

My Remote Reader Mea Culpa

We live in an imperfect world, bounded by imperfect knowledge, each of us with imperfect recall and limited by imperfect “facts”. These imperfections are compounded by a feudal, ruling elite who’s motto is....”From Chaos, Order”....and as such these feudalists amplify the knowledge and fact defects to create as much chaos as possible. Human caused Carbon climate forcing is a glaring example of both, intentionally defective knowledge and intentionally defective facts.

With the “coronation” of a Hawaiian imposter as president, and his promise of Carbon controls based on faux science, I intensified my lifelong Earth science studies to understand and correct this intuitively defective science. I have devoted 50 hrs per week, every week, for nearly five years to completely understand this matrix of lies. In the process, I have authored a hundred articles with prominent web postings, and engaged in thousands of emails every year with the principles, in this rather rigged debate. I have also had a limited involvement in on-line science blogs.

Blogs are a thankless pit of false name trolls and agenda driven shills, conducted in a Family Feud quiz show response manner. You must respond rapidly to the blog thought train, or your point is lost in moderation or rapid subject changes. Once you begin a blog reply you have limited fact checking ability. If you have a second computer and ISP, you can online fact check. If you’ve downloaded all necessary data, or have a large organized library and can access key points, then you can increase your factual content. This is always with the caveat that your fellow bloggers have a similar knowledge level and can grasp your intended reply.

For all of these reasons, I limit my exposure and idle waste of time on this method of communication. However, in the course of communicating about the “worst science since the world was flat”, I have developed productive relationships with a number of principled, traditionally trained scientists, co-authored a climate science textbook and helped formed an international science organization. Recently, the “world most read climate science website” undertook a crude recreation of an illustration of the fallacy of ‘back-radiation’ in the form of an experiment. Neither myself, nor my colleagues were informed of this experiment, and when improperly performed, were never informed of the erroneous results. Instead the “most viewed” webmaster, posted his failure as gloating proof that Luke Warm science was correct. Since this webmaster has barred the name of my co-authored book, *Slaying the Sky Dragon*, barred mention of the Principia Scientific International science organization and barred the words of my website, Faux Science Slayer....then it is fitting to maintain this protocol. Informed readers will easily understand references to this site and, since ‘Carbon back-radiation’ is a mythical force, mythical names will describe the other “unnamed individuals”.

When attacked in this manner one is required to respond, or by silence, lose by default. In the rapid comment section exchange, I made a factual error on the operation of cheap, remote read infrared thermometers. In Feb 2011, there was a large CC thread on the Luke supported level of Carbon warming that included Chris Monckton, Fred Singer, Richard Lindzen, Roy Spencer, Judith Curry and two dozen similar level climate scientists. During that exchange, Chris Monckton made the comment that “a \$60 remote read IR thermometer was all the proof that you needed of back radiation”. This presumed empirical evidence from IR toy measurements on clouds.

Carbon climate forcing can be rejected independently and collectively on a number of science issues, including violation of the Laws of Thermodynamics, disparity of thermal mass and back radiation. It is back radiation that the improper Luke Webmaster team set out to prove using a light/mirror mirage. My colleagues will discuss the experimental errors in the two posted trials, and the pending third trial, but for now, my remote reader faux pa.

In the Feb 2011 thread, I did a quick review online of these IR toys and saw the laser feature, wrongly assumed this was a Doppler method device, then in haste, mentioned this in the comment section as a minor point. I was promptly bludgeoned by the Weather Wizard, the Prince of Mini Warm and the Duke of Luke. The Weather Wizard then did a cut and paste of his rebut in the lead article and ascribed my error to my colleague, Joe Postma. I formally apologize to Joe Postma, to my colleagues and to my readers, for this factual misstatement. I have researched a variety of readers, within the full price range of these instruments, and all have theory of operation and construction data available online. My bad, for reflex over research.

Following advice from the Prince of Mini Warm, I bought one of these cheap toys and have some additional information to offer. My Harbor Freight, Cen-tech Class II IR toy has these specifications

Measurement Range	-36° F to 968° F (-38C to 520C)
Accuracy	+/- 2% above 32F, +/- 4.5% below 31F
Spot Ratio Size	8:1

These values are based on a single fixed emissivity, further limiting accuracy. The instructions further state

“Non-reflecting surfaces will yield a more accurate reading than reflective surfaces. Duct tape can be applied to reflective surfaces in order to get a better measurement. Allow sufficient time for the tape to match the temperature of the surface it is applied to before trying to get a reading”.

With basic instruction out of the way, it was time for some scientific data collection. First readings were at 9 pm, high thin clouds 4F, mid level moving clouds 8F, treetop canopy 65F and ground surface 75F. At 4:00 am a second set of readings with different conditions. A low uniform cloud mass eliminated all but first magnitude stars and a $\frac{3}{4}$ gibbous full Moon was overhead. The cloud mass readings averaged 20F and a reading directly at the Moon and associated cloud halo read 28F. The 4:00 am ground temperature was 72F.

The 8:1 field of view is extremely wide, especially on clouds of higher altitude. All of the cloud temperatures were in the $\pm 4.5\%$ instrument error range, based on emissivity that is outside the IR toy range. Clouds are reflective and there was no practical method of attaching duct tape to the measured locations. The least measured temperature difference was 44F and energy flow, per the Laws of Thermodynamics, is always from hotter to colder. I'm curious if there is any data supporting the reflected infrared moonlight warming a halo of clouds by 8°F , based on the location of the IR toy.

“The emissivity for water droplet clouds decreases as the wavelength decreases from 10.7 meter to 10.9 meter to 3.9 meter. When viewing a cloud, one can ‘see’ further into the interior with the 3.9 meter...the emissivity of clouds not only changes with the wavelength, but also with the clouds composition” [1]

And this composition goes from thin haze vapor to dense masses of snow, sleet, hail and massive amounts of water. A \$60 toy, meant for close proximity use and common averaged emissivity has no method of correcting erroneous ‘cloud’ temperature data. To extrapolate “science” from an improperly used toy is indefensible. Humanity is threatened by a demonic ruling elite who have seized control of the federal government and diverted over \$140 billion in direct faux science grants, and imposed trillions in remediation costs, to solve a Carbon problem that does not exist. It takes more Thermodynamics education to get an undergraduate degree in engineering than a PhD in Climatology. There has been NO inter-disciplinary oversight of this errant branch of science since its creation, at the time of rampant funding increases.

Humanity has a limited window of opportunity for properly trained scientists to discuss on an open, unfiltered internet the correct science to resolve this modern flat-earth fraud. You can be on the right side of the human cause for warming, and still be on the wrong side of science. It is entirely appropriate to ridicule those who have altered data, hidden methods, suppressed dialogue and reaped fortunes in grant money in the process. It is inappropriate to ridicule an honest, dedicated scientist who missed one round of Family Feud. Remaining on the wrong side of science will inevitably place you on the wrong side of history.

Joseph A Olson, PE
May 31, 2013

[1] <http://sc.chula.ac.th/coursework/2309507/Lecture/remote10.htm>

Sidebar to my Readers

I get at least a dozen requests weekly to join Facebook, Twitter, Linkin or similar social networking groups. I am fully engaged in research, writing and emailing on this critical End Times faux science issue. Until there is a clear victory of Truth, I must limit my distractions. If I have not joined your Facebook as a friend, it is not your fault, or that I am unfriendly. Truth has a war to win....in Peace we will all have many friends.
Thanks.