

‘SCIENTIFIC CHICANERY’ ignoring the physics of CO₂ and demonizing it as carbon pollution with mangled definitions of science terms explains the fake climate crisis.


CO₂ and Global Warming: I’m still not convinced.

[Jiggerj](#) [Uncategorized](#) February 15, 2021 2 Minutes

Every time I get curious about how CO₂ is impacting the Earth’s climate, it seems I always find articles that agree upon one thing: The amount of carbon dioxide in the air is 0.04%.

Now, you have to understand just what that number means. If we were to add 0.96 percent to the 0.04 it would total just one percent of a hundred percent. The graph below represents the atmosphere. There are one-hundred squares, so each square represents 1% of the whole. That little black line in the bottom right square is the amount of CO₂ in the air. And, that teeny-tiny amount of carbon dioxide is keeping the Earth’s excess heat from seeping out into space? Hey, I’m no climatologist, but this surely offends my common sense.

The Atmosphere 100%



This is 0.04% CO₂

If we were to turn this graph into a grate that covers a heating duct, and then have experts claim that the little black line is causing your house to heat up more than usual (into dangerous levels), you'd call him crazy (wouldn't you?).

This article <https://www.sciencealert.com/co2-is-only-a-tiny-part-of-our-atmosphere-but-it-has-a-huge-influence->

[here-s-why](#) states that “Scientists widely agree that Earth’s average surface temperature [has already increased by about 2 F](#) (1 C) since the 1880s...” Two degrees? In 140 years of the most industrial time of smoke stacks and cars with zero emissions controls? Again, I’m no expert, but I find a 2 degree increase over that time period to be rather remarkable. It proves that our planet knows how to take care of itself quite well.

What I find most odd is the fact that it is well known that plant life NEEDS carbon dioxide in the air — it’s the stuff that forests grow on. So, the question that we and our scientists should be asking is, What would happen to all of Earth’s vegetation if we accidentally decreased the CO₂ levels to zero, or close to zero? Would plant life diminish? Completely die off? Now, THAT’S a scary thought.

What’s missing in this whole climate change debate is the answer to how massive amounts of ice has been melting for the last 2.6 million years without any human interference, and how that particular process is separate from what we’re seeing now? How does a few hundred years of human industrialization get blamed for a process that started even before homo erectus evolved into homo sapiens?



The Pleistocene Epoch is typically defined as the time period that began about **2.6 million years** ago and lasted until **about 11,700 years** ago. The most recent Ice Age occurred then, as glaciers covered huge parts of the planet Earth. Aug 29, 2017

www.livescience.com > 40311-pleistocene-epoch

Pleistocene Epoch: Facts About the Last Ice Age | Live Science

I know I'm wrong, but after hearing the numbers involved, what I would expect the scientific community to be shouting is:



Share this:

<https://jiggerj.com/2021/02/15/co2-and-global-warming-im-still-not-convinced/>

“Doublespeak used to deceive usually through concealment or mispresenting truth. Often attributed to George Orwell’s 1984. newspeak” is language



When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean, neither more nor less.

William Lutz

- “While it is true that politicians can use any word they want, we reply that language works only when those using it agree on what the words mean, and that the meaning of words cannot be unilaterally changed by someone without the agreement of others.”
- *What is Lutz saying in this quote?*

ABSTRACT

Lutz is saying in effect the **tricky** new definitions of the key science terms in the climate debate are unilaterally amended in favour of the alarmist side of the debate are wrong. These definitions lose their common sense meaning like saying that *war is peace*. Calling CO2 carbon is like saying white is black. Calling global warming only human caused warming from CO2 is using the key unfounded research question as the answer. Calling CO2 carbon pollution is a big lie.

Definition are revised to take away any debate and deceive the public as they have done. You want to debate is the climate changing and you go to the certainty of the dictionary with a one sided answer. The dictionary answers are not based on the observed science and data from

the real world. Amending definitions to remove debate is a sly and invidious tactic as a way of duping the public.

A Tweeter discussion this week asked why such public support for global warming without research showing a “discernible human influence.”

Given that there is no empirical evidence that more CO₂ causes ‘global warming’, i.e. there is no published paper in the literature which quantifies a tropospheric warming and then attributes any of that warming to increasing atmospheric CO₂ why then do so many people believe it?

1000Frolly

The best answer is simply that the public are told ‘CO₂’ is ‘carbon’ which is pollution.

I submit key terms are mis defined and misrepresented to demonize otherwise wholly beneficial CO₂ as pollution for increased public support.

Alarmist politicians with media support are mangling key science terms unilaterally to conceal or misrepresent the truth by inserting the unfounded hypothesis of human caused climate effects into the definitions and by distorting meanings of CO₂ to wrongly conflate it with carbon pollution.

