

How to Make AI Intelligent and Save America \$2 Trillion

Making AI intelligent and saving America \$2 trillion requires using the scientific method to reject climate fiction and to reject the false idea that consensus determines scientific truth. Consensus determines opinion, not truth.

Montana Republican Traitors

Sheehy's a Trojan horse who can't remember who he is. Zinke lies to Trump. It's insanity to give shady Sheehy six years and zombie Zinke two more years to destroy us. This is more important than who controls Congress. I'm voting for former President Donald Trump, Sen. Jon Tester and Monica Tranel.

The True Science of Climate Change

Republicans deny climate truth and refuse to even discuss climate truth with climate experts. They are wimps who do not have the courage to learn and stand up for the truth that would make us free. Republicans are responsible for Montana's disastrous loss of the Held v Montana climate lawsuit in 2023.

How ‘World Economic Forum’ Threatens Montana & the Rest of America

The World Economic Forum (and Bill Gates) wants to cull 80 percent of the world’s population and take ownership of our land and property, so we will, in their words, own nothing, go nowhere, eat bugs, and “be happy” submissive, quiet socialists. Their planned “great reset” now in progress plans to put America under socialism.

Top Montana Republican Leaders Support Democrats’ Climate Fraud

Our Children’s Trust of Oregon began in Montana because it’s easy for power people to control Montana’s elected officials. For all I know, this Republican betrayal of truth and freedom may go all the way to Bill Gates. As of now, the set climate precedent is a YES answer to the question.

Consequences of Censorship

Montana's radical right (RR) controls Montana's government. They happily rearrange their political deck chairs, unaware that their powerful Titanic will hit an iceberg on June 12, 2023, when the Our Childrens' Trust (OCT) of Oregon, Held v Montana (HvM) trial begins.

If Republicans Support Climate Truth

It is impossible to prove a theory is true but only one contradiction with data or accepted physics proves a theory is false. Science progresses by proving theories are false, not by claiming theories are true.

Why Climate Change Is a Fraud

My paper shows if human CO2 emissions were to stop, the small human-caused CO2 increase would quickly fall, meaning there is no scientific basis to claim there is a climate emergency or worry about our grand kids. My paper overturns IPCC's climate fraud with a clarity that can win in a court of law.

A Climate Miracle to help President Trump Win

The Democrat's V8 is running on all 8 cylinders. Not well but running. Their argument on climate is bad, stupid, and fraudulent, but it is getting votes because it is based on fear. The Dems have captured 5 to 10 percent of the Republicans who voted for Trump in 2016

Stand for Climate Truth

Today, I see children in America and other countries with their minds bound to purposely turn them into mental cripples for life, presumably so they will support votes for a political cause that in the end will destroy their own country. These children have suffered mind-warping child abuse.

58 Delusional Senior Military And National Security Leaders Denounce NSC Climate Panel

by Ed Berry, Ph.D., Physics

When someone is delusional about climate change, it makes them feel better when they join with another 57 people who are

equally delusional. That is called groupthink.

Climate groupthink believes human emissions cause climate change. They have no evidence to support their belief. So, to defend themselves they attack and block those who disagree with their belief. You will notice they do not list any evidence to support their belief.

On March 5, 2019, 58 “former national security leaders” signed a [letter](#) addressed to President Trump. They claim,

“climate change is real, it is happening now, it is driven by humans, and it is accelerating. The overwhelming majority of scientists agree: less than 0.2% of peer-reviewed climate science papers dispute these facts.”

They sound like used-car salesmen who desperately need to sell you worn-out car. The “overwhelming majority of scientists” do not agree that humans cause climate change:

1. The promoters of human-caused climate change do not use the scientific method. So, they are not scientists.
2. I can count about 2000 atmospheric physicists who say we are not causing climate change. There are likely not over 4000 atmospheric physicists on the planet.
3. The alarmist side counts ecologists, pediatricians, college sophomores, and “environmentalists” as “experts” in climate cause and effect.
4. The number of papers has no relevance. There is no climate physics paper that shows humans cause climate change that has not violated physics.

They say they signed their letter because they

“are deeply concerned by reports that National Security Council officials are considering forming a committee to dispute and undermine military and intelligence judgments on the threat posed by climate change.”

They are concerned all right. They do not want a Presidential science panel to peer-review the scientific basis of their climate claims.

They say the people who disagree with them are,

“second-guessing the scientific sources used to assess the threat, such as the rigorously peer-reviewed National Climate Assessment, and applying that to national security policy.”

The [*National Climate Assessment*](#) (NCA) presents no evidence to support its claim that human CO2 causes climate change.

Read the NCA (if you want to waste your time). You will find long discussions about how climate changes and the damage climate change causes. You will find loads of cited papers. But you will find no evidence that human CO2 causes climate change.

The NCA merely ASSUMES we cause the rise in atmospheric CO2. The fact that atmospheric CO2 has increased does not prove we caused the increase. And if we did not cause the increase then we do not cause climate change. Checkmate.

My [*preprint*](#) and other published papers prove this NCA assumption is wrong. The last thing Americans want is their national security policy based on the *National Climate Assessment*.

They are the ones who morph climate science into politics.

“Imposing a political test on reports issued by the science agencies, and forcing a blind spot onto the national security assessments that depend on them, will erode our national security.”

They say,

“It is dangerous to have national security analysis conform to politics. Our officials’ job is to ensure that we are prepared

for current threats and future contingencies. We cannot do that if the scientific studies that inform our threat assessments are undermined.”

“Undermined”?

Science is based upon proving theories are wrong. They oppose climate truth because it undermines their political positions. They are afraid of a peer review. Why?

“Our national security community will not remain the best in the world if it cannot make decisions based on the best available evidence.”

“Best available evidence”?

They don't understand scientific evidence. Their theoretical base is in the reports by the *United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*. Their theory makes wrong predictions. Therefore, their climate theory is wrong.

Statistics prove they are wrong:

The statistical correlation between annual human CO₂ emissions and annual changes in CO₂ in the atmosphere is ZERO! (See Munshi reference [here](#).) Where there is no correlation, there is no cause and effect. There is NO rational scientific basis to claim or believe that human CO₂ emissions CAUSE the climate to change.

They are guilty of malpractice.

The signers are not climate physicists. They don't know how to determine cause and effect for climate change. It would not matter if 10,058 government-paid dignitaries and high-ranking officials signed their letter. They would still be wrong.

The signers of the letter threaten America.

By assuming human CO₂ causes dangerous climate change, they

threaten our economy and our national security. Their signed letter is bad for science, bad for national security, and bad for America.

To comment on this article or to view references, please [click here](#).

Dr. Ed Berry is editor and publisher of edberry.com based in Bigfork, Montana. He has a PhD in Physics, is a Certified Consulting Meteorologist, and an expert in climate change who takes the position that our carbon dioxide emissions are insignificant to climate change.

© 2019 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Ed Berry: ed@edberry.com

They Say Their ‘Climate Change’ Evidence Hits The “Gold Standard” But Offer NO Evidence

Environmental Correspondent Alister Dyle penned the news pseudoscience article entitled, “[Evidence for man-made global warming hits ‘gold standard’: scientists.](#)”

The article claims,

Evidence for man-made global warming has reached a “gold standard” level of certainty.

Well, where is the evidence? Evidence means cause and effect

evidence. They don't give any evidence to support their claim.

Are there any scientists on the climate alarmist side who understand how science works? I don't think so. If they understood science, they would not be climate alarmists.

Rising temperatures, even if true, are not evidence that human CO2 caused the rise. The public does not get this. (How many kids paying off their college loans learned how science works?)

