

Interactive
Comment

Interactive comment on “Ice melt, sea level rise and superstorms: evidence from paleoclimate data, climate modeling, and modern observations that 2 °C global warming is highly dangerous” by J. Hansen et al.

N. Swedan

nabilswedan@yahoo.com

Received and published: 29 July 2015

“(The claim was made “Heat transfers from a warmer object to a colder object, period.” How does the cold object “know” about the warm object? Would it “know” about an even colder object? In the first case it would not transmit heat; in the second case it would. That would require that objects be sentient. A previous poster rightly pointed out that all objects above 0 degrees K emit heat C5331 ACPD 15, C5331–C5332, 2015 Interactive Comment Full Screen / Esc Printer-friendly Version Interactive Discussion

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



Discussion Paper energy. What matters is net transfer. Roy Spencer includes the "reasoning" presented by Nabil Swedan as #2 in his "Skeptical Arguments that Don't Hold Water")"

Nabil's Reply:

If a colder object radiates back to a warmer object, the warmer object will radiate more energy to the colder object and the world's temperature spirals out of control. This is not observed and observations what matters. Heat transfers from a warmer object to a colder object, period. This is what is written in the science books and the world agrees on this. You will have an impossible task to prove otherwise because your argument is against the laws of nature.

Water is not sentient but it does not flow uphill for it is against gravity. Electrical currents are not sentient but they do not flow in the direction of higher potential. So is radiation. Body temperature is the potential and radiation is the energy flow. Radiation is not sentient but can only flow from higher potential, or warmer body temperature, to colder body temperature.

Things abide by the laws of nature as we humans should. In the case of the greenhouse gas effect, we defied the laws of nature, and that is why we do not agree on the climate science.

Interactive comment on Atmos. Chem. Phys. Discuss., 15, 20059, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

