

CLIMATE TRUTH SNIPPETS

To imagine that taxing the planet's human population would have anything to do with the climate is an exercise in hubristic nonsense, which seems to be the green's greatest talent.

Why is it mostly chemists that seem to understand the behaviour of carbon dioxide whilst even professors of physics appear incapable of grasping the basics of thermodynamics?

http://www.conscious.com.au/_documents/additional%20material/Nature%20controls%20CO2%20levels.pdf

Using the above figures, and thinking in layman's terms, in every 85,800 molecules of air, 33 are CO2. Of those, humans just produce one. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of CO2 in 85,800 molecules of air catastrophically warms the planet is nonsense. That the UN IPCC and Al Gore claim that one (1) molecule of human CO2 causes catastrophic warming while the remaining 32 molecules of Nature's identical CO2 do not is insanity.

Temporarily suspending science by assuming the UN radiative back-warming 'theory' of global warming is valid. Purely for purposes of illustration one can calculate an indicative impact of human production of CO2 on rising temperature. Use relevant **assumptions** widely acknowledged worldwide:

- CO2's theoretical maximum share of the greenhouse gas theory's effect is 3% (water vapour is 95%)
- Total human production of CO2 is 3% of Earth's annual production (UN IPCC figure), and
- Using temperature increase of 0.8 Degrees C since 1860 - close to start of industrialisation and end of Little Ice Age.

Then, human effect on temperature would be: $0.8 \times 0.03 \times 0.03 = 0.0007$ degrees C.

These indicative calculations exaggerate the UN IPCC's theorised impacts of human CO2 because they ignore the supposed logarithmically decreasing impact of raising CO2. The calculations also exaggerate because they ignore proven negative feedback which more than offsets theorised temperature from higher CO2.

Despite overstating the 'theory's' effect, this calculation provides indicative scale of human contribution.

Given the 'theory' has no proof whatsoever and contradicts laws of physics, it is safe to conclude human production of CO2 has no impact on global average temperature?

In God and Nature, we trust. All others bring data.

<http://www.nada.kth.se/~cgjoh/ambblack.pdf>

1.2 Climate Alarmism, Greenhouse Effect and Backradiation

In particular, the objective is to show that the "greenhouse effect" of climate alarmism claimed to arise from "backradiation" of particle streams, is pure fiction without real physical meaning. This removes a main source of energy from climate alarmism.
Prof. Claes Johnson, Sweden

All ye who have data to prove that the above is NOT true, put it on the table and let the world see it. So far, after more than 20 years of "research", not one shred of actual observed empirical data has ever been presented.

Hans Schreuder, retired analytical chemist - www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com