The article reports,

Ben Santer, lead author of Monday's study at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in California, said he hoped the findings would win over skeptics and spur action.

Not a chance in hell. The skeptic scientists understand science and don't fall for false logic.

Ben and his buddies use the following false logic:

- If human CO2 causes [global warming](#), then bad stuff will happen.
- Bad stuff happens. Therefore, human CO2 caused the global warming.

If you believe that, then you also believe this parallel in logic:

- If Bill Gates owned Fort Knox, then Bill Gates is rich.
- Bill Gates is rich. Therefore, Bill Gates owned Fort Knox.

It is called the logical error of affirming the consequent. Look it up.

To convince any rational person that human CO2 is causing global warming, Ben and his buddies must show evidence to confirm these cause-effect hypotheses:

1. Human CO2 emissions caused the rise in atmospheric CO2 since 1750.
2. Increased atmospheric CO2 caused the claimed global warming.
3. Global warming causes bad stuff to happen.

But they never talk about the first two necessary hypotheses. They just harp that bad stuff happens and hope you won't notice their logical deficiency.

Ben and his buddies use the same irrational logic the Aztecs used to cut out beating hearts and roll decapitated heads down temple steps, thinking their sacrifices would bring rain for their crops. They continued their sacrifices until it rained. Then, they concluded their sacrifices caused the rain.

While it is not possible in science to prove a hypothesis is true, it is possible to prove a hypothesis is false. We do that by proving a theory's prediction is false.

In contrast to the unsupported opinions of Ben and his buddies, simple physics proves the following:

1. Carbon-14 data and some simple physics prove human emissions have caused a rise of only 18 ppm and nature causes a rise of 392 ppm. Nature caused 95% of the rise in atmospheric CO2. Therefore, human CO2 is insignificant to the level of atmospheric CO2 and insignificant to global warming. **Checkmate.**
2. Data show that changes in temperature come before changes in CO2. Therefore, temperature change is the cause, rather than the result, of changes in CO2. **Checkmate.**
3. Data show that human life is better when the earth is warmer.

Ben and his buddies ignore the facts that prove their ideas are false. They do not understand science itself. They have NO evidence that human CO2 causes any significant global warming.

Furthermore, Jamal Munshi published his statistical calculations that show the correlation between annual CO2 emissions and annual increase in atmospheric CO2 is ZERO! Where there is no correlation, there can be no cause and effect. ***Checkmate.***

The article claims,

Mainstream scientists say the burning of fossil fuels is causing more floods, droughts, heat waves and rising sea levels.”

They have no scientific evidence to support their claim and they ignore scientific evidence that proves they are wrong. So much for “mainstream” scientists.

Ben and his buddies are part of the Swamp. Our tax dollars are still paying them to tell lies to the American people, while scientists who tell you the truth still get no support from government.

The article claims,

Sixty-two percent of Americans polled in 2018 believed that climate change has a human cause, up from 47 percent in 2013, according to the Yale Program on Climate Change Communication.

If this poll is valid, it only proves Americans as a group are getting dumber. God save America.

To comment on this article or to view references, please [click here](#).

© 2019 Edwin X Berry – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Ed Berry: ed@edberry.com

The Fork In The Road Of The Climate Change Debate

By Edwin Berry, PhD, Atmospheric Physics

Al Gore framed the climate debate. He said, human carbon dioxide emissions increase atmospheric carbon dioxide. Carbon dioxide is a greenhouse gas. Greenhouse gases traps heat like a blanket that keeps you warm at night. It was that simple, he told us.

People believe big Al's story. Simplicity sells. But simple is not always correct. A whole lot of people who don't care about correct, push for laws to reduce carbon dioxide emissions. They are the "climate alarmists." They think they are saving the planet.

Since they think Al Gore's basic claims are correct, the alarmists focus on possible consequences of global warming. They believe that finding consequence proves we must stop carbon dioxide emissions. But the climate debate is not about consequences because consequences do not prove their cause.

The critical questions about climate are about cause-and-effect:

1. How much do human emissions increase atmospheric carbon dioxide?
2. How much does increased atmospheric carbon dioxide change climate?

In a climate debate, the alarmists must prove the answers to BOTH questions are "significant." If they miss on only one question, they still lose the debate. They have the burden of proof.

President Trump is a "climate realist." He disagrees with the alarmists. Many good atmospheric physicists are climate

realists. They have shown the answer is “insignificant” to both questions.

These answers may seem counter-intuitive if you think the atmosphere is a simple system. But the atmosphere is a complex system and, as good systems engineers know, complex systems are counter-intuitive.

Al Gore and his alarmists think the atmosphere is like a garbage landfill. What we dump in, stays. They could not be more wrong.

Neither nature’s emissions nor human emissions stay in the atmosphere. They merely flow through the atmosphere. The atmosphere is like a lake where a river flows in and lake water flows out over a dam. The lake’s water level will rise or fall until the outflow over the dam equals the inflow from the river.

If the inflow increases, the level will rise until the outflow equals the inflow and the level becomes constant. Conversely, if inflow decreases, the level will decrease until, once again, outflow equals inflow. The faster the inflow, the higher the level to balance the inflow. Fig. 1 illustrates the simple physics model for both the lake and the atmosphere.




Fig. 1. The Model shows the rate of change of the level equals the difference between Inflow and Outflow. This model applies to both the lake model and the atmosphere model.

Nature's carbon dioxide emissions are over 20 times human emissions.

Suppose the first river represents nature's carbon dioxide emissions and a second river represents human emissions. The first river produces 95 percent and the second river produces 5 percent of the total inflow into the lake.

Question: What percent of the water in the lake came from the first river and second river?

If you answered 95 percent came from the first river and 5 percent from the second river, then you passed your physics exam. You are more qualified in physics than any climate alarmist including their PhD's. This intuitive answer is backed up by solid math that good physicists use.

The ratio of natural to human carbon dioxide in the atmosphere is the ratio of their inflows. Nature produces more than 95 percent of the carbon dioxide in our atmosphere and human emissions produce less than 5 percent.

In terms of the often-quoted ppm (or parts per million), these percentages show that human emissions cause an 18-ppm rise, and nature's emissions cause a 392-ppm rise, in atmospheric carbon dioxide. The total of each inflow is today's carbon dioxide level of 410 ppm.

The flows and corresponding levels of natural and human carbon dioxide are independent of each other. It does not matter what natural emissions are. If natural emissions went to zero, the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would fall to 18 ppm and we all would die.

If alarmists could stop ALL human emissions, the present inflow of natural carbon dioxide would maintain the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere at 392 ppm.

The Paris Climate Agreement proposed to reduce worldwide human

emissions by 28 percent. Twenty-eight percent of 18 ppm is 5 ppm. The Paris Agreement would have reduced atmospheric carbon dioxide by only 5 ppm, which is insignificant. Even 18 ppm is insignificant. The alarmists have no case.

Alarmists claim human emissions have caused all the rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide since 1750. They claim human emissions have caused the 130-ppm rise from 280 ppm to 410 ppm. They believe the human-produced inflow of 5 percent of the total causes 32 percent ($130 \text{ ppm} / 410 \text{ ppm}$) of the carbon dioxide in the atmosphere. It can't happen.

Climate alarmists don't understand how nature works. They deny the way how nature balances itself. Therefore, they are not good guardians of nature because they flunk simple physics.

The IPCC scientists made a critical scientific error.

The IPCC (Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change) inserted their critical error into their climate models. This error negates all their alarmists' beliefs and claims.

