


Clean, Green and Barefoot in the Snow.

A Submission on

*The Proposal from the Government of New Zealand
to set an Emissions Reduction Target of
50% of 1990 emissions by 2050.*

by

The Carbon Sense Coalition
www.carbon-sense.com



28 February 2011

A print friendly pdf of this report can be found at:
<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/barefoot-in-the-snow.pdf>

Keywords: Emissions targets, global warming, cooling, carbon dioxide, population trends, alternate energy, wind and solar power, cows, sheep and trees, central planning.

Submissions to be sent to: 2050target@mfe.govt.nz

Introduction.

The New Zealand government is proposing to nominate a reduction target for emissions of certain natural gases produced by human activities.

With no mathematics, science, logic or economics to support their target, they propose to nominate that 2050 emissions will be just 50% of 1990 levels.

This submission looks at a few key aspects of this proposal and concludes that it is not feasible, not sustainable and not justified.

What is the purpose of the Emission Reduction Targets?

The fundamental claims used to justify the emissions cuts are:

- Emissions of certain natural gases from human activities (mainly carbon dioxide and methane) have caused unusual global warming.
- Unless these emissions are curbed, dangerous global warming will occur.

Until both of these beliefs can be proven to be true, there is no justification whatsoever for any reduction targets.

Is there "Unusual Global Warming"?

The answer to this question is an emphatic "No".

Global warming started long before man started to use coal, oil, cattle, sheep or timber in any significant quantity. Today's warming era started in the days of the cave men and resulted in melting of the massive ice sheets which covered much of the earth's surface. This melting of the ice and warming of the oceans caused sea levels to rise by about 130 metres.

Just one graph should be enough to kill the idea that there is anything unusual about current global temperatures:




FIG 1.

Note the Dramatic Global Warming over 11,000 years ago, long before cars and steam turbines.

For a larger clearer image see: <http://carbon-sense.com/2009/10/03/climate-always-changing/>

This graph, compiled by Ex-CSIRO scientist Dr Guy LeBlanc Smith PhD, AIG, AAPG, from data obtained from deep core drilling on the Greenland Ice Sheet, shows that current temperatures are generally lower than several warm periods in the recent past. Not one of these past warm eras was caused by human industry and there is no reason to believe that the natural processes which caused them are any different today.

This graph also illustrates the futility of trying to put a limit of 2° on possible global warming – in Roman times, the earth was approximately 2° warmer than it is today.

Today is not unusual in any way, apart from the spectacular rise of a pagan global religion that places life-supporting carbon dioxide as the devil, worships green gods, sells indulgences to carbon sinners and advocates a return to the life style of the cave men.

Is the Earth Still Warming?

The graph below shows there has been no global warming since 1998 (13 years). Moreover the 20th century warming was insignificant. None of the more reputable temperature records provide any basis for a world-wide panic on emissions reduction.




FIG 2.
No warming for 13 years.

Source: http://www.climate4you.com/Text/Climate4you_January_2011.pdf

Is Global Warming caused by Carbon Dioxide?

There is no dispute that earth is currently in a warm phase – this is lucky for life on earth, otherwise the high latitudes would still be covered in life extinguishing sheets of ice.

The key question is: Was the warming caused by natural forces, or by man's emissions of carbon dioxide? The answer to this question requires real evidence, hard facts or sound logic not opinions, beliefs or un-validated computer models.

Three facts are relevant:

Firstly, the most dramatic global warming to affect the planet recently took place over 11,000 years ago, and human production of carbon dioxide cannot possibly have played any part in this warming. Moreover, the ice core data shows that, since then, earth has experienced 10 warm eras when global temperatures rose higher than in the Modern Warm Era which started about 1900. Human production of carbon dioxide cannot be blamed for these warm eras either. See Fig 1 above.

Secondly, close observation of ice core data shows that at every major turning point over the last 20,000 years, temperature changes precede changes in carbon dioxide content of the atmosphere. The cause must come before the effect. Therefore changes in carbon dioxide cannot be the cause of temperature changes. See Fig 3, below.




FIG 3. Carbon dioxide levels (the red line above) change after temperature changes. Therefore rising carbon dioxide cannot cause rising temperature.

