
Interview: Lord Christopher Monckton

Destroying National Sovereignty: The Real Face of ‘Global Warming’

Lord Christopher Monckton, former science advisor to British Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher, was interviewed by Gregory Murphy, Associate Editor of 21st Century Science & Technology, on June 2, at the Heartland Institute’s Third International Conference on Climate Change in Washington, D.C.

Monckton is recognized as a leading spokesman against the global warming swindle as “genocidal.” He has special authority in stating this. His grandfather played a key role in arranging the 1936 abdication of that chief symbol of Britain’s Nazi-loving aristocracy, King Edward VIII, as part of the effort by anti-fascists to crush the Hitler project in Britain.

In March of this year, Monckton testified at two hearings on Capitol Hill, just days after the global warming lovefest organized by former British Prime Minister Tony Blair and Lord Nicholas Stern. At these hearings, Monckton presented testimony demonstrating that the effects of passing any climate change legislation that includes a cap-and-trade scheme for carbon emissions would be genocidal for the poor.

In the interview, one sees that, Monckton’s view of the “cabal,” as he calls the people behind the fascist global warming swindle, is limited. The interviewer’s view of this cabal is broader, which includes the financial oligarchy centered in the City of London and the self-confessed genocidalists Prince Philip and Prince Charles, along with their lap dog Al Gore.

Murphy: In the Senate and the House and on Capitol Hill, there’s a debate on the Cap and Trade Bill, known as the Waxman-Markey bill, which has devastating effects on rationing energy. What other effects will the bill have?

Monckton: The first effect is that this is the largest tax increase ever to be inflicted on a population in the history of the world. And it is also the most pointless and unnecessary tax increase. Winston Churchill used

to say that the only legitimate purpose of taxation is to raise revenue. But what has happened on the left in politics is that the left are now using taxation not only as an instrument of raising revenue, but as an instrument of policy, to try to make people behave in a way which the left thinks is desirable.

So they have decided that “global warming” as they used to call it, “climate change” as they began to call it, and “energy security” as the bill now calls it—and “absolute rubbish,” as I call it—is a problem that needs to be addressed by inflicting taxation on the entire population. However, it occurred to them, after I testified in front of them and told them so, that if they were to put up the cost of energy, then that cost would fall disproportionately on the very poorest taxpayers. Or even if they weren’t taxpayers, it would fall disproportionately on them, because energy costs form a far larger proportion of the household budget of poor people than of wealthier people.

And the first response I got when I said this to the committee was, “Why are you calling them ‘poor people’? We call them ‘low income families.’” And I said, “That means that they are poor, and if they are poor, we should say that they are poor, and we should do something about it, rather than making them poorer still. And I’m not here,” I said, “to bandy words about what is the politically correct phrase about somebody who is poor. Somebody who is poor is disadvantaged by not having enough money to live on.”

“And so, let’s call a spade a spade. This bill will in particular needlessly, pointlessly, extravagantly, hurt the poor.”

Now, of course, the Democrats eventually realized this. So they decided that they would use some of the revenue from taxing the richer purchasers to subsidize the poorer purchasers so that they can go on using energy. But of course, the moment that you do that, you undermine the purpose of the bill, which is to stop people from using lots of energy.



Lord Christopher Monckton

Raise the Standard of Living!

Murphy: In the past you've described the global warming scare, fraud, hoax—you've used numerous words to describe this—as a “genocidal” policy, similar to the policy of how AIDS was handled, or to the ban on DDT. Is that still your view?

Monckton: What we have here, is a faction in politics, and it's a worldwide faction, that really came out of the Marxist extreme left when the Berlin Wall collapsed, and found its new home in the environmental movement. And it got into the environmental movement and took it over. A friend of mine is one of the founders of Greenpeace, and he said, “All of us who are genuine environmentalists left after a year, because the Marxists moved in and took it over.”

So, what we have, is what I call the traffic light faction: the greens too yellow to admit that they're really red. And it's they who are trying to say to us that this climate scare is real, so that they can impose upon us measures that would drastically reduce the human population by direct intervention, if necessary.

