

# Vi skal passe på KLIMAET

70% CO2-reduktion betyder  
reduktion af alt med 70%,  
inkl. mennesker.



**U.N. Agenda 21  
Is a  
Trojan Horse  
That Will End  
All Freedoms  
For All Nations  
For All People  
For All Time**

**Den grønne klima agenda  
er del af den overordnede  
FN Agenda 21 / 2030.**

**Læs dette dokument om  
CO2 og lyt til budskaber,  
og du vil forstå alvoren!**

#### **SUSTAINABLE AGENDA:**

*The key is total monitoring, total measuring and total rationing of everything; all energy, food, water, housing, transportation, education, land use, medical care, right to travel, and the monitoring of everything you say and do.*

**These U.N. policies are transforming and reconfiguring global society under the false science that humans have caused Global Warming and that critical climate action must be taken to reduce greenhouse gas and CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, immediately.**

***The U.N. Agenda 21 / ICLEI calls for CO<sub>2</sub> emission reduction by 2020 to 1990 levels and reduced another 80% by 2050***

# Er CO2 årsagen til global opvarmning? Er CO2 den største faktor i drivhusgasserne?

De følgende 13 sider besvarer ovenstående spørgsmål, m.m.

Først et uddrag fra bogen "[The First Global Revolution](#)" (s. 75) fra 1993, Club of Rome:

*"Menneskehedens **fælles fjende** er mennesket.*

*I vor søgen efter en ny fjende til at forene os, kom vi på idéen, at forurening, **truslen med global opvarmning**, vandmangel, hungersnød og lignende ('**virus**', m.m. se \*) ville være passende. Alle disse farer er forårsaget af menneskelig indgriben, og det er kun gennem ændrede holdninger og adfærd, at de kan overvindes. **Den virkelige fjende derefter er menneskeheden selv.**"*

- \* F.eks. '**virus**' pandemier. +125 institutioner over hele verden, inkl. STATENS SERUMS INSTITUT melder "**NO RECORD FOUND**" om 'covid-19 virus'. Se <https://tinyurl.com/norecordfound>
- \* **Værd at lytte til** "Dissident European Parliament Members Drop Truth Bombs" <https://tinyurl.com/EUmemberTruthBombs>
- \* **Se eventuelt** "To all Members of the European Union: Make a wise choice!" <https://tinyurl.com/toEUMembers>

Udtalelse fra klima-bevidst borger, maj 2019: "*Vil tro at vi alle sammen holder af miljøet og vil det bedste for vores jord. Jeg har dog svært ved at støtte implementeringen af **FN's Agenda 21 / 2030** (Bæredygtig Udvikling), både på lokalt og internationalt plan. Med de FN grene og NGO'er der deltager på Folkemødet, virker det primært som en fejring og indoktrinering af denne **grønne klima religion**.*" Lyt til Ærkebiskop Viganò om Agenda 2030 <https://tinyurl.com/ArchbishopVigano>

"Human Caused Global Warming – **The Biggest Deception In History** – The Why, What, Where, When and How It was Achieved" (Dr. Tim Ball, 2016). Han har skrevet forordet i bogen "**GREEN GOSPEL – The New World Religion**", som de næste 11 side er uddrag fra. Her i 3 minutter video "**Dr Tim Ball shows the real facts of CO2!**" <https://tinyurl.com/realCO2facts>

CO<sub>2</sub>—DESIGNER  
POLLUTANT

For a number of reasons, carbon dioxide is one of the most important gases on earth and is necessary for the survival of all life on this planet. People need to ask why CO<sub>2</sub>, which is essential to plant life and by its production of oxygen to all life, became demonized as a pollutant that has to be drastically reduced. The IPCC claims it is at record levels when, at 396 ppmv, it is the lowest in 300 million years. If that level is reduced, plants do not grow as much and when the level reaches 150 ppmv, most plants are dead. To illustrate the contradictions in the urge to reduce levels, commercial greenhouses pump in extra CO<sub>2</sub> to raise levels to 1200 ppmv that increase yield by a factor of four.

Two terms thrown around that few understand are “The Greenhouse Effect” and “Global Warming.” They are linked for political effectiveness because people associate a greenhouse with high temperatures. In fact, the Earth’s atmosphere doesn’t work like a greenhouse. The objective of the UN agency the

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) was to isolate and demonize CO<sub>2</sub>. It began when they were told to examine only human causes of global warming. There are three so-called greenhouse gases, water vapour is 95 percent by volume, CO<sub>2</sub> is 4 percent, and methane 0.36 percent. The IPCC immediately eliminated water vapour as they explained. “Water vapour is the most abundant and important greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. However, human activities have only a small direct influence on the amount of atmospheric water vapour.” So the claim is human produced CO<sub>2</sub> is the effectively the cause of all temperature increase since 1950. The human portion of CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere is 3.4 percent or 0.00272% of the total atmosphere. (Please see chart.)<sup>58</sup>

In the 2007 Report the IPCC wrote, “Water vapour is the most abundant and important greenhouse gas in the atmosphere. However, human activities have only a small direct influence on the amount of atmospheric water vapour.”<sup>59</sup>

It is essentially impossible to determine the impact of 4 percent if you have very limited knowledge about 95 percent.