Source: <http://carbon-sense.com/2009/10/03/taxing-ambulances/>

It is far more likely that changing temperatures cause changes in the amount of carbon dioxide dissolved in the oceans – higher temperatures cause the oceans to expel carbon dioxide.

For detailed discussion on how the oceans control carbon dioxide see:

<http://carbon-sense.com/2010/12/29/forbes-co2-and-oceans/>

Thirdly, close inspection of the trends of global temperatures and atmospheric content of carbon dioxide shows that despite continually rising CO₂ content, global temperatures have gone through warming and cooling periods. See Figure 4, below. It is clear from this graph, that even in the era of heavy use of carbon fuels, carbon dioxide does not drive global temperature.




FIG 4.

Temperature and carbon dioxide for the whole period for which relatively accurate modern measurements are available. Clearly much more than carbon dioxide is controlling global temperature.

Source: http://www.climate4you.com/Text/Climate4you_January_2011.pdf

The Nero Plan – the Impossible Mathematics of the Proposed Targets.

The CS50 document (produced by the NZ Government) proposes to meet a “greenhouse reduction target of 50% below 1990 levels by 2050” – glibly referred to as “50 by 50”.

Quite clearly, there is no science behind such bland well-rounded targets – they were chosen mainly for their alliterative attractions and propaganda power.

What do these targets mean for future generations of Kiwis? The people of New Zealand need to examine what their politicians are proposing.

In every country of the world, living standards are closely correlated with the available energy per head of population. And more energy means more emissions.

The population of New Zealand in 1990 was about 3.5 M and is estimated to grow to 6.2 M by 2050.

In the period 1990 – 2007, according to NZ government figures, New Zealand emissions have grown by 22%. By 2010 that figure was probably 30%. If so, emissions in 2010 may already be 30% **above** the base year of 1990. It will thus require a cut of 62% from current levels to get emissions back to 50% **below** 1990 levels.

The table below gives some idea of what the targets may mean for Kiwi living standards:

YEAR	Estimated Population	Index of Emissions Mt	Emissions per Capita (Mtpa)	Index of Emissions per capita of 2010
1990	3.5 M	100	28.6	97%
2007	4.2 M	122	29.0	98%
2010	4.4 M	130	29.6	100%
2050	6.2 M	50	8.1	27%

This table shows that to achieve an absolute cut of 50% from 1990 levels will require a cut of 73% from current emissions per capita.

The usage of carbon fuels (coal, oil and gas) more than any other measure, correlates with living standards. Higher living standards bring higher carbon dioxide emissions. And vice versa – a long never-ending depression would be required to achieve the cuts envisaged by the proposed targets. If this occurs, by the year 2050, boat loads of Kiwi refugees will be migrating to Queensland where they can live on welfare like Aussie hippies and shower once a week in tepid water from a canvas bucket shower hung under the mango tree.

Or the dream of the new levellers will be achieved - Kiwis will all stay at home and live like peasants with worldwide equality of emissions per person.

Are such drastic cuts feasible? Are Kiwi's prepared for massive reductions in living standards?

The promoters of "50 by 50" must explain, in detail, how this target will be achieved:

- Will there be a massive program to build hydro, nuclear and geothermal power plants?
- Will Kiwi farmers sell 73% of their cattle and sheep by 2050? Will eating meat and milk be banned except on weekends? Will all farmland be covered by sterile monocultures of bio-fuel plantations?
- Will Kiwis use bicycles and horses for 73% of their transport needs?

- Will 73% of Kiwis be encouraged to migrate to Australia so the rest can live at current levels of comfort?
- Will there be a massive program to build rafts, yachts and sailing clippers for ocean transport and tourism?
- Will Air New Zealand be sold so that its emissions can be transferred to China or Singapore?
- What will supply the power for the fleets of electric cars?
- Will all home heating/cooling be banned? Or will carbon cops be able to turn off the power to electricity gluttons?
- Will cutting a tree become a capital offence? What will be the punishment for poaching firewood in government forests?
- Who is working on the plan to manufacture steel and cement without emitting carbon dioxide? Or will NZ Steel relocate to India?

Naturally the glib answer from the Deep Greens is: "We will have green offsets like carbon forests, and rely on alternate/green energy".

