

Is this the DEFINITIVE DEATHKNELL to CLIMATE ALARMISTS?

UPDATE 21h50GMT 12 February 2008 : This page is all about the rebuttal dished out to the vociferous climate alarmists and not about the validity or otherwise of the German physicists' scientific paper – two distinct issues. Climate alarmists are in the same category as the Spanish Inquisitors ever were. Shame on them for their bigotry.

Once again, we are shown that everytime climate alarmists are publicly confronted, their arguments do not hold up. Below is a must read from the New York Times Website! RealClimate.org's Raymond T. Pierrehumbert attempted to smear the two German physicists Gerlich and Tscheuschner who are featured in the Senate 'Consensus Busters' Report of over 400 (now over 470 and growing) scientists. The German's fired back in a powerful rebuttal below. Pierrehumbert has thus far disappeared after the German's rebuttal tore his arguments apart. Gerlich and Tscheuschner go to the heart of climate modeling and completely deflate Pierrehumbert.

Below written by: **Physicist Dr. Gerhard Gerlich, of the Institute of Mathematical Physics at the Technical University Carolo-Wilhelmina in Braunschweig in Germany, and Dr. Ralf D. Tscheuschner co-authored a July 7, 2007 paper titled "Falsification of the Atmospheric CO2 Greenhouse Effects Within the Frame of Physics."** Paper found here: <http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.1161>

New York Times Rebuttal of Gerlich and Tscheuschner:

<http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/24/earth-scientists-express-rising-concern-over-warming/#comment-12204>

974.

February 11th,
2008

[4:25 am](#)

Dear all,

Dear Dr. Raymond T. Pierrehumbert,

We (Gerhard Gerlich and Ralf D. Tscheuschner) are very sorry that we cannot reply to all statements published in Internet blogs since our "times on-line" are rather limited. Especially, we do not reply to semi-anonymous virtual climate pets like Eli Rabett and other Internet geniusses such as Gavin Schmidt, Stefan Rahmstorf and others at "Real Climate" or "Atmoz Blog" anti-scientific smear sites. Most of them do know so little about physics such that they quote the second law of thermodynamics incorrectly in order to falsify our work. Even the difference between energy, work and heat seems to be unknown to these experts. This cannot be the basis of a scientific discussion.

First, let us start with discussing the identity of Eli Rabett. We have been informed that Eli Rabett is the pseudonym of Josh Halpern, a chemistry professor at Howard University. He is a laser spectroscopist with no formal training in climatology and theoretical physics.

On 2007-11-14 we sent Josh Halpern the following E-Mail:

"Josh Halpern alias Eli Rabbett - [If you are not Josh Halpern, then forgive me and delete this message immediately.] Apparently, believing to be protected by anonymity you (and others) want to establish a quality of a scientific discussion that is based on offenses and arrogance rather than on critical rationalism and exchange of arguments. Scientist cannot tolerate and endorse what is becoming a quality in weblogs and what is pioneered by IPCC-conformal virtual climate bloggers. I must urge you to reconsider.

My questions to you:

1. What is the most general formulation of the second law of thermodynamics?
2. What is your favorite exact definition of the atmospheric greenhouse effect within the frame of physics?
3. Could you provide me a literature reference of a rigorous derivation of this effect?
4. How do you compute the supposed atmospheric greenhouse effect (the supposed warming effect, not simply the absorption) from given reflection, absorption, emission spectra of a gas mixture, well-formulated magnetohydrodynamics, and unknown dynamical interface and other boundary conditions?
5. Do you really believe, that you can transform an unphysical myth into a physical truth on such a low level of argumentation?"

We did not get any response.

