CLIMATE COUP
The Politics

by Dr. David Evans

SPPI
Science & Public Policy Institute
"science-based policy for a better world"

SPPI REPRINT SERIES ♦ March 23, 2012

How the regulating class is using bogus claims about climate change to entrench and extend their economic privileges and political control.

The science foundation

for this article is in

*"**Climate Coup—The Science**".*[1]

Dr David M.W. Evans, 29 Feb 2012,

last updated 19 Mar 2012,

*latest pdf **here**.*

CLIMATE COUP—THE POLITICS

by Dr. David Evans | March 19, 2012

THE SCIENCE

The sister article *Climate Coup—The Science* contains the science foundation for this essay. It checks the track record of the climate models against our best and latest data, from impeccable sources. It details how you can download this data yourself. It finds that the climate models got all their major predictions wrong:

Test	Climate Models
Air temperatures from 1988	Actual rise was less than the rise predicted for drastic cuts in CO_2
Air temperatures from 1990	Over-estimated trend rise
Ocean temperatures from 2003	Over-estimated trend rise greatly
Atmospheric hotspot	Completely missing → water feedbacks not amplifying
Outgoing radiation	Opposite to reality → water feedbacks not amplifying

The latter two items are especially pertinent, because they show that the crucial amplification by water feedbacks (mainly humidity and clouds),[1] *assumed* by the models, does not exist in reality. Modelers *guessed* that of the forces on temperature, only CO_2 has changed significantly since 1750. The amplification by water feedbacks causes two-thirds of the warming predicted by the models, while carbon dioxide only directly causes one third. The presence of the amplification in the models, but not in reality, explains why the models overestimated recent warming.

WHO ARE YOU GOING TO BELIEVE — THE GOVERNMENT CLIMATE SCIENTISTS OR YOUR OWN LYING EYES?

The climate models are incompatible with the data. You cannot believe both the theory of dangerous manmade global warming and the data, because they cannot both be right.

In science, data trumps theory. If data and theory disagree, as they do here, people of a more scientific bent go with the data and scrap the theory.

Many people simply cannot get past the fact that nearly all the authority figures believe the theory. To these people the data is simply irrelevant.

But in politics we usually go with authority figures, who in this case are the government climate scientists and the western governments—and they strongly support the theory. Many people simply cannot get past the fact that nearly all the authority figures believe the theory. To these people the data

is simply irrelevant. Society needs most people to follow authority most of the time, just like an army needs soldiers who do not question orders.

The world's climate scientists are almost all employed by western governments. They usually don't pay you to do climate research unless you say you believe manmade global warming is dangerous, and it has been that way for more than 20 years.[2] The result is a near-unanimity that is unusual for a theory in such an immature science.

Sideshows Instead of the Whole Truth

The government climate scientists and mainstream media have kept at least two important truths from the public and the politicians:

1. Two thirds of the warming predicted by the climate models is due to amplification by the water feedbacks, and only one third is directly due to CO_2.
2. The dispute among scientists is about the water feedbacks. There is no dispute among serious scientists about the direct effect of CO_2.

The government climate scientists and mainstream media have kept at least two important truths from the public and the politicians.

They seek to persuade with partial truths and omissions, not telling the truth in a disinterested manner. Instead, we are treated to endless sideshows. Issues such as Arctic ice, polar bears, bad weather , or the supposed psychological sickness of those opposing the authorities, tell us nothing about the *causes* of global warming. They divert public attention and the water feedbacks escapes scrutiny—hidden in plain sight, but never under public discussion.

The Silence of the Mainstream Media

The data presented in *Climate Coup—The Science* is plainly relevant, publicly available, and impeccably sourced from our best instruments—satellites, Argo, and the weather balloons. Yet it never appears in the mainstream media.[3] Have you ever seen it?

If the mainstream media were interested in the truth, they would seek out the best and latest data and check the predictions against the data. They don't.

If the mainstream media were interested in the truth, they would seek out the best and latest data and check the predictions against the data. They don't.

