IPRPD
International Journal of Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2693-2547 (Print), 2693-2555 (Online)
Volume 05; Issue no 02: February, 2024
DOI: 10.56734/ijahss.v5n2a3

THE CARBON LEVIATHAN AS TROJAN HORSE FOR TECHNOCRACY

Michael S. Northcott[1]

[1]*University of Edinburgh, Scotland; Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia*

Abstract

Carbon dioxide is the most ubiquitous chemical constituent of life on Earth, and Earth is the only known planet on which life is present. Increases in atmospheric CO2 since 1870 are said to be associated with coal, oil and gas extraction and burning to have enhanced a natural cyclical warming trend which began in 1875: 1875 which was the coldest year in more than 2000 years, and marked the end of the Little Ice Age which began in 1250, and which is testified to in historic narrative weather records in Europe and China, and by modern studies of tree rings, ice core and other physical data (Thompson, Mosley-Thompson et al 1986). The coldest century in that era was the seventeenth. Historic records show a major die-off of the human population occurred in that century, provoked by large scale famines and wars. Numerous violent conflicts emerged in Europe and Asia, including the European Thirty Years War and the English Civil War, and a huge multi-decadal conflict that led to the collapse of the Ming Dynasty in China (Parker 2013).

Keywords

Carbon dioxide, Trojan Horse, Technocracy

Carbon dioxide is the most ubiquitous chemical constituent of life on Earth, and Earth is the only known planet on which life is present. Increases in atmospheric CO2 since 1870 are said to be associated with coal, oil and gas extraction and burning to have enhanced a natural cyclical warming trend which began in 1875: 1875 which was the coldest year in more than 2000 years, and marked the end of the Little Ice Age which began in 1250, and which is testified to in historic narrative weather records in Europe and China, and by modern studies of tree rings, ice core and other physical data (Thompson, Mosley-Thompson et al 1986). The coldest century in that era was the seventeenth. Historic records show a major die-off of the human population occurred in that century, provoked by large scale famines and wars. Numerous violent conflicts emerged in Europe and Asia, including the European Thirty Years War and the English Civil War, and a huge multi-decadal conflict that led to the collapse of the Ming Dynasty in China (Parker 2013).

Periods of cooling in Earth's history provoke a die-off of numbers of species because cooling reduces the availability of food. By contrast Life in Earth's history has exploded in abundance and variety in the warmer and wetter eras of the Earth's climate history. Humans owe their evolution to the warm and moist Miocene era, 50-60 million years Before Present, in which average Earth temperatures were 10-20% higher than present. Carbon dioxide levels in the Miocene were above 1000 parts per million – more than double present CO2 levels – but oxygen levels also rose because of increased plant activity from increased warmth, moisture and CO2 levels. These increases were factors in the first emergence of the Apes from which evolutionary theory holds that the ancestors of modern humans split off morphologically in the late Miocene (Begun 2010). The era was so warm that the Mediterranean all but evaporated until a great flood – the Zaclean flood - refilled it at the Straits of Gibraltar.

In more recent history, the period from 950-1250 was unusually warm in Europe and is known as the Medieval Warm Period (Fagan 2008). Crop surpluses from that period, together with the die off a part of the population of Europe from plague, helped see off the widespread practice of slavery in Europe since productivity rose, food declined in price and wages rose. The surpluses were also used for the construction of Europe's medieval cathedrals and the founding of other medieval institutions including Europe's oldest universities including the University of Aberdeen, the University of Bologna and Christchurch College, Oxford.

The Earth has warmed on average approximately 0.5-0.8 degrees Centigrade since the end of the Little Ice Age. A proportion of this warming is attributed to industrial era carbon dioxide emissions since carbon dioxide is one of four greenhouse gases which moderate diurnal temperature changes by keeping a proportion of reflected

solar heat from the Earth's surface within the atmospheric envelope. Without this effect the Earth would freeze everywhere at night and not just near the Poles and at high altitudes. However, the alleged 'scientific consensus' that human emissions of carbon dioxide are responsible for most of the warming since 1750, and that there is a causative thermal coupling between carbon dioxide levels in the atmosphere and Earth temperatures is not a consensus, and is not empirically proven. A widely cited paper that claimed to have identified a '97%' consensus was based on a biased selection of scientific papers that *left out* those that did not support anthropogenic warming (Cook et al 2013, Tol, R. S. J. 2014).

