



Open Letter to Dr S Fred Singer, American Thinker

By Pierre R Latour, PE, PhD Chemical Process Engineer

March 8, 2012

Following your excellent seminar at the University of Houston on February 6, 2012, I introduced myself, indicated Greenhouse Gas Theory (GHG) is a perpetual motion machine to drive anthropogenic global warming (AGW) violating First & Second Laws of thermodynamics, and emailed you my proof at ['No Virginia.'](#)

I noticed your February 29, 2012 post ['Climate Deniers Are Giving Us Skeptics a Bad Name'](#) included things you did not cover at the University of Houston:

“Now let me turn to the deniers. One of their favorite arguments is that the greenhouse effect does not exist at all because it violates the Second Law of Thermodynamics—i.e., one cannot transfer energy from a cold atmosphere to a warmer surface. It is surprising that this simplistic argument is used by physicists, and even by professors who teach thermodynamics. One can show them data of down welling infrared radiation from CO₂, water vapor, and clouds, which clearly impinge on the surface. But their minds are closed to any such evidence.”

First, I recognize your expertise at evaluating climate data and UN Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) conclusions for validity; you are well-known to have proven GHG Theory effects on AGW are greatly exaggerated and not supported by any reliable data. You go further to claim carbon dioxide (CO₂) does cause warming, without proof or quantification.

Second, I recognize this subject has experienced great and important controversy for many years. I can appreciate to achieve and maintain the reputation you now enjoy in the face of unfair attacks by GHG & AGW promoters calls for exceptional care and a compromising middle of the road approach. Your reporting skills are very convincing.

Third, you may be interested to learn your younger successors, whom you called skeptical deniers, are moving the debate from simply falsifying GHG Theory with data, which you have already done, to getting it right with physics and engineering. Along that path, we have discovered some striking violations of the laws of engineering in the GHG Theory. Many were reported last year in a book, Johnson, C, A Siddons, H Schreuder, T Ball, C Anderson, J O'Sullivan, et al, *'Slaying the Sky Dragon'*, 2011. While I am unpaid and have no obligation to disprove the GHG Theory, you might like to learn about the much stronger intellectual arguments against that theory by your natural allies than simply analyzing data.

Fourth, you acknowledge that this thermodynamics “argument is used by physicists and even some professors who teach thermodynamics”. If my support of that denier claim when I spoke to you personally at U of H prompted this acknowledgement, I am pleased.

Fifth, then you say you are surprised this thermo claim is used. Does this indicate you have not studied engineering thermo as carefully as UN IPCC data? Your adjective “simplistic” indicates

this to be the case, not any incorrectness of the thermo violation claim by engineers like me. Scientists and mathematicians consider simplicity like $F = mA$, $e = mC^2$, $c = \pi d$, $c^2 = a^2 + b^2$, $e^{i\pi} = -1$ to be virtues. Once you review my proof, you will find it almost as simple, perhaps even virtuous.

Sixth, I accept the data provided by you and Roy Spencer that the sky emits infrared radiation toward the earth. Everyone knows gas scatters and emits in all directions. But this does not prove that the warmer surface absorbs all or any of the back-radiation from cold CO₂ molecules, thus emitting more infrared than otherwise and heating the Earth. I took some care to describe this in English and math in my '[No Virginia](#)' post. If you can invalidate or validate my proof, that would help reconciliation. I recommend you brush up on absorptivity, emissivity, scatter, reflection, transmission and conversion of radiation by colorful matter.

Seventh, my post and personal email reply to you and Roy Spencer on this issue proves my mind is quite open to all such evidence. My testimony of provable fact refutes your allegation against me and your many engineering allies.

Eighth, as everyone knows or should know, the preponderance of evidence supports the correctness of thermo, to the point where anyone offering data to disprove those laws has a lot of work to do. It has been futile since engineer Sadi Carnot, 1824, so educated people refrain from wasting time and money on such nonsense.

Ninth, since my claim and proof, supported by physicists and professors known to you, that GHG Theory incorporates a perpetual motion machine to drive global warming in perpetuity is such a momentous result, and GHG Theory is such a ridiculous and falsified theory, it is fair to say your casual dismissal with this brief paragraph is quite unscientific and an affront to the engineering profession. It behooves you to study this science more carefully. You really owe them some evidence to support your charge "their minds are closed to any such evidence" or a retraction, to restore your sterling reputation.

Tenth, those Denier subgroups you identify in your last two post paragraphs seem well positioned and your dismissal of them was frivolous. I recommend you apply the same intellectual rigor you use to analyze UN IPCC data to any critique of your natural allies that are using well-known science and engineering to straighten out the GHG – AGW mess invented by a narrow group in the fledgling area of meteorology research. Just because we are called skeptics and deniers does not prove we are wrong. In fact you should be aware that GHG AGW promoters have publicly injected a sinister inference to the meaning of the perfectly legitimate noun denier. I trust you did not intend that unfortunate meaning. Correct science comes from the first minority to get it right and is not necessarily in the middle of the road, where one can get run over. I fear many of your followers concluded *Climate Fence Sitters Are Giving Us Skeptics a Bad Name*.

In your defense, you did a better job refuting UN IPCC nonsense than proving deniers are incorrect. I applaud your seminar tour of western US universities in February to publicize the inaccurate UN IPCC data and your corrections showing AGW is exaggerated and could be vanishingly small. Excluding your post paragraph from your seminar was a wise move. I just wish your mind was not closed to science, engineering and facts about proven falsehoods of GHG Theory.

Dr. Latour is Engineering Consultant for, and member of [Principia Scientific International](#)