The newspapers are happy to devote acres of newsprint to the climate sideshows or to demonizing anyone who criticizes the theory. So why are they unwilling to publish the most relevant data?

Global warning has been a big issue for years. Yet all of the world's investigative journalists—those cynical, hard-bitten, clever, incorruptible, scandal-sniffing reporters of the vital truths who are celebrated in their own press—all of them just happen not to notice

that the climate models get *all* their major predictions wrong? Really? Even though we point it out to them?

Good detectives do not overlook clues. The presented data contains half a dozen clues of brick-in-your-face subtlety. How could anyone miss them? Will the journalists who read this paragraph now follow the instructions on downloading the data, and report on what they find? No.

Perhaps they think it's all too complicated, that it will make our brains hurt? A story with two numbers is too hard? No, we all understand a graph of temperature over time and can spot trends. Judging by the huge response on the Internet, the public want well-explained technical details about the climate.

The government climate scientists and their climate models said it would warm like this and heat up the atmosphere like that. But it didn't, just download the data and check.

The media are withholding this data, so the "climate debate" is obviously not about science or truth. It must be about politics and power. Reluctantly, uncomfortably, the only possible conclusion is that the ***media don't want to investigate the claims of the government climate scientists***. Why? Who benefits?

The media are withholding this data, so the "climate debate" is obviously not about science or truth. It must be about politics and power.

THE REGULATING CLASS

Consider the array of forces in the climate argument:

Believers	Doubters
UN (including the IPCC)	Independently-funded scientists
Western governments	Private sector middle class
Major banks and finance houses[4]	Amateurs (from *amore* , the Latin for love)
NGO's and Greenies	
Totalitarian leftists	
Government-funded scientists[5]	
Academia	
Renewables corporations	
Mainstream news media	

The supporters of the theory of manmade global warming are mainly financial beneficiaries,[6] believers in big government, or Greens. They are usually university educated. They generally prefer the methods

of government, namely politics and coercion, rather than the voluntary transactions of the marketplace—especially when it comes to setting their own remuneration.

They are an ***intellectual upper class of wordsmiths,*** who regulate and pontificate rather than produce real stuff. There is little demand in the economy for their skills, so they would command only modest rewards for their labor in the marketplace. Arguably they are a class of parasites enriching themselves at the expense of producers, because they are rewarded out of proportion to the value they create—value as determined not by themselves, but by voluntary transactions in the marketplace.

They don't like the market place, basically because the marketplace doesn't like them.[7] The marketplace doesn't reward them as much as they think it should. They prefer a system where people like them form the government and bureaucracy, where they take a large slice of everyone else's income by threat of force, and then they pay themselves what *they* think they are worth out of those taxes. This stands in stark contrast to most people, who are generally paid only what the market will allow.

The regulating class does not try to hide its belief that it is cleverer, and morally superior too.

Their shared economic basis makes them a class. Let's call them the "regulating class".[8,9] (It seems like a trivial thing, but this argument is bedeviled by the lack of a widely-accepted name for this class. Due to the modern context they are a new phenomenon, but they are similar to coalitions identified in the past—such as the "new class" of Milovan Djilas[10] which is described by George Orwell as "a new aristocracy",[11] or the *classe politique* in France ,[12] or the tradition of Legalism in Imperial China. We chose "regulating class" because regulation is their core action, their standard tactic to advance their interests.)

The regulating class also attracts people who are not part of it for strictly economic reasons, but who identify with it because of similar backgrounds, or culture and beliefs. The regulating class does not try to hide its belief that it is cleverer, and morally superior too. Annoy a member of this class sufficiently to strip away their veneer of politeness, and soon you will be called an "idiot" and eventually a "racist". Who has not at times felt the siren call and ego boost of feeling superior to one's fellow man? Viewers can get a very real sense of superiority by watching the mainstream media, especially the government-owned channels, and adopting the trendy beliefs being pushed there. "Oh, I feel so superior to all those idiots and racists out there because I have these shiny new beliefs as validated by the superior regulating class with whom I now identify myself." Share their beliefs, show them off to your friends, and you too can feel superior and of high status—even though your situation or remuneration may be modest. It is a cheap grab for status that costs almost no effort to earn.

