

Climate hysterics: useful idiots or just idiots

Dr T P Wilkinson

In 1973 a dystopian film, *Soylent Green*, was released, starring the sincerely gun-toting Charlton Heston.¹ The scene was New York City, inhabited by 40 million (only twice as many as Beijing, today), with equatorial temperatures and humidity due to the 'greenhouse effect'. The story was set in 2022! That is three years from now.

One obviously fanatical author from Los Angeles² has also warned us of impending doom – most recently that the world was scheduled to end on or about 2026. No doubt he will keep writing and spreading the current blend of eschatology until we all do die in 2026, or the forces driving the audience for his kind of madness have met their goal – or by the grace of universal (as opposed to human) sanity are reduced to the recognisable sociopaths that they are.

So in this brief reaction, spurred by concerns with the life and well-

¹ He is infamous for the exclamation 'from my cold, dead hands' delivered at the National Rifle Association Convention in 2000. See <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=5ju4Gla2odw>> at 2.06).

He was also in a number of disaster and/or apocalyptic films between the late 60s and the mid 70s. As well as *Soylent Green*, these included the original *Planet of the Apes* pair of films (1968 & 1970), *The Omega Man* (1971), *Earthquake* and *Airport 1975* (both released in 1974). See <<https://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000032/>>

² Robert Hunziker is the author of numerous articles about climate catastrophe, e.g. at <Counterpunch.org> or <Dissidentvoice.org>. See, for example, 'Ignoring Climate Catastrophes' (*Counterpunch*, 8 November 2019) and 'Climate Confusion, Angst, and Sleeplessness' (*Counterpunch*, 14 November 2019).

For my critique of his 'Extinction Rebellion Sweeps the World' (*Dissident Voice*, 17 October 2019), see 'If the Poles of Mars have melted, why bother writing?' (*Dissident Voice*, 18 October 2019) and 'The Temperature Movement: The Reincarnation of a Perennial Anglo-American Obsession' (*Dissident Voice*, 29 October 2019).

Mr Hunziker is certainly not the only exponent of the views found in his articles. Reference to these articles is made because they are quite illustrative of the tone and substance found throughout the mass media on the issue of climate change. Giving Mr Hunziker the benefit of a doubt, he may not be a fanatic himself, but merely reporting the views to which he is exposed with attention to verisimilitude.

being of the majority of humanity for whom 'climate hysterics'³ are merely potential holiday neighbours, I would like to address just one peculiarity of this endless rant.

Leaving aside for a moment the spurious attempts to justify environmental Wahhabism, primarily among the English-speaking peoples, it strikes me – and I am sure many other still thinking people – that the climate hysterics have no substantial response to the overthrow of democratic governments in South America by forces of the petroleum and mining industries.

I hate to bore some of those readers of the Climate Apocalypse with the fact that this is largely – though not exclusively – the work of the reconstituted Standard Oil Trust; i.e. Rockefeller, Rockefeller Brothers, and an intricate system of financial and industrial holdings – the infamous David Rockefeller's recent demise notwithstanding.⁴ The Standard Oil Trust comprised Esso (ExxonMobil), Chevron, Amoco and now includes Gulf and Texaco. The Trust's network includes its allied financial enterprises, e.g. JP Morgan Chase and Goldman Sachs, along with the Open Society and the

³ Or shall we call them 'Sharp's posthumous Climate Rangers'? Gene Sharp, founder of the Albert Einstein Institution, a psychological operations organisation based on exploiting ideas, concepts and programmes developed in US pacification operations, especially during its war in Vietnam. The core concepts upon which what has been called a 'revolution factory' are based can be found in Sharp's book *National Security through Civilian-based Defense* (Omaha, Nebraska: Association for Transarmament Studies, 1970). Of course to understand Sharp's exercise in reverse engineering it is helpful to read Douglas Valentine, *The Phoenix Program* (New York: William Morrow & Co., 1990).

