Unified Theory of Climate

Expanding the Concept of Atmospheric Greenhouse Effect Using Thermodynamic Principles:
Implications for Predicting Future Climate Change

Ned Nikolov, Ph.D.   &   Karl Zeller, Ph.D.

USFS Rocky Mountain Research Station, Fort Collins CO, USA

Emails: ntconsulting@comcast.net   kzeller@colostate.edu

Abstract

We present results from a new critical review of the atmospheric *Greenhouse* (GH) concept. Three main problems are identified with the current GH theory. It is demonstrated that thermodynamic principles based on the Ideal Gas Law must be invoked to fully explain the Natural Greenhouse Effect, which essence is the boost of global surface temperature above that of an airless planet exposed to the same solar irradiance. We show via a novel analysis of planetary climates in the solar system that the physical nature of the so-called Greenhouse Effect is in fact a Pressure-induced Thermal Enhancement (PTE), which is independent of the atmospheric chemical composition. Hence, the down-welling infrared radiation (a.k.a. *greenhouse-* or *back*-radiation) is a product of the atmospheric temperature (maintained by solar heating and air pressure) rather than a cause for it. In other words, our results suggest that the GH effect is a thermodynamic phenomenon, not a radiative one as presently assumed. This finding leads to a new and very different paradigm of climate controls. Results from our research are combined with those from other studies to propose a Unified Theory o*f* Climate, which explains a number of phenomena that the current theory fails to explain. Implications of the new paradigm for predicting future climate trends are briefly discussed.

1. Introduction

Recent studies revealed that Global Climate Models (GCMs) have significantly overestimated the Planet's warming since 1979 failing to predict the observed halt of global temperature rise over the past 13 years. (e.g. McKitrick et al. 2010). No consensus currently exists as to why the warming trend ceased in 1998 despite a continued increase in atmospheric CO_2 concentration. Moreover, the CO_2-temperature relationship shows large inconsistencies across time scales. In addition, GCM projections heavily depend on positive feedbacks, while satellite observations indicate that the climate system is likely governed by strong negative feedbacks (Lindzen & Choi 2009; Spencer & Braswell 2010). At the same time, there is a mounting political pressure for Cap-and-Trade legislation and a global carbon tax, while scientists and entrepreneurs propose *geo-engineering* solutions to cool the Planet that involve large-scale physical manipulation of the upper atmosphere. This unsettling situation calls for a thorough reexamination of the present climate-change paradigm; hence the reason for this study.

2. The Greenhouse Effect: Reexamining the Basics

According to the current theory, the Greenhouse Effect (GHE) is a *radiative phenomenon* caused by heat-trapping gases in the atmosphere such as CO_2 and water vapor that are assumed to *reduce* the rate of surface infrared cooling to Space by *absorbing* the outgoing long-wave (LW) emission and *re-radiating* part of it *back*, thus increasing the total energy flux toward the surface. This is thought to boost the Earth's temperature by 18K - 33K compared to a gray


Figure 1. The Atmospheric *Greenhouse* Effect as taught at universities around the World (diagram from the website of the Penn State University Department of Meteorology).

body with no absorbent atmosphere such as the Moon; hence making our Planet habitable. Figure 1 illustrates this concept using a simple two-layer system known as the Idealized Greenhouse Model (IGM). In this popular example, S is the top-of-the atmosphere (TOA) total solar irradiance (TSI) (W m^{-2}), A is the Earth shortwave albedo, T_s is the surface temperature (K), T_e is the Earth's *effective emission* temperature (K) often equated with the mean temperature of middle troposphere, ϵ is emissivity, and σ is the Stefan-Boltzmann (S-B) constant.

2.1. Main Issues with the Current GHE Concept:

A) *Magnitude of the Natural Greenhouse Effect.* GHE is often quantified as a difference between the actual *mean* global surface temperature (T_s = 287.6K) and the planet's *average* gray-body (no-atmosphere) temperature (T_{gb}), i.e. GHE = T_s - T_{gb}. In the current theory, T_{gb} is equated with the *effective emission* temperature (T_e) calculated straight from the S-B Law using Eq. (1):

$$T_e = \left[\frac{S_o(1-\alpha_p)}{4\epsilon\sigma}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \qquad (1)$$