The skeptics are overwhelmingly from the private sector. People who work with the real physical world but are not employed by government are usually skeptics.

The mainstream media have withheld the data presented in *Climate Coup—The Science*, which strongly suggests they are part of the regulating class. Most of the larger media organizations are sympathetic to the regulating class and relentlessly promote its views.

If human emissions of CO_2 are causing a major planetary problem, then there are only two plausible solutions: wait and adapt, or regulate and reduce. Only the second solution interests the regulating class.

On the other side of the argument stand those doubting the theory. The skeptics are overwhelmingly from the private sector. People who work with the real physical world but are not employed by government are usually skeptics. The mainstream media is largely denied to skeptics, so they communicate via the Internet and talkback radio.

Why Global Warming is So Important to the Regulating Class

If human emissions of CO_2 are causing a major planetary problem, then there are only two plausible solutions: wait and adapt, or regulate and reduce. Only the second solution interests the regulating class. To regulate CO_2 emissions effectively and fairly you must regulate nearly all energy use, and thus most of the economy, in every nation of the world.

The regulating class promotes the dual beliefs that the "problem" of global warming is very scary and that it is caused by human emissions of CO_2. ***The only solution they offer just happens to be complete regulation of the whole world's economy by … the regulating class, of course***. "Enlightened" self-interest doesn't come any bigger than this.

The theory of manmade global warming is not a conspiracy. It is a confluence of vested interests in increased political regulation of the economy and rejecting market forces. Bureaucrats, academics, government scientists, utilities, renewables manufacturers, bankers, most politicians—all these have a shared financial interest in imposing their solution to "manmade" global warming.

The theory of manmade global warming is not a conspiracy. It is a confluence of vested interests in increased political regulation of the economy and rejecting market forces.

The Copenhagen Treaty was an Attempted Coup

Nearly all the world leaders met in Copenhagen in late 2009, expecting to sign the "Copenhagen Treaty" to limit CO_2 emissions. But China and India torpedoed the negotiations, saying more research was needed to establish whether warming is manmade and refusing to commit to any quantified emissions reduction targets.[13] The much weaker "Copenhagen Accord"[14] was signed instead.

Figure 1: The regulating class at work in Copenhagen. President Obama of the US [Credit: AP/Susan Walsh], Ban Ki-moon the Secretary General of the United Nations [Credit: China Daily], British PM Gordon Brown [Credit: Reuters/Ints Kalnins], presided over by Connie Hedegaard, the Danish climate and energy minister [Credit: EPA].

The draft Copenhagen Treaty is still available in a few corners of the Internet.[15] It is 181 pages of dense, convoluted, bureaucratic language, slow and difficult to read. The draft contains options and blanks to be filled in. Nonetheless, it is clear enough.

> *If something like the draft Treaty had been signed, it would have been the biggest transfer of sovereign power in recorded human history.*

The Treaty would have set up a new bureaucracy with the power to regulate CO_2 emissions worldwide, able to regulate any market, over-riding national governments as required.[16] It could also fine and tax any signatory government.[17] In the hands of a judge from the regulating class, it could be interpreted to give this new global bureaucracy the power to tax every signatory nation and regulate its energy use almost completely—just look at how the US Constitution has been extended by interpretation over the years, and that's a much clearer document. A hint or ambiguity in the Treaty could become the basis for a full blown mechanism to do almost anything the bureaucrats wished.

From experience with the monotonic growth of centralized power in federations of states, such as the United States or Australia, it is almost inevitable that within a few decades this new body would be parlayed up into a strong global bureaucracy regulating more than just CO_2 emissions.

The mainstream media are very talkative when power changes hands in democracies (elections), and extremely interested when outside groups impinge on a nation's sovereignty (wars), yet were almost entirely silent about the implications of the Treaty for the loss of national sovereignty. If something like the draft Treaty had been signed, it would have been the biggest transfer of sovereign power in recorded human history: nearly all the nations of the world would have ceded much of their sovereign power all at once. Yet the media scarcely raised an eyebrow.

