Crap and Tax - A Lobotomy for the United States of America?

By Kevin Klees

OK, I'll start right off by admitting that I am a "Climate Change" Denier, Naysayer, Skeptic, Cynic, Disbeliever, Doubter, Doubting Thomas, Flat Earther, and any other phrases that you might find in your Thesaurus. There, I admit it. Do I feel guilty about the future of the planet? No, not in the least.

Why do I reach this decision?

Because, as an engineer I have extensive training on the actual limits placed on human activities by the LAWS OF PHYSICS. For more than a quarter of a century I have tried to design things that violate the LAWS OF PHYSICS. I am ashamed to admit that I HAVE NOT BROKEN ANY OF THEM YET. As an engineer I am in the FRONT LINES fighting the LAWS OF PHYSICS every day. So far the LAWS OF PHYSICS are winning, 99-0.

So, here is one of those NASTY little LAWS OF PHYSICS, it's called the THIRD LAW OF THERMODYNAMICS. It can make for a really drowsy read, but the simple version states:

"IT IS IMPOSSIBLE TO TRAP HEAT"

Yep, that's it, pretty simple; it means that there is NOTHING NATURE, OR A MAN/WOMAN CAN DO TO TRAP HEAT.

This LAW is demonstrated MILLIONS of times every day. When you put more insulation into the attic of your house, you are SLOWING the flow of heat from inside (umm, warm and toasty) to the outside (ugh, cold and wet). You are NOT TRAPPING HEAT.

Ask yourself this simple question; if a Greenhouse can "TRAP HEAT" why is it colder inside one in January than in August? Why can't you "trap" the heat from August and use it during the whole rest of the year? Because of the THIRD LAW.

So, if the THIRD LAW is enforced in manmade greenhouses on the surface of the earth, why is it not enforced in the atmosphere of the earth? Simple answer, it applies equally in all locations.

So you are probably now asking, what's that whole Lobotomy thing about? Back in the 1930's and 1940's there was a "consensus" that lobotomies' were an effective treatment for mental disorders. Unfortunately, one sibling of a recently deceased US Senator from Massachusetts had this "therapy" applied to her. In fact, the doctor that "perfected" the lobotomy was awarded a Noble prize for his efforts to torture and cripple individual human beings. Of course, it was later determined that the "consensus" was "mistaken".

Whoops! The next "consensus" will certainly do better, we promise.

So are we really ready to perform a Lobotomy on the Economy of the United States of America by passing the CRAP AND TAX bill because a "consensus" is really really sure that: "most" of the (poorly measured) warming is "very likely" caused by human activities ? (UN IPCC statement, paraphrased slightly).

Should we commit economic suicide because a "consensus" is sure that MOST of the (poorly measured) warming is VERY LIKELY caused by humans? One definition of MOST is "more than half", and the UN's own definition of VERY LIKELY is 90%, so the UN is stating that 51% * 90% = 45% of the (poorly measured) "warming" is caused by human activities. Should we perform a self-inflicted lobotomy to "solve" a problem that has a likely occurrence of 45% ?

You should of course also know that the manufacturers of this "consensus" depend entirely on the propagation of the "consensus" for their livelihood i.e.: no consensus, no jobs.

From Alan Siddons, October 25, 2009:

And let me add that in terms of SLOWING the loss of thermal energy to space, solids and liquids are far superior to tenuous gases. For one thing, solids and liquids have staggeringly more vibrating molecules, thus a far greater heat content. For another, solids and liquids present only a single surface to their surroundings, while gases are exposed on all sides and lack even a "surface" to speak of. Add to this the curiously high heat capacity of water and you have the rudimentary ingredients to put together a PROPER model of how planet earth captures and releases heat. A swirling atmosphere is the LAST place to look for heat retention because its movement alone quickly dissipates the heat it acquires.

Substances with low specific heat such as metals require less input energy to increase their temperature. Substances with high specific heat such as water require much more energy to increase their temperature. The specific heat can also be interpreted as a measure of how well a substance preserves its temperature, i.e. "stores" heat, hence the term "heat capacity".

http://www.statemaster.com/encyclopedia/Specific-heat
In practice, this translates to "easy come, easy go." The faster a body heats up, the faster it loses heat. Apply that rule to gases, then. The heat capacity of carbon dioxide is about 0.84 (kJ/kg K), as compared to nitrogen and oxygen at about 1.0. This means that if your aim is to ***mediate*** heat gain and loss, to even-out temperature extremes between day and night, you'll naturally go with nitrogen and oxygen. For CO2's faster heating response is only an index of how fast it will cool down. Nevertheless, the substances in question here are REAL at least. What of a blackbody?

