

UN IPCC: To Be Trusted or Questioned?



Image source: <https://principia-scientific.org/un-ipcc-to-be-trusted-or-questioned/>

by Hans Schreuder
June 2018

On-line at http://tech-know-group.com/essays/UN_IPCC_Trusted_or_Questioned.pdf

UN IPCC: To Be Trusted or Questioned?

by Hans Schreuder – June 1, 2018

You decide whether the UN's Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) is to be trusted on their interpretations of climate science and projections of future climate calamities..

CLIMATE ISSUE #1:

According to one of many [official energy budgets](#) for planet Earth, as used by the IPCC, our planet as a whole absorbs 239 W/m^2 of solar energy, which equates to minus 18°C , but due to the surface reflecting some of that energy straight back out again, the net amount on the surface is reckoned to be a only 161 W/m^2 , which equates to minus 42°C .




Fig. 1: Earth Energy budget figures with their relevant temperatures

[Latest UN IPCC Earth Energy Budget has varying numbers](#) – but the most important concepts remain unchanged, see below.

The actual solar power that the Sun sends to earth amounts to about 1364 W/m^2 when it arrives at the top of our atmosphere ([TOA](#)), some 20 km above the earth's surface.

Due to the atmosphere itself scattering some solar power back into space plus the effect of clouds and a variety of airborne particles, it is generally agreed that about 30% of that TOA solar power does not reach Earth's surface, so we end up with $1364 \times 0.7 = 954.8 \text{ W/m}^2$ actually penetrating the sunny-side of our Earth.


On the Equator, that amount of solar energy would heat the surface to 87°C .

Knowing that Earth is actually spherical and that a sphere has [four times the area of a disc](#), climate scientists unfold Earth's spherical surface to a flat plane and then cut solar irradiance by 4 times to compensate.


That division of solar power means that instead of having one half of the Earth in sunlight whilst the other half is in darkness and cooling off (= Reality), the IPCC scientists have recreated a mathematical planet Earth with a perpetual twilight Sun.

As per above, such a twilight Sun sends us 239 W/m^2 which equates to a frigid minus 18°C but when taking surface reflection into account, it amounts to just 161 W/m^2 bringing it to minus 42°C – all over the Earth, all the time (= Fiction). (That's lower than the average temperature at the [South Pole in February!](#))

This kind of interpretation has been accepted by scientists all over the world and has convinced politicians that they need to do something to prevent the Earth from warming by more than 2°C if levels of atmospheric CO_2 were to double.



Reality versus Fiction



The above depiction of the whole Earth in twilight is what climate scientists want us to believe, it is the basis of computer simulations that produce the dire predictions and what is actually taught in schools and colleges.

Mathematically this makes perfect sense to the experts who never step outside of their “thought-bubble” and realise that we have a day and a night which, despite being able to do so mathematically, can not be “averaged” into an ice-ball planet at minus 42°C .

It's the same as calculating the “average” number of children per household, with the result showing that the “average” number of children is 2.4 per household

Have you ever come across such a child?!


What about the idea of cooking a meal for 6 hours at 10°C rather than 1 hour at 60°C . Mathematically it's the same amount of power!

Not everything can be converted in a meaningful manner to an “average” or a “total power” number just because it can be so “calculated”.

You decide whether or not it is realistic to divide the Sun's power by 4 to create an average solar input which does not reflect on the reality of having a day and a night.

CLIMATE ISSUE #2:

IPCC scientists and others have to resort to a clever trick in order to compensate for that alarmingly cold surface. They describe a “[greenhouse effect](#)” in which the atmosphere sends twice as much energy to the surface than the Sun does – a massive 342 W/m^2 in the [latest IPCC's Earth Energy Budget](#) as compared to the 161 W/m^2 as seen in Fig.1 or slightly different numbers in similar Earth Energy Budget graphics.



This plumbing diagram illustrates what IPCC scientists are proposing.

The secret is that mathematically you can conjure up anything you like *in between* the energy going into a system and the energy coming out of that system.

If these scientists imagine that OUT must match IN, but anything can happen in between, then why not a million W/m^2 ? And why don't we see power plants based on such a plan?

You decide whether or not it is realistic for the atmosphere to emit energy that is twice as strong as the Sun's averaged input on Earth's surface.