Here are the examples of unilateral distortion of the meaning of terms.

The climate debate is distorted with DOUBLESPEAK about the key terms defining the science of climate change, carbon dioxide and global warming.

WORDS MATTER. I submit the public are deceived with a misuse of words about CO₂ intended to hide the truth that CO₂ is invisible trace gas that is not pollution. Calling carbon dioxide carbon is a deceit. Carbon is not carbon dioxide. It is -

car·bon

/ˈkɑːbən/

the chemical element of atomic number 6, a nonmetal which has two main forms (diamond and graphite) and which also occurs in impure form in charcoal, soot, and coal.





OXFORD LANGUAGES

History and Etymology for *carbon*

French *carbone*, from Latin *carbon-*, *carbo* ember, charcoal

In addition, the solid form of CO₂ is dry ice not carbon. There are no carbon emissions in the atmosphere. You cannot leave a ‘carbon dioxide black footprint because CO₂ is colorless.’

It is impossible to achieve the ‘carbon neutral’ climate goal.

The solid form of carbon dioxide is dry ice not carbon.

DRY ICE
IS ACTUALLY
SOLID CARBON DIOXIDE
AT A TEMPERATURE OF

-79 °C



The evidence is overwhelming that politicians and media falsely equate carbon dioxide with carbon. Here are recent examples –

History and Etymology for *carbon*

French *carbone*, from Latin *carbon-*, *carbo* ember, charcoal

Recent Examples on the Web

With several major initiatives, Massachusetts has ramped up its efforts to curb climate change and now leads the nation in its commitments to reduce *carbon* emissions.— [David Abel, *BostonGlobe.com*, "Massachusetts takes major steps in fight against climate change," 4 Jan. 2021](#)

Biden's climate change plan, which has essentially embraced the framework of the Green New Deal, aims to end *carbon* emissions from power plants by 2035 with a broad investment in jobs and infrastructure.— [Natalie Gontcharova, *refinery29.com*, "A Practical Guide To Making Change In 2021," 4 Jan. 2021](#)

The long-term outlook for natural gas isn't good in California, which wants to eliminate most *carbon* emissions by 2045.— Anne C. Mulkern, *Scientific American*, "California Is Closing the Door to Gas in New Homes," 4 Jan. 2021

At the same time, Chavez said, the river's challenges point to the urgent need for solutions in addressing *carbon* emissions, both at the federal level and the local level.— Ian James, *AZCentral.com*, "Climate's toll on the Colorado River: 'We can weather maybe a couple of years'," 1 Jan. 2021

According to the United Nations Environment Programme, the fashion industry is responsible for more *carbon* emissions than all international flights and maritime shipping combined.— San Francisco Chronicle, "Neutral Ground is on a mission to make vintage modern — and more inclusive," 1 Jan. 2021

Climate change is a global problem, and the U.S. now contributes roughly 15 percent of *carbon* emissions, the second most of any country on the planet after China.— Kate Aronoff, *The New Republic*, "How to Make the Paris Agreement Really Work," 29 Dec. 2020

That means the country's ability to challenge China's actions in Hong Kong, against the Uighurs, or in the South China Sea could be stymied by negotiations with China over *carbon* emissions.— Jerry Dunleavy, *Washington Examiner*, "Biden says building coalitions key to confronting China's 'abuses'," 28 Dec. 2020

Under the process, *carbon* emissions produced by power plants and other heavy industry are contained and injected deep into the ground where saline rock formations can store the gas for centuries.— Ledyard King, *USA TODAY*, "'The most significant climate legislation ever': How stimulus bill tackles warming planet," 28 Dec. 2020

<https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/carbon>

Climate change includes both the **global warming** driven by human emissions of greenhouse gases, and the resulting large-

scale shifts in weather patterns. Though there have been [previous periods of climatic change](#), since the mid-20th century, humans have had unprecedented impact on Earth's climate system and caused change on a global scale.^[2]

Climate change - Wikipedia

Definition of Carbon Emission

Carbon emission is the release of carbon into the atmosphere. To talk about carbon emissions is simply to talk of greenhouse gas emissions; the main contributors to climate change.

<http://www.ecolife.com/define/carbon-emission.html>

Carbon footprint

A carbon footprint is a calculation of the total amount of greenhouse gases you produce in a given time frame (usually over the course of the year) expressed in the equivalent tons of carbon dioxide (CO₂)

<http://www.ecolife.com/define/carbon-footprint.html>



Definition of Carbon Neutral

What Is Carbon Neutral?

