



Your Request..

OK, if you refuse to defend your misinformation, then let's just let your lies fall flat. But just as a teaser for what your distortions have overlooked, I'll do the honors of just taking one of your so-called facts and examine it under the scrutiny of the scientific community, whose job it is to look at the data, analyze its collection methodology to make sure that it is representative or at least operationalize it, then examine it in light of what we know about the physics of the earth's climate systems and what it tells us about what the data is telling us in a testable, reproducible way.

Taking the first one: oops! "The scientific community is subjugated by the climate emergency industrial complex" is not even a factoid! It's a judgement that the many discussions and community organizations preparing for adaptation to a changing climate have created a "climate emergency industrial complex." Well, faced with having to upgrade your community's infrastructure to accommodate the inevitable volumes of runoff from more severe flash flooding, or raising levees to accommodate full scale flooding, or upgrading water supplies to conserve water for upcoming droughts, or changing landscaping regulations to deal with increasingly frequent and severe wildfires, what is the alternative? Just pay for the damages incurred when you DON'T take these measures, a far more disruptive and expensive option? Here's to more communities taking these measures to accommodating to the observed changes, and hopefully they are coupled with measures to increase energy conservation and switching to a low carbon future as the real way to address the changing climate.

OK, now, let's try one that is actually trying to state a fact: "No scientific proof that CO2 is the prime driver of temperature. " Pretty clever, Nigel--this is a classic example of a "straw dog," or cherry picking for that matter, which I'm quite sure you're aware of. Because in a system such as the earth's climate, where there is a dynamic set of factors creating the net balance, it is totally inaccurate to depict one of those elements as "the prime driver." Is water vapor the prime driver? Well, it has is a huge greenhouse gas, but the dynamics of CO2 are necessary for it to be present in the atmosphere. The increased presence of CO2 warms the air, and since the air is warmer, it is capable of containing a higher amount of

water vapor, which turbocharges the extreme weather capacity of the atmosphere. But don't take my word for it: check out what the science says about this relationship from that notoriously suspect organization: NASA <https://science.nasa.gov/earth/climate-change/steamy-relationships-how-atmospheric-water-vapor-amplifies-earths-greenhouse-effect/>

My response.

On your first point, I am not talking about local organizations undertaking local adaption to weather conditions and any slight changes in climate. This is an ongoing and valid and very affordable activity compared with CO2 mitigation which is termed NetZero that is unnecessary, technologically unattainable, economically unviable and extremely foolish.

What I am talking about is the climate emergency rhetoric that has funded the growth of a climate emergency industrial complex enjoying vast amounts of funding which is breeding an almost religious fanaticism at all levels and has subjugated the scientific community and prevented a balanced scientific viewpoint on the issue from academia and organizations where any dissension against the religion is career limiting etc.. This is covered very well in both documentaries linked here.

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=k3Ut3cjENZg>

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRfQzMgvfDA>

Also, they explain that although there are variations in weather patterns that create small amounts of changes to flood plains and rainfall levels these are normal and not unusual when considered over an average and statistical timeframe and experts have declared based on this logic that to date no severe trends can be attributed to any climate change. (see IPCC reports)

A good source is the book "Unsettled" by Koonin and he quotes directly from the IPCC and various meteorological authorities.

Remember weather happens every year and climate is a 30 year summary.

The big bottom line .. the impact of climate change and CO2 increase is NOT evident as a negative in the ecological data such as for floods fires tornados sea level rise sea ice etc. the only thing it has done is improved the greening of the planet and improved our food supply and growing seasons. Weather extremes have always been with us and creating a panic by picking a short range of data is foolish, and this is what the media likes to do to push up the panic to sell product. This is well covered in the documentaries above.

Pick an impact subject and lets review real data.. a good source of this is here..

[Climate Quiz - CO2 Coalition](#)

<https://co2coalition.org/climate-quiz/>

All the data is from official organizations including the IPCC but without the panic political spin.

Predictions using climate models are just that... and are way off and keep getting proved wrong. One big reason is they refuse to consider anything other than CO2 and many scientists urge them to include the sun and other external galactic forces into these models. But they are only focused on proving climate is human induced not building a realistic model.

The NASA article...

A nice opinion piece with no data to support the unproven hypothesis..

The article says.. Carbon dioxide is responsible for a third of the total warming of Earth's climate due to human-produced greenhouse gases. Small increases in its concentration have major effects. A key reason is the length of time carbon dioxide remains in the atmosphere. This is highly disputed...As many scientists show that CO2 is saturated and adding more will have little effect.

For a better understanding of why CO2 gets too much attention refer to this link and go to 24 minutes in on the video for the point I am making.

<https://ca.video.search.yahoo.com/search/video?fr=yfp-t-s&ei=UTF-8&p=happer+on+climate+change#id=1&vid=efac5af9d8a75e6822ec7fe5188e64de&action=click>

The Nasa article is based on the premise that CO2 drives temperature but historical proxy measurements of temperature versus CO2 shows CO2 ALWAYS lagging temperature. So gives a strong argument that although we have added CO2 its something else driving temperature.... Maybe the sun?.. but don't tell the IPCC

Also there is now some discussion about debunking the theory of the currently accepted theory of the green-house-effect using thermodynamic equilibrium theory, and if true it explains why the climate models that use CO2 to predict temperature keep getting it wrong.

Its now being suggested that any energy that is trapped by CO2 in its bandwidth will be transmitted at other wavelengths. Also that the theory of a positive feedback effect that can amplify increases in CO2 is wrong.

Bottom line.. we need a deeper scientific review before this articles hypothesis can be accepted.

They need to stop building hypothesis to justify the need for NetZero and seek the truth.

In general a warmer planet is a better option than a colder planet and history shows we thrived when it was warmer than now and suffered when colder.

Also, In earth's history we are at a low temperature and low CO2 point and more is better than less for many reasons.

So its clear based on the past trends showing no issues and the uncertainty of the predictions and the adverse effects on our prosperity by following NetZero that we should halt that journey and not over react.

Summary

Climate change is natural, it's not an emergency, and it's not us.

Stop the mitigation of CO2 and only adapt to any weather or climate change using the power of fossil fuels.

More data if you want.

<https://www.brainzmagazine.com/post/take-back-manufacturing-climate-realism>