



Technocracy: Critics Slam UN “Climate” Scientists’ Bid for Dictatorial Power

DUBAI — Top leaders at the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) are seeking the power to prescribe “climate” policy at the international level and then potentially even oversee its implementation and enforcement. Critics, however, warned that the demands were not just unscientific, but would undermine self-governance while ushering in an “insane” totalitarian technocratic form of government.

Speaking to the U.K. [Guardian](#), one of the largest newspapers in the British Isles and perhaps the most alarmist on “climate” issues, almost half a dozen IPCC officials suggested that these UN “scientists” needed vast new powers. The supposed goal: Save humanity from itself and carbon dioxide (CO₂), known to scientists as the “gas of life” despite being demonized as “pollution” by man-made global-warming theorists.

“At some point we need to say that if you want to achieve this aim set by policymakers then certain policies need to be implemented,” explained UN IPCC Vice Chairman Sonia Seneviratne, who has served as coordinating lead author of the UN “climate science” body for over a decade. “As climate change becomes worse and worse, it is becoming more difficult to be policy relevant without being prescriptive.”

Leading scientists in the field, however, ridiculed the calls. Princeton University Physics Professor Emeritus Will Happer, who served as climate advisor to President Donald Trump and is a vocal critic of the UN’s alarmism, paraphrased well-known conservative pundit William F. Buckley, telling *The New American* he would “rather have climate policy set by the first 1,000 people in the telephone directory than by IPCC ‘scientists.’”

Top astrophysicist Dr. Willie Soon with the independent [Center for Environmental Research and Earth Sciences](#) (CERES) was similarly dismissive of the proposed IPCC power grab. Soon, who recently worked with dozens of scientists to publish [three scientific papers in peer-reviewed literature](#) showing that observed warming could be explained by changes in solar activity and the “urban heat-island effect,” was appalled.

“This is a rather appalling, [though] not unexpected, development for all the ‘humble’ scientists at [the] UN IPCC to now call for IPCC to violate its own founding 35-year principle for their reports to never be policy prescriptive but merely policy relevant,” he told *The New American*.



Wikimedia Commons



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2023

“The bad weather and extreme climate were all imagined in those scientists’ computer climate model toys,” continued Dr. Soon, who retired last year from the Harvard-Smithsonian Center for Astrophysics. “It is sad and dangerous for those non-elected scientists to go this far to stretch their daily dramas to the epic levels that they can literally now be permitted to stop anyone from enjoying a fine filet mignon or cooking their food with gas. This is what the ‘power’ to prescribe policy that they have demanded means.”

For her part, Seneviratne of the IPCC expressed “shock” about what *The Guardian* referred to as the “discrepancy” between the supposedly “scientific” findings of the scandal-plagued (and frequently wrong) UN climate body and the policies being pursued by governments around the world. “It’s very difficult for us to understand as scientists because it doesn’t seem to make any sense,” she was quoted as saying.

The policies that Seneviratne and other IPCC leaders said the UN climate body should be allowed to dictate are enormously significant. They would alter the lives of everyone on the planet. For example, one she mentioned was phasing down or even eliminating humanity’s use of “fossil fuels” (hydrocarbon energy such as oil, gas, and coal). Those sources currently provide well over 80 percent of all the energy people use around the world.

In short, the UN climate body would become the global master of all energy use, with deadly implications, critics observed.

Asked about “fossil fuel” elimination in 2019, Greenpeace co-founder and former Greenpeace Canada President Dr. Patrick Moore, an environmental scientist, said eliminating hydrocarbon energy would be a “recipe for mass suicide.” “It’s amazing that somebody in government would propose that we eliminate all fossil fuels in 12 years,” he told *The New American*, saying that if done globally it would result in the “decimation of the human population” and the cutting down of virtually every tree.

Greenpeace co-founder, Dr. Patrick Moore, on Net Zero/the Green New Deal: "It's a recipe for mass suicide".

"Why would anyone vote for something that was going to result in the death of nearly all humans on Earth?"

"It would basically begin a process of cannibalisation amongst... pic.twitter.com/OzHvVli2lG
— Wide Awake Media (@wideawake_media) [December 1, 2023](#)

Speaking of the IPCC being allowed to dictate and even enforce policy under the guise of stopping climate change, Patrick Wood, author of several books on technocracy and the leading critical expert on the movement, warned of disastrous consequences. If such a scheme were to move ahead, it would mean the end of freedom and the emergence of a new form of government dreamed up almost a century ago and pushed by David Rockefeller’s Trilateral Commission.

“That a single group of deluded technocrat scientists should declare themselves to be the sole enforcers of their own ‘science’ is patently insane,” he told *The New American*. “If they are not summarily stopped, it will give them the dictatorial power to implement every facet of Agenda 21, the UN 2030 Agenda, Global Biodiversity Assessment, and more — in other words, total scientific dictatorship.”



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2023

Wood noted that when the idea of “technocracy” — rule by scientists and experts — was originally hatched by scientists at Columbia University in 1932, they had a vision similar to that hinted at by the IPCC. “They basically called on FDR to declare himself dictator, to summarily dismiss Congress and to appoint scientists to run all of society,” explained Wood.

Pointing to the infamous Club of Rome’s 1991 book *The First Global Revolution*, Wood also noted that these would-be tyrannical technocrats openly discussed “searching for a common enemy,” as they put it. That led to the idea of “the threat of global warming,” ultimately allowing them to claim the “real enemy” was “humanity itself.” “In other words, it was a scam made up as a pretext for implementing Technocracy,” Wood said.