Most climate scientists agree that the earth has warmed approximately 0.5-0.8 degrees since 1750 (Lundquist and Widding 2019). This amount of warming is within the normal range of climate variability in the last 3000 years as ice core records clearly show (Mayewski and White 2002). 'consensus' among scientists that this is humanly caused is no substitute for empirical verification since scientific opinion is not scientific proof. Frequent resort to surveys of scientific opinion on this matter reflects an epistemic problem which is that it is impossible to empirically prove that a historically *normal* planetary temperature change in this one two-hundred-and-fifty-year period in earth's 3 billion year history due to a novel factor, namely the industrial era burning of fossil fuels. As Richard Feynman argues, the scientific method for validating scientific theorems involves comparing predictions made on the basis of a theorem with empirical observations (Feynman 1965). Given that observed temperature increases since 2000 do not correlate to known and significant increases in industrial carbon dioxide emissions. 0.5 degrees of global warming occurred between 1895 and 1950 while, despite a quadrupling of carbon dioxide emissions since 1950, the same amount of warming – 0.5 degrees – occurred from 1950 - 2000, indicating a greater likelihood that warming *throughout* the twentieth century was natural and not anthropogenic (Happer and Lidzen 2022).

In geological records show that present levels of CO2 at 412 ppm are close to the lowest levels of CO2 in the 500 million year history of multi-cellular life forms. The record also shows that in those 500 million years there is *no* correlation between carbon dioxide levels and temperature (Happer and Lindzen 2022).

The principal causes of planetary warming, and cooling in earth history are changes in the tilt of the earth's axis relative to the sun leading to increases in surface solar heating, known as Milankovitch cycles after the Serbian scientist who discovered this (Milankovitch 1930). Changes in levels of solar activity also influence the climate but much less than the orbital cycle of the Earth. (Broecker W S, Thurber D L et al 1968). But the computerized Global Circulation Models (GCMs) which are maintained by meteorologists in the United States and Europe, and on which the IPCC and climate scientists rely for their predictions of the climate impacts of carbon dioxide emissions *all* assume a strong thermal coupling or 'sensitivity' of the Earth's climate to industrial-era carbon dioxide emissions. The models also assume a linear relationship between rising CO2 emissions and rising global temperatures. But since 2000 this coupling in computer models is at odds with temperature records which show a slowing in global temperature rises during a period of rising CO2 emissions (Lovelock 2014 62-75).

A reasonable explanation for the slowing down of temperature rise since 2000 is that most of the warming was a result of natural cyclical warming from the Little Ice Age which is tailing off. Another is that as carbon dioxide is a plant fertilizer, and additional carbon dioxide has resulted in the Earth greening significantly since 2000, thi effect may have moderated global temperature rises (Piao, Wang et al 2020). James Lovelock posits a third possibility which is that upo welling of cooler water in the Pacific in the last twenty years ended the rise in global temperatures before 2000 (Lovelock 2014). Whatever the cause for the tailing off of rises in Global Mean Surface Temperatures (GMST), and there is still uncertainty about the cause, there is strong scientific *uncertainty* concerning the claim that the Earth is warming at the present time as a result of human activities.

The lack of demonstrable empirical evidence for Anthropogenic Global Warming (AGW) is not however reflected in most academic, governmental, globalist and media claims about AGW. On the contrary, international agencies including the UN's Intergovernmentla Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) together with governments and the media have continued to ramp up global anxiety about a 'climate crisis', a claimed increase in 'extreme weather events' and the relationship with fossil fuel emissions.

While there is growing public sensibility concerning global warming and weather extremes it is likely that this is an artefact of increased media focus on the *effects* of such events since scientific data do *not* reveal increases in extreme weather events in the last one hundred years. The 100-year hurricane record shows a *decreasing* number of tropical cyclones in recent decades – for example there was an exceptionally low number of hurricanes in the North Atlantic in 2022. And in the last three decades there are historically normal numbers of droughts and floods (Sheffield, Wood et al 2012). Mortality data also indicate that deaths from natural disasters are at historic lows. Hence while deaths from temperature extremes (heat) show a rise from 169 in the 1930s to 11644 in the 2010s these are vastly offset by major declines in deaths from all other climatic events, and by reduced deaths from extreme cold which is what previous major climatic changes would lead us to expect since cold, and reduced sunlight, are the bigger threats to life on earth, including humans, and not warmth. In the 1920s droughts caused 472,400 deaths and in the 1930s flooding caused 436,147 deaths. In the 1990s there were just 311 deaths from drought and 9549 from floods, and in the 2010s 339 from droughts and 5811from floods (Our World In Data 2022).

The basis for the anthropogenic warming theory is not real-world empirical evidence of the increased frequency of extreme weather events relative to historic frequency, nor temperature rises, nor increased human mortality or suffering from these, but the unverifiable assumption built into Global Circulation Models, including those relied on by the IPCC, that most of the warming *since the* Industrial Revolution is attributable to human activities: the IPCC assumes 90% since 1900 and 100% since 1970 (Myhre, Shindell et al 2013). The choice to attribute so much of global warming since 1850 to human activity rather than cyclical changes in the relationship of the earth to the sun – which is the long established historically *proven* climate driver - is an arbitrary one for which there is no proven empirical basis. (van Geel and Ziegler 2013).

