# A CHALLENGE TO THE CARBON DIOXIDE / GLOBAL WARMING CONNECTION 

by JULES KALBFELD

## PART I <br> some fundamental relationships between mass and heat

One issue that seems to have been lost or avoided in the debate over the connection between atmospheric carbon dioxide ( CO 2 ) and global warming is the miniscule mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ that is being blamed for so many past, present and predicted natural disasters. The mass of atmospheric $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is extremely small when compared to the total mass of the Earth's atmosphere and even smaller when compared to the combined masses of the land and water features on the Earth's surface as well.

The directly proportional relationship that exists between the mass of any object and its heat capacity is essentially axiomatic: all other factors being the same, the larger the mass of an object, the greater its ability to capture, store, transport and release heat. Since the concentration of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the Earth's atmosphere is so small, the notion that it is causing global warming seems to ignore this basic truth.

It should be noted that CO exists only as a gas within the the temperature extremes of the Earth's atmosphere and as such, is uniformly distributed throughout the atmosphere. It cannot form layers that are capable of acting as reflective surfaces or insulating barriers. Although $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ can absorb heat energy from the Sun in the form of infrared radiation, the bulk of that energy is absorbed by the Earth's surface, itself, as well as by atmospheric water, oxygen and non-greenhouse gases.

The objective here is to demonstrate that the mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the Earth's atmosphere is too small to absorb solar and reradiated infrared energy in quantities sufficient to cause catastrophic global warming; and thus, to challenge those who support the connection between $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and global warming to explain their theories in terms of classical science.

The arithmetic application of established physical data to classical science can be used to construct models that demonstrate the basic premise of this challenge. Each model must include a measured mass of CO to capture a measured quantity of heat energy from the Sun and to transfer that heat to a measured mass of the Earth's surface.

## AUTHOR'S NOTE:

The following discussion is going to involve some illustrative equations that are critical to developing this challenge. The numerical data will be presented in each equation with their applicable terms. Like terms, appearing above and below the divisor lines in each equation will be struck through with single lines to cancel each other from the final results. Having the final results of each calculation described in the proper terms is a good indication that the data were properly manipulated. Like terms in more complicated equations will be presented in like colors so as to make the arithmetic easier for the reader to follow.

The concentration of CO 2 in the Earth's atmosphere is approximately 380 parts per million (ppm) on a volume ( $\mathrm{VcO}_{2}$ )/volume (Vair) basis.
The density of $\mathrm{CO} 2=1.977$ grams $(\mathrm{g}) /$ liter $(\mathrm{L})$ at sea level Standard Temperature and Pressure (STP) conditions.

The first step in developing a model to illustrate this challenge is to determine the mass of CO 2 in a measured volume of air at sea level STP conditions. 1 cubic meter of air ( M 3 air ) will be used in this model so as to simplify the arithmetic.

The volume fraction of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in air is determined as follows:

$$
\frac{380 \text { Liters (LCO2) }}{1,000,000 \text { Liters (Lair) }}=0.00038 \text { Lco2 / Lair }
$$

One cubic meter $\left(1 \mathrm{M}^{3}\right)=100$ centimeters $(\mathrm{cm}) \times 100 \mathrm{~cm} \mathrm{X} 100 \mathrm{~cm}=1,000,000 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}$ :
$1 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}=1$ milliliter ( mL ).
$1 \mathrm{~L}=1,000 \mathrm{~mL}$
$1 \mathrm{M}^{3}=1,000 \mathrm{~L}$
(As a frame of reference: $1 \mathrm{M}^{3}=35.3 \mathrm{ft} 3$ : That is larger than the inside volume of a large (27ft3) family refrigerator.)

The mass concentration of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in $1 \mathrm{M}^{3}$ air at STP conditions can be established from the following calculation:

Establishing a measured contact mass of material to receive all of the heat captured by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is the next step in creating these models. Water makes the ideal contact mass for this discussion because its density, specific heat capacity, fluidity and other physical characteristics are more uniform than those of the Earth's land surfaces and thus can be described more accurately through simple arithmetic. It is also critical that this contact mass should be thermally isolated from its surroundings, except where it makes contact with a measured volume of air, so as to limit all heat exchange to contact with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ or with $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ heated air within the model's $1 \mathrm{M}^{3}$.