The term carbon neutral refers to a zero sum calculation of carbon emissions for any process, product, business, system, person, or even country. In other words, something that is carbon neutral, also referred to as having a net zero carbon footprint or climate neutral, offsets as many carbon emissions as it emits. Carbon neutrality doesn't refer only to carbon dioxide emissions but to any greenhouse gas emission that contributes to global warming, usually measured in carbon dioxide equivalence.

<http://www.ecolife.com/define/carbon-neutral.html>

Carbon pollution

Is carbon a pollutant?


Though many living things emit **carbon** dioxide when they breathe, the gas is widely considered to be a **pollutant** when associated with cars, planes, power plants, and other human activities that involve the burning of fossil fuels such as gasoline and natural gas. Feb 4, 2019

Air pollution, facts and information - National Geographic



This photo is a lie as CO₂ is colorless and invisible but it grabs public concern.

BUT CO₂ is the clean non pollutant air we all exhale that is the excelsior of plant life.



"CO2 for different people has different attractions. After all, what is it? - it's not a pollutant, it's a product of every living creature's breathing, it's the product of all plant respiration, it is essential for plant life and photosynthesis, it's a product of all industrial burning, it's a product of driving – I mean, if you ever wanted a leverage point to control everything from exhalation to driving, this would be a dream. So it has a kind of fundamental attractiveness to bureaucratic mentality."

- Richard S. Lindzen, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus of Atmospheric Science, MIT

"CO2 is not a pollutant. In simple terms, CO2 is plant food. The green world we see around us would disappear if not for atmospheric CO2. These plants largely evolved at a time when the atmospheric CO2 concentration was many times what it is today. Indeed, numerous studies indicate the present biosphere is being invigorated by the human-induced rise of CO2. In and of itself, therefore, the increasing concentration of CO2 does not pose a toxic risk to the planet."

- John R. Christy, Ph.D. Professor of Atmospheric Sciences, University of Alabama

"Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant but a naturally occurring, beneficial trace gas in the atmosphere. For the past few million years, the Earth has existed in a state of relative carbon dioxide starvation compared with earlier periods. There is no empirical evidence that levels double or even triple those of today will be harmful, climatically or otherwise. As a vital element in plant photosynthesis, carbon dioxide is the basis of the planetary food chain - literally the staff of life. Its increase in the atmosphere leads mainly to

the greening of the planet. To label carbon dioxide a "pollutant" is an abuse of language, logic and science."

- Robert M. Carter, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus of Environmental and Earth Sciences, James Cook University

"Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. On the contrary, it makes crops and forests grow faster. Economic analysis has demonstrated that more CO₂ and a warmer climate will raise GNP and therefore average income. It's axiomatic that bureaucracies always want to expand their scope of operations. This is especially true of EPA, which is primarily a regulatory agency. As air and water pollution disappear as prime issues, as acid rain and stratospheric-ozone depletion fade from public view, climate change seems like the best growth area for regulators. It has the additional glamour of being international and therefore appeals to those who favor world governance over national sovereignty. Therefore, labeling carbon dioxide, the product of fossil-fuel burning, as a pollutant has a high priority for EPA as a first step in that direction."

- S. Fred Singer, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus of Environmental Sciences, University of Virginia

"To state in public that carbon dioxide is a pollutant is a public advertisement of a lack of basic school child science. Pollution kills, carbon dioxide leads to the thriving of life on Earth and increased biodiversity. Carbon dioxide is actually plant food."

- Ian R. Plimer, Ph.D. Professor Emeritus of Earth Sciences, University of Melbourne

"Carbon and CO₂ (carbon dioxide) are fundamental for all life on Earth. CO₂ is a colorless, odorless, non-toxic gas. CO₂ is product of our breathing, and is used in numerous common applications like fire extinguishers, baking soda, carbonated

drinks, life jackets, cooling agent, etc. Plants' photosynthesis consume CO₂ from the air when the plants make their carbohydrates, which bring the CO₂ back to the air again when the plants rot or are being burned."

- Tom V. Segalstad, Ph.D. Professor of Environmental Geology, University of Oslo

"To suddenly label CO₂ as a "pollutant" is a disservice to a gas that has played an enormous role in the development and sustainability of all life on this wonderful Earth. Mother Earth has clearly ruled that CO₂ is not a pollutant."

- Robert C. Balling Jr., Ph.D. Professor of Climatology, Arizona State University

"CO₂ is not a pollutant as Gore infers. It is, in fact essential to life on the planet. Without it there are no plants, therefore no oxygen and no life. At 385 ppm current levels the plants are undernourished. The geologic evidence shows an average level of 1000 ppm over 600 million years. Research shows plants function most efficiently at 1000-2000 ppm.

Commercial greenhouses use the information and are pumping CO₂ to these levels and achieve four times the yield with reduced water use. At 200 ppm, the plants suffer seriously and at 150 ppm, they begin to die. So if Gore achieves his goal of reducing CO₂ he will destroy the planet."

