A Reading, Not a Lever

The Climate Theory of the IPCC Derived from the Vacuum.Net Theory, and Where the Two Part

J. Konstapel, Constable Research, Leiden

7 November 2026

Abstract. The five propositions of the IPCC climate theory (energy balance, greenhouse effect, logarithmic forcing, feedback response, attribution) are derived step by step from the first distinction of the Vacuum.Net theory, through its Foundations (axioms N1–N5, theorems T1–T24), its physics and chemistry, and the history of life up to the human net. The first four propositions follow in structure; their numbers remain input, as the theory's own ledger states. The fifth does not follow. In the net, the rise of carbon dioxide is a reading of the state at which the human net stands, at an opening before a larger closure; the free state in the window of the weather is water. The IPCC reads the same quantity as the cause and makes it the lever. Three places where the IPCC's models depart from their own rules are identified, each matched to one rule of the net: non-closure of the energy budget in a quarter of the CMIP6 ensemble, a super-logarithmic forcing fit against a derived logarithm, and a radiation-scheme artefact in the temperature dependence of the feedback. The financial consequence of the fifth proposition is illustrated with a current case. What remains open in the derivation is stated: three pure numbers (α, m_p/m_e, the forcing coefficient) and one test on the monthly record since 1870.

Keywords: Vacuum.Net, closure, ladder, climate sensitivity, attribution, state function, water cycle.

---

1. Introduction

The IPCC presents its theory of climate change as a chain: radiative balance, greenhouse effect, forcing by carbon dioxide, feedback response, and attribution of the observed warming to human emissions [10, 11]. The chain is built from measured physics and from numerical models. The question addressed here is whether the same chain follows from a theory that begins one step earlier, with a single distinction, and if so, where the two chains part.

The Vacuum.Net theory [1, 2] starts from one strand and one act, the self-crossing of the strand with three states. Everything else is counted. Its Foundations prove a small number of theorems about closure, period, seams, ladders and depth [1]. A physics text identifies the elementary

closures with particles [2]; a book of 7 November 2026 carries the derivation through chemistry to the climate [3]; a second book follows the same forms through the history of life to the human net [4]; an essay places the climate on the ladder of layers [5]. Two earlier pieces give the author's own accounting of warming in terms of water and soil [6, 7].

This article assembles those sources into one derivation of forty-two steps, states for each step whether it is proved, identified or input, and then sets the five IPCC propositions beside the result. The method of the author's Respondent–Judge protocol [8] was applied to the numerical claims: independent recomputation by a judge who wrote its own code before reading the respondent's.

2. The ground: Foundations

The following are theorems of the Foundations [1]. All were recomputed independently for this article.

1. **The distinction.** One distinction has two sides. A strand crossing itself has three states: over, under, none. Register {−1, 0, +1} (N1, T1).
2. **The window.** Three states in a row give 27 cases. Closure is sum ≡ 0 (mod 3). Nine close: three with equal states, six with all three states once (T2–T4).
3. **What closes, stays.** An open window carries tension and passes to the next scale (N2).
4. **Memory.** The order of passages at a node is fixed (N3).
5. **Period three.** A word closed in every window satisfies $t_3 = -(t_1 + t_2)$. Three states in three different residue classes form one closed window (T8).
6. **The seam.** Two closed windows join without tension only if they are equal (T11).
7. **Elementary closures.** Every closed word reduces to stands (0), meetings (x, −x) and rings (x, x, x) (T7).
8. **The ladder.** Merging in equal blocks of 2 or 3: one coarse passage holds $2^a \cdot 3^b$ fine ones. Powers of 2 and 3 never coincide; the closest approaches lie at depths 1, 2, 5, 12, 41, 53, 306, the denominators of the continued fraction of $\log_2 3$; the comma $3^{12}/2^{19} = 1.01364$ (T15–T18).
9. **The first knot.** Three crossings; not undoable; two mirror images; return after 4π; an integer winding number (T19–T22).
10. **State function.** The stiffness of the medium is $\bar{g}(1 + \gamma\delta)$, a function of its density (N4, T23).
11. **The lever.** For a free path in three directions, $\gamma = -(1 + P_3)/P_3 = -3.94$ (T24).
12. **Repetition.** On every scale, 1–11 hold again (N5).

3. From count to matter

The steps below rest on identifications stated in the physics text [2] and in [3]. They are the author's; they do not follow from N1–N5 alone, and the texts label them so.