Where So TOA TSI (W m-2) and α_p is Earth's planetary albedo ($\approx$0.3). However, this is conceptually *incorrect*! Due to Hölder's inequality between non-linear integrals (Kuptsov 2001), T_e is *not* physically compatible with a *measurable* true mean temperature of an airless planet. In order to be correct, T_{gb} must be computed via proper spherical integration of the planetary temperature field. This implies *first* calculating the temperature at every point by taking the 4th root of the absorbed radiation at that point and *then* averaging the resulting temperature field across the planet surface, i.e.

$$T_{gb} = \frac{1}{4\pi}\int_0^{2\pi}\int_0^1 \sqrt[4]{\frac{(S_o + c_s)(1-\alpha_{gb})\mu}{\epsilon\sigma}}\, d\mu\, d\varphi$$

$$= \frac{2}{5}\left[\frac{(S_o + c_s)(1-\alpha_{gb})}{\epsilon\sigma}\right]^{\frac{1}{4}} \qquad (2)$$

where α_{gb} is the Earth's albedo *without* atmosphere ($\approx$0.125), μ is the cosine of incident solar angle at any point, and c_s = 13.25e-5 is a small constant ensuring that T_{gb} = 2.72K (the temperature of deep Space) when $S_o = 0$. Equation (2) assumes a spatially constant albedo (α_{gb}), which is a reasonable approximation when trying to estimate an average planetary temperature. Since in accordance with Hölder's inequality $T_{gb} \ll T_e$ (T_{gb} =154.3K), GHE becomes *much larger* than presently estimated. According to Eq. (2), our atmosphere boosts Earth's surface temperature *not* by 18K—33K as currently assumed, but by 133K! This raises the question: *Can a handful of trace gases which amount to less than 0.5% of atmospheric mass trap enough radiant heat to cause such a huge thermal enhancement at the surface?* Thermodynamics tells us that this not possible.

B) *Role of Convection.* The conceptual model in Fig. 1 can be mathematically described by the following *simultaneous* Equations (3),

$$\begin{cases} \frac{S_o}{4}(1-\alpha_p)(1-\nu_a) + \epsilon\sigma T_a^4 - \sigma T_s^4 = 0 \\ \frac{S_o}{4}(1-\alpha_p)\nu_a + \epsilon\sigma T_s^4 - 2\epsilon\sigma T_a^4 = 0 \end{cases} \qquad (3)$$

where v_a is the atmospheric fraction of the total shortwave radiation absorption. Figure 2 depicts the solution to Eq. (3) for temperatures over a range of atmospheric emissivities (ϵ) assuming $S_o = 1366$ W m^{-2} and v_a =0.326 (Trenberth et al. 2009). In this model, an increase in atmospheric emissivity does *indeed* cause a warming at the surface as stated by the current theory. However, Eq. (3) is *physically incomplete*, because it does *not* account for convection, which occurs *simultaneously* with radiative transfer. Adding a convective term to Eq. (3) such as a sensible heat flux yields the system:

$$\begin{cases} \dfrac{S_o}{4}(1-\alpha_p)(1-v_a) + \epsilon\sigma T_a^4 - \sigma T_s^4 - c_p\rho(T_s - T_a)g_{bH} = 0 \\ \dfrac{S_o}{4}(1-\alpha_p)v_a + \epsilon\sigma T_s^4 + c_p\rho(T_s - T_a)g_{bH} - 2\epsilon\sigma T_a^4 = 0 \end{cases} \qquad (4)$$

where g_{bH} is the aerodynamic conductance to turbulent heat exchange. Equation (4) dramatically alters the solution to Eq. (3) by collapsing the difference between T_s, T_a and T_e and virtually erasing the GHE (see Fig. 3). This is because convective cooling is *many orders* of magnitude *more efficient* that radiative cooling. These results do not change if using multi-layer models. In radiative transfer models, T_s increases with ϵ *not* as a result of *heat trapping* by greenhouse gases, but due to the *lack* of convective cooling, thus requiring a larger thermal gradient to export the necessary amount of heat. Modern GCMs do *not* solve *simultaneously* radiative transfer and convection. This *decoupling* of heat transports is the *core* reason for the surface warming projected by GCMs in response to rising atmospheric greenhouse-gas concentrations. Hence, the predicted CO_2-driven global temperature change is a model artifact!


