a “*Build Back Better for the World*” scheme or “*Global Green New Deal*” could have said the same thing.

The ‘sustainability’ ideology is impoverishing the world

‘Man is the measure of all things’, Greek philosopher Protagoras wrote over 2,500 years ago. Unfortunately, our elites today tend not to see it that way.

In recent years, the massively-overused word ‘sustainability’ has fostered a narrative in which human needs and aspirations have taken a back seat to the green austerity of Net Zero and ‘regrowth’.

The ruling classes of a fading West are determined to ‘*save the planet*’ by immiserating their fellow citizens.

Their agenda is expected to cost the world \$6 trillion per year for the next 30 years. Meanwhile, they will get to harvest massive green subsidies and live like Renaissance potentates.

In *Enemies of Progress*, author Austin Williams suggests that ‘the mantra of sustainability’ starts with the assumption that humanity is ‘the biggest problem of the planet’, rather than the ‘creators of a better future’.

Indeed, many climate scientists and green activists see having *fewer* people on the planet as a key priority. Their program calls not only for fewer people and fewer families, but also for lower consumption among the masses.

They expect us to live in ever smaller dwelling units, to have less mobility, and to endure more costly home heating and air-conditioning. These priorities are reflected in a regulatory bureaucracy that, if it does not claim justification from God, acts as the right hand of Gaia and of sanctified science.

The question we need to ask is: sustainability for whom? U.S. Treasury secretary Janet Yellen recently suggested that her department sees ‘climate change’ as ‘the greatest economic opportunity of our time’.

To be sure, there is lots of gold in green for the same Wall Street investors, tech oligarchs and inheritors who fund the campaigns of climate activists. They increasingly control the media, too.

The Rockefellers, heirs to the Standard Oil fortune, and other ultra-wealthy greens are currently funding climate reporters at organs like the Associated Press and National Public Radio.

Under the new sustainability regime, the ultra-rich profit, but the rest of us not so much. The most egregious example may be the forced take-up of electric vehicles (EVs),

which has already helped to make Elon Musk, CEO of Tesla, the world's second-richest man.

Although improvements are being made to low-emissions vehicles, consumers are essentially being frog-marched into adopting a technology that has clear technical problems, remains far more expensive than the internal-combustion engine and depends primarily on an electric grid already on the brink of blackouts.

Green activists, it turns out, do not expect EVs to replace the cars of *hoi polloi*. No, ordinary people will be dragooned to use public transport, or to walk or bike to get around.

The shift to electric cars is certainly no win for the West's working and middle classes. But it is an enormous boon to China, which enjoys a huge lead in the production of batteries and rare-earth elements needed to make EVs, and which also figures prominently in wind turbines and solar panels.

China's BYD, which is backed by Warren Buffett, has emerged as the world's top EV manufacturer, with big export ambitions. Meanwhile, American EV firms struggle with production and supply-chain issues, in part due to green resistance to domestic mining for rare-earth minerals. Even Tesla expects much of its future growth to come from its Chinese factories.

Building cars from primarily Chinese components will have consequences for autoworkers across the West. Germany was once a car-manufacturing giant, but it is expected to lose an estimated 400,000 car-factory jobs by 2030.

According to McKinsey, the US's car manufacturing workforce could be cut by up to 30 per cent. After all, when the key components are made elsewhere, far less labor is needed from US and European workers. It's no surprise that some European politicians, worried about a popular backlash, have moved to slow down the EV juggernaut.

This dynamic is found across the entire sustainability agenda. The soaring energy costs in the West have helped China expand its market share in manufactured exports to roughly equal that of the US, Germany and Japan *combined*.

American manufacturing has dropped recently to its lowest point since the pandemic. The West's crusade against carbon emissions makes it likely that jobs, 'green' or otherwise, will move to China, which already emits more 'greenhouse gases' than the rest of the high-income world.

Meanwhile, the Chinese leadership is looking to adapt to changes in the climate, instead of undermining economic growth by chasing implausible Net Zero targets.

There are clear class implications here. California's regulators recently admitted that the state's strict climate laws aid the affluent, but hurt the poor. These laws also have a

disproportionate impact on ethnic-minority citizens, creating what attorney Jennifer Hernandez has labelled the 'green Jim Crow'.

As China's increasingly sophisticated tech and industrial growth is being joyously funded by U.S. venture capitalists and Wall Street, living standards among the Western middle class are in decline. Europe has endured a decade of stagnation, while Americans' life expectancy has recently fallen in 2021 for the first time in peacetime.