Climate "science" is clearly flawed, but it is an excuse for a massive power play.

All of that national sovereignty would have been ceded to an unelected group of global bureaucrats: Never in the field of human administration would so much power have been transferred by so many to so few. ***This was a narrowly averted global coup, an attempt to seize a great deal of power by stealth without the knowledge or explicit consent of the world's people.*** It can only have been kept silent with the active support of the world's media. But because of that silence, the coup has never been acknowledged, so the people of the world are unaware of it and further attempts could be made. Climate "science" is clearly flawed, but it is an excuse for a massive power play.

Figure 2: It is one of the oldest scams in human history: witchdoctors go to the rulers and say "the Gods are angry, there will be (more) catastrophes … we know how to appease the Gods, but it will cost you" [Credit: CDC].

Any global system is prone to tyranny taking over forever, because if it is global there is no possibility of outside help or refuge for those under its yoke—so the tyranny is harder to dislodge.

A Global Bureaucracy Would Be Bad

If a bureaucracy is global, there is nowhere to run to from high taxes, persecution, exploitation, selective enforcement of regulations, and so on. It would bring an end to the competition that keeps sovereign nations in check and makes them treat their productive citizens decently. Furthermore, any global system is prone to tyranny taking over forever, because if it is global there is no possibility of outside help or refuge for those under its yoke—so the tyranny is harder to dislodge.

It is competition in human affairs that keep people and organizations "honest", that fuels dynamism and progress. Monopolies are bad for customers. Of course we all want to escape from competition for ourselves, to be monopolists in our own little ways. But we all know that we benefit from competition among those who provide us with goods and services, including bureaucratic services.

A global bureaucracy is especially bad for industries, like mining, that have traditionally relied on competition between nations to prevent being exploited. It would end all that by simply imposing conditions on the miners, take it or leave it—and miners would effectively become serfs.

A global bureaucracy is especially bad for industries, like mining, that have traditionally relied on competition between nations to prevent being exploited. Nations are in competition with each other for the services of miners: if a nation make conditions too hard or is too taxing then the miners move to a different jurisdiction. Currently there is a world marketplace in mining, a system of voluntary agreements between nations and mining companies. A global bureaucracy would end all that by simply imposing conditions on the miners, take it or leave it—and miners would effectively become serfs.

GLOBAL WARMING: WHAT'S AT STAKE FOR YOU

If you are an economic member of the regulating class, a global bureaucracy instigated by the alleged need to regulate CO_2 emissions would be terrific: more jobs, power, and money for bureaucrats and their allies. You would be part of what would effectively become a ruling class, free to tax a captive population whatever they could bear and pay yourselves whatever you "know" you're worth.

Figure 3: If their "solution" to global warming ushered in a global bureaucracy, people like these would be setting regulations worldwide, with no escape for anyone: The President of the European Council, Herman Van Rompuy, [18] Chairman of the UN's IPCC, Rajendra Pachauri [Credit: Mikhail Evstafiev], and David Suzuki, Canadian conservationist [Credit: Rich Frishman].

For everyone else, what's at stake is ***freedom from the demands of a hostile ruling class, as well as more disposable income, more choice, less red tape, and a better quality of life***. The new regulating class—bureaucrats, academics, greenies—look down on others as stupid and morally inferior, they don't like people who make real stuff, and they don't like the private sector or the marketplace. They would be happy for the everyone else to compete in the marketplace to make them stuff, but they themselves won't have to compete. Their regulations would be global so there would be no escape, and competition between nations vying for our services and taxes would shrivel.

What's at stake is freedom from the demands of a hostile ruling class, as well as more disposable income, more choice, less red tape, and a better quality of life.