Figure 2. Solution to the two-layer model in Eq. (3) for T_s and T_a as a function of atmospheric emissivity assuming a non-convective atmosphere. Also shown is the predicted down-welling LW flux(L_d). Note that $L_d \leq 239$ W m^{-2}.

Figure 3. Solution to the two-layer model in Eq. (4) for T_s and T_a as a function of atmospheric emissivity assuming a convective atmosphere ($g_{bH} = 0.075$ m/s). Also shown is the predicted down-welling LW flux (L_d). Note that $L_d \leq 239$ W m^{-2}.

C) *Extra Kinetic Energy in the Troposphere*.

Observations show that the lower troposphere emits 44% *more* radiation toward the surface than the *total* solar flux absorbed by the *entire* Earth-Atmosphere System (Pavlakis et al. 2003) (Fig. 4). Radiative transfer alone *cannot* explain this effect given the negligible heat storage capacity of air (e.g. Figs. 2 & 3), no matter how detailed the model is. Thus, empirical evidence indicates that the lower atmosphere contains *more* kinetic energy than provided by the Sun. Understanding the origin of this *extra* energy is a key to the GHE.

3. The Atmospheric Thermal Enhancement

Figure 4. According to observations, the Earth-Atmosphere System absorbs on average a net solar flux of 239 W m^{-2}, while the lower troposphere alone emits 343 W m^{-2} thermal radiation toward the surface.

Previous studies have noted that the term *Greenhouse Effect* is a misnomer when applied to the atmosphere, since real greenhouses retain heat through an entirely different mechanism compared to the free atmosphere, i.e. by physically trapping air mass and restricting convective heat exchange.

Hence, we propose a new term instead, *Near-surface Atmospheric Thermal Enhancement* (ATE) defined as a *non-dimensional ratio* (N_{TE}) of the planet actual mean surface air temperature (T_s, K) to the average temperature of a Standard Planetary Gray Body (SPGB) with no atmosphere (T_{gb}, K) receiving the *same* solar irradiance, i.e. $N_{TE} = T_s / T_{gb}$. This new definition emphasizes the essence of GHE, which is the *temperature boost* at the surface due to the presence of an atmosphere. We employ Eq. (2) to estimate T_{gb} assuming an albedo $\alpha_{gb} = 0.12$ and a surface emissivity $\epsilon = 0.955$ for the SPGB based on data for Moon, Mercury, and the Earth surface. Using $S_o = 1362$ W m^{-2} (Kopp & Lean 2011) in Eq. (2) yields $T_{gb} = 154.3$K and $N_{TE} = 287.6/154.3 = 1.863$ for Earth. This prompts the question: *What mechanism enables our atmosphere to boost the planet surface temperature some 86% above that of a SPGB*? To answer it we turn on to classical Thermodynamics.

3.1. Climate Implications of the Ideal Gas Law

The average thermodynamic state of a planet's atmosphere can be accurately described by the Ideal Gas Law (IGL):

$$PV = nRT \qquad (5)$$

where P is pressure (Pa), V is the gas volume (m^3), n is the gas amount (mole), $R = 8.314$ J K^{-1} mol^{-1} is the universal gas constant, and T is the gas temperature (K). Equation (5) has three features that are chiefly important to our discussion: *a*) the product $P{\times}V$ defines the internal *kinetic* energy of a gas (measured in Jules) that produces its temperature; *b*) the linear relationship in Eq. (5) guarantees that a *mean* global temperature can be *accurately* estimated from planetary *averages* of surface pressure and air volume (or density). This is in stark contrast to the non-linear relationship between temperature and radiative fluxes (Eq. 1) governed by Hölder's inequality; *c*) on a planetary scale, pressure in the lower troposphere is effectively *independent* of the other variables in Eq. (5) being only a function of gravity (g), total atmospheric mass (M_{at}), and the planet surface area (A_s), i.e. $P_s = g M_{at}/A_s$. Hence, the near-surface atmospheric dynamics can safely be assumed to be governed (over non-geological time scales) by *nearly isobaric* processes on average, i.e. operating under *constant* pressure. This isobaric nature of tropospheric thermodynamics implies that the average atmospheric volume varies in a *fixed* proportion to changes in the mean surface air temperature following the Charles/Gay-Lussac Law, i.e. T_s/V = const. This can be written in terms of the average air density ρ (kg m^{-3}) as