There is an urgent need for ways of investigating the alleged relationship between human activities and global warming independently of the Global Circulation Models in which have inbuilt biases towards anthropogenic warming. One new approach to statistical review of global temperatures from 1850, and prior, using a more complex and widely distributed form of computer modelling, an Artificial Neural Network, reveals that the Earth is at least 40% *less* sensitive to increased carbon dioxide emissions than GCMs and hence UN reports predict (Abbot and Marohasy 2017).

Despite scientific controversy and lack of empirical proof that industrial greenhouse gas emissions are responsible for modest global warming since 1850, the United Nations has constructed with governments a set of globally encompassing governance and economic structures as part of a new 'climate regime', or 'climate leviathan' (Latour, 2017, Wainwright and Mann 2018, Coeckelbergh 2021)). These nomenclatures point to the gradual ceding of political sovereignty to these globalist structures because 'climate change' is said to be an immanent crisis of such severity that citizens, businesses, and nations need an over-arching supra-national sovereign power capable of restraining their freedoms of action.

The climate leviathan has succeeded in turning what should be an opportunity for increased food production, and other economic benefits – modest global warming – into a major disruption of the well established 100 year-old positive association between increased availability of cheap primary energy and increases in human health and longevity. While the meetings of the UNFCCC have had no impact on global greenhouse gas emissions, they have had other impacts, of which the most politically significant is a rise in energy prices together with recent short-falls in energy supplies in some European countries resulting from reduced investment in new fossil fuel extraction, and from switching power generation from locally available fossil fuels to imported allegedly 'low-carbon' fuels, such as air dried woodchips shipped from the US to the UK for power generation. Energy shortages were exacerbated by Western sanctions against Russia in 2022 which led to diminished supplies of natural gas and rocketing prices.

The main government device for raising energy prices has been energy taxes which have led to the export of many energy-intense activities – such as metal smelting and heavy industry more broadly – from high income to lower income countries since the inauguration of the UNFCCC. In Western Europe much of this activity moved from the UK and European Union to Turkey and China. Countries such as the UK then *import* carbon-intense materials – such as wood chips for power generation, wind turbine blades, solar panels, and iron and steel for manufacturing - for which the carbon dioxide emissions are attributed to the source country (Helm 2012).

Energy prices in countries such as the UK are also rising because of the suppression of investment in new fossil fuel extraction, and the promotion of costly biofuel and other allegedly 'renewable' energy substitutes, including wind power and wood chips, for fossil fuels. Not only is the cost of energy driving industrial activity away from the UK. Household energy bills have quadrupled in the UK since 2011, and the increases were so big in 2022 that they were associated with a near collapse of the UK economy, while many small businesses were forced to close as a result of 200% increases in energy bills.

Huge increases in the cost of energy also reduce the ability of many citizens to heat their homes, and fuel poverty became a major social problem in the UK as a result of 'climate change' related energy price hikes a decade before the war in Ukraine led to sharp rises in European wholesale gas prices (Stockton and Campbell 2011). Energy price hikes, and proposed energy rationing, are also impacting citizens' freedoms to travel by car, plane or train.

There are similar problems in continental Europe. An 'environmental' tax on diesel in France in 2018 led to widespread protests in France associated with the 'Gilet Jaunes' movement concerning the effect of rising energy costs on poorer and especially rural households who need to travel to work by car (Douenne and Fabre 2022). The protests came to an end with the nationwide imposition of 'lockdowns' in 2020-21. In the autumn of 2022 a university at which I am a guest professor – Evangelisches Fakulteit Theologi, Leuven - went into an effective 'energy lockdown' because the price of energy made it financially non-viable to operate in-persons classes and other activities as normal. Dutch farmers engaged in mass protests at efforts by the government to reduce farming activities in the second largest exporting nation of agricultural products in the world allegedly to 'protect the climate' from artificial ammonia, which is an essential component in arable and dairy farming. In Germany energy rationing was already in place at time of writing with citizens prevented from taking hot showers, and limits set on indoor temperatures on pain of imprisonment.

Human suffering from energy rationing by price already affects billions of people, and in the Northern hemisphere it will give rise increased excess mortality since houses in damp Northern climes that are not insulated to the highest standards are prone to condensation and mould growth in the winter when unheated and these are major causes of ill health and early death in poorer households. Many old people will spent a greater proportion of daylight hours in bed in the winter of 2022-23 because their pensions do not provide them with sufficient income to pay for the cost of heating their homes. This will also provoke increased mortality. All of this is principally a result of the unwise quest in the UK and Europe for 'net zero' by which is meant drastic reductions in carbon dioxide emissions to meet 'climate targets' which are based, as we have seen, on computer models of 'climate sensitivity' and future temperature changes that are not supported by real world observations.

