

Why we need those 10-10 goals

By Hans Schreuder, 4 October 2010
www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com

There is an ongoing and concerted effort [1] by a well-funded group of eco-warrior style partners [2] to reduce the emissions of so-called “greenhouse gases” for the sole purpose of reducing the impact of human developments on the “disruption of our climate”.

As a scientist with no faculty to support or a desk to defend, I am free from the shackles of academia that prevent the truth from surfacing. [3]

So instead of aiming for a 10% reduction of “greenhouse gas emissions” some time before the end of this year, 2010, I propose to do the exact opposite and I’ll explain why.

First and foremost, there is not one single shred of evidence that so-called “greenhouse gases” do what they are alleged to do: warm the earth by either trapping or re-radiating some energy back to earth. [4]

Secondly, there is also no evidence that the increased level of atmospheric carbon dioxide is caused exclusively by the emissions from human developments. The only evidence that does exist quantifies the human emissions as no more than about 5% of all the atmospheric carbon dioxide. [5]

Thirdly, it is impossible for any gas to trap heat in our open-to-the-vacuum-of-space atmosphere. By definition any gas that is warmer than its neighbouring molecule will rise and in so doing lose its heat in the three ways that heat passes from one molecule to the next: conduction, convection and radiation. [6]

Last but not least any heat that is re-radiated back to earth can not make the earth any warmer than it had become from solar radiation that made it warm in the first place. If that was not the case we could produce extra energy from chambers filled with carbon dioxide; if only that were true all our energy problems would be solved overnight.[7] This is in fact the worst crime of junk science claims - because carbon dioxide is not a “heat trapping” gas. Not in an open-to-the-vacuum-of-space setting, only in a laboratory flask where the heat can not escape.

So then, instead of reducing our emissions and thus reducing our industrial output and thus reducing the wealth of all citizens dependent upon those emissions [8] [9], we should rather work to increase our emissions in order to spread wealth where there is now poverty, clean drinking water where now there is none, sanitation where now there is none and a life with basic education where now there is none. [10] [11] [12]

The terms “renewable” and “green energy” refer to sources that are not renewable, green or sustainable but are, in fact, glib green-wash misnomers hawked by big industry for the sole purpose of attracting big government subsidies taken from the taxpayer. [13] [14] [15]

Let us instead aim for an atmospheric carbon dioxide content of 1010 parts per million, as that would greatly enhance the growing potential of all our crops and also help trees to grow big and strong [16] [17].

1010ppm – let’s go for it!

References:

- [1] <http://climaterealists.com>
- [2] <http://www.1010global.org/uk/about/partners>
- [3] <http://www.haapala.com/sepp/twtwfiles/2010/TWTW%202010-10-02.pdf>
Unfortunately, the "human-caused global warming" or "carbon dioxide forcing" hypothesis has become embedded in the minds of otherwise strong teams of observational scientists and their publication outlets.
- [4] www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com/carbondioxide.html
- [5] http://www.tech-know.eu/uploads/IPCC_deception.pdf
- [6] <http://climaterealists.com/index.php?id=5847>
- [7] http://www.americanthinker.com/2010/02/the_hidden_flaw_in_greenhouse.html
- [8] http://www.tech-know.eu/uploads/Black_Crosses_and_Black_Deaths.pdf
- [9] <http://canadafreepress.com/index.php/article/28333>
- [10] <http://www.worldfuturefund.org/wffmaster/Charts-HTML/wff-sanitation.htm>
- [11] <http://water.org/learn-about-the-water-crisis/facts/>
- [12] <http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats>
- [13] <http://www.resourceinvestor.com/News/2010/8/Pages/The-Rare-Earth-Elements-Crisis.aspx>
- [14] <http://www.altenergystocks.com/archives/2010/09/rareearths1.html>
- [15] <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2010/climate-wind-0312.html>
- [16] http://www.energysolutionscenter.org/resources/PDFs/GT-W06_CO_%20from_CHP_supports_greenhouse.pdf
- [17] <http://www.novabiotique.com/hydroponics-systems/plant-555-co2-concentration.cfm>
For many fruits and vegetables, the ideal CO₂ level in the garden should be at least between 1000 and 1200 ppm.