- Tim F. Ball, Ph.D. Climatology

"Many chemicals are absolutely necessary for humans to live, for instance oxygen. Just as necessary, human metabolism produces by-products that are exhaled, like carbon dioxide and water vapor. So, the production of carbon dioxide is necessary, on the most basic level, for humans to survive. The carbon dioxide that is emitted as part of a wide variety of natural processes is, in turn, necessary for vegetation to live. It turns out that most vegetation is

somewhat 'starved' for carbon dioxide, as experiments have shown that a wide variety of plants grow faster, and are more drought tolerant, in the presence of doubled carbon dioxide concentrations. Fertilization of the global atmosphere with the extra CO₂ that mankind's activities have emitted in the last century is believed to have helped increase agricultural productivity. In short, carbon dioxide is a natural part of our environment, necessary for life, both as 'food' and as a by-product."

- Roy Spencer, Ph.D. Meteorology, Former Senior Scientist for Climate Studies, NASA

"I am at a loss to understand why anyone would regard carbon dioxide as a pollutant. Carbon dioxide, a natural gas produced by human respiration, is a plant nutrient that is beneficial both for people and for the natural environment. It promotes plant growth and reforestation. Faster-growing trees mean lower housing costs for consumers and more habitat for wild species. Higher agricultural yields from carbon dioxide fertilization will result in lower food prices and will facilitate conservation by limiting the need to convert wild areas to arable land."

- David Deming, Ph.D. Professor of Geology and Geophysics, University of Oklahoma

"Carbon dioxide is not a pollutant. It is a colorless, odorless trace gas that actually sustains life on this planet. Consider the simple dynamics of human energy acquisition, which occurs daily across the globe. We eat plants directly, or we consume animals that have fed upon plants, to obtain the energy we need. But where do plants get their energy? Plants produce their own energy during a process called photosynthesis, which uses sunlight to combine water and carbon dioxide into sugars for supporting overall growth and development. Hence, CO₂ is the primary raw material that

plants depend upon for their existence. Because plants reside beneath animals (including humans) on the food chain, their healthy existence ultimately determines our own. Carbon dioxide can hardly be labeled a pollutant, for it is the basic substrate that allows life to persist on Earth."

- Keith E. Idso, Ph.D. Botany

"To classify carbon dioxide as a pollutant is thus nothing short of scientific chicanery, for reasons that have nothing to do with science, but based purely on the pseudo-science so eagerly practiced by academia across the world in order to keep their funding sources open to the governmental decrees, which are in turn based on totally false IPCC dogma (yes, dogma - not science)."

- Hans Schreuder, Analytical Chemist


"Atmospheric CO₂ is required for life by both plants and animals. It is the sole source of carbon in all of the protein, carbohydrate, fat, and other organic molecules of which living things are constructed. Plants extract carbon from atmospheric CO₂ and are thereby fertilized. Animals obtain their carbon from plants. Without atmospheric CO₂, none of the life we see on Earth would exist. Water, oxygen, and carbon dioxide are the three most important substances that make life possible. They are surely not environmental pollutants."

- Arthur B. Robinson, Ph.D. Professor of Chemistry


Mangling the definitions of CO₂ as pollution is not justified because some human sources, not breathing, come from burning fossil fuels where other gases like Nitrogen do cause pollution. However, the major sources of CO₂ do not come from burning that creates collateral pollutant.

Some companies like the National Geographic admit CO2 is the invisible air you exhale, but justify their perverted definition because CO2 escapes when fossil fuels burn causing pollution from the Nitrogen and Sulphur and this justifies demonizing all CO2 as pollution. WHAT DISTORTED NONSENSE.

Fossil fuel emissions of CO2 are less than 3% of natural so this is no justification to condemn the other 97%! It is a terrible case of the tail wagging the dog.




97. Oceans and land ecosystems thus serve as both sources and sinks for carbon.



Forest, aesthetic, rot, decay, nature, dead, dead wood, tree, landscape, branches, wood

Evidence that Oceans not Man control CO2 emissions



All the highest concentrations are downwind of warm water.

The Mediterranean gets very warm in summer so you can see the plume across the Middle East.

Australia gets CO₂ from the ocean between it and South Africa.

South America gets CO₂ from the Pacific upwind.

Western USA from the Pacific, upwind.

Southern Asia gets CO₂ from the Indian Ocean, upwind.

There is a plume of CO₂ downwind of the warm Gulf of Mexico.
and so on.

There is little or no significant excess CO₂ above or downwind of major population centres such as Western Europe or the North Eastern USA.

<https://www.newclimatemodel.com/evidence-that-oceans-not-man-control-co2-emissions/>

THE HOCKEY SHTICK

If you can't explain the 'pause', you can't explain the cause...

