3. Planetary Changes

If an accurate view of the causes of climate change is to be obtained, it must be properly recognised that ALL planets (with an atmosphere) in the solar system seem to be undergoing change. Basic, referenced data is presented in this section and, once again, this should be carefully reviewed and not ignored. It can be seen that in the last 30 years, significant changes (i.e. not specifically “warming” alone) have been observed and recorded in ALL planets of the solar system. The significance of this should be obvious. A paper/article by Wm. Robert Johnston provides some additional comparisons to the ones shown below19.

3.1 Venus - Changes in Composition of Atmosphere

“Our model shows Venus has changed dynamically in the recent past,” said Bullock. “Since Venus and Earth have a number of similarities, there are implications here for our own future.” An article by Bullock and Grinspoon regarding global change on Venus appears in the March issue of Scientific American.20

3.2 Mars - Polar Ice and Hexagon Shape?

“Particularly evident is the marked hexagonal shape of the polar cap at this season, noted previously by HST in 1995 and Mariner 9 in 1972; this may be due to topography, which isn’t well known, or to wave structure in the circulation. This map was assembled from WFPC2 images obtained between Dec. 30, 1996 and Jan. 4, 1997,”21

3.3 Jupiter

3.3.1 April 2004 - Researcher predicts global climate change on Jupiter as giant planet’s spots disappear.

“According to Marcus, the imminent changes signal the end of Jupiter’s current 70-year climate cycle. His surprising predictions are published in the April 22 issue of the journal Nature.”22

2.12.1 Shot of England from Space on 18 Oct 2007

Europe_2_01 - Date: 2007/291 - 10/18, True color - Satellite: Terra - Pixel size: 1km

Why are all the clouds in France in lines – like ripples on a pond? (Photo now archived and not easily accessible17.)

19 http://www.johnstonsarchive.net/environment/warmingplanets.html
20 http://www.colorado.edu/news/releases/1999/65.html
21 http://www.xtec.es/recursos/astronom/hst/hst2/9715b.htm
17 http://rapidfire.gsfc.nasa.gov/subsets/?Europe_2_01/2007291/Europe_2_01.2007291.terra.1km.jpg
3.4 Saturn: “Saturn’s rotation puts astronomers in a spin”

The most commonly cited figure for Saturn’s rotation period - 10 hours, 39 minutes and 22.4 seconds - was derived in 1980 from Voyager observations of radio waves generated by solar radiation hitting the planet’s atmosphere. Yet Cassini has returned a result almost 8 minutes longer, a difference that defies easy explanation.26

3.4.1 Saturn’s Polar Hexagon

What if there are “resonance wave” effects in the atmosphere creating centres of warming or cooling?27 This could be what is happening on Saturn.28

3.4.2 Huge Storm on Saturn – 29 December 2010 29

was travelling at 500 mph for the time the trail was forming, this means that the trail persisted for at least:

\[
\frac{364}{(500 \times \frac{8}{5})} = 0.455 \text{ hours} = 27 \text{ minutes!}
\]

(and it could be longer, since the satellite photo may have been taken AFTER the trail had formed.)

2.12 Case Study - Many Trails seen around the UK, and from Space - 18th Oct 2007

All photos in this section were taken on 18th Oct 2007.30

26 http://www.newscientist.com/article/dn9100­saturns­rotation­puts­astronomers­i n­a­spin.html
27 http://news.discovery.com/space/saturns­north­pole­hexagon­mystery­solved.html
28 http://www.planetary.org/blog/article/00002471/
31 http://apod.nasa.gov/apod/ap110119.html
32 http://saturn.cstoneind.com/
3.6 Neptune – “Seasonal Changes”?

