

SCIENTIFIC “GLOBAL WARMING”/“CLIMATE CHANGE” ANALYSIS.

This essay is written by HR Marks to analyze allegations by mainstream media, government, UN and NGOs (non-governmental organizations) that say that human activity, when burning hydrocarbon fuels for energy production, is causing an existential threat to humanity from “Global Warming” and/or “Climate Change”. The author is just a humble physicist/mathematician/statistician, a member of the American Physical Society (APS) and American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) doing what is best done for incredible doomsday claims, namely, analyzing such claims by gathering irrefutable and totally relevant facts, logic with testable (falsifiable) hypotheses and demonstrations.

ONLY hard data and impartial analysis by competent professionals, PhDs of physics, meteorology, mathematics, geology and others that use the scientific method with testable hypotheses are acceptable. We will use Main\$treame Media (M\$M) sources of data if that data is in total agreement with scholarly sources. M\$M stories and narrative, unless well-referenced and confirmed, are not acceptable resources. We include many references herein, videos, impeccable data sources and calculations by reputable scholars, organizations and ordinary people who have no agenda. Most members of APS/AAAS and meteorologists who have researched the subject see no strong and/or hard, credible, evidence that dystopian predictions of climate change alarmists are true. Worse, it can be seen that some climate alarmists have “weaponized” strong evidence against dystopian “climate change” narratives by using provably false narratives, which M\$M has been hypnotically droning “doomsday” scenarios about, billions of times, for maybe 30+ years.

It is mind-boggling that M\$M has unlimited praises for the false climate narratives of uneducated mouthpieces like Greta Thunberg while “tarring and feathering” decorated weather scientists and physicists by creating grossly false narratives and parroting unverified fact checks.

One should ask why M\$M does NOT get punished for making false statements. Answer is that the “Telecommunications Act” in the USA and its equivalent in many countries – does not mandate that M\$M must tell the truth. Worse, the same act protects M\$M from revealing the identities of “anonymous news sources” and whistle blowers. Worse yet, laws protect anonymous news sources and whistleblower sources so strongly that it is legally next to impossible to determine even whether anonymous news sources or whistleblower sources are real or fake.

There is only one agenda in this essay: To discover TRUTH. M\$M and the narratives of many NGOs and governments have created an “atmosphere” of TERROR about the subject self-named “Global Warming” through their endless repeating of the false narratives by M\$M billions and billions of times since the late 1970s, citing “horror stories” of an up and coming extreme “global warming” apocalypse if the percentage of carbon dioxide (CO₂) in the atmosphere kept increasing.

Confounding the alarmists temporarily, in about year 2000 for about 15 years, there was NO increase in supposed “global warming”. So, the alarmists, governments and NGOs conveniently relabeled the Global Warming predicted “apocalypse” narrative to “Climate Change” – even though, during those ~15 years, the carbon dioxide content of Earth’s atmosphere continued to go up. As “Storytellers” not mandated to “tell the truth” the climate alarmists changed the story while creating a “plausible” alibi !

Let’s make things crystal clear: nitrogen and oxygen make up about 99% of Earth’s atmosphere, even including water & water vapor – with CO₂ now only about 0.04%. Hence, CO₂ is less than 1 part in 1000 of Earth’s atmosphere. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmosphere_of_Earth

WHAT PART DO BELIEFS AND CONSENSUS HAVE IN SCIENTIFIC TOPICS?

Beliefs and Consensus have NO value in science. True investigators of scientific truths use the scientific method to determine scientific “truths”. This consists of using incontrovertible data from the

observation of a phenomenon to create testable hypotheses, then testing the hypotheses, finally accepting or rejecting hypotheses on the basis of irrefutable logic impartially applied to correctly organized incontrovertible data. Running the loop: phenomena - hypothesis - test - round & round, many times, if necessary, is not unusual for truly critical thinkers! And interim, "I don't know" are perfectly acceptable conclusions a non-agenda driven investigator can come to. The climate alarmists, right up to the top of the totem pole – including Kyoto and Paris accords – have flat not done this and impartial investigation of all accords and the IPCC can be shown to be, in the minimum, politically “agenda-driven,” not truth-driven. What does this say for the “scientists” that put their name on such? What incentives or disincentives were they given?

