



Climate fanatics say there's no room for personal choice if global warming is to be stopped: Everyone will need to decrease their standard of living by 75% – using force if necessary

Description

In the near future, everyone on earth – except the “elite,” of course – will have to drastically reduce their standard of living in order to save the planet from the devastating effects of warm weather, according to the *BBC*.

In its “Future World” series, the *BBC* is telling viewers that it is no longer an option to live an “ultra-low carbon lifestyle” – it is a *requirement* if the planet is to be saved from man-made so-called climate change.

Right now, the “carbon footprint” of someone living in the developed world ranges anywhere from 4.46 metric tons per year in France, all the way up to 15.43 metric tons per year in Canada.

In the United States, the average person’s carbon footprint clocks in at 14.67 metric tons per year, which is nearly eight times higher than the two metric tons per year limit being proposed by the “green” cult.

(Related: TikTok is complicit in the ruse – children who use it must *never* be allowed to hear the truth.)

***BBC* conveniently left out China, which produces more pollution than any country in the world by a longshot**

According to the *BBC*, two metric tons per year of carbon “waste” is about half the output of a single gas-powered car in the U.S. – and nothing more. In order to keep one’s life beneath that limit, cars would have to go, as would energy usage, meat eating, and so much more.

The average person's lifestyle would have to change dramatically in order to comply with an ultra-low carbon green lifestyle, which for most people would mean abject poverty and misery, not to mention a prison-like life where there is very little travel allowed, and minimal, if any, freedoms.

Others in the green cult believe that even two metric tons of carbon footprint per person per year is too much, suggesting just 1.4 metric tons instead by the year 2040, and just 0.7 metric tons per year per person by the year 2050.

For some reason, the *BBC* ignored communist China in its reporting on the worst carbon-emitting countries. China, by far, generates the most pollution and carbon "waste," if you want to call it that, trailed by the U.S. and Canada way further down the totem pole.

Communist China almost always gets a free pass in the media when it comes to things like energy usage, pollution, and other green-related issues. Perhaps this is because the country is a massive slave camp for multi-national corporations to pay rock-bottom wages to workers who manufacture often cheap-quality products that are then sold at a massive markup in the West?

Another thing to keep in mind about Canada specifically is that it is a cold-weather country located in the far north. It thus only makes sense that the average Canadian household generates a lot of carbon, seeing as how they probably do not want to freeze to death without heat.

Ironically, the claim that the world needs to voluntarily plunge into poverty to "save lives" from global warming is a misnomer in that more people die every year from being too *cold* than they do from being too warm.

If the climate fight is really about saving lives, then we should be releasing *more* carbon to help keep people from freezing. Since this is never part of the climate conversation, we have to ask: what *really* is the motivation behind the anti-carbon climate push?

"We live in a world where many people believe many different things, but nowhere else do we find the kind of mandatory buy-in required as with the so-called climate crisis," reports Mark E. Jeftovic.

"Fortunately we're hearing from an increasing number of scientists that there is no crisis, and whose voices are getting louder even in the face of corporate media "fact checking" and other headwinds of narrative control."

by: Ethan Huff

Category

1. Crime-Justice-Terrorism-Corruption
2. ECO-Climate-Environment
3. Main

Date Created

05/14/2023