The Trademark Tactics of the Regulating Class

If you oppose the regulating class, you will get called an "extremist", a "nut", a "conspiracy theorist", "right wing", and every variation of "stupid" and "ignorant", irrespective of the merits of what you say. Say anything that mentions or might imply race and they will also call you a "racist". Because they own the mainstream media, they will call you these names in the news and current affairs, newspapers, television, websites, books, movies, and in trendy conversation.

Figure 4: Oppose them, and they call you names. And they *own* the media. [Credits: Office for the Protection of Children and Youth, Nonprofithub.]

Name-calling by members of the regulating class is so rife that it often replaces content entirely. Asked to explain why they believe something, they will often just indulge in name-calling, sometimes sophisticated or cleverly disguised name-calling, but often there will be no actual evidence, argument, or reasoning in their thicket of pejoratives.

Name-calling by members of the regulating class is so rife that it often replaces content entirely.

Their name-calling frightens most people into submission most of the time: "Ooh, I don't want to get called names, especially in public, so I won't say anything." A second important effect is to make their supporters arrogant and confident to the point of delusion,

Opinions and evidence counter to the interests of the regulating class are "illegitimate", and are ruthlessly suppressed.

because they believe their critics *really are* stupid, ignorant kooks—after all, everyone trendy like them says so!

But above all, they want to shut their critics up—by any means short of violence. Opinions and evidence counter to the interests of the regulating class are "illegitimate", and are ruthlessly suppressed.[19]

The regulating class does not debate—why bother, when you have the media on your side to repeat your message and to discredit and block your critics? They hold pretend debates in their media studios with an audience of their supporters or a panel predominately of their supporters, or in an interview where the host is one of theirs, ready to interrupt a critic immediately they start to make a good point or get any momentum—but these are really just exercises in demonizing their non-class guest, educating their supporters on whom to hiss and call names. An honest debate, on the other hand, risks getting past name-calling and exposing their vested interests and defects in evidence or reasoning.

The regulating class does not debate—why bother, when you have the media on your side to repeat your message and to discredit and block your critics? The other main tactic of the regulating class is to appoint themselves the authorities and then play the authority card.

The other main tactic of the regulating class is to appoint themselves the authorities and then play the authority card. They say, on climate change or any issue (and read this in your most patronizing and authoritative voice please):

"Trust us, we are the experts. All the experts agree with us. … Anyone who disagrees with us is a fool, or a nut, or just politically motivated."

The regulating class enforces solidarity and uniformity of view within their ranks by directing personal attacks, often quite vicious, against anyone who deviates from the current class line. In their world, social relationships are secondary to political solidarity: express a different opinion and you will face unfriendliness or exclusion by class members you thought were your friends.

The regulating class enforces solidarity and uniformity of view within their ranks by directing personal attacks, often quite vicious, against anyone who deviates from the current class line. In their world, social relationships are secondary to political solidarity: express a different opinion and you will face unfriendliness or exclusion by class members you thought were your

friends. This habit of socially censuring those who disagree with the class view, plus the contempt they feel for others, ensures that social relations between this class and the rest of society tend to be shallow or short-lived. The result is a ruling elite that is increasingly socially isolated. Their opinions are seriously out of synch with wider society—such as on climate change, or government intervention to bail out the executives, shareholders and bondholders of failing banks and to interfere in markets everywhere.

On climate change, the regulating class has won over the leadership of most professional and business organizations by lobbying and pressure.

On climate change, the regulating class has won over the *leadership* of most professional and business organizations by lobbying and pressure. Who would oppose the bureaucrats, knowing their power to selectively enforce a myriad of rules or to award contracts and consultancies? They created a bandwagon effect, manufacturing the appearance of a consensus but having only persuaded or bought a minimum of people. They isolate and exclude their opponents from government-related activity and the media, suppress criticisms by name calling and worse, have opponents fired where possible, and reward and hire only their supporters. The result: professionals and organizations appear to be all on their side. After all, they have all the government power, and all the taxpayers' money.