GREENLAND AND ANTARCTICA. In the case of "global warming" and/or "climate change," we have a massive history of weather that is stored in the permanent "deep freeze" in Antarctica and Greenland. These two spots have preserved weather and time-dated atmospheric gas information for millions of years - readily available. Contrary to Mainstream Media's (MSM) allegations, the top of the Greenland icecap has been increasing in mass, not decreasing, as it has for eons. (Yes, iceberg pieces go into the ocean often. The Titanic was sunk by a breakaway iceberg from Greenland). See article linked below and look at NOAA and NASA time-based satellite observations. If one remembers their history of the North Atlantic/Arctic Oceans, one will recall the adventures of sailors in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, looking for and finding that "Northwest Passage" across the top of the world as the north passage melted enough to allow passage!

Two provably incorrect assumptions promoted by MSM: About floating ocean ice melting & about natural gas:

1) Let us say that ALL the ice in the North Atlantic, Pacific and Arctic Oceans melted. Contrary to MSM, the sea level would REMAIN essentially the same!! Why? About 10% of an iceberg is physically above the water, 90% submerged, floating because the density of ice is about 0.9. Hence, ice weighs about 10% less than the water it is floating on. If the ice melts, zero-sum-gain. The water level will not change significantly. You can do an experiment with ice cubes in a water glass to confirm this! Or a search will explain this.

2) We agree that methane as a "greenhouse gas," 25 times as potent as carbon dioxide. And, one of the biggest by-products of oil wells is leakage of natural gas (methane, CH₄), into the atmosphere. Many of these wells have "smoke-stacks" that burn off this natural gas and some of these oil wells have been burning or leaking methane for even 50+ years! Imagine the natural gas that is added daily to the atmosphere!! Luckily, the density of methane is 16 grams per gram molecular weight - while nitrogen and oxygen are 28 and 32 respectively; hence the methane rises when it is released. Luckily, for millions of years in the higher atmosphere, -OH ions from ionized water vapor "scrub" the atmosphere of natural gas in a cycle that is well-understood. (Look it up.)

Earth axis precession, as one can see from a video by Dr Janice Hall, linked here <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vC-FNoEn-Y> and later in this essay, is an infinitely bigger climate change issue than humans burning hydrocarbon fuels. And, as you will see, human generated carbon dioxide (CO₂) from burning hydrocarbons is small compared to CO₂ generated by natural sources, especially from plant and animal respiration, especially life in bodies of water.

The last video below linked, interviewing a geologist, explores the beneficial aspects of CO₂ increases. Other NASA and space agency data shows that, contrary to the media claims, that the Antarctic ice cap is growing, not shrinking and that tornados, fires, etc. are on the decline or not hitting new highs, not as depicted by the agenda-driven mainstream media. The author asks the reader to ONLY analyze irrefutable data or look at non-agenda-driven resources.

REGARDING M\$M's CLAIM THAT A CONSENSUS OF "97% OF SCIENTISTS BELIEVE THAT 'HUMAN-CAUSED' CLIMATE CHANGE IS AN EXISTENTIAL DANGER TO THE HUMAN RACE.

This is pure, agenda-driven, hype, demonstrable in the following paragraphs.

First, science doesn't run by consensus. Second, the supposed "study" was based on approximately 10,000 weather related scientific magazine articles - and the author of a "study", Naomi Oreskes, only analyzed THE ABSTRACTS of the articles, ASKING THE QUESTION: "Does the abstract of the article support or not support the (anthropogenic) 'global warming' hypothesis?"

Oreskes tossed away over 9,000 articles, as their abstracts didn't support or deny any global warming hypotheses. And Oreskes did not ask the authors themselves whether they thought "runaway" anthropogenic global warming was a problem. The appropriate question that Oreskes should have asked, to the authors themselves, was "Should the human race be worried that anthropogenic global warming is an "existential danger?"

Another group of investigative authors did ask each author of the 10,000+ articles, contacting each author to get their scientific "opinion" on M\$M's "global warming/climate change hypothesis." Oreskes' 97% "consensus" WAS OFF by a factor of 250, as the existential "climate change" hypothesis was held by only 0.4% of the authors of Oreskes' chosen 10,000 articles. Oreskes, by not asking the right question and tossing most of the articles and authors, falsely inflated the "consensus" by 25,000%. Worse, the M\$M made no effort to correct the 97% falsehood, showing that, on the climate change narrative, that Main\$stream Media is purely agenda-driven.

Why in the world would M\$M ignore the real results, to this day and promote "Greta" memes? Why wouldn't Naomi Oreskes have bothered to ask the articles' authors what they thought? Did she have an agenda? Equally bad, why would M\$M not expose the "97% consensus" claim as false if truthful reporting was really their "goal"? This is a perfect example of an agenda-driven M\$M untrue "statistic". Wait! There are billions of dollars in "R&D grants given yearly on "climate change". Is there a \$\$ connection? But, let's dive into the calculations and data. Keep your mind clear!!