The IPCC tried to downplay the role of water vapor in affecting global temperatures by amplifying the role of CO<sub>2</sub> and CH<sub>4</sub>. The range of numbers used to determine greenhouse effectiveness or Global Warming Potential (GWP) suggested people were just creating numbers—their formula was not scientific. The IPCC notes,

The Global Warming Potential (GWP) is defined as the time-integrated RF (radio frequency) due to a pulse emission of a given component, relative to a pulse emission of an equal

<sup>58</sup> [http://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-1-3.html](http://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-1-3.html).

<sup>59</sup> [https://www.ipcc.ch/publications\\_and\\_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-2-1.html](https://www.ipcc.ch/publications_and_data/ar4/wg1/en/faq-2-1.html).

mass of CO<sub>2</sub>. The GWP was presented in the First IPCC Assessment (Houghton et al., 1990), stating “It must be stressed that there is no universally accepted methodology for combining all the relevant factors into a single global warming potential for greenhouse gas emissions.” This is where the first deception begins. There are three gases that account for 99.9 percent of the GHG. They are water vapour (H<sub>2</sub>O), carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>), and methane (CH<sub>4</sub>). The most important and most abundant by far, is water vapour at 95+ percent, while CO<sub>2</sub> is approximately 4 percent and methane less than 0.01 percent.

The question is who are the small group of elitists and how did the focus on CO<sub>2</sub> evolve from their objectives? They are members of the Club of Rome (COR) founded in 1968 and they promoted an agenda for global government. We need to show how CO<sub>2</sub> became pivotal to the scientific support and justification for their actions.

I mentioned Thomas Malthus and his book *An Essay on the Principle of Population* earlier. Now I need to explain how his work became the basis for establishing a socialist, one world, anti-Christian government.

Malthus was a political economist concerned about what he saw as the decline of living conditions in nineteenth century England. He blamed the decline on three elements: the overproduction of young, the inability of resources to keep up with the rising human population, and the irresponsibility of the lower classes. To combat this, Malthus suggested the family size of the lower class ought to be regulated such that poor families do not produce more children than they can support.

It wasn't the first time population and "carrying capacity" were linked, but this connection was different because it advocated government policy and control of population numbers. Charles Darwin was one of the strongest advocates of Malthus and took a copy of Malthus's book on his famous voyage. Malthus's theory would be instrumental in formulating Darwin's evolutionary theory. In his autobiography Darwin wrote,

In October 1838, that is, fifteen months after I had begun my systematic inquiry, I happened to read for amusement Malthus on Population, and being well prepared to appreciate the struggle for existence which everywhere goes on from long-continued observation of the habits of animals and plants, it at once struck me that under these circumstances favourable variations would tend to be preserved, and unfavourable ones to be destroyed. The results of this would be the formation of a new species. Here, then I had at last got a theory by which to work.

The Club of Rome became Neo-Malthusians by taking Darwin's basic premise and expanding it to the claim that population would outgrow all resources. This identified two problems, limited resources and too many people. The Club brought focus on these with three books. One was Paul Ehrlich's *The Population Bomb* in 1968, which immediately became central to the environmental movement's focus that people were the problem.

The second book, *Limits to Growth*, appeared in 1972. It was a grossly simplistic study commissioned by the Club. It was the first to use computer models as scientific forecasters to

justify public policy. They took current trends of resource use, and with a simple trend analysis, projected that forward against the then known estimates of the amount of resources. The third book was published in 1977, *Ecoscience Population, Resources, Environment*. It was co-authored by Holdren and Ehrlich and combined and concentrated the ideas of the first two books.

At that time, Holdren expressed truly frightening views about overpopulation. These included the following:

Women could be forced to abort their pregnancies, whether they wanted to or not.

The population at large could be sterilized by infertility drugs intentionally put into the nation's drinking water or in food.

Single mothers and teen mothers should have their babies seized from them against their will and given away to other couples to raise.

People who "contribute to social deterioration" (i.e., undesirables) "can be required by law to exercise reproductive responsibility"—in other words, be compelled to have abortions or be sterilized.

A transnational "Planetary Regime" should assume control of the global economy and also dictate the most intimate details of Americans' lives—using an armed international police force.

