

Copenhagen // A Rational Perspective

1. Abstract

The upcoming December 7-18, 2009 UN chaired Copenhagen/Denmark greenhouse conference constitutes a continuation of the 1997 Kyoto protocol (a greenhouse cap as to the industrialized nations) that the USA did not accede to. In the global quest for environmental preservation the USA is being singled as the dominant carbon/CO2 emitter (politicsdaily.com). In accordance with the Copenhagen protocol the industrialized nations (barring India/China) will be mandated to 80-90% emissions abatement by 2050 (foxnews.com). The Copenhagen conference will accordingly institute UN managed taxes/abatement/relocations levy as means to the end (foxnews.com).

2. Global Equilibrium

In order to develop a perspective of global warming we need understand what is really going on as to the evolution of the world as we know it. With a recent construction/sustainability conference in Chongqing China, a computational analysis as to the global “thermal” forces was presented under the auspices of “Polar Equilibrium” (www.polarequilibrium.com). The study comprised two discrete elements, i.e.:

Part A of the analysis focused on a global heat balance in terms of 1) the heat manmade combustion of fossil fuels and 2) the consequential polar interaction thereto. It has been determined that approximately 50% of the heat generated by human activity reaches/ interact with the polar ice cap & global glacier fields.

Part B of the analysis focused on the chilling of the crust/mantle of the earth subsequent to formation. A unique computational model as to the “freezing” of molten steel in crucibles, ingots and steel-making furnaces (circa 1965), was applied to model the crust formation of the earth. A noteworthy discovery was that the earth cooled from a boiling magna at 6-10,000F to below 200F within one BILLION years of formation. Most striking however was that the surface temperature dropped to FREEZING a billion years ago (3.5B years after formation) with radiation into deep space the obvious driving force. An inevitable consequence is that the world of today would have been relegated to an ICE CUBE in accordance with the ensuing regression trend. Was it not for fracturing of the mantle of the earth at the time and subsequent continental drift (with ensuing intense volcanic activity that reheated the atmosphere and seeded the atmosphere with fertilizing compounds), the matured earth would have been relegated to lifeless caps and glacier fields.

3. Computational Illustration

To illustrate the balance/interaction of global thermal forces an elemental example is being constructed as to the interaction of man-made activities (i.e. deforestation and the combustion of fossil fuels) on the one hand and the dominant global forces (i.e. the polar ice caps, tropical rainforests and atmosphere proper).

The pertinent global quanta have been summarized in terms of matter and intrinsic heat content (Tons and British Thermal Units // Btu's) as follows;

Polar ice = 156×10^{18} Btu's

Earth atmosphere = 4.4×10^{15} Ton

Fossil fuel combustion (year 2000) = 3×10^{17} Btu's

Rainforest biomass = $1.5 \times 140 \times 10^9 \times 12,000 \times 2,000 = 50 \times 10^{17}$ Btu's

Regenerative/reformation biomass = $4.8 \times 10^9 \times 12,000 \times 2,000 = 1.2 \times 10^{17}$ Btu's.

The following **100year** (impact) corollary is hence being constructed:

1. Total heat = **100x** $3 \times 10^{17} = 3 \times 10^{19}$ Btu's
2. 50% of global heat of combustion = 1.5×10^{19} Btu's
3. Polar impact = $1.5 \times 10^{19} / (1.56 \times 10^{20}) = \mathbf{9\%}$ meltdown of the ice reserves
4. Atmospheric temperature rise (@25% impact) = $3 \times 10^{19} / 4 / (4.4 \times 2,000 \times 0.25 \times 10^{15}) = 30/8.8 = \mathbf{3.4F}$.

4. Heat of Combustion

This is a very fundamental and forceful number, i.e. that even in a “worst” scenario the global temperature rise will only amount to **3.4F** by 2100. However, that is where the buck stops, i.e. it is not the temperature rise (OR greenhouse gas/CO2 for that matter) that melts the polar ice caps, but the **Btu's** emanating from human activity. Although **9%** ice loss (100year term) may not sound like much, it is massive in terms of the “peripheral” (i.e. glacial) impact. More significantly, “greenhouse” emissions, OR CO2, does not contribute to the heat balance OR consequences thereto. As a product of combustion, CO2 simply serves as an indicator of human activity. CO2 is also impervious as to coal, oil OR natural gas (the conversion factor of 3.636 particles per Btu combustion heat is virtually flat). CO2 is also by all means irrelevant as to global warming OR polar regression as global warming is **HEAT** driven. Radiation into deep space is a function of the absolute temperature quadrupled. Thermal convection also grossly outpaces the reflective impact of CO2 at its present level (which is by all means = ZERO) at this instance in time.