The IPCC reports are clear. While the IPCC correctly assumes nature's emissions of about 100 ppm per year balance outflow to inflow, the IPCC incorrectly assumes human emissions do not balance. The IPCC assumes 1.5 ppm per year of human emissions gets stuck in the atmosphere and stays there. That 1.5 ppm is coincidentally just enough to support their claim that human emissions have caused all the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide since 1750.

The IPCC and its believers and scientists began, not with science, but with their emotional, ecological belief that human emissions are bad and natural emissions are good. They have built their whole climate fraud on a foundation of sand.

Here's why the core IPCC assumption is invalid.

First, the IPCC method rejects simple physics that proves the

level, of lake water or atmospheric carbon dioxide, will always adjust outflow to balance inflow. The physics question is NOT whether there is an imbalance of flows. There is. Nature always proceeds toward balance.

The physics question is how much will the level change to achieve this balance. We have already described the answer to this simple physics question.

Second, the atmosphere cannot open its exit door to nature-produced carbon dioxide and close its exit door to human-produced carbon dioxide because it can't tell the difference between nature-produced and human-produced molecules of carbon dioxide.

In physics, the Equivalence Principle means if we cannot tell the difference between two things then they are identical, and nature will process them the same.

Third, even IF nature could identify nature-produced from human-produced carbon dioxide, to treat them differently would violate the Second Law of Thermodynamics, because it would decrease entropy without an input of energy.

For example, if you mix cream in your coffee, it goes in with no effort. But try to take the cream back out of your coffee. It would take an energy source to separate the cream from your coffee. There is no energy source available to separate identical carbon dioxide molecules based upon their history.

In summary, the IPCC claims, and all climate alarmists believe, that nature separates human and natural carbon dioxide molecules – thereby violating the Equivalence Principle – and that nature shuts its exit door for human-produced carbon-dioxide molecules while letting nature-produced carbon-dioxide molecules pass freely – thereby violating the Second Law of Thermodynamics.

IPCC's Bern model proves the IPCC's climate claims are wrong.

The IPCC has something it calls the Bern model. The Bern model is a seven-parameter curve fit to the output of IPCC climate models. To satisfy the intended curve fit, the Bern model must have the same mathematical form as the climate models. Therefore, the Bern model tells us a lot about what is in the climate models.

Specifically, the IPCC claims the Bern model simulates how our atmosphere treats human carbon dioxide emissions. The Bern model says a one-year "pulse" of human carbon dioxide inflow that sets the carbon dioxide level to 100 ppm, will cause the level to still be 29 ppm after 100 years and have a permanent level of 15 ppm forever. This is for only one year of emissions.

The Bern model then adds these permanent levels for all successive years. This invalid idea follows the initial assumption that nature does not balance human emissions. It is the reason alarmists claim human carbon dioxide emissions cause permanent and long-range damage. This is why James Hansen claimed in 2008 that we must shut down all coal-electric power plants by 2012 in order to save the planet. Alarmists believe and preach their irrational feelings rather than logical physics.

These alarmist claims derive from the invalid idea that the atmosphere is a garbage dump rather than a reservoir the processes inflows and outflows. The IPCC built these claims into all its climate models. The built-in false claims are why all IPCC climate models are pieces of junk.

Here is a simple way to test the Bern model and thereby all IPCC climate models. According to the Equivalence Principle, the Bern model must hold for natural emissions as well as human emissions, even though the IPCC says it only applies to human emissions.

If we insert natural emissions of 100 ppm per year into the

Bern model, it predicts these natural emissions would add 15 ppm per year permanently to the atmosphere. Therefore, the Bern model predicts that the last 1000 years of natural emissions would have added a permanent increase of 15,000 ppm today. Obviously, this has not happened. This invalid prediction proves the IPCC Bern model and all IPCC climate models are wrong.

Here are the steps in the IPCC climate alarmist logic:

1. Claim human emissions cause all the increase in carbon dioxide.
2. This means nature must restrict outflow of human carbon dioxide.
3. Insert this restriction into climate models.
4. Insert also the false claim that more carbon dioxide increases temperature.
5. Models calculate that human emissions increase carbon dioxide and carbon dioxide increases temperature.
6. Then alarmists claim the climate model output proves human emissions cause climate change.

Here are the steps in climate physics logic:

1. Understand how nature adjusts outflow to balance inflow.
2. Develop simple Model of how nature balances inflow.
3. Show the Model reproduces real data, like carbon-14 data.
4. Show the Model proves that IPCC models are fundamentally wrong.

The fork in the road of the climate change debate

It may be hard for you to believe, but climate realists now come in two opposing flavors: vanilla and chocolate.

The chocolates want to prove the IPCC is fundamentally wrong by using solid, simple arguments like I have summarized above. The chocolate argument is sufficient to cut off the alarmist

argument at its knees. Nothing more is needed. It would be a slam-dunk win in a quick checkmate. The jury would be impressed. The judge would be happy. The chocolates would reverse the EPA Endangerment Finding.

By contrast, the vanillas would begin by trashing physics and admitting that Al Gore, the IPCC, and the alarmists are right about the warming effects of human emissions. Then they would try to prove that global warming brings more benefits than the status quo. That approach opens the door to endless arguments that the alarmists have perfected.

Even worse, the vanillas would reverse the burden of proof from the alarmists to the vanillas.

The vanillas would confuse the jury, upset the judge, lose the climate debate, and forever extinguish the opportunity to win the debate using simple physics.

The alarmists have already noticed the cave-in by the vanillas and expect to easily win a debate or trial if the vanillas are their opponents. The alarmists will simply claim they want to stop all carbon dioxide emissions so they can keep the climate status quo. Checkmate win.

Conclusion

President Trump is right to recognize the climate fraud. Now, it is up to the realist scientists to recognize and promote a debate based on the physics of climate change, rather than on the vanillas plan to admit the alarmists are right and then try to prove warming is good. Yikes.

To comment on this article, please [click here](#).

This article is written for the layman. To read my preprint that explains the physics of this post, please see "[Why human CO2 does not change climate.](#)"

E-Mail Ed Berry: ed@edberry.com

How the “Montana’s last indian water compact” explains the republican party

The story of Montana’s Last Indian Water Compact reveals, like no other true story, the nature of the split in the Republican Party.

This story needs to be told, and I may be the only one who will ever tell it. To understand politics, you must understand this story.

You can get the Amazon Kindle version FREE from February 15 to 19

“Montana’s Last Indian Water Compact: The Truth about the Compact and the Republican Party” is available in paperback or Kindle on Amazon.

Montana’s CSKT Water Compact

Montana’s Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Water Compact in 2015 may have been the most important and controversial issue in Montana’s history.

Its ratification would resolve all Montana’s Indian water-rights issues forever. Its rejection would subject Montanans to a generation of the most-costly legal battles in Montana’s history.

Most Montana’s farmers and ranchers, city managers and

business leaders supported the Compact. Democrat legislators supported the Compact.

Before November 2014, I opposed the Compact. But, as a physicist, I realized I should study the Compact. So, I read and organized the arguments on both sides.

By December 2014, I realized my original conclusion was wrong. The arguments against the Compact clearly failed and facts proved the Compact was necessary for Montana.

My book explains the well-documented four faces of the Republican Party and how one face opposed the Compact.

The Republican split

The Republican split occurs because the three faces that compose 80 percent of Republicans regularly support the Republican nominee, while the one face that composes 20 percent of the Republican Party regularly opposes the Republican nominee.

The source of the split is major ideological difference between the 80 percent and the 20 percent. Therefore, Republicans cannot resolve the split by compromise because these diverse ideologies cannot compromise. Only the 20 percent can resolve the split when they realize their ideology is factually and morally wrong. Don't hold your breath.

The split over the Water Compact matched the split in the Republican Party. The 80 percent supported the Compact and the 20 percent opposed the Compact.