One side or surface of a $\mathrm{M}^{3}$ is equal to 1 square meter ( $\mathrm{M}^{2}$ ). Making $1 \mathrm{M}^{2}$ the area of the contact surface between air and water and setting the depth of a contact layer of water at 1 cm , establishes the volume of that contact layer at $10,000 \mathrm{~mL}$ :

$$
100 \mathrm{~cm} \times 100 \mathrm{~cm}=10,000 \mathrm{~cm}^{2}=1 \mathrm{M} 2
$$

$$
10,000 \mathrm{~cm}^{2} \times 1 \mathrm{~cm}(\text { deep })=10,000 \mathrm{~cm}^{3}=10,000 \mathrm{~mL}=10 \mathrm{~L}=2.64 \text { gallons }
$$

$I \mathrm{~mL}$ of water has a mass of 1 g . Thus, this contact volume contains $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ of water.
By definition, 1 calorie (cal) = the amount of heat required to raise the temperature of 1 g of water $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at sea level STP conditions.

It then follows that the specific heat capacity of water $=1 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ at STP conditions. Thus, $10,000 \mathrm{cal}$ are required to raise the temperature of the thermally isolated, $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ contact mass of water $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

The literature value for the specific heat capacity of CO 2 is given as $0.843 \mathrm{Joule} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The Joule $(\mathrm{J})$ is a term applied to multiple forms of energy. Consistency in these calculations requires the conversion of $\mathrm{J} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ to cal. $/ \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The conversion factor is:
$1 \mathrm{~J} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}=0.24 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.
Specific heat capacity of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}=0.843 ~ / / \mathrm{g}^{\ominus} \mathrm{G} \times \underline{0.24 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \underline{\mathrm{C}}=0.202 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}$ $J / g^{\theta} G$

Since the model's $1 \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of air contains 0.75 g of CO 2 and the specific heat capacity of $\mathrm{CO} 2=0.202 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, that mass of CO 2 can trap only 0.1515 calories for each $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ rise in its temperature.

$$
0.75 \mathrm{gcos} \times \frac{0.202 \mathrm{cal}}{\mathrm{gcos}^{-} \mathrm{C}}=0.1515 \mathrm{cal} /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}
$$

In order for that 0.75 g of CO 2 to trap and transfer $10,000 \mathrm{cal}$. to the model's contact mass of water, it would have to capture enough heat to produce the equivalent of a $66,000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature rise over time.

$$
\frac{10,000 \text { Gat }}{0.1515 \text { Gal/ }{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}=66,000^{\circ} \mathrm{C}
$$

If the CO 2 in the model could achieve the accumulated effect equivalent to a $66,000{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature increase at a rate of $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C} /$ hour (hr) and uniformly transfer that heat to the model's $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ ( 2.64 gal .) contact mass of water, it would require 27.5 days to raise the water's temperature $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$.

$$
\underline{66,000} \underline{\theta} \times \underline{1}=27.5 \text { days }
$$

$$
100 \text { өG/hr— } 24 \text { hr/day }
$$

Glacial melting represents another series of catastrophic events being blamed on $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ induced global warming. A model that brings $1 \mathrm{M}^{3}$ of air in contact with 10 L of ice can be constructed to examine this notion.

Since the density of ice is approximately $0.9 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{mL}$, a $10,000 \mathrm{~mL}$ contact volume contains $9,000 \mathrm{~g}$ of ice.

The heat of fusion of any solid is defined as the quantity of heat required to change that material from the solid state to the liquid state (melt) without any rise in temperature. The heat of fusion for water (ice) at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ and sea level STP conditions is $79.71 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}$.