Monday, September 16, 2013

New paper finds the oceans are a net source of CO₂ to the atmosphere

A new paper published in *Global Biogeochemical Cycles* proposes large revisions to the ocean carbon cycle based upon observations and models, finding the global oceans act as a net source of CO₂ to the atmosphere.

According to the authors, the flow ["flux"] of carbon from deep ocean layers ["obduction"] to the middle layer ["ML"] is 3-5 times greater than assumed previously and by the IPCC. The authors find middle-layer carbon flux toward the ocean surface exceeds flux to the ocean depths ["subduction"] by **11** Petagrams of carbon per year, which by comparison is significantly more carbon than generated by all man-made activities [8.8 Petagrams of

carbon per year].

In other words, the deep oceans naturally contribute more carbon to the middle ocean layers [between 25-150 meters deep] than produced by all of man's activities combined.

At the ocean surface, the authors find the oceans contribute 2.4 Petagrams of carbon per year to the atmosphere ["efflux"] and absorb 1.9 Petagrams of carbon per year from the atmosphere ["influx"], and thus, the oceans act as a net source of .5 Petagrams of carbon per year to the atmosphere.

The authors find the tropical and Southern oceans act as net sources of CO₂, while the temperate NH & SH and high latitude oceans act as net sinks [see figure 5 below] and "Our results emphasize the strong sensitivity of the oceanic carbon cycle to changes in mixed-layer depth, ocean currents and wind," i.e. factors not incorporated in IPCC carbon cycle models.

The paper illustrates that IPCC carbon cycle assumptions may be highly erroneous by a factor of up to five times, how little is actually known with confidence about the global carbon cycle, and suggests that ocean outgassing is the primary reason for the increase of atmospheric CO₂ levels, rather than mankind.

<http://hockeyschtick.blogspot.com/2013/09/new-paper-finds-oceans-are-net-source.html>

The forest decay and ocean outgassing are major sources of CO₂ without any connection to pollution making the deliberate lies used broady a blotch on the intergrity of our civilization.

You may say well the lie is a means to a good end i.e. arresting air pollution. But the lie also arrests buring coal to save lives health in developing nations where the WHO says > 4 million die annually from

air pollution at home from the ill effects of cooking and living in the dark off the grid. Coal is the only reasonable cheap and effective energy path to light.



<https://www.quora.com/Why-do-you-think-the-poor-will-suffer-the-most-due-to-climate-change/answers/246273749>

ADVANCED ENERGY FOR LIFE

Coal is Essential for World Economic Growth and to Alleviate Energy Poverty

- See more at: <https://www.advancedenergyforlife.com/article/coal-essential-world-economic-growth-and-alleviate-energy-poverty#sthash.KTUY8JGR.dp>

Dr. Roger H. Bezdek
Energy Economist and President of MISI

If you could pick just one thing to reduce poverty, by far you would pick energy, business magnate and philanthropist Bill Gates has said. And few could find reason to disagree. I submit only coal can provide the large amount of affordable, reliable energy the world needs for economic growth to reduce energy poverty and to achieve the U.N. development goals. A recent report by the Australia Institute takes issue with this simple concept and that's why the report is seriously flawed..

. Dr. Bezdek is an internationally recognized energy economist and President of MISI, in Washington D.C. He has 30 years' experience in research and management in the energy, utility, environmental, and regulatory areas, serving in private industry, academia, and the federal government. He has served as Senior Adviser in the U.S. Treasury Department, as U.S. energy delegate to the EU and NATO, and as a consultant to the White House, federal and state government agencies, and numerous corporations and research organizations. His most recent book is The Impending World Energy Mess.

- <https://www.advancedenergyforlife.com/article/coal-essential-world-economic-growth-and-alleviate-energy-poverty>



Wiki Commons photo

October 25, 2018

4

From Merriam-Webster:

Carbon dioxide. A heavy colorless gas CO_2 that does not support combustion, dissolves in water to form carbonic acid, is formed especially in animal respiration and in the decay or combustion of animal and vegetable matter, is absorbed from the air by plants in photosynthesis, and is used in the carbonation of beverages.

Carbon. A nonmetallic chiefly tetravalent element found native (as in diamond and graphite) or as a constituent of coal, petroleum, and asphalt, of limestone and other carbonates, and of organic compounds or obtained artificially in varying degrees of purity especially as carbon black, lampblack, activated carbon, charcoal, and coke.