We call the 20-percent face of the Republican Party, VCEs. My book describes this designation in detail. They represent only 10 percent of all voters. Percentages differ somewhat in different states but the general pattern is consistent in all states.

Democrats and Republicans differ on partisan bills. However,

the Compact was a bipartisan bill that all parties should have decided on facts and logic. But the VCEs disagreed.

Aristotle's Golden Mean

Nelson Hultberg describes Aristotle's Golden Mean in his book "The Golden Mean: Libertarian Politics, Conservative Values." Aristotle concluded the middle 60 to 80 percent are much more likely to be correct than the radical 10 percent on each end of the political spectrum.

In the political spectrum, VCEs are to the right of 1.4 standard deviations from the mean. They are the last 10 percent on the right. They are the radical right.

VCEs were wrong about the Compact.

Compact proponents based their arguments on facts and logic.

Compact opponents based their arguments on delusions. They opposed the Compact because they believed it was an Agenda 21 government conspiracy to steal Montana's water. The fact is Compact rejection would have caused Montana to lose control of its water. VCEs had their "facts" backwards.

VCEs are so convinced they are right, that they reject evidence that proves they are wrong. Their radical ideology led them to oppose the CSKT Water Compact and to reject all arguments that proved their claims were wrong.

They voted their conscience rather than their intelligence. They let their fears drive their decisions.

They opposed the Compact because their political religion dictated opposition. Their opposition to the Compact proves their political religion is wrong.

Why the split matters.

You might ask, why should the split matter because the

Republican 80 percent can outvote the 20 percent?

The split matters because the 20 percent VCEs are much more politically active than the other 80 percent of Republicans. Neither Republican nor Democrat voters understand the difference between the Republican 80 percent and the radical VCEs 20 percent. Therefore, unaware voters elected VCEs to 80 percent of the Republican seats in Montana's 2015 House.

Because the VCEs dominated the Republicans in Montana's House and Republicans outnumbered the Democrats, Montana's House ratified the Compact by only ONE vote.

The Compact was not an inconsequential bill that would have minor effect on Montana whether approved or rejected. The Compact was a significant bill that would have a dramatic effect on Montana's economy, forever. Compact ratification would save Montana's water rights and Compact rejection would lose Montana's water rights, forever, plus cost Montana a whole lot of money.

Radical VCEs almost destroyed Montana. They still don't get it. They don't care to learn facts and logic. They have their political religion to guide them.

VCEs make bad political decisions. Montana's Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes Water Compact is a case in point.

Perfection or Rejection

As a group, VCEs have unique characteristics. They have a perfection obsession. They believe if something or someone is not perfect by their definition, they must vote to condemn the something or the someone to hell.

VCEs view the world as black and white with no gray scale. To them, it's perfection or rejection.

VCEs demand Godly perfection of candidates and bills. Yet, they are far from Godly perfection themselves. Godly

perfection does not exist in our real world. VCEs live in a dream world.

VCEs thought if they could find one imperfection in the Compact, that was a reason to reject the Compact. After 12 years of work funded by our taxpayers, VCEs decided the Compact was not good enough for them to send to heaven, so they voted to send the Compact to hell.

Negative Voting Mantra

Another unique characteristic is their negativity. Their preachers are negative. Compared to other Republicans, VCE's see the cup as half empty whereas other Republicans see the cup as half full.

VCEs follow the Negative Voting Mantra: "A vote for the lesser of two evils is still a vote for evil."

They use their Negative Voting Mantra to justify their votes against Republican nominees who are "not good enough" for them. They vote for third-party candidates who can't win.

VCEs remove votes from the better candidate among candidates who can win. They achieve the exact opposite of their political goal. The Negative Voting Mantra achieves the greater evil and is immoral.

Positive Voting Principle

The alternative to the Negative Voting Mantra is the Positive Voting Principle. Aristotle's Positive Voting Principle is:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

Stated simply, the Positive Voting Principle is:

Always vote and act to achieve the greatest possible good.

Historically, some very qualified philosophers have weighed in on the Positive Voting Principle and the Negative Voting Mantra. The Catholic Church and the six major Protestant churches support the Positive Voting Principle and reject the Negative Voting Mantra.

America's Founding Fathers used the Positive Voting Principle. They voted for the greater good. If each Founding Father rejected what he thought was imperfect, they would not have approved our Constitution.

VCEs call themselves "Constitutionalists" but they reject the Positive Voting Principle that was necessary to produce our Constitution. The VCEs who opposed the CSKT Water Compact would have opposed our Constitution because it was not perfect.

Mandatory Conditions

VCE claim a candidate must meet certain "mandatory" conditions to get their vote. They think their mandatory conditions show they hold high moral standards. In fact, their mandatory condition show they do not understand morals and logic.

For example, some VCEs told me before the 2014 election, "I can't vote for Ryan Zinke" because his prolife position "is not good enough" for me.

I replied that Ryan Zinke scored 90 percent on a prolife evaluation and his Democratic opponent scored zero. This did not matter to these VCEs. Zinke's 90-percent score on a prolife test was "not good enough" for them. They required a score of 100 percent. They required perfection.

These VCEs believed it would have been a sin for them to vote for Zinke because he was not perfect. Yet they believe it was no sin to help the Democrat to win. They are not only illogical, they are immoral.

Their VCE mandatory conditions eliminated Ryan Zinke who was clearly the “greater good” candidate from their own VCE perspective.

Here how VCEs think:

Suppose you can vote for Candidate A, whose abortion policies will kill 10 million babies, or Candidate B, whose policies will kill 1 million babies. Who will you vote for?

All normal Christians will vote for Candidate B so they can save 9 million babies.

VCEs won't vote to save 9 million babies because Candidate B is not perfect enough for them.

VCEs don't understand bipartisan issues

VCEs believe all issues are partisan. They do not believe in bipartisan bills where Republicans should vote the same as Democrats, like paving our highways.

Compact opponents claimed Republicans should always vote the opposite of Democrats. They call Republicans who vote the same as Democrats, “RINOs.” They don't understand that “RINO” applies only to partisan issues, not to bipartisan issues.

Therefore, they concluded, since the Democrats supported the Compact, all Republicans must oppose the Compact.

VCEs don't understand Bible admonition on “works”

VCE they VCEs don't understand the definition of the word “works.” They think their actions are works. They do not understand that works are the results of actions, not the actions themselves.

VCEs think they do good works if they vote their feelings or “conscience,” as VCE Ted Cruz told his audience to do at the 2016 Republican National Convention.

VCEs define “good” by how their actions make them “feel,” regardless of the consequences.

VCEs who opposed the CSKT Water Compact, voted their “conscience.”

VCEs claim they have a moral compass. But their compass points in the wrong direction.

It takes intelligence to predict results of our actions. We must use our intelligence to choose the action that brings the desired result.

VCEs elected Democrat US Senator Tester in 2012.

The VCEs voted Libertarian rather than for Republican Congressman Denny Rehberg for US Senate. The VCEs’ Libertarian votes were substantially more than Tester’s win over Rehberg. So, the VCEs elected Democrat Tester to the US Senate for six more years.

Now you know why the dominantly conservative State of Montana elects Democrats to key positions in Montana and Congress. It is because VCEs throw childish temper tantrums when Republican voters nominate non-VCE candidates.

Ryan Zinke won decisively in 2014 and 2016

VCEs would not support Ryan Zinke for Congress. But Ryan Zinke won the Republican primary election and the Republican nomination without their help.