The question is how could such policies be implemented in the supposed liberties of democracy guaranteed in the United States? Holdren explained, in a format that emulates the technique used by all socialists regardless of the issue, create a false problem that justifies normally unacceptable actions as

a resolution. “Indeed, it has been concluded that compulsory population-control laws, even including laws requiring compulsory abortion, could be sustained under the existing Constitution if the population crisis became sufficiently severe to endanger the society.”<sup>60</sup>

The key to understanding what he is proposing is that he is the unseen person who has concluded that laws could be sustained. Then, he is the one who determines when the crisis is endangering society.

The Club of Rome (COR) then added a rider to the original Malthusian claim by arguing that all nations were growing in population and their exploitation of resources, but developed, industrialized nations were doing it at a much greater rate. It was necessary to slow them down. Maurice Strong, a member of the COR, expressed the idea obliquely to Elaine Dewar in her book *Cloak of Green* when he is quoted as saying,

What if a small group of these world leaders were to conclude the principal risk to the earth comes from the actions of the rich countries? In order to save the planet, the group decides: Isn't the only hope for the planet that the industrialized civilizations collapse? Isn't it our responsibility to bring this about?<sup>61</sup>

How do you collapse the industrialized civilizations? They were built on fossil fuels, so if you cut off their supply, the engine of development would stall. Politically, that was an impossible objective, but you can also stop an engine by

---

<sup>60</sup> Andrew Curtis, *1984 Redux: Say Hello to "Big Brother,"* (Bloomington, IN: Author House, 20110), 281.

<sup>61</sup> <http://mediamatters.org/blog/2010/05/13/beck-pushes-scary-conspiracy-theories-about-eli/164655>.



blocking the exhaust. If you could show that the by-product of those industrialized engines, CO<sub>2</sub>, was causing runaway global warming, you could achieve the goal. Dewar then challenged Strong to explain how he would do this as a politician.

Strong said he was going to do it through the UN because, “He could raise his own money from whomever he liked, appoint anyone he wanted, and control the agenda.”<sup>62</sup>

As Dewar explained after spending several days with Strong at the UN, “Strong was using the UN as a platform to sell a global environment crisis and the Global Governance Agenda.”

So CO<sub>2</sub> became the demon gas that was causing population increase and development, both threatening the future of the planet. Strong set up a two-pronged system to control the agenda. The first was the political side that culminated in Agenda 21; the second was the United Nations Framework Convention of Climate Change (UNFCCC) that gave the very narrow definition of climate change as only those caused by humans to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC). All this came together at the Rio 1992 conference that Strong organized as chair of the United Nations Environment Program (UNEP), a division he created. Part of the Declaration from that conference says,

There is also general agreement that unsustainable consumption and production patterns are contributing to the unsustainable use of natural resources and environmental degradation as well as to the reinforcement of social inequities and of poverty with the above-mentioned consequences for demographic parameters.

---

<sup>62</sup> Elaine Dewar, *Cloak of Green: The Links between Key Environmental Groups, Government and Big Business*, (Toronto, ON; Lorimer, 1995).

So CO2 became the focus of their anti-Christian socialist agenda, which believes people are an aberration, not children of God. This anti-humanity theme underlies environmentalism and is expressed in various comments.

In a 1990 Greenpeace Report on Global Warming, The author notes, “Carbon dioxide is added to the atmosphere, naturally and unnaturally.” The unnatural refers to the human contribution, so if what we do is unnatural then, by default, we are unnatural. German philosopher Goethe dealt with this inanity when he said, “The unnatural—that too is natural.”

David Graber, a research biologist with the US National Park Service, said,

Human happiness, and certainly human fecundity, are not as important as a wild and healthy planet. I know social scientists who remind me that people are part of nature, but it isn't true. Somewhere along the line—at about a billion years ago—we quit the contract and became a cancer. We have become a plague upon ourselves and upon the earth. It is cosmically unlikely that the developed world will choose to end its orgy of fossil energy consumption, and the Third World its suicidal consumption of landscape. Until such time as Homo Sapiens should decide to rejoin nature, some of us can only hope for the right virus to come along.

Likely this is where Prince Philip, grand central figure to the Illuminati, got his idea.

In 1988, Britain's Prince Philip expressed the wish that, should he be reincarnated, he would want to be a deadly virus that would reduce world population.

Ingrid Newkirk of People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA) said,

Mankind is a cancer; we're the biggest blight on the face of the earth. If you haven't given voluntary human extinction much thought before, the idea of a world with no people in it may seem strange. But if you give it a chance, I think you might agree that the extinction of Homo Sapiens would mean survival for millions if not billions, of earth-dwelling species. Phasing out the human race will solve every problem on earth, social and environmental.<sup>63</sup>

Writing in *Audubon*, Richard Connif, an American non-fiction writer specializing in human and animal behavior, wrote, "Among environmentalists sharing two or three beers, the notion is quite common that if only some calamity could wipe out the entire human race, other species might once again have a chance." Think of the insanity of the depopulation proponents who want to wipe out a majority of the population, and yet they too have families. It reeks of the idea that they feel they and their families are exempt from this culling. It begs the question—who gets to decide who lives and who dies? But then who can get in the mind of a megalomaniac to figure out their bizarre twisted thoughts?