$$\rho T_s = \text{const.} = P_s M / R \qquad (6)$$

where P_s is the mean surface air pressure (Pa) and M is the molecular mass of air (kg mol^{-1}). Eq. (6) reveals an important characteristic of the average thermodynamic process at the surface, namely that a variation of global pressure due to either increase or decrease of total atmospheric mass will immediately alter *both* temperature and atmospheric density. What is presently unknown is the *differential effect* of a global pressure change on each variable. We offer a solution to this in & 3.3. Equations (5) and (6) imply that pressure *directly* controls the kinetic energy and temperature of the atmosphere. Under equal solar insolation, a higher surface pressure (due to a larger atmospheric mass)

would produce a warmer troposphere, while a lower pressure would result in a cooler troposphere. At the limit, a zero pressure (due to the complete absence of an atmosphere) would yield the planet's *gray-body* temperature.

The thermal effect of pressure is vividly demonstrated on a cosmic scale in the process of star formation, where gravity-induced rise of gas pressure boosts the temperature of an interstellar cloud to the threshold of nuclear fusion. At a planetary level, the effect is manifest in Chinook winds, where adiabatically heated downslope airflow raises the local temperature by 20C-30C in a matter of hours. This leads to a logical question: *Could air pressure be responsible for the observed thermal enhancement at the Earth surface presently known as a 'Natural Greenhouse Effect'?* To answer this we must analyze the relationship between N_{TE} factor and key atmospheric variables including pressure over a *wide* range of planetary climates. Fortunately, our solar system offers a suitable spectrum of celestial bodies for such analysis.

3.2. Interplanetary Data Set

We based our selection of celestial bodies for the ATE analysis on three criteria: 1) presence of a solid planetary surface with at least traces of atmosphere; 2) availability of reliable data on surface temperature, total pressure, atmospheric composition etc. preferably from direct measurements; and 3) representation of a wide range of atmospheric masses and compositions. This approach resulted in the choice of four planets - *Mercury, Venus, Earth,* and *Mars*, and four natural satellites - *Moon* of Earth, *Europa* of Jupiter, *Titan* of Saturn, and *Triton* of Neptune. Each celestial body was described by 14 parameters listed in Table 1.

For planets with tangible atmospheres, i.e. Venus, Earth and Mars, the temperatures calculated from IGL agreed rather well with observations. Note that, for extremely low pressures such as on Mercury and Moon, the Gas Law produces $T_s \approx 0.0$. The SPGB temperatures for each celestial body were estimated from Eq. (2) using published data on solar irradiance and assuming $\alpha_{\mathrm{gb}} = 0.12$ and $\epsilon = 0.955$. For Mars, global means of near-surface temperature and air pressure were calculated from remote sensing data retrieved via the method of radio occultation by the Radio Science Team (RST) at Stanford University using observations by the Mars Global Surveyor (MGS) spacecraft from 1999 to 2005. Since the MGS RST analysis has a wide spatial coverage, the new means represent current conditions on the Red Planet much more accurately than older data based on Viking's spot observations from 1970s.

Table 1. Planetary data used to analyze the physical nature of the Atmospheric Near-Surface Thermal Enhancement (N_{TE}). Information was gathered from multiple sources using cross-referencing. The bottom three rows of data were estimated in this study using equations discussed in the text.