Zinke proved Republican candidates do better when they get more votes in the middle of the political spectrum even if they lose votes from the radical VCEs

The Montana 2016 election results prove the VCEs have little influence in the outcome of major elections. VCEs simply do not have enough votes to change elections in their favor. The only effect they can have is to vote Libertarian to try to

deprive a Republican candidate of a victory.

Subscribe to NewsWithViews Daily Email Alerts

Email Address *

First Name

*required field

Thanks to Republican voters in Montana, Ryan Zinke will be your next Secretary of Interior.

Voter wake-up call

The CSKT Water Compact is an example of how the far-right VCE Republicans make bad decisions.

All voters everywhere should realize the danger to themselves when they elect too many VCEs.

To read the full story and better understand Republican politics, get my book for FREE on Amazon from February 15 to 19.

© 2017 Edwin X Berry, Ph.D – All Rights Reserved

Why our CO2 emissions do not increase atmosphere CO2 Pt. 2

Over 4000 people, including hundreds of scientists, read my article “Why our CO2 emissions do not increase Atmosphere CO2”. As I write this (January 3, 2017), there are 112 comments.

One well-respected scientist wrote to me:

Your article is (in my opinion) the BEST commentary yet that

I've seen on this topic. I cannot see any way to shorten it. Your analogies are fantastic.

This article brings the (atmospheric physicist) scientific level of understanding down to the level of a 6th-grade education.

Just science, facts. No politics, no hysteria, and no hype. I love it.

I appreciate that comment because that is my writing goal. However, I have a scientific goal as well. That is to prove the arguments to support alarmist Claim #1, namely, that "Human CO2 emissions caused all or most of the observed rise in atmospheric CO2," are wrong.

The discussion in the 112 comments shows I have proved by logic that their 4-step argument to prove Claim #1 is invalid. Also, I proved the arguments that use carbon isotopes to prove Claim #1 are wrong.

All alarmist arguments for Claim #1 include the classic mathematical error of having more unknowns than equations. Therefore ...

There exists no scientific basis to claim that human CO2 caused all or most of the increase in atmospheric CO2.

The comments by one Icarus62 and my replies best illustrate the core of the debate:

Icarus62:

It couldn't be simpler: We've emitted twice as much CO2 since the preindustrial as remains in the atmosphere today. Therefore, nature had been a net sink of CO2 from the atmosphere over this period and we're responsible for 100% of the 120ppm rise. Agreed? It cannot possibly be otherwise.

Berry:

Dear Icarus62, Thank you again for your comment. "It could not be simpler," said the Aztec priests. "We simply cut out beating hearts and roll heads down the temple steps ... and it rains." They all believed it.

What is missing? The scientific method and good physics are missing. You are using what Richard Feynman called Cargo Cult science.

Icarus62:

1. Anthropogenic sources have emitted ~2,000Gt of CO₂ since the preindustrial.
2. Atmospheric concentration has risen by ~850Gt / 120ppm.
3. The remaining ~1150Gt is no longer in the atmosphere – it has been sequestered by the land and oceans.
4. Hence the land and oceans have been a net sink for atmospheric CO₂ over this period, and 100% of the 120ppm rise in atmospheric CO₂ is anthropogenic.

This proves your argument wrong. If you disagree, please let me know which of these four items you dispute, and why. Thanks...

Berry:

Dear Icarus62, Thank you for your comment because it is directly on point. You have presented the key 4 steps of the standard argument that human CO₂ caused 100% of the rise in atmospheric CO₂.

They are the same 4 steps that I present and rebut in my article above. The 4 steps fail because of invalid wording in steps 3 and 4. The phrase "land AND oceans" should be "land OR oceans." The fact that (land + oceans) is less than 0 does not prove (land is less than 0) AND (oceans is less than 0).

Land can be a net sink even while oceans can be a net source for atmospheric CO₂. Therefore, step 4 is invalid.

The 4-step argument does not prove human CO2 drives atmospheric CO2. That is because there are other scenarios where oceans can drive atmospheric CO2, while still meeting all the constraints of steps 1-3 after the "and" in step 3 is changed to "or" as required by logic.

My Fig. 1 above is a scenario where land absorbs all the human CO2 while oceans absorb and much CO2 as they emit. In that scenario, atmospheric CO2 remains constant. Steps 1-3 (with the "or") do not exclude this scenario.

A second scenario can be where land absorbs all human CO2 emissions while oceans add CO2 to the atmosphere. (Simply change the ocean input in Fig. 1 from 44 to 46.) Steps 1-3 (with the "or") do not exclude this scenario.

As you can see, there are an infinite number of scenarios that prove the 4-step argument is wrong.

You are not the first to challenge me with this 4-step argument. Keith Pickering, writing for Peter Gleick and company, challenged me with the same 4 steps. Keith acknowledged that I would win if I could produce even one scenario that showed his argument wrong. I did and Keith provided no counter argument.

Icarus62:

Your comment is not a valid rebuttal. I can replace "the land and oceans" with "the natural world" and the logic is still the same – it's immaterial how that 1150Gt of anthropogenic CO2 that is no longer in the atmosphere has been partitioned between land and oceans. The natural world (land + oceans) has been a net sink of CO2 from the atmosphere since the preindustrial and there is no scenario in which we can be responsible for less than 100% of the 120ppm rise in atmospheric CO2.

To take one of your scenarios as an example:

If the land had absorbed 2,000Gt CO₂ since the preindustrial, while the oceans had added ~850Gt to the atmosphere, the net natural change would be -1150Gt, i.e. a net sink. 100% of the 120ppm rise in atmospheric CO₂ would be due to us, because in the absence of our emissions, the natural world would have caused a decline to 130ppm, instead of the increase to 400ppm we have observed. Not a physically realistic scenario, but it does demonstrate why your argument is wrong.

Berry:

Dear Icarus62, Thank you again for your comment.

You make an invalid assumption. You assume the "natural world" does not adjust to human input of CO₂. Only a very small adjustment by the "natural world" will easily compensate for all human CO₂ emissions.

If humans add CO₂ to the atmosphere, land will absorb more CO₂ and oceans will reduce their CO₂ transfer to the atmosphere. That is because transfer rates are controlled by partial pressures of CO₂.

Nothing in the 4-step argument excludes that ocean temperature can control the rate of change of atmospheric CO₂. Since the 4-step argument cannot exclude this alternative, the 4-step argument is NOT proof that human CO₂ caused all the rise in atmospheric CO₂.

Further, the 4-step argument does not exclude the Fig. 1 alternative that shows atmospheric CO₂ can remain constant if atmospheric CO₂ is at equilibrium with ocean temperature. In Fig. 1, the "natural world" is a net sink but atmospheric CO₂ remains constant.

Remember, to be proof, the 4-step argument must exclude all possible scenarios where atmospheric CO₂ can remain constant in the presence of human CO₂ emissions. The 4-step argument does not accomplish that proof.

The 4-step argument is a case of having more unknowns than equations. For example, if there were an equation that proved land and oceans emissions would not adjust to human CO2 emissions, then that would be sufficient to be a proof. But there is no such equation. So, the 4-step argument is based on an invalid assumption.

Icarus62:

The '4-step argument' explicitly states that the natural world has adjusted by absorbing around half of our CO2 emissions, thus becoming a net sink. Any scenario in which we're not responsible for 100% of the rise in atmospheric CO2 is logically ruled out. I illustrated this with one of your scenarios above (land = -2000Gt, ocean = +850Gt, net natural change = -1150Gt CO2, thus 100% of the 120ppm increase in atmospheric CO2 is due to anthropogenic emissions, and none of it is due to nature).

Berry:

Dear Icarus62, the 4-step argument incorrectly assumes the natural world absorbs only enough human CO2 emissions to account for the excess in its argument. That is illogical because it does not allow the natural world to absorb any more than this amount.