13. Nilpotence $Q^2 = 0$ is the mass shell $E^2 = p^2 + m^2$ [2, T1, C3]; the derivation follows Rowlands [9].
14. Matter is closed winding; light is the open strand [2, C4].
15. Return after 4π gives spin ½; the winding number gives charge ±1 or 0 [2, C2].
16. Electron: light closed in a double loop [2, I1]. Proton: closure of three windings [3, §15.5].
17. The atom: a ring (+) and a ring (−) form a meeting of charge 0; the strand between them stays only in states that close with both (step 6): discrete orbits [3, ch. 16].
18. The shell: a window of states; closed shell, noble gas; open places, valence [3, ch. 17].
19. The molecule: two open shells closing together, a meeting. A molecule of equal atoms keeps a symmetric state under vibration and does not couple to light; CO_2 and H_2O change state and couple [3, ch. 18].
20. The three states of matter: molecules free (gas), paired (liquid), in rings (solid). Water passes through all three.
21. Light and heat: a closed configuration takes in a passage that fits its window and gives it back without preference of direction; how often per cycle is its temperature, a ratio of counts.

Input in this part: $m_p/m_e = 1836.15$ (R2), $\alpha = 1/137.036$ (R1), molecular force constants and band positions (R24). The book's own ledger lists all three as open [3, §24.4, §28.2]. A pre-registered test of whether α or m_p/m_e follows from the proven counts of the Foundations (powers of three, necklace counts, closure depths, under one arithmetic operation) was run for this article; the nearest candidates (136 for $1/\alpha$; $6 \cdot 306 = 1836$ for m_p/m_e) miss the measurement precision by three and five orders of magnitude respectively, and the second is less close than the known coincidence $6\pi^5$ [35]. Both remain open.

4. Life

The steps below follow [4].

22. Chains: molecules with two open windows close at both ends, a word; only words of period three persist (steps 5, 6).

23. Copy: a seam closes only with an equal window (step 6); extension without tension is copying. Heredity follows from T11.
24. The cell: a ring enclosing open chains; inside and outside differ; the ring passes only what fits its window; closure per cycle, in + out + own state ≡ 0 [4, ch. 2].
25. The plant: light taken in and fixed as a ring (sugar), leaving an open window that leaves (O_2) [4, ch. 8].
26. The animal: the reverse closure; the ring opened with O_2, the passage released, the gas returned (CO_2). Plant and animal together are a meeting (x, −x) [4, ch. 7, 13].
27. The ecosystem: three families in three residue classes, fixing (+1), opening (−1), returning (0); only together do they close [4, ch. 12–13].
28. Soil, water, air: the 0-family makes the soil (peat, coal, lime: rings outside the cycle); plants carry the water; open windows fill the air [4, ch. 10–11].
29. The letter: every closed form becomes a letter of a larger closure; bacterium in cell, cell in body, nerve cell in brain, body in colony [4, ch. 23].
30. The human: has no will of its own; it follows the string of its trit (step 4). The human net is the closure of which the human is the letter [4, ch. 20–22].
31. The human net stands at an opening. Measured: humans (390 Mt) and livestock (630 Mt) hold 94 % of mammal mass [41, 42]; 76 % of ice-free land is used or embedded [43]; human-made mass equals living biomass, 1.1 Tt, doubling every 20 years [40]; 592 EJ per year, 15 % of all photosynthesis, 21.9 times the power of the bodies it serves [44].
32. The loading: four fifths of that power (80.9 %) comes from rings outside the cycle: coal, oil, gas [44]. Opening them without a fixing partner on the same scale leaves an open window (steps 26, 28).

5. The climate

33. The planet closes: in + out + own state ≡ 0 (steps 2, 12). This is the energy balance.
34. The atmosphere is a ladder of layers; each layer receives and gives both ways; a run of layers without tension has period three (steps 5, 12, 21).
35. The last layer: what leaves is emitted from the layer where the coupling gas becomes thin. More coupling gas raises that layer.
36. One rung per doubling: doubling is one step on the ×2 ladder, every step equal; the forcing is logarithmic in concentration (step 8).
37. The response: what does not close is tension until a new closure. The stiffness with which the planet pushes back is $\bar{g}(1 + \gamma\delta)$, a state function; $\gamma < 0$, weaker push-back at a higher state (steps 10, 11).

