

CLIMATE CHANGE 'GROUP THINK' IS THE REAL THREAT

The following letter was published in the Trail Times and is also found at:

<https://www.trailtimes.ca/opinion/letter-climate-change-group-think-is-the-real-threat/>

The comments pertaining to my letter (now removed as of Jan 8) failed to attack the message, preferring to attack the messenger. However, there is a glimmer of hope that truth will eventually prevail. One comment by Trevor Bertram referred to a 2013 paper that presents sound arguments for rejecting the greenhouse gas effect.

<https://principia-scientific.org/greenhouse-theory-computer-fail-real-evidence-slays-carbon-science/>

Dr. Tim Ball's book covers this topic in some detail – “Slaying the Sky Dragon – Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory”.

Nevertheless, 5 years later the greenhouse effect is still the Holy Grail of Western cultures with a whole generation of indoctrinated children supporting the myth. For this reason, I have not tried to explain why the greenhouse effect is a myth but rather have used other approaches to debunk the alarmist, climate-change narrative.

Adherents of the anthropogenic, global-warming orthodoxy are usually quite fanatical in their religious-like beliefs. Any facts undermining the orthodoxy are deemed heresy and must be suppressed/condemned.

The rioters in France are protesting rising fuel taxes, apparently unaware that they are also victims of a scientific fraud. How will the fanatics react when they realize that they have been duped/betrayed by the “Versailles Elite” (politicians, media, academia)? Will they then “storm the Bastille” and overthrow the government?

Thorpe

<http://watsongallery.ca/ClimateReality/CR/ClimateReality.htm>

LETTER TO THE EDITOR

Trail Times – Friday, January 4, 2019

CLIMATE CHANGE 'GROUP THINK' IS THE REAL THREAT

This letter is in response to Joslyn Sharp's defense of the CO₂-induced, climate-change narrative ("Majority of scientists see climate change threat" Trail Times, Dec. 19).

Sharp's defense relies primarily on the now debunked "97% consensus" and neglects to address the evidence that undermines the alarmist message.

It must be emphasized that 'consensus' is not part of the scientific method. Some of the greatest scientific accomplishments have been achieved by individuals refusing to accept the consensus. Remember the Italian who challenged the flat-Earth consensus.

Lacking any scientific basis for their fearmongering, the alarmists wrongly cite naturally occurring weather events as anecdotal evidence in support of human-induced climate change. In addition, they falsely claim 'consensus' while ignoring the hundreds, if not thousands, of scientists who meet annually to explore the real factors that control climate.

Climate is always changing and has exhibited at least four major climate cycles. For example, Canada has been covered with a mile-thick ice sheet more than 23 times during the current Holarctic-Antarctic Ice Age.

Another shorter-term cycle is revealed by the six warm periods since the Wisconsin Glaciation 10,000 years ago. Civilizations have prospered during the warm periods but have experienced economic hardship during the intervening cool periods.

Consistent with historical solar/climate trends, we may be witnessing the start of a solar minimum; hence, the onset of the next intervening cool period. The Maunder Solar Minimum (1645-1715) marked the coolest period of the Little Ice Age.

Why is Russia increasing its Arctic fleet of icebreakers? Is the real estate market overwhelmed with ocean-front properties because of alleged,

accelerating sea level increases? Are harbour masters having to deal with unusual sea level increases?

The correct answers to the foregoing questions provide ample reason to reject the alarmist message. Antarctica's ice, which constitutes 90 per cent of the world's ice, is growing while the Arctic ice is still within natural variability.

Furthermore, the alarmists' own numbers discredit their message. They claim that a doubling of the CO₂ level will increase the planet's temperature by 1.5 to 3.0 degrees Celsius.

However, they fail to disclose that the carbon in the planet's reserves of hydrocarbon fuels (coal, oil, and natural gas) represents only a small fraction of the carbon in the CO₂ used to form carbonate rocks. Therefore, it is impossible to generate "too much" CO₂.

In fact, it is only possible to increase the CO₂ level by 25 per cent. Instead of 3 degrees, an insignificant, temperature increase of 0.75 degrees over a 1,000-year period would be expected if the alarmist, CO₂/temperature relationship were valid.

Clearly, we are victims of the herd mentality ("group think"). Let us hope that the energy Scrooges don't deny us our lump of coal to cope with the next Little Ice Age. Otherwise, collapsing economies and mass migrations will once again define this imminent, naturally-occurring, climate cycle.

Thorpe Watson, PhD

Warfield