	Mercury	Venus	Earth	Moon	Mars	Europa	Titan	Triton
Mean TOA Total Solar Irradiance (W m^{-2}), S_o	9,126.0	2,613.9	1,361.7	1,361.7	589.2	50.5	13.7	1.51
Bond Albedo, α_p	0.12	0.75	0.30	0.11	0.18	0.67	0.22	0.76
Mean Gravity (m s^{-2}), g	3.700	8.836	9.798	1.622	3.690	1.314	1.352	0.779
Planet's Total Atmospheric Mass (kg), M_{at}	-	-	5.148×10^{18}	25,000	-	-	-	-
Planet Surface Area ($\times 10^{12}$ m^2), A_s	74.8	460.0	510.072	37.93	144.8	30.9	83.0	23.0
Atmospheric Mass per Unit Surface Area (kg m^{-2}), M_{at}/A_s	*2.7×10^{-10}	*1.0412×10^6	*10,092.7	*6.6×10^{-10}	*185.7	*1.284×10^{-7}	*108,505.9	*2.2
Mean Surface Pressure (Pa), P_s	10^{-9}	9.2×10^6	*98,888.2	*1.069×10^{-9}	685.4	10^{-7}	146,700.0	1.7
Mean Surface Air Density (kg m^{-3}), ρ	0.00	65.00	1.20	0.00	0.02	*5.24×10^{-12}	*5.24	1.58×10^{-4}
Atmospheric composition (% of volume)	N/A	96.5 CO$_2$ 3.5 N$_2$ 0.02 SO$_2$	78.08 N$_2$ 20.95 O$_2$ 0.93 Ar 0.039 CO$_2$	N/A	95.3 CO$_2$ 2.7 N$_2$ 1.6 Ar 0.13 O$_2$	≈100 O$_2$	98.6 N$_2$ 1.6 CH$_4$	98.0 N$_2$ 2.0 CH$_4$
Molecular Mass of Air (kg mol^{-1}), M	N/A	*0.0434	*0.0290	N/A	*0.0434	*0.0320	*0.0278	*0.0278
Observed Mean Surface Temperature ($^{\circ}$K), T_s	*248.2	737.2	287.6	154.3	182.0	73.4	93.7	36.8
Mean Surface Temperature from Gas Law ($^{\circ}$K), T_s	*0.0	*738.8	*287.4	*0.0	*182.0	73.4	93.7	*35.9
SPGB Mean Surface Temperature ($^{\circ}$K), T_{gb}	*248.2	*181.6	*154.3	*154.3	*125.1	*67.7	*48.9	*28.2
N_{TE}, T_s/T_{gb}	***1.000**	***4.068**	***1.863**	***1.000**	***1.455**	***1.084**	***1.918**	***1.276**

3.3. Physical Nature of ATE / GHE

Our analysis of interplanetary data in Table 1 found no meaningful relationships between ATE (N_{TE}) and variables such as total absorbed solar radiation by planets or the amount of greenhouse gases in their atmospheres. However, we discovered that N_{TE} was *strongly* related to total surface pressure through a nearly perfect regression fit via the following nonlinear function:

$$N_{TE}(P_s) = \frac{T_s}{T_{gb}} = \exp\left(0.233001\, P_s^{0.0651203} + 0.0015393\, P_s^{0.385232}\right) \qquad (7)$$

where P_s is in Pa. Figure 5 displays Eq. (7) graphically along with the 8 celestial bodies. The tight relationship signals a *causal* effect of pressure on N_{TE}, which is theoretically supported by the IGL (see & 3.1). Also, the P_s-N_{TE} curve in Fig. 5 strikingly resembles the response of the temperature/potential temp. (T/θ) ratio to altitudinal changes of pressure described by the well-known Poisson formula derived from IGL (Fig. 6). Such a similarity in responses suggests that both N_{TE} and θ embody the effect of pressure-controlled *adiabatic* heating on air, even though the two mechanisms are not identical. This leads to a fundamental conclusion that the '*Natural Greenhouse Effect*' is in fact a *Pressure-induced Thermal Enhancement* (PTE) in nature.

N_{TE} should *not* be confused with an actual energy, however, since it only defines the *relative* (*fractional*) increase of a planet's surface temperature above that of a SPGB. Pressure by itself is *not* a source of energy! Instead, it *enhances* (*amplifies*) the energy supplied by an external source such as the Sun through density-dependent rates of molecular collision. This relative enhancement *only* manifests as an *actual* energy in the presence of external heating. Thus, Earth and Titan have similar N_{TE} values, yet their absolute surface temperatures are *very* different due to vastly dissimilar solar insolation. While pressure (P) controls the magnitude of the enhancement factor, solar heating determines the average atmospheric volume (V), and the product $P \times V$ defines the *total kinetic energy* and *temperature* of the atmosphere. Therefore, for particular solar insolation, the N_{TE} factor gives rise to *extra* kinetic energy in the lower atmosphere *beyond* the amount supplied by the Sun. This *additional energy* is responsible for keeping the Earth surface 133K warmer than it would be in the absence of atmosphere, and is the source for the observed 44% extra down-welling LW flux in the lower troposphere (see &2.1 C). Similarly, the kinetic energy of pressure is the reason that Venus, with its 93 times more massive atmosphere than Earth, has a 450°K warmer surface despite absorbing 32% *less* solar radiation than our Planet. What keeps the surface of Venus so immensely hot is not a '*runaway greenhouse effect*' caused by copious amounts of CO_2 in the atmosphere as claimed by the current theory (e.g. Svedhem et al. 2007; Houghton 2009), but the sheer magnitude of its atmospheric pressure delivering enormous kinetic energy to the ground. Hence, the atmosphere does *not* act as a '*blanket*' reducing the surface infrared cooling to space as maintained by the current GH theory, but is *in and of itself* a *source* of extra energy through pressure. This makes the GH Effect a *thermodynamic* phenomenon, *not* a radiative one as presently assumed!