The heat required to melt $9,000 \mathrm{~g}$ of ice at $0^{\circ} \mathrm{C}=9,000 \mathrm{~g} \times 79.71 \mathrm{cal} /-\mathrm{g}=717,390 \mathrm{cal}$.
As shown above, the 0.75 g mass of CO 2 in this model can trap only 0.1515 calories for each $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ rise in its temperature. To trap and transfer the $717,390 \mathrm{cal}$ required to melt the model's $9,000 \mathrm{~g}$ of ice, its 0.75 g of CO 2 would have to capture enough heat to produce the equivalent of a $4,735,247^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature rise over time.

$$
\frac{717,390 \text { Gat }}{0.1515 \mathrm{Gal} / \mathrm{O}^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{C}}=4,735,247{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}
$$

If the CO 2 in this model achieved the accumulated effect equivalent to a $4,735,247{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature rise at a rate of $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C} /$ hour, it would take 5.4 years to melt the model's $9,000 \mathrm{~g}$ of ice without raising its temperature.

$$
\frac{4,735,247-\theta}{100^{\theta} \mathrm{G} / \mathrm{hr}} \mathrm{C} \frac{1}{24 \text {-hr/day }} \quad \mathrm{X} \quad \frac{1}{365 \text {-day } / \mathrm{yr} .}=5.4 \mathrm{yr} .
$$

An alleged increase in extreme weather phenomena such as hurricanes and tornadoes has also been attributed to increased levels of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the Earth's atmosphere. The energy released in these storms is derived from the change of state of water from liquid to gas and, back again, to liquid.

The heat of vaporization is defined as the heat per unit mass required to convert a liquid into a vapor (gas) without a change in temperature. The Heat of vaporization of water is 540 cal / g.

Referring back to the model, it would require 5,400,000 cal to vaporize the thermally isolated $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ contact mass of water. To trap and transfer that 5,400,000 cal, the models 0.75 g of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ would have to capture enough heat to produce the equivalent of a $35,643,564{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature increase over time.

$$
\frac{540 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g} \times 10,000}{0.1515 \mathrm{cal} /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}}=35,643,564^{\circ} \mathrm{C}
$$

Allowing the heat trapped by the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in this model to achieve an accumulated effect equivalent to this $35,643,600^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ temperature rise at a rate of $100^{\circ} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{hr}$., would require 40.7 years to vaporize the model's $10,000 \mathrm{~g}$ contact mass of water.
$\frac{35,643,564}{100^{-\theta} \mathrm{C} / \mathrm{hr}} \stackrel{\theta}{\mathrm{G}} \quad \mathrm{X} \frac{1}{24 \text {-hr/day }} \quad \mathrm{X} \frac{1}{365 \text { day } / \mathrm{yr} .}=40.7 \mathrm{yr}$.

It has been suggested that up until about 100 years ago, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ maintained the thermal equilibrium of the Earth's atmosphere and that a $25 \%$ rise in $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ concentration since then has resulted in global warming. With only $25 \%$ of the total $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ concentration in air being responsible for global warming, $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ temperature changes required to warm the thermally isolated mass of water $1^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$, or to change its physical state all have to be multiplied by 4 .

These models were developed through the arithmetic application of established physical data to classical scientific principles. They define the quantities of heat that are required to be collected by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and transferred to a fixed mass of otherwise thermally isolated water or ice and raise its temperature or change its phase. Thus, they pose a challenge to the inferred connection between catastrophic global warming and the over emphasized $25 \%$ increase in the very small mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the atmosphere. A large fraction of a small number is a smaller number.

Water, which has 505 times the density and 5 times the specific heat capacity of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is a much larger heat sink than $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The fact that water can exist in all three states of matter within the temperature range of the Earth's atmosphere gives it the ability to trap, store, transport and release large amounts of heat and gives it the ability to layer out in the atmosphere to form reflective surfaces and insulating barriers. Moreover, convection currents that are created by the conversion of heat to kinetic energy carry water vapor and heat laden air aloft until it reaches its dew point, where the water vapor gives up its stored heat to a less dense atmosphere (and eventually space) and condenses out to form clouds, rain or snow.