The application of Sharp's work in augmenting the NATO war against Yugoslavia is the subject of the film *The Weight of Chains*. There are a number of sources for further information on this documentary, principally from the director's own website <<https://weightofchains.ca/>>. He has made a series of three films under this moniker: *The Weight of Chains* <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=waEYQ46gH08>>; *The Weight of Chains 2* <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vNNG_mn_9D>; trailer for *The Weight of Chains 3* <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=te1c8t75rCM>>.

⁴ Gerald Colby and Charlotte Dennett, *Thy Will be Done: The Conquest of the Amazon : Nelson Rockefeller and Evangelism in the Age of Oil* (New York: HarperCollins, 1995) provides a detailed description of how the Rockefeller corporate structure permeated a broad range of governmental and religious institutions throughout the Western hemisphere that could be coordinated in the pursuit of the extended family interests emerging from and maintained by the legacy of Standard Oil.

ubiquitous but rarely mentioned Rothschild bank.⁵ Further acknowledged help comes from the IMF, World Bank, ECB and other franchises of the banking cartel.

In the past few years at least, the heads of the European Central Bank, the Banco d'Italia, Banque du France, Bank of England and Federal Reserve, have come overwhelmingly from Goldman Sachs, with some Rothschild alumni. Yet there is scarcely any suggestion that either bank could thus exercise disproportionate influence or obtain unfair advantage in the creation of US and European monetary and economic policies. The role of the privately owned Bank of International Settlements and the private control over the international funds transfer network SWIFT aggravate or enhance the power accumulated.

For those who have never dealt with the concept of monopoly capitalism – the prevailing economic system, euphemistically called 'free enterprise' – a trust is a usually secret agreement among big businesses (banking, oil, transportation, utilities etc.) to fix prices and allocate markets so as to guarantee profits and cushion losses; or, in US legal jargon, to 'restrain competition'. Despite some weak attempts to prohibit such combinations, the absolute primacy of private property and profits in the US (and most of the West) has meant that such prohibitions have been half-hearted at best. In any event since the installation of Ronald Reagan as POTUS, followed by William Jefferson Clinton a few actors later, the few controls – even public condemnation – have been eliminated. To the extent it was ever seriously weakened, the power of this trust has been restored.

The acceptance of trusts (secret or obscurely constituted) monopoly and oligarchy agreements has been promoted both in the media and in fact. A worldwide computer system developed to strengthen US capacity to wage atomic warfare is dominated by a handful of software manufacturers who are

⁵ Rarely mentioned because the family with which it is associated belongs to the class of 'privileged victims'. It is difficult to point to its covert power without either evoking charges of 'anti-semitism' or that one believes in some old-fashioned right-wing conspiracy theory. Yet the facts of relationships, ownership and control can be identified – although admittedly often indirectly: e.g. Rothschild investment in *Liberation*, *Die Tageszeitung* (when each was faced with bankruptcy), Soros' 'apprenticeship' with a bank in the Rothschild group, Rothschild trusteeships in numerous important funds and corporations, etc. A common argument against asserting such relationships is that they do not constitute 'ownership'. However, it is a characteristic of modern corporate and trust law that control can be exercised independent of material ownership through often very complex legal mechanisms intended to conceal such control.

simply part of the national security state – never mind what Mr Snowden says about the NSA. It may not be possible in our lifetimes – or ever – to reorganise human society so as to be freed of these sociopaths and the corporations they have created to outlive themselves and us. However, I think we can reduce our vulnerability to the latest hordes of neo-medieval flagellants and children’s crusaders if we just read our history.