Figure 5. Atmospheric near-surface Thermal Enhancement (N_{TE}) as a function of mean total surface pressure (P_s) for 8 celestial bodies listed in Table 1. See Eq. (7) for the exact mathematical formula.


$$T/\theta = (P/P_o)^{0.285}$$

Figure 6. Temperature/potential temperature ratio as a function of atmospheric pressure according to the Poisson formula based on the Gas Law (P_o = 100 kPa.). Note the striking similarity in shape with the curve in Fig. 5.

Equation (7) allows us to derive a simple yet robust formula for predicting a planet's mean surface temperature as a function of only *two* variables – TOA solar irradiance and mean atmospheric surface pressure, i.e.

$$T_s = 25.3966 \, (S_o + 0.0001325)^{0.25} \, N_{TE}(P_s) \qquad (8)$$

where $N_{\text{TE}}(P_s)$ is defined by Eq. (7). Equation (8) almost *completely* explains the variation of T_s among analyzed celestial bodies, thus providing a needed additional function to parse the effect of a global pressure change on the dependent variables ρ and T_s in Eq. (6). Together Equations (6) and (8) imply that the chemical composition of an atmosphere affects average air density through the molecular mass of air, but has *no* impact on the mean surface temperature.

4. Implications of the new ATE Concept

The implications of the above findings are numerous and paradigm-altering. These are but a few examples:


Figure 7. Dynamics of global temperature and 12-month forward shifted cloud cover types from satellite observations. Cloud changes appear to have been the cause for temperature variations during the past 30 years (Nikolov & Zeller, manuscript).

A) Global surface temperature is *independent* of the down-welling LW flux known as *greenhouse* or *back* radiation, because both quantities derive from the *same* pool of atmospheric kinetic energy maintained by solar heating and air pressure. Variations in the downward LW flux (caused by an increase of tropospheric emissivity, for example) are *completely* counterbalanced (offset) by changes in the rate of surface convective cooling, for this is how the system conserves its internal energy.

B) Modifying chemical composition of the atmosphere *cannot* alter the system's total kinetic energy, hence the size of ATE (GHE). This is supported by IGL and the fact that planets of vastly different atmospheric composition follow the same P_s-N_{TE} relationship in Fig. 5. The lack of impact by the atmospheric composition on surface temperature is explained via the compensating effect of convective cooling on back-radiation discussed above.

C) Equation (8) suggests that the planet's albedo is largely a *product* of climate rather than a driver of it. This is because the bulk of the albedo is a function of the kinetic energy supplied by the Sun and the atmospheric pressure. However, independent small changes in albedo are possible and do occur owning to 1%-3% secular variations in cloud cover, which are most likely driven by solar magnetic activity. These cloud-cover changes cause ±0.7C semi-periodic fluctuations in global temperature on a decadal to centennial time scale as indicated by recent satellite observations (see Fig. 7) and climate reconstructions for the past 10,000 years.


Figure 8. Dynamics of global surface temperature during the Cenozoic Era reconstructed from [18]O proxies in marine sediments (Hansen et al. 2008).

Figure 9. Dynamics of mean surface atmospheric pressure during the Cenozoic Era reconstructed from the temperature record in Fig. 8 by inverting Eq. (8).

D) Large climatic shifts evident in the paleo-record such as the 16C *directional* cooling of the Globe during the past 51 million years (Hansen et al. 2008; Fig. 8) can now be explained via changes in atmospheric mass and surface pressure caused by geologic variations in Earth's tectonic activity. Thus, we hypothesize that the observed mega-cooling of Earth since the early Eocene was due to a 53% net loss of atmosphere to Space brought about by a reduction in mantle degasing as a result of a slowdown in continental drifts and ocean floor spreading. Figure 9 depicts reconstructed dynamics of the mean surface pressure for the past 65.5M years based on Eq. (8) and the temperature record in Fig. 8.

