

Freedom Matters

A News & Opinion Paper

Dane County, Wisconsin

Our mission is to restore our constitutional republic and its defense of our unalienable rights as individuals to life, liberty and property.

Vol. 9, No. 12

Friday, November 20, 2009

The Year of the Quiet Sun, Part II

by Bob Bowman

Al Gore, our former Vice-President, acts as if he's a **climate** scientist, even accepting a Nobel Prize for his error-filled climate film, "*An Inconvenient Truth*." It tries to sell us on a badly flawed theory, arguing that CO₂ – a trace greenhouse gas (**GHG**) – threatens Earth with catastrophic global warming.

A scientific paper by Gerlich & Tschuschner reveals a major flaw in Gore's model. It says, "Hold on. GHG theory tries to sell us a **perpetual motion machine**." Such a scam may be what Gore and his "*real scientist*" pals are peddling.

Climate, roughly, is "averaged weather." Climatology is a new field, and climatologists, often naive. Some embrace the work of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, a **United Nations** bureaucracy created, so it says, to **prove** that the rising level of atmospheric CO₂ from the burning of fossil fuels is leading to catastrophic global warming. *By that, you see that the U.N. did not set out to pursue science. It set out to push a political dogma.* Pushing a dog is just what the U.N. is doing. Using dogma as if it's science is a more serious issue than global warming; climatologist Richard Lindzen has reviewed its ill effects on global warming science.

My topic here, however, is the science by which Gore's CO₂ greenhouse is a perpetual motion machine. Earth moves in the vacuum of space, so it only gains or loses heat via radiation. Hence, **climate models** on global warming focus on **radiation** as the prime heat mover, and on the atmosphere as Earth's main radiator. They slight issues of storage and transport of heat in oceans, air and land, and mechanisms of **heat conduction** (molecular kinetics), **convection** (air or water flows), **latent heat** loads (evaporation and condensation of water), **heat reflection** (e.g., effects of clouds), etc.

Current computer models of climate utilize the radiative scheme of Kiehl & Trenberth (1999; 2007). It says that CO₂ in air absorbs outgoing heat (i.e., **infrared radiation, IR**), then re-emits it, sending half of it back to earth, thus trapping it, in a sense. *That's the **greenhouse effect**, says the model, by which Earth is warmer than without GHGs.*

Hey, we all know that! It's like our closed car in the sun, where the glass lets in sunlight but will not let the IR radiate back out, trapping the IR inside and thus overheating the car. Try touching the steering wheel; it can be painfully hot.

"Hold on," says science. "Equip the car with glass transparent to IR, so it doesn't trap IR. Behold, the closed car still overheats! It's the trapping of the air, not of IR, that overheats the car. Ventilate the air, and *voila*, no overheating."

Such data show that trapping outgoing IR has very little greenhouse effect. But, does a greenhouse model apply to Earth's air and its GHGs? Yes, say most accounts, even those of scientists or of their organizations.

Yet, unlike a car, Earth is two-thirds ocean two miles deep.

That's a huge heat sink. Its deep cold currents overturn every 10-30 years, thus warming or cooling the air. Such overturning caused warming in 1976-1998, a warming that the U.N. wrongly lays to an increase of CO₂ in air. As another strike against the U.N.'s CO₂ dogma, warming in air **stopped** after 1998, *despite CO₂ in air continuing to increase unabated.*

The U.N.'s climate model posits CO₂ as if it's 12 kilometers up; i.e., at the tropopause (the top of the troposphere or lower layer of air). There, the model's CO₂ absorbs outgoing IR radiation and re-emits about half of it back down, thus re-warming the earth and surface air.

The trouble is, the tropopause is at -60 C, while earth and surface air are much warmer (+14 C). The killer is this: *cold air cannot beat up warm air.* That would be like your car engine moving your car without using fuel. Such "perpetual motion" can't happen. So the U.N.'s climate model is wrong.

The U.N.'s model also errs in positing air as Earth's main radiator, since **gases are poor at radiating**. Earth likely loses heat mostly by radiation from ground. So **Michael Hammer** proposes, from 25 years in spectroscopic research. See jennifermarohasy.com/blog for his 2009 paper, "An analysis of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere."

Nitrogen and oxygen (>99% of dry air) pass thermal radiation (wavelengths of 5 - 50 microns). But, GHGs (i.e., water vapor, CO₂, methane and ozone) have narrow wavelength bands **that block heat loss**. Thus, ground and cloud tops radiate heat *except at wavelengths where GHGs absorb it*. The stratosphere (air above the tropopause) lacks water vapor. That lets the tropopause radiate heat through the warmer stratosphere and out into space, cooling the tropopause.

So, Hammer has Earth lose heat by radiating it from ground into space at wavelengths **between** GHG absorption bands. Those bands, being narrow, fill quickly. After that, doubling a GHG widens the bands, giving an undisputed linear rise in air temperature versus log GHG. Thereby, if **+170 ppm** CO₂ in air gives +0.4 C (as the U.N. says it does), then each doubling of CO₂ in air adds another 0.4 C. So, instead of +1700 ppm CO₂ giving a 4 C rise, it only gives a 1.6 C rise. *If we burned all of our fossil fuel, we couldn't get that much CO₂ rise.*

The U.N. claims that CO₂ will rise **+170 ppm** in air by 2070 (to 560 ppm), adding 0.4 C to global temperature. That's too small a rise to be catastrophic, so the U.N. **inflates it to a 3 degree rise** by *pretending* positive feedback by water vapor. Contrary to the U.N. *pretense*, data says that the water vapor cycle in air acts to **reduce** any heat rise, **not** to inflate it.

There's yet another factor. Global **cooling** may dominate the rest of this century, for the **sun** has gone magnetically quiet. Historically that has meant less heat for Earth, so we will likely welcome CO₂, a gas we need for the survival of life, because it may also help to warm our air a bit. ☞

Next up: Oh how worms wriggle, put on a book.

Readers' Bulletin Board. e-mail us your comments. Include your name, for publication by *Freedom Matters*

*** Published by Freedom Matters, Inc., Cross Plains, WI. 53528, Elena Byrne, Editor ***
To subscribe or unsubscribe, e-mail to rebshar@chorus.net, or call Bob at (608) 831-6653.
Our e-mail subscriber list is confidential. We will not sell it or reveal it.

All Issues of Freedom Matters are on: www.freedommatters.org