MERCOLA
Take Control of Your Health

How the War on Climate Change Destroyed the Environmental Movement

Analysis by A Midwestern Doctor | May 09, 2023

In the first part of this series (which must be read to understand many of the concepts here), I reviewed how many different industries are dominated by individuals who will put profits before human lives — and that this happens to a degree that is often difficult to even imagine. The military industrial complex, and the recent war in Ukraine best embody this grotesque facet of the human condition, but the same patterns are seen in many other fields as well.

As a longtime environmentalist, one of the most depressing things I have watched in my lifetime has been major polluters hijacking the environmental movement and transforming it from something that fought to against the destruction of our air and water to a fanatical crusade against (harmless) carbon dioxide. Sadder still, this crusade has gradually become a war and has adopted the same playbook used by the parties which lust for complete power over the citizenry.

Disclaimer: Some of what I will write here will likely raise strong disagreements with some of you. I am **completely fine** if you disagree with this piece, particularly since it is not my field of expertise, and I likely made some unintentional errors in writing this.

The War on Climate Change

Before COVID-19 vaccines, the drugs best known for having a terrible risk-to-benefit ratio but nonetheless being pushed on entire populations were statins.

Note: I would argue the antidepressants were worse in this regard, but the issues with statins were better recognized.

When you dive into statins, you find a very familiar pattern — the evidence shows there is no benefit from them, the public is not even allowed to view most of the evidence, and all the bodies which mandated statins on the population (e.g., government health panels) were being bribed by statin manufacturers.

Beyond the COVID-19 vaccines, this is precisely what happened (and can be clearly proven) with Remdesivir, which for a long time was **the only** approved treatment for COVID-19 despite it being deadly and ineffective.

One of the leading advocates against statins, Malcolm Kendrick MD, has advanced a compelling argument for why the drug industry will never let statins go. It took so much money to create the cholesterol market built upon the dogma that cholesterol is the primary cause of heart disease and that we must do everything possible to lower it, that the industry will never let that investment go.

Similarly, with global warming, because so much was invested into having it be the entire face of environmentalism, once all its predictions failed to materialize, something else had to be done to preserve the investment. This was, of course, "climate change," an even more vague and undefinable target that anything and everything could fit into, including **every destructive effect of pollution that had nothing to do with carbon dioxide being emitted**.

Throughout my lifetime, I have repeatedly read numerous documents either authored by or allegedly authored by government think tanks which have essentially said that to effectively control the population and exploit them (e.g., have a national unity behind a terrible policy), wars and crises are necessary.

In each case, that emergency can be used to justify rapid changes in society, no one would otherwise accept, and the minority who go against them can be labeled as traitors and, in one way or another, neutralized.

In the old days, this was done with physical wars (best encapsulated by 1984's reference to the totalitarian state the main character lived in, always being at war with one of the other two empires).

However, when World War 2 happened, a significant issue with that approach emerged — war technology had advanced to the point that physical wars between major powers were immensely devastating and resulted in destroyed infrastructures no one could make money off of once the war ended.

This, along with the threat of mutually assured destruction, led to various alternative warfare methods being developed, such as economic conflicts between major powers, limited proxy wars in smaller nations (e.g., Vietnam), and pseudo-wars being created domestically.

In the case of pseudo-wars, the goal was to create a war against an "idea" so the war could never end, and it could be continually used to justify all the policies that normally required a war. In most of the documents I read, the typical targets for a pseudo-war were:

- An infectious disease.
- Terrorism.
- A widespread environmental threat.

Since we all lived through Bush's War on Terror, it should be clear how that played out, and that it accomplished nothing besides making a lot of money for those invested in it and it diverted a lot of America's attention toward non-existent terror threats (e.g., does anyone remember how long we had a color code of terror alert days?). Early in COVID, a wise friend called me up and stated the following:

> *"I just realized something. COVID-19 is the Democrat's War on Iraq. It's going to be built on a bunch of blatant lies the media will viscously uphold as truth, and everyone behind this is going to do as much profiteering off of it as they can for as long as possible, which is probably going to be a long, long time.*

> *I guess I can't complain though; at least we aren't killing tons of Iraqis overseas to fund this."*

In the book **The Real Anthony Fauci**, RFK Jr. provided the best case I have seen for just how much many members of government (e.g., the intelligence services) and the oligarchs have pushed for a "war" against a disease. To share two of its many quotes:

> *[Bill] Gates reiterated: "The world needs to prepare for pandemics in the same* ***serious*** *way it prepares for war."*

> *"Governments do like epidemics, just the same way as they like war, really. It's a chance to impose their will on us and get us all scared so that we huddle together and do what we're told."* — Dr. Damien Downing, President, British Society of Ecological Medicine (Al Jazeera, 2009)

