

# Some comments on Mr. Dewhirst's interesting article

October 2022

*Comments indented in red in the body of the article*

## The Great Reset – a world war on mankind

By [Howard Dewhirst](#)

October 24, 2022



Those with a scientific mind are busy day and night thinking about science. They have little time, let alone taste, for politics, and, furthermore, being overcome by doubt they understand the futile vanity of trying to influence global policies. Those who fail in science do politics while posing as scientists, which they are not.

Additionally, having some sense of proportions a true scientific mind cannot take itself seriously, whereas politicians and activists do take themselves seriously, to the utmost degree, and doubt never affects their judgement.

A LARGE number of businesses, including factories, pubs, shops, farms and fishing, might not survive the winter. This is primarily due not to the war in Ukraine or to Covid, but to the Great Reset that the World Economic Forum (WEF), the UN and their Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) have been working towards since the 1970s. At that time climate 'science' was warning of a new Ice Age and acid rain. When these did not materialise, they were replaced in the early 1980s by the new 'science' of Global Warming and 40 more years of failed predictions.

It is quite ironic that the abrupt reversal from Icing to Melting theories coincided with the British coal strikes of 1984-85 and Margaret Thatcher's scheme to make nuclear energy palatable to the public as a clean source of energy. It seems it took 30 years after her departure from Downing Street for her stratagem to succeed.

It seems that human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions are to blame, despite the fact that CO<sub>2</sub> emissions were too small to cause a period of warming that ended in 1943, and too large to explain periods of low to no warming from 1943-1978 and post 1998. Despite this absence of correlation, the UN/IPCC still insist that what is now called Climate Change is driven solely by human emissions of CO<sub>2</sub>.

Somehow the official stance seems to be one of Climate Invariance along the ages, a quite silly proposition, as any observer with the thinnest veneer of geology would know.

Incidentally, despite the most dreadful warnings, there has been just one (1) hurricane/tropical storm in the Gulf of Mexico in this 2022 hurricane season, to the probable chagrin of Doomsday propagandists. The media, which had predicted with the highest degree of confidence scores of devastating storms, had made it a Category 5 or higher, reporting it at one point as the biggest ever hurricane in the history of the biggest hurricanes, although readings from various weather stations along its path seem to confirm a Category 1 storm only. There are about 1,500 automatic weather buoys all along the U.S. shores, which return weather conditions in real time, plus tens of thousands of airport stations across the globe. However, their actual readings are never taken into consideration in the reports, which confuse man made prediction with actual natural facts. Additionally, in population compensated terms, the 2022 hurricane killed about 1/6 of Hurricane Camille's fatalities in 1969, 1/16 of Katrina's in 2005, 1/37 of the 1935 hurricane, and 1/3,500 of the 1900 Galveston hurricane.

Human activity does cause problems for the environment in the form of multiple pollutants, but the essential plant food CO<sub>2</sub> is not one of them. Why do so many scientists claim that it is?

Apparently because either they are not scientists, or science has become so compartmentalized that a physicist today has no clue about biology. Where did the polymaths go, from the Greek philosophers of the Antiquity to the gentlemen of the Age of Enlightenment and onwards to Richard Feynman?

Isn't it amusing that at the same time carbon is accused of being a nasty pollutant the branch of chemistry that deals with it is called organic. The atom of life.

It all began with an idea that appeared admirable – the redistribution of resources and wealth between the developed West and poor undeveloped countries such as China and India. This search for what is called social justice became formalised in the doctrine of the Great Reset, which began life in a book published in 1972 by the Club of Rome, a global think tank. Titled *The Limits to Growth*, it is a Malthusian interpretation of humanity's impact on the Earth summarised as too many people and too few resources.

All such interpretations being based on elementary arithmetics, a branch of mathematics think-tankers seem not to be too conversant with.

These ideas were re-imagined in an interview in 1990 given by Maurice Strong, a founding member of the IPCC and the WEF, in which he postulated that:

- In order to save the planet, the group asks: Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialised civilisations collapse?

Mr. Strong seems to really believe he is akin to God Almighty, or at least some of his archangels.

- Isn't it our responsibility to bring that about?

It is Mr. Strong's responsibility to care about his own life, not about mine.

- This group of world leaders (then) form a secret society to bring about an economic collapse.

