

A Basic Analysis - Case A versus Case B

One of the most essential basic questions of climatology is whether the two following variants lead to identical effects, i.e. whether they would be interchangeable 1:1 without greenhouse gases? The first case **A** assumes a globe which is permanently irradiated with a solar spectrum of the power 342 W/m^2 in a spherical shape parallel to the entire surface. This value is obtained by distributing the 1368 W/m^2 of solar power at a distance from the earth to a circular "earth disk" of $r^2\pi$ on a full spherical surface of $4r^2\pi$. This results in quartered $1368/4=342 \text{ W/m}^2$ all around and permanently constant.

The comparison case **B** is a globe which rotates once around its own axis within 24 hours and is irradiated by the sun with 1368 W/m^2 on one side. So the question is, are these two cases identical with respect to the resulting effect?

In the first case A, storage properties of the earth materia (i.e. land or oceans) do not play a role, because it is an eternal stationary state. All existing storages are therefore fully charged. The temperature calculated by Stefan-Boltzmann formula [$P = \text{Sigma} \times T^4$] with assumed 30% reflection and 70% absorption is -18°C as a uniform balance value over the whole surface ($\Sigma\text{In} = \Sigma\text{Out}$). Ocean currents would not occur because at -18°C all oceans would be completely frozen. This model conception is used by climatology and derives from it that there must be a "natural greenhouse effect", which warms up starting from -18°C around $+33^\circ\text{C}$, in order to come to the observable approx. $+15^\circ\text{C}$ average temperature.

In the other case B, 1368 W/m^2 act on a perpendicular line between the earth's surface and the sun. Deviating from the perpendicular, the effective component of the power decreases with the sine of the incident angle down to zero at 0° or 180° grazing light limit. With again 70% absorption, theoretical temperatures of maximum 87.5°C result in the zenith vertically at 90° , approx. 57°C with sun at 45° , approx. 30°C with 30° oblique irradiation and approx. 3°C at 20° . The earth axis is now known to be inclined by approx. 23° , therefore even the polar surfaces receive in the year alternating from the sun effective powers up to a maximum of 534 W/m^2 at summer solstice and 0 W/m^2 in the opposite dark case. So it is not a stationary state but a periodic one with 24 hours period duration. Thus, a hemispherical irradiation zone with periodically dynamically resulting intensity distributions according to the spherical shape moves once in 24 hours over the earth's surface. And in addition this scheme oscillates once in the yearly rhythm back and forth between north and south, whereby there is no single place of the surface where eternal darkness prevails. This oscillation determines the change of the seasons. Strictly speaking, the irradiation zone is even slightly beyond 180° , because the sun is much larger than the earth and therefore reaches slightly beyond the 180° edge. In this second case B, therefore, the storage properties have an effect and ocean currents due to temperature differences play an important role. These currents from the warm equatorial regions to the cooler polar regions cause a permanently ongoing temperature redistribution and mixing, which therefore does not follow a static radiation calculation. It is certainly possible to simulate this situation approximately by models with the help of known formulas of theoretical physics and the known continental forms. However, it is enough to analyze the situation considering observable reality. Observable reality proves that the temperature response of individual points of the surface does not follow a theoretical result of a daily temperature response curve by the actual irradiation power, but due to the natural storage properties of the respective matter per location only small temperature differences between day and night occur. This is especially true for oceans, where the water temperature at a location remains approximately constant over 24 hours due to storage

inertia. If the axis of rotation were not oblique but perpendicular to the sun, the calculated freezing limit would be about 72° north or south. So, without the possibility of flow, the two polar caps between about 72° and 90° latitude would be frozen, the huge rest would be much warmer. In the north this would be a circle around the pole reaching south to about the middle of Greenland. The -18°C limit would be at about 77° latitude, around northern Greenland or Spitsbergen. However, because there are actually currents and the Earth's axis is tilted, stored/charged equatorial heat is distributed far to the north or south, causing the ice crusts that form to melt and refreeze cyclically, depending on the season. This determines the change in annual sea ice extent. So, case B corresponds to reality and all measurable facts are in direct and good agreement with this assumption. If one determines the mean temperature in case B, the result is approx. +15°C. These +15°C are not the result of a mysterious "greenhouse effect", which supposedly warms up from -18°C by 33°C to +15°C, but the completely natural mean temperature due to storage properties of the matter plus current redistribution without any "additional effect by greenhouse gases".

Thus it is shown that these two model conceptions A compared to B are by far not identical! The widespread -18°C theory is falsified and with it the whole framework on which the "commercial alarm climatology" is based. In the bible language this would mean, the house is built on sand. But allegedly 97% of climatologists believe in the absurd replacement model A. The main reasons for the divergence are the natural storage properties of the matter, heat distribution by currents and the fact that one may not quarter linearly with a formula with a 4th power, CO₂ has nothing to do with it! All this proves clearly, with which kind of science one has to do it here. With it also all consequential theories like e.g. Trenberth/Kiehl 97 become senseless and insubstantial. And if this +33°C "natural greenhouse effect" does not exist, how can an anthropogenic additional greenhouse effect exist?

