

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 nor 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 in a moment.

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 not one single shred of evidence that the increased levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide are caused exclusively by the emissions from human developments and in fact, the only evidence that does exist quantifies the human emissions as being 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 ever so slightly warmer than its neighbouring molecule will rise and in so doing lose its heat in the three ways that heat passed from one molecule to the next: conduction, convection and radiation. [6]

Fourthly and lastly 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, again by definition, lest 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]

So than, instead of reducing our emissions and thus reducing our industrial output and thus reducing the wealth of all citizens dependent upon those emissions, 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. [8] [9] [10]

So-called “green energy” or the even worse-named “renewable energy” sources are not the answer as none of these energy sources are either green, renewable or even reliable. [11] [12] [13]

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 [14] [15].

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.worldfuturefund.org/wffmaster/Charts-HTML/wff-sanitation.htm>
- [9] <http://water.org/learn-about-the-water-crisis/facts/>
- [10] <http://www.globalissues.org/article/26/poverty-facts-and-stats>
- [11] <http://www.resourceinvestor.com/News/2010/8/Pages/The-Rare-Earth-Elements-Crisis.aspx>
- [12] <http://www.altenergystocks.com/archives/2010/09/rareearths1.html>
- [13] <http://web.mit.edu/newsoffice/2010/climate-wind-0312.html>
- [14] http://www.energysolutionscenter.org/resources/PDFs/GT-W06_CO_%20from_CHP_supports_greenhouse.pdf
- [15] <http://www.novabiomatique.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.