That Bogus Greenhouse Gas Whatchamacallit Effect
by John O'Sullivan

Red-faced global warming policymakers are now back tracking as independent experts increasingly discredit the cornerstone of climatology: the greenhouse gas effect (GHE).

One such whistleblower is Dr. Pierre R Latour who below adroitly explains how his NASA colleague, septuagenarian Dr. James Hansen, concocted a mythical 33 degree Centigrade atmospheric greenhouse gas global warming phenomenon.

NASA's global warming guru, Dr. James Hansen, will go down in history as climate science's Bernie Madoff for his pivotal role in touting the GHE hypothesis. This is no imprudent comparison - just "follow the money" as they say. It was Hansen's now legendary doomsaying pronouncements to the U.S. Congress in 1981 that spawned a hundred billion dollar, 30-year government Ponzi scheme (Madoff scammed 'only' $50 billion).

None who sat on that congressional committee appear to have been aware that in 1951 the American Meteorological Society (AMS) had already condemned the GHE to the trashcan of failed theories.

When Cooking the Numbers Ain't Ok

Now retired, former DuPont and NASA Chemical Engineer, Latour is unconstrained in his opinion, "The 33°C are whatchamacallits. This greenhouse gas effect does not exist."

Dr. Latour is one of many experts old enough to remember that in 1981 James Hansen stated the average thermal T (temperature) at Earth's surface is 15°C (ok) and Earth radiates to space at -18°C (ok). From that he declared the difference 15° - (-18°) = 33°C (arithmetic ok) to be the famous greenhouse gas effect.

This is not 'ok' to more astute analysts critical of Hansen's number fudging. They say Hansen's math is very seriously awry because there is no physics to connect these two dissimilar numbers.

Latour recounts his altogether more conventional if less alarmist explanation for what is actually happening with our climate. Apologies to those of you not of a scientific or engineer disposition but hereon in is where we need to get somewhat technical.

The professional engineer registered in Texas and California and from Houston clarifies, "Thermal T is a point property of matter, a scalar measure of its kinetic energy of atomic and molecular motion. It's what thermometers measure and it decreases with altitude. The rate of thermal energy transfer by conduction or convection between hot Th and cold Tc is proportional to (Th – Tc)."

Dr. Latour then explains that radiation, t, is a point property of massless radiation, EMR, a directional vector measure of its energy transmission rate per area or intensity, w/m², according to the [Stefan-Boltzmann law](#). It is measured by pyrometers and spectrometers.

False Atmospheric Heating Assumptions of Climate Scientists

Solar radiation, t, increases with altitude. Black bodies are defined to be those that absorb and radiate with the same intensity and corresponding t. Real, colorful bodies reflect, scatter, absorb, convert and emit radiant energy according to the nature of the incident radiation direction, spectrum and body matter's reflectivity, absorptivity, emissivity and view factors. The rate of EMR energy transfer from a hot body, th, is Q, w = $5.67Ae(th + 273)^4$. But it may not be absorbed by all bodies that intercept it, as GHG theory assumes. In particular, hotter radiating bodies do not absorb colder radiation and reemit it more intensely, as GHG back-radiation theory assumes.

The Houston engineer reminds us that above Earth's stratosphere, thin air, T, is rather cold, about -80°C. Yet solar radiation t is rather hot, about 120°C. So spacesuits have thermal insulation and radiant reflection. He points out, "The difference, 200°C, is meaningless. On a cold, clear, winter day on snowcapped mountains, dry air, T = -10°C and radiation, t = 50°C. I can feel them both."

Where the Difference Between 'T' and 't' was Missed

Much of GHE theory fails to make clear distinctions between these two different kinds of temperature, T and t. One temperature, t, is analogous to velocity, 34 km/hour north (see [nb] on page 5); the other, T, is analogous to density, 1 kg/liter.

"So 34 km/hour - 1 kg/liter is indeed 33 whatchamacallits by arithmetic, but nobody will ever know what a whatchamacallit is because velocity and density are not connected by nature," bemoans Dr. Latour.

He further explains, "To clarify this enormous intellectual flaw, take boiling point of water is 100°C (true) and freezing point is 32°F (true), subtract 100 – 32 = 68 (correct arithmetic) and declare atmospheric pressure is 68 psia. The declaration is false because a) the difference between C and F has no meaning, b) there is no physics to connect 68 to pressure, psia, and, c) atmospheric pressure is actually 14.7 [psia](#)"

Thus we can see that the 33°C greenhouse gas effect that has everybody so upset and is researched (*ad nauseam*) to death is not an effect, merely an easily explained pair of facts.

"Therefore, it is quite true the 33°C greenhouse gas effect defined by Dr. Hansen in 1981 as thermal T = 15°C at surface minus radiant t = -18°C to space is whatchamacallit nonsense," according to Dr. Latour.

How Greenhouse Gas Theorists Compare Apples to Eggs

Latour assures us that since this is irrefutable logic, no experiment is called for. In other words, everybody knows you can't compare apples to eggs; except, that is, unless you're a Greenhouse Gas theorist like Hansen.

