

# Does climate legislation have merit?

**Calvin Parker, Bakersfield Californian, 5-1-10**

Parker, a retired geologist, operated Parker Production Geology Services.

A recent rash of alarmist global warming opinions in The Bakersfield Californian generate more heat than light because one can argue warming or cooling depending on the time interval selected.

Recent NASA weather satellites and data compiled by the U.K. Hadley Center reveal that warming since 1975 has leveled off from the 1998 El Niño year. Global temperature has since dropped below the 30-year average in 2008 in spite of a CO<sub>2</sub> steady climb of 1.7 parts per million per year. Thus, the most recent Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change prediction of rapidly rising global temperatures has failed during the first decade of the 21st century.

This recent temperature decline facing CO<sub>2</sub> levels is not new over selected eras of the 20th century, too, and has been correctly documented by local climate "realists" in recent letters to The Californian by chemical engineer Thomas Creswell and geologist Phil Ryall. Phil Jones, the director at Hadley, was compelled to step down temporarily while superiors studied whether he had tried to conceal this recent divergent CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature trend from the general public ("Climate-Gate" scandal). But, he has now admitted to its validity.

Depending on the context, climate alarmists, aka anthropogenic (man-made) global warming (AGW), could be corrected about the overall warming trend as Earth has recovered from the "little ice age" 250 years ago (before SUVs), but they're wrong about AGW being the reason.

Carbon dioxide is odorless, colorless and tasteless, so it's pointless to regulate it or tax it. CO<sub>2</sub> is essential for all life and is beneficial to our valley farmers because it helps crops grow better in dry climates. The notion the CO<sub>2</sub> whether natural (95 percent) or man-made (5 percent), drives climate is bogus because of CO<sub>2</sub> thermodynamics: CO<sub>2</sub> cannot absorb unlimited amounts of infrared radiation. It only absorbs heat along limited bandwidths and is already near maximum absorption levels.

This is the reason why there's no direct or close correlation with CO<sub>2</sub> and temperature over time. This lack of correlation disproves any current causation. A good example is the worldwide 30 percent decline of man-made CO<sub>2</sub> emissions during the Great Depression years 1929-33 (an economic CO<sub>2</sub> sequestration) which had no effect on the dramatic rate of temperature rise.

Opinions in The Californian about the co-called "greenhouse effect" have no validity because in a real greenhouse there is no heat transfer from the cold panes to the inside of the greenhouse. The glass enclosure isolates the greenhouse from the outside surrounding and prevents heat loss by natural convection. The atmosphere's CO<sub>2</sub> content at current levels has no significant effect on the natural convection process in the atmosphere. The heating effect in a greenhouse has nothing to do with the IR (infrared) absorption of the glass enclosure.

And yet, a Forum-page opinion in The Californian incorrectly assumed that IR emitted at the Earth's surface and absorbed by atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub> could be redirected downward to "heat" the Earth. That is utter nonsense. First, Earth's infrared (heat) energy so absorbed by "greenhouse" gases is re-radiated to outer space as soon as it is absorbed.

Also, the notion that colder air above can heat the warmer atmosphere below is a direct violation of the 2nd Law of Thermodynamics, which stipulated that in the absence of external work, heat flows from a higher temperature to a lower temperature, never the reverse (a cold body cannot heat a warm body without compensation).

The best explanation for global warming and cooling is natural variability of multiple climate drivers both around the Earth and outside the Earth. I don't deny the kinetic energy generated by molecule absorption, but I object to the manner it is applied by AGWs.

I conclude the so-called "greenhouse theory" leading to AGW is the greatest scientific hoax of all time. This is a scare tactic for "cap and trade" legislation, which will raise our living costs and taxes for no good reason.

Nonscientists wanting more details on the above science would benefit from a 2009 short book, "Fire, Ice and Paradise," by H. Leighton Steward. He is a former Shell Oil geologist, author of a New York Times best-seller and is current chairman of the Plants Need CO<sub>2</sub> Foundation.