

carbon

In
brief... It seems I was the first to say and scientifically prove
'Carbon Offsetting does not work! "You can't plant tree's and
fly in an aeroplane"....also terms like 'Carbon Neutral', Carbon
Footprint' etc.. In the way used, do not stand up to simple scrutiny.
"Carbon Offsetting is a CON!" so what are the
Politician's and other Experts including Universities, NGO's and
other Academic Institution's doing, why did they not point out this
was not possible before my article was published? and why are there
subsidies, grants and investments etc still being given out...?

An
outline of events....

Summer
2006. Carbon became a subject... in the media... and all carbon was
considered bad. Subsidies were given to plant trees and to be
'Green'...

Oct
2006. My first 'Carbon' article published in local magazine.

Jan
2007. MP's including Mr. Blair and Mr. Cameron etc. were on TV
Planting Tree's to Carbon Offset their flying in aeroplanes , driving
cars, gas heating and electricity

much was on TV News and
other Media.....

June
1st 2007. My article published in Green Building Journal. Many said I
was right... but because of their connection with a certain
organisation or institution could not say publicly...

August
ish 2007. I saw Mr Paxman referring to my article (but not my name) on
'Newsnight' with Lord Lawson and George Monbiot who said about
religious indulgences (several hundred years ago people paid others
to pray for them), saying it was not possible to buy Carbon
offsetting.

Sept

2007. Government, News Papers, Media use the term Fossil Fuel Carbon.
Green groups change tune and websites!

Oct

2009. Various Celebs say about planting trees to Carbon Offset!!!
(Jamie Oliver and Joanna Lumley, who told them this is possible?)
have said about Carbon offsetting by planting Tree's. Does anyone
know who is saying this? Are they getting public money in the form of
a grant or subsidy.

Oct

2011. Carbon subject still in media..... but... What happened to all
the experts.....

April 2013. BBC radio 5 'Up All Night' (broadcast internationally) (phone in) I answered question about the causes and
the real impact on the UK and Northern Hemisphere. (I have audio).

May

2013. In News... Atmospheric Carbon levels hit 400ppm first time in
3.5 million years, a 30% increase since 1940.....

Sept

2013. (27th Sept) UN - IPCC report.. saying - Humans 95%
responsible for Climate Change ...

Feb 2014. BBC radio 5 'Up All Night' Accademic curiously uses same terms as I did in April 2013. (I have audio).

March 2014 (31st) UN - IPCC report... The impacts of global warming are likely to be "severe, pervasive and
irreversible", a major report by the UN has warned.

This latest Summary for Policymakers document highlights the fact that the amount of scientific evidence on the impacts
of warming has almost doubled since the last report in 2007. Be it the melting of glaciers or warming of permafrost, the
summary highlights the fact that on all continents and across the oceans, changes in the climate have caused impacts on
natural and human systems in recent decades. "Climate change is really important but we have a lot of the tools for
dealing effectively with it - we just need to be smart about it. "There is far greater emphasis to adapting to the impacts of
climate in this new summary. The problem, as ever, is who foots the bill? "It is not up to IPCC to define that" said Dr Jose
Marengo, a Brazilian government official who attended the talks. "It provides the scientific basis to say this is the bill,
somebody has to pay, and with the scientific grounds it is relatively easier now to go to the climate negotiations in the
UNFCCC (United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change) and start making deals about who will pay for
adaptation."

~~~~~

The IPCC only seems to look at a global perspective ... and only carbon ... and some how money will solve it ...

The causes and implications refered to in my article on the UK and Northern Hemisphere are still missing ... (and other  
things ...)

~~~~~

... a thought ... remember the (fake) bomb detectors that were sold internationally ... many people asked me how did they work? I replied "I didn't know". I did make inquiries via my MP, DTI and MOD and was told "It was secret" or "We have experts". I understand the seller was put in prison... What about ALL the officials... Internationally ...

Over the years I have tried to bring my view point which is non-political and without vested interests to the attention of the Government, Parliamentary Committees and the Media... but...

The story continues.....

1st June 2007 :::: My Article has been published in the GREEN BUILDING magazine, the Journal of the GREEN BUILDING BIBLE 1st June 2007..Vol17 no1 page 19 and is titled "Dispelling the Carbon Myth."