Even if there were a clear relationship between fossil fuel use and temperature rises sufficient to increase human suffering on a larger scale than that already being inflicted on millions of fuel poor people, an Ockham's Razor approach would be to regulate the agencies most responsible for fossil fuel extraction, as I have argued elsewhere (Northcott 2014). But in anticipation of this, the corporate sector, and governments, shifted focus from fossil fuel companies to the 'carbon footprint' of citizens and households as a target for climate change concerns and climate 'governmentality' which would not harm energy company profits and related national receipts.

This approach has been mainstreamed and governments and corporations now use behaviourial psychology, alongside increased energy costs, to persuade citizens that they are responsible for rising global temperatures when they heat their homes, drive cars or eat meat (Paterson and Stripple 2010). The UK Government first proposed assessing individuals' and households' carbon footprints in a report it commissioned in 2008 (Owen et al 2008). The UK is also a lead national government in pressing for enforced top-down changes in citizen activities, such as forthcoming bans on new fossil fueled vehicles, and on fossil fuels to heat new homes, despite poor regulation of volume house builders who continue to build some of the least energy-efficient houses in Europe.

Many of the devices that the UNFCCC promoted in relation to 'carbon accounting' and 'carbon footprinting' serve as a distraction from the real sources of carbon dioxide emissions – which is to say oil and gas wells and coal mines. Carbon markets are a particularly transparent example of the failure of this approach to reduce global carbon emissions. Governments in many domains including the European Union have set up 'carbon markets' in which carbon emitters – whether individuals or agencies – can purchase 'carbon credits' to 'offset' their carbon emissions in complex artifices such as the Clean Development Mechanism under which it is possible for developing countries to sell carbon credits in exchange for planting fast growing trees such as eucalyptus or for the installation of equipment to phase out climate-harming refrigerants and other chemicals. I have elsewhere written on the numerous frauds perpetrated under these 'offsetting' schemes and on the fact that the energy and finance devoted to such schemes would have been better spent on genuine energy-reduction schemes – such as building retrofitting – if fossil fuels are really the cause of increases in global temperatures since the Industrial Revolution (Northcott 2007, 2012).

This raises the broader fraud of 'green consumerism' and greenwashing, both of which are widely used by corporations in marketing products that are environmentally problematic with the intent to obfuscate the root cause of the environmental crisis which is economic development understood as transformation of unmodified ecosystems into marketable resources capable of accumulation by oligarchic capital owners (Budinsky and Bryant 2013). Electric cars are a prime example of green consumerism. A European audit found that electric cars far from being 'zero emission' vehicles put out as many emissions as fossil fueled vehicles if life-cycle and energy generating emissions, and their extra weight, are taken into account and not merely tailpipe emissions (Krajinska 2021). Electric cars are also significantly more expensive to the consumer than gasoline or diesel-powered vehicles and the sourcing of lithium, rare earth and other elements is no less environmentally damaging per vehicle unit than the sourcing of fossil fuels for modern low emission gasoline powered vehicles. Their widespread adoption will also significantly raise travel to work costs of those same poorer, and urban-edge and rural households who are already suffering from prohibitive increases in fuel costs.

Given the growing invasiveness of government measures allegedly designed to address the non-empirically verifiable human causes of 'climate change', it has not gone without notice by many citizens, and some academics, that 'climate action' is increasingly reducing the incomes of citizens and their freedoms to make choices about how and where to travel, what to eat, how to power their homes, run businesses, grow food, and so on. But justified public skepticism about the contested and unproven IPCC claim that fossil fuels are 100% responsible for changes in global temperatures since 1970 is countered by growing government and media propaganda about alleged increases in extreme weather events, heat, drought, floods and so on which as we have seen real world data do not support.

A significant example of climate change propaganda is the claim in official documents that climate change is generating and will generate large numbers of refugees: a UK government report claims that up to '50 million refugees' are likely by 2030 (Stern 2006 56). Evidence for such estimates is in based on the large numbers of refugees already coming to the shores of Europe. But analysis of the origin of refugees to Europe reveals that they are in the main from nations subjected to military and political interference by the United States, the UK and their

allies, including aerial and drone bombing, since the unilateral announcement of an endless 'war on terror' by the Bush administration in 2001 after the September 11 events in New York City and Washinngton DC (Northcott 2005) The long list of over 90 such countries includes Afghanistan, Iraq, Niger, Mali, Bosnia, Rwanda, Palestine, Lebanon, the Congo, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Angola, East Timor, Pakistan, Darfur, Iraq, Somalia, Sudan, Syria, Libya, and Yemen.

While the resultant migration crisis is often presented as a consequence of crop failure from extreme weather, disruptions of food production is occurring because of armed conflict in these regions not extreme weather. And since 2020 food supply chain disruptions have also grown significantly as a result of novel government responses to the Covid-19 virus which had no impact respiratory illness but disrupted global supply chains. War and violent conflict instigated by the United States and its allies, and since 2020 novel 'public health policies', are the real reasons for increasing migration to Europe in the last two decades, not climate change.