Seasons on Neptune occur for the same reasons as on Earth. The seasonal changes on both planets occur because their axes tilt slightly. Earth is inclined 23.5 degrees. Neptune is tipped at an even greater angle: 29 degrees. As both planets travel around the Sun, their southern and northern hemispheres are alternately tipped toward or away from the Sun.36

But is this really correct? The time period covered is 6 years. However, Neptune’s orbital period is 165 years – ¼ of this would be approximately 41 years…

Caption: A time series of images of the planet Neptune taken by the Hubble Space Telescope illustrate increasing cloudiness that is a hallmark of seasonal change. The growing bands of clouds in the southern hemisphere of the planet suggest seasonal change. Because the planet takes about 165 years to orbit the Sun, the seasons on Neptune last more than 40 years.37

So, a season lasts 6 years – or 40 years?

3.7 Pluto: Pluto is undergoing global warming, researchers find

Pluto is undergoing global warming, as evidenced by a three-fold increase in the planet's atmospheric pressure during the past 14 years, a team of astronomers from Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Williams College, the University of Hawaii, Lowell Observatory and Cornell University announced in a press conference today at the annual meeting of the American Astronomical Society’s (AAS) Division for Planetary Sciences in Birmingham, AL.38
4. Solar Activity and Climate and the MWP

4.1 Solar Activity

4.1.1 The Maunder Minimum

It is far too often that the enormity of the sun is overlooked. For example, a 1976 paper concludes there probably was a link between sunspot activity and “the little ice age”.

In a paper entitled “The Maunder Minimum” by John Eddy,[44] the conclusions note:

The coincidence of Maunder’s “prolonged solar minimum” with the coldest excursion of the “Little Ice Age” has been noted by many who have looked at the possible relations between the sun and terrestrial climate (73). A lasting tree-ring anomaly which spans the same period has been cited as evidence of a concurrent drought in the American Southwest (68, 74).

The paper goes into quite some detail.

4.1.2 Jasper Kirby and Solar Activity

He was lambasted in 1998 for stating:

that the sun and cosmic rays “will probably be able to account for somewhere between a half and the whole of the increase in the Earth’s temperature that we have seen in the last century.”[45]

He was involved in work at CERN with regard to the effects of cosmic rays and cloud formation.[46]

4.2 The Medieval Warming Period (MWP)

This is generally disliked by the anthropogenic climate catastrophists – who have a lot of evidence to argue with - when many diverse records show that the period between about 1000 to 1300 was as warm in many parts of the world as it is now.[47] Clearly, this warming cannot be blamed on industrialization!

Lord Monckton has written about this in some detail, as well as the contested “Hockey Stick” graph.[48]

5.1.3 UK - Infra Red Photo Weather Anomalies – 10 Sep 2010, Met Office

Note criss-cross lines – west of Bay of Biscay (bottom left of photo) – original source now archived\(^{51}\). This criss/cross pattern appeared between 0400 and 1600 hours.

This can also be seen in a video of frames\(^{52}\).

\(^{51}\) http://www.metoffice.gov.uk/satpics/latest_uk_ir.html
\(^{52}\) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rMfCO1U0jJw
5.3 Hurricane Erin on 9/11

The research of Dr Judy Wood, former professor of Mechanical Engineering at Clemson University (South Carolina), into the destruction of the World Trade Centre, lead her to post a collection of data about Hurricane Erin\(^\text{56}\). Few people are aware that this category 3 storm, comparable in diameter to Hurricane Katrina, was closest to New York City at about 8am on the morning of 9/11/2001\(^\text{58}\). In the morning weather reports, only 2 out of 4 local news channels reported the presence of the Hurricane\(^\text{59}\) – even though it had been moving, in a fairly straight line, towards New York City since its encounter with Bermuda on 7\(^\text{th}\) Sep 2001\(^\text{60}\). (This is noteworthy because storm swells would have posed a risk of flooding – potentially to New York’s subway system, had the hurricane remained where it was on 9/11/01. Oddly, on 12 Sep 2001, the Hurricane made a right hand turn and moved off east, towards Newfoundland.)