In 1977, the Russians sent their Venera spacecraft to Venus, discovering an atmosphere that is 75% CO₂ and an air pressure of 450 PSI, 30 earth atmosphere pressure, and temperatures exceeding 700 degrees F! At that time, "runaway global warming" possibilities were brought up - but dismissed, still in the 1970s, as animal life cannot exist as we know it if the CO₂ level is much above 1%. Right now, CO₂ is less than 1/2 part in 1,000 (about 00.04%) of Earth's atmosphere. If the percentage was much more, the constraints of carbon-based life wouldn't allow it. Look it up.

IS THE USE OF "FOSSIL" AS AN ADJECTIVE TO "FUEL" APPROPRIATE?

To use "fossil" to describe hydrocarbon fuels such as natural gas (methane or CH₄), crude oil and/or coal, one must, beyond reasonable doubt, PROVE that such hydrocarbon fuels are the result of past or, as implied by the use of the word, "fossil", prehistoric biological activity. It is NOT sufficient to show that some of Earth's life NOW creates hydrocarbons that could be used as a fuel.

We will see that the word, "Fossil" is a misnomer, both for natural gas and for crude oil. The serious lack of leaf or lifeform "fossils" in coal – also casts serious, if not fatal, doubt on coal, too as a "fossil fuel."

WHY IS "FOSSIL" FUEL NOT A FITTING ADJECTIVE FOR NATURAL GAS (aka Methane, CH₄)?

The outer planets all have temperatures TOO LOW to be conducive to life, 100s of degrees below zero F. No life has been observed in any outer planet or their moons – from Jupiter to Pluto. Even so, there are massive amounts of methane in the outer planets' atmospheres and/or moons – including "lakes" or "oceans" of liquid methane and/or solid methane "ice" (because of extreme cold). Clearly,

the presence of methane in the outer planets is not from biological activity. Hence, CH₄ is naturally occurring. Why should Earth be the exception? Except as part of an agenda-driven story, it's not!

On Earth, methane/natural gas has been leaking from the ground substantially for millions of years, from the ocean beds, lakes, oil fields (now), etc. As mentioned before, methane is automatically cleansed in the ionosphere, CH₄ rising because it is lighter than oxygen and nitrogen (O₂, N₂).

WHAT ABOUT CRUDE OIL BEING A "FOSSIL" FUEL?

Crude oil, if one examines its basic chemical properties, needs to be "produced" in a reducing (non-oxidizing) atmosphere, as components of crude oil slowly "burn" at room temperatures. But, if, in prehistoric times, crude oil was created without oxygen, that would also mean that no animals were present. One cannot have it both ways. If oil is, as the climate alarmists claim, a result of something like remnants of dinosaur or animal carcasses, then something must shuttle the carcasses out of oxygen fast--- Suffice to say that that wouldn't be the way things worked in prehistoric times -- even to the present. Hence, oil, like natural gas, is naturally occurring. "Fossil" is an incorrect adjective.

WHAT ABOUT COAL?

Meteorites sometimes do have carboniferous deposits - looking much like anthracite coal. Carbon is significant in the Earth's crust. Yes, there are peat bogs and some coal resulting from trees, but as a geological society presentation author contributed in a meeting maybe 30 years ago, a thorough examination of the frequency of plant or animal fossils in coal – resulted in statistics of "rarely".

Why is it that Main\$stream Media, wikipedia and other "news sources" are prejudiced toward promoting uneducated Greta's agenda while "tarring and feathering" meteorology PhDs and physicists, like the well-respected professors – some of whom have videos in this essay below.

THEN CAME AL GORE

If one studies Al Gore history, he won a seat in congress - much of it rallying on claims of Global Warming that he got from a course in the University that he got a grade of "D" in!! And Gore's Professor Revelle, in the 1990s (before he passed away) - responding to questions about his student, Al Gore's claims of the legitimacy of a global warming crisis theory, said, "There isn't evidence to demonstrate Gore's claims - suggesting a formal study at the time that Al Gore was sounding a "911".

All studies below are scholarly studies, or from the media itself, except for Forbes and CBS sources below, which also agree in raw numbers. Scholarly study researchers are not trying to convince anyone of anything, as they only wish to convey truth. The difference is the INTERPRETATION. And the numbers speak for themselves.