5. Unified Theory of Climate

The above findings can help rectify physical inconsistencies in the current GH concept and assist in the development of a Unified Theory of Climate (UTC) based on a deeper and more robust understanding of various climate forcings and the time scales of their operation. Figure 10 outlines a hierarchy of climate forcings as part of a proposed UTC that is consistent with results from this research as well as other studies published over the past 15 years. A proposed key new driver of climate is the variation of total atmospheric mass and surface pressure over geological time scales, i.e. tens of thousands to hundreds of millions of years. According to our new theory, the climate change over the past 100-300 years is due to variations in global cloud albedo that are *not* related to ATE/GHE. This is principally different from the present GH concept, which attempts to explain climate changes over broad range of time scales (i.e.

13

from decades to tens of millions of years) with the *same* forcing attributed to variations in atmospheric CO_2 and other heat-absorbing trace gases (e.g. Lacis et al. 2010).

Earth's climate is currently in one of the warmest periods of the Holocene (past 10K years). The Planet is unlikely to become any warmer over the next 100 years, because the cloud cover appears to have reached a minimum for the present level of solar irradiance and atmospheric pressure, while the solar magnetic activity began declining, which will likely lead to more clouds, higher planetary albedo, and cooler surface temperatures. The observed lack of global warming since 1998 and the presence of significant cooling trends in some regions such as the continental USA for the past 12 years may be the first signs of a climate reversal. According to the hereto proposed UTC, at present, only a sizable increase of total atmospheric mass can bring about a significant and sustained warming. However, human-induced gaseous emissions are extremely unlikely to produce such a mass increase. Hence, there is *no* anthropogenic forcing to global climate.


Figure 10. Global *climate forcings* and their time scales of operation according to the hereto proposed Unified Theory of Climate (UTC). Arrows indicate process interactions.

6. References

Hansen, J., M. Sato, P. Kharecha, D. Beerling, R. Berner, V. Masson-Delmotte, M. Pagani, M. Raymo, D.L. Royer, and J.C. Zachos (2008). Target atmospheric CO_2: where should humanity aim? *Open Atmos. Sci. J.*, 2, 217-231.

Houghton, J.T. (2009). *Global Warming: The Complete Briefing (4th Edition)*. Cambridge University Press, 456 pp.

Kopp, G. and J. L. Lean (2011). A new, lower value of total solar irradiance: Evidence and climate significance, *Geophys. Res. Lett.*, 38, L01706, doi:10.1029/2010GL045777.

Kuptsov, L. P. (2001) Hölder inequality, in Hazewinkel, Michiel, *Encyclopedia of Mathematics*, Springer, ISBN 978-1556080104.

Lacis, A. A., G. A. Schmidt, D. Rind, and R. A. Ruedy (2010). Atmospheric CO_2: Principal control knob governing earth's temperature. *Science* 330:356-359.

Lindzen, R. S. and Y.-S. Choi (2009). On the determination of climate feedbacks from ERBE data. *Geophys. Res. Lett*., 36, L16705, doi:10.1029/2009GL039628.

McKitrick, R. R. et al. (2010). Panel and Multivariate Methods for Tests of Trend Equivalence in Climate Data Series. *Atmospheric Science Letters,* Vol. 11, Issue 4, pages 270–277.

Nikolov, N and K. F. Zeller (manuscript). Observational evidence for the role of planetary cloud-cover dynamics as the dominant forcing of global temperature changes since 1982.

Pavlakis, K. G., D. Hatzidimitriou, C. Matsoukas, E. Drakakis, N. Hatzianastassiou, and I. Vardavas (2003). Ten-year global distribution of down-welling long-wave radiation. *Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss*., 3, 5099-5137.

Svedhem. H., D.V. Titov, F.W. Taylor and O. Witasse (2007). Venus as a more Earth-like planet. *Nature* 450:629-632

Spencer, R. W. and W. D. Braswell (2010). On the diagnosis of radiative feedback in the presence of unknown radiative forcing, *J. Geophys. Res*., 115, D16109, doi:10.1029/2009JD013371

Trenberth, K.E., J.T. Fasullo, and J. Kiehl (2009). Earth's global energy budget. *BAMS*, March:311-323