Hand-out by Hans Schreuder, Harbertonford, 7 November 2011

I'd like to explain all the reasons why climate alarm is a complete fabrication, but time does not allow this although I'm always available for discussion and debate.

Allow me to quote from three highly qualified scientists and also suggest that you visit my website for more in-depth information: www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com

Professor Nasif Nahle:

"The real definition of the term "greenhouse effect" is as follows:

"The atmosphere radiating three times more intensely than the Sun warms up the Earth. The Sun is merely a beautiful dimly candle in the space illuminating our planet, but without causing any warming on it."

"My Rabbi was quite correct once as he told me: "People love to be deceived. Many patients will trust more in a doctor who diagnosed the worst disease than in a doctor who diagnosed a not so shocking problem, even if the worst was a wrong diagnosis. Such patients will think always clinical analysis are wrong, not their doctors, just because the latter told them what they wanted to hear." Perhaps this is the reason by which AGW doomsday prognosticators have been successful."

Joe Postma, MSc Astrophysics:

The first time energy is used is THE MOST work you will get out of it. In the case we're interested with, that WORK is the associated rise in temperature. After that, any reemission/reflection of that energy does not have a quality of available work such as to do MORE work than was originally done.

Otherwise you would have above-unity efficiency, i.e. perpetual motion. It is so very basic. If the glass or atmosphere reflects/reemits energy, it does not have the quality of work available to do more work on its source.

Dr. Klaus Kaiser:

As recently as 10,000 years ago, much of the world's northern hemisphere was covered with a solid sheet of ice, anywhere from 2,000 to 4,000 m thick. Most of it has disappeared – melted away since. How much energy was required to melt that mega-ice cube? (Don't be put off by the calculations, that's why I have indented them.)

Volume of the Ice

Let's assume the ice to have been, on average, "only" 2,000 m thick, and having covered evenly the area north of latitude 45 N. With the earth's radius of 6,500 km, that equates to an area of 2 x 3.14×6500^2 x (1-0.7) = 6 x 42×10^6 x 0.3 = 80 x 10^6 (km^2). At a thickness of 2 km, the volume of ice was 160 x 10^6 (km^3), or 160 x 10^{15} m^3, with a mass of 160 x 10^{18} kg.

Energy required to melt the Ice

To melt one kg of ice (at 0 °C), an energy input of 80 kcal is required. For the entire block of hemispheric ice to melt, the energy required calculates then to 160 x 10^{18} x 80 = 13000 x 10^{18} kcal.

Oil equivalent

Upon combustion, one mol (0.140 kg) of decane ($C_{10}H_{22}$) – a proxy for gasoline – releases 6800 kJ, or 6800/4.2 = 1600 kcal. One kg of decane releases then 1600/0.14 = 11500 kcal. Hence, to melt the entire block of ice, the heat of combustion of $13,000 \times 10^{18} / 11,500 = 1.1 \times 10^{18}$ kg (or, roughly the same number of liters) of decane would be required. If we assume the average makeup of crude oil to be the equivalent of decane, and 140 liters per barrel, then the amount of oil comes to 1.1×10^{18} kg $/ 140 = 7 \times 10^{15}$, or 7,000,000,000,000,000 barrels of oil.

Comparison with our Oil Consumption

The world uses somewhere around $85 \times 10,000,000$ barrels of oil a day. If we assume the same rate of consumption for the last 100 years, the total consumed amount comes to $100 \times 365 \times 85 \times 10^6 = 3 \times 10^{12}$ barrels of oil. That amount is a measly 1/2,000 of the energy provided by nature to melt the continental ice sheets.

Expressed in a different way, nature has thus provided the (extra) heat equivalent of burning some 2,000,000,000 barrels of oil per day over a period of 10,000 years to melt that block of ice.

Climate Change Implications

The disappearance of this massive block of ice over a relatively short period of time was the result of a large-scale climate change (warming) from natural causes.

It could not possibly have been due to mankind's influence; the world's population then numbered only in thousands.

Furthermore, it could not have been due to a large natural release of carbon dioxide as the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere barely changed during that melting period; it was a constant 250-300 ppm.

If nature can provide such a massive energy flux "without cause," one has to ask "has it stopped now, or is it still continuing?"

The Future

If Mother Nature keeps adding a similar amount of energy, any and all of mankind's attempts to arrest or control "climate change" (i.e. global warming) will be in vain.

On the other hand, if nature were to decide that it wants to stop adding that energy, or possibly even withdraw some of that energy, we could be in for new ice age arriving very soon.

In fact, the declining number of sunspots supports the projections of a global cooling period over the next decades; even NASA says so.

http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/41106