

Re: OT : excellent article on global warming

Source: <http://sci.tech-archive.net/Archive/sci.electronics.design/2009-05/msg00926.html>

- *From:* bill.sloman@xxxxxxxx
 - *Date:* Sun, 3 May 2009 07:04:32 -0700 (PDT)
-

On May 3, 5:21 am, Eeyore <rabbitsfriendsandrelati...@xxxxxxxxxxxx> wrote:

Eeyore wrote:

Some REAL science at last, notably illustrating that the effect of CO₂ in the atmosphere is nearly already at saturation level and more can contribute very little to temperature rise.

And another.

<http://www.nov55.com/ntyg.html>

" There is no Valid Mechanism for CO₂ Creating Global Warming

Proof one: Laboratory measurements show that carbon dioxide absorbs to extinction at its main peak in 10 meters under atmospheric conditions.* This means there is no radiation left at those frequencies after 10 meters. If then humans double their 3% input of CO₂ into the atmosphere, the distance of absorption reduces to 9.7m. A reduction in distance is not an increase in temperature. Convictional currents stir the heat around removing any relevance for distance.

That's a really old fallacy.

http://www.aip.org/history/climate/co2.htm#L_0241

Around 1900 "Knut Ångström, asked an assistant to measure the passage of infrared radiation through a tube filled with carbon dioxide. The assistant ("Herr J. Koch," otherwise unrecorded in history) put in rather less of the gas in total than would be found in a column of air reaching to the top of the atmosphere. The assistant reported that the amount of radiation that got through the tube scarcely changed when he cut the quantity of gas back by a third. Apparently it took only a trace of the gas to "saturate" the absorption that is, in the bands of the spectrum where CO₂ blocked radiation, it did it so thoroughly that more gas could make little difference.(7*)"

Re: OT : excellent article on global warming

Scientists who promote the global warming hype try to work around this fact by claiming something different happens higher in the atmosphere, which they claim involves unsaturation. The difference due to height is that the absorption peaks get smaller and sharper, so they separate from each other. Near the earth's surface, the absorption peaks for water vapor partially overlap the absorption peaks for CO₂. Supposedly, in some obfuscated way, separating the peaks creates global warming. There is no real logic to that claim. It is nothing but an attempt to salvage global warming propaganda through obfuscation of complexities

Which is to say, the author doesn't know enough to understand what is actually going on, any more than Eeyore does.

The AIP web-site goes on to say

"These measurements and arguments had fatal flaws. Herr Koch had reported to Ångström that the absorption had not been reduced by more than 0.4% when he lowered the pressure, but a modern calculation shows that the absorption would have decreased about 1% like many a researcher, the assistant was over confident about his degree of precision.(8a) But even if he had seen the 1% shift, Ångström would have thought this an insignificant perturbation. He failed to understand that the logic of the experiment was altogether false. The greenhouse effect will in fact operate even if the absorption of radiation were totally saturated in the lower atmosphere. The planet's temperature is regulated by the thin upper layers where radiation does escape easily into space. Adding more greenhouse gas there will change the balance. Moreover, even a 1% change in that delicate balance would make a serious difference in the planet's surface temperature. The logic is rather simple once it is grasped, but it takes a new way of looking at the atmosphere not as a single slab, like the gas in Koch's tube (or the glass over a greenhouse), but as a set of interacting layers. (The full explanation is in the essay on Simple Models).

The subtle difference did not occur to anyone for many decades, if only because hardly anyone thought the greenhouse effect was worth their attention. For after Ångström published his conclusions in 1900, the few scientists who had taken an interest in the matter concluded that Arrhenius's hypothesis had been proven wrong. Theoretical work on the question stagnated for decades, and so did measurement of the level of CO₂ in the atmosphere.(9)"

Trust Eeyore to find and tout a long-exploded proposition.

--

Bill Sloman, Nijmegen

.