In **a recent interview**, RFK Jr. also discussed how the War on Climate Change had been coopted by those same war profiteers:

> *"The climate issues and pollution issues are being exploited by the World Economic Forum and Bill Gates and all of these big Mega billionaires the same way that COVID was exploited.*

> *To use it as an excuse to clamp down — top down totalitarian controls on society and to then to give us engineering solutions. And if you look closely as it turns out, the guys who are promoting those engineering solutions are the people who own the IPs, the patents for those solutions. It's being used …*

> *… They've given climate chaos a bad name because people now see that it's just another crisis that's being used to strip mine the wealth of the poor and to enrich billionaires."*

Questioning Climate Change

One of the things I always marvel about with life is how often a sincere commitment to the truth ends up putting you at odds with a peer group you join because you share many of their values. I care about the environment but am stuck in a position where the environmentalists hate me because I do not support the Climate Change narrative.

In contrast, those who do not support the Climate Change narrative hate me because I care about the environment and do not believe polluters should be given a free pass to support economic growth.

Because of how much has been invested into the climate change narrative and the vital social functions it serves (protecting industrial polluters from scrutiny and being a war that can be drawn out when needed), the need to hold onto the investment is even stronger than that seen with statins.

So, as you might expect, when evidence emerges that challenges the climate change narrative, whatever is necessary to dismiss it occurs, while when evidence appears to support it, regardless of how flimsy it is, everyone parades it as irrefutable proof of the narrative. In other words, it is a situation not too different from what we have seen with COVID-19 vaccines.

From a philosophical standpoint, the root problem with the climate change narrative is that nothing can disprove it (thereby making it fulfill **the classic criteria of pseudoscience**). Climate change is an intentionally vague term, and fluctuations in weather always occur, so any unwanted fluctuation can be attributed to human-caused climate change (especially given how flexible our "models" are), and there is no way to prove or disprove any argument asserting climate change.

Consider natural disasters, which always occur. Many of them ultimately result from the fact that settlements were built where they should not have been (New Orleans being the classic example, since it is in a hurricane zone and below sea level, flooding is almost inevitable there).

However, each time a disaster occurs, rather than acknowledging what really caused it, something else is blamed (e.g., bad luck or climate change) so disaster money can be

gotten to patch the issue. Then, years later, the disaster repeats.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, whenever evidence emerges that suggests the climate change hypothesis is wrong, that data is attacked, censored, hidden, or altered. In the same way, those questioning vaccines are never given a platform to present their argument (as doing so asserted as equivalent to enabling murder), those questioning climate change are treated the same.

Many noteworthy examples of data have been presented that challenged the global warming hypothesis (either that warming was happening or that carbon dioxide, which only composes 0.04% of our atmosphere, correlates to temperature changes). Almost all of these have been censored.

The best example I ever came across happened during what was known as "Climategate," where hackers got access to many documents and private emails from leading climate researchers worldwide in 2009. Although the press buried this story, the leaked files showed the following:

- A lot of data manipulation occurred to support the climate narrative; especially once raw data showed a downward trend in global temperatures after 2001. For example, a decision was made to primarily use temperature monitoring stations in hotter areas (while throwing out many more stations in colder areas) and then using the remaining (hotter) stations to extrapolate (hotter) temperatures for every single station (e.g., those in the colder areas).

  Similarly, numerous "adjustments" were made to the raw data, which increased the final temperatures.

- Most of the raw temperature data (which the theory of global warming was founded upon) was thrown out, thereby making it impossible for anyone to question or verify the scientist's work. In emails, the scientists also discussed working to illegally circumvent Freedom of Information Act laws so their misconduct could not be uncovered.

- Leading climate scientists actively conspired to subvert the scientific peer review process to ensure that papers skeptical of their climate change narrative had no access to publication.

- This scientific malfeasance occurred globally (e.g., in England and in the USA at NASA and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration). Their erroneous results provided the involved scientists with continued funding and were repeatedly cited by officials (e.g., the Obama administration) worldwide to justify public climate policy.

For individuals wishing to learn more about these events, they are detailed here.

Note: A case can be made that many harmful weather events we experience are artificially created and that technologies already exist that could mitigate them. I feel this topic is beyond the scope of this article (and some aspects of it are too speculative), so it will not be discussed further.

Climate Profiteering

Given that a "war" has been created for climate change, it raises the question, what is the goal of that war? Like every other strategy of control, the aims are essentially the same. In this instance, I believe those goals are as follows:

1. Come up with climate-related reasons to control the population.
2. Make a lot of money selling green technologies.
3. Make green technologies that increase the existing control over the population.