What physics would constrain the natural world to absorbing only enough human CO2 to support the unfounded alarmist hypothesis?

None! It is a hand-waving argument with no physical basis, and no support from the argument itself. If the natural world can absorb about half, the natural world can absorb all human CO2 emissions.

The 4-step argument assumes the natural world cannot absorb more CO2 than an amount specified in the assumption. And, lo and behold, the 4-step argument concludes its own assumption

is correct. That is a perfect case of garbage in, garbage out. Sorry. That proves the 4-step argument is a religion and not a science.

The 4-step argument still has more unknowns than equations.

Maybe Icarus62 will return but my argument will prevail.

There exists no scientific basis to claim that human CO₂ caused all or most of the increase in atmospheric CO₂.

My article references Murry Salby's videos and book. My lake analogy conveys the same correct physics that Salby puts into differential equations.

Alarmists claim Salby's calculations do not "conserve carbon." They are wrong. Salby's calculations conserve carbon, just as my lake example conserves water.

Alarmists claim I needed to include ocean acidification, land and ocean absorption limits, etc., to refute their hypothesis. My response is as follows:

1. The alarmist hypothesis claims human CO₂ causes all the observed rise in atmospheric CO₂.
2. The alarmist hypothesis includes only data on human CO₂ emissions and atmospheric CO₂.
3. I showed their hypothesis fails by including all data in their hypothesis.
4. I do not need to include data that alarmists did not use in their hypothesis.

There is no end to the illogic of climate alarmists.

What if we could do an experiment to prove whether human CO₂ increases atmospheric CO₂?

We could stop all human CO₂ emissions and see if atmospheric CO₂ goes down. Fat chance of pulling off that experiment.

We could increase human CO2 emissions and see if atmospheric CO2 increased its slope – or rate of increase – as the alarmist hypothesis predicts.

Then:

- If atmospheric CO2 increases its slope, the alarmists win.
- If atmospheric CO2 does not increase its slope, the alarmists lose.

Well, we did that experiment. It is at the end of my article. Here it is again.

After 2002, human CO2 emissions increased its slope by three times. At the end of 2012, human CO2 emissions were three times where they would have been if we continued “business as usual.”

Atmospheric CO2 scaled did not change its slope.

The alarmist hypothesis made an incorrect prediction. Therefore, the alarmist hypothesis is wrong.

Human CO2 emissions do not significantly increase atmospheric CO2. As the alarmists like to say, “the science is settled.”

Soon-to-be President Trump is correct. Our CO2 emissions do not cause global warming or climate change. We do not need to restrict our CO2 emissions.

© 2017 Edwin X Berry, Ph.D – All Rights Reserved

Why our CO2 emissions do not

increase atmosphere CO2 Pt. 1

The genius of Al Gore

Give Al Gore an A for marketing and an F for science. But, hey, we all know the sale is in the marketing. The genius of Al Gore was to make his invalid myth simple:

1. Our CO2 emissions increase Atmosphere CO2, and
2. Atmosphere CO2 heats the Earth.

What could be simpler? Al Gore assumed his two invalid claims were true. His marketing job was to make you believe bad things happen when Atmosphere CO2 rises.

Everybody believed Al Gore. Well, almost everybody. His simple, inaccurate description of how our climate works created a generation of science deniers, some with PhD's. Al Gore turned climate science into a political-environmental movement.

The alarmists' goal is to scare you into believing our CO2 causes climate change. Once scared into an invalid belief, you will tend to hold that invalid belief forever.

Those who believe Al Gore's marketing believe they can make the Earth cooler by reducing our CO2 emissions. Al Gore has sold them a bridge to nowhere.

Climate alarmists are like the Aztecs who believed they could make rain by cutting out beating hearts and rolling decapitated heads down temple steps.

Both of Al Gore's two assumptions are wrong. This article shows how his first assumption is wrong. Nature, not human CO2 emissions, causes the changes in Atmosphere CO2.

The Logical Fallacy of Climate Change

Climate alarmists tell us climate change causes bad stuff to happen, and if bad stuff happens, they claim it is our fault. The alarmist logic goes like this:

If human CO₂ causes climate change, then bad stuff will happen.

Bad stuff happens. Therefore, human CO₂ causes climate change.

This alarmist claim is the well-known logical fallacy called "Affirming the Consequent." Here is an example that illustrates this logical fallacy:

If Bill Gates owns Fort Knox, then Bill Gates is rich.

Bill Gates is rich. Therefore, Bill Gates owns Fort Knox.

The logical error is to assume that every result has only one possible cause. Shrinking glaciers do not prove we caused them to shrink.

The relevant climate change questions are about cause and effect.

The relevant climate change questions are not whether the climate has changed. Climate always changes. The only relevant climate change questions concern cause and effect:

1. Do Human CO₂ emissions significantly increase Atmosphere CO₂?

2. Does Atmosphere CO₂ significantly increase climate change?

Climate alarmists must prove BOTH answers are YES. Otherwise, they lose their case.

This article shows why the answer to the first question is NO. A future article will show why the answer to the second question is also NO.

Why Human CO₂ emissions do not cause climate change.

Fig. 1 shows why nature's CO₂ emissions, not Human CO₂, are

the major cause of the observed change in Atmosphere CO₂.

All numbers in this article represent amounts of CO₂. CO₂ units are in parts per million by volume (ppmv) of CO₂. Gigatons of Carbon (GtC) convert to ppmv using: 1 ppmv of CO₂ = 2.13 GtC.

In the middle of Fig. 1 is a box that represents the CO₂ in our atmosphere. The amount of CO₂ in our Atmosphere in 2015 was 400.

Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions into the Atmosphere total about 100 each year (plus or minus ten percent). An almost equal amount flows from Atmosphere CO₂ to Land and Ocean CO₂ each year (CDIAC, 2016; IPCC, 2007a; IPCC, 2007b).

Let's use an analogy to help understand Fig. 1. Let water in a lake represent Atmosphere CO₂.

Two large rivers flow into the lake. One river represents Land CO₂. The other river represents Ocean CO₂. Together, they supply about 100 units per year to the lake.

Lake water spills over a dam. The inflow of 100 raises the lake level until the outflow over the dam equals the inflow.

Similarly, the flow of Land and Ocean CO₂ into our Atmosphere increases the amount of CO₂ in our Atmosphere. Increased Atmosphere CO₂ increases CO₂ outflow to Land and Ocean. Like the lake, Atmosphere CO₂ is at equilibrium when outflow equals inflow.

If inflow exceeds outflow, the lake level (Atmosphere CO₂) will rise until outflow equals inflow. If outflow exceeds inflow, the lake level will fall until outflow equals inflow.

Fig. 1. Our Atmosphere's CO₂ is like a big lake. It receives CO₂ from two big rivers (Land and Ocean) and from one small river (Human). Temperature controls CO₂ flow from Land and Ocean to Atmosphere. Lake level rises or falls until outflow

equals inflow.

The dam separates the CO₂ spill into two parts. One part goes back to Land. The other part goes back to the Ocean.

Fig. 1 includes the much longer CO₂ cycle where Land CO₂ becomes Fossil Fuels. Human CO₂ emissions complete this CO₂ cycle by returning Fossil Fuel CO₂ to the Atmosphere.

A small river, with a flow of 4, also flows into the lake. This small river represents the Human CO₂ flow into our Atmosphere. This small river adds only 4 percent to the Land and Ocean flow of 100 into the lake. This small river raises the total flow into the lake to 104. This will raise the lake level until the outflow equals 104.