But why does this fail, even if they are eventually granted the authoritarian powers that would be necessary to enforce the sterilization of the male population, or to enforce a one-child policy? These were policies that were tried, respectively, in India and China, and both have abjectly failed. The only way to prevent the population in the poorer countries (or the “lower-income countries”) from rising rapidly beyond the resources of that country being able to cope with them is

to raise the standard of living of the general population of these countries. Nothing else works.


This is perhaps the fundamental fact of demographics: that if you want to stabilize populations in poorer countries, you must raise their standard of living. Nothing else works whatsoever.

So, we come along and we say, even to China and India, and this is what the Democrats have been saying, “Either you agree that you will not ever burn CO₂ into the atmosphere at the rate we did, that you will keep yourselves poor, or we will impose protectionist trade sanctions upon you.” I heard the Democrats arguing this when I was testifying in front of them, and I told them what an extremely bad idea that was. And why it's a bad idea, is because even if protectionism worked—and, of course, it always, in fact, backfires on the person who tries to impose it—all it would do is to keep China, India, Russia, Indonesia, Brazil, and other large countries, poor. If it keeps them poor, their populations will continue to increase rapidly. If their populations continue to increase rapidly, their carbon footprints will increase rapidly in the long run, if not in the short, and probably even in the short.

So you will have achieved the precise opposite of what you say you're intending to do, and you will have a growing population, when the left's real aim is to reduce population. So what they are advocating at the economic and political level, simply doesn't work. And it works no better than their attempts to ban DDT, which led to the deaths of 40 million children in the poorer countries. A totally unnecessary ban. DDT is not dangerous! You can eat it by the tablespoonful—do you no harm at all. But they invented a scare that it causes cancer, which it does not. They invented a scare that it might thin the eggshells, which it does not—unless you happen to deprive the birds of calcium in their diet, before you do the measurement, which is how they got the bogus result they based it on.

So, we've seen these lies and manufacturing of data before. Same with HIV, where, as with any other fatal, incurable infection, it should have been treated as what's called a notifiable disease, carriers isolated immediately to protect the rest of the population. This was not done. The result? Twenty-five million dead, 40 million infected and going to die, and heaven knows how far the epidemic will continue to spread. In Washington, D.C., here, where we're speaking from, 3% of the population is now infected with HIV, and that means

Figure 1



Source: Science and Public Policy Institute's monthly CO₂ report for March 2009.

The arithmetic mean of the Hadley and NCDC (terrestrial surface) and RSS and UAH (satellite lower-troposphere) temperature anomalies shows global temperature falling at a rate equivalent to 2 C°/century for more than seven years. The IPCC's predicated path for global temperatures is shown by way of comparison.

that there's a good chance that Congressmen and Senators rubbing shoulders with cleaners and other basic labor inside Congress, some of them are going to get infected before very long, because the correct public health measure wasn't taken, because yet again, the left had a policy on this and the policy did not accord with scientific reality at any point.

So we've seen it with DDT—they acted against the science: 40 million killed. We've seen it with AIDS—they acted against the science: 25 million killed, 40 million infected and going to die. And already people are now dying, all over the world, of starvation, as a result of the biofuels scam which came out of the global warming scare and has taken, for instance, one third of all the agricultural land of the United States out of producing food, for people who need it. Now it's producing fuel for automobiles that don't.

In any view, whichever aspect of this scare you look at, the policies of the left are not just heroically stupid, but deeply damaging for the future of humankind, and particularly damaging for the very poorest.

The Goal Is World Government

Murphy: That is very true. What is coming out—you've identified the biofuels scam as hurting the poor with food starvation, which is listed as one of WHO's

top causes of death. Now, [UN Secretary-General] Kofi Annan has just issued a bizarre, bogus report stating that 300,000 people have died already as a result of global warming or climate change per year, and more deaths are possible. But the policies that he's advocating to solve this will kill *billions* of people, and will eclipse that, even if it were true.

Monckton: Let's look at this report. It's produced by the usual crowd of rent-seekers wanting to enhance the role of the UN as a world government. That's what is really behind this: It's world government that the left are after. And world government, of course, does not mean democratic government. It means autocratic government, rather like the EU writ large.

