

# The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels

## A Book Review



In his book, *The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels*, Alex Epstein makes a compelling argument for the virtues of using fossil fuels. With the support of globalists, governments, environmentalists and the use of a largely unopposed marketing campaign, the green lobby has controlled the narrative to abandon cheap, reliable energy that has given mankind (and I use that term in the traditional sense to include all of humanity) the means to control his environment, increase reliable food production, provide clean water, enjoy mobility, as well as develop medicines that cure disease and increase life expectancy. Significantly, the availability of fossil fuels has given us “time” to solve civilization’s most pressing problems by relieving us of onerous, manual labor-intensive work.

Epstein addresses each of the arguments for urging a swift transition to “sustainable” energy and counters the limited solutions mandated by ideological and self-seeking interests. Beware of those who use noble objectives to cover nefarious motives, such as the harbingers of environmental disaster who manipulate economic conditions that ultimately force the rest of us to turn to public transportation while they fly on private jets.

Since 1972 the UN, the popular media and “climate experts” have been predicting environmental catastrophes that would shortly devastate the planet. (I’m still waiting.) Whereas many hypothetical computer models predicted the dire consequences of future calamities, the results were obtained by fudging the findings. Anything or anybody who disagreed was aggressively cancelled. And we continue to hear that “the sky is falling.”

Claims of an impending climate change crisis are based on the idea that warming will cause extreme weather, resulting in droughts, wildfires, tornadoes, “hovering” hurricanes and extreme drops or rises in regional temperatures. Some of this appears to have started, but much of it is actually due to natural weather fluctuations, as well as ecological mismanagement. However, do not discount man-made weather modification begun by the U.S. Navy in 1947. For some background information on the topic, go to: [www.GeoEngineeringWatch.org](http://www.GeoEngineeringWatch.org) and view the video, *The Dimming*, or do an internet search on the HAARP program.

Yes, it’s true. CO<sub>2</sub> emissions have increased. Slightly. However, worldwide, plant growth has also increased—including trees, fruits, vegetables and grains. Modern increases in agricultural yields are attributed to increased atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>. And don’t forget that the planet has many powerful self-balancing functions at work. For example, increased CO<sub>2</sub> promotes plant life and plants absorb CO<sub>2</sub>. The belief that manmade impacts on our environment are necessarily bad and that the standard of value is nonimpact has led to the cessation of more creative and effective solutions than sending civilization back to the dark ages.

Cheap, reliable and available energy has enabled advances in civilization to multiply exponentially. The earth’s supply of fossil fuels can adequately supply the world with power for the next 100-200 years. Fossil fuels offer us the ability to insulate ourselves from climate disasters as well. Climate-related deaths have actually plummeted during the same time that climate disasters were reported.

Now to be sure, we have a responsibility to those who will inherit the earth that they will actually **have** an earth to inherit. We have responded to that challenge by focusing much of man’s (there’s that word again) ingenuity on cleaning up the planet and minimizing the negative consequences attributed to the production and use of fossil fuels.

Certainly, it's worthwhile to look for alternative sources of energy. Unfortunately, the two sources of "sustainable" energy being promoted as the final solution, solar and wind power, are inconsistent, unreliable, inadequate, as well as require huge amounts of space and massive storage systems. In addition, they use hardware with a limited lifespan and disposal challenges. While the West is focused on transitioning to green energy and electric cars, it must turn hat-in-hand to China, which holds the lion's share of the natural resources needed to accomplish these energy goals. China is the world's worst polluter and resorts to child labor exploitation to satisfy our green energy ambitions. Even if those green ambitions could be achieved, is it worth the price?

Fortunately, when these two sources of energy fail to meet the world's needs, the two best alternatives to fossil fuels—hydrotechnology and the peaceful use of nuclear energy— will likely become viable options. According to Epstein, "Our concern for the future should be running out of the **freedom** to create energy resources."

Unfortunately, the fossil fuel industry has fallen in line with the green energy narrative and rather than promoting the vastly improved quality of life that fossil fuels have made possible, they have largely conceded to the intimidation tactics of the government, globalists, environmentalists and other entities that control our world.

Epstein has written a book that documents (through the use of extensive footnotes) the enormous but often unrealized benefits that access to affordable, reliable fossil fuels has given us and the immorality of pressuring underdeveloped countries to accept the green agenda, which has resulted in food insecurity in the world's poorest countries.

There is, of course, much more to the story. I urge you to read [The Moral Case for Fossil Fuels](#). It may open your eyes to things unimagined.

