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The Problem Defined

Physics Model versus UN IPCC Model

Multiple lines of evidence support Physics Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Physics Model</th>
<th>UN IPCC Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replicates 14C data</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proves 14C outflow = Level / Residence Time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proves Adjustment time = Residence time</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows human effect on 14C level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shows human effect on 13C level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proves no CO2 “sticks” in atmosphere</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treats human and natural CO2 the same</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simple theory applies to all CO2 definitions</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can restart calculation and continue simulation</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN core argument fails</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN net importer argument fails</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN theory fails correlation</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UN buffer capacity argument fails</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Physics Model

The Physics model replicates global 14CO2 data

Physics theory: Outflow = Level / Te

\[
\text{dL/dt} = \text{Inflow} - \text{Outflow} \quad (1)
\]

\[
\text{dL/dt} = \text{Inflow} - \frac{L}{Te} \quad (2)
\]

\[
\text{dL/dt} = \frac{L}{Te} - \frac{L}{Te} \quad (3)
\]

\[
L(t) = L_b + (L_0 - L_b) \exp(-t / Te) \quad (4)
\]

Physics theory: Outflow = Level / Te

Balance levels for human and natural Inflows:

\[
L_{bh} = 4.6 \text{ (ppmv/year) } * 4 \text{ (years)} = 18.4 \text{ ppm} \quad (1)
\]

\[
L_{bn} = 98 \text{ (ppmv/year) } * 4 \text{ (years)} = 392 \text{ ppm} \quad (2)
\]

The ratios are independent of residence time:

\[
\frac{L_{bh}}{L_{bn}} = 4.6/98 = 18/392 = 4.6\% \quad (3)
\]

\[
\frac{L_{bh}}{(L_{bh} + L_{bn})} = 4.6/102.6 = 18.4/410 = 4.5\% \quad (4)
\]

Physics theory consequences

\begin{align*}
\text{Natural and human CO2 set balance levels} \\
&= 392 \text{ ppm} \\
&= 18 \text{ ppm}
\end{align*}

\[
\text{98} \quad 98 \quad 4.6 \quad 4.6
\]

\[
\text{Nature} \quad \text{Human}
\]

\[
\text{Adjustment Time} = \text{Residence Time}
\]

\[
\text{UN says, if Outflow} = \frac{L}{Te}, \text{then}
\]

\[
\text{Adjustment Time} = \text{Residence Time}
\]

\[
14C \text{ data prove Outflow} = \frac{L}{Te}
\]

\[
\text{14C data support Physics theory}
\]

\[
\text{Physics balance level of -4.5 fits 14C data.}
\]

\[
\text{IPCC balance level of -32 does not fit 14C data.}
\]

\[
\text{13C data support Physics theory}
\]

\[
\begin{array}{c|c|c|c}
\text{13C Ratio} & \text{Physics} & \text{UN IPCC} \\
\hline
0.15 & 0.64 & 0.09 \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{Physics theory fits 13C Ratio.}
\]

\[
\text{UN theory fails.}
\]
UN IPCC Model

UN Bern model can't simulate 14C data and can't replicate itself on restart.

UN theory fails the Scientific Method

If your prediction is wrong, your theory is wrong.

UN says nature can't increase Atmos CO2 because nature absorbs Human CO2

UN wrong because outflow depends on level, not upon inflow.

UN says Human CO2 reduces "buffer capacity"

Would increase Tₑ - but 14C data show no change in Tₑ.

UN says 15% of human CO2 stays in atmosphere

The UN demon traps human CO2

Bern model traps 15% of HUMAN CO2

\[ L(t) = L_0 \left[ + 0.150 \\
+ 0.252 \exp(-t/173) \\
+ 0.279 \exp(-t/18.5) \\
+ 0.319 \exp(-t/1.19) \right] \]

So, 15% of natural CO2, or 15 ppm/year, sticks in atmosphere.

Then 1000 years will stick 15,000 ppm of natural CO2.

The result is clearly absurd. So, the UN theory is wrong.