And this report they produced is plainly nonsense, and you can just look at one simple fact, and that is that for the last 15 years, as [MIT climatologist] Dick Lindzen is about to tell us, there has been no statistically significant global warming. For the last eight and a half years, there has actually been a trend of global cooling, and quite a rapid one. So, why is Kofi Annan coming along now, 15 years after the warming stopped—and, of course, the warming was pretty unremarkable even while it was happening; it was entirely within natural variability—but the warming stopped 15 years ago, and only now do they tell us that this warming was killing

people. It certainly can't have been killing people recently, because we've been having global cooling. And that one fact is enough to establish what complete nonsense this UN report is.

All it is, is another way of keeping this flagging, failing scare in the headlines between now and the Copenhagen Climate Summit organized by the UN for December 2009. And at that summit, they are hoping the first steps to turn the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change into a world government will be taken. They are not frankly particularly worried about whether they get a deal on who should cut global emissions by how much. It is not, and never was, about that. It is not and never was about the climate. As Vaclav Klaus, the president of the European Union at the moment, has rightly said, "It's not about climatology; it's about freedom."

They want to take our freedom away. They want to set up a world government which will tell the rest of us how to behave, and which will certainly not be subject to any democratic recall or accountability or constraint. And they will do this by saying that, of course, the peoples of the world if left to their own devices, would screw up the planet, because of the emissions of carbon dioxide. Therefore, to save you from yourselves, we are going to ask your government to hand over their sovereignty and their powers—of course in our democratic countries, their powers are peoples' powers—to unelected bureaucrats, technocrats, and dictators, so that they will govern us in the future.

That is what this is all about, and they have to be stopped, which is why I am here.

The Climate Can Look After Itself

Murphy: There was an interesting report that didn't get much play, that came from the Center for International Cooperation at New York University. This had different scenarios—in the one they were promoting, there would be no deal at Copenhagen; everything falls apart. And in another scenario, there *is* a deal at Copenhagen, but it falls apart. And then there's one where you agree over time to make emission cuts. But the key to the one they are pushing is that they want two things: One, to set up an IAEA-type of agency to govern all nations, willing or unwilling, on the carbon emissions, so your world government question is there. And, two, they want to use carbon credits as—and this is really wild and outlandish, but based on the credit crisis we're having right now, the eco-

conomic downturn, the breakdown crisis—they want to use carbon credits as the new currency, with the IMF as the clearing house, central bank for the world. This is just ridiculous.

Monckton: Well, no, it isn't ridiculous, you see. It's *dangerous*. That's what it really is. This is exactly the type of mechanism which those who are in the small cabal that is plotting all this are working on in order to bring about world government before anyone notices. That is why they're so very angry with us. Because what we're saying is that as far as the science is concerned, there is no basis for doing anything whatsoever about the climate, which has looked after itself for four and a half billion years and will continue to do so. Our perturbations of it are so small as to be entirely insignificant, so insignificant that they cannot hope to be distinguished from natural climate variability, as even NASA itself said the other day.

There is no basis scientifically for doing anything. *The correct policy to address a non-problem is to have the courage to do nothing.* However, they are not concerned with whether there is a problem or not. They merely wish to pretend that there is a problem, and try to do so with a straight face, for long enough to persuade, not the population, because we have no say in this, but the governing class in the various member-states of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change: That they should hand over their powers as government to the United Nations or to a new agency, or possibly just to the existing climate panel, merely restructured a bit. So that we would no longer be free to decide what our currency would be, or how much of it there should be, or what we could burn, or what we could do. These things would be dictated to us by the dictators at the center.

And this is an extremely dangerous moment, because it repudiates freedom, it repudiates democracy, it denies us both of those. It repudiates any form of justice. It is a kick in the teeth for the poor. It has no merit whatsoever except to enhance the wealth and the power of the governing elite, and that really what we're seeing here is a conspiracy of the governing class against the governed. And if the governed continues to be as passive, and acquiescent, and as unquestioning as too many of them are being in Europe (it's a little better in the States), then this faction is going to get its way, and when it gets its way, we shall realize that it's far too late for us to do anything to throw it into reverse.