On the question of a possible warming of the atmosphere by CO₂, one can also do a simple thought experiment in addition. First, one simply assumes that the atmosphere would consist of 100% of a fictitious gas species that would be radiation-sensitive over the entire infrared wavelength range in question, e.g., from 1 µm to 300 µm. Such a theoretical gas type could heat up by the radiation of the earth's surface at most to the same temperature, which the earth's surface also has or radiates. Exactly this temperature is passed on thermodynamically by contact. So there would be no higher temperature in the gas by radiation than by contact. But real CO₂ is not sensitive over the whole infrared wavelength range, but only in a narrow range around 15 µm wavelength, so only a tiny fraction of the radiated energy, whose entire spectrum ranges from about 3 µm to several 100 µm depending on the ground temperature, can be absorbed by the CO₂. Therefore, for reasons of energetic symmetry, the maximum possible temperature by irradiation can only be far below the radiated one. This means that the temperature of the atmosphere is almost 100% thermodynamically determined and not by irradiation of the CO₂ molecules. The CO₂ molecules get their temperature by contact with the air and not vice versa. In addition, the atmosphere does not consist of 100% CO₂, but only of 0.04%! So only a few isolated molecules can be hit by radiation and this radiation is by far not sufficient to cause a higher molecular temperature than thermodynamically caused anyway. The CO₂ molecules therefore have the identical temperature in each air layer as the surrounding air. Therefore, they cannot radiate a warmer temperature/heat than this air has. And as is well known, this temperature decreases continuously from the ground upwards due to the air pressure. Also this consideration shows clearly that everything must be absurd nonsense, what is mentioned under the title radiation transfer and results in a temperature increase by CO₂!

This analysis leads directly into another consideration: our air consists of 78% nitrogen and 21% oxygen, which adds up to 99%. The remaining 1% consists of noble gases such as argon and others and just a tiny approx. 0.04% CO₂. Of this worldwide share of tiny 0.04% CO₂, at least 75% is of natural origin, such as rotting, volcanism, outgassing, etc., and only about 25% of it is attributable to human combustion processes, if all other natural sources are excluded. So even if you attribute the entire CO₂ increase since 300 ppm to humans, that's about 100 ppm, or one more molecule of CO₂ per 10,000 air. So that's 25% of 0.04%, or 0.01% anthropogenic. Of this, Austria accounts for approx. 0.2%, which then corresponds to 0.00002%. So 2 anthropogenic molecules of CO₂ per 10 million molecules of air accumulated during 60 years. (Remark: This analysis is basically made from an Austrian point of view). The preceding analysis concerning model comparison A versus B shows nevertheless clearly that a so-called "natural greenhouse effect" of +33°C cannot exist, therefore the question arises, what 2 molecules CO₂ on 10 million air can cause? How can a green-populist politician voluntarily declare himself responsible for having culpably caused weather events somewhere in the wide world and pay 360 million Euros of Austrian tax money as compensation? But exactly these stories are propagated at present by green-do-gooder brainwash, in order to destroy with it the affected own economy de facto deliberately! That is it, which endangers in reality the future of our children lastingly! So it is correct, we have a problem! And this problem is at present in the process to take up furiously fast speed, see energy shortage, inflation and de-industrialization. That is in truth the actual crisis, which threatens us! With all these discussions it is also completely forgotten and faded out that CO₂ is essential together with water and sunlight for any life on this earth, and not a harmful substance or even poison, as not rarely to hear. To whom is actually an António Guterres responsible, if he claims, the earth races with full throttle into a climatic disaster caused by humans and therefore worldwide young people feel seduced to absurd climate actionism?

It shows up evenly that the terrestrial weather has a gigantic range, which humans estimate unfortunately all too often wrongly also in the "enlightened" 21 Century with its spreading over the planet earth. There is not a single weather event, which did not exist in similar, even in more extreme form, in the known past already often. The small temperature increase has with security the same causes, which already worked in the investigated earth history e.g. since end of the last ice age before approx. 12.000 years. Witnesses for it are e.g. frequent finds, which were found under melting glaciers again and again and are clear evidence of former periods of warmer climate.

Summary: There is not a single argumentation, which is compatible with the known physics at the same time and would prove an atmospheric warming by CO₂! Not to mention measurements or experiments in this respect. Not least for this reason also IPCC since its foundation in 1988 is not able to make a concrete statement about the effect of CO₂ in the atmosphere. Everything discussed by IPCC has the status of assumptions without any concrete evidence! And on assumptions (ECS) are also based the different IPCC temperature scenarios due to CO₂ increases in the future. Good night world and good night Austria, one can only say ...

Translation supported by [deepl.com](https://www.deepl.com), thank you!

N. P. Eberhard