

Due to an oversight, some links incorrectly end up on this essay. The oil link is here: "[http://tech-know.eu/uploads/Oil\\_is\\_NOT\\_a\\_Fossil\\_Fuel.pdf](http://tech-know.eu/uploads/Oil_is_NOT_a_Fossil_Fuel.pdf)" – apologies for the error.

## **SUN heats EARTH, EARTH heats ATMOSPHERE – *not the other way around.***

A definitive chapter on the fallacy of man-made global warming/climate change.

By Hans Schreuder  
13 May 2009

"Our understanding of the natural world does not progress through the straight forward accumulation of facts because most scientists tend to gravitate to the established popular consensus also known as the established paradigm. Thomas Kuhn describes the development of scientific paradigms as comprising three stages: prescience, normal science and revolutionary science when there is a crisis in the current consensus. When it comes to the science of climate change, we are probably already in the revolution state." Jennifer Marohasy, 2009.

After all is said and done, it will be found that carbon dioxide does not and can not affect either the global temperature or climate change. Carbon dioxide has no climate forcing effect and is not a greenhouse gas and, for that matter, neither is water vapour.

"To understand heat transfer we have to keep in mind that heat is not a substance, but energy that flows from one system toward other systems with lower density of energy." [1]

The only worthwhile source of warmth for planet earth is our Sun, warming all of the land and all of the seas, which then warm the atmosphere – not the other way around; the atmosphere does not warm the earth, other than during short-term exceptional weather conditions such as the Sirocco winds over the Canary Islands.

Volcanoes add a small amount of heat locally as and when they erupt and sometimes may cause temporary global cooling until the ash and other material has settled back to earth. Erupting underwater volcanoes will add some warmth to the sea, but in the bigger picture, it is only the sun that adds global warmth to our planet. The atmosphere is warmed up from the heat that radiates off the surface of the earth. During the day, the atmosphere in fact helps to cool the earth and, depending where on earth you are, during the night the atmosphere will either continue to cool the earth (at the poles and in dry deserts) or keep the earth warm (at the equator). Water vapour helps to maintain some of the daytime warmth during the night-time, the greater the humidity, the greater the capacity of the atmosphere to maintain temperature. At no stage though does water vapour *add* warmth to the atmosphere and neither does carbon dioxide – only in closed test flasks in a laboratory, but under no circumstances in the open atmosphere in which we all live.

Before discussing the issue of man-made global warming (AGW) or the man-made climate change, one central definition has to be stated quite clearly.

The so-called greenhouse effect of the atmosphere is commonly explained as follows: "The heating effect exerted by the atmosphere upon the Earth because certain trace gases in the atmosphere (water vapor, carbon dioxide, etc.) absorb and reemit infrared radiation. [...] The component that is radiated downward warms the Earth's surface more than would occur if only the direct sunlight were absorbed. The magnitude of this enhanced warming is the greenhouse effect. Earth's annual mean surface temperature of 15°C is 33°C higher as a result of the greenhouse effect ..." [2]

The above definition is the accepted one by climate alarmists and climate realists alike and is the one that is referred to throughout this chapter. That definition is the "settled science" heralded by the UN IPCC. *That definition is 100% wrong on all counts.* [7]

"We would be mistaken if we were to think that the change of temperature was caused by CO<sub>2</sub> when, in reality, it was the Sun that heated up the soil. Carbon dioxide only interfered with the energy emitted by the soil and absorbed a small amount of that radiation (0.0786 Joules), but carbon dioxide did not cause any warming. Please never forget two important points: the first is that carbon dioxide is not a source of heat, and the second is that the main source of warming for the Earth is the Sun." [1]

"It started with a genuine concern by senior scientists in Europe and the USA that if uncontrolled, increasing emissions of carbon dioxide and other gases into the atmosphere from burning fossil fuels, mainly coal, could have serious consequences. It is also very important to note that global climate models are unable to produce an output that is verifiable. In other words the output can neither be proved nor disproved. What grounds do those who use these models have to refute observations made by others to the effect that there is no believable evidence of the postulated dramatic adverse changes produced by the models?" [4]

"Throughout the last decade, supporters of the idea of an anthropogenic global warming (AGW) or the impact of an anthropogenic "greenhouse" effect on climate (IAGEC) have been insisting on an erroneous concept of the emission of energy from the atmosphere towards the surface. The AGW-IAGEC assumption states that half of the energy absorbed by atmospheric gases, especially carbon dioxide, is reemitted back towards the surface heating it up. This solitary assumption is fallacious when considered in light of real natural processes" [1]

"If there was strong evidence of undesirable changes, then the whole climate change issue would have been resolved long ago. The tragedy is that there is a world-wide policy in the opposite direction. Not only has the observation theory route been avoided, but climate change scientists and their organisations have adopted a policy of deliberately denigrating all those who practise it. Why are they following this thoroughly unethical and unscientific procedure? [...] after 20 years of massive international effort (the overwhelming consensus), climate change scientists have still to produce solid, verifiable evidence of the consequences of human activities. They have been unable to proceed beyond claims that climate change will result in the 'intensification of the hydrological cycle' for which there is no scientifically believable evidence. Not only do our studies completely negate the claims made by climate change scientists, but we can demonstrate with a high degree of assurance that all the proposed measures to limit greenhouse gas emissions will be an exercise in futility. [4]