We would like to encourage the readers of this blog to read our paper, at least the conclusions. It can be found here:

<http://www.arxiv.org/abs/0707.1161>

The following is a delayed reply to the very offending posting #111 of Raymond T. Pierrehumbert who wrote to Marc Morano:

>"You can obfuscate all you want, but you can't hide from the fact that we have been going at this for nearly two weeks now and none of the skeptics we have discussed so far have established a credible publication record for the ideas that qualify them as skeptics in your eyes. Whatever these ideas are, they evidently can't stand up to the same kind of scrutiny that the ideas in the IPCC report have been subjected to."

Neither the validity of a scientific result depends on the publication record of its authors, nor the number of publications is an indicator of the quality of research .

To put it bluntly, virtual climate research (Pierrhumbert and his buddies may call it “real climate” research) is nonsense (non-science). **The thousands of publications reviewing the results of these computer games are not worth the papers they are printed on, not to mention the hardware, CPU times and memory.** (my emphasis)

>”Today I’m in a good mood, so I’ll give you a twofer: Gerhard Gerlich and Ralf D. Tscheuschner. Neither of these physicists has produced a single peer-reviewed paper bearing on any aspect of climate science, or even on the radiative physics underpinning climate science.”

Indeed, this is a great advantage for the whole discussion, both scientifically and politically. It is a presupposition for to have a fresh look at the topic. We (Gerhard Gerlich and Ralf D. Tscheuschner) are unbiased totally independent theoretical physicists, familiar with stochastic description of nature and quantum field theory, respectively, and last but not least familiar with the physics lab and software engineering. Of course, we have published our papers in peer-reviewed journals, and on topics that belong to science, **not to science fiction as the computer games of global climatology do.** (my emphasis) We are physicists, not climatologists.

The main results of our paper are:

- **the CO2 greenhouse effect is not an effect in the sense of a physical effect and, hence, simply does not exist;**
- **computer aided global climatology will not be science, if science is defined as a method to verify or falsify conjectures, according to the usual definition of science.** (my emphasis)

(We do not get into the ideas of e.g. Feyerabend “anything goes” here in that they do not apply to physics, in particular to applied physics, e.g. aeroplanes).

Due to research grants, huge amount of financial support, virtual global climatologists suffer from a kind of omnipotence delusion comparable to the state of highness of the early super string community. (my emphasis) However, physics is different. “Physics is where the action is”, i.e., finally, reproducible results in the lab. **We cannot overemphasize that science is a method to prove conjectures, and not to go on-stage like the pop star Al Gore performing what-if-when-scenarios beyond any reality and scaring kids.**

>”The two links you provide in fact point to the same paper. What you seem to be unaware of is that this paper has not been published in any journal. It appears only in the unreviewed ArXIV repository of manuscripts. This repository has no screening whatsoever as to the the content of the papers posted. Indeed, a look at the paper by anybody who has even a nodding acquaintance with radiation physics shows why they wouldn’t dare subject it to peer review. About 40 pages of this 90 page opus is in fact devoted to discussing the well-known flaws in the glass-greenhouse analogy sometimes used in simplified explanations of the phenomenon. These flaws have no bearing whatever on the manner in which the greenhouse effect is actually computed in climate models.”

We are not sure, whether you, Dr. Pierrehumbert, really know what you are talking about. (my emphasis)The full theory of the atmospheric system must be a fusion of magnetohydrodynamics and radiation theory including earth’s gravity and rotation. The full theory should be a multi component theory and should include phase separation (interesting!), plasma physics, and highly involved boundary conditions which, in general, even cannot be written down. You, Dr. Pierrehumbert, first solve the turbulence problem, and then we can discuss the existence of a local thermodynamic equilibrium for the photon bath in which the atmosphere is embedded. Point us to only one source in the literature, where the CO2 term enters the fundamental equations (not the **useless phenomenological toy model equations**). (my emphasis)

Mathematically, even within the most simplified models you cannot predict anything, because all these ones crudely approximate non-linear partial differential equations with unknown boundary conditions. There is simply no physical foundation of the computer models with and without CO2. (my emphasis)

>”The rest of the paper is simply bad physics; in fact, if they were right, not only would there be no anthropogenic greenhouse effect, there would be no greenhouse effect at all!”