It should be pretty clear carbon dioxide (CO_2) and carbon aren't the same things. CO_2 is a colorless and odorless gas emitted when all animals exhale, and it's given off when formerly living things — plants and animals — decay. Not mentioned by Merriam-Webster is that it's also generated when these formerly living things, even after millions of years — as with the case of coal and oil — are burned. Also not mentioned by the online dictionary is the fact carbon dioxide, in addition to its role in photosynthesis, is what is called a "greenhouse gas." That is, in conjunction with other gases, water vapor being the most dominant, acts as a blanket that keeps heat from escaping the

atmosphere and prevents the planet from freezing over. Carbon dioxide is essential for sustaining life.

Carbon, on the other hand, is a solid. It's present in all living things and things that were once living. As noted, when these once-living things that contain carbon are burned, the carbon combines with oxygen to form carbon dioxide and is emitted into the atmosphere along with the CO₂ that we exhale or that comes from decaying plant life. So, while it is one of the elements that goes into forming carbon dioxide, it's no more the same as carbon dioxide than hydrogen or oxygen is the same as water. Water being two parts hydrogen (H₂) and one part oxygen (O).

So, why, in nearly all discussions of global warming, is the word "carbon" freely substituted for "carbon dioxide?"

"Carbon emissions," "carbon taxes," "carbon footprint," and "cost of carbon" all use the word carbon, when actually what's being referred to is carbon dioxide. Carbon can't logically be a substitute expression for carbon dioxide any more than hydrogen or oxygen can be a substitute expression for water. In the latter case, everyone would realize such a substitution would be silly and just bad science.

And yet, when it comes to talking about carbon dioxide and carbon, the switch in terminology is made seamlessly and really without notice. In fact, it's so common to refer to CO₂ as carbon that it is done regularly by people on all sides of the global warming debate and even by government agencies, as with the expression "cost of carbon" used to describe the EPA's estimate of how much emissions of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are estimated to cost society.

My speculation is the transformation of the legitimate and accurate “carbon dioxide” into the false and inaccurate “carbon” has been part of an effort, in this case, a quite successful one, to obfuscate what is really talked about. It is a tool of propaganda. Note that this has also been done with the substitution of “climate change” for “global warming,” despite the fact what’s referenced is the warming of the planet, not any general change in climate that occurs all the time.

The word carbon conjures up images, captured in Merriam-Webster’s definition, completely unrelated to carbon dioxide. In most people’s minds, carbon is associated with everything that is black and dirty — coal, charcoal, asphalt, carbon black, etc. Of course, none of these describe CO₂, which is a colorless and odorless gas. If one wants the vision of black soot being emitted from power plant smokestacks and automobile tailpipes, then CO₂ emissions will just not work. But, of course, that’s exactly what carbon emissions would look like. And it would hardly make sense to talk about colorless, odorless, and harmless CO₂ emissions as contributing to “dirty air,” which is done regularly. But carbon? Now that’s something quite different. It’s black, it’s “sooty,” and if it were being emitted into the air as a result of heating our homes or driving our cars, it would make the air “dirty” by any standard.

In discussions of global warming, we need to take back the language for sound science. Intentionally or not, it’s deceptive and misleading to refer to carbon dioxide as carbon. As noted, this is not just because they are, in fact, not the same thing but because they bring to mind two very different notions. The use of the word

carbon allows special interest groups to transform the simple science into a tool of propaganda. Honest protagonists on either side of the global warming debate, particularly those who actually care about scientific accuracy, should make a concerted effort to reject substituting the word carbon for carbon dioxide. They should not only stop making the switch themselves but begin calling out others who continue the charade.

Roy Cordato is senior economist and resident scholar at the John Locke Foundation.

Ref. [Caring about sound science: Carbon is not carbon dioxide - Carolina Journal](#)

The fallacy of seeing CO2 as pollution is championed today by leaders who use this blatant falsehood to justify carbon taxes.

Trudeau defends 'price on pollution' in anti-carbon-tax heartland

The prime minister acknowledged it's a concern "many people have" but argued the policy is necessary because major carbon polluters in this country face no consequences.



Prime Minister Justin Trudeau addresses a town hall meeting in Saskatoon, Sask. (Jonathan Hayward/Canadian Press)

"The idea of putting a cost, a price on pollution is not just to bring in money ... It's actually to encourage someone to say, 'Well it won't cost me as much if I only pollute half as much.'"

That answer provided some insight into the Liberal government's new messaging strategy on its climate plan, which demands every province in the country put some sort of price on carbon to help offset greenhouse gas emissions.

A Liberal MP, speaking to CBC News after the caucus retreat, confirmed there's a concerted effort being made now to brand the tax as a "price on pollution." The idea is to convince voters that the tax is not a revenue grab but an attempt to drive down pollution levels by discouraging carbon emissions. Liberal MPs discussed at the caucus retreat how best to sell the pollution plan to voters weary of any additional costs.

"Because who really likes pollution?" the MP said.