Commenting on the IPCC scientists’ calls for more power, Climate Depot editor Marc Morano, one of the world’s leading “climate skeptics,” suggested there was a link between their latest pronouncements and governments’ Covid power grabs of recent years. “The UN scientists were jealous when they saw how public health officials could implement authoritarian policies during COVID and now they want Fauci-like powers!” he argued, describing the advocates as “scientist dictators.”

As if to confirm that, another IPCC coordinating lead author, Gert-Jan Nabuurs, blasted the fact that governments and people — often through democratic mechanisms such as voting — were able to withstand the UN body’s demands. “The IPCC’s critical, independent and guiding roles seem to be less and less evident,” he said. “As they decline, countries seem to be exerting a larger and larger influence.”

If “countries” should not be exerting influence, the alternative would be the increasingly aggressive UN or its legions of IPCC scientists acting in defiance of nations and their governments. For Nabuurs and other IPCC “experts,” the problem is that “we can’t be policy prescriptive.” In other words, they cannot make demands and “hard statements” about what should be done.

Nabuurs lamented that, despite the UN continuing to produce “assessment reports” warning of imminent doom, governments are not doing what he believes is required. “We already know that in five to six years’ time the message is not going to be very different, the problem will still be there, emissions will still be going up, there will be more evidence of impacts and less time to try to stay under 2 degrees Celsius [of warming],” he complained.

And yet, in reality, the IPCC has consistently been wrong. Noting failures ranging from [debunked predictions about Antarctic ice](#) and snow fall to [outlandish “climate” models predicting massive warming and sea-level rise](#) that never happened, numerous scientists have told this magazine that the UN body cannot be trusted.

In a [2018 interview with *The New American*](#), former UN IPCC sea-level scientist Dr. Nils-Axel Morner, chairman of the geophysics and geodynamics department at Stockholm University, suggested the IPCC was deliberately lying. “There is no big sea-level rise going on, and there will not be,” said the late scientist, widely considered one of the top experts in his field before he passed away. “On the contrary, if anything happens, it will go down a little bit.”

When Dr. Morner tried to force the IPCC to remove its demonstrably fraudulent claims from its “assessment report,” the IPCC refused, so he resigned, he explained.

As has become typical, the IPCC did not respond to multiple requests for comment or interviews from *The New American* — requests made both in person and by email. However, a statement provided to *The Guardian* said: “It is important to note that the IPCC assessments are policy relevant but not policy



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2023

prescriptive: they may present projections of future climate change based on different scenarios and the risks that climate change poses and discuss the implications of response options, but they do not tell policymakers what actions to take.”

But as the UN and its members are becoming more and more extreme in their demands, a global rebellion of sorts is brewing. In the United States, [recent polls show](#) the vast majority of Americans do not even believe the man-made global-warming theory underpinning it all. During the COP28 summit, Tucker Carlson — the most significant voice in U.S. media today by far, with shows on X viewed by tens of millions — [slammed Biden “Climate Czar” John Kerry](#) and the whole climate agenda.

As the 80,000 or so attendees at the “climate” summit were buzzing around Dubai working on “solving” the alleged crisis, U.S. Senator Mike Lee (R-Utah) introduced a bill to get the United States out of the UN entirely. Calling it the “DEFUND” (“[Disengaging Entirely From the United Nations Debacle](#)”) Act, Sen. Lee said the global organization is an “enemy of Judeo-Christian beliefs,” a “usurper of sovereignty,” and a “voice for Marxism” costing U.S. taxpayers almost \$20 billion per year for its “anti-American agenda.”

“No more blank checks for the United Nations. Americans’ hard-earned dollars have been funneled into initiatives that fly in the face of our values — enabling tyrants, betraying allies, and spreading bigotry,” Lee said in a news release. “With the DEFUND Act, we’re stepping away from this debacle. If we engage with the UN in the future, it will be on our terms, with the full backing of the Senate and an ironclad escape clause.”

With pushback growing, the UN and leaders of the climate movement are also sounding more autocratic, claiming that nothing can stop them now. UN banners on giant screens around the conference boldly proclaimed victory. “The transformation is unstoppable,” they blared, even as political leaders from Holland and Argentina to the United States threaten to upend the whole agenda. Trump has repeatedly referred to the man-made warming hypothesis as a Chinese Communist Party “hoax.”

Separately, when Kerry was asked at COP28 about the prospect of Trump coming back to power and derailing the “progress” made on “climate,” he responded arrogantly. “They’re not going to stop this,” he told the world after making faces. “This economic transformation is going to be the biggest transformation in human history — it’s bigger by far than the industrial revolution — and it is *going* to happen.”

The New American asked seven U.S. senators at the UN summit about the prospect of Trump’s return to power and the fact that most Americans reject the man-made global-warming theory, with just over a third being willing to pay even one single additional dollar on their electric bills to “fight climate change.” Senator Chris Coons (R-Del.) sounded just as confident as Kerry that nothing could stop the agenda.

Boasting that the “Inflation Reduction Act,” described as the largest “climate” bill in world history, had already hooked conservative states with tens of billions of tax dollars, he painted it all as unstoppable. “Am I suggesting that were the former president to be our next president that everything would be fine? Not at all,” he said. “But I am saying that there is broad enough and deep enough support for continuing investments to combat climate change and for the Inflation Reduction Act and bipartisan infrastructure law; in particular that we will continue — we’ll continue to move forward regardless.”

As UN IPCC leaders and other technocrats seek more and more power at the expense of national



Written by [Alex Newman](#) on December 11, 2023

sovereignty, democratic norms, individual rights, and self-government, opposition is growing in tandem. Americans and people around the world are clearly rejecting the agenda as costs and reality begin to hit home, with few Americans willing to fork over even a dollar a month for the cause. The prospect of voluntary submission to an all-powerful pseudo-scientific climate dictatorship under the IPCC is zero. But the battle is just getting started.




Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe