

Why Did A Small Group of Politicians Lie To The World About Climate Change Data?

By E&E Investigations

The answer: *For Profiteering At The Expense of The Public!*

There is no doubt that the climate changes. No sane person can argue that. You can't argue that the sky is not blue or the grass is not green either. You don't care either way.

If a group of people told you that climate change will kill you, or that if the sky turns too blue it will deform your children or that if the grass gets too long it will eat your dog, then you will join your neighbors to proclaim that "*something must be done!*"

What if those assertions, by famous politicians, were outright lies that were being told to you so that those politicians and their Silicon Valley financiers could rape the U.S. Treasury?

A new study found adjustments made to global surface temperature readings by scientists in recent years "are totally inconsistent with published and credible U.S. and other temperature data." The data was rigged.

"Thus, it is impossible to conclude from the three published GAST data sets that recent years have been the warmest ever – despite current claims of record setting warming," [according to a study](#) published June 27 by two scientists and a veteran statistician.

The peer-reviewed study tried to validate current surface temperature datasets managed by NASA, NOAA and the UK's Met Office, all of which make adjustments to raw thermometer readings. Skeptics of man-made global warming have criticized the adjustments.

Why would a specific group of politicians lie about a thing if the lying about that thing does not put profits in their bank accounts? In all of human history, has it not always been the case that big political lies are created for big corrupt profiteering schemes?

Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama fabricated the entire Climate Change issue in order to put payola cash in the private bank accounts of their financiers: Elon Musk, John Doerr, Eric Schmidt, Vinod Khosla, Larry Page, Mark Zuckerberg, Greylock Partners, Kleiner Perkins, Goldman Sachs, Vantage Point, Draper Fisher, Khosla Ventures, Firelake Capital, CBRE, Westley Group and Wilson Sonsini. These are the very same people who engaged in the epic Silicon Valley sexual abuses, anti-trust abuses, public privacy rights abuses and who were the primary financiers and crony beneficiaries of Obama and Clinton. They are, obviously, a pack of organized crime operators with no moral code and an absolute willingness to break the law.

Any player who was not on the payola list and who had better competing technology: ie: Bright Automotive, XP Vehicles, Zap Motors, Brammo and over 100 other American companies, was sabotaged by the U.S. Department of Energy to protect the campaign financiers market share of the

fake Climate Change Repair technology providers. The entire thing was a scam to finance the Obama/Clinton campaigns and get taxpayers to pay for it while scraping illicit profits off the scheme. These companies lost billions of dollars exclusively because of Department of Energy managed attacks on them!

Did political contributors snag stimulus funds for cleantech companies?

April 2, 2011 | Matthew Lynley
2 Comments



Political contributors might have steered clean energy loans from the U.S. Department of Energy to companies in their investment portfolios, according to a report by the Center for Public Integrity and ABC News.

The report suggested that four companies that Steve Westley, a managing partner at clean technology investment firm The Westley Group, has invested in received more than \$500 million in loans, grants and stimulus money from the Department of Energy after Westley contributed \$500,000 to the Obama campaign. The companies in Westley's portfolio that received federal funding are Tesla Motors, RecycleBank, EdeniQ and Amyris Biotechnologies.

Both Amyris Biotechnologies and Tesla Motors have since gone public. Amyris is valued at \$1.2 billion and Tesla Motors is valued at \$2.5 billion. Westley said that the company in his portfolio went through a strict screening process and was awarded each loan based on merit, and that each received the loan before he was an advisor to U.S. Department of Energy secretary Steven Chu, according to the report.

The Department of Energy also made several loans to companies that Kleiner Perkins Caufield & Byers has invested. Managing partner John Doerr and other executives from the storied venture capital firm have donated more than \$1 million over the past two decades to federal political causes — mostly to Democrats.


