

Final Analysis: Climate Change – Man-made or not?

By Hans Schreuder*, 13 August 2012

After studying and analysing climate related issues over the past seven years, here is my final analysis, based on the best scientific practice of test, test and then test again - in real life that is, with empirical data, not via elaborate computer code run through models of our earth's situation.

1. Our earth revolves around a star, our Sun, which nullifies the premise that what goes for a star goes for our earth - there is a fundamental difference between a self-illuminating body and one being illuminated. Our earth is made up of two [fundamentally opposite hemispheres](#) that can not be averaged to produce a sphere that is bathed in a luke-warm sun, as per the [unrealistic K&T](#) energy budget on which so much hype is based. [1, 2] For those wanting a formula for that: 12h Day + 12h Night \neq 24h Twilight.
2. Carbon dioxide is not a warming gas at all, it is a cooling gas but when you trap such a gas in a container, the container will warm up and do the trapping of the heat, radiated at it off the so-called greenhouse gas, which is desperate to get rid of the heat that has been forced upon it from outside the bottle. If the gas did trap the heat, how can the bottle get warm? Open the bottle and the gas will cool down almost instantly whilst the container will take its time to reach ambient temperature.

In our open-to-space atmosphere, the excellent radiating properties of all so-called greenhouse gases serve to cool the atmosphere, never to warm it. Any and all gases in our atmosphere cool the planet, either by absorbing solar radiation on its way to the surface or by taking energy away from the surface but at no stage can any gas add energy. In reality, it is the oxygen and nitrogen that act as "greenhouse gases" – they retain heat much longer than the gases now labeled such.

A dry desert is always much hotter than a humid zone at the same latitude during the hours of sunshine. Delaying the cooling does not equal warming, as is the case with water vapour. No heat is ever added other than that which was added to the (earth + atmosphere) system via geo-thermal and solar energy. Carbon dioxide does not even delay any cooling, [it accelerates it!](#) [3] Sending its own energy back to its source can never make the source produce yet more energy, if it could, engineers would by now have designed machines that produced more energy than the input allowed for. Does a thermos delay the cooling? Yes. Does it make the contents warmer than they ever were? No, never.

So despite all that has been written by scientists who claim to have proof of the effect that humans have on the climate and its changes, such "proof" is probably best illustrated by the disclaimer at the top of an otherwise [scientific paper](#) [4]:

The climate change being observed today is unprecedented in modern times and can only be explained by the rapid increase of greenhouse gases by human activities. There are no known natural forces that could have caused the modern climate change.

Let me elaborate: there is no empirical evidence mentioned here that could be repeatedly observed and tested by scientists around the world. The only "evidence" is that they "can't think of anything else", so it has to be humans and their pesky "greenhouse gases" – [all 4% of it at most](#) [5] - an issue that has been dealt with in the best scientific manner possible by many scientists from around the world and proven not to be the cause of any warming; see references [6, 7, 8, 9 and 10] listing hundreds of relevant scientific papers. There are thousands more sites on this issue of course, those mentioned have links to many of them.

The world awaits a debate over the non-warming effect of carbon dioxide and the non-existence of an atmospheric greenhouse effect. A debate over "the degree of warming" is a non-starter, as no additional warming is ever possible.

*Hans Schreuder is a retired analytical chemist, educated in The Netherlands.

Postscripts, thanks to Benny Peiser's CCNet of the [Global Warming Policy Foundation](#) [11]:

1. Solar subsidies are a placebo which is giving the general public a sense of security about our energy future and is robbing the motivation of those entrepreneurs that could actually address our energy problems.

Subsidies are much worse than just wasteful, they're diabolical. They lull us into thinking we have almost solved the problem and they hinder us from seeking the real solutions. In the near term, perhaps our bigger concern than climate change is anthropogenic energy policy. --[David Bergeron](#). [12]

2. The Government's ideological obsession with wind power is inflicting ever greater damage on Britain, driving up our energy bills and ruining our countryside. Brutalist, expensive and inefficient, wind farms are nothing more than vast monuments to political vanity.

Green politics is predicated on the belief that man-made global warming is destroying the planet. But there is no hard scientific evidence for this thesis. Indeed, climate change has taken place throughout the earth's history, long before the advent of man or industrialisation.

Nor will the construction of wind farms in Britain make the slightest difference to the global output of carbon emissions, given the phenomenal economic growth of the developing world. But wind power certainly causes destruction at home by ruining our natural heritage.

There is a curious paradox at work here. In the name of protecting the environment, the green politicians are inflicting terrible damage on our landscape. Anyone who loves our green and pleasant land should be fighting for the removal of these monstrosities.

--[Leo McKinstry](#) [13]

References:

[1] http://principia-scientific.org/publications/Copernicus_Meets_the_Greenhouse_Effect.pdf

[2] <http://johnosullivan.livejournal.com/19541.html>

[3] http://www.biocab.org/Mean_Free_Path_Length_Photons.html

[4] http://www2.sunysuffolk.edu/mandias/lia/little_ice_age.html

[5] http://www.tech-know-group.com/archives/IPCC_deception.pdf

[6] <http://principia-scientific.org>

[7] <http://www.slayingtheskydragon.com>

[8] <http://www.tech-know-group.com>

[9] <http://www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com>

[10] <http://www.climatedepot.com>

[11] <http://thegwpf.org>

[12] <http://www.thebigquestions.com/2012/08/06/paging-diogenes/#more-7824>

[13] <http://www.express.co.uk/ourcomments/view/338258/Leo-McKinstry>