Understanding the possible reason for the presence of this hurricane is difficult – as one has to re-analyse, at a fundamental level, the official story of 9/11 – especially in relation to the way the WTC complex was destroyed. This has been the subject of most of the rest of Dr Judy Wood’s analysis of 9/11 data and evidence, which resulted in her submitting a “qui tam” case for science fraud\(^\text{61}\) against some of the contractors whom NIST employed to contribute to the 10,000 pages of reports entitled “The Collapse of the World Trade Centre Towers”.

This increase is larger than any during the 11-14 September period for the previous 30 years, giving ammunition to critics who state that weather conditions at this specific period were very extraordinary and no scientific based conclusions could be taken. However even more surprising is the fact that the 11-14 September increase in DTR was more than twice the national average for regions of the United States where contrail coverage has previously been reported to be most abundant, such as the Midwest, Northeast and Northwest regions.

In the subsequent days after September 14th when civil flight operations resumed there was a temperature drop of about 0.8°C, denoting the return to ‘normal’ conditions. This underlines the impact of contrails on global surface temperatures with a noteworthy cooling down effect, especially reducing the maximum day temperatures. A new proof that aviation significantly affects climate emerged after the massive grounding in Europe in 2010 due to the volcano eruption in Iceland. It is too early to assess the quality of the survey, but the Kings College in London claims that ‘airports are air polluters’.

2.3 Persistent and Non-Persistent Trails

It is emphasized that the general properties of contrails are known and recognized by people who have submitted these photos to me. The difference between these types of trails is shown in videos referenced in section 2.10. A difference is also shown in the right hand photo in section 2.8. Also, please review and study the satellite photos especially.

2.4 New Documentary Presents Evidence of Ongoing Geoengineering

A new documentary film has just been released called “What in the World Are They Spraying” where statements by some of the scientists involved with developing geoengineering proposals are documented and challenged\(^\text{12}\). The film also shows some of the data which some people have gathered in relation to aircraft trails and their apparent effects at ground level (which are denied by most scientists). The observed effects seem to match those discussed in some of the geoengineering proposals themselves, even though no large geoengineering projects are said to be in operation. In the film, one scientist is interviewed who explains how the pH of the soil in the area where he lives has increased from being alkaline to being neutral over the last few years – and this has affected the growth of vegetation. Other laboratory tests on snow from Mount Shasta in Northern California are also mentioned. These tests have shown anomalous high levels of strontium and aluminium – both substances which are referenced in some geoengineering/solar radiation management (SRM) research proposals.

The signatories to this report are extremely concerned by the issues covered in this film – and also feel the need for much more investigation to be done.

\(^{56}\) http://weatherwars.info/?page_id=73
\(^{57}\) http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/erin/
\(^{58}\) http://911digitalarchive.org/REPOSITORY/IMAGES/PHOTOS/1467.png
\(^{59}\) http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W2VYlfxKg
\(^{60}\) http://irma.ssec.wisc.edu/imagearchive/2001/storms/erin/erin-track.gif
\(^{61}\) http://www.drjudywood.com/articles/NIST/Qui_Tam_Wood.shtml
6. An Answer to Environmental Pollution & Destruction?

6.1 Investment in Energy Alternatives
The real problems are much, much different – and deeper and wider - than those assumed to be caused by CO₂ emissions (or any other emissions for that matter). Traditional renewable alternatives such as wind turbines, solar heating, solar photovoltaic systems and geothermal energy systems are being utilised more – as some technologies that are publicly available become cheaper and/or more robust, but all these systems have limitations because of things like energy storage and maximum energy output for a given situation (e.g. solar PV is much less useful in northern latitudes).

It is now time for a fundamental change in thinking and a realization of “how things really are”. From other research, it becomes clear than much less polluting – even non-polluting - and perhaps limitless energy sources have been perversely (and fatally) suppressed.

6.2 Cold Fusion – Killed off by Vested Energy Interests
- Examine Cold Fusion of Research
- Cold Fusion Champion Murdered
- Fire From Water Documentary Interviewing Scientists who worked on Cold Fusion Experiments

6.3 “Salter's Duck” – Killed off in the 1980's
Salter has drawn some attention with his “cloud maker” idea. However, he does not seem to talk about his “duck” device which could have produced large quantities of energy and was reviewed independently and funding was recommended. It was then withdrawn without the agreement of the independent reviewer.