The report doesn't make any direct connections and doesn't offer substantial proof that the companies received special interest because of Westley and the other executives' contributions. So, as usual, correlation does not imply causation. But it's worth keeping an eye on — particularly because Westley is a member of Chu's 12-person advisory board, and Doerr is on the Economic Recovery Advisory Board.

[Previous Story: Entrepreneur Corner: Succession planning and napkin entrepreneurs](#)

Elon Musk, John Doerr, Vinod Khosla, Larry Page, Mark Zuckerberg, Greylock Partners, Kleiner Perkins, Goldman Sachs, Vantage Point, Draper Fisher, Khosla Ventures, Firelake Capital, CBRE, Westley Group and Wilson Sonsini owned and controlled the solar and battery markets to “solve” climate change. If any other party tried to “solve” the problem, they were considered competitors and outsiders and “taken-out” with coordinated “hit-jobs” including character assassinations, black-lists, DOE freeze-outs, permanent DOE stone-walling and “bottom-drawing” and other, more sinister and lethal, dirty tricks.



Senators Nancy Pelosi, Harry Reid, Kamala Harris, and Dianne Feinstein personally manipulated Climate Scam payola and personally received millions of dollars in cash and stock market kick-backs in compensation for their efforts.



[printable version](#) - [fixed-width version](#)

[Afghanistan | U.S.](#)

"DIRTY" CRIMES FOR "CLEAN" ENERGY: THE AFGHANISTAN LITHIUM SCAM

by Lucreta Munoz
Sunday Jun 21st, 2015 5:35 PM

"DIRTY" CRIMES FOR "CLEAN" ENERGY: THE AFGHANISTAN LITHIUM SCAM

Latest case assessment summary:

At this point, enough evidence has accumulated to clearly prove that a mining scam was underway involving trillions of dollars of lithium, which Tesla, John Doerr and the Silicon Valley Cartel, 1.) clearly acquired the monopoly ownership of, 2.) at exactly the right moment to time it to the Afghan War, 3.) and place their associate: Steven Chu in office, 4.) and arrange the Dept. of Energy exclusive cash give-aways and 5.) tie in with Goldman Sachs commodity rigging which every suspect has now been shown to have had an operational hand in, and financial & political benefit from.

Afghanistan: The Saudi Arabia of Lithium?

Lithium, which is from mobile phone nation's economy.

By JAMES RISEN
Published: June 13, 2010

WASHINGTON — The United States has discovered nearly \$1 trillion in untapped mineral deposits in Afghanistan, far beyond any

As of late February, held Ener1 Group. previously known reserves and enough to fundamentally alter the loan to Think Global, which is trying to emerge from bankruptcy — is held by Bzinfin, a British Virgin Islands company whose "indirect beneficial owner" is Boris Zingarevich, a Russian businessman. Zingarevich has close ties to Russian President Dmitry Medvedev and Prime Minister Vladimir Putin.

Investing in Lithium Mining Stocks

Green power corrupts

How To Profit from the Lithium Boom

By Brian Hicks
Friday, October 16th, 2009

Editor's Note:

While Western Lithium remains trades — and possibly a third opportunity to double if not trip

Goldman Sachs culture 'toxic'? Letter confirms suspicions about Wall Street.

A123 lithium-ion battery maker bankruptcy fuels criticism of President Barack Obama's alternativ

Energy & Genius

The Saudi Arabia of Lithium

Brendan I. Koerner, 10.30.08, 06:00 PM EST
Forbes Magazine dated November 24, 2008

The gas engine made petroleum the world's biggest commodity. The electric car could do the same for the third element on the

Ener1 Wants to Win Lithium Ion Battery Race



U.S. Identifies Vast Mineral Riches in Afghanistan

The problem with lithium

David Booth, National Post

N chloride ring SQM creating the illucid the ultra-arid sala

Image: CarSpace

RUSSIAN OWNED

Goldman Sachs discloses ownership in Talison Lithium Corp.