In the case of number one, many have theorized carbon dioxide emission quotas occurred to prevent poorer nations from being able to industrialize and compete with first-world countries effectively. While I am unsure if this was the ultimate goal, in recent times, we have seen a much more transparent illustration of how the climate change narrative is being used to control the population.

Since a young age, I was told the goal the ruling class always had was for the general members of society to go to work, work long hours, go home to a tiny home, consume mindless entertainment, go to sleep, and then repeat the same thing the next day, something almost inconceivable in the era when I first heard about this.

As the decades go by, it has thus been hard not to notice how people become more and more trapped in this cycle as their economic impoverishment increases and all the different policies that have been enacted that helped facilitate this transition.

Note: Economic feudalism (corporate serfdom), the model which leads to this lifestyle, is discussed further in this article, and speaking out against it has been a key component of RFK Jr.'s campaign.

Shortly after COVID-19 forced lockdowns upon the world, we began being introduced to the idea of climate lockdowns to fight the "emergency" of climate change since the COVID-19 lockdowns were so miraculous for the environment. Since the lockdowns, the World Economic Forum has praised the significant reduction in emissions resulting from the lockdowns the caused and promoted the need to redesign the post-lockdown society to maintain those reductions.

Since then, the idea of climate lockdowns has built momentum, and to quote Bloomberg: "the idea of a '15-minute city,' in which residents live within a short walk or bike ride of all their daily needs has been embraced by many mayors around the world during the global pandemic as a central planning tenet."

Although the idea seems great on the surface (having everything one needs close by), it has been met with widespread resistance at one its initial trial sites in Oxford. This is due to:

- Many poorer parts of the city not having the resources necessary for a "15-minute city."
- The burdens of this plan disproportionately affect the poor.

- A belief it is a deliberate attempt to take the rights and freedoms of the citizens away.
- The “utterly undemocratic” decision for it to be implemented occurred at a central level (allegedly to fight the emergency of climate change) that was in direct opposition to the wishes of the citizens affected (most of whom voted against it).

Note: For those interested in knowing more about this topic, **this English television broadcast** discusses it.

Green Technologies

Since controlling the population requires monopolizing each life-essential resource, a lot of work will be directed by whoever is in charge of controlling any resource that can be centrally managed. Because one of the most critical resources in this regard is energy, ever since **Rockefeller monopolized the oil industry**, tight control has been exercised both over the available energy options and any others which can compete with them.

I hence theorized all the green energy technologies we saw being introduced would have the following characteristics:

- Be costly and expected to rise in cost as time progresses.
- Not be effective in addressing the core energy needs of the country.
- Be increasingly mandated on the population as people became habituated to them.
- Be much easier to control than the existing energy technologies and by extension, easier to control the population with.

If we then look at how the green technology issue has been addressed, that is precisely what we find has happened. Some of the most significant issues are as follows:

1. Most existing green technologies require rare earth elements to be produced. This is a problem for a few reasons:

- The supply of these critical elements is extremely limited (China, for example, has invested its long-term geopolitical strategy around securing them).
- It is almost inevitable that their costs will climb in the future (which will make some people a lot of money while everyone else is forced to pay for the increasingly expensive green technology).
- Their mining is environmentally destructive to the point (remember the Prius example) and often creates far more damage than any possible benefit of the technology. Additionally, it often requires cruel child labor.

Note: This is why I mentioned the concept of social justice washing.

2. The green technology devices are much easier to control and ration than their older fossil fuel counterparts. For example, electric cars can be locked out of use when the grid is overloaded (and cannot drive long distances), and electric vehicles are much easier to control and monitor. Additionally, they are often much less reliable (particularly due to battery failures), requiring repeatedly purchasing new expensive vehicles.

   Note: Many individuals I know have difficulty in electric cars due to the electrical fields they generate, and are having progressively more issues as older vehicles are retired from the market.

3. **There is no possible way** the existing green technologies can meet our energy needs, and it is unlikely, due to the raw material (e.g., rare earth elements) required to produce them, that this production can be sufficiently scaled up to meet that demand. This means we can expect more and more rationing and cost increases to address this "crisis."

The great shame about this is that for all the noise people make on this subject, viable green energy technologies exist. It's just that there is no actual interest in utilizing any of them.

The best analogy I know of to this entire situation happened with “peak oil,” where it was alleged that we would soon run out of oil, and we needed to prepare for the cataclysm that would result from it running out. Those predictions never materialized, but they did serve to justify the oil industry inflating their prices.

What I find particularly interesting about peak oil is that evidence has existed for decades as proof that it could not happen, as its foundational premise, that oil arises from dead lifeforms (and thus will eventually run out), is not as true as we were led to believe.