Is a plan that relies on covering the whole country with sacred trees, bio-fuel crops, wind towers and solar panels a sustainable one? What do the people eat?

"50 by 50" sounds like a plan worthy of Emperor Nero – "trash the place first and then we will produce a plan for our brave new world."

(Note: The Great Fire of 64 AD destroyed half of Rome. Emperor Nero was accused by some of lighting the fire in order to allow him to found a new city planned by him.)

Do we face Global Warming or Global Cooling?

We can do no better than quote David Archibald, an Australian scientist who has looked at the relationships between solar cycles and earth's climate. He says:

"Do we live in a special time in which the laws of physics and nature are suspended?"

No, we do not.

"Can we expect relationships between the Sun's activity and climate, that we can see in data going back several hundred years, to continue for at least another 20 years?"

With absolute certainty.

"In this presentation, I will demonstrate that the Sun drives climate, and use that demonstrated relationship to predict the Earth's climate to 2030.

"It is a prediction that differs from most in the public domain. It is a prediction of imminent cooling."

Source: <http://www.davidarchibald.info/papers/Solar%20Cycle%2024%20-%20Implications%20for%20the%20Unites%20States%20David%20Archibald%20March%202008.pdf>

The predictions of global warming are based on some 23 complex and creative computer models designed by mathematicians and atmospheric physicists who built into the models the assumption that carbon dioxide is the major factor in controlling global temperatures. Their forecasts do not agree with one another, so most of them must be wrong. They are manipulated so that they can forecast the past, but they have never successfully forecast the future. They ignore much of the findings of geologists and astro-physicists.

The precautionary principle would surely dictate that politicians should assume that global cooling is at least as likely as global warming.

History illustrates that global cooling is far more destructive of life than global warming. The short warm eras are recorded in history as "Golden Ages" and are times of civilisation and plenty. The longer and more numerous cold periods are recorded as "Dark Ages" and are times of famine, migration, war and species extinction.

All of this suggests a new slogan for the carbon-free world in brave New Zealand:

"Clean, Green and Barefoot in the Snow".

Is the World going to meekly follow New Zealand into the Dark Green Forests?

New Zealand is a small economy far from all the major economies of the world. It would be more prudent for such a country to follow, not lead, in the emissions target game.

What will the rest of the world do?

Russia, India, China, South America and Africa have no intention of sacrificing any economic growth on climate nonsense. They will play along with the charade only while it appears they can benefit from carbon credits, carbon trading, emissions reparations, manufacture of green energy equipment or in any other make-believe industry manufactured by posturing western politicians.

Japan, the birthplace of the infamous Kyoto Treaty, will not renew membership. Neither will Canada. USA is far from any carbon tax or carbon rationing. Does New Zealand want to tread the tragic road of Spain, Denmark and UK who are well on the way to poverty because of the soaring costs of irrational anti-carbon energy policies? They are learning that creation of subsidised green projects destroys more real jobs than the green jobs created.

Unlike the Europeans, Kiwis cannot rely on French nuclear power or Russian gas to step in when green energy fails. Nor will massive new hydro or nuclear plants be allowed by the Greenshirts.

New Zealand should take no comfort from the recent announcements on carbon taxes and emissions trading by the ALP/Green coalition temporarily ruling Australia. The political battle about Climatedism has already claimed the heads of ex-PM Rudd, and ex-Opposition Leader Turnbull, both strong supporters of Climatedism. And the ALP has lost control of both houses of Parliament because of the many scandals and waste in the climate subsidy industry they created. Now Australia is about to have an almighty battle about a carbon tax. Opinion polls already show that Climatedism may yet have a few more political heads to lop.

Cows and Sheep are as Green as Grass

It is amazing that New Zealand, which is so dependent on its sheep and cattle, shows so little scientific understanding of the carbon cycle involving ruminants.

Any farmer would know that no cow, sheep, pig or goat has yet managed to create carbon out of nothing. Nor do they eat fossil fuel. Every atom of carbon sequestered in meat, bones, wool and milk, or expelled in solid, liquid or gaseous animal waste, was extracted from the air by the pastures and grain crops which the animals ate. Pastures, crops and soil fungi live on carbon dioxide, the universal plant food from the atmosphere, and on water and minerals from the soil. Ultimately, all carbon in the food chain comes from the air (apart from some artificial "foods" made from coal or petroleum derivatives, and very minor soil humus derived from oxidised coal or oil shale).

