

Why There Is No Anthropogenic Global Warming

The scientific conflict about global warming/climate change is rooted in the scientific question of whether or not the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has an impact on climate. There is a difference between climate and weather. Climate has social relevance and is determined from weather data by averaging over a certain period of time.

Water vapor has an impact on climate because it absorbs infrared radiation and there is more water vapor in the tropics than in a desert. Every traveler should know that at night a tropical island is warmer than a desert. On the other hand, the core of the Earth is very hot, and a small amount of heat reaches the surface of the Earth. It is reasonable to say this heat affects the weather but not the climate. Another example of the difference between weather and climate is the very unusual weather event in which a lake emits a large amount of carbon dioxide. The 1986 Lake Nyos disaster in Cameroon killed 1746 people and 3500 livestock through asphyxiation. It is absurd to say that the climate of Cameroon is dangerous.

Many scientists who studied the connection between temperatures and the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and know all the forces that change weather explain in articles and books that the amount carbon dioxide in the atmosphere has no affect on climate. There are also many scientists who have studied the data and disagree.

Influenced by these studies, the U.S. federal government and state governments have spent about 40 billion dollars over the years promoting and subsidizing solar and wind energy even though solar energy is 4 times more expensive than gas, oil, and coal and wind energy is 2 times as expensive. The rationale behind this expense is that decreasing the amount of carbon dioxide emitted by burning fossil fuels will make the climate colder than it would be without the renewable sources of energy. The scientists who support this large expenditure are the scientists who say carbon dioxide has an impact on climate.

The atmosphere mostly consists of nitrogen (78%), oxygen (21%), and argon (1%). There is also water vapor, which varies depending on location. There are also trace gases. Carbon dioxide accounts for 96% of the trace gases. What follows is the atmospheric composition in terms of the number of molecules in a dry area of the planet:

carbon dioxide: 1 molecule
argon: 25 molecules
oxygen: 525 molecules
nitrogen: 1950 molecules

The carbon dioxide in the atmosphere comes from animal and human respiration, oceanic and mantle degassing, volcanoes, decomposition of biota, and burning of oil, gas, and coal. Only 3% comes from burning fossil fuels, which can be referred to as anthropogenic carbon dioxide. We can re-write the composition of the atmosphere as follows:

anthropogenic carbon dioxide: 1 molecule
non-anthropogenic carbon dioxide: 33 molecules

argon: 850 molecules
oxygen: 17,850 molecules
nitrogen: 66,300 molecules

About half of the anthropogenic carbon dioxide in the United States comes from producing electricity which is what solar and wind energy are used to replace. We can revise the above table:

carbon dioxide from electricity: 1 molecule
carbon dioxide from transportation et. al. : 1 molecule
non-anthropogenic carbon dioxide: 66 molecules
argon: 1,700 molecules
oxygen: 35,700 molecules
nitrogen: 132,600 molecules

As a result of this enormous expenditure, 2% of electricity in the U. S. is now produced by solar and wind energy. Revising the table:

carbon dioxide from electricity removed: 1 molecule
carbon dioxide from electricity not removed: 50 molecules
carbon dioxide from transportation et. al. : 51 molecules
non-anthropogenic carbon dioxide: 3,366 molecules
argon: 86,700 molecules
oxygen: 1,820,700 molecules
nitrogen: 6,762,600 molecules

This means that for every 8,673,468 molecules in the atmosphere there is one less carbon dioxide molecule thanks to the 40 billion dollars. But this change was spread over the entire globe. This raises the question of what benefit the U.S. got from the expense. Since the U.S. emits about 1/7th of the carbon dioxide from burning fossil fuels, it is reasonable to use the factor of 7 to estimate the impact on the U.S. of this reduction in carbon dioxide molecules. What the U.S. got for the 40 billion dollars is one less carbon dioxide molecule out of 60,714,276 molecules.

There is another consideration. The reason carbon dioxide is considered to be bad is that it absorbs infrared radiation. But water vapor also absorbs infrared radiation and there is about as much water vapor in the atmosphere as argon. I think it is reasonable to use the factor 100 to account for the impact of water vapor. In other words, the 40 billion dollars spent eliminates 1 molecule of carbon dioxide for every 6 billion molecules in the atmosphere.

There is yet another consideration. People prefer living in Florida than Minnesota. This means there is a 50% chance that the change in climate will be beneficial. So we can say that 1 molecule of carbon dioxide was removed from 12 billion molecules in the atmosphere. It is safe to say that the 40 billion dollars spent on reducing the amount of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere was a waste of money, and that people who say it is money well spent can't be trusted.