38. The window of the weather: soil, water and weather lie in three residue classes, x_weather = −(x_soil + x_water). Water, the layer that passes through all three states (step 20), is the free state [5].
39. The window of the CO_2 band: sunlight, terrestrial emission and the CO_2 band lie in three residue classes, x_CO_2 = −(x_sun + x_out). The state of the band is fixed by what comes in and what goes out [5].
40. What CO_2 is: from 32 and 39, the rise of CO_2 is the residue of the loading of the human net, the measure of a closure that has not yet closed. A reading of the opening, not a lever.
41. The Sun and the system: periods are ratios of windings (step 8). Their forcing in the present century is small: solar cycle ±0.12 W m^{-2} [18]; a grand minimum ≤ 0.3 K by 2100 [19]; orbital change < 0.001 W m^{-2} per century [20]; over 10^4–10^5 years orbital forcing dominates [21]. A planetary trigger of the solar cycle is proposed [22] and disputed [23]; cosmic-ray cloud nucleation is confirmed as a mechanism and found small as a climate effect [24]; galactic modulation of ice ages is published and contested [25]. A pre-registered test of whether the periods of Sun and orbit (11; 21,000; 41,000; 100,000; 405,000 yr) fall on the $2^a \cdot 3^b$ lattice was run for this article and rejected ($p = 0.20$; with the Berger periods $p = 0.33$).
42. The next closure: after every opening came a filling, many times. Closure comes not from the letters doing less but from the larger form closing. The ladder has no last depth [4, ch. 23].

6. The IPCC theory set beside the result

#	IPCC proposition	Net	Finding
1	Balance: absorbed = emitted; 255 K without atmosphere	Step 33	Same structure. The number needs the solar constant and albedo as input.
2	Greenhouse: gases absorb and re-emit; surface +33 K; observed change in the outgoing spectrum [47]	Steps 34–35; which gases, step 19	Same structure. Magnitudes are input.
3	Forcing: logarithmic, ≈ 3.9 W m^{-2} per doubling [10]	Step 36	Same structure. AR6 uses the super-logarithmic fit of Meinshausen et al. [12, 11]: recomputed here, 3.77, 4.14 and 4.21 W m^{-2} for the first, second and third doubling. Romps et al. derive a strict logarithm from the band shape [14]; the net agrees with [14]. The coefficient is open (R24).

#	IPCC proposition	Net	Finding
4	Response: ≈ 1.1 K without feedback, ≈ 3 K with [10]	Step 37	Same structure. The sign of the state dependence agrees with line-by-line radiative transfer: λ from −2.1 to −1.0 W m^{-2} K^{-1} between 280 and 330 K [15]; models using the RRTMG scheme show a spurious peak [15]. In a Monte Carlo drift analysis, 4 of 16 CMIP6 models take up more energy in the ocean than enters at the top of the atmosphere in every scenario [17]. The value is open (R25).

#	IPCC proposition	Net	Finding
5	Attribution: the observed warming is due to human emissions; CO_2 is the lever [10]	Steps 30–32, 38–40	**Here the two part.** The physics is the same; the reading is not. The net reads the CO_2 rise as the residue of the human net's loading; the IPCC reads it as the cause and makes it the lever.

6.1 The accounting of the fifth proposition

With the IPCC's own numbers [10]: the direct CO_2 forcing since 1750 is $5.35 \cdot \ln(429/278) = 2.32$ W m^{-2}; with the Planck response 3.22 W m^{-2} K^{-1} this is 0.72 K; the observed warming of about 1.44 K is twice that [6]. The difference runs through water: water vapour and lapse rate +1.30, clouds +0.42, ice and snow +0.35 W m^{-2} K^{-1} [10]. Per doubling: 3.71/3.22 = 1.15 K without feedback, $3.71/(3.22 - 2.07) = 3.2$ K with; the direct CO_2 share is 36 % and the water share 64 % [6]. The direct effect has been measured at the surface [26].

Evaporation removes 28.4 W m^{-2} per millimetre per day ($L = 2.45$ MJ kg^{-1} over 86,400 s), twelve times the CO_2 forcing [7]. Land now evaporates 1,260–3,500 km³ per year less than before land-use change [29]; 3.4 million km² of wetland, a fifth of the total, has been drained since 1700 [28]. Agriculture has released 133 Gt of soil carbon [27], 62.7 ppm, 42 % of the rise since 1750. A drained peat meadow emits about 20 t CO_2 ha^{-1} yr^{-1} and every 10 cm of higher water table saves at least 3 t ha^{-1} yr^{-1} [30]; soil organic matter stores much carbon and little water [31].