<https://www.forbes.com/sites/startswithabang/2017/06/06/how-much-co2-does-a-single-volcano-emit/#19150f3e5cbf> (alarmist source, in agreement with others.)

1) Mass of Earth's atmosphere: 5 quadrillion tons, or approx. 5,000,000 billion Tons (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Atmosphere_of_Earth)

2) CO₂ present in Earth's atmosphere: 3,200 billion Tons (Forbes source)

3) Annual CO₂ emissions from all energy generating sources, cars, electric generation, heat, etc. from oil, gas, coal, etc.: 38 Billion Tons of CO₂ per year.

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/carbon-dioxide-emissions-rise-to-24-million-pounds-per-second/>

4) Annual Human being CO₂ emission: 29 Billion Tons CO₂ per year (source above, Forbes #1).

5) Annual Livestock CO₂ emissions: cows, chickens, etc. estimated: 50 Billion Tons per year (<https://www.independent.co.uk/environment/climate-change/study-claims-meat-creates-half-of->

all-greenhouse-gases-1812909.html)

6) All animal Life other than human or livestock, including wild animal, fish, and microbial respiration producing CO₂: 100 Billion Tons per year.

7) All plant life, in the nighttime, produce CO₂, including ocean plants, algae, fungi, etc: 300 Billion Tons of CO₂ per year.

8) Volcanic and seismic Earth Sources (Forbes site above): Less than 1 Billion Tons per year.

Assuming that we don't "kill off" any humans to reduce their CO₂ emissions, we can calculate how much CO₂ human activity has below:

Human CO₂ production from burning fuels: (#3 above) 38 billion tons.

Animal-plant CO₂ production: (Livestock) 50 billion tons + (all animal & plant life) 100 billion tons + (nighttime plant life) 300 billion tons.

Volcano and seismic sources of CO₂: 1 Billion tons.

i.e. Humans produce: $38 \text{ billion} / 451 \text{ billion} \times 100 = 8.4\%$ of all CO₂,
not including the human act of "breathing"!

Scientific incontrovertible unchangeable facts:

1) Ice is always sliding into the surrounding ocean in all areas where it is possible, such as Antarctica, Greenland, Iceland, etc. - unchanged from before - for as long as it has been observed, as the water is a bit warmer than the ice - and the ice crawls as seasons melt/thaw & change. An example of such ice flow to water, in 1912: The Titanic was sunk by a piece of ice(berg), traced from Greenland. See link: the Titanic: <https://www.bbc.co.uk/programmes/p00rfhqj>

2) Space debris, most microscopic, some visible as meteors - is always falling from space, adding to water level when falling on water (70% of Earth is water). I've seen some estimates - in inches per century. This is one-way, as no Earth debris leaves Earth (other than our space launches!).

3) It is generally agreed that the Earth is still warming from an ice age of 10-12,000 years ago, and this warming trend from the ice age is continuing - not to be confused in any other way, such as MSM hype!

There is a big explanation of how this ice-age cycle happens: the (gyroscopic) precession of the Earth on its axis: unlike a toy gyroscope that may precess at one revolution per second, the earth's precession cycle is one revolution every 30,000 years. And the angle is very large - 47 degrees – half of 23 ½ degrees.

(Dr. Janice Hall on precession & climate change <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-vC-FNoEn-Y>)

Dr. Kary Mullis Nobel Laureate: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Y1FnWFIDvxE> very good informative video by Nobel Laureate PhD

John Coleman

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SyUDGfCNC-k&t=1687s> Professional Meteorologist, co-founder of Weather channel, degree in journalism

Dr. Happer, Princeton University <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vro-yn59uso>

Dr. Happer #2: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=U-9UIF8hkhs>

MIT Professor: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pwvVephTIHU>

Dr. Ivar Giaever Nobel Prize recipient: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TCy_UOjEir0&t=117s

Myron Ebell - climate change hysteria is a political and profit animal: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=xRXzfJVcV6s>

myth busting dr patrick moore: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=TjlmFr4FMvI>

Freeman Dyson: Climate change discussion: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=BQHhDxRuTKI>

Funny thing happened on the way to climate change Dr. Steven Hayward:
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RZlICdawHRA>

Independent Institute report on human caused "global warming" via CO2 emissions.
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=1zrejG-WI3U>

DR Bell debunking Al Gore and alarmists with data, not consensus: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=M1VJtER2IUE>

Hillsdale college Dr Rupert Darwall on global warming: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9tLmiJmbZHU>

Climate change advocates don't want to hear these inconvenient facts: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aSV21pPeF3g>