This idea was taken up in the Club of Rome's 1991 book, *The First Global Revolution*, which said: 'The common enemy of humanity is man. In searching for a new enemy . . . we came up with the idea that pollution, the threat of global warming, water shortages, famine and the like, would fit the bill.'

They love mixing all their eggs in one omelet, don't they?

Regarding water shortages, someone needs to redo one's calculations: for instance, my daily personal fresh water consumption is but 2/10,000 of the amount of fresh water that rains down each day on average for each human being on the planet. Surely there's some room to wiggle here.

Also, if push came to shove and somehow all rains stopped abruptly (of course miraculously in conjunction with the end of evaporation, but I wouldn't bet too much on this), and if all fresh water came from sea water desalination using good old thermal distillation, the amount of energy required would be 2% of the energy released by all fossil fuel consumption, of which at least 70% is wasted anyhow. Again, surely there would be some room to wiggle.

The IPCC issue massive compilations of the latest climate scientific 'consensus' every few years, but only the 'Summary for Policy Makers' is read by most, and it focuses on the message, not the facts. The 1995 IPCC Main Report said:

- None of the studies . . . has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed [climate] changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases.

This was replaced in the Summary by:

- There is evidence of an emerging pattern of climate response to forcing by greenhouse gases and sulfate aerosols . . . *These results point toward a human influence on global climate.*

This change was then approved by the 'consensus'; why?

Because like almost everyone else, they are interested only in the story of their choice and whatever helps them bring home the bacon. They lack the one quality anyone with a true scientific mind must have: **detachment**, which means not to care a bit about the outcome, whether one likes it or not.

One answer is buried in the unelected UN's Agendas 21 and 30 which posit the way forward to the brave new world where you will 'own nothing and be happy', apparently; sustainable development is clearly something to strive for but at what cost? The planned economic collapse is now upon us – the West that is – and is moving towards completion, mission accomplished. But in execution this ambition has become stridently despotic. There has been no discussion of the IPCC conjecture that human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions cause warming, just blind acceptance of what is falsely claimed to be a consensus.

Another irony is that modern activists have reinvented the so called "*sustainable development*" concept, whereas the thing was conceived perhaps 10,000 years ago in the Neolithic Age, when agriculture was invented (or rather when those with a sword compelled those without one to invent it). We are here today discussing sustainable development precisely because our ancestors developed sustainable development 400 generations or so ago.

The majority of those who accept the conjecture believe it is true, because data that does not support it has been shut down by multiple agencies such as Google and Facebook, where algorithms push different opinions out of sight. Scientific journals, universities and scientific institutions have been corralled into rejecting any paper that does not support this blind consensus, not based on facts, but on the suspect papers 'not meeting editorial standards.'

One believes whatever one chooses to believe, irrespective of science. Some believe in Genesis, some in the Flood, some in Methuselah, and some in Santa Claus. Some believe in aliens coming from distant galaxies, and some believe in man undertaking interstellar travel. Some even believe that the new space telescope can see the details of planets several hundreds of light-years away, and some believe that a large asteroid such as that which resulted in the last global extinction event can be artificially deflected from its course. Some don't believe in Evolution and some do, although both would be hard pressed to explain why. Some don't believe in Relativity, and some do, although both would be hard pressed to explain why. Many even believe that the simultaneous explosion of part or all of the existing nuclear arsenal would instantly incinerate Earth in the Flames of Hell, several thousands of degrees hot (Celsius or Fahrenheit) and destroy forever all life on its surface and in its oceans, probably not realizing that the very essence of nuclear deterrence is precisely to make them believe that (which is not to say that a great many of us would not die, but that's another story).

All relish fiction much more than reality, otherwise horror, fantasy, superhero, and magical movies wouldn't enjoy such huge success, children wouldn't be read

almost exclusively stories in which animals talk, and there would be no churches. I do not criticize the above in any way: mankind is what it is and our civilizations are all deeply influenced by the past, but one cannot at the same time boast imaginary beliefs and a genuine respect for science, in the same fashion that one cannot at the same time boast patriotic beliefs and an absolute lack of bias when addressing international disputes.

I would also venture that almost all of those who fall prey to the Great Carbonaceous Scare as well as those who flatly reject it are equally ignorant of such disciplines as thermodynamics and geology. Their opinion about the subject matter is only a matter of political or philosophical opinion, not the result of careful and personal scientific reflection.