The fragile and global nature of many food supply chains are a consequence of concerted actions by Western governments, globalist agencies such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund which from the 1980s used external debt to pressure countries to abandon staple food production and shift farmers to cash crops whose prices then plummeted on world markets (Northcott 1999). Resultant reductions in national food security, and increased dependence on food imports from the 1990s, are part of the broader neoliberal globalisation project led by the United States and the World Trade Organisation whose establishment was led by the Clinton-Gore administration in 1997-8 (Northcott 2007). Nonetheless crop production globally shows a consistent annual increase in the past two decades according to the Food and Agriculture Organisation although the FAO reports a modest decrease in 2022 over 2021 which it attributes, perhaps unsurprisingly, to extreme weather events (FAO 2022). However the report shows that the two countries with the most notable declines in cereal production are Ukraine and Sri Lanka. The decline in Ukraine is related to Western and Russian interference in Ukraine from 2014 not climate change. This was a result of an IMF debt-restructuring package to the pro-Western government that was installed after the 'Maidan coup' in 2014. The package required Ukraine to change the law preventing foreign ownership of agricultural land and subsequently companies from the United States and West Europe – including DuPont and Monsanto - bought up the majority of Ukraine's crop producing land, production from which then declined (Mousseau 2015). A sudden collapse in Sri Lanka's crop production occurred in 2022 because the government banned the use of nitrogen fertilizer to farmers, and required farmers to use an unproven and ineffective Chinese liquid feriliser which the government claimed was 'organic' and more 'climate friendly.' The ban caused 30-60% declines in rice production and the wave of hunger which followed led to the collapse of the Sri Lankan government after widespread protests in 2022 (Jayasinghe and Ghoshal 2022).

Another instance of global warming propaganda occurred in the summer of 2022 in the UK when temperature gauges on the giant heat island of Heathrow Airport and surrounding area of West London reached 40 degrees centigrade for just one day in July. In anticipation, the government declared an 'Extreme Heat Warning' on July 18 for the first time in UK history. People were advised to work from home because of possible infrastructure disruptions and risk of heat stroke (Kirka and Lawless 2022). But nowhere in the UK in July 2022 – which is usually the warmest month - did UK temperatures stay above 30 degrees for more than 72 hours which used to be the definition of a 'heat-wave': the last summers in which this occurred were 2003 and 1976.

While the scientific claim that human economic and industrial activities are responsible for modest rises in global temperatures since 1850 is contestable, what is incontestable is the extent to which this claim is being used by globalist organisations to construct a climate-governance regime in which human activities are increasingly envisaged as in need of top-down control and restraint by governments as a 'solution' to the alleged humanly caused problem of climate change. The favoured devices for such restraints, in addition to increases in the cost of primary energy, and reductions in energy availability, are coercive controls on human movements and business, cultural, farming and social activities analogous to those which were imposed during lockdowns.

The ideology used to promote such technocratically invasive controls is 'Net-Zero' (Fankhauser, Smith et al 2022). This is a concept premised on the carbon accounting and carbon credit structures already discussed, and according to which corporations acquire government-conferred wealth from environmentally dubious developments such as fast-growing forests and oil palm plantations on former old growth forest land, or the substitution of woodchips and other biomass for fossil fuels in electricity generation. For citizens 'Net-Zero' does not mean new business opportunities but quite the opposite. A UK government report indicates that to achieve 'Net-Zero' carbon emissions in Britain by 2050 the government will have to close all airports, end all except plant-based farming and food consumption, and ban the construction of new buildings (Allwood, Azevedo et al 2019). Since all living things are composed mainly of carbon, and humans and other animals emit carbon dioxide when they breath, a 'ban' on carbon dioxide is in effect a vitaphobic (anti-life) concept. It takes to a Malthusian extreme already existing anti-human tendencies in the scientistic ideologies of eugenics, and deep green environmentalism.

Despite the highly problematic implications of Net Zero it is embraced with enthusiasm by the UK government and media, and increasingly by other domains including the countries of the European Union. The government of Ireland recently announced that to achieve net-zero it will have to bring to an end most farming activity in Ireland which is strongly dominated by beef and dairy cattle. In parts of Africa it is proposed that to meet

'Net-Zero' targets governments will need to halt the electrification of rural Africa, while in Asia the prices of electricity, oil and gas are already rising, albeit not yet to the punishing levels achieved in the UK and EU27.

Given that the 'climate regime' has not reduced global greenhouse gas emissions, and that there is no empirically demonstrable relationship between these and human suffering from climate events – since such suffering has been in decline for 120 years because of improvements to infrastructure in large part on the basis of increased primary energy production – the climate regime begins to look less like a remedy for the real environmental ills from which the Earth and her peoples and species are suffering – and especially declines in biodiversity and hence in ecosystem health more broadly – the most evident outcome of this regime is a technocratic dystopia in which human activities are increasingly controlled by governments and large corporations. This technocratically governed and QR coded 'new normal' was experienced in advance by billions of people in the course of the government response to the emergence of Sars-Cov-2 in 2020. The most significant economic effect of this regime was a huge shift in income and wealth from ordinary people to the oligarchic owners of Big Technology and Big Pharmacy companies who benefited financially from government restraints on small business and face to face activities in the lockdowns.