This carbon extraction process starts the day the animal is conceived and ceases on the day it dies. This is the carbon food cycle that supports all life on earth.

In fact all farm animals should get a carbon credit, because they sequester part of the carbon extracted from the air in bones, meat, milk and wool. Much of this carbon then gets transferred to the bones and flesh of the growing human population. It eventually gets sequestered in sewerage (often, unfortunately, lost to the biosphere on the sea floor); adds to humus in the soil; lingers in bone ornaments, leather saddlery and clothing; or gets buried in coffins in the cemeteries. This is a proven process which provides more secure and far cheaper carbon sequestration than some of the billion dollar geo-sequestration schemes being investigated.

In this respect grazing animals are just like trees - both sequester CO₂ for their lifetimes, sometimes for much longer if they are regularly harvested and put to long-term use.

Of course farm tractors, harvesters, trucks, pumps, quad bikes and helicopters all generate carbon emissions from coal and oil but each of these activities would attract its own carbon tax. None are essential elements in the raising of domestic farm animals – the essentials are soil, water, grass and the atmospheric gases, especially oxygen, nitrogen and carbon dioxide.

The climate alarmists will cry "But ruminants release methane, which is even worse than carbon dioxide."

Methane is just another natural gas released by many natural processes including volcanoes, swamps, trees, termites and wild animals. In the atmosphere, methane is soon removed by atmospheric oxidation to produce the same old carbon dioxide – one molecule of methane produces exactly one molecule of carbon dioxide. And methane levels in the atmosphere are falling, not rising.

No matter how you do the sums, farm animals have caused a net removal of carbon gases from the atmosphere. Thus they should get a carbon credit, certainly not a carbon tax.

Pollies all know the moon is made of green cheese.

It is time to teach them that "All cows and sheep are also green."

See Professor David Bellamy's comments on New Zealand primary industries:

<http://carbon-sense.com/2008/07/20/safely-graze/#more-103>

See also "All Cows are Green":

<http://carbon-sense.com/2008/04/06/all-cows-are-green/#more-72>

Don't rely on Wind or Solar Power to cut Emissions

There is nothing new or innovative about using wind and solar power. They are the ancient sun-fuelled energies of the past. Neither will support complex industrial societies or modern cities.

Both wind power and solar power are very dilute, and thus a large area of land is required to gather significant energy. Both need a wide network of access roads, transmission lines and collection sites which degrades any area used to collect solar energies. They have a huge land footprint and high capital and maintenance costs.

These power sources are also intermittent, unpredictable and unreliable. Therefore large backup or storage systems are required. This adds to the capital and operating costs and increases the instability of the network.

Wind farms are uniformly hated by neighbours and will not be willingly accepted without heavy compensation payments. Their noise, flicker, fire risk and disturbing effect on domestic and wild animals are well documented. Solar arrays also sterilise and uglify large areas of land.

The energy from the sun arrives free, but harnessing it to produce economical and reliable electricity is very costly. Its cost is far above all conventional methods of generating electricity. Either taxpayers or consumers must pay this bill.

Moreover, no one has proved that the introduction of wind/solar energy into a power grid reduces the total production of carbon dioxide.

For more information on the weakness of wind power see:

Viv Forbes, 2011, "Why Wind Won't Work":

<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/why-wind-wont-work.pdf>

The Failed Promise of the Solar Options.

"Wind and solar energy from the sun have been touted as the panacea for global warming and energy independence.

They are presented as the way to cut carbon emissions and the promoters tell us they are renewable and "free".

Yes, sunbeams and sea breezes are free.

But they do not convert themselves into electricity,
delivered into every home and factory.
That costs mega-dollars.

Therein lies the failure of the promise of green energy."

Adapted by Viv Forbes from a quote by Sheri Kimbrough, "Wind Power: Friend or Foe?"