The sage Texan advises, "Logic trumps nonsense; that is why humans invented it around 400 B.C. No one needs to prove or disprove the existence of whatchamacallits. They are not even imaginary. There is no greenhouse in the sky."

Planetary atmospheres reflect, scatter, transmit, absorb, emit and diminish stellar radiation intensity at the surface according to Beer-Lambert Law, 121°C incident to Earth's stratosphere to 15°C at surface. Thermal T of atmospheres increase as gravity compresses gas and converts potential energy to kinetic energy closer to the surface from -80°C in the stratosphere to 14.5°C at the ground. Therefore atmospheres cause the surface to be colder than it would be if the atmosphere were thinner or non-existent. The more O_2 (oxygen) is exchanged for higher heat capacity CO_2 (carbon dioxide), the colder the surface radiation intensity temperature. Atmospheres are refrigerators, not blankets.

Dr. Latour continues, "GHG theory postulates back-radiation from cold atmospheric CO_2 is absorbed by the surface, heating it more." He is in agreement with the 'Slayers' group of skeptics who says that violates Second Law of thermodynamics (energy can only be transferred from hot to cold bodies).

Hansen's hokum led climate science to 'create' additional GHE energy, a violation of the First Law of thermodynamics (energy conservation). Latour now joins experts, astrophysicist, [Joe Postma](), Dr. [Matthias Kleepsies]() and Professor [Nasif Nahle]() in vociferously declaring that the infant science of climatology has spawned an impossible perpetual motion machine; a device that man-made global warming promoters have exploited to promote the nonsense of eternal global warming. Together these highly credentialed specialists from diverse fields, collectively referred to as the ['Slayers'](), are building a compelling body of evidence.

Seven Fine Facts Frustrate Hansen's Folly

Latour reminds us "CO_2 does not trap radiation; like all molecules, it absorbs some incident radiation according to its absorption spectrum and promptly emits it according to its emission spectrum. Moreover, CO_2 is not a pollutant; it is inert green plant food. CO_2 should not be curtailed, starving Earth's flora.

As independent science professors are proving, minor solar driven global warming from 1974 to 1998 has [stabilized this century](). CO_2 has nothing

to do with global warming; it actually cools Earth. Arctic ice does not melt because of global warming, increasing T; it melts when the average T > 0, at rate proportional to T, no matter whether T is increasing or decreasing."

Dr. Latour will be causing quite a stir among government climatologists with his essay of seven scientific facts (33°C whatchamacallit, no blanket, no back-radiation, CO_2 no trap, CO_2 inert food, no AGW, ice melts).

Each of Pierre Latour's seven deadly facts slay James Hansen's CO_2 sky dragon and refute GHG theory and the man-made global warming sham. What Dr. Latour presents is robust and verifiable science.

But the unassuming Latour doesn't claim his analysis is cutting edge or requiring any special peer review because what he presents is well known to professional physicists and engineers; "it does not merit a research paper, or research, or experiments."

As the man-made global warming cult collapses the 'science' of human caused global warming is being condemned just as emphatically as Wall Street's sub-prime mortgage scam. Thus Latour's final words of advice are succinct and to the point: "Logic just needs clear definitions and common sense, not government spending and regulation."

John O'Sullivan is coordinator and coauthor of [Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory.](#)

Below is Dr Latour's original essay:

GHG Theory 33°C Effect Whatchamacallit

Pierre R Latour, PhD, Houston, January 15, 2012

GHG Theory was invented to explain a so-called 33°C atmospheric greenhouse gas global warming effect. In 1981 James Hansen[1, 2] stated the average thermal T at Earth's surface is 15°C (ok) and Earth radiates to space at -18°C (ok). Then he declared the difference 15° - (-18°) = 33°C (arithmetic ok) is the famous greenhouse gas effect. This is not ok because there is no physics to connect these two dissimilar numbers. The 33°C are whatchamacallits. This greenhouse gas effect does not exist.

Here is the science for what is happening. Thermal T is a point property of matter, a scalar measure of its kinetic energy of atomic and molecular motion. It is measured by thermometers. It decreases with altitude. The rate of thermal energy transfer by conduction or convection between hot Th and cold Tc is proportional to (Th - Tc).

Radiation t is a point property of massless radiation, EMR, a directional vector measure of its energy transmission rate per area or intensity, w/ m^2, according to the Stefan-Boltzmann law. It is measured by pyrometers and spectrometers. Solar radiation t increases with altitude. Black bodies are defined to be those that absorb and radiate with the same intensity and corresponding t. Real, colorful bodies reflect, scatter, absorb, convert

and emit radiant energy according to the nature of the incident radiation direction, spectrum and body matter reflectivity, absorptivity, emissivity and view factors. The rate of EMR energy transfer from a hot body, th, is $Q, w = 5.67Ae(th + 273)^4$, where A is radiating area and e is emissivity fraction. But it may not be absorbed by all bodies that intercept it, as GHG theory assumes. In particular, hotter radiating bodies do not absorb colder incident radiation and reemit it more intensely, as GHG back-radiation theory assumes.