Boy, you got it.

>”They’ve proved too much!”

We did not prove anything.

We did not show anything.

We only demonstrated that you and your virtual global climatology buddies and Al Gore and the peace Nobel prize committee do not know anything about fundamental university physics. We conclusively showed that you guy and your buddies never will prove or disprove anything in the context of your unproven computer models. (my emphasis)

Moreover, we are sure that you are fully aware of this fact. (my emphasis)

>"The Earth would be a solid ball of ice, and Venus would be 400 degrees colder than it is."

In our paper, we clearly show that the standard calculation giving the 33 Celsius degrees for the greenhouse effect is wrong. Moreover, the Venus problem has nothing to do with the greenhouse effect, since in this case even the core presupposition is not fulfilled, namely that the sunlight reaches the ground.

>"And, as an aside, infrared weather satellites wouldn't work either."

Apparently, you do not know the subtle difference between absorption and warming. Read Chandrasekhar, read Unsoeld, read Schack.

>"Since the work was never published, it of course has never been discussed in the peer reviewed literature. The obvious flaws in the paper cannot be discussed easily in a comment box, but for a good general guide to the junk physics in this paper I refer the reader to Eli Rabett's discussion at ..."

Our paper is a brand new preprint submitted for publication. You are allowed to cite it in your future work according to the arXiv conventions.

Apparently, you rank a peer reviewed published paper higher than a preprint, no matter of its content. Even so, really surprising in this context is that you attribute to the statements of a semi-anonymous virtual climate pet, namely Eli Rabett, the highest value.

What is this about? (my emphasis)

Gerhard Gerlich
Ralf D. Tscheuschner

— *Posted by Gerhard Gerlich and Ralf D. Tscheuschner*

With thanks to

Marc Morano
Communications Director
Senate Environment and Public Works Committee (EPW) Inhofe Staff
202-224-5762
202-224-5167 (fax)
marc_morano@epw.senate.gov
www.epw.senate.gov

From comments I have seen in other alarmists blogs, I wonder what motivates the alarmist participants in exclaiming their ranting and raving, it must be the mass hysteria syndrome explained in Gustave le Bon's book.

The only people worth talking to are those in charge of us, the bureaucrats who kow-tow to the alarmists' view of doom to come. It can only be a matter of time before even they realise that they have led around the garden path by the elitist pressure groups who have so successfully diverted billions of dollars into wasteful research, all based on the new god on the block: computer models. Be ashamed of yourselves, you green activist extremists, be very ashamed!

At all times, please remember the simple weather forecasts in your area: How often they better than 50% accurate?

Hans Schreuder
Ipswich, UK
www.ips-pix.biz
www.ilovemycarbondioxide.com

PS: <http://dotearth.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/01/24/earth-scientists-express-rising-concern-over-warming/#comment-12205>

Andy Lacis writes in 939 " And that if they look at the physics that are relevant to global climate, and examine the observational evidence for increasing greenhouse gases, and identify their source, the inescapable conclusion arrived at by mathematical reasoning is that the Earth is indeed warming, and that humans are indeed the cause." What a load of garbage!!!! What "observational evidence"? I have repeated over and over again, and no warmaholic has proved me wrong, that there is not one scintilla, not one single solitary jot of experimental data that connects the recent rise in CO2 concentration in the atmosphere, and the recent rise in temperature. Hard, measured independently replicate experimental data is the basis of true science. Until such data is available, AGW will remain merely a hypothesis. If there are any "scientists" around who believe "the science is settled", and all there is is a hypothesis, then the mind boggles. As of February 2008, the experimental evidence shows that the world is COOLING!!!!

— *Posted by Jim Cripwell* (Thanks Jim, you put it in a nutshell: no evidence whatsoever to support AGW or ACC)