The Global Warmist Justifications for Emissions Controls

The key propositions of the global warming alarmists are:

- There has been unusual and alarming warming since the start of the industrial revolution.
- This has been caused mainly by man's contribution of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere.
- The current levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are unprecedented.
- Unless human emissions are curbed they will cause dangerous runaway global warming.
- Now every extreme weather event is blamed on this innocent trace gas.
- Carbon dioxide is a pollutant in the atmosphere.

There is no evidence whatsoever to support any of these beliefs and considerable evidence from geological records, scientific observations and logical deductions to say that:

- The warming is not unusual and the current warming trend started well before man's production of carbon dioxide became significant.
- Carbon dioxide is a very minor player in determining surface temperature. The sun, the clouds, the moon, cosmic rays and the oceans are the dominant determinants of surface temperature and weather events.

- Earth's atmosphere has had far higher levels of carbon dioxide in the past without causing runaway global warming. There is no reason to expect this time will be different.
- There is considerable evidence (including experimental data) to indicate that more carbon dioxide poses no danger and has considerable benefits for life on earth. It is a sick joke to claim that carbon dioxide is a "pollutant". It is the supporter of all life on earth. More carbon dioxide produces more plant food and supports more life. Without carbon dioxide in the atmosphere there would be no life and we would not be having this debate.
- There is no evidence that warming produces more extreme weather events.

If it's not broken, don't fix it.

"Global Warming is part of a natural cycle and there's nothing we can do to stop these cycles. The world faces spending a vast amount of money to try to solve a problem that does not actually exist."

Professor David Bellamy

The policies being proposed to control emissions of carbon dioxide will have major effects on the cost of power, transport, steel, cement and food, affecting every aspect of living and cause big distortions in the economics of all the fuel industries for no benefits.

The claim that carbon dioxide is an atmospheric pollutant is a good example of the lie so huge, and repeated so often, that people think it must be true.

Carbon dioxide, along with water vapour, oxygen and nitrogen, is essential to all life. They are all beneficial life-supporting natural gases in the atmosphere. They have always been in earth's atmosphere in varying concentrations. Carbon dioxide is presently in such small trace amounts in the atmosphere (390 ppm) that the natural world is not far above the level causing carbon starvation. (Plant growth ceases at about 150 ppm. The ideal level for plants is probably at least 1,000 ppm. Humans breathe in 390 ppm of CO₂ and breathe out 40,000 ppm. Submariners live in air with 8,000 ppm CO₂).

There are many actual studies (not theoretical models) on the effect on plant life if carbon dioxide levels are increased. The report below lists 55 benefits of carbon dioxide.

There is no justification whatsoever to use carbon dioxide as a scapegoat to cripple carbon energy and provide crutches to support energy cripples like wind and solar power.

See: "The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO₂ Enrichment":

http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/other/55_benefits_of_co2_pamphlet.pdf

And: "Carbon Dioxide feeds the World":

<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/carbon-dioxide-feeds-the-world.pdf>

Is there Another Agenda for Emissions Targets?

The quotes below, attributed to some of the leaders of the anti-carbon crusade, suggest that carbon dioxide may just be a convenient excuse to serve a deeper agenda:

"Current lifestyles and consumption patterns of the affluent middle class - involving high meat intake, use of fossil fuels, appliances, air-conditioning, and suburban housing - are not sustainable."

- Maurice Strong, Rio Earth Summit

"My three main goals would be to reduce human population to about 100 million worldwide, destroy the industrial infrastructure and see wilderness, with its full complement of species, returning throughout the world."

- Dave Foreman, co-founder of Earth First!

The most dangerous feature of the global warming hysteria is the world-wide lurch back to the failed central planning and command policies of the Lenin, Stalin, Hitler and Mao era. And largely this new collectivism is led by the same people who promoted those failed policies using the same techniques of public propaganda and crisis mongering. The danger to world prosperity and peace is not global warming but global warming policies. A massive program of national and international taxes, subsidies, controls, commands, wealth redistribution, national plans, international plans and fake industries will undoubtedly destroy initiative, prosperity and individual freedom.

It is sad to see even Conservative western leaders falling for this new world collectivism on such a flimsy excuse. Unless rolled back it will create a new world as dreary as the old Eastern Europe, as unproductive as the old Soviet Empire and eventually as aggressive as the Nazis, the Fascists, the Red Guards and the Khmer Rouge of Pol Pot, most of whom advocated a return to nature.

