CATASTROPHIC SEA LEVEL RISES -

MELTING MOUNTAIN ICE

INTRODUCTION

For forty years, the Green leadership and their scientists assert that rising global temperatures will cause ice to melt resulting in catastrophic sea level rises. These are the four different ways this is meant to happen;

1. Melting Arctic Ice.
2. Melting Mountain Ice,
3. Antarctic and Greenland Ice, and
4. Antarctic and Greenland Glaciers

This note is about "Melting Mountain Ice". Before we adopt the role of Henny Penny and run around telling everyone that the sky is falling in, let us look at this problem – rather than personalities and labels.

THE PROBLEM

"Available Ice"

The ice the scientists are talking about is "land locked ice" – ice that is in an environment with a temperature colder than 0^{o}C. For this note we will assume a temperature rise of 4^{o}C – a rise most unlikely to happen [1]. It is this temperature rise that will melt some ice, which we will call 'available ice', but not most of the ice.

The temperature at the top of Mount Everest ranges from -36^{o}C to -76^{o}C, so a four degree rise will not melt any of this ice. The adiabatic lapse rate [2] tells us that a four degree rise in global temperatures will lift the freezing level around the bottom of mountains by approximately 600 metres (2,000 feet).

So, the only mountain ice that can be considered "available" is the ice in the first 600 metres.

The Other Side of the Coin.

Where does this ice come from? From precipitation (in this case snow) from the sky. How did it get up in the sky? From water evaporating from the oceans resulting in a lowering of the sea levels.

So, to get any sea level rise, the "available" ice is now the net ice available.

Predicted Sea Level Rises

Depending on the gullibility of their audience, Green scientists have predicted sea level rises ranging from 0.8 metres to 30 metres [3]. For our exercise below, we will assume a 'low' two metre sea level rise. Some Greens claim that sea level rises of two metres are already being seen in Pacific islands today.

How Much Ice Do We Need?

Two thirds of the surface of the Earth is covered by oceans, the remaining one third is covered by the land. So, to raise the ocean levels by two metres we must cover every square metre of land with available ice, that is four metres high.

That is a lot of ice – most do not realize the magnitude of this problem.

A PRACTICAL EXERCISE

Your job in the exercise is to find enough land-locked ice to raise the sea levels by two metres. Forget the “other side of the coin” factor and the depth of the available ice over four metres as they are not material to the point being made.

Most of the satellite photographs used on Google Earth have been taken in summer so cloud does not cover the land. Consequently, most of the ice you will see is land-locked ice that is available for this exercise.

The Greens will tell you that this ice in say;

- The Himalayas,
- The Andes,
- The Rockies
- The Swiss and the French Alps, etc

is enough to cause catastrophic sea level rises.

In this exercise, try ‘picking up’ the ice you see on Google Earth on these mountain ranges, to try to cover all the land in a nearby country. You see the problem – it is going to be impossible. There is not enough ice!

If you think the depth of the ice is going to help you, it must be remembered much of this deep ice is not ‘available’.

Having failed to even cover the land in countries nearest the ice, you should now look at the large areas of Russia, Africa, and Australia. They also must be covered in four metres of ice.

Below are photos taken from Google Earth of the Himalayas and the Alps as an example of this impossible task.

CONCLUSION

In a previous handout we found that melting Arctic ice had no effect on sea levels.

In this handout we find that, even ignoring that annual rainfall is lowering sea levels, there is not enough “available ice” in the mountains to have anything but a trivial effect on sea levels.

Now do you think that we will see “catastrophic sea level rises” of two metres, thirty metres, or even 0.8 of a metre? No? So, why did we blindly and unthinkingly accept such alarmist predictions without any critical examination of any part of the claim. Have we lost these skills?

Notes.

1. Between 1970-2000 global temperatures rose naturally by 0.3 degrees Celsius instead of rising 3-5 degrees as predicted by the Green scientists. Another failed prediction that falsified their theory.
2. While the dry adiabatic lapse rate is a constant 9.8 °C/km (5.38 °F per 1,000 ft, 3 °C/1,000 ft), the moist adiabatic lapse rate varies strongly with temperature. A typical value is around 5 °C/km, (9 °F/km, 2.7 °F/1,000 ft, 1.5 °C/1,000 ft) https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lapse_rate .
3. One of the low predictions (0.8 metres) was made in an Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) report. Professor Flannery in a radio talk back show in Australia telling Australians that by 2050 eight story buildings in Sydney will be covered by the ocean.


Poland
Netherlands
Germany
Belgium
Luxembourg
Czechia
Slovakia
Austria
Hungar
France
Switzerland
Slovenia
Croatia
Bosnia and
Herzegovina
Monaco
Monteneg
Italy
Andorra
Tyrrhenian Sea


Sign in
Tajikistan
QINGHAI
JAMMU AND KASHMIR
HIMACHAL PRADESH
TIBET
Pakistan
PUNJAB
UTTARAKHAND
HARYANA
ARUNACHAL PRADESH
Nepal
UTTAR PRADESH
SIKKIM
Bhutan
RAJASTHAN
ASSAM
NAGALAND
BIHAR
MEGHALAYA
MANIPUR
Bangladesh
GUJARAT
MADHYA PRADESH
JHARKHAND
TRIPURA
India
WEST BENGAL
MIZORAM
Myanmar (Burma)
CHHATTISGARH
ODISHA
MAHARASHTRA
TELANGANA
GOA
KARNATAKA
ANDHRA PRADESH
Bay of Bengal
TAMIL NADU
3D
Google