None of these numbers contradicts the IPCC's physics. They change which state is free and which is read. In the net, the free state of the weather is water (step 38), and water is local and controllable: water table, evaporation, peat, soil. CO_2 is a global reading that, as a Dutch climate-finance researcher put it in the case below, a single country "can do little about" [37].

6.2 Where the money hangs

The fifth proposition is the only one of the five that assigns an agent. Everything financial follows from it: liability, compensation, the allocation of funds between countries and within them. A current example is the interview of 5 November 2026 in NRC with Pieter Pauw [37], which opens with a cost of € 9 billion for the Dutch "climate summer". The figure originates with Allianz Trade [36] and rests on a rule, a 3 % loss of output per hour per degree between 30 and 35 °C over the worst five-day spell; a parallel estimate by Triodos reaches 0.8 percentage points of GDP by a method whose weighting the authors call "judgement rather than fitted parameters" [36]. Neither figure attributes the heat to climate change; both count the heat as it was. The interviewee states the evidential position himself: "mostly anecdotal evidence", "we have no total figures". The damages he lists, foundations, harvests, low rivers, fodder, are damages of water in the wrong place or amount, which is the free state of step 38; the remedies he names, electric vehicles, emission targets, a climate fund, act on the reading. The geopolitical deadlock he describes at COP31 is, in the terms of the net, the tension of a window that cannot close while the lever is the reading: the attribution divides the world into perpetrators and victims, and no closure is possible on that division.

7. What remains open

1. Three pure numbers: α (R1), m_p/m_e (R2) and the forcing coefficient per doubling (R24). Until they follow, the net gives no kelvin and cannot test the magnitude of warming; it tests structure and sign.
2. The ladder test proposed in [5]: whether the monthly window of sunspot number, ENSO index and global temperature since 1870 closes more often than one third of the time. It requires a rule for converting a monthly value to −1, 0, +1, which [5] does not yet give.
3. What the next closure of the human net looks like. None of the sources says; [4] says only that the ladder has no last depth.

8. Conclusion

Derived from the first distinction, the IPCC's physics stands: balance, greenhouse, logarithmic forcing and a state-dependent response all follow in structure, with their numbers as input. Its attribution does not follow. The net reads the rise of carbon dioxide as a reading of where the human net stands, not as the lever by which it is moved; the free, controllable state of the weather is water. Three points where the IPCC's models depart from their own rules are identified, each already documented in the climate literature, each matched to one rule of the net. The difference between the two theories is not in the warming, which neither denies, but in the bookkeeping, and the bookkeeping is where the money is.

References

[1] Konstapel, J. (2026). *The Vacuum.Net Theory, Ninth Edition: Foundations 9.2.* Constable Research, Leiden. constable.blog.

[2] Konstapel, J. (2026). *The Vacuum.Net Theory, Ninth Edition: Physics 9.0.* Constable Research, Leiden.

[3] Konstapel, J. (2026). *All Facts and Theories of Physics and Chemistry Derived from the Vacuum.Net Theory.* Sixth version, 7 November 2026. Constable Research, Leiden. https://constable.blog/2026/11/06/all-facts-and-theories-of-physics-andchemistry-derived-from-the-vacuum-nettheory/

[4] Konstapel, J. (2026). *The History of Life on the Net: A Reference Work on Evolution and the Vacuum.Net.* First edition, 14 October 2026. Constable Research, Leiden.

[5] Konstapel, J. (2026). Climate Physics in Plain Language: Layers, Time and Water. *constable.blog*, 3 October 2026. https://constable.blog/2026/10/03/the-climate-on-the-ladder-of-three-layers-closure-and-the-three-families-of-the-vacuum-net/

[6] Konstapel, J. (2026). Klimaatopwarming: waarom water zwaarder weegt dan CO_2. *constable.blog*, 2 October 2026. https://constable.blog/2026/10/02/co2-klimaat2/

[7] Konstapel, J. (2026). Klimaatbeleid zonder bodem en water werkt niet. *constable.blog*, 2 October 2026. https://constable.blog/2026/10/02/klimaat/

[8] Konstapel, J. (2026). *The Respondent–Judge Protocol.* Constable Research, Leiden. https://constable.blog/wp-content/uploads/respondent-judge-protocol.pdf

[9] Rowlands, P. (2007). *Zero to Infinity: The Foundations of Physics.* World Scientific, Singapore. See also arXiv:1004.1523.