Deutsche Bank's Eric Heymann suggests that the only way to achieve Net Zero emissions by 2050 is by squelching all future growth, which could have catastrophic effects on working-class and middle-class living standards.

Rather than the upward mobility most have come to expect, much of the West's workforce now faces the prospect of either living on the dole or working at low wages. Today, nearly half of all American workers receive low wages and the future looks worse.

Almost two-thirds of all new jobs in recent months were in low-paying service industries. This is also true in Britain. Over recent decades, many jobs that might have once supported whole families have disappeared.

According to one UK account, self-employment and gig work do not provide sustenance for anything like a comfortable lifestyle. Rates of poverty and food shortages are already on the rise. As a result, most parents in the U.S. and elsewhere doubt their children will do better than their generation, while trust in our institutions is at historic lows.

The fabulists at places like the *New York Times* have convinced themselves that 'climate change' is the biggest threat to prosperity. But many ordinary folk are far more worried about the immediate effects of climate policy than the prospect of an overheated planet in the medium or long term.

This opposition to the Net Zero agenda was first expressed by the *gilet jaunes* movement in France in 2018, whose weekly protests were initially sparked by green taxes.

This has been followed by protests by Dutch and other European farmers in recent years, which are angry at restrictions on fertilizers that will cut their yields. The pushback has sparked the rise of populism in a host of countries, notably Italy, Sweden and France. Even in ultra-with-it Berlin, a referendum on tighter-emissions targets recently failed to win over enough voters.

This is class warfare obscured by green rhetoric. It pits elites in finance, tech and the nonprofit world against a more numerous, but less connected, group of ordinary citizens. Many of these folk make their living from producing food and basic necessities, or from hauling these things around.

Factory workers, truck drivers and farmers, all slated for massive green regulatory onslaughts, see sustainability very differently than the urban corporate elites and their woke employees.

As the French *gilets jaunes* protesters put it bluntly: *'The elites worry about the end of the world. We worry about the end of the month.'*

This disconnect also exists in the United States, according to long-time Democratic analyst Ruy Teixeira. Attempts to wipe out fossil fuels may thrill people in San Francisco, but are regarded very differently in Bakersfield, the center of the California oil industry, and in Texas, where as many as a million generally good-paying jobs could be lost.

Overall, according to a Chamber of Commerce report, a full national ban on fracking, widely supported by greens, would cost 14 million jobs – far more than the eight million jobs lost in the Great Recession of 2007-09.

No surprise then that blue-collar workers are not so enthusiastic about the green agenda. Just one per cent, according to a new Monmouth poll, consider climate as their main concern.

A new Gallup poll shows that just two per cent of working-class respondents say they currently own an electric vehicle and a mere nine per cent say they are 'seriously considering' purchasing one.

These Western concerns are nothing compared to how the sustainability agenda could impact the developing world. Developing countries are home to roughly 3.5 billion people with no reliable access to electricity.

They are far more vulnerable to high energy and food prices than we are. For places like Sub-Saharan Africa, green admonitions against new agricultural technologies, 'fossil fuels' and nuclear power undermine any hope of creating desperately needed new wealth and jobs.

It's no wonder that these countries increasingly ignore the West and are looking to China instead, which is helping the developing world to build new 'fossil-fuel' plants, as well as hydroelectric and nuclear facilities.

All of this is anathema to many Western greens. To make matters worse, the EU is already considering carbon taxes on imports, which could cut the developing world off from what remains of global markets.

More critical still could be the impact of the sustainability mantra on food production, particularly for Sub-Saharan Africa, which will be home to most of the world's population growth over the next three decades, according to United Nations projections.

These countries need more food production, either domestically or from rich countries like the US, the Netherlands, Canada, Australia and France. And they are acutely aware of what happened when Sri Lanka adopted the sustainability agenda.

This led to the breakdown of Sri Lanka's agricultural sector and, eventually, to the violent overthrow of its government.


We need to rethink the sustainability agenda. Protecting the environment cannot come at the cost of jobs and growth. We should also assist developing countries in achieving a more prosperous future.

This means financing workable technologies – gas, nuclear, hydro – that can provide the reliable energy so critical for economic development.

It does no good to suggest a program that will keep the poor impoverished.

Unless people's concerns about the green agenda are addressed, they will almost certainly seek to disrupt the best-laid plans of our supposedly enlightened elites.

In the end, as Protagoras said, human beings are still the ultimate 'measure' of what happens in the world – whether the *cognoscenti* like it or not.



Blessings,

Pastor Bob, EvanTeachr@aol.com
www.pastorbobreid.com