A blackbody is nothing more than a cipher, an abstract temperature vs radiance formula with no actual existence. Ask, for example, "what is the heat capacity of a blackbody?" There is no legitimate answer. Because a blackbody loses heat as fast as it gains heat, a direct ramification of having a 100% temperature response to electromagnetic radiation. Turn off the light and a blackbody reverts to absolute zero, as it must. It should go without saying, then, that blackbody physics is no way to calculate a planet's temperature. Yet blackbody physics underpins the whole of climate science.

In short, climatology has been barking up the wrong tree for many decades. It is wrong for assuming that circulating gases warm the surfaces they draw their energy from, wrong for assuming that CO2 plays a special heat-retaining role, wrong for assuming that a planet's temperature can be estimated with an averaged irradiance blackbody formula. No WONDER that climate science is in such tatters and is constantly confounded by each new discovery. Not even an infant science, climatology has yet to be born.

From Norm Kalmanovitch, October 10, 2009

More to the point of the UN IPCC and climate models, there is a very interesting point to be made about the climate models of Hansen which are more about attacking fossil fuels than they are about climate.

The 1971 version of the climate models assumed the global cooling of the time was caused by particulate matter from fossil fuels reducing the amount of solar energy reaching the Earth.

This was incorporated as a parameter in the climate models, and based on the continued increase in fossil fuel usage, the models predicted **50 years of further cooling!**

Suddenly just four years later and in spite of the continued increase in fossil fuel usage, in 1975 global cooling ended proving the premise of the climate models to be wrong.

Somehow Hansen managed to quietly remove this parameter based on effects to the incoming solar energy, and replaced it with a new forcing parameter based on effects to the outgoing thermal energy from the Earth.

He ignored all the physical properties of CO**2** and created a parameter based solely on the false assumption that 100ppmv CO**2** concentration increase caused a 0.6°C global temperature increase (ignoring the fact that 0.5°C of this was due to natural warming since the Little Ice Age).

This model started the whole global warming scam in 1988, but just a decade later with increases in CO**2** emissions continuing, global warming stopped, and **all predictions of this revised model have subsequently been wrong**.

It is now eight years since the world started cooling and for eight years now the model predictions have been in the wrong direction.

The only way Hansen can continue his fight against fossil fuels is to now go back to his 1971 model that uses the "particulate parameter" to predict global cooling.

This will serve him well because global cooling is now predicted to last for at least the next two decades so his models for the first time will finally make valid long term predictions, but this will put him on the side of the global warming deniers and put him at odds with the environmentalists who are saving the world from global warming.

From Hans Schreuder slideshow
(www.nothingtodowithco2.com/pdf/AGW_presentation_ILMCD.pdf):

Trapping heat does not, can not, warm the atmosphere. In any case, CO**2** does not have the physical or chemical property to trap heat; only ice and water have that property and whilst the trapping of heat (energy) happens, on the way to changing phase, the substance itself does not increase in temperature.

Once a mouse is trapped, does it still eat the cheese?

The fact remains that the atmosphere is not warmer than it "should be" due to a greenhouse effect; in high-humidity regions earth merely cools down more slowly at night than it would without the high-humidity atmosphere, but at the same time it would be unbearably hot during the hours of sunshine if there was no high-humidity atmosphere. Think of dry deserts: hot during the day, cold at night.

Water literally traps heat (the only substance known to science to do so) in order to become vapour and when that vapour turns back into water, most of this latent (trapped) heat thus released does not come back down to earth; it warms the immediate air around it within the clouds and causes the updraft that keeps the clouds afloat and rising ever higher into the atmosphere.

If anything, water vapour is a superb anti-greenhouse gas! Although carbon dioxide has no latent heat to radiate it is a superb radiator of any heat it may have acquired and if anything, will add to the cooling efficiency of the air within which it is contained.

No gas, not even carbon dioxide, is able to trap heat — in fact, because they swirl around, gases only cool whatever they're in contact with. You have to make a gas stand still, like tiny air pockets in clothing do, in order to keep something warm.

IR-sensitive gases release infrared energy; they do not trap infrared energy.
Think about a thermos. Despite the infrared photons repeatedly bouncing between the silvered walls, unable to escape and being re-absorbed by the contents, the flask doesn't get any hotter than before.

Re-emitted and re-absorbed energy does not cause warming.

Earth releases to space the same amount of thermal energy as it gets from the sun.

Yet, in climate change circles, the bouncing around of infra red energy within the atmosphere due to a few extra molecules of carbon dioxide from human emissions is the alleged cause of increased atmospheric temperatures!

The desire to be part of the crowd is the true ongoing driver of climate alarm.
The science isn't there, never was.