Nitrogen $\left(\mathrm{N}_{2}\right)$, oxygen $\left(\mathrm{O}_{2}\right)$ and Argon (Ar), together, make up 99.9\% (999,000 ppm) of the Earth's atmosphere on a Vgas/ $\mathrm{V}_{\text {air }}$ basis and are not considered to be "greenhouse gases". The basic premise of this discussion requires a comparison of the combined masses of these non-greenhouse gases to the mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The literature value for the density of air at sea level STP conditions is given as $1.2928 \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{L}$. Thus, the model's $1 \mathrm{M}^{\beta}$ ( $1,000 \mathrm{~L}$ ) of air has a mass of $1,293 \mathrm{~g}$ and the combined masses of $\mathrm{N}_{2}, \mathrm{O}_{2}$ and Ar make up $99.9 \%$ of that mass or $1,292 \mathrm{~g}$.
$1.293 \mathrm{~g} / \pm X 1,000 \downharpoonright X 0.999=1,292 \mathrm{~g}$
The literature value for the specific heat capacity of dry air is $0.240 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$. The total heat capacity for the model's $1,292 \mathrm{~g}$ of non-greenhouse gases is 313 cal for each degree C rise in its temperature.

1,292 g X $0.240 \mathrm{cal} / \mathrm{g}^{\circ} \mathrm{C}=310 \mathrm{cal} /{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$
It was previously shown that the total heat capacity for the model's $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ is 0.1515 cal for each degree $C$ rise in its temperature. The non-greenhouse gases in the model's $1 \mathrm{~N}^{\beta}$ of air have a total heat capacity that is 2,047 times that of the model's CO .

```
\(310 \mathrm{cal} \angle^{\ominus} \underline{\underline{G}}=2047\)
0.1515 cal \(^{\circ} \mathrm{G}\)
```

This exercise demonstrates that the combined masses of non-greenhouse gases in the Earth's atmosphere can trap, store, transport and transfer 2,047 times as much heat as the total mass of its $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$.

The Earth's water features (about 71 \% of its surface) provide for a heat sink, capable of trapping, storing, transporting and releasing huge quantities of heat. The mass of water on the Earth's surface far exceeds the mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in its atmosphere. Add to that, the heat exchange that occurs when water changes phases and one cannot ignore water's role in regulating global temperatures. Water is also a $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ sink, capable of trapping, storing, transporting and releasing huge quantities of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$. The solubility of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in water ( 0.759 Lco2/ Lwater at sea level STP conditions) decreases with an increase in water temperature. As water is heated by the Sun, it not only heats the atmosphere but also releases $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ into it. One could infer that concomitant changes in the atmosphere's temperature and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ concentration are the result of the Earth's water features being heated by the Sun.

Unfortunately, too many people do not understand that solids and liquids are hundreds of times more dense than are gasses. That is to say, solids and liquids contain hundreds of times more mass per given volume than gasses do. As shown in the preceding equations, mass is a critical factor in defining the heat related physical properties of any substance.

## PART II <br> ILLUSTRATING THE MEANING OF 380 PPM

The fact that most people cannot conceptualize the true meaning of the fraction 380 ppm provides the underlying reason for the broad unquestioning popular acceptance of the theory of carbon dioxide induced global warming. Exercise 1. (pages 7 and 8 ) is designed to give the reader a tangible evaluation of that fraction. Table 1. (page 9) serves as an approximate connection of Exercise 1. to the real world, while illustrating the significance of a half-value curve. Fig. 1. (page 10 ) serves as a model that illustrates that portion of our atmosphere that is $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ and the portion of that $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ that is being blamed for global warming. Figs. 2 and 3 (pages 11 and 12 ) illustrate the molecular distribution of CO 2 in our atmosphere, a factor that is critical to any discussion of the resonance transport of infrared radiation from $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ molecule to $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ molecule (see Part III).

## EXERCISE 1:

The true meaning of 380 ppm can be tangibly demonstrated by means of a simple number experiment.

The experimental materials:
An 8 1/2" X 11" sheet of paper, A sharp pencil (or fine ball point pen)
A 12" ruler.