"[...] atmospheric gases do not cause any warming of the surface given that induced emission prevails over spontaneous emission. During daytime, solar irradiance induces air molecules to emit photons towards the surface; however, the load of Short Wave Radiation (SWR) absorbed by molecules in the atmosphere is exceptionally low, while the load of Long Wave Radiation (LWR) emitted from the surface and absorbed by the atmosphere is high and so leads to an upwelling induced emission of photons which follows the outgoing trajectory of the photon stream, from lower atmospheric layers to higher atmospheric layers, and finally towards outer space. The warming effect (misnamed "the greenhouse effect") of Earth is due to the oceans, the ground surface and subsurface materials. Atmospheric gases act only as conveyors of heat." [1]

"It is human arrogance to think that we can control climate, a process that transfers huge amounts of energy. Once we control the smaller amount of energy transferred by volcanoes and earthquakes, then we can try to control climate.

***Until then, climate politics is just a load of ideological hot air.***

To argue that human additions to atmospheric CO<sub>2</sub>, a trace gas in the atmosphere, changes climate requires an abandonment of all we know about history, archaeology, geology, solar physics, chemistry and astronomy. We ignore history at our peril.

I await the establishment of a Stalinist-type Truth and Retribution Commission to try me for my crimes against the established order and politicised science." [5]

To conclude this chapter, it is necessary to understand that the underlying drive for control over the use of energy is based on the principles set out in the United Nation's Agenda 21 [8] as well as two other relevant agendas [9], [10]. When the idea of blaming carbon dioxide came to be understood by those who wished to wield their control over global affairs, the wheels of political manipulation were set in motion via the UNFCCC. All Western governments subscribed to the ideals without understanding the deeper meaning of the hidden agendas and lured by the promise of huge subsidies, taxation and green job creation schemes.

As a final word on the matter of greenhouse gases and the greenhouse effect, I quote from the most elaborate and accurate scientific paper on the subject:

"The atmospheric greenhouse effect, an idea that many authors trace back to the traditional works of Fourier (1824), Tyndall (1861), and Arrhenius (1896), and which is still supported in global climatology, essentially describes a fictitious mechanism, in which a planetary atmosphere acts as a heat pump driven by an environment that is *radiatively* interacting with but radiatively equilibrated to the atmospheric system. According to the second law of thermodynamics, such a planetary machine can never exist. Nevertheless, in almost all texts of global climatology and in a widespread secondary literature, it is taken for granted that such a mechanism is real and stands on a firm scientific foundation. In this paper, the popular conjecture is analyzed and the underlying physical principles are clarified. By showing that (a) there are no common physical laws between the warming phenomenon in glass houses and the fictitious atmospheric greenhouse effects, (b) there are no calculations to determine an average surface temperature of a planet, (c) the frequently mentioned difference of 33 degrees C is a meaningless number calculated wrongly, (d) the formulas of cavity radiation are used inappropriately, (e) the assumption of a radiative balance is unphysical, (f) thermal conductivity and friction must not be set to zero, the atmospheric greenhouse conjecture is falsified." [3] [6]

With thanks and gratitude to Alan Siddons, Gerhard Gerlich, Ralf Tscheuschner, Gerhard Kramm and a score of eminent scientists and analysts across the world, without whose insight and encouragement I could not have written this chapter.

Hans Schreuder  
Darsham, England  
Analytical Chemist (ret.)  
mMensa  
[www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/carbondioxide.html](http://www.ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/carbondioxide.html)

#### References:

- [1] [http://www.biocab.org/Heat\\_Stored\\_by\\_Atmospheric\\_Gases.html](http://www.biocab.org/Heat_Stored_by_Atmospheric_Gases.html)
- [2] <http://amsglossary.allenpress.com/glossary/search?id=greenhouse-effect1>
- [3] [http://arxiv.org/PS\\_cache/arxiv/pdf/0707/0707.1161v4.pdf](http://arxiv.org/PS_cache/arxiv/pdf/0707/0707.1161v4.pdf)
- [4] <http://anhonestclimatedebate.wordpress.com/2009/04/03/climate-change-%e2%80%93-the-clash-of-theories-by-professor-will-alexander/>
- [5] Ian Plimer, Professor of Earth and Environmental Sciences at the University of Adelaide and Emeritus Professor of Earth Sciences at the University of Melbourne, author of Heaven and Earth - Global Warming: The Missing Science (Connor Court).
- [6] <http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/0904/0904.2767.pdf>
- [7] [http://tech-know.eu/uploads/UK\\_Submission.pdf](http://tech-know.eu/uploads/UK_Submission.pdf)
- [8] <http://www.un.org/esa/sustdev/documents/agenda21/index.htm>
- [9] <http://www.mdgmonitor.org/index.cfm>
- [10] <http://www.globio.info/>