

## More on Global Warming.....

As a follow-up to my recent spiel on this matter, I offer up the following cites, quotes, and figures...

"[According to UN data](#), deforestation accounts for around 25 percent of man-made emissions of carbon dioxide..... The destruction of world forests releases about two billion tonnes of carbon per year, most the loses coming in the tropical forests of Asia, South America, and Africa. "

"At 6 billion tons, [humans are then responsible for a comparatively small amount](#) - less than 5 percent - of atmospheric carbon dioxide," he said. "

"[In the report](#), the IPCC wrote that some 90 billion tons of carbon as carbon dioxide annually circulate between the earth's ocean and the atmosphere, and another 60 billion tons exchange between the vegetation and the atmosphere."

"Anyone who honestly examines global energy trends must reach these harsh conclusions. In 2004, [world emissions of carbon dioxide](#) (CO<sub>2</sub>, the main greenhouse gas) totaled 26 billion metric tons.....The IEA expects China to pass the United States as the largest source of carbon dioxide by 2009. "

"[Carbon dioxide is released in large quantities from natural processes](#), notably respiration by living organisms. Releases from respiration are balanced by a similar quantity taken up by photosynthesis. Other natural sources of carbon dioxide include volcanoes, forest fires and evaporation from seawater. Man-made releases of carbon dioxide are much smaller, accounting for about 4% of the total CO<sub>2</sub> currently being released to the atmosphere, and include burning fossil fuels (coal, oil and natural gas) and other fuels containing carbon (e.g. wood) mainly for power generation and transport."

"[NOAA research](#) estimates that 97% of atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> created each year is from natural sources and approximately 3% is from human activities."

Now here's the problem - isn't it obvious that we've got some pretty wild variations in the numbers? Humans create 3% of the CO<sub>2</sub>. Or is it 4%. Or 5%? Or, if you believe the "26 billion ton" number for us, its what - 20% or more? As for raw figures, is it 2 billion tons? 4? 6? Or 26?

That's a hell of a range, don't you think?

When alleged "scientists" cite numbers that vary by a factor of more than 10:1 (and if you look further you'll find even WIDER variation) you one thing is clear immediately - they're not reporting measurements. They are taking what is commonly called a "WAG" (I'm sure you can figure out what those letters stand for!)

Now try to figure out how much CO<sub>2</sub> is released by natural sources. Good luck. You get a similarly wild range of values.

Note that none - and I do mean none - of these numbers have uncertainties attached to them.

That's likely because the uncertainties are wildly larger than the measurements, and were they to be reported nobody would take their "figures" seriously!

What's worse is that CO2 in the form of carbonate and bicarbonate ions in the earth's oceans [absolutely dwarf atmospheric CO2](#). Indeed, were it all to be released it would weigh *40 times as much as the rest of the atmosphere does!* To put this in perspective, this means that there is an amount of CO2 "bound" in the oceans that is some ***one hundred and twenty thousand times that in the atmosphere.***

Then there are those who believe that CO2 levels in the atmosphere are a *indicator* of global temperature. This, by the way, is not a "nuts" viewpoint, particularly when you look at oceanic heat content. See, chemical reactions and equilibrium levels are strongly correlated with temperature. With a reservoir of *one hundred and twenty thousand times* the atmosphere in the earth's oceans, and with *known* chemical reactions that buffer atmospheric CO2 levels (after all, the earth's surface IS 70% water) it is not unreasonable to believe that in fact atmospheric CO2 levels may be a **result** rather than a **cause** of global temperatures!

Fact is that we don't even have *the basic data necessary to draw conclusions* at this point. We can't even point with any reasonable scientific certainty to whether atmospheric CO2 levels are *a cause or an effect* of global temperatures!

I've seen *nothing* among the global-warming-is-manmade crowd that accounts for the oceanic buffering of CO2 content in the atmosphere - yet these chemical reactions are a known fact.

Finally, even if we **are** the source of a significant part of the reason for warming, what do you think we're going to be able to do about it given that China will surpass the United States as a CO2 emitter within the next two years.

It is essentially certain that if we demand that they stop **their** economic growth in order to "address" this issue we will either be ignored entirely or, far more likely, they will reply "NUTS!"

Then what?

Before we begin to make public policy - decisions that may impact our global competitiveness, economic growth and ultimately the future of our nation don't you think we should have answers to these questions?

I do.

Labels: [climate change](#), [co2](#), [global warming](#)

Posted by Karl Denninger at 21:54