5. Destruction of Rainforests

We obviously have a problem. We have seen the deterioration of environmental balances for some time. There may well be other forces at work, however global cycles come and go in 10-100,000 year cycles. The compounding factor is the destruction of the rainforests. One square kilometer of Amazon rainforest contain about 91×10^3 tonnes (metric ton) of living plants. The Amazon basin contains 1.7B acres (772M hectares) of rainforests (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Amazon_Rainforest). The global rainforest combustion heat content = 50×10^{17} Btu's. Global fossil fuel combustion = 3×10^{17} Btu's. The regenerative/remedial power of the rainforests = 1.2×10^{17} Btu's. This is the key to preserving the global ecology, as we know it. Normally the rainforests (a massively powerful carbon/CO2 conversion engine) (www.syncool.com) would

be capable of negating 50% of the CO2 emanating from fossil fuel combustion. However the rainforests (the balancing factor) are being destroyed in par with the melting of the ice caps. This is the primary issue (i.e. preserving/expanding the tropical/rainforests) that needs to be addressed.

6. Copenhagen Priorities

Cognizance will have to be taken in Copenhagen as to the dominant and subservient global greenhouse forces and rational remedy thereto. The focus must therefore be on 1) orderly (free market) driven fossil conversion and 2) the spawning of manmade rain forests as an offset as to the combustion of fossil fuels. The intrinsic value of fossil fuels is that of chemical **building blocks** for the future, and the remaining resources should be treated accordingly. CO2 is nonetheless a useful toll as to the measurement of trends and should be maintained accordingly. The name of the game must however be CARBON **offset** in lieu of **cap-and-trade**. The wisdom of **OFFSET** vs. **cap-and-trade** is that offset **investment/fees/levies** spawns a remedial forces in lieu of 1) simply perpetuating the destructive forces and 2) burdening the industrialized nations with a slate of wanton costs. The same token (i.e. constructive rewards that maintain the cash at home) should apply to micro forestation and wind/solar/geothermal enterprising.

7. Micro Forestation

Finally, "rainforests" are the result of organic refrigeration (the SYNCOOL synthesis) that precipitates moisture constructively out of the ambient air and progressively evolves into a powerful organic engine after hundreds/thousands of years. It is being submitted that the process may be morphed/accelerated on a grand scale as a CARBON contra-force (the rational greenhouse solution). Large tracts of the USA gulf states, Mexico, China, Arabia, Africa and India would be conducive to micro (rainforest) forestation. Given 10Ton biomass growth per hectare pa, new forestation =100M hectare would negate 10% of the global CO2/heat of combustion. Given that soy alone occupies 35M hectare of arable land in the USA, populating 100M hectares non-arable land globally with micro forestation would present a very rational alternative to "cap-and trade" bartering.

Kartogo Inc (LA/CA)

November 20, 2009

Enclosures 1/2/3

Footers:

1. How Hard Is Obama Trying on Global Warming?

Posted: 11/18/09

Sadly, none of this is surprising. Obama entered office, vowing he would do what George W. Bush had not: lead the world to a global climate accord. But the challenges were clear. Though China and India are heading to the top of the carbon-spewing charts, they have insisted that the United States, historically the

number-one emitter, cut back first. Meanwhile, recalcitrant Republicans and coal-friendly Democrats in the Senate declared they wouldn't back any accord that didn't include tough limits for China and other emerging economies.

<http://www.politicsdaily.com/2009/11/18/how-hard-is-obama-trying-on-global-warming/>

Polar ice = 156×10^{18} Btu

Earth atmosphere = 4.4×10^{15} Ton

Fossil fuel combustion (2000) = 3×10^{17} Btu

Rainforest biomass = $1.5 \times 140 \times 10^9 \times 12,000 \times 2,000 = 50 \times 10^{17}$ Btu

Regenerative/reformation biomass = $4.8 \times 10^9 \times 12,000 \times 2,000 = 1.2 \times 10^{17}$ Btu

2. Rainforests

The researchers show that remaining tropical forests remove a massive 4.8 billion tonnes (metric ton) of CO₂ emissions from the atmosphere each year. This includes a previously unknown carbon sink in Africa, mopping up 1.2 billion tonnes of CO₂ each year. <http://www.futurepundit.com/archives/005981.html>

The Amazon is estimated to 90-140 billion metric tons (short ton) of carbon, according to calculations by other scientists. <http://news.mongabay.com/2009/0812-amazon.html>

3. U.N. 'Climate Change' Plan Would Likely Shift Trillions to Form New World Economy

A United Nations document on "climate change" that will be distributed to a major environmental conclave next week envisions a huge reordering of the world economy, likely involving trillions of dollars in wealth transfer, millions of job losses and gains, new taxes, industrial relocations, new tariffs and subsidies, and complicated payments for greenhouse gas abatement schemes and carbon taxes — all under the supervision of the world body.

In an influential but highly controversial paper called "Key Elements of a Global Deal on Climate Change," British economist Nicholas Lord Stern, formerly a high British Treasury official, has declared that industrial economies would need to cut their per capita carbon dioxide emissions by "at least 80% by 2050," while the biggest economies, like the U.S.'s, would have to make cuts of 90 percent.

By way of comparison, according to the U.S. Department Of Energy, roughly 72 percent of U.S. electrical power generation in 2007 was derived from burning fossil fuels, with just 6 percent coming from hydro-power and less than 3 percent from non-nuclear renewable and "other" sources. And even then, those "other" non-fossil sources included wood and biomass — which, when burned, are major emitters of carbon. <http://www.foxnews.com/story/0,2933,510937,00.html>