Click on image to enlarge... then click on the page to magnify.

In brief...

"You can't plant tree's and fly in an aeroplane"....

"Carbon Offsetting is a CON!"

"so what are the Politician's and other Experts including Universities NGO's and other Academic Institution's doing, why did they not point out this was not possible before my article was published?"
It seems I am the first to Say and Scientifically prove "CARBON OFFSETTING DOES NOT WORK!" also terms like "Carbon Neutral", "Carbon Footprint" etc... do not stand up to simple scrutiny.

Also I think I am the first to use the term "HOLISTIC ECOLOGICAL EVALUATION" (HEE)....a Holistic Ecological Evaluation (HEE) of the impact of production, use and disposal, both socially and materially, of any amenity offered that we may care to enjoy.

Below is the unedited version of the above article, to which I am adding to... as New's transpires... also as the certain people from Green Experts and organisations (who I note are changing their website's and what they say!) to 'others' who like to steal other people's Idea's (to which I will take no prisoner's!)

There are additional Idea's and Information that I have excluded, this is for the Journalist, Editor, etc who Covers my story about this issue....

THE MYTH OF THE "CARBON FOOTPRINT";

Does planting trees offset flying in aeroplanes?

Can planting trees, buying green tariff electricity or funding projects in the third world offset carbon intensive activity such as air travel or poor quality buildings? Who could blame you for thinking it does when we are constantly bombarded through the media with so-called expert opinion that supports the idea that ecological harm can be ameliorated —our so-called "Carbon Footprint"; reduced — by paying for trees etc.. to be planted on our behalf.

There are of course other viewpoints. I for one believe that such "carbon offsetting" is largely cosmetic, to the point of being futile. Underpinning my argument is a simple understanding of our environment.

Imagine the Earth in two layers: the living planet — our ecosystem — and, below that, the geological substrate of magma and minerals, both organic (coal, oil-shale, etc..) and inorganic (igneous rock) in origin.

Whether Boy Scouts making campfires from hedgerow sticks, a gas, oil, or coal-fired power station, burning material produces Carbon and Carbon Dioxide — in addition, of course, to other carcinogenic pollutants, such as Benzene and its related compounds that do not degrade, but linger, concealed in our environment to ambush individual health.

However, there is a significant fundamental difference between these fuel sources. In the case of wood, un-processed vegetable oils, hydrogen produced by solar power, or biomass, for example — things that are contained within the living planet — burning just returns them into the atmosphere without adding extra carbon or other pollutants. This closed "carbon cycle" occurs entirely within our ecosystem. The use of fossil fuels, on the other hand, entails the transfer of organic compounds (that have been deposited, and sequestered, over millions of years) from the substrate into our ecosystem, thus altering the balance of the environment in which we exist. This effect would also apply in the case of material imported from above the troposphere i.e.: off-planet (extraction of helium3 from the moon is proposed).

A basic understanding of this simple model should reveal why the concept of carbon offsetting is basically invalid. Planting trees is undoubtedly beneficial in many ways (the destruction of the forests in the UK and abroad seems to have been forgotten and international agreements do not include the lungs of the planet or our vast oceans for example) and may help reduce CO2 on a small scale but, as a response to global warming (assuming that this is indeed primarily induced by the burning of fossil fuels from the substrate and not as a result of solar activity, for example, as is suggested by many outside the current politically acceptable scientific convention) it is wholly inadequate.

Climate change may of course not only be confined to global warming. The threat of global freezing may also be hypothesised. The UK population may have a lot of carbon offsetting to purchase in a search for 'winter sun'; when the gulf stream turns and we begin to enjoy a climate more associated with that of Moscow or Labrador.

So, while it is both unclear and largely irrelevant whether the motives of those proposing the 'offsetting' model as a viable solution for survival are deliberate obfuscation, or merely confusion, the effect of its promotion is to provide populations with a feel-good factor, a false-security blanket which gives cover to a potentially dangerous complacency.

This syndrome is apparent in many areas of 'consumer environmentalism', where the true, but hidden, costs of 'solutions' may not be generally appreciated.

Environmentalists are beginning to refer to this as 'Externality'.