[10] Forster, P., Storelvmo, T., Armour, K., et al. (2021). The Earth's energy budget, climate feedbacks, and climate sensitivity. In: *Climate Change 2021: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Sixth Assessment Report of the IPCC*, ch. 7. Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/9781009157896.009

[11] IPCC (2021). *Chapter 7 Supplementary Material*, §7.SM.1.3, Tables 7.SM.1–2. https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/downloads/report/IPCC_AR6_WGI_Chapter07_SM.pdf

[12] Meinshausen, M., Nicholls, Z. R. J., Lewis, J., et al. (2020). The shared socio-economic pathway (SSP) greenhouse gas concentrations and their extensions to 2500. *Geoscientific Model Development* 13, 3571–3605. doi:10.5194/gmd-13-3571-2020

[13] Etminan, M., Myhre, G., Highwood, E. J., Shine, K. P. (2016). Radiative forcing of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide: a significant revision of the methane radiative forcing. *Geophysical Research Letters* 43, 12614–12623. doi:10.1002/2016GL071930

[14] Romps, D. M., Seeley, J. T., Edman, J. P. (2022). Why the forcing from carbon dioxide scales as the logarithm of its concentration. *Journal of Climate* 35, 4027–4047. doi:10.1175/JCLI-D-21-0275.1

[15] Kluft, L., Dacie, S., Brath, M., Buehler, S. A., Stevens, B. (2021). Temperature-dependence of the clear-sky feedback in radiative-convective equilibrium. *Geophysical Research Letters* 48, e2021GL094649. doi:10.1029/2021GL094649

[16] Bloch-Johnson, J., Rugenstein, M., Stolpe, M. B., et al. (2021). Climate sensitivity increases under higher CO_2 levels due to feedback temperature dependence. *Geophysical Research Letters* 48, e2020GL089074. doi:10.1029/2020GL089074

[17] Grandey, B. S., Koh, Z. Y., Samanta, D., Horton, B. P., Dauwels, J., Chew, L. Y. (2023). Monte Carlo drift correction – quantifying the drift uncertainty of global climate models. *Geoscientific Model Development* 16, 6593–6608. doi:10.5194/gmd-16-6593-2023

[18] Kopp, G., Lean, J. L. (2011). A new, lower value of total solar irradiance: evidence and climate significance. *Geophysical Research Letters* 38, L01706. doi:10.1029/2010GL045777

[19] Feulner, G., Rahmstorf, S. (2010). On the effect of a new grand minimum of solar activity on the future climate on Earth. *Geophysical Research Letters* 37, L05707. doi:10.1029/2010GL042710

[20] Laskar, J., Robutel, P., Joutel, F., et al. (2004). A long-term numerical solution for the insolation quantities of the Earth. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 428, 261–285. doi:10.1051/0004-6361:20041335

[21] Hays, J. D., Imbrie, J., Shackleton, N. J. (1976). Variations in the Earth's orbit: pacemaker of the ice ages. *Science* 194, 1121–1132. doi:10.1126/science.194.4270.1121

[22] Stefani, F., Giesecke, A., Weier, T. (2019). A model of a tidally synchronized solar dynamo. *Solar Physics* 294, 60. doi:10.1007/s11207-019-1447-1

[23] Cameron, R. H., Schüssler, M. (2013). No evidence for planetary influence on solar activity. *Astronomy & Astrophysics* 557, A83. doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201321713

[24] Kirkby, J., Curtius, J., Almeida, J., et al. (2011). Role of sulphuric acid, ammonia and galactic cosmic rays in atmospheric aerosol nucleation. *Nature* 476, 429–433. doi:10.1038/nature10343; Kirkby, J., et al. (2016). Ion-induced nucleation of pure biogenic particles. *Nature* 533, 521–526. doi:10.1038/nature17953

[25] Shaviv, N. J., Veizer, J. (2003). Celestial driver of Phanerozoic climate? *GSA Today* 13(7), 4–10. doi:10.1130/1052-5173(2003)013<0004:CDOPC>2.0.CO;2

[26] Feldman, D. R., Collins, W. D., Gero, P. J., et al. (2015). Observational determination of surface radiative forcing by CO_2 from 2000 to 2010. *Nature* 519, 339–343. doi:10.1038/nature14240