Above Earth's stratosphere, thin air T is rather cold, about -80°C. Yet solar radiation t is rather hot, about 120°C. So spacesuits have thermal insulation and radiant reflection. The difference, 200°C, is meaningless. On a cold, clear, winter day on snowcapped mountains, dry air T = -10°C and radiation t = 50°C. I can feel them both.

Much of GHG theory fails to make clear distinctions between these two different kinds of temperature, T and t. One temperature, t, is analogous to velocity, 34 km/hour north[nb]; the other, T, is analogous to density, 1 kg/liter. So 34 km/hour - 1 kg/liter is indeed 33 whatchamacallits by arithmetic, but nobody will ever know what a whatchamacallit is because velocity and density are not connected by nature.

To clarify this enormous intellectual flaw, the boiling point of water is 100°C (true) and freezing point is 32°F (true), subtract 100° - 32° = 68° (correct arithmetic) and declare atmospheric pressure is 68 psia. The declaration is false because a) the difference between C and F has no meaning, b) there is no physics to connect 68 to pressure, psia, and c) atmospheric pressure is actually 14.7 psia. That 33°C greenhouse gas effect that has everybody so upset and is researched *ad nauseam* to death is not an effect, merely an easily explained pair of facts.

Therefore, it is quite true the 33°C greenhouse gas effect defined by James Hansen in 1981 as thermal T = 15°C at surface minus radiant t = -18°C to space is whatchamacallit nonsense.   Everybody knows you can't compare apples to eggs; except perhaps Greenhouse Gas theorists. Since this is irrefutable logic, no experiment is called for. Logic trumps nonsense; that is why humans invented it around 400BC. No one needs to prove or disprove the existence of whatchamacallits. They are not even imaginary. There is no greenhouse in the sky.

Planetary atmospheres reflect, scatter, transmit, absorb, emit and diminish stellar radiation intensity at the surface according to Beer-Lambert Law, 121°C incident to Earth's stratosphere to 15°C at surface. Thermal T of atmospheres increase as gravity compresses gas and

---

[nb] "north" is there to remind the reader velocity has a direction, NESW, Up, or Down. Pilots know all about roll, pitch and yaw. So do sailors. To add or subtract vectors and forces, you use vector arithmetic. This is first year Newtonian physics and elementary mechanical engineering. Radiation intensity is a vector, it has direction. Remember, Boltzmann says intensity t is perpendicular to the radiating surface? Sunshine comes from the direction of the sun. Thermal T has no direction, it is just an amount. Combining them is the basic logical error or Hansen's 33°C declaration!

converts potential energy to kinetic energy closer to the surface, -80°C in stratosphere to 14.5°C at surface. Therefore atmospheres cause the surface to be colder than it would be if atmosphere were thinner or non-existent. The more O_2 is exchanged for higher heat capacity CO_2, the colder the surface radiation intensity temperature. Atmospheres are refrigerators, not blankets.

GHG theory postulates back-radiation from cold atmospheric CO_2 is absorbed by the surface, heating it more. This violates Second Law of thermodynamics (energy can only be transferred from hot to cold bodies), leading to creation of energy, a violation of the First Law of thermodynamics (energy conservation), and the impossible perpetual motion machine AGW promoters need to cause eternal global warming.

CO_2 does not trap radiation; like all molecules, it absorbs some incident radiation according to its absorption spectrum and promptly emits it according to its emission spectrum. CO_2 is not a pollutant; it is inert green plant food. CO_2 should not be curtailed, starving Earth's flora. Minor solar driven global warming from 1974 to 1998 has stabilized through 2011. CO_2 has nothing to do with global warming; it actually cools Earth. Arctic ice does not melt because of global warming, increasing T; it melts when the average T > 0, at rate proportional to T, no matter whether T is increasing or decreasing.

This essay has seven scientific facts (33°C whatchamacallit, no blanket, no back-radiation, CO_2 no trap, CO_2 inert food, no AGW, ice melts), each of which refute GHG and AGW. It has not been peer reviewed because it is well known to professional physicists and engineers; it does not merit a research paper, or research, or experiments. Logic just needs clear definitions and common sense, not government spending and regulation.

1. Hansen, J, Johnson D, Lacis A, Lebedeff S, Lee P, Rind D & Russell G, "Climate Impact of Increasing Atmospheric Carbon Dioxide", *Science*, Vol 213, n 4511, pp 957 - 966, August 28, 1981.

2. Hansen, J, Fung I, Lacis A, Rind D, Lebedeff S, Ruedy R & Russell G, "Global Climate Changes as Forecast by Goddard Institute for Space Studies Three-Dimensional Model", *Journal of Geophysical Research*, Vol 93, n D8, pg 9341 - 9364, August 20, 1988.