External costs might include factors such as child/bonded slavery and low-wage employment – the lorry driver who does not see his kids from one week to the next; the seven year-old working 16-hour days sewing sequins onto high-street fashion garments – health and safety shortcuts, pollution arising from the manufacture and transportation of goods and services. These external costs are often exported to the poor and developing countries of the world who are 'exempt' from the environmental and employment regulation regime to which producers closer to home must conform. Low-priced electronic consumer goods manufactured in Worldwide 'sweat-shops', for example – while undoubtedly appreciated by the home consumer – are not necessarily as 'cheap' in reality as they might at first appear. With people saying ... (I quote Digby Jones who has now been made a Lord!) "The British are unreliable, they don't like to get their hands dirty"... how can the home market survive? ... When the full environmental and social implications of raw material extraction, processing, production, transportation, installation and eventual disposal are taken into account the small personal financial gain might seem increasingly difficult to justify.

The same arguments can similarly be employed to undermine the claims made by those promoting (and selling) many other 'green' products and ideals. Shows and events, Government and NGO's that say they are green but are only there to make money (through grants, subsidies or other 'free money' from the public purse, or just plain profit!). The rash of self proclaimed TV and media experts (from engineers, fashion creators, so called artists/designers, musician's etc, or those who just want to be seen to be doing the right thing and be hip as their own trades have waned, they needed another market and thus maintain their own little nepotistic world of self indulgent worth and exclude those who have been living it for real for most of their lives without 'free money') and so called environmentalists flying round the planet, what did they do before they saw the 'green' light?

Is this a reactionary covering up of the realisation of how they have assaulted the planet and for how long?

How did the 'green' experts make their money to go green?

Are they listed in the GREEN BUILDING BIBLE or other genuine non-political listing and for how long?

The public might generally consider that the installation of a wind turbine on the roof of their home would be of benefit, both personally, in terms of financial saving and social conscience, and to the wider ecology. However, an assessment of the external environmental cost versus perceived benefit might challenge this expectation. When the full environmental and social implications of raw material extraction, processing, production, transportation, installation and eventual disposal are taken into account – not to mention 'economic payback time' – and the small

financial and personal energy self-sufficiency gain might seem increasingly insignificant.

In illustration: a local council building (south northamptonshire district council... also noticed as at 3rd Aug 2007 that water solar panel's have been fitted, I question how they are facing and positioned, there are other council and non council buildings this could apply to), recently commissioned, and incorporating a wind turbine (which has since been repositioned July 2007 slightly higher than originally fitted) for green credential could, in my opinion, have been designed to efficiently save far more energy through the simple use of skylights and reflective tubes to bring illumination to its workers, thus negating the necessity for permanent artificial lighting.

A much more honest, radical, holistic approach to the understanding and solution of the problem (to understate the possible extinction of planetary life as we know it) is necessary if the best efforts of a well-meaning public are to be harnessed to achieve anything more than "cosmetic" results.

While it is entirely laudable for environmentally concerned individuals to take steps to influence the situation on a microcosmic scale, I believe that their efforts would be far more effectively directed through the utilization of their democratic and commercial power to influence national and international policy.

Concerned consumers and voters need to demonstrate to governments that they are not prepared accept "individual responsibility and choice" as the sole mitigation to ecological threat. We can all influence our microcosmic environments, but the macrocosm needs a concerted, large-scale collective effort to bring about any meaningful, global change.

As a society, we must educate ourselves regarding the true implications of our day-to-day, (ultimately self-destructive) life-styles, and then to exert pressure on decision-makers to institute effective change. To the international corporations, profit is paramount. We must tell them that, until they do more than pay lip-service to "green" ideals, we will refuse to purchase their products. Politicians must likewise be made to understand that our votes - and their power - are contingent on the sincerity and effectiveness of their environmental policy.

We, as a (Democratic Capitalist) society, must insist on a true appreciation, by government, consumer and producer, of the implications of the consumption of all resources - a Holistic Ecological Evaluation (HEE) of the impact of production, use and disposal, both socially and materially, of any amenity offered that we may care to enjoy. Only when the real costs are apparent will we be equipped to make a true choice - between the sustainable enjoyment of reasonable comfort and the harsh reality of a new "Stone Age". There is more... email me..

Mark - www.squeakydesign.info

Listed in the Green Building Bible

Member of A.E.C.B.