THE SKEPTICS ARE WINNING

The western public was about 20% skeptical in 2008 but is now about 50% skeptical, according to opinion polls. The blogs of the climate alarmists are despairing that they have "lost the public".[20]

The western public was about 20% skeptical in 2008 but is now about 50% skeptical, according to opinion polls. The blogs of the climate alarmists are despairing that they have "lost the public. The regulating class is being defeated by a rag-tag army of mainly disorganized amateurs, because the skeptics have the data on their side.

The regulating class is being defeated by a rag-tag army of mainly disorganized amateurs, because the skeptics have the data on their side. The big lesson here is that ***the Internet trumps the mainstream media, it just takes a while***. The suppressed data gets through eventually. Without the Internet, the meme of manmade global warming almost certainly be dominant and the coup at Copenhagen would have succeeded.

There is an historical precedent. In Europe several hundred years ago the Church had a monopoly on distributing high quality information—via the pulpit.[21] Then along came the printing press, which broke the monopoly. Soon afterwards came the Reformation, and eventually the Enlightenment, and the Church's status, wealth, and power fell substantially. For the last few decades in western society, the mainstream media have had a monopoly on distributing

information. Now the Internet is dissolving that monopoly; climate change is the first major public issue where the Internet affected the outcome.

Figure 5: Getting the information through: printing press (1440), Internet (1990), and the Lobbyist's briefcase.[22]

> *For the last few decades in western society, the mainstream media have had a monopoly on distributing information. Now the Internet is dissolving that monopoly; climate change is the first major public issue where the Internet affected the outcome.*

The skeptics have also won in the legislatures. Governments nearly everywhere are backing off, with only Europe, Australia, and New Zealand imposing regulations to reduce CO_2 emissions (only Australia's are meaningful and punitive, and only because the Greens temporarily hold the balance of power). How did the skeptics win? By ***walking the data through to the legislators in lobbyist's briefcases***, bypassing the block that is the mainstream media, and in many case penetrating the smears and disinformation intended to inoculate the legislators from anything skeptics say.

When President Obama and a Democrat-controlled Congress came to power in 2009, they were all set to "do something about climate change". The lobbyists went in and showed them the data. In enough cases, when the legislators saw the data they decided they wanted no part of CO_2 regulation. They were not going to argue publicly with government climate scientists, but they made it plain that they were not going to legislate to regulate CO_2 emissions. President Obama backed off, and the legislation was never introduced. Now everyone knows that the US Congress is not going to act.

> *There is no way to spin this for the regulating class. They look stupid or dishonest for supporting "climate change" for so long, and for having so vehemently discredited the critics. They are in a terrible quandary.*

Obviously the regulating class will now respond by regulating the Internet and lobbyist's briefcases.

WHY THE REGULATING CLASS CANNOT CONCEDE IT IS WRONG

There is no way to spin this for the regulating class. They look stupid or dishonest for supporting "climate change" for so long, and for having so vehemently discredited the critics. They are in a terrible quandary.

They are wordsmiths, and honesty is not their highest value, so they will use words to hide and obfuscate the obvious failure of their theory. Owning the media, they will block contrary data as long as possible. The loss of face should be huge, but with their near-complete control of the media they should be able to minimize the pain: "we don't talk about that now, how un-cool, I knew something was wrong with it all along".

Harder for them to hide will be the ***loss of their presumed qualification to lead society.*** Their justification for their privileged status and their right to govern, at least in their own eyes, has been contradicted. Remember how often they implied that anyone who didn't "believe in climate change" was a backward fool? The death of the global warming issue will reverse their claim to being wiser and more capable. They will fight it fiercely and dogmatically, with only feigned respect for evidence. This phase may persist for years.

Fraud is acquiring other people's property by deception. The coup by the regulating class would have allowed them to tax the world's wealth as they pleased.

THE PERFECT CRIME

Fraud is acquiring other people's property by deception. The coup by the regulating class would have allowed them to tax the world's wealth as they pleased. There is obviously deception in the pretext of dangerous manmade global warming and the silence around the implications of the Copenhagen Treaty. So has a crime being committed? Crimes are defined and prosecuted by government and bureaucrats, so no matter what the statute books say, no one will be prosecuted.

