


TWO SHORT VIDEOS PERFECTLY SUM UP THE CLIMATE CHANGE SCAM

<https://www.2thepointnews.com/two-short-videos-perfectly-sum-up-the-climate-change-scam/>



Frost Fair on the Thames in 1608

While it's obvious that humankind can destroy its local environments (and has been doing that for millennia), it is equally obvious that the Earth's climate trends are unaffected by humankind's limited industrial abilities.

I just caught up with two videos from May that show just how ridiculous the climate scam is...and how it's being used to enrich our most powerful geopolitical opponent to our great detriment.

First however, a few points about climate from a history major's perspective:

The Bronze Age collapse, which saw all the thriving civilizations around the Mediterranean vanish at the beginning of the 12th century B.C., was almost certainly driven by a mega-drought and a series of earthquakes. In other words, no human agency.

The Black Death occurred after a long warming period that had seen Europe's population grow dramatically, with trade routes spread ever farther north in what's now northern China. As the Little Ice Age set in, so did famine, weakening Europe's population. When the cold caused trade routes to shift into regions with plague endemic among local rodents, that plague *killed one third to one half of Europe's* weakened population in less than ten years (1346-1353). Again, no human agency behind that climate change.

After 400 years, the Little Ice Age began to wane at the end of the 18th century, which is how women could transition from bulky, layered fashions to the diaphanous clothes of the late 18th and early 19th centuries. And again, the same point about human agency.

Between 1309 and 1814, the Thames froze at least 23 times and on five occasions the ice was strong enough to hold a fair on the river. The ice was several feet thick and could support shops, pubs, fairground rides, thousands of people—and even elephants could walk across it.

The suffering that Washington's troops experienced during the winter of 1776 at Valley Forge and when they crossed a Delaware River filled with ice floes to attack the Hessian soldiers at Trenton were both consistent with the last decades of the Little Ice Age.

In 1816, interrupting the warming period, there was a year without summer and mass starvation because of a single volcanic eruption: Mount Tambora in the Dutch East Indies (now Indonesia), caused a worldwide temperature drop of 0.7–1 degrees Fahrenheit. The plume was so huge and filthy that it literally blocked the sun.

We are inconsequential — the climate changes due to its own rhythm. In the scheme of things, humans account for only a small percentage of CO₂ in the atmosphere.

What climatistas don't acknowledge is that a slightly warmer world is human-friendly because it releases into the atmosphere water that's usually trapped in ice. Water, not alcohol, is the true *aqua vitae*. No water, no life. When there's drought or cold, people die.

For the climatistas, logic clouds reason and even the survival instinct. Their vision of paradise is a world unsullied by humans. I was reminded of this when I saw the following: If Humans Went Extinct, What Would The Earth Look Like One Year Later?

The article that answers that question is written for kids. It explains that humans are noisy, they leach blue from the sky, and they create pollution. Yes, your house would decay, but new plants would bloom, insects would multiply, wildlife would return to America's streets, and "the rhythm of the natural world would return."

The article acknowledges that civilization requires effort but seems to yearn for humans to vanish, which "would reveal something about the way we treated the Earth." Nirvana, right?

But of course, a humanity-free Earth wouldn't reveal anything at all *because the Earth has meaning only because humans provide that meaning*. It is our higher consciousness that sees both beauty and ugliness. Without that, it's just a matter of animals, red in tooth and claw, mindlessly and instinctively struggling against one another to survive.

Understanding history, along with the Left's anti-human yearnings, its desire to concentrate power in government, bring America to its knees, and pass America's wealth to un-American nations, the ones without liberty, helps explain the incoherence of climate change theology. There's no way the *Nomenklatura* can admit to real climate science or their actual goals.

That's how you end up with the following video, in which Sen. John Kennedy asked David Turk, the deputy secretary for the U.S. Department of Energy, to explain exactly how much America could lower the Earth's temperature if it spent \$50 trillion to become carbon-neutral by 2050:



There you see the true face of a climate bureaucrat: a robot whose programming breaks when asked to go beyond its indoctrinated universe and engage with reality.

Given that the purported climate goal is ridiculous, and the left knows it, why the huge push for “clean energy” and those “renewables”? Economics Professor Diana Furchtgott-Roth at George Washington University testified that eliminating fossil fuels would do nothing to alter the Earth's temperature in a meaningful way...but it will enrich China at our expense:

A warming Earth is a human-friendly Earth, nothing we do will change the climate, and everything the Climatista Left is doing will impoverish and weaken us.

Andrea Widburg is deputy editor of American Thinker

Copyright ©2024 **2 The Point News** unless otherwise noted.