## Procedure:

Using the pencil and ruler, draw a line parallel to the long (11") edge of the paper from one short (8 $1 / 2$ ") edge to the other. Label the intersection of that line with the left edge " 0 ppm". Label the intersection of that line with the right edge "1,000,000 ppm". A number line or graph depicting the interval from " 0 ppm " to "1,000,000 ppm" has thus been constructed. See EXERCISE 1: FIG. 1A. Carefully fold the paper so that the "0 ppm" edge exactly overlays the " $1,000,000$ ppm" edge. Make a sharp crease in the paper, mark the intersection of that crease with the number line and label that mark "500,000 ppm". See EXERCISE 1: FIG. 1B. Next fold the paper so that the " 0 ppm" edge touches the " 500,000 ppm" mark on the number line. Make a sharp crease in the fold and mark the intersection of that crease with the number line and label it " 250,000 ppm". See EXERCISE 1: FIG. 1C. Repeat this halving process by folding the paper so that the " 0 ppm" edge touches the " 250,000 ppm" line. Make a sharp crease in the fold, mark the intersection of that crease with the number line and label that intersection "125,000 ppm". See EXERCISE 1: FIG. 1D. Continue this halving process through " $62,500 \mathrm{ppm}$ ", "31,125 ppm" ("32,000 ppm" for convenience), to "16,000 ppm". The folding process will become extremely difficult to continue through " $8,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ ", "4,000 ppm", "2,000 ppm", " $1,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ " and " 500 ppm ", which will bring us to within one order of magnitude of 380 ppm. Even though the " 0 ppm " to " 380 ppm " interval on the number line will have to be (and could have been from the beginning) calculated, this halving process tangibly enforces the the true meaning of 380 ppm . The " 0 ppm " to " 380 ppm " interval on the number line can be calculated as follows:

$$
\left(380 \times 11^{\prime \prime}\right)=0.0042 "
$$

$$
1,000,000
$$

0.0042 inches very closely approximates the thickness of United States paper currency.

## Conclusion:

If the whole sheet of paper represented the Earth's atmosphere, its CO content would be represented by the edge of the paper.

Only $25 \%$ of the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in our atmosphere is actually being blamed for causing global warming. That $25 \%$ would be represented by an interval of only 0.001 " on our " 0 ppm " to "1,000,000 ppm" number line or about 1/4 of the thickness of the paper and would represent that portion of the atmosphere that is being blamed causing global warming in this model.

## EXERCISE 1:

## FIG.

1. 


B.

C.


TABLE 1.
The composition of the Earth's atmosphere remains uniform from its surface to an altitude of about 110,000 feet ( 20.8 miles). The density of the atmosphere diminishes with increasing altitude in agreement with a half value curve where the half value layers are about 18,000 ft. thick. Thus, $1 / 2$ of the atmosphere exists below $18,000 \mathrm{ft}$., $75 \%$ below $36,000 \mathrm{ft}$., $87.5 \%$ below 54,000 ft, 93.75 \% below 72,000, $96.8 \%$ below 90,000 ft and 98.45\% below $108,000 \mathrm{ft}$. The concentration of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the atmosphere is uniform throughout this volume and remains at 380 ppm on a $\mathrm{V} \mathrm{coz}^{2} / \mathrm{V}_{\text {air }}$ basis. If the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the first $18,000 \mathrm{ft}$. (1/2 of the atmosphere) of air were to layer out against the Earth's surface at sea level STP conditions, it would be about 3.42 ft . thick.

$$
18,000 \mathrm{ft} \times 0.00038 \times 0.5=3.42 \mathrm{ft}
$$

A similar $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ layer from each succeeding 18,000 ft of altitude would diminish by 1/2. Combining all of these $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ layers at the Earth's surface at sea level STP conditions would amount to a $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ layer that is approximately 6.73 ft thick (measurements were made in $18,000 \mathrm{ft}$ blocks rather than calculating the area under the $1 / 2$ value curve).

| ALTITUDE IN FT | VOL. \% OF <br> ATMOSPHERE | VOL. FRACTION. OF <br> ATMOSPHERE | VOL. FRACTION. <br> OF CO2 | EQUIVALENT <br> OAYER OF CO2 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :--- | :---: |
| O TO 18000 | 50 | 0.5 | 0.00038 | 3.42 FT |
| 18000 TO 36000 | 25 | 0.25 | 0.00038 | 1.71 FT |
| 36000 TO 54000 | 12.5 | 0.125 | 0.00038 | 0.85 FT |
| 54000 TO 72000 | 6.25 | 0.0625 | 0.00038 | 0.43 FT |
| 72000 TO 90000 | 3.13 | 0.0313 | 0.00038 | 0.21 FT |
| 90000 TO 108000 | $\underline{1.57}$ | 0.0157 | 0.00038 | $\underline{0.11 \mathrm{FT}}$ |
| TOTALS | 98.45 | 0.9845 |  | 6.73 FT |

Table 1. Estimated volumes of air and $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ taken in $18,000 \mathrm{ft}$. blocks and converted to sea level STP conditions


FIG 1: VOLUME OF CO2 (95 mm³) CAUSING GLOBAL WARMING /LITER OF AIR VS. TOTAL VOLUME OF CO2 $\left(380 \mathrm{~mm}^{3}\right) /$ LITER OF AIR.