After a few scientists explored the hypothesis that oil did not have a biological origin, the theory was heavily researched in Russia under Stalin. It, however, did not make it to the Western world due to both the cultural barriers at the time and the extreme controversy of it.

Later, an eminent scientist (who I can only describe as brilliant), Thomas Gold, decided to research it further and made some very intriguing discoveries. I learned of this after Malcolm Kendrick recommended his book as an example of how science rejects dissenting hypotheses, as few have even heard of Gold’s work. In The Deep Hot Biosphere, Thomas Gold made a strong case for the following:

> When planets form, large amounts of hydrocarbons coalesce at their formation site; as a result, a lot of oil (and other hydrocarbons) exists within them.

> Life typically originates deep inside planets under high pressures where bacteria spontaneously evolve, which “eat” these hydrocarbons. This is really important because it provides a pathway for life to form that is remotely possible, whereas all the existing models we have such low probabilities of occurring they border on the impossible.

> The reason we think oil has a biological origin is because it contains the remains of those primitive bacteria life originated from.

> Thomas Gold provided a lot of robust evidence to support his hypothesis. More importantly, he then demonstrated that large numbers of the bacteria he described exist (where no life was thought to be possible) through a specialized oil drilling experiment. He also identified one meteorite that provided a strong case that a similar ecosystem exists below the surface of Mars.

> Thomas Gold made a strong case that the earthquakes result from large bodies of methane trapped beneath the ground escaping to the surface.

> Thomas Gold made a case that carbon dioxide in the atmosphere that surface life depends upon arises from the natural or biological oxidation of this vast underground reservoir of hydrocarbons that is always leaking to the surface.

One of the most significant insights I gained from this book was that the lines of earth energy and consciousness beneath the surface that many different cultures believe in likely have a relationship to this massive underground biosphere. I have also wondered if some of the healing benefits attributed to hot springs arise from the fact they are the one place we are likely to come in contact with these primitive bacteria.

Energy Technologies

Most of this article has been predicated on better energy technologies existing that no one is using. I will now try to break down my insights on what they are.

> **"Fossil" fuels —** About 60% of the US's energy supply comes from fossil fuels, of which a third (20% of our energy production) comes from coal. My primary issue with our reliance on fossil fuels is that coal is highly polluting when burned and is responsible for much of our air and water contamination.
>
> Most of this comes from China, which consumes 54.4% of the world's coal (the US, in comparison, consumes 6.6%) and has created significant pollution both locally and globally.

Unfortunately, due to the fact, we are now transitioning to less efficient forms of power (e.g., generating electricity from fossil fuels, transferring it across the electrical grid to a charging station, and then storing it in an electric car battery, all of which wastes a lot of energy, rather than just burning fossil fuel within the car) coal is often needed to make up for the deficit in electrical energy production.

Note: There can also be a variety of issues with natural gas fracking polluting the groundwater in the area where it is done, but that is beyond the scope of this article.

Nuclear energy — Nuclear energy offers the most straightforward solution to all energy issues. However, the approach for doing so is relatively unknown. Conventional nuclear technology suffers from a few major issues:

- Nuclear plants almost always leak radiation and contaminate their surroundings. I've researched this and have identified areas that have mysterious cancer clusters that can be traced to a leaky nuclear power plant. Since I would not live near a conventional nuclear power plant, I can't ethically endorse the approach as a solution to our energy woes.

- Nuclear power produces a significant amount of nuclear waste. Although people typically focus on the spent fuel rods (which are a pain to dispose of but are relatively low in volume), I believe a major issue also occurs during the fuel rod's production.

  Only a tiny percentage of uranium is usable for conventional nuclear power (**0.7% of it**), so something must be done with the rest.

  In the 1970s, it was realized that this "depleted" uranium was both an extremely effective munition and armor. Since the Gulf War, **depleted uranium** has been used in numerous overseas battlefields and has been **linked to various cancers** and **horrendous birth defects** in regions where it was deployed.

  The dangers of depleted uranium are now well known enough that US government agencies **acknowledge them**.

Nonetheless, despite numerous calls to ban them, military applications continue (e.g., Russia recently condemned England's plan to send depleted uranium munitions to Ukraine, claimed it would poison the soil and people of Ukraine for decades, and warned that it would be treated as a nuclear escalation of the conflict). Sadly, the warning was not heeded:

Note: Scott Ritter, a former weapons inspector is considered by many to be a leading expert on weapon proliferation. He has made a case that it is one of the greatest threats facing the world and has stated that RFK Jr. is the only presidential candidate who has ever taken the time to seriously consider the issue and discuss it with Ritter.

Recently they had a podcast discussing the brutal realities of the Ukrainian conflict.