The contribution of Human CO₂ to the new lake level (Atmosphere CO₂) is only 4 percent of the lake level above the dam, or only 4 percent of the total flow into and out of the lake. Ninety-six percent of the CO₂ flow into and out of our Atmosphere is due to nature.

Fig. 1 shows a scenario where the total inflow into the Atmosphere equals the total outflow, and where the Human CO₂ contribution goes to Land to support vegetation growth. Because inflow equals outflow, Atmosphere CO₂ will remain constant whether Atmosphere CO₂ is 400 or 300 or any other value.

Salby (2016) comes to the same conclusion. Salby (2012) authored the comprehensive textbook, "The Physics of the Atmosphere and Climate."

Our Atmosphere does not treat Human CO₂ any differently than CO₂ from Land and Ocean. Human CO₂ is simply another input to Atmosphere CO₂ that will increase the outflow of Atmosphere CO₂ to Land or Ocean by the same amount as the Human CO₂ flow into the Atmosphere.

Temperature controls Atmosphere CO2.

Salby (2015) shows, directly from data and with no hypotheses, that Temperature sets the rate at which Atmosphere CO2 increases or decreases. This means temperature sets the equilibrium value of Atmosphere CO2. Fig. 1 indicates the Temperature effect by the symbol for the Sun.

If the Sun, cloud cover, or ocean currents change to increase temperature, the increased temperature will cause more Land and Ocean CO2 to flow into Atmosphere CO2. This will increase Atmosphere CO2 until outflow balances inflow.

Temperature is like the accelerator in your car. Atmosphere CO2 is like the speed of your car. Atmosphere CO2 follows Temperature like the speed of your car follows your accelerator. Press down, your car speeds up. Let up, your car slows down.

Contrary to what Al Gore told you, CO2 does not control temperature. Temperature controls CO2.

Climate alarmists present their case.

Climate alarmists claim our CO2 emissions cause 100 percent of the observed rise in Atmosphere CO2. We will show why their claim is unphysical and invalid.

Here is the alarmists' four step argument they claim proves their case:

1. From 1750 to 2010, humans added 171 units of CO2 to our Atmosphere and Atmosphere CO2 increased by 113 units. This leaves 58 units.
2. Land and Oceans absorbed the 58 units of Atmosphere CO2.
3. Therefore, Land and Oceans are net absorbers of CO2.
4. Therefore, Human CO2 caused 100 percent of the increase in Atmosphere CO2 since 1750 and 1960.

Here is my rebuttal to the Alarmists case:

During the same period that Human CO₂ emissions added 171 units of CO₂ to our Atmosphere, the Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions added 26,000 units to our Atmosphere. Land and Ocean also absorbed about 26,000 units of CO₂ from our Atmosphere, including the 171 units from Human CO₂. There were no 58 units left over.

Fig. 2 illustrates how Land & Ocean CO₂ emissions compare to Human CO₂ emissions during this period. The ratio is 152 to 1.

Fig. 2. Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions are 152 times greater than Human CO₂ emissions during the period from 1750 to 2010.

The alarmists case fails because it omits Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions. Their omission leaves Human CO₂ emissions as 100 percent and makes their claim that Human CO₂ caused ALL the Atmosphere CO₂ increase artificial.

During the 260-year period, Human CO₂ caused "at most" 0.7 of the 113 rise in Atmosphere CO₂.

"At most" is because Salby (2015) showed that Temperature controls the rate of change of Atmosphere CO₂, and the equilibrium value of Atmosphere CO₂. Under that scenario, Land and Ocean emissions and absorptions will adjust to neutralize the effect of Human CO₂ emissions, and the effect of Human CO₂ on Atmosphere CO₂ will be ZERO!

The Atmosphere does not know whether its CO₂ came from Land, Ocean, or Human CO₂ emissions. No matter what the source, the greater the total Atmosphere CO₂, the greater the flow of Atmosphere CO₂ to Land and Ocean CO₂. Therefore, Atmosphere CO₂ will seek the same balance level with or without Human CO₂ emissions.

Land can absorb CO₂ from the Atmosphere while Ocean provides CO₂ to the Atmosphere. Fig. 1 shows this scenario where Land absorbs ALL Human CO₂ emissions while Atmosphere CO₂ remains constant.

In 2015, Human CO₂ emissions were 4 percent of Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions. Therefore, Human CO₂ emissions caused “at most” only 4 percent of the rise in Atmosphere CO₂.

A small river with a inflow of 4 cannot cause an outflow of 104. Yet this is what climate alarmists claim happens. The following tale illustrates the absurdity of the alarmist case:

An elephant crosses a bridge. A mouse, riding on the elephant’s back, says to the elephant, “We sure made that bridge shake, didn’t we?”

The alarmists’ case is a shell game. They would flunk physics.

Three more reasons Human CO₂ emissions do not control Atmosphere CO₂.

Fig. 3 shows Atmosphere CO₂ scaled to fit Human CO₂ emissions and the annual change in Atmosphere CO₂ (NOAA, 2016; CDIAC, 2016; IPCC, 2007b).

Salby (2016) makes the following three arguments using Fig. 3.

1. Human CO₂ emissions increased significantly after 2002 due to China (Oliver, 2015). Yet Atmosphere CO₂ continued its same steady rise.
2. Annual changes in Atmosphere CO₂ (jagged line) do not follow the smooth increase in Human CO₂ emissions. (Also, Courtney, 2008.)
3. In some years, particularly the period from 1988 to 1993, Atmosphere CO₂ falls while Human CO₂ emissions continue to rise.

Therefore, Human CO₂ emissions do not control Atmosphere CO₂.

Fig. 3. Human CO₂ emissions, annual change in Atmosphere CO₂, and Atmosphere CO₂ scaled (by subtracting 266 and dividing by 50).

Conclusions

Climate alarmists claim Human CO₂ causes ALL the increase in Atmosphere CO₂. Their argument fails because they omit Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions that are many times greater than Human CO₂ emissions.

Climate alarmists also omit how Land and Ocean CO₂ emissions and absorptions balance Atmosphere CO₂ with or without the presence of Human CO₂. Temperature sets the equilibrium Atmosphere CO₂ independent of Human CO₂ emission.

Here are three more reasons Human CO₂ does not cause ALL the rise in Atmosphere CO₂:

1. Human CO₂ emissions increased significantly after 2002, yet Atmosphere CO₂ continued its same steady rise.
2. Annual changes in Atmosphere CO₂ do not follow the smooth increase in Human CO₂ emissions.
3. In some years, particularly the period from 1988 to 1993, Atmosphere CO₂ falls while Human CO₂ emissions continue to rise.

Therefore, Human CO₂ emissions do not increase Atmosphere CO₂.

Most public climate alarmist arguments use this invalid logic:

If human CO₂ causes climate change, then bad stuff will happen.

Bad stuff happens. Therefore, human CO₂ causes climate change.

Such arguments are invalid because they do not prove Human CO₂ caused the change.

If we stopped all Human CO₂ emissions today, it would not change future Atmosphere CO₂. For part two click below.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, Ph.D – All Rights Reserved

The team that makes the fewest mistakes wins

Politics is like the sport of sailing. In a world-class competition, you may have 30 to 50 competitors, all very experienced, smart sailors. You all have identical boats. You have a level playing field. You have no control over the wind, the waves, the current, or your competition. You control only where your boat goes.

Competitive sailing is like a three-dimensional chess game where you must make a new decision every second. The race lasts about two hours. The wind may be 5 to 25 knots. At the end of the race, you will have made about 7200 decisions. You are physically and mentally exhausted, but not so much that you can't attend the evening parties.

You have one race per day for several days. At the end of the series, the team that made the fewest mistakes wins.

