

## Hot

(27 December 2023)

1. The choice of the words "*hot*", or "*scorching*" in climate articles is quite puzzling. For example, the temperatures at Kingsford Smith Sydney airport varied today between 17 and 24 C, and yesterday between 21 and 27 C, the average being yesterday 3.5 C "*hotter*" than today, which is equal to 219 years of theoretical global warming.

However, it is doubtful that anyone in Sydney would ever contend that today is 219 times "*hotter*" than yesterday, and it remains unexplained how a general temperature increase of even 1.6 C in a century would cause much general harm, Siberians, Tibetans, and Patagonians tending to believe that the opposite would be true.

2. The temperature in Yakutsk, a Siberian city of a half million is currently minus 42 C at 0730 GMT. Would a temperature rise of 0.016 C over the year be characterized by Siberians as making the local climate "*hot*"?
3. Below is a list of some skyscrapers around the world. As we all know, temperature decreases according to elevation. The last column shows the number of years of theoretical global warming equal and opposite to taking the elevator to the top floor.

<i>Building</i>	<i>City</i>	<i>Height in m</i>	<i>Cooling C</i>	<i>Years equivalent</i>
Burj Khalifa	Dubai	829.8	4.98	311
Merdeka	Kuala Lumpur	678.9	4.07	255
Taipei 101	Taipei	509.2	3.06	191
Empire State Building	New York	381.0	2.29	143
Crown Sydney	Sydney	271.0	1.63	102

How does one reconcile the figures above with the announced climate catastrophes?

4. Additionally, since the carbon content of all know reserves of all fossil fuels equals 79 years of annual carbon release, one would think, if warming were indeed a consequence of fossil fuel consumption, that after all has been extracted and burnt to the last spoonful the global temperatures would have finally risen by 1.3 C, or about 61 floors of the 75 of the Crown Sydney building, and that would be it.
5. Also, it is said that whether the known reserves are burnt overnight or within a long period time is not making much of a difference, since it is argued that fossil carbon released in the atmosphere is there to stay. Consequently, since it is unlikely that those in the rich countries who wish to ban fossil fuel forever and everywhere on the planet will succeed in preventing poorer countries from continuing to use it if they so wish, the end result of the purported general ban would be a drop in prices and the rapid development of poorer countries while the rich make do without central heating and industrial energy, and this until the last drop is extracted, no matter who used it, the eventual temperature still being 1.3 C "*hotter*". As for places such as Russia or China, it is unlikely that they will accept the slightest winter discomfort in order to placate the Grand Western Coalition, except of course if the latter succeeds in its Natoleonic dreams of universal conquest.