

## Interrupting the Zombie-Robot Monotribe

Recently a fervent supporter of the ‘human Carbon Dioxide controls the climate hypothesis’ admitted to several potential criminal activities. Historically, human thought has been restricted to view everything as a “two sides to every story” false didactic. Often there are multiple sides to every story, but if there is money to be made by only two sides, then the full range of options is often not permitted.

A perfect example of this is the two faced, single party American political system. Locking debate into Republican-Democrat, or Conservative-Liberal leaves no room for wider alternatives, but provides the delusion of democracy, with no need of a ‘third’ party. The climate science debate is in fact a three sided debate, but with only two sides funded, you would be hard pressed to notice.

This well known, now confessed criminal Warmist supporter, obtained opposition documents that he felt would be very damaging and released them to his fellow Warmists. The greatest damage seems to be self inflicted as this advocate has been removed for board positions at the Pacific Institute, the National Center of Science Education and as Chairman of the American Geophysical Union Task Force on Scientific Ethics. Sometimes advocacy becomes uncontrollable zealotry, a frequent occurrence in the eco-movement. Dr Michael McPhaden, President of AGU has posted the societies position on this man’s behavior at their website, which reads in part:

“In doing so he compromised AGU’s credibility as a scientific society, weakened the public’s trust in scientists, and produced fresh fuel for the unproductive and seemingly endless ideological firestorm surrounding the reality of Earth’s changing climate.” Posted 27 Feb 2012

Dr McPhaden has an impressive resume in Oceanography and includes a Citation for Excellence in Refereeing. Objective refereeing should require a through examination of all of the opposing points of view. The Oregon Institute of Science and Medicine has an online petition with over 31, 487 scientists, including 9,029 with PhD’s that disagree with Warmist orthodoxy. To label this legitimate dissent as **unproductive ideological firestorm** is not the expected treatment for scientific debate.

There is limited private sector demand for Oceanography and almost none for Climatology. The current scientific debate has been controlled by the big-warm, or little-warm sides that Climatologist feel are the only possible opinions. The AGW hypothesis rests on out of context Physics principles that render the hypothesis useless, as evidenced by absolute lack of any exact quantification or of any predictive ability.

What has been portrayed as “Skeptic, or Denier” is actually two positions. The still falsely premised Greenhouse mechanisms with less dramatic effect is the dominate position, and is sometimes referred to as Luke Warmist. The unmentioned third side will be referred to in this article as the Rationalists.

Following the Warmist Zealot’s attack, a prominent Luke website posted a summary of the Luke position by a prominent Luke scientist. The names are not mentioned, as this is the standard Luke Science position, and is thus not an indictment of this website or of this individual. The website and author are footnoted for verification and context.

“Feedbacks are due to the ways the Earth reacts to the direct warming effect of the CO<sub>2</sub>. The threefold amplification by feedbacks is based on the assumption or guess, made around 1980, that more warming due to CO<sub>2</sub> will cause more evaporation and that this extra water vapor will in turn lead to even more heat trapping because water vapor is the main Greenhouse Gas.” [1]

The Rationalist will stop reading this article at this point....”the threefold amplification by feedbacks is based on the **assumption or guess**”....at that point you have stopped doing science. When you “assume or guess” you have at best a hypothesis that must be rigorously tested with empirical evidence and proven to have predictable, repeatable results. Anything less is NOT science.

I am a Rationalist due to the great fortune of being an engineering student at the cusp of the computer age. We were first trained in the dominant calculating device of the era, the lowly slide rule, and then rapidly into Fortran and hand held calculators. Before you computer age snobs downplay the role of the slide rule, here is some historical context.

The Wright Brothers created the first controlled, powered flight in Dec of 1903. Chuck Yeager broke the sound barrier with the Bell X-1 in Oct of 1947. Using no greater than slide rule, three-digit accuracy, engineers were able to provide quantum leaps in speed, distance and altitude that allowed this great progress in less than 44 years.

Freed from the tedious, three-digit results of slide rules, 70’s era engineering students were soon trying to impress our professors with our new TEN digit accuracy. We were quickly admonished. It is UNETHICAL to assume any greater accuracy than that of your lowest variable. Known as the “Significant Digit Principle”, you cannot claim any more than three-digit knowledge from just three-digit data, formulas or calculations.

For engineers who are charged with using “applied science to protect the health and safety of the public” this error is more than unethical, it can become illegal and immoral. In analysis of the Warmist-Luke hypothesis there is the huge variable of Earth’s albedo, or light reflection.

Albedo is continuously varying as cloud cover, snow pack and vegetation constantly change the amount and wavelengths of solar energy absorbed or reflected by the Earth. The common value is around 0.3 and albedo is used as a variable coefficient to 'adjust' the incoming solar radiation with the known outgoing satellite radiation measured data.

The Warmist's and Luke's claim that a change in the 0.00010 range in Carbon Dioxide, can make a measurable change in a computer model with **NO GREATER THAN TWO DIGIT ALBEDO ACCRACY IS UNETHICAL**. When this 'hypothesis' is used to divert 7% of the worlds croplands to bio-fuel production that results in starvation for millions, this behavior becomes **IMMORAL**.

In attacking one of his opponents, whom he described as part of a "concerted, well-funded and aggressive anti-science campaign" the former Director of the AGU Task Force on Science Integrity made the following statement

"I don't normally respond to the posts of James Taylor – reading them makes my head explode. They are written as though from a completely different universe – some parallel universe where up is down, left is right and global warming is not happening".

The leadership of the AGU responded to the vacancy at the Task Force for Scientific Integrity by announcing his replacement by Dr Linda Gunderson, current Director of the Office of Science Quality and Integrity at the US Geological Survey. Dr Gunderson is a fellow member on the TFSI board with the ethically challenged former director.

It is important that the AGU leadership recognize that dissent over global warming is **NOT AN UNPRODUCTIVE IDEOLOGICAL FIRESTORM**. This statement is counter to all basic scientific principles. Thirty years ago Climatology made an "assumption or guess" and embarked on a damaging and expensive cul-de-sac. It is incumbent that the AGU now appoint a review panel made entirely of scientists who are not invested in either Warmist or Luke orthodoxy. In addition, this panel should be free from the apparent conflict of interest with government funding.

In a recent satire on these two entrenched and mutually vested sides of this Faux Debate, I characterized the Warmists as Zombies and the Lukes as Robots in some parallel universe.. Addressing the valid scientific positions of the Rationalists is the only way to end the Zombie-Robot Monotribe. To do anything less would only weaken the public's trust in scientists.

Joseph A Olson, PE  
Mar 01, 2012

[1] <http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/02/26/the-skeptics-case/>