<https://www.cbc.ca/news/politics/trudeau-price-on-carbon-saskatchewan-1.4823098>

[Trudeau's carbon tax is government science by political advantage.]

Likewise former US President Barack Obama often pushed his climate agenda with the false claim that carbon dioxide is a pollutant. Why not lie if you think the end justifies the means and anti pollution sells much better than the truth.



WASHINGTON: Setting up an ambitious target to cut pollution emissions from the coal-fired power plants, US President Barack Obama has announced that by 2030 carbon pollution from American power plants will be reduced by 32 per cent, I ..

Read more at:

US targets 32 per cent reduction in carbon pollution from power plants by 2030

"And these advances have grown our economy, they've created new jobs, they can't be shipped overseas -- and, by the way, they've also helped drive our carbon pollution to its lowest levels in nearly 20 years. Since 2006, no country on Earth has reduced its total carbon pollution by as much as the United States of America. (Applause.)"

The carbon pollution lie makes every person alive a carbon polluter.

How could there be a footprint when CO₂ is the air you exhale with every breath at 35,000 ppm.

If CO₂ had a footprint think of the tragedy when doctors infuse large amounts of this life giving gas for premature babies in incubators? Or when surgeons add the gas during operations to improve the chances of success. Or when fire fighters use CO₂ extinguishers to put out fires.

There is much harm in the false notion that reducing your carbon foot print is reducing pollution. In fact reducing Co₂ emissions will be very detrimental to life of earth. Co₂ is non-toxic even at 4000 ppm for submarines for 7 24.

- What is at stake with reducing Co₂ emissions?
- We need much more as the earth is starved based on past experience.
- We lose increased plant and forest life from photosynthesis as Co₂ is essential.
- We lose greening the deserts and more water retention.

- We lose carbonization of real greenhouses at > 2000 ppm making plants grow bigger and faster.
 - [CO2 and You: The Benefits of Adding Carbon Dioxide To Your Grow](#)



CO2 and You: The Benefits of Adding Carbon Dioxide To Your Grow

This entry was posted on May 17, 2018 by Devin Martinez.

Why use Co2 in my grow?

There are two main benefits to using Co2 in your indoor garden that I found: greater yield and faster growing. To explain further, plants have a certain amount of moisture and energy in their leaves at all times, and Co2 aids in bringing out that energy to

help your plants thrive. By unlocking that stored energy, most growers agree that you will get about 20-30% more yield with an increased growing speed of at least 15%.

What is Carbon Dioxide (CO₂)?

Plants breathe differently than humans and other animals. While animals breathe in O₂ and breathe out carbon dioxide (CO₂) plants do the reverse. This is one of the most important factors why plant life is an essential part of Earth's ecosystem. Without greens, CO₂ levels would reach suffocating levels in an extremely short while. CO₂ is used by plants for growth, because it's essential for photosynthesis, alongside light and water. Even though the current CO₂ levels in the atmosphere is about 350 PPM, it seems that plants have maintained their ability to consume up to 1500 PPM of CO₂, as they did eons ago. Knowing this is extremely important because the assertion that plant growth could be sped up by increasing the CO₂ intake is true.

[Why use Co2 in my grow?](#)

We lose CO₂ fire fighting machines.

- Co₂ is often the used in fire extinguishers to put out fires.



- We lose life saving medical use in premie incubators and Co2 for surgery at 20,000 ppm.
- Medical Carbon dioxide

Carbon dioxide is used as an insufflation gas and as a cryotherapy agent.

Carbon dioxide is commonly used as an insufflation gas for minimal invasive surgery (laparoscopy, endoscopy, and

arthroscopy) to enlarge and stabilize body cavities to provide better visibility of the surgical area.

- [Medical Carbon dioxide](#)



Medical carbon dioxide.

Therapeutic indications

Carbon dioxide is used:

- to increase depth of anaesthesia rapidly when volatile agents are being administered. It increases depth of respiration and helps to overcome breathholding and bronchial spasm
- to facilitate blind intubation in anaesthetic practice
- to facilitate vasodilation and thus lessen the degree of metabolic acidosis during the induction of hypothermia

- to increase cerebral blood flow in arteriosclerotic patients undergoing surgery
- to stimulate respiration after a period of apnoea
- in chronic respiratory obstruction after it has been relieved
- to prevent hypocapnia during hyperventilation
- for clinical and physiological investigations
- in gynaecological investigation for insufflation into fallopian tubes and abdominal cavities
- as solid carbon dioxide (dry ice) in tissue freezing techniques and for the destruction of warts by freezing.


