



A Conservative View

Position Paper VII: How about Climate Change?

Brad Fregger

It is my position that all of these global threats of pandemics, nuclear war, over-population, and human-caused catastrophic global warming, have one main goal. That is to scare the bejeebers out of the billions of ignorant and uninformed people in the world, so that they will willingly accept a world government to keep them safe and secure.

This is a reminder of what happened in Austria just prior to World War II. They were in a deep depression and couldn't find their way out. The media told them that their next door neighbor, Germany, was experiencing excellent socioeconomic health since Hitler came to power. The Austrian people wanting "what Germany had," voted 98 percent to be annexed to Germany with Hitler as their ruler. Within 5 years, they were captives of a full-blown dictatorship.

So what I'm saying is that human-caused catastrophic global warming, the over-population fear, and the Covid-19 pandemic are global frauds designed to bring about demand for and/or compliance with a global government. This government will be in complete control of every human activity, the end of freedom and liberty, the end of personal rights and responsibilities, the end of everything we hold dear.

"Those who would give up essential Liberty, to purchase a little temporary safety, deserve neither liberty nor safety." Benjamin Franklin

Then there's the proverb, "Be careful what you wish for, you just may get it."

I've discussed the Covid issue in a couple of previous position papers, so this time I will focus on the fraud of "climate change."

First, the statement that 97 to 98 percent of scientists believe in climate change is not accurate. The figure is actually closer to 99.9 percent. Climate change is a fact of life on this planet and has been ever since Earth had an atmosphere. The real question is, how much has human activity increased the potential for catastrophic climate change?

The media even misrepresent this statement: 97-98 percent of scientists believe in anthropogenic (human-caused) climate change. Again, it is obvious that human activity will have an impact on the climate. So, if you ask scientists if they believe human activity is having an impact on the climate, you will get the 97-98 percent figure. But, the real question is: to what degree is human activity impacting the climate? There is no consensus here, the estimates are all over the map.

How did this controversy begin?

There was a major cooling period, called the “Little Ice Age” that lasted from the early 14th century through the mid-19th century. As we came out of the “Little Ice Age,” (1850-1860) the planet began to warm. Coincidentally, around 1880 we began to use coal extensively as an energy source and, with the internal combustion engine (early 1900s), petroleum began to be used extensively.

It didn’t take long for some 19th and early 20th century scientists to notice that as we used more and more coal and petroleum, the planet was getting warmer and warmer. Putting all this together, these scientists offered up the initial hypothesis that the warming of the planet was due to the massive use of these fossil fuels.

This was a reasonable hypothesis. But, just because the two existed at the same time, does not prove a causal relationship. In fact, even if a causal relationship is proven, we need to determine what the driving force is. In other words, the warming of the planet could be driving the increase in CO₂.

In the 1970s and 1980s we flirted with an upcoming ice age and an overpopulation disaster. For a short time, the fear of human-caused catastrophic global warming took a back seat to these other issues.

Then in the later years of the 20th century, Michael Mann developed the “hockey stick” hypothesis, which essentially said, that global warming was happening at an exponential rate, due to human activity, and that we were only a few short years from disaster.

To describe the “exponential rate” I have a quick analogy: You have a single cell of algae in your pond that divides in half once a day and fills your pond to half full on the 29th day. When will the pond be completely full? The answer is, of course, on the 30th day. This is what makes exponential growth rates so scary, so dangerous.

Well, other scientists, scientific organizations, and governments around the world accepted the hypothesis at face value and began to massively fund research that would tell us the actual effects on numerous ecological systems. In addition scientific organizations and companies were trying to minimize this awful potential.

For example, the US spends over 13 billion a year on the wide variety of climate change activities, which include research, development, and production in order to combat and/or minimize the impact of global warming.

The end result is literally millions of people dependent on the “reality” of the catastrophic global warming hypothesis, with thousands of scientists and scientific organizations depending on the hypothesis for funding and to protect reputations and careers.

However, the hypothesis has yet to meet the scientific criterion needed to prove its accuracy. In fact, all of the global warming predictions to date have failed to materialize.

The scientific method states clearly, that if the hypothesis cannot predict the future, the hypothesis fails and needs to be tossed or adjusted and retested.

In this instance, instead of the hockey stick's predictions of an exponential rate of global warming, there has been, essentially, a pause for the past couple of decades. What warming has happened, is meaningless as there are many potential explanations for some minor warming. Regardless, the hockey stick hypothesis is dead in the water.

Truth is, the additional CO₂ in the atmosphere, mostly caused by natural events, has been a boon to the plant kingdom. In fact, NASA has shown the immense greening of the planet, as plant life are finally getting more of the CO₂ needed to be healthy and resistant to disease. This means more forests and bigger crops, not to mention more oxygen, critical for the animal kingdom.

This is a natural process, during cooling phases plant life becomes starved for CO₂; then as the planet warms and CO₂ is released naturally back into the atmosphere, plants again begin to thrive. Our addition, through the burning of fossil fuels, is minimal but still helpful. Right now CO₂ makes up about 400 PPM in the atmosphere; we could easily double (probably triple) that without causing anywhere near catastrophic global warming.

Scientists that are not dependent on the hockey-stick hypothesis are well aware of this fact. But, they are up against formidable forces that make sure the opposing view gains no traction.

There are governments needing the excuse to raise taxes, the media needing catastrophic issues to boost ratings, the many scientists and scientific organizations needing the funding and their careers and reputations protected, plus the thousands of powerful and influential globalists who need the fear issue to achieve their objective.

The opposing scientists stand alone, risking funding and their reputations, but determined to discover the truth about what truly causes climate change.

It appears more and more that global warming isn't causing the increase of CO₂ in the atmosphere; in fact, it's looking like the warming of the planet is, essentially, causing the increase of CO₂.

So, what does anything I've said here have to do with the Fairfield City Council? Everything, from the rules, regulations, and laws that progressive-minded council members, who have been totally taken in by climate change propaganda, are prone to foster on our community, to the tax dollars that are supporting this global fraud.

As I've stated before, it is critical that we have a conservative voice on the council.

Thank you.