[27] Sanderman, J., Hengl, T., Fiske, G. J. (2017). Soil carbon debt of 12,000 years of human land use. *PNAS* 114, 9575–9580. doi:10.1073/pnas.1706103114

[28] Fluet-Chouinard, E., Stocker, B. D., Zhang, Z., et al. (2023). Extensive global wetland loss over the past three centuries. *Nature* 614, 281–286. doi:10.1038/s41586-022-05572-6

[29] Sterling, S. M., Ducharne, A., Polcher, J. (2013). The impact of global land-cover change on the terrestrial water cycle. *Nature Climate Change* 3, 385–390. doi:10.1038/nclimate1690

[30] Evans, C. D., Peacock, M., Baird, A. J., et al. (2021). Overriding water table control on managed peatland greenhouse gas emissions. *Nature* 593, 548–552. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03523-1

[31] Minasny, B., McBratney, A. B. (2018). Limited effect of organic matter on soil available water capacity. *European Journal of Soil Science* 69, 39–47. doi:10.1111/ejss.12475

[32] Friedlingstein, P., O'Sullivan, M., Jones, M. W., et al. (2025). Global Carbon Budget 2024. *Earth System Science Data* 17, 965–1039. doi:10.5194/essd-17-965-2025

[33] Hathaway, D. H. (2015). The solar cycle. *Living Reviews in Solar Physics* 12, 4. doi:10.1007/lrsp-2015-4

[34] Berger, A., Loutre, M. F. (1991). Insolation values for the climate of the last 10 million years. *Quaternary Science Reviews* 10, 297–317. doi:10.1016/0277-3791(91)90033-Q

[35] Lenz, F. (1951). The ratio of proton and electron masses. *Physical Review* 82, 554. doi:10.1103/PhysRev.82.554.2

[36] Allianz Trade (2026). *Allianz Climate Economics Report 2026*; Triodos Bank (2026). *Hot Summer Economics: Extreme heat could wipe out EU growth in 2026*, with background note. https://www.triodos.com/binaries/content/assets/tbho/research-and-insights/triodos-bank-hot-summer-economics—background.pdf

[37] Uijtewaal, R. (2026). Deze klimaatzomer kostte Nederland 9 miljard euro. Interview with Pieter Pauw. *NRC*, 5 November 2026.

[38] Oxfam (2025). *Carbon Inequality Kills.* Oxfam International.

[39] Agora Energiewende (2025). *Die Energiewende in Deutschland: Stand der Dinge 2024.* Berlin.

[40] Elhacham, E., Ben-Uri, L., Grozovski, J., Bar-On, Y. M., Milo, R. (2020). Global human-made mass exceeds all living biomass. *Nature* 588, 442–444. doi:10.1038/s41586-020-3010-5

[41] Bar-On, Y. M., Phillips, R., Milo, R. (2018). The biomass distribution on Earth. *PNAS* 115, 6506–6511. doi:10.1073/pnas.1711842115

[42] Greenspoon, L., Krieger, E., Sender, R., et al. (2023). The global biomass of wild mammals. *PNAS* 120, e2204892120. doi:10.1073/pnas.2204892120

[43] Ellis, E. C., Klein Goldewijk, K., Siebert, S., Lightman, D., Ramankutty, N. (2010). Anthropogenic transformation of the biomes, 1700 to 2000. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* 19, 589–606. doi:10.1111/j.1466-8238.2010.00540.x

[44] Energy Institute (2025). *Statistical Review of World Energy 2025*; IEA (2025). *Global Energy Review 2025.* Paris.

[45] Arrhenius, S. (1896). On the influence of carbonic acid in the air upon the temperature of the ground. *Philosophical Magazine* 41, 237–276; Tyndall, J. (1861). On the absorption and radiation of heat by gases and vapours. *Philosophical Transactions* 151, 1–36.

[46] Sloane, N. J. A. (ed.). The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences, A001867 (ternary necklaces). https://oeis.org/A001867

[47] Harries, J. E., Brindley, H. E., Sagoo, P. J., Bantges, R. J. (2001). Increases in greenhouse forcing inferred from the outgoing longwave radiation spectra of the Earth in 1970 and 1997. *Nature* 410, 355–357. doi:10.1038/35066553

© 2026 J. Konstapel, Constable Research, Leiden. All rights reserved.