

Zombie Science - January 2018

For well over three decades now the world has been held to ransom by a perceived “consensus science” that has convinced scientists and politicians alike that human emissions of carbon dioxide (CO₂) cause a myriad of “extreme” weather events and other claimed but unrelated issues.

We have been told repeatedly that the “consensus science” has been settled for over a century and that carbon dioxide is a so-called “greenhouse gas” that “traps heat” and thus makes the earth “warmer than it would otherwise be”.^{1,2}

But that narrative of a robust, long-supported theory is not true. We know these ideas about CO₂ were abandoned by mainstream science when debunked by Professor H. W. Woods in 1909.³ The discredited “greenhouse gas theory” stayed out of the mainstream right up to the late 1970's as earth went through a decades-long cooling phase.

The “heat trapping greenhouse gas” concept came back into favor after 1979 when global temperatures conveniently began to rise again. This “theory” is the most insidious concept that has become the basis for the consensus thinking on catastrophic anthropogenic global warming (CAGW), conveniently rebranded catastrophic anthropogenic climate change (CACC) when “global warming” failed to follow the continuous increase in atmospheric CO₂ and now routinely referred to as just “climate change” or lately the even more extreme “climate crisis”, thus giving the public the false impression that all climate change is due to the human emissions of CO₂.

This “theory” effectively proposes that the sum of reflected earth energy is greater than the original energy that earth receives from the Sun. Below we see why this is an unphysical concept and to illustrate the point it may help to look at actual reflections of light, for example:



Glass dome in the Buttermarket shopping centre, Ipswich, England

In the above photograph we see the brightly lit yellow chandelier on the right with its reflections in the glass dome above it. The photograph illustrates well the concept of what energy reflection looks like in nature. What we see in the reflection is a dimmer yellow light, with less intensity than the bright yellow chandelier (the energy source). Likewise, in our atmosphere, solar energy is reflected off the earth and the carbon dioxide molecules in the atmosphere send a lesser amount of energy back to the earth.

Like the sun and the earth, it should be clear to all that the total amount of reflected energy can never equal the amount of energy coming from the energy source in the first place, yet when it comes to carbon dioxide, that is exactly what is stated as “scientific fact” by the majority of scientists. ^{4,5}

A further complication in the “consensus climate science” is the perceived presence in our atmosphere of a so-called “greenhouse effect”, enhanced, it is proposed, by the addition of so-called “greenhouse gases” such as water vapor and carbon dioxide. Such a concept has been widely disproved. ^{6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14}

However, in line with a long list of discredited “scientific” paradigms, the appeal to authority concept as well as a more recent explanation offered to illustrate the hurdles that exist in overcoming any paradigm, there is no quick solution to bring alarm over human emissions and global warming, climate change, extreme weather to an end. ^{15, 16, 17, 18, 19}

From the most recent explanation it is worthwhile to quote the advanced stage of denial of the truth:

Stage 6: The Theory Lives On as a Zombie. Despite being debunked, the theory lingers on in published scientific studies, popular books, outdated web pages, and common “wisdom.” Adherents in academia cling on in a state of denial – their egos depend upon it. ¹⁷

It is thus that the world at large, now fortunately excluding the United States of America, remains locked into a mindset that bears no resemblance to reality and a “scientific theory” that has never yet produced any scientifically acceptable proof of the basic tenets of that “theory”.

17 January 2018
Hans Schreuder
Scientist

References

1. principia-scientific.org/publications/PROM/GHE-UNIPCC.pdf
2. arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1510/1510.02503.pdf
3. tech-know-group.com/papers/Note on the Theory of the Greenhouse.pdf
4. tech-know-group.com/essays/Greenhouse Effect Fact or Fiction.pdf
5. principia-scientific.org/does-carbon-dioxide-trap-heat/
6. tech-know-group.com/essays/Climate Science Paradox.pdf
7. www.biocab.org/Wood Experiment Repeated.html
8. tech-know-group.com/essays/SURFRAD Data Falsifies GHE.pdf
9. principia-scientific.org/publications/History-of-Radiation.pdf
10. climateofsophistry.com/2017/11/03/the-alarmist-radiative-greenhouse-effects-final-end/
11. biocab.org/Total Emissivity CO2.html
12. biocab.org/Observation Backradiation.pdf
13. tech-know-group.com/papers/Role of GHE-EaE.pdf
14. tech-know-group.com/essays/Three Impossible Outcomes.pdf
15. en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Superseded_scientific_theories
16. tech-know-group.com/essays/Appeal to Authority.pdf
17. climatechangedispatch.com/the-rise-and-fall-of-catastrophic-global-warming/
18. rt.com/shows/sophieco/415907-violence-protests-usa-terrorism/
19. principia-scientific.org/r-i-p-greenhouse-gas-theory-1980-2018/

Addendum – see below

To further illustrate the scientific elitism that is sweeping all before it, there are a group of people in this world who claim to be the possessors of "*the*" scientific truth and if you are not in their club you don't even have the right to express an opinion.

Beyond that, the IPCC's various Assessment Reports (written by credentialed scientists and highly peer reviewed) would never have been written, because the IPCC would have, after reviewing the "carbon dioxide is causing catastrophic climate change" question concluded that there is no problem and they would have disbanded. So much for credentialing and peer review.

Today, "credentialed" scientists (especially university professors) are to science as ordained clergymen are to religion. They are both groups of people who claim to be smarter than you and therefore expect you to surrender your mind to them. They are both groups of people whose word is to be taken on faith and, indeed, both groups say, "You can trust us!"²⁰ - Carl Brehmer, scientist

These politicians are desperate for scapegoats – anything to deflect attention away from their failures and incompetence. The future of our free speech and other democratic safeguards and institutions is at stake. So is the future of sound, evidence-based science, on climate and other topics – and of reliable, affordable energy.²¹ - Paul Driessen, senior policy analyst

20. tech-know-group.com/essays/Trust_Us.pdf

21. iceagenow.info/blatant-blue-state-hypocrisy/