That the United Nations and financial and technological corporations already envisage this outcome is evident in the increasing linkages proposed between digital identities, digital finance, and digital surveillance records of the behaviours of individual citizens and households. Such a system is already in place in communist China where most financial transactions are cashless and where citizens are given social credit scores which impact their careers and their financial and social freedoms (Sithigh and Siems (2019). An equivalent invasive project to 'control' the carbon emissions of ordinary people, as envisaged by the United Nations, will link digital money – in the form of credit and debit cards and proposed programmable Central Bank Digital Currencies which give to central bankers the ability to determine how money is spent – to estimates of individuals' carbon emissions. On the basis of such estimates individuals will be given carbon scores in a system of top-down economic control analogous to social credit scores in China. While current systems linking carbon emissions to Fintech in the West are voluntary, in a cashless economy and with the planned roll out of Central Bank Digital Currencies in many domains, central bankers and governments will be able to use carbon foot-printing and other government priorities – in China 'disinformation' or challenging the government are significant causes of negative social credit scores - to determine how small businesses and individuals spend their money (Zhongming, Z, Linong L 2022). This will be a 'carbon leviathan' on speed, and a technocratic dystopia since fundamental freedoms and human agency – cultural, personal and political – depend upon individuals' capacities to support themselves and to make choices independent of government and corporate bureaucrats.

Technocracy, rule by scientific experts, was first envisaged by American economists, and scientists, and most influentially Thorstein Veblen, in the early 1900s as the best form of governance for the increasingly interconnected and scientifically-informed global civilization of the twentieth century (Veblen T 1921, Akin W 1977) . The technocratic vision of an expert-ruled and science-governed civilisation was presciently outlined in Bertrand Russell's *The Impact of Science on Society* (Russell 1952). Technocracy was often merged with the scientistic ideology of eugenics according to which individual humans need guidance and restraint in their reproductive capacities in order to limit human numbers, and to prevent the emergence or continuance of 'undesirable' genetic traits in the human population (Levine 2017). Aldous Huxley gave influential shape to the two ideologies combined in his science fiction novel *Brave New World* which, as artificial wombs, universal drug mandates and Artificial Intelligence mediated human movement tracking all emerged during the Covid pandemic, begins to look like a prescient map of the post-Covid'new normal' society as proposed by the founder of the World Economic Forum Klaus Schwab (Huxley 1932, Mallaret and Schwab 2020).

Both ideologies were discredited by their anti-human and elitist origins and tendencies but it does now appear that in the early twenty-first century, these ideologies are once again in the ascendant. Perhaps the clearest evidence for their ongoing influence, and linkages with Covid-19 and climate change, is to be found on the website, and in the publications of the World Economic Forum and its CEO and founder Klaus Schwab, and especially in his co-authored book *Covid-19: The Great Reset* in which a post-human transformation of societies is envisaged under which artificial intelligence will increasingly survey and control all human-human and human-nature interactions and humans themselves will eventually adopt digital and mechanical enhancements in a post-human merger of biological, psychological and digital identities (Mallaret and Schwab 2020).

The ideologies of technocracy and eugenics are strongly associated with the highly influential fossil-fuel fortune of the Rockefeller dynasty, whose land was used for the establishment of the United Nations in New York City. In their report *Scenarios for the Future of Technology* in 2010 the Rockefellers envisaged a global pandemic in the near future which would require governments around the world to impose in 'lockstep' technocratic controls on all aspects of human life of the kind (Rockefeller Foundation 2010). Though such a centralized and global form of government by a global science-informed elite would initially be unpopular, the Rockefellers advise that governments sustain this new global technocratic system beyond the pandemic in order to address other global problems such as climate change and violent conflict. It is hard to avoid the conclusion that the weird concerted and interactive promotion of such controls for a virus with an infection fatality rate equivalent to a bad flu, and going

forward to prevent alleged increases in human suffering from extreme weather – though as we have seen there are no such increases at the present time – indicates that the carbon leviathan is the trojan horse for a technocratic takeover of human and nonhuman life which will be unprecedented in its invasive reach into every aspect of life, and which is in effect 'vitaphobic' or anti-life (Cudenac 2021). If this is the prognosis, then it becomes evident that it is incumbent on those who are able to see what is planned, and aware of its hugely deleterious effects on human freedoms and souls, and on ecosystem health, to resist it by all means at their disposal including critical analysis and citizen resistance.