Climate criminals almost took control of the whole world by deception, a grand fraud. Money has changed hands on a vast scale due to a bunch of easily-dispelled untruths, yet somehow no one will be found to be at fault.

Climate criminals almost took control of the whole world by deception, a grand fraud. Money has changed hands on a vast scale due to a bunch of easily-dispelled untruths, yet somehow no one will be found to be at fault. The government climate scientists will say they did the right thing by alerting the world to a possible problem and that they the only made "projections", not predictions. Bureaucrats, politicians and media will say they were acting on the scientists' advice. Renewables companies will say that it was not their fault they were subsidized. The regulating class will denigrate anyone who mentions the attempted coup. All the beneficiaries are from the new regulating class, which happens to be in charge of the justice system. So no one will go to

The push towards a global bureaucracy, using climate change as an excuse, is a clear and present danger to sovereign nations, to the competition between nations for productive citizens, and to freedom everywhere.

jail or even pay back their ill-gotten gains to the taxpayers. The rest of society paid for this nonsense, transferring huge quantities of money to the new class, and almost became serfs on their own planet in the process. But no one will be at fault.

The Planet Will Be OK

While there will be warming due to our emissions of CO_2, the climate models exaggerate and the warming will only be mild. In the tropics it will have almost no effect, while elsewhere it will be equivalent to moving a few tens of kilometers closer to the equator. There are much larger natural forces on our climate at play, and it is they and not our puny CO_2 that drives the planet's temperature. Finally, all that extra CO_2 in the air is great for the plants: plants are nearly half carbon by dry weight, and they get it all from the air.

It has been well said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Conclusions

The push towards a global bureaucracy, using climate change as an excuse, is a clear and present danger to sovereign nations, to the competition between nations for productive citizens, and to freedom everywhere. The attempted stealthy globalization of bureaucracy is a crime by a new regulating class that demands the privilege of taxing and paying itself whatever it thinks is worth, while the rewards for the rest of society are instead set by competition in the marketplace.

The threat of a bureaucratic coup is perhaps receding, but will be revived if the climate warms, or *if it is perceived to warm.* For instance, satellites naturally degrade with time but might not be replaced, we could be shown just "global" temperatures from land thermometers in artificially warming locations, the ocean data could be biased by rejecting data from Argo buoys that give colder readings, and there are a myriad of computing tricks that could be employed on the data. It has been well said that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

Coalitions like the current regulating class have always been instinctively totalitarian, desirous of interfering in every tiny detail of our lives—for our own good of course, and prodigiously at our expense.

The real issue here is a grab for absolute power by those who already govern. They have grown tired of democracy and would like to do away with it, without ever giving the game away by actually saying so. This is the age-old divide between the totalitarians and libertarians. Coalitions like the current regulating class have always been instinctively totalitarian, desirous of

interfering in every tiny detail of our lives—for our own good of course, and prodigiously at our expense. They are now even telling us what kind of light-bulbs we can use. With the rise of democracy, it looked like the regulating class would be subject to the will of the people. The US Constitution explicitly defines the obligations of government to the people, and not of people to the government. However, liberty, democracy, and the free market are now again at grave risk, and "global warming" is the Trojan Horse the regulating class is hoping to ride to victory over the people.

Liberty, democracy, and the free market are now again at grave risk, and "global warming" is the Trojan Horse the regulating class is hoping to ride to victory over the people.

About the Author

Dr David M.W. Evans consulted full-time for the Australian Greenhouse Office (now the Department of Climate Change) from 1999 to 2005, and part-time 2008 to 2010, modeling Australia's carbon in plants, debris, mulch, soils, and forestry and agricultural products. Evans is a mathematician and engineer, with six university degrees including a PhD from Stanford University in electrical engineering. The evidence supporting the idea that CO_2 emissions were the main cause of global warming reversed itself from 1998 to 2006, causing Evans to move from being a warmist to a skeptic. The response Evans received for making some obvious points about the evidence in 2007 was overly-strong and dishonest, alerting him that there was more to the global warming issue than just the science.