If these climate hysterics – such as the author from Los Angeles and the pretender from Sweden – were seriously educated and concerned about ‘carbon’, then why are there no protests against the corporations and the government agencies that represent them who have been in the process of rollback in Latin American countries such as Chile, Bolivia, Ecuador, Brazil and, of course, Venezuela? If ‘carbon’ were really the issue here, and these folks were not merely fanatical but also ecological, then they would see that any policies and actions designed to enhance control over foreign natural resources – such as oil and gas – can only preserve or strengthen the corporate opposition to their alleged objectives. Why would Chevron need control over Ecuadorian oil if the foundations (in the Rockefeller suite) were supporting an end to carbon footprints? What is the human price hysterics are prepared to pay for the lithium in Bolivia, Afghanistan, or even Portugal, for the high capacity batteries to run their electric cars?⁶

Instead we see the restoration of what might be called the ‘standard issue carbon boot’ that smashes the faces of Bolivians, Brazilians, Chileans, Ecuadorians, Venezuelans (if the US is ever successful in overthrowing their elected government), not to mention the continued military action in the Middle East and Indonesia. With the exception of BP, Royal Dutch Shell, and the minor league Elf Aquitaine and some Russian companies, all of the super carbon criminals are in the US.

Some other aspects of this vile hysteria summon a reaction, which could

⁶ Afghanistan is not only defended for its supply of the opium market but also for lithium reserves. The Bolivian government of Evo Morales was just overthrown in order to restore Western control over Bolivia’s enormous lithium deposits. See <<http://www.informationclearinghouse.info/52542.htm>>.

Portugal apparently has Europe’s largest known lithium reserves. While the country has been plagued by forest fires for the past three years, attributed in the media to global warming, it appears that much of the fire (and the subsequent ground clearance) has been concentrated in areas where lithium deposits are suspected.

be best called nostalgic. Take the 1972 'oil crisis'.⁷ The US had accumulated massive debt in order to fund the costly wars in Korea and Vietnam – so massive it was becoming a threat to the value of the US dollar and the Nixon administration was faced with the possibility of a devaluation. Since the establishment of the fixed exchange rates in the Bretton Woods agreements – which also created the World Bank and International Monetary Fund – the US dollar had been pegged at a gold price of about \$35 per ounce. Following its two far Eastern wars, the US Treasury was convinced that this exchange rate would no longer hold.⁸ To avoid having to devalue the dollar and still maintain the rate of war spending, OPEC members were persuaded to sell oil solely for US dollars. This meant that the 'oil crisis' of the 70s hit the oil-importing economies, both in Europe and the newly independent colonies, forcing them to buy dollars to meet their oil needs. This artificial demand for the dollar stabilised the exchange rate for the US despite the decision to float it. While OPEC was generating billions through oil sales at high dollar prices, this money flowed back into the US as dollar denominated investment. This restored the US to its status as creditor nation and would provoke the 80s debt crisis in the Third World.

At about the same time a clique of capitalists convened the so-called *Club of Rome* and published a book called *The Limits to Growth*. Full of euphemistic eugenics, like the language of today's hysterics, it preached essentially that after the decimation of two world wars and the previous destruction of 400 years of slavery and colonialism, white folks were threatened by an explosion in the number of 'brown people'. Of course the book did not use such explicit language but anyone who read the list of countries could see that what was to be limited was the growth in brown people.⁹ Meanwhile, Nixon resigned but the petrodollar continued to wreak havoc everywhere except Manhattan and Mayfair.

⁷ There was in fact no oil shortage, there was just a conspiracy to keep the oil in the ground and let the price rise. You don't have to take my word for it. Just read John Blair's *The Control of Oil* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1976) – based on US Congressional research.

⁸ A similar short term problem occurred when George Soros forced sterling out of the European Monetary System by placing massive naked shorts on the pound and forcing the UK government to buy pounds to support the exchange rate mechanism. The British government's efforts failed and it had to withdraw from the EMS – making Soros a packet.

⁹ I do not know why the capitalist elite always seems to choose Italian cities to name its campaigns against the rest of the world – Rome, Bologna, Pisa. Perhaps it is because Arnold J Toynbee – an affine of the Round Table group – devoted so much attention to the fall of Rome in his *A Study of History*.