Talison Lithium Ltd's

Lithium ion battery manufacturer Ener1 (HEV) could become the country's first lithium ion bat mass producer—if it wins a \$480M Department of Energy loan. [CNNMoney](#) has more.

At this point, enough evidence has accumulated to clearly prove that a mining scam was underway involving trillions of dollars of lithium, which Tesla, John Doerr and the Silicon Valley Cartel, 1.) clearly acquired the monopoly ownership of, 2.) at exactly the right moment to time it to the Afghan War, 3.) and place their associate: Steven Chu in office, 4.) and arrange the Dept. of Energy exclusive cash give-aways and 5.) tie in with Goldman Sachs commodity rigging which every suspect has now been shown to have had an operational hand in, and financial & political benefit from.

Solyndra was staged to exploit indium and other related minerals from the same mining deal. Alas, the Afghan War failed, costing U.S. taxpayers (According to multiple news reports) over six trillion dollars, the Republicans found out about the "Cleantech Scam" and dissected it, almost all of the Cartel's pool of exploitation companies went out of business, the Russian portions went into cold war mode with their U.S. counter-parts and leaks from Dept. of Energy staff broke the cover-up. Senior Federal employees participated in, coordinated and benefitted from the crime.

How many Afghan farmers, soldiers and workers had to die to buy John Doerr his new mansion?

Why did federal employees get the profits from helping do this crime?

Climate scientists often apply adjustments to surface temperature thermometers to account for “biases” in the data. The new study doesn’t question the adjustments themselves but notes nearly all of them increase the warming trend.

Basically, “cyclical pattern in the earlier reported data has very nearly been ‘adjusted’ out” of temperature readings taken from weather stations, buoys, ships and other sources.

In fact, almost all the surface temperature warming adjustments cool past temperatures and warm more current records, increasing the warming trend, according to the study’s authors.

“Nearly all of the warming they are now showing are in the adjustments,” Meteorologist Joe D’Aleo, a study co-author, told The Daily Caller News Foundation in an interview. “Each dataset pushed down the 1940s warming and pushed up the current warming.”

“You would think that when you make adjustments you’d sometimes get warming and sometimes get cooling. That’s almost never happened,” said D’Aleo, who co-authored the study with statistician James Wallace and Cato Institute climate scientist Craig Idso.

Their study found measurements “nearly always exhibited a steeper warming linear trend over its entire history,” which was “nearly always accomplished by systematically removing the previously existing cyclical temperature pattern.”

“The conclusive findings of this research are that the three [global average surface temperature] data sets are not a valid representation of reality,” the study found. “In fact, the magnitude of their historical data adjustments, that removed their cyclical temperature patterns, are totally inconsistent with published and credible U.S. and other temperature data.”

Based on these results, the study’s authors claim the science underpinning the Environmental Protection Agency’s (EPA) authority to regulate greenhouse gases “is invalidated.”

The new study will be included in petitions by conservative groups to the EPA to reconsider the 2009 endangerment finding, which gave the agency its legal authority to regulate carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases.

Sam Kazman, an attorney with the Competitive Enterprise Institute (CEI), said the study added an “important new piece of evidence to this debate” over whether to reopen the endangerment finding. CEI [petitioned](#) EPA to reopen the endangerment finding in February.

“I think this adds a very strong new element to it,” Kazman told TheDCNF. “It’s enough reason to open things formally and open public comment on the charges we make.”

Since President Donald Trump ordered EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt to review the Clean Power Plan, there’s been speculation the administration would reopen the endangerment finding to new scrutiny.

The Obama-era document used three lines of evidence to claim such emissions from vehicles “endanger both the public health and the public welfare of current and future generations.”

D’Aleo and Wallace filed a petition with EPA on behalf of their group, the Concerned Household Electricity Consumers Council (CHECC). They relied on past their past research, which found [one of EPA’s lines of evidence](#) “simply does not exist in the real world.”