But if you are not convinced then you will be surprised to learn that the lockdown of much of the worlds' industry and activity has not reduced the rise of CO₂. I repeat CO₂ has been rising during the lockdown. How could that be? The answer is the alarmist scientists much exaggerated the amount of human emissions in the atmosphere some experts think by more than 4 X.

The infamous and fraudulent Paris Accord demands countries reduce their human emission to net zero by imposing carbon taxes, etc. Yet the recent lockdown from the Covid 19 pandemic is evidence that human emissions are too small to matter.

Weekly average CO₂ at Mauna Loa

Week beginning on May 24, 417.43
2020: ppm
Weekly value from 1 year ago: 414.40 ppm
Weekly value from 10 years ago: 392.63 ppm

Last updated: June 5, 2020



Preliminary weekly (red line), monthly (blue line) and daily (black points) averages at Mauna Loa for the last year.

May 2020 Mauna Loa data shows CO2 levels are increasing over last year. Why? Because human emissions are not a significant source of CO2 when compared with natural and variable emissions from volcanos, wildfires, termites and coal seams.

Dr Timothy Ball thinks human CO2 emissions are misrepresented by as much as 4 X too high in order to keep up the fear of AGW by alarmists about fossil fuels.

There are so many natural sources of CO2 ignored by alarmists that dwarf our human emissions.

The "scientists" who attempt to strike fear in your heart regarding man-made carbon dioxide intentionally withhold from you the tremendous amounts sent skyward by the 1500 active volcanoes; the hundreds of coal-seam fires; the trillions of tons of organic matter that decompose; the rotting of billions of animal and fish corpses and other natural sources. These yearly "producers" of trillions of the stuff make human-"contribution" insignificant.

Kathleen Blake

A coal-seam fire is a natural burning of an outcrop or underground coal seam. ... Due to fine thermal insulation and the avoidance of rain/snow extinguishment by the crust, underground coal-seam fires are the most persistent fires on Earth and can burn for thousands of years, like BurningMountain in Australia.

CLIMATE CORRUPTION spurs a fake global warming crisis by waging war on

carbon. Lies conflating Co2 with pollution make fossil fuels the enemy. Fearsome yet false predictions of sea rise cause a group think panic like yelling FIRE in a crowded theater.



James G Matkin

...more ▼

JAMES MATKIN ABSTRACT

CLIMATE CORRUPTION spurs a fake global warming crisis. The deliberate deception is the conflation of Man-made atmospheric CO2 with pollution. China scientists warn of global cooling. August 15, 2019 at 12:35 am | # This article is an excellent summary of why there is no human made global warming for governments to vainly try to stop. Think about it, we live in the Quaternary Ice Age Holocene Optimum interglacial why do we not welcome global warming to save us from the next devastating glaciation? Yes, Co2 is only a trace gas impossible physically to cover the earth like a greenhouse because.....”a mathematical analysis shows that the human produced carbon dioxide concentrations are so low as to be unmeasurable and there is no correlation to the increases in carbon dioxide and man’s burning of fossil fuels.” In the 1995 2nd Assessment Report of the UN IPCC the scientists included these three statements in the draft:

1. “None of the studies cited above has shown clear evidence that we can attribute the observed (climate) changes to the specific cause of increases in greenhouse gases.”

2. “No study to date has positively attributed all or part (of observed climate change) to anthropogenic (i.e. man-made) causes.”

3. “Any claims of positive detection of significant climate change are likely to remain controversial until uncertainties in the natural variability of the climate system are reduced.”

Those three statements by ‘scientists’ above were replaced by non scientists with this political swindle:

“The balance of evidence suggests a discernable human influence on global climate.”

This story explains why the warmists want no debate falsely claiming the science is settled. “The HOLOCENE OPTIMUM is called an “optimum” because it was warmer than it is now. Since that best of times, temperature has been falling by 0.25°C per thousand years and water has become locked up in the ice sheets, causing sea level to fall. Which is what happening before we plunge into a glaciation.” Resilience is the only plan as the earth is cooling. <https://principia-scientific.org/climatic-effects-of-manmade-carbon-dioxide/#comment-25233> (Natural News) Everything you’ve been told about global warming, climate change and carbon dioxide by the mainstream media — and mainstream “science” — is an outright lie. Far from being a dangerous poison, carbon dioxide is a miraculous life-giving nutrient that plants need to thrive. Rising carbon dioxide is actually helping “green” the planet, as any legitimate science already knows. Without CO2 in the atmosphere, ne

https://www.academia.edu/40107819/CLIMATE_CORRUPTION_spurs_a_fake_global_warming_crisis_by_waging_war_on_carbon_Lies_conflating_Co2_with_pollution_make_fossil_fuels_the_enemy_Fearsome_yet_false_predictions_of_sea_rise_cause_a_group_think_panic_like_yelling_FIRE_in_a_crowded_theater