It seems to me that a confluence has been overlooked, especially by our social media generation for whom history is little more than a subject in which many did poorly at school. Despite their complexity, the fundamental struggles of the 20th century can be seen in the shift between a class society that derived its essential wealth from African slavery and colonialism until about 1886 with the abolition of chattel slavery, and struggles to end colonialism. The economic system in the West that was produced by African slavery and maintained by the ideology of white supremacy is called variously 'free enterprise', 'the free market', or, if need be, 'capitalism'.¹⁰ It is a nihilistic system as can be seen by the fact that, from 1917 until 1989, no rich white person could actually say what 'capitalism' was. They could only say what it wasn't. Foremost capitalism was not anything approximating environmental health, income equity, political equality, or even religious freedom. The most that could be said was that it was 'freedom to own things', like land and people. The minute people could no longer be owned there was suddenly only scarcity – whereas previously the big economic issue was how to allocate surplus. The minute colonies became independent nations there was no such thing as economic autonomy or control of national resources. Is it a coincidence that marginalism¹¹ in economics and progressivism (in civilian and military forms) emerged as management ideologies at the same time slavery was abolished and labour unions were becoming a serious threat to the order of things?

Another colloquial abuse is the term 'Marshall Plan'. Generally this term is loaded with positive connotations. The European Recovery Program in the

¹⁰ See on this subject Eric Williams, *Capitalism and Slavery* (Chapel Hill, North Carolina: University of North Carolina Press, 1944), available free at <<https://archive.org/details/capitalismandsla033027mbp/page/n8>> and Gerald Horne *The Apocalypse of Settler Colonialism* (New York: Monthly Review Press, 2018) reviewed at <<https://tinyurl.com/rfgncpx>> or <https://monthlyreview.org/product/apocalypse_of_settler_colonialism/>.

¹¹ 'One of the key foundations of marginalism is the concept of marginal utility. The utility of a product or service is its usefulness in satisfying our needs. Marginal utility extends the concept to the additional satisfaction derived from the same product or service.

Marginal utility is used to explain the discrepancy between products that should be considered valuable but are not and products that are rare and expensive. For example, water is essential to human existence and, as such, should be considered more precious than a diamond. However, an average human being is willing to pay more for an additional diamond than a glass of water. The theory of marginal utility claims that this is so because we derive more satisfaction from owning an additional diamond than another glass of water.'

From <<https://www.investopedia.com/terms/m/marginalism.asp>>.

1948 Foreign Assistance Act was a political and economic assistance plan focussed on the reconstruction of parts of Western Europe damaged during World War II. It was heavily promoted by propaganda on both sides of the Atlantic as American generosity – compared to the acrimony of the post-World War I treatment of the defeated belligerents. Thus the Marshall Plan, named after General, then US Secretary of State, George Marshall, entered common political speech as a term for any kind of global government sponsored and/or funded programmes for economic rescue. However the Marshall Plan was anything but benevolent or altruistic: it was political warfare launched against the Soviet Union in Western Europe.¹²

Rebuilding the US-occupied part of Germany was part of galvanising the German population (and the rest of Western Europe) against the communists. It was structured to accelerate the rebuilding of the West with surplus resources from the undamaged USA to demonstrate that the Soviet Union could not deliver (after having single-handedly defeated Nazi Germany) the quality of life that the US would offer.¹³ The Marshall Plan was also economic promotion for US capital which made money, selling to Western Europe, financing reconstruction. It also bought – or, with the benefit of occupation government, absorbed – the industrial, commercial and intellectual assets of Germany, and finally integrating Western European economies into the US corporate control. Much of what people in Germany today would identify as German businesses are in fact subsidiary to US corporations through various holding schemes. There was justifiable resistance to the European Recovery Plan in France, even in Germany, and from the Soviet Union because of the control of the economy and political regime that the plan gave to the US wherever it was introduced. In short, promoted as economic rescue it was in fact a new model of economic and political domination.