That there has never been an experiment which proves global warming is caused by human CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, and that for more than 50 years, every one of the predicted climate 'tipping points' has failed to happen, are quietly ignored for the sake of the consensus. What drives the consensus is the determination of the WEF, IPCC and the UN to drive home the Great Reset, come what may. In the words of Christiana Figueres, executive secretary of UN's Framework Convention on Climate Change, the goal is 'to intentionally transform the (existing global) economic development model . . . in other words not to save the world from ecological calamity, but to replace capitalism with something based on sustainable development driven by de-carbonisation of industry and agriculture.'

How they plan to coerce everyone on the planet not to mine, extract, and burn all existing fossil fuels down to the very last drop is unclear. Will every rich country of the world resort to the same tribunals of extraterritorial jurisdiction that are currently in vogue in the United States of America? Or will they only compel themselves to cut all such fuels from their diet, such fuels becoming therefore dirt cheap, thus allowing the poor of the world to finally develop their economies while the economies of the West go bankrupt?

What this means was explained by the Democratic Governor of Washington State, Dixy Lee Ray: 'The future is to be World Government with central planning by the United Nations. Fear of environmental crises – whether real or not – is expected to lead to compliance.'

What is a World Government without a World Army and a World Navy? What is the significance of law without law enforcement? How would the 200 plus nations of the world resolve their irreconcilable disputes? Also, I assume that the United States of America, who control 4% of the overall population and 6% of the land,

would pledge undivided allegiance to the World Government and would courteously abide by the edicts of the 96% of people that control 94% of the planet's land.

Confirmation of the UN's determination to control the debate can be deduced from the recent declaration that they 'own the science and the world should know' and that they have joined with Google to ensure that searchers find only UN results.

What is the penalty for circumventing Saint Google?

This is the thinking behind what the WEF call the Great Reset, which will use climate change to undermine the capitalist economy and then nationalise everything, so people will indeed 'own nothing and be happy' and, as in Russia after the revolution and in China today, the state is all.

This last paragraph does not do service to the rest of the article. In China today the state is not all, quite far from it. If in doubt, you just need to travel to China. Things are seldom as they look, and the tacit attack against communism is largely outdated, irrelevant, and means nothing, if it ever meant anything.

Also, in which way are governments of the West not controlling all power within their boundaries and without, although they were voted in by perhaps between 15% and 25% of their actual populations? Hasn't democracy become the dictatorship of less than one half of the electorate over the other? Did the President ask me for my assent before he lavished my savings on showering weapons on a war in which I have no beef? I am sure he would tell me to relax, it's for my own good. Am I in a position to disagree? In other words, what is it exactly that the average Chinaman should be jealous of? Could it be the constant never ending scuffles, brawls, rumpus, badmouthing and tournaments of lies between politicians seeking the rewards of electoral victory?

And which international head of state can we say is less unreasonable at the moment?

As for the media, it is quite comical to observe their outraged moral indignation when suspected of being propagandists, since the whole business model for the media rests precisely on commercial propaganda, otherwise dubbed advertisement, while those media outlets that are not on one advertiser's payroll or another's are on that of one government or another. Only such a news outlet as that in Washington which is personally owned by the world's wealthiest shopkeeper could afford total impartiality, but that would probably be contrary to

the very rationale for which he spent \$150 million to acquire the paper, i.e. shower the world with the superior wisdom of a shopkeeper. It is to be noted though that I am a faithful customer of his shop and appreciate the facility, although that is a different issue, but I don't see by which intellectual process the particular skills and dedication required for convincing people to give their money to one shopkeeper rather than to another automatically entitles the successful shopkeeper to universal consideration as a world-class philosopher.

This being said, privately owned media outlets are, that I know, quite at liberty to say, write, or suppress whatever they choose, contrary to the Government of the United States which is prohibited by the magnificent First Amendment to the Constitution from succumbing to the temptation.

Governments of Europe are not limited by their constitutions, though, since they do not enjoy sturdy enough constitutions that one half of a popular vote could not abolish in a second, and said "constitutions" do not guarantee in any way or form the freedoms of speech and religion.

---

You may be interested in reviewing some of my other relevant studies and commentaries:

- A sense of climatological proportion (2017)
- Questions about basic scientific knowledge (2019)
- Laura, myth and reality (2020)
- About disagreealists (2021)
- Full circle (2021)
- Comments on the Houston flood of August 31, 2017 (2017)

M