Oct 2006 ::::Below is the first published version.

Marks Eco Bit… as published in PermOrganic newsletter ..oct 2006

Mark is a Qualified Professional Design Consultant with over 21years living without ANY mains services, spent acquiring experience in multi-disciplinary ecological design (built his first hot water solar panel over 30 years ago). He “Squeaky Design” is listed in the Green Building Bible under ‘Design’ and also ‘Timber Frame’ (2nd and the new 3rd edition ISBN 1-898130-03-05) and is the only person/business (other than PermOrganic's who Mark sponsored....) listed in Northamptonshire (other areas of the UK include Architects and all the range of Building services) and is also a member of the A.E.C.B. (Association for Environment Conscious Building). Is non political and has given talks/lectures locally and on a National level. Mark is also a R.Y.A./M.C.A. Coastal Skipper both Power and Sail. With a life long interest in Traditional Crafts and Woodwork.

The Carbon Cycle.....

The Expert Media as usual has over simplified and in doing so misinformed the Nation about the Carbon Cycle, this is not the only subject, past, present or future.

I hope this will clear things up. Simply.

Imagine three layers with the upper atmosphere and the clay substrate (in our area) being the demarcations between the layers…

Space

Upper atmosphere-----

Our Ecosystem

Clay substrate-----

Crude oil and Coal

If we get some sticks of wood from the hedgerow and make a little fire. It will produce Carbon, Carbon Dioxide (CO₂) and other things, these elements were absorbed when the tree grew and burning just releases them, this all happens within Our Ecosystem. The same applies to all things we can grow like Vegetable Oil used in Diesel Engines. These processes do not add carbon or other pollutants to our Ecosystem.

….one solution to the carbon build-up (apart from burying it! or using it as a building material ie. insulation!) is to send Blocks of Carbon (having first made use of the gasses emitted! This would be a permanent solution!) into space using fuel from Our Ecosystem the N.A.S.A. Shuttle uses Hydrogen/Oxygen (which could be produced using solar methods) in its main Engine but, uses Peroxide side rockets! In Britain and around the world various people have been building Sugar Rockets.. yes just like what we use in a cup of Tea! and they work VERY well, although I don’t think they have got into Space (over 64 miles approx) yet they have got into the upper atmosphere

….if things made from Crude Oil or Coal are brought into our Ecosystem… then this will revert it back to a time when Humans did not exist…. (or more correctly before plants existed!)

SO WHO SAYS PLANTING TREES OFFSETS FLYING IN AEROPLANES?

So you have read that lot.... here's something to plan for.... just in case.....

This was also published Oct 2006.

Are you ready for the worst?

For the last few years there have been warnings of deep snow. Earlier this year we did have the right climatic conditions to cause this, but a lack of rain did not complete the equation (that's why there's a drought!) to produce snow depths like in 1963 or 1947! In England, UK.

This could quite easily pull power lines down because of the weight of Ice.

The same situation exists for Hot weather, Floods and Wind... etc)

Most homes are dependant on electricity &but my central heating is Gas& you might say, but most rely on an electric pump to circulate the water and maybe other electricity dependant control systems, just to make it work. If you are all Electric then…?

What I ask you to do is think! How can you HEAT, LIGHT and COOK… SAFELY.

At the simplest is an outdoor fire (remember to check that you are not lighting it over a manhole or gas, water or other services etc), do you have some wood/newspaper, firelighters/and Matches or a lighter (do you have a pan without a plastic handle?) Solar outdoor lights aren't bright but are safe and work without mains! (how would you charge the Batteries?) There are also torches that you shake or windup, and there are now DAB radios that windup in addition to the ordinary FM type (whether the local transmitter will work is another story. Obviously Candles including Tea lights (remember to use a tray of water or other Non-inflammable base! and remember man-made materials (clothing, curtains etc) like Nylon etc are extremely inflammable).

THINK SAFETY FIRST!

If you would like some real fun with the family.. SWITCH THE ELECTRICITY and GAS OFF for a couple of hours; it will be an education! (you will need to reset the clocks etc after..)

If you're unsure contact me and I will guide you to some solutions.

Notice of Origination Granted to whole website 2007.

Mark James.. Copyright December 2006.