- Conventional nuclear plants are vulnerable to catastrophic meltdowns. As far as I know, all disasters that have happened thus far resulted from the plant's catastrophic mismanagement, which has led me to believe that the lack of oversight for the operational management of these plants will eventually come back to bite us.

The sad part about this is that nuclear technologies without these issues have existed for decades. Per my understanding, the whole problem started because when nuclear power was initially developed, the design utilized was settled upon because it produced plutonium containing nuclear waste which provided necessary raw materials for building nuclear weapons.

Once a need for plutonium no longer existed, the nuclear power sector was so entrenched that it would not allow alternative nuclear reactor designs to enter the market. This is because those other designs would have rapidly outcompeted the existing nuclear power plants (which require an immense degree of government subsidies to stay afloat for costs like insurance due to their previously mentioned issues).

Note: Although it matches the facts, I am unsure how to prove or disprove the narrative I put forward in the preceding paragraph as I am simply repeating what someone who seemed knowledgeable told me.

What, then are the alternative designs? The first option is to utilize thorium rather than uranium for nuclear power. Thorium has the advantage of being much more common than uranium, its reactors produce much less waste, and the reactors are not vulnerable to nuclear meltdowns.

Decades of slow research have progressed on developing these reactors (especially in India, which has thorium but not uranium reserves), and there **are now viable plants** showing the concept works. Many advocates believe thorium reactors are the ideal solution to our energy issues.

My distant friend who worked in this field for over a decade told me that they had to actively work against the conventional nuclear industry doing everything possible to sabotage the technology developing, which is why the development process has taken so long. Since I cannot further verify his claim, I suspect it is partially true but not the complete picture.

The second option is to utilize a different green nuclear design. I am going to quote a few points from **an article** Steve Kirsch wrote on the subject:

> *"These next generation reactors, such as the sodium-cooled **integral fast reactor (IFR)**, are extremely safe because if the cooling goes bad, the reactor safely shuts down based on the laws of physics. These reactors also recycle their own waste on site so the nuclear material can be used over and over again (a method known as pyroprocessing).*
>
> *There is a very small amount of "waste" product but it can be safely stored and becomes "safe" after less than 100 years (and we know how to store things safely on those time frames vs. thousands of years required for traditional nuclear waste).*

> *Sadly, Bill Clinton killed the program (which was supported by both Democratic and Republican Presidents) for political reasons (the oil companies didn't like the competition).*
>
> ***Chuck Till** and **Yoon Chang** are the two people most knowledgeable about this work. It is world-class thinking and it is very sad that it is likely they will die before seeing their work adopted.*
>
> *Yoon Chang and I did meet with Bill Gates, but instead of funding the slam dunk solution, he decided to fund scientists working on a "better" design."*

Note: That "better" design has still not been produced. For those interested, much more information about these reactors is available **here**.

If you step back and think about it, a green source of nuclear energy would solve all of our climate issues but simultaneously would destroy countless industries built around controlling and profiting off the population.

Note: Nuclear fusion also holds promise. I, however, suspect it will always be something research money will be directed towards to create a magic solution to our energy problems in the "future" that we will never actually arrive at.

Wind — A major point that is never discussed with wind power is that windspeed **increases dramatically with height**. For this reason, the most efficient way to harvest wind power is not by lining the ground with turbines but rather **by having turbines floating in the air**.

I believe this technology has a great deal of promise, but it never received the necessary investment to support researching it before we jumped to mass adoption of ground turbines and firmly established that industry.

Solar — For a long time, I was immensely excited about all the revolutionary new solar panel technologies coming to market and followed them intensely. I then watched them all fail because they could not compete with China making conventional solar

panels for a much smaller cost than any US manufacturer could make a novel technology.

After looking at this for a while, I realized that the most sustainable solar panel we could ever make would be a mirror. More specifically, one solar design uses a series of mirrors to redirect sunlight to a central point, which is then used to heat water and run a turbine in a manner equivalent to a conventional power plant rather than trying to convert sunlight to electricity directly.

These plants have a lot of promise and have been deployed worldwide, but they have fallen out of favor due to conventional solar panels presently being cheaper to produce as the cost of solar continues to go down. Thus, I suspect the mirror approach will only be revisited once the raw materials needed to make solar panels (or replace broken ones) dry up.

However, I do not believe any solar technology can meet our energy needs as they simply do not produce enough power for the area they occupy.

Note: One of the underappreciated issues with solar power is that most roof systems create dirty electricity in the house. More electrically sensitive individuals experience severe adverse effects from this, and in a few cases, I've heard of it resulting in them being unable to live under the solar roof. I presently only know of one company that builds systems designed to prevent this issue.

Hydroelectric — A lengthy discussion could be had about the effects of dams on the environment. However, the more important point is that while their energy is relatively green, the options for making more hydroelectric plants are more limited.