CLIMATE ISSUE #3:

The above mentioned [greenhouse effect](#) is deeply entrenched and even many [skeptics](#) agree that it exists.

The villain in the IPCC climate scientists' plot, carbon dioxide (CO_2) – now in the guise of a thermal pollutant – is portrayed as enhancing the [greenhouse effect](#) by creating the back-radiation that will send temperatures [beyond human endurance](#).

Many people believe that this [greenhouse effect](#) is “like a blanket that keeps Earth warmer than it would be”. A blanket merely holds heat in, however, while the back-radiation from added CO_2 is regarded as a second heat source, making it equivalent to an electric blanket.

Energy is thus created out of nothing or better said “out of thin air” which is what the official diagrams all show – energy that is more than twice the Sun's coming down from the atmosphere!



The only reason that such a [greenhouse effect](#) is created is because the scientists have taken an average satellite reading of the energy that Earth sends into space - an energy that amounts to 239 W/m² - and assume that this is equivalent to a twilight Sun shining 24 hours all over the Earth at the same time, making the Earth's average temperature a cold minus 18°C.

There is however another average temperature for the Earth, based on a few thousand weather stations, at about 1.5 metres off the ground, spread out over the 30% or so of the Earth's solid surface, but almost none in the oceans that cover some 70% of Earth's surface and hardly any in the Arctic and Antarctica – this produces an average Earth temperature of some 15°C.

So, to sum up the situation, satellites give Earth an “average” temperature of minus 18°C and the weather stations give earth an “average” temperature of 15°C and that brings us to the third climate issue of needing a [greenhouse effect](#) that makes Earth 33°C “warmer than it would be”.

You decide whether or not it is realistic to make such calculations.


CLIMATE ISSUE #4:

According the official IPCC documentation, the amount of [CO₂ that humans produce](#) constitutes 3 – 5 % of the total CO₂ in the atmosphere and that small amount is so powerful that it can warm the whole Earth up by at least 2°C if we keep on adding more of it to the atmosphere.

You decide whether or not it is realistic to state that the 3 - 5% of CO₂ from human origin can warm the entire Earth.

CLIMATE ISSUE #5:

According to some [UN's IPCC documentation](#) CO₂ remains in the atmosphere for up to 100 years, yet [other IPCC documentation](#) on page 469 states: “**The removal of human-emitted CO₂ from the atmosphere by natural processes will take a few hundred thousand years (high confidence). Depending on the RCP scenario considered, about 15 to 40% of emitted CO₂ will remain in the atmosphere longer than 1,000 years. This very long time required by sinks to remove anthropogenic CO₂ makes climate change caused by elevated CO₂ irreversible on human time scale.**”, but much less according to [many other sources](#) (for larger image, click image for the source).



Here is a graphic illustration of the likely [scenario](#).

You decide whether or not it is realistic to accept the IPCC figures about CO₂ residence time.

CONCLUSION:

All the above climate issues are the only cause for climate alarm despite each and every one of these issues having been dealt with scientifically over and over again.

Time has come for you to decide whether human produced CO₂ is a real threat to the planet or whether the climate scientists have sold their souls to the dark side of that same United Nations, to wit, [Agenda 21](#) and [similar](#) documentation, for money and the sheer power of controlling the masses.


Is it all about downsizing the developed world, keeping the underdeveloped nations locked in an energy-poor economy based on near-useless [solar power](#) plants and [wind turbines](#)?

The carbon footprint of those allegedly “green” energy generators is huge and the recycling of those installations [a veritable nightmare](#) awaiting future generations.

And for what?

YOU DECIDE

If you agree, send this on to your local politicians and ask them to verify the facts laid bare here for the world to see. Below is a range of web sites with hundreds of scientific papers and essays that contain all the relevant and genuine scientific reasons as to why climate alarm over human CO₂ is a hoax – each and every climate alarm scenario has effectively been dealt with.



<http://ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/>

<http://www.tech-know-group.com/>

<http://climateofsophistry.com/>

<http://principia-scientific.org/>

<http://climatechangedispatch.com>

<http://ilovemycarbon dioxide.com/carbondioxide.html>

<http://principia-scientific.org/two-new-studies-destroy-climate-crisis-greenhouse-gas-carbon-claims/>

http://tech-know-group.com/essays/Are_They_All_Wrong_Then.pdf

With thanks to [Alan Siddons](#) for most of the graphics herein.