Their 2016 study “failed to find that the steadily rising atmospheric CO2 concentrations have had a statistically significant impact on any of the 13 critically important temperature time series data analyzed.”

“In sum, all three of the lines of evidence relied upon by EPA to attribute warming to human GHG emissions are invalid,” reads CHCC’s petition. “The Endangerment Finding itself is therefore invalid and should be reconsidered”.

Pruitt’s largely been silent on whether or not he would reopen the endangerment finding, but the administrator did say he was [spearheading a red team exercise](#) to tackle climate science.

Secretary of Energy Rick Perry also came out in favor of red-blue team exercises, which are used by the military and intelligence agencies to expose any vulnerabilities to systems or strategies.

Environmental activists and climate scientists largely panned the idea, with some even arguing it would be “dangerous” to elevate minority scientific opinions.

“Such calls for special teams of investigators are not about honest scientific debate,” [wrote](#) climate scientist Ben Santer and Kerry Emanuel and historian and activist Naomi Oreskes.

“They are dangerous attempts to elevate the status of minority opinions, and to undercut the legitimacy, objectivity and transparency of existing climate science,” the three wrote in a recent Washington Post op-ed.

“Frankly, I think you could do a red-blue team exercise as part of reviewing the endangerment finding,” Kazman said.

Though Kazman did warn a red team exercise could be a double-edged sword if not done correctly. He worries some scientists not supportive of the idea could undermine the process from the inside and use it to grandstand.

The conclusions that can be drawn is either that climate ‘scientists’ including those at NOAA and NASA are fundamentally ignorant of the effects of atmospheric enthalpy and the correct metrics for energy content -or- there is significant malfeasance in these government agencies and academia.


Both conclusions support the immediate defunding of every climate ‘science’ department in NOAA, NASA and academia. The facts prove, beyond a doubt that: **Much of recent global warming has been fabricated by climate scientists to make it look more frightening in order to give Silicon Valley campaign billionaires free hand-outs of payola**, a [study](#) has found.

The peer-reviewed study by scientists and veteran statisticians looked at the global average temperature datasets (GAST) which are used by climate alarmists to argue that recent years have been “the hottest evah” and that the warming of the last 120 years has been dramatic and unprecedented.

What they found is that these readings are “totally inconsistent with published and credible U.S. and other temperature data.”

That is, the adjusted data used by alarmist organizations like NASA, NOAA, and the UK Met Office differs so markedly from the original raw data that it cannot be trusted.

This chart gives you a good idea of the direction of the adjustments.



The blue bars show where the raw temperature data has been adjusted downwards to make it cooler; the red bars show where the raw temperature data has been adjusted upwards to make it warmer.

Note how most of the downward adjustments take place in the early twentieth century and most of the upward take place in the late twentieth century.

[According to meteorologist Joe D'Aleo](#), who co-authored the study with statistician James Wallace and Cato Institute climate scientist Craig Idso, this has the effect of exaggerating the warming trend:

“Nearly all of the warming they are now showing are in the adjustments.”

“Each dataset pushed down the 1940s warming and pushed up the current warming.”

“You would think that when you make adjustments you’d sometimes get warming and sometimes get cooling. That’s almost never happened.”

What this means, the report concludes, is that claims by DOE, EPA, NASA, NOAA, and the UK Met Office that the world is experiencing unprecedented and dramatic warming should be taken with a huge pinch of salt: they all use the same corrupted global average temperature (GAST) data.

The conclusive findings of this research are that the three GAST data sets are not a valid representation of reality. In fact, the magnitude of their historical data adjustments, that removed their cyclical temperature patterns, are totally inconsistent with published and credible U.S. and other temperature data. Thus, it is impossible to conclude from the three published GAST data sets that recent years have been the warmest ever – despite current claims of record setting warming.