Inquiries to david.evans@sciencespeak.com.

The sister article of this article, called "Climate Coup—The Science", is at jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/guest/evans-david/climate-coup-science.pdf.

---

1 As in Climate Coup—The Science, we are using the "water feedbacks" to mean all the feedbacks involving water in any of its forms (freshwater, ocean water, water vapor, clouds, rain, etc.) or the lapse rate. The main feedbacks are the water vapor and cloud feedbacks. (Water vapor is water in its gaseous form, i.e. humidity).

2 See pages 28 and 29, "Most Western Climate Scientists Believe Global Warming is Man-Made: True But Murky", in jonova.s3.amazonaws.com/corruption/climate-corruption.pdf.

3 As far as I know. The Internet skeptics would very likely have noticed and commented if it had occurred.

4 Climate money: Bigger money moves in.

5 Climate change suspect must be given a fair trial, *The Weekend Australian.*

6 joannenova.com.au/2009/07/massive-climate-funding-exposed. Auditing is left to unpaid volunteers.

7 www.martindurkin.com/blogs/real-global-warming-consensus-or-why-intellectuals-hate-capitalism.

8 For want of a better or existing name. Maybe a clever acronym would be best (eg PRAM for "Parasitic/Political Regulating Anti-Marketeer"). This designation bears no relationship to the writers on political economy originating in 1970s France, called the "regulationists".

9 If we were to partition society by economic mode it might look something like:

- Remuneration primarily determined by political means:
  - Regulating class.
  - Military class (armed forces, police, customs, spies, drug enforcement, etc.)
  - Welfare class.
- Remuneration primarily set by the market:
  - Commercial class.
  - Criminal class (of course they have their own special ways of avoiding most competition).

  Here we are only interested in fleshing out the characteristics of the regulating class, because it is they who are driving the global warming issue.

[10] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/New_class.

[11] www.mutualist.org/id7.html.

[12] But not "political class", because many politicians oppose the regulating class—very notably, Ron Paul.

[13] www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2010/jan/24/china-climate-change-adviser.
www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/dec/21/copenhagen-treaty-gordon-brown.
www.guardian.co.uk/environment/2009/dec/20/ed-miliband-china-copenhagen-summit.

[14] en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Copenhagen_Accord.

[15] www.globalclimatescam.com/documents/un-fccc-copenhagen-2009.pdf,
wattsupwiththat.files.wordpress.com/2009/10/un-fccc-copenhagen-2009.pdf.

[16] Page 18, paragraphs 36 and 38.

[17] Page 135 options 7 and 8, page 145 paragraph 76, page 74 paragraph 38, page 110 paragraph 113, page 134 Option 3. Page 43 paragraph 41 (d), page 173 paragraph 50 (c).

[18] Image: en.wikipedia.org/wiki/President_of_the_European_Council.

[19] Recent example: An Australian Government Report appears to recommend regulating political speech, especially regarding climate change: www.stopgillardscarbontax.com/2012/03/urgent-new-govt-report-calls-for-big-brother-regulator-to-silence-climate-skeptics.html and joannenova.com.au/2012/03/finkelstein-yes-please-just-try-it.

[20] Humorous but informative article about the current unpopularity of climate alarmism with the British public: www.thecommentator.com/article/972/the_high_priests_of_global_warming_have_lost_their_prestige_and_the_realists_are_winning_the_debate.

[21] The church maintained its monopoly not just through the pulpit but through its control of hand writing of Biblical texts and the writings of the church fathers, in Latin. It was too expensive to write out the Bible in the vernacular. The invention of the printing press changed all that, and within a few years hundreds of thousands of Bibles, in English and German, had been printed and distributed.

[22] Printing press image: dstopsky.com/teaching-samples/the-renaissance,
Internet image: Credit Svilen.milev, commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:World_wide_web.jpg,
Lobbyist image: Credit csmonitor.com, www.heatingoil.com/blog/green-industries-lobby-hard-climate-bills1014.