References

Abbot J and Marohasy J (2017) 'The application of machine learning for evaluating anthropogenic versus natural climate change.' *GeoResJ* 14 36-46.

Akin W E (1977) *Technocracy and the American Dream: The Technocrat Movement, 1900-1941*. Berkeley CA, University of California Press.

Allwood J M, Azevedo J et al (2019) *Absolute Zero: Delivering the UK's climate change commitment with incremental changes to today's technologies,* Cambridge, UK FIRES and the University of Cambridge, https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.46075

Began, D (2010) 'Miocene hominids and the origins of African apes and humans.' *Annual Review of Anthropology* 29, 67-84.

Bendavid A., Mulaney B et al (2021) 'COVID-19 antibody seroprevalence in Santa Clara County, California.' *International Journal of Epidemiology* 50, 410-19.

Bendavid A, Oh C et al (2021) 'Assessing mandatory stay-at-home and business closure effects on the spread of COVID-19.' *European Journal of Clinical Investigation* 51: e13484.

Broecker W S, Thurber D L et al (1968) 'Milankovitch hypothesis supported by precise dating of coral reefs and deep-sea sediments.' *Science* 159, 297-300.

Budinsky, J and Bryant S (2013) ' "It's Not Easy Being Green." The Greenwashing of Environmental Discourses in Advertising.' *Canadian Journal of Communication* 38, 207-26.

Coeckelbergh, M (2021) *Green Leviathan or The Poetics of Political Liberty: Navigating Freedom in the Age of Climate Change and Artificial Intelligence*. London, Routledge.

Cook, J, Oreskes N et al. (2013) 'Consensus on consensus: a synthesis of consensus estimates on human-caused global warming.' *Environmental Research Letters* 11, 048002.

Cudenac, P (2021) 'Sombre truths behind bright green lines.' Paul Cudenac Blog May 17 https://network23.org/paulcudenec/2021/05/17/sombre-truths-behind-bright-green-lies/

De Larochelambert Q, Marc A et al, 'Covid-19 Mortality: A Matter of Vulnerability Among Nations Facing Limited Margins of Adaptation.' *Frontiers in Public Health* 8

Douenne, T and Fabre A (2022), 'Yellow Vests, Pessimistic Beliefs, and Carbon Tax Aversion.' *American Economic Journal: Economic Policy* 14, 81-110.

Fagan, B (2008), *The Great Warming: Climate Change and the Rise and Fall of Civilizations*. New York, Bloomsbury.

Fankhauser S, Smith S M et al (2022), 'The meaning of net zero and how to get it right.' *Nature: Climate Change* 12, 15-21.

Food and Agriculture Organisation (2022). *Crop Prospects and Food Situation – Quarterly Global Report No 2, July 2022,* Rome, FAO and published online at https://www.fao.org/3/cc0868en/cc0868en.pdf

van Geel P and Ziegler P A (2013) 'IPCC underestimates the sun's role in climate change.' *Energy and Environment* 24 431-53.

Happer W and Lindzen R (2022) 'Comment and Declaration on the SEC's Proposed Rule
'The Enhancement and Standardization of Climate-Related Disclosures for Investors.' File No. S7-10-22, 87 Fed. Reg. 21334.

Helm. D (2012) *The Carbon Crunch: How We're Getting Climate Change Wrong and How to Fix It*. New Haven, CT, Yale University Press.

Huxley A (1932) *Brave New World*. San Francisco, Harper and Row.

Ioannidis, J (2021) 'Reconciling estimates of global spread and infection fatality rates of COVID-19: an overview of systematic evaluations.' *European Journal of Clinical Investigation* 51, e13554.

IPCC (2018) *Global Warming of 1.5°C. An IPCC Special Report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5°C above pre-industrial levels and related global greenhouse gas emission pathways, in the context of strengthening the global response to the threat of climate change, sustainable development, and efforts to eradicate poverty*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.

Jayasinghe U and Ghoshal D (2022) 'Fertiliser ban decimates Sri Lankan crops as government popularity ebbs.' Reuters March 3 2022 and published online at https://www.reuters.com/markets/commodities/fertiliser-ban-decimates-sri-lankan-crops-government-popularity-ebbs-2022-03-03/

Kirka D and Lawless J (2022) 'Millions swelter as UK endures its 1st Extreme Heat Warning.' Associated Press July 18 2022, https://www.usnews.com/news/world/articles/2022-07-18/extreme-heat-warning-goes-into-effect-in-uk

Krajinska, A (2021) *Magic Green Fuels: Why Synthetic Fuels Will Not Solve Europe's Pollution Problems*. Brussels, European Federation for Transport and Environment https://www.transportenvironment.org/discover/magic-green-fuels-why-synthetic-fuels-in-cars-will-not-solve-europes-pollution-problems/