Pitch Document created by DNC (and pitched by Clinton Foundation (Who also gave away America’s Uranium mining rights) and Clinton backed USAID) to sell the Afghan War to Silicon Valley billionaires by promising 6 trillion dollars in high tech lithium battery and solar panel material mining profits to Silicon Valley campaign financiers:

Prepared in cooperation with the Afghanistan Geological Survey and at the auspices of the U.S. Agency for International Development

Preliminary Assessment of Non-Fuel Mineral Resources of Afghanistan, 2007




Figure 1. Map of Afghanistan showing mineralized areas recommended for further study (rectangular areas), known non-fuel mineral deposits and prospects (small dots), and selected mineral deposits for which resources have been published in the past (various symbols).

Introduction

Afghanistan has abundant mineral resources, including known deposits of copper, iron, barite, sulfur, talc, chromium, magnesium, salt, mica, marble, rubies, emeralds, lapis lazuli, asbestos, nickel, mercury, gold and silver, lead, zinc, fluorapatite, bauxite, beryllium, and lithium (fig. 1). Between 2005 and 2007, the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) funded a cooperative study by the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) and the

Afghanistan Geological Survey (AGS) to assess the non-fuel mineral resources of Afghanistan as part of the effort to aid in the reconstruction of that country.

An assessment is an estimation or evaluation, in this instance of undiscovered non-fuel mineral resources. Mineral resources are materials that are in such form that economic extraction of a commodity is currently or potentially feasible. In this assessment, teams of scientists from the USGS and the AGS compiled information about known mineral deposits and then evaluated the possible occurrence of undiscovered deposits

of all types. Quantitative probabilistic estimates were made for undiscovered deposits of copper, mercury, non-earth elements, sulfur, chromite, asbestos, potash, graphite, and sand and gravel. These estimates were made for undiscovered deposits at depths less than a kilometer. Other deposit types were considered and discussed in the assessment, but quantitative estimates of numbers of undiscovered deposits were not made. In addition, the assessment resulted in the delineation of 20 mineralized areas for further study, of which several may contain resources amenable to rapid development.

The entire Climate Change thing was a criminal profiteering scam.

Google’s scheme of paying professors to influence public opinion is also how the “global warming” scam works.

“Google operates a little-known program to harness the brain power of university researchers to help sway opinion and public policy, cultivating financial relationships with professors at campuses from Harvard University to the University of California, Berkeley,” the WSJ [reported](#).

In a similar fashion, politicians, foundations and corporate magnates also fund professors to perform “research” into “man-made climate change” which almost always reaches the existing consensus that it’s a threat only global government can handle.

The arguments claiming “the science is settled” and “97% of scientists believe in global warming” are *appealing to authority* fallacies that are easily debunked given the Google revelations.

And those were nearly the same arguments tobacco companies were making decades ago when they were funding scientists to downplay health risks associated with smoking.

“Research and other professional activities are professionally rewarded only if they are channeled in certain directions approved by a politicized academic establishment — funding, ease of getting your papers published, getting hired in prestigious positions, appointments to prestigious committees and boards, professional recognition, etc.,” [revealed](#) climatologist Dr. Judith Curry, who once held a tenured position at Georgia Tech before resigning in disgust.

Simply put, academia is not independent but is rather just one tentacle of a vast network of politicians and conformists in finance, media and entertainment who all work in unison to push agendas that originated from the private meetings of the world’s power players.

They’re motivated by the feelings of prestige that comes with joining the upper echelons of society that, unknown to them, only leads to decline of civilization thanks to the heavy burden this predatory class places on productive people who are the real sources of human innovation.

It’s an inherent maxim of social climbers to abandon independent thought out of fear of public disapproval, and that’s why the elites use them to push “global warming” and other propaganda meant to empower the state despite leading to an empty shell of civilization. Google’s executives and investors are some of the largest financial beneficiaries of the political payola from Obama and Clinton’s climate change/global warming scam. That is why Google hates Trump.