Consider the Canadian environmentalist David Suzuki and his bizarre comments in a 1992 keynote address to the Environmental Grantmakers Association, "Economics is a very species-chauvinistic idea. No other species on earth—and there are may be 30 million of them—has had the nerve to put forth a concept called economics, in which one species, us, declares

---

<sup>63</sup> *Reader's Digest*, June, 1990.

the right to put value on everything else on earth, in the living and nonliving world.”

He is incorrect. All other species assign one value to everything else. It is food or it is not food. Humans put a very wide range of values on everything; indeed, the differences between humans and all other animals is so great that Darwin’s contemporary, Alfred Russell Wallace, said these differences alone invalidate Darwin’s evolutionary theory. Suzuki also has the number of species wrong. Thirty million is a gross underestimate. A study by PLoS Biology says, “. . . A staggering 86 percent of all species on land and 91 percent of those in the seas have yet to be discovered, described, and catalogued.”<sup>64</sup>

Of course no other species has the ability to develop concepts like economics. Lack of accurate data and misinterpretation of mechanisms allow the misapplication of the role and function of CO<sub>2</sub>. While adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere causes far less warming than previously feared, it has a positive effect on plant life. With more carbon dioxide in the air, plants grow better in warmer and cooler temperatures and wetter and drier soils, make better use of soil nutrients, and resist diseases and pests better, increasing their fruit production, expanding their range, and greening the earth. This makes more food available to all other creatures, especially—as agricultural yields rise—making food more affordable for the world’s poor. This is ironically the exact opposite of the views expressed by the people we have introduced you to in this book. Green energy projects, such as substituting wind, solar, and other low-density energy sources for coal, oil, and natural gas therefore hurt the poor not only by raising energy (and all other) prices but also by reducing

---

<sup>64</sup> <http://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2011/08/110823180459.htm>.

food production. These energy projects also hurt the rest of life on earth by depriving it of the fertilizing effect of heightened carbon dioxide.

Truly, “The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament proclaims his handiwork” (Ps. 19:1). Carbon dioxide, on which life depends, beautifully reveals the Creator’s wisdom and care for all of His creation—people, animals, plants, and the earth itself. The fact that God’s own handiwork is demonized as harmful instead of deemed essential to life, illustrates the corruption of science to push an anti-human, anti-Christian agenda. But for what purpose, you ask? Why? Simply put, the anti-Christian Technocracy wants a New World Order. Chapter 1 discussed the history and evolution of this objective. It has generally failed through political systems such as National Socialism in Germany and communism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere. Environmentalism and global warming provided the next vehicle for achieving the objective.

# Tør du se virkeligheden i øjnene?

Herunder finder du svar på mange spørgsmål. Vær nysgerrig.

Hvilke **ministre/politikere** har modtaget nedenstående bøger i fysisk udgave mellem oktober-december 2018?

Download oversigten her: <https://tinyurl.com/politikeroversigt>

Nu har du læst kapitel 6 om CO2-bedraget. Download hele bogen **"GREEN GOSPEL – The New World Religion"** i pdf her:

<https://tinyurl.com/greengospel>

Bogen **"SUSTAINABLE - The WAR on Free Enterprise, Private Property & Individuals"** beskriver Agenda 2030, og hvad den reelt betyder. Vi har siden marts 2020 set, hvordan der har været en krig mod små/mindre virksomheder. Det er lige efter bogen.

Download her: <https://tinyurl.com/sustainablewar>

Bogen **"Illuminati Agenda 21"** beskriver den mørke og ondskabsfulde agenda, der foregår mod menneskeheden og skabelsen.

Download her: <https://tinyurl.com/illuminatiagenda21>

**COP26: Mette Frederiksen - Den Grønne Kvinde** med Den Grønne Pagt (FN Agenda 2030) er 1½ time, der afslører, hvad hele den grønne klimaagenda går ud på: <https://tinyurl.com/groenkvinde>

Dokumentaren **"DE GRØNNE MONSTRE"** (sep. 2020) afslører hele agendaen. <https://tinyurl.com/degroennemonstre>

Ærkebiskop Viganò taler om **"Agenda 2030: The Gates of Hell"**  
<https://tinyurl.com/ArchbishopVigano>

**OBS: "Bedemand & whistleblower afslører Covid Pandemien"**  
<https://tinyurl.com/bedemandtalerud>

Hvis man **"IKKE SE, IKKE HØRE, IKKE TALE"**, da medvirker man til indførelsen af **FN's AGENDA 2030!**  
Har du forstået alvoren? Tør du lade som ingenting?