Conclusions

- There is no evidence, no experimental data and therefore no proof that reducing carbon dioxide emissions will reduce global warming or extreme weather events.
- Neither current temperatures nor the content of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are unusual compared to past fluctuations. Nothing that New Zealand does will have any measurable effect on either of them.
- Past records of temperature and carbon dioxide prove that carbon dioxide is no more than a minor player in determining global climate. Ice core research and the proven behaviour of gases in the atmosphere and the oceans indicate that rising temperature causes an increase of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere, rather than the reverse.

- There has been no global warming since 1998 (13 years), and global cooling looks just as likely as global warming from here on. Prudent governments would assume that cooling is at least as likely as warming.
- Global cooling would cause far more pain to humans and the biosphere than global warming (especially to people in New Zealand who look over their back fence at frozen Antarctica).
- The claim that New Zealand's ruminants are continually adding to so-called greenhouse gases in the atmosphere is not worthy of rational people who should understand the carbon cycle. Cows and sheep merely recycle carbon dioxide from the atmosphere – they are as green as the grass and trees that also form part of the same carbon cycle. Domesticated ruminants should not be included in an emission calculation or rationing system.
- To achieve a 50% cut in 1990 emissions by 2050 is an impossible dream. To achieve it would require a massive and never-ending depression of living standards and a return to the failed central planning policies of the comrade societies. Promoters of "50 by 50" need to explain in detail how it will be achieved.
- In climate matters, humans must do what they have always done – prepare to adapt and recover from whatever surprises nature has in store.
- The world does have problems in places from real pollution of air and water, but this is not caused by carbon dioxide or methane. Pollution and protection of the natural environment is only acted on in rich societies. People who are starving and freezing will have no concern whatsoever about the environment – their concern is to scabble for food and fuel for themselves and their families. Any serious pursuit of "50 by 50" will reduce the prosperity of New Zealand and the world and thus do long term damage to the environment.

Recommendations

1. *The New Zealand Government should immediately abandon its emissions targets and shift its focus to sensible and achievable goals such as improving the ability of the community to cope with whatever climate changes, weather extremes or natural disasters that may occur. This requires a focus on improving infrastructure and emergency equipment and stopping the waste of community savings and resources on the climate change industry.*
2. *If however the draconian "50 by 50" target is adopted, New Zealand should also adopt a new national slogan:*

"Clean, Green and Barefoot in the Snow."

Submitted on behalf of the Carbon Sense Coalition by:
Viv Forbes
Chairman
28 February 2011

Disclosure: The above report was produced by Viv Forbes with assistance from several other members of the Carbon Sense Coalition. No one prompted or paid us to produce it. The Carbon Sense Coalition is based in Australia, which will benefit if the New Zealand government is silly enough to continue or expand its suicidal war on carbon.

Selected References

Steve Goreham, 2010, "Clmatism! Science, Common Sense and the 21st Century's Hottest Topic", New Lennox Books, USA. (An encyclopaedia of useful information on all aspects of the Global Warming/Green Energy scam. Worth having on every shelf.)

Vaclav Klaus, 2007, "Blue Planet in Green Shackles – What is Endangered: Climate or Freedom?" Competitive Enterprise Institute, Washington USA.

SPPI, 2011, "The Many Benefits of Atmospheric CO2 Enrichment":
http://scienceandpublicpolicy.org/images/stories/papers/other/55_benefits_of_co2_pamphlet.pdf

John Robertson, 2011, "Carbon Dioxide feeds the World":
<http://carbon-sense.com/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/carbon-dioxide-feeds-the-world.pdf>

Viv Forbes, 2010, "Coal, Combustion and the Grand Carbon Cycle":
<http://carbon-sense.com/2010/06/03/coal-combustion/>

The Carbon Sense Coalition is an Australian based organisation with members in many countries including New Zealand. The coalition opposes waste of resources, opposes pollution, and promotes the rational and sustainable use of carbon energy and carbon food.

Please spread "Carbon Sense" around.

For more information visit our web site at www.carbon-sense.com

Literary, financial or other contributions to help our cause are welcomed.

Chairman: Viv Forbes MS 23, Rosewood Qld 4340 Australia. info@carbon-sense.com