One of the more intriguing options people have looked into is instead using the flow of the tides for power (which, due to their always being present, makes it an ideal option for renewable energy). There is some debate over this, as underwater turbines kill marine life, but I am hopeful this can be addressed.

Biomass — A variety of options exist for converting crops to energy. The most common one is deriving ethanol from corn, which I do not support. This is because ethanol damages car engines (excluding ones specially designed for it), lowers gas mileage, and is only used because government subsidies (used to get votes from the Midwest, where much of our corn is grown) incentivize the practice.

Another common approach is directly utilizing waste biomass and (typically) burning it to generate energy.

Many believe that the best case for biofuels can be made if industrial hemp (which is similar, but not the same as marijuana) is used. This is because the plant is easy to grow and produces a large amount of fiber (cellulose) and oil. These can then be utilized to produce paper, textiles (fabric), concrete, plastic, food, and biofuels.

Hemp was initially a very popular raw material (e.g., Henry Ford made a car from hemp that ran on hemp oil). Sadly, numerous industries threatened by hemp's potential economic impact successfully worked together to create a hysteria around marijuana (e.g., Reefer Madness) so hemp would also be taken off the market.

There are a lot of important applications of hemp-based materials. I believe the most critical application of hemp (and why it needs to be widely grown) is the plastics that can be made from it, as the ones we currently derive from oil are immensely damaging to the environment.

At this point however, I am not sure if, without subsidies similar to the ones ethanol receives, an economically viable hemp-based fuel can make it to the market (I have seen conflicting arguments on this).

Geothermal — In certain places where geothermal energy is readily accessible (e.g., Iceland), it is heavily utilized. However, what is less appreciated about geothermal energy is that vast reservoirs exist (the current estimate is that only 6.9% of the available geothermal resources have been utilized).

Due to my interest in hot springs, I've learned that many geothermal pockets were discovered in the United States while drilling for oil and then capped by the industry and forgotten since money could not be made from them. In my exploration, I've also learned that areas of underground geothermal activity can be detected with the correct infrared imaging equipment (as they cause a slight increase of heat at the surface).

Because of this, I've always hoped a team would start investigating where these pockets were, drilling for them, and creating small geothermal centers which utilize those power sources (which could then either be used at an industrial level to run a power plant or to supply the energy needs of small decentralized communities adjacent to the geothermal pocket — both for heating and by using an electrical generator like this one).

Batteries — One of the significant problems with all "green" technologies is the batteries, as they require rare earth elements, have limited storage capacities, and have a limited usage life before they need to be replaced. While these issues may be surmounted in the future with improved technology, I am doubtful they will.

I believe that the solution to this problem is to use a much simpler storage technology — use energy generated to convert water to hydrogen, store the hydrogen and then combust the hydrogen when it is needed for power. While this technology has been viable for a long time (and is continually improving), there has been a general hesitation to use it because more energy is lost in the storage process than is lost during storage and discharge from a battery.

However, I believe that providing a good quality energy source is available (e.g., green nuclear energy), the benefits of not needing rare earth elements or continually replacing batteries outweigh the downsides of hydrogen's reduced efficiency.

Note: Another green option is to store energy by compressing air and then uncompressing it when needed. Like hydrogen, it suffers from decreased efficiency

but simultaneously does not have the production or longevity issues associated with standard batteries.

Cars — Having spent a long time looking at all the options for the most economical fuel-efficient cars, I eventually concluded your best bet was to do nothing and maintain an older gasoline car you already had. Put differently, in give or take every case, the extra costs incurred (e.g., replacing a battery) outweighed the saving from getting the vehicle. That said, there are a few promising options I find people rarely are aware of:

- **Natural gas —** these cars are relatively cheap (e.g., a used Honda GX), and their fueling costs are much lower than gasoline cars (even during the recent gas price spikes).

  The two main issues with compressed natural gas (CNG) cars are that their natural gas tanks have to be replaced every 15-20 years, which is likely to apply when getting a used vehicle and costs a couple of thousand dollars, and that since fueling stations are less common, depending on where you live, you have to deal with the hassle of planning routes around them.

  Conversely, you can get a relatively cheap setup to fuel one at home off of your natural gas line. Overall, I feel CNG cars are the best deal and most practical option for alternative fuel vehicles (and typically receive all the same “green” benefits many states give to electric vehicles).

- **Biodiesel —** provided you have the correct diesel car, in addition to regular diesel fuel, it can run off purified vegetable oil (or biodiesel sold at certain gas stations). People who are really serious about this will go to restaurants, collect their free waste vegetable oil, filter it, and use it to run their cars.