FIG 2.

The numeric representation of 380 ppm equals the fraction: $380 / 1,000,000$. Dividing both the numerator and denominator by 100 gives an equivalent fraction: 3.8/10,000 or 3.8 parts per 10,000.
Rounding off 3.8 to its next higher integer gives the fraction: 4/10,000. The field below, which is 100 units $X 100$ units contains 10,000 square units. Making this field 1 unit thick would give it volume of 10,000 cubic units. The 4 red dots ( ${ }^{\circ}$ ), one cubic unit each, in that volume illustrate a concentration of 4 parts in 10,000, which approximates the molecular distribution of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the Earth's atmosphere.


FIG 3.

The catastrophic impact of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ on the Earth's atmosphere, and its surface as well, is being blamed on the $25 \%$ increase in its concentration over the past 100 years. From the discussion associated with FIG 2., it can be seen that $25 \%$ of the total concentration of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the atmosphere amounts to 1 part in 10,000, which can be illustrated by the one red dot (1 cubic unit) in this field of 10,000 cubic units.


## PART III <br> CHARACTERISTICS OF RADIANT (HEAT) ENERGY

The mechanism exploited by $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ induced global warming models is related to specific vibrational frequencies of the carbon-oxygen bond that can resonate with those same frequencies within the infrared region of the electromagnetic spectrum; thus absorbing that energy and reradiating it to and from other CO 2 molecules within the Earth's atmosphere. However, two important facts have to be considered in connection with this notion. First of all, infrared light (radiant heat ) appears within the low energy region of the electromagnetic spectrum. Secondly, all radiant energy (E) varies indirectly as the square of the distance (D) from its source ( $E=1 / D^{2}$ ). Interpreting FIG. 2 (page 11) on a molecular scale, illustrates that this weak (infrared) radiant energy will be significantly diffused as it moves among the widely separated molecules of CO 2 in our atmosphere. Nitrogen, oxygen and argon, which make up $99.9 \%$ ( $999,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) of our atmosphere and thus occupy much of the space surrounding its CO 2 molecules, can directly absorb that diffused radiant heat in proportion to their individual masses and specific heat capacities. This resonance form of energy transfer among $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ molecules is more efficient on Venus where the atmosphere is $98 \%$ ( $980,000 \mathrm{ppm}$ ) CO 2 and where the atmosphere is much more dense than Earth's is. There are more molecules of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the atmosphere of Venus and they are closer together than they are within the is Earth's atmosphere. These two factors lead to a more efficient resonance transfer of infrared energy among CO 2 molecules on Venus than on Earth.

## PART IV CONCLUSIONS

This discussion illustrates how the connection between global warming and the tiny mass of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in the Earth's atmosphere has been exaggerated. The physical properties of any substance or object that involve the capture, storage, transport and transfer of (heat) energy are mass dependent and the notion that $25 \%$ of the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ in our atmosphere can cause the melting of glaciers and the warming of oceans implies that an infinite amount of energy can be stuffed into a finite mass. The challenge, expressed here, requires the proponents of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ induced global warming to reconcile their models with classical scientific principles and established physical data. Any response must define, explain, illustrate, and, most importantly, quantify the physical properties of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ that conclusively establish this miniscule component of our atmosphere as a greenhouse gas, capable of heating the relatively huge mass of the Earth's land and water features to catastrophic proportions.
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## GENERAL NOTES:

1. The scientific principles presented in this paper can be verified by referring to any of the of the on-line encyclopedias such as ABOUT.COM, ASK.COM and/or WIKIPEDIA
2. Physical data and conversion factors were obtained from POCKET REF, SECOND EDITION, Thomas J. Glover, Sequoia Publishing, Inc. and HANDBOOK OF CHEMISTRY AND PHYSICS, The Chemical Rubber Co.
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