This power was exerted through the financial instruments, e.g. loans granted and managed through US banking cartels (acting as agents or

¹² It must be recalled that in 1947 the secret *NSC 68* of 1950 had been drafted and the framework for the US anti-Soviet alliance based on German rearmament – NATO – was already adopted. The European Recovery Programme was an overt operation, the fig-leaf for US economic penetration, to complement the covert operations, and a central element of US regime strategy as formulated by George Kennan and others.

¹³ The continued malignancy of this policy was reaffirmed recently by a resolution adopted in the European Parliament. See http://www.europarl.europa.eu/doceo/document/TA-9-2019-0021_EN.html.

directly) and the political agenda of anti-communism. This meant coupling aid with policies that would suppress democratic movements of the Left (socialists and communists were treated equally as subversive or criminal by the US regime). This was especially true where they enjoyed substantial support, as in France, Italy and the industrialised regions of Germany. As with all 'aid' programs based on loans and free trade, more money in fact flowed back to the US than reached Europe as subsidy. Subsequent US control over the greater part of the German economy also ensured that the Soviet Union would be deprived of the reparations it had been promised at Yalta – a critical element of the continued US war against the Soviet Union after 1945.

When hysterics start demanding a 'Marshall Plan' for the climate, they would do well to recall what the long-dead Mr Marshall's plan was.¹⁴ Perhaps we should also ask whom the true beneficiaries of the Global Environmental Fund and other banking and 'market-based' tools are?

This kind of 'Climate' hysteria is discursively the same as the anti-communism hysteria (and other evangelical movements in the US and its suzerain states). It generates the reaction – I believe deliberately – that anyone who is not a 'climate defender' or 'carbon buster' automatically holds the opposite position that all carbon emissions are permissible or harmless, that nothing humans do affects the climate, etc. (This might also be deliberately misconstrued as sympathising with Russia or China, too.)

This is one of the frequently successful strategies of political marketing (or any other kind of hype). The purpose is not to propose policy interventions – which could be negotiated – but to create a polarisation which a) isolates non-extremists and b) establishes a framework for ideological policing. Such isolation and policing was very successful in the 50s when lots of people were consumed with proving they were not communists. Now anyone who questions the evangelium of Extinction

¹⁴ A refresher course in the Bretton Woods agreements and how the World Bank and International Monetary Fund understand 'rescue' can be found in the 2001 film *Life and Debt*. See <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=l2HwWR_WCA4> or <<http://www.lifeanddebt.org/>>.

An interesting story about the propaganda for the Marshall Plan and the so-called German Economic Miracle can be found in the 2015 WDR television documentary *Operation Wunderland* (unfortunately only in German) available on YouTube, in three parts, at
1 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3vmgiQvDVWU>>
2 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=ejfjh0ayQi8>>
3 <<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=NmT08hSmSOE>>.

Rebellion, or similar elements of the sect, has to prove that he or she does not want human extinction through global warming

Let us allow that the complexity of historical processes I have described above might not really be intentional or even calculable. Again, if I wax nostalgic, I learned that feminism also meant that sex was not destiny and gender not the essence of human identity. I also learned that environmentalism was fundamentally recognition of indeterminacy. In other words, humans should be cautious and conservative (in the sense of conserving) because it really was impossible to determine the exact vector of any human action. If we were environmentally aware then that meant that every action had not only intended but untold, unintended and unpredictable consequences.

Is any of the learning experience that I have just detailed still valid? Perhaps a few of our current hysterics could engage in their own economic and intellectual history research and find out? If they find that it is still valid then how do these folks come to the conclusion that they – or their cultic scientists – know that anything done ostensibly to alter the climate will actually have such intended effect? How do they also know that no unintentional effects will be triggered for which no corrective can yet be anticipated?

I am quite sure that they have no answers to these questions. It lies in the very nature of Western apocalyptic eschatology that the end of the world is inevitable. The only issue is to prevent the privileged from suffering more than their brown brothers and sisters. This was true in Avignon in the Middle Ages and it is true now in Fortress America.