  I think this is too much of a hassle, but there is a survivalist benefit because if the gas stations shut down, you could go to the store and buy vegetable oil directly or grow (and press) vegetable oil to run your vehicle.

A major issue with biodiesel most people do not appreciate is that the most common cars people tend to convert to biodiesel (due to their engines being possible to run on biodiesel and their widespread availability) are the Volkswagen TDIs.

This is a problem because those cars are more prone to mechanical issues, and I know many people who have had bad experiences in this regard.

- **Hydrogen powered vehicles —** presently, there are only three hydrogen-powered vehicles on the commercial market.

  I think this technology has a lot of potential, and I am hopeful for it, but in most areas, a minimal number of fueling stations exist for the car, most of which are in California (and it will likely be years before more are available — in 2022 only 15,000 hydrogen cars were on the road).

Free energy sources — I have looked at many alleged free energy devices over my lifespan. Many were compelling, had a lot of claims attached to them, seemed promising, and I really wanted to believe in some of them. However, I have only ever found three things that I thought harnessed energy from the environment and were not an already known technology (like those detailed previously).

The first, as discussed in the previous article, is liquid crystalline water, which can capture ambient infrared energy from the environment and then create separation of solutes from water, mechanical expansions, fluid flows, or charge separations that can be turned into electricity.

The main limitation of this approach is that the power available is relatively small (so its value is primarily within living organisms rather than for industrial applications). Pollack has, however, been exploring ways to scale it up (e.g., for water filtration), which may have some degree of use in the future.

The second is Orgone accumulators. These devices were created by Wilhelm Reich and designed to concentrate the biological energy of the atmosphere so it could be

used therapeutically for those inside it. I have tried these out and believe they concentrate something inside them which has healing properties.

Since they concentrate energy from the vicinity (Reich was also able to provide data supporting this), this qualifies as “free energy” technology. However, the amount of energy collected inside appears to be far too small for any industrial application, although some believe it can be utilized.

Note: One of the most interesting arguments I’ve found against nuclear power was Reich’s observation that very small amounts of nuclear radiation had significant adverse effects on Orgone energy.

The final one was one of Tesla’s oscillators. Decades ago, I was shown this device by someone who had rebuilt one of Tesla’s patents. The device was a small metal device (I would guess a 5-inch square that was 6 inches tall) that had a piston that could go up and down in the center, which was designed to block different air input holes during its motion so the force vectors would cause it to move up and down in a repeating pattern.

The oscillator was connected to the air input from a lightly pressurized tank (the airflow was pressurized and felt like a strong breeze but light enough to plug easily with your finger). Once the air was turned on, the piston rapidly moved up and down, and the entire oscillator seemed like a jackhammer shaking the heavy table it was bolted to.

It was evident to me that the amount of force it generated was significantly greater than the pressurized air input it received. I could also see how the whole thing was designed (it was just metal that had been precisely cut), and I could see no other inputs. I noticed the exiting air was noticeably cooler than the incoming air, so I assumed the heat in the pressurized was somehow being transformed into mechanical motion.

The individual who showed me this device died shortly afterward, and I still regret not having a way to regain access to it (hopefully, another Tesla researcher could find the

patent they used based on the description here).

Energy Options

Over the years, I've watched a lot of promising energy technologies be pitched to investors and then either go nowhere or take decades longer to bring to market than initially promised (both of which were not good for the investors).

This has led me to appreciate that although monopolies exist in the energy field too, like medicine, complete solutions to the problems we face are not quite as simple as many make them out to be (e.g., those pitching the newest energy technology to investors). While some amazing options exist, no solution is perfect, and it often takes a lot more work than people realize to make the best ones become viable.

Assuming there is not a miraculous energy technology that has been hidden away (which is always possible — but as I tried to show in the last section, despite my best efforts, I have not been able to find it), I believe the best solution to our energy issues are:

- Adopt green nuclear energy.
- Fund research for better versions of the existing green energy technologies rather than mass-producing the imperfect ones currently available.
- Use hydrogen to store the large amount of energy generated by green nuclear power for applications where it needs to be stored (which is much less of a concern with nuclear power since, unlike renewable energy resources, it can provide continuous power generation).
- Produce less oil and consider replacing petroleum-based products we require oil for with hemp-based products.

If these measures were to be adopted, they would address every single concern about our current energy production paradigm. However, they would also:

- Make it much harder to precisely ration energy to control the population.
- Knock the existing energy industries out of business, or at least force them to operate at much smaller margins and not be as lucrative to continue.
- Destroy the green energy industry everyone is investing in and profiting handsomely from.
- Eliminate the upcoming war on Climate Change.

As a result, they will likely never be implemented. Instead, I expect new (and expensive) technologies which are just good enough to support our existing paradigm to continually emerge.

