

THE GLOBAL WARMING MAFIA

AN UNCOMFORTABLE TRUTH AND A NON-EXISTENT CLIMATE CHANGE, SUPPORTED BY ECONOMIC INTERESTS THAT SILENCE A LARGE PART OF THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY.



1. Catastrophic Alerts to Spread Fear

"Global Warming" is an extended ideology, a sort of moral assumption, a given truth. The idea surged in the 1970s and boomed in the 1990s. Then it became dominant and now is part of the global agenda, it's within most government's policies and it is an undeniable fact. But is it real? We receive catastrophic warnings about a terrible future if we don't stop producing CO2, which is believed to be the cause of the raise in temperatures. There are environmental journalists that deliver panic each time there is a climatic event and remind us that it's all our fault, ignoring there have always been droughts and hurricanes and floods and snow storms.

In 2021, Bill Gates released a book on climate change, in which he proposes humanity should reduce greenhouse gases (carbon dioxide equivalents) from 51 billion tons a year to zero. In his opinion, that's the only way to stop global warming and avoid huge catastrophes. Our kids receive that same information at school, and many of them come back home terrified of what will happen if their parents don't stop using cars, for example.

There are other issues that come into play. Electricity is a means of development. For most poor and developing countries, it is the only way to improve their standards of living and to become industrialized countries. There is also a crusade on crypto

currencies because they consume huge amounts of energy, and over this issue two of the most powerful and wealthiest men on earth are confronted, even when they are both working on the global warming agenda: Bill Gates and Elon Musk. Musk has supported Bitcoin and the cryptos (and has influenced on their prices every time he made a public comment on them), while Bill Gates is one of the crusaders against the "trashcoins".

Energy is not an innocent subject. The whole industrial revolution was based on it, and its consumption levels are evidently related to income per capita levels, as Gates shows in his book. Oil became so important that there were at least four armed confrontations caused by it. There are billions of dollars at stake (both on policies and on research), while the future of developing countries depends on it. Also, a great part of the scientific community has been silenced so that the "global warming" truth is fully accepted. Former Vice President Al Gore was heading the "global warming" crusade (he even won a Nobel Peace Prize for his efforts) and released in 2006 a documentary named "An uncomfortable truth" to show how dramatic the climate change situation was. He shared the Nobel Peace Prize together with the IPCC, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a UN organization that is highly challenged by hundreds of scientists for manipulating or ignoring evidence in order to back the "climate change" narrative. There was even a "Climate Gate" in 2009, when a hacker released thousands of mails that showed how figures were manipulated to give the idea that temperatures were raising, when in fact they were not. Young and eloquent Greta Thunberg, a Swedish girl born in 2003 took the global warming cause as her own and made headlines all over the world when she addressed presidents and leaders: "The eyes of all future generations are upon you. And if you choose to fail us, I say - we will never forgive you".

It is said that global temperatures have raise 1 degree Celsius since pre industrial times, and could make a second degree by 2100. Apocalyptic predictions are made: fires, glaciers melting and raising sea levels, diseases, extinction. But at the same time many scientists claim that global warming as a threat is not that

evident, and the same happens with attributing a direct relation between temperatures and CO2 emissions. Since 1998, more than 30,000 scientists signed a petition agreeing that there is no scientific evidence to support the idea that man made global warming exists. Is it just an argument to keep part of the world deprived of energy and development, is it part of a new economic paradigm that would justify the transition towards societies based on new types of energies, or is it a real threat? As "global warming" has become an extended ideology that is driving agendas and policies (even when countries like USA only consume more energy each year), it's necessary to be informed and to consider a bigger picture regarding fossil fuel energy and the disputes over it.