Latour, B (2017) *Facing Gaia: Eight Lectures on the New Climatic Regime*. Trans. Catherine Porter. Cambridge, Polity.
Latour, Bruno (2020) 'La crise sanitaire incite à se préparer à la mutation climatique', *Le Monde, 25 March*.
Latour B (2021) *After Lockdown: A Metamorphosis.* Trans. Julie Rose, Cambridge, Polity Press.
Levine, P (2017) *Eugenics: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
Lovelock J (2014) *A Rough Ride to the Future*. London, Penguin.
Mallapaty S (2020) 'What the cruise-ship outbreaks reveal about COVID-19.' *Nature* 580, 18.
Mallaret T and Schwab K (2020) *Covid-19: The Great Reset*. Geneva, World Economic Forum.
Mayewski, P. A. and White, F (2002) *The Ice Chronicles: The Quest to Understand Global Climate Change*. Greenwich, CT, University Press of New England
Milankovitch M (1930). *Mathematische Klimalehre und Astronomische Theorie der Klimaschwankungen. Handbuch der Klimatologie. Vol. 1* Berlin, Teil A. von Gebrüder Borntraeger.
Mousseau, F (2015) 'The Corporate Takeover of Ukrainian Agriculture.' *Inter-Press Service* January 28 2015 and published online by CommonDreams.Org at https://www.commondreams.org/views/2015/01/28/corporate-takeover-ukrainian-agriculture
Myhre G, Shindell D et al (2013) 'Anthropogenic and natural radiative forcing.' In *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of working group 1 to the fifth assessment report of the intergovernmental panel on climate change*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Nguyen, Huang et al (2021) 'Record decline in global CO2 emissions prompted by COVID-19 pandemic and its implications on future climate change policies.' *Energy Sources Part A: Recovery, Utilization and Environmental Effects* DOI: 10.1080/15567036.2021.1879969
Northcott M S (1999) *Life After Debt: Christianity and Global Justice*. London, SPCK and Christian Aid.
Northcott, M S (2004) *An Angel Directs the Storm: Apocalyptic Religion and American Empire*. London, I B Tauris.
Northcott, M S (2007) 'The World Trade Organisation, Fair Trade and the Body Politics of Saint Paul.' In John Atherton ed. *Through the Eye of a Needle: Theology, Ethics and Economy*. London, Epworth Press, 169 – 188.
Northcott, M S (2014) *A Political Theology of Climate Change*. London, SPCK.
Oreskes, N. (2004) 'The scientific consensus on climate change.' *Science* 306, 1686-7.
Our World In Data (2022) 'OFDA/CRED International Disaster Data: Annual global numbers of deaths from natural catastrophes per decade 1900-2015.' https://ourworldindata.org/ofdacred-international-disaster-data
Owen L., Edgar L., Prince S., Doble C, (2008) *Personal carbon trading and public acceptability: a report to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.* London, DEFRA.
Parker, G (2013) *Global Crisis: War, Climate Change and Catastrophe in the Seventeenth Century*. New Haven CT, Yale University Press.
Paterson, M and Stripple J (2010), 'My Space' governing individuals' carbon emissions.' *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 28, 341-62.
Piao, S, Wang X et al (2020) 'Characteristics, drivers and feedbacks of global greening.' *Nature Reviews: Earth and Environment* 1 14 – 27.
Rockefeller Foundation and Global Business Network (2010) *Scenarios for the Future of Technology and International Development*, New York, Rockefeller Foundation.
Russell, Bertrand (1952) *The Impact of Science on Society*. London, Unwin Hyman.
Savaris R F, Pumi G et al (2021) 'Stay-at-Home Policy Is a Case of Exception Fallacy: An Internet-Based Ecological Study.' *Scientific Reports*, 11: 5313.
Síthigh, DM and Siems M (2019), 'The Chinese social credit system: a model for other countries?' *Modern Law Review* 82, 1034-71.
Stern N. et al (2006), *The Economics of Climate Change*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
Stockton H and Campbell R (2011), *Time to Reconsider UK Energy and Fuel Poverty Policies?* York, Joseph Rowntree Foundation https://beatcold.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2011/10/NEA-JRF-Viewpoint.pdf
Thompson L G, Mosley-Thompson E et al (1986), 'The little ice age as recorded in the stratigraphy of the tropical quelccaya ice cap.' *Science* 234, 361-64.
Tol, R S J (2014) 'Quantifying the consensus on anthropogenic global warming in the literature: A re-analysis.' *Energy Policy* 73, 701-5.
Veblen T (1921) *The Engineers and the Price System.* New York, Harcourt, Brace and World.
Z. Zhongming, Z., L Linong, Y. Xiaona, et al, 'Can e-commerce help save the planet?' Published online by the United Nations Environment Program (2022) at http://119.78.100.173/C666/handle/2XK7JSWQ/344770
Wainwright , J and Mann G (2018), *Climate Leviathan: A Political Theory of Our Planetary Future.* London, Verso.