Throughout his career, RFK Jr. has held that the solution to the current polluting energy-producing technologies is to allow a free market to select the most efficient and clean energy-producing technologies.

Most people do not realize that many of our existing energy-producing technologies have massive costs attached to them (such as their liability for damaging the environment or being highly inefficient ways of producing energy). Because of this, they can only remain on the market due to subsidies being provided for them.

It is my hope that if those subsidies were not guided by the ones who provided the most lobbying to maintain their market dominance and instead were used to support new and emergent technologies, most of our energy problems would rapidly solve themselves.

Opposing Arguments

Although I disagree with the climate change narrative, as a committed environmentalist, I've put a lot of thought into questioning that skepticism too. At this point, there are three arguments I've identified that argue against what I've put forward in this series I feel for fairness, I must also disclose.

The first is that the fossil fuel industry funded a significant degree of skepticism against global warming. This means it's very possible some of what I believe on this subject was

originally disinformation I incorrectly evaluated.

However, given that “climate change” has allowed the fossil fuel industry to reap record profits due to the war against carbon dioxide reducing the available energy supply and thus raising its costs, I suspect it is less likely they are putting forward disinformation I am falling prey to here.

The second is that because the entire topic of environmental pollution is so complex and nuanced, for many people giving them something simple (carbon dioxide) to focus on is the most practical way to have them work to address the actual sources of air and water pollution such as burning coal.

My issue with this is that I don’t think it is ever a good idea to make the population do what you think they need to do **by lying to them**, but my philosophy differs from that of virtually every leader.

The third is that due to the immense complexity of the climate system, our actions may be affecting it and causing some of the weather patterns we are seeing.

I can identify many things humans are doing that I am relatively sure are affecting the weather (including certain pollutants being discharged into the atmosphere); I just can’t say the same for carbon dioxide emissions and am unsure if any of the climate mitigation methods we are using have a chance of positively affecting the climate.

Our current way of life is immensely destructive to the environment, and there is a good chance the pollution we are producing and our overconsumption of natural resources will eventually cause devastating environmental collapses. It’s just that since I do not believe carbon dioxide emissions are causing any of the current environmental damage we are seeing, I can’t, in good faith, endorse the current Climate Change narrative.

Conclusion

When I reflect upon the profoundly troubling behavior of many individuals detailed in this series (e.g., the arms dealer), I am reminded of what a spiritual teacher once told

me:

> *“If people’s internal environments are a mess, they will stop caring about their external environment and allow it to become a mess as well.”*

This cuts to the heart of many of the issues described in this article. Similarly, Ivan Illich, a polymath I periodically reference in my articles, had a variety of insights about medicine, society, and education that hold just as true now as they did decades ago.

One of his most accurate predictions was the assertion that as technology (and means necessary to run it) became more complex, the socialists would respond by trying harder and harder to micromanage every detail of society so that we could work in harmony with their vision of the future that was enabled by that technology. Illich did not support this solution because he felt it took away much of what made us human.

He believed that if you replaced our manipulative institutions that tried to direct society in the ways the socialists thought was best with created decentralized systems that trusted each individual's ingenuity and provided the tools to empower them to address the issues at hand, you would have a much less resource-intensive system that produced better results and happier human beings.

As the years go by, I become more and more convinced of the truth of Illich’s words and that they represent the direction we as a species must fight to go in.

Although all the ideas discussed in this article appear separate, I would argue they all represent the same systemic issue that plagues our country and show the natural trend toward monopolization and exploitation of the American people once government gets bought out by corporatocracy.

Recently one of the most important segments I have ever seen on television aired on Fox News, which coincidentally ties together virtually every single theme of this article:

After Tucker was fired on April 24th, RFK Jr. shot up in the polls and is now at 20%, which is quite frankly astounding.

Thursday, April 27

Race/Topic (Click to Sort)	Poll	Results	Spread
2024 Democratic Presidential Nomination	FOX News	Biden 62, Kennedy 19, Williamson 9	Biden +43
2024 Democratic Presidential Nomination	Emerson	Biden 70, Kennedy 21, Williamson 8	Biden +49

Because of this, networks that have censored him for decades are now being forced to cover him and allow our message to be heard. If you have not yet seen heard RFK Jr.'s historic presidential campaign announcement speech, which touches upon many of the themes of this series, it can be viewed here.

A Note From Dr. Mercola About the Author

A Midwestern Doctor (AMD) is a board-certified physician in the Midwest and a longtime reader of Mercola.com. I appreciate his exceptional insight on a wide range of topics and I'm grateful to share them. I also respect his desire to remain anonymous as he is still on the front lines treating patients. To find more of AMD's work, be sure to check out The Forgotten Side of Medicine on Substack.