6.4 Meyer Cell – Efficient Water Splitter – Emission-less Car
Stanley Meyer developed this extremely efficient (unconventional) electrolyser – and was eventually poisoned at a meeting with investors.

6.5 Safe Hydride Storage System for Hydrogen Car - Illegal
Bob Lazar’s ingenious system is deemed illegal because of the Hydride it uses - a safe material, but it is a “weapons grade material” and so cannot be sold.

6.6 Other Energy Issues
The cases mentioned briefly here are mentioned in more detail in a 2-hour presentation (by the author) available online.

---

67 http://www.lenr-cnr.org
69 http://freedomvideo.org/2010/05/fire-from-water/
70 http://www.mech.ed.ac.uk/research/wavepower/rain%20making/rain%20making.htm
71 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_bdeNuRF-yE
72 http://www.cyberphysics.pwp.blueyonder.co.uk/topics/energy/wave.htm
74 http://www.top-alternative-energy-sources.com/stanley-meyer.html
75 http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=GV5OuBDQ
7.2.2 Private doubts about whether the world really is heating up:

The fact is that we can’t account for the lack of warming at the moment and it is a travesty that we can’t. The CERES data published in the August BAMS 09 supplement on 2008 shows there should be even more warming: but the data are surely wrong. Our observing system is inadequate.

7.2.3 Suppression of evidence:

Can you delete any emails you may have had with Keith re AR4? Keith will do likewise. He’s not in at the moment – minor family crisis. Can you also email Gene and get him to do the same? I don’t have his new email address. We will be getting Caspar to do likewise.

7.2.4 Fantasies of violence against prominent Climate Sceptic scientists:

Next time I see Pat Michaels at a scientific meeting, I’ll be tempted to beat the crap out of him. Very tempted.

7.2.5 Attempts to disguise the inconvenient truth of the Medieval Warm Period (MWP):

……Phil and I have recently submitted a paper using about a dozen NH records that fit this category, and many of which are available nearly 2K back—I think that trying to adopt a timeframe of 2K, rather than the usual 1K, addresses a good earlier point that Peck made w/ regard to the memo, that it would be nice to try to “contain” the putative “MWP”, even if we don’t yet have a hemispheric mean reconstruction available that far back…..

7.3 Many Scientists Do Not Agree with AGW Theory

7.3.1 Breaking: Less Than Half of all Published Scientists Endorse Global Warming Theory

Of 528 total papers on climate change, only 38 (7%) gave an explicit endorsement of the consensus. If one considers “implicit” endorsement (accepting the consensus without explicit statement), the figure rises to 45%. However, while only 32 papers (6%) reject the consensus outright, the largest category (48%) are neutral papers, refusing to either accept or reject the hypothesis. This is no “consensus.”

7.3.2 Notes on “Global Warming”

I could not resist including this cartoon (see section 3.3 for a good reference).
7.3.5 Global Warming Petition Project

This petition was set up by Arthur B. Robinson, BS Caltech, PhD UCSD and Noah E. Robinson, BS SOU, PhD Caltech, and is circulated with a summary of peer-reviewed research. The petition has already been signed by over 30,000 scientists.

We urge the United States government to reject the global warming agreement that was written in Kyoto, Japan in December, 1997, and any other similar proposals. The proposed limits on greenhouse gases would harm the environment, hinder the advance of science and technology, and damage the health and welfare of mankind.

There is no convincing scientific evidence that human release of carbon dioxide, methane, or other greenhouse gases is causing or will, in the foreseeable future, cause catastrophic heating of the Earth’s atmosphere and disruption of the Earth’s climate. Moreover, there is substantial scientific evidence that increases in atmospheric carbon dioxide produce many beneficial effects upon the natural plant and animal environments of the Earth.
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