In the last race, you may have to forego first place to assure that you beat your closest competitors in the series ... like I did in a world competition when I won first place in the series by purposely getting third place in the last race.

In politics, we call this the art of compromise. We never get 100 percent of our desires in politics but by compromise, we can get much of what we want. If we refuse to compromise, or vote third party, we will get little of what we want. Compromise is part of the Art of the Deal and smart politics.

Presidential election

Donald Trump won the nomination because he made fewer mistakes

than his Republican competitors. He won the presidency because he made fewer mistakes than Hillary Clinton. His detractors criticized his every action that they thought was a mistake. But Trump is smarter than his detractors. That's why he won and they lost.

Similarly, now that Trump has won, we should let him do his job. We should not try to micromanage him. We should not criticize his decisions. Trump is smart and his data sources far exceed ours. What may seem like a bad decision to us, is very likely the best decision in the big picture.

Opinions about why Trump won are as many as there are pundits but here are the facts. Trump won because he had the best game plan, "Make America Great Again," and he did not make very many mistakes.

Trump appealed to the disenfranchised working class, many of them lifelong Democrats. He appealed to the nationalists and populists. He appealed to conservative Evangelicals He gathered the support of all four faces of the Republican Party. No other Republican candidate had such wide support.

Donald Trump won because his candidacy became a people's revolution. This song from Les Miserables describes the candidacy of Donald Trump. Understand this song to understand politics:

Do you hear the people sing?
Singing the songs of angry men?
It is the music of the people
Who will not be slaves again!

When the beating of your heart
Echoes the beating of the drums
There is a life about to start
When tomorrow comes!

Shocked at their loss, Democrats want to eliminate the

Electoral College and choose presidents by popular vote. They don't understand that America is a Republic. America is modeled after the Iroquois Federation of Hiawatha. Each state votes independently. The Electoral College gives each state one vote for each Senator plus one vote for each Representative. That was part of the deal when each state joined the United States. Democrats want to change the deal.

Rather than eliminate the Electoral College, how about we simply count the states? Trump won 30 states. Clinton won 20 plus Washington, DC. The states choose Donald Trump for president. That is why the Democrats will never get two-thirds of the states to approve the elimination of the Electoral College.

Clinton won Washington, DC, with 92.8 percent of the vote. That shows how strongly the Democrats control America. They dominate the bureaucrats. Washington, DC, has 3 electoral votes, the same number as Montana, Wyoming, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Alaska.

Montana's elections

The fewest mistakes also determined the election results in the political microcosm of Montana. The Montana GOP did a good job. They properly took credit for GOP wins in Montana. But they were lucky and they could have done better.

The Montana GOP was lucky because Donald Trump's popularity pulled all the Republican candidates ahead. The Montana GOP made a mistake in not realizing Trump would win by so much. Many tea party players who dominate the Montana GOP did not support Trump.

Here are the results of Montana's key statewide votes.

Montana's vote for AG Tim Fox not only reelected him as Attorney General but also assured his election as Montana's next Governor in 2020.

Montana's second most popular candidate is Congressman Ryan Zinke. His reelection was a significant win over his opponent Juneau. Democrats tried to defeat Zinke by advertising Zinke's support of Trump. They failed to recognize Trump's popularity among Montana voters. Their advertising helped Zinke win.

The only Republican to lose a Montana statewide race was governor candidate Greg Gianforte. Gianforte's opponent was incumbent Democrat Governor Bullock, certainly a worthy opponent.

Montana GOP's and Gianforte's mistake was to not connect Gianforte with Trump. I advised Gianforte personally to connect himself with the Trump campaign and to adopt Trump's positions on the issues.

Gianforte did not attend Donald Trump's widely-viewed primary rally in Montana. Zinke did. Bullock beat Gianforte by 52 to 48 percent. Trump beat Clinton 61 to 39 percent. Had Gianforte associated his campaign with Trump's, he would have gained at least 5 percentage points and won the governor's race.

A former Montana Congressman, who advised Gianforte and the Montana GOP, continued to claim on Twitter and Facebook that Trump could not win. He was very anti Donald Trump. I argued that his logic was wrong and that Trump was going to win, and win strongly in Montana. His response was to call me "stupid" and block me on Twitter and Facebook. His political mistakes helped Bullock beat Gianforte.

Republicans Stapleton, Rosendale, and Arntzen also won their statewide races. Rosendale and Arntzen won by small margins and were helped more by Donald Trump than by the Montana GOP.

Democrats would have won more legislative races if they had simply connected their Republican opponents with their votes against the critical 2015 legislative bill, SB 262, Montana's Last Indian Water Compact.

This bill was a clear example where the voters supported the Compact and the tea party Republicans opposed the Compact without good reason. AG Tim Fox and Governor Bullock supported the Compact and they won reelection.

Governor Bullock could have used the Compact against Gianforte because Gianforte contributed to many Republicans who voted against the Compact. Had Bullock done this, he would have raised voter awareness of the Water Compact vote, and helped Democrats win their legislative races. Lacking this attention to the Compact, unaware voters reelected many Republican legislators who voted against the Compact.

In conclusion, the team that makes fewest mistakes wins.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Donald Trump and the myth keepers

Pastor Chuck Baldwin's article today did a magnificent job of blasting Hillary Clinton. He made it very clear that Hillary Clinton would be a disaster if she became president.

I agree with everything the good Pastor said about Hillary, but when I got to the end of his article, something was missing. Something very critical was missing. In marketing, we call the missing part the "Call to Action."

As I read his article, I anticipated this would be the first time, to my knowledge, that Pastor Baldwin would advise his followers to vote for the Republican candidate. But that was not to be. He just left his readers hanging.

Do they vote a third-party candidate? Do they not vote at all? Or do they buy Baldwin's book on gun rights, clean their AR-15s, and bunker down for a shootout with the US government?

Pastor Baldwin is not clear.

Donald Trump has two groups of enemies

Trump's first group of enemies are the hard-core Hillary Democrats.

Trump's second group of "enemies" are the Myth Keepers. They are the undecided, tea party Evangelicals who follow the Negative Voting Myth.

Myth Keepers dominate the 5 to 10 percent of voters who will determine who be the president of the United States. So, this is a very, very serious subject.

Do we tell them to NOT vote for Hillary? Or do we tell them to vote FOR Donald Trump?

The difference is whether we see the world as negative or positive.

They believe the Negative Voting Myth

Myth Keepers do a good job of criticizing Hillary. But they won't admit to themselves that they must vote for Donald Trump to help stop Hillary from becoming our next president.

They are mixed up because they follow the Negative Voting Myth:

A vote for the lesser of two evils is still a vote for evil.

They admit Hillary is the "greater evil," but they consider Trump the "lesser evil" because he is not "perfect" enough for them. So, they use their Negative Voting Myth as their excuse to not vote for Donald Trump.

Their Negative Voting Myth is irrational, unethical, and immoral.

History of the Negative Voting Myth

In 1968, Jane Fonda and Tom Hayden led the progressives protest of the Vietnam War. Their protests involved supporting third-party candidates.

They promoted the Negative Voting Myth to get their third-party votes.

They did not realize the Negative Voting Myth does not win elections. It pulls votes from the "lesser evil" and helps elect the "greater evil."

In 1980, progressives abandoned Jimmy Carter because he "was not good enough for them." So, they helped Ronald Reagan beat Carter.

In 2000, progressives decided Al Gore was their "lesser of two evils." So, they gave 3 million votes, or 2.7% of total votes, to Ralph Nader, United States Green Party "progressive" candidate. They unwittingly helped elect their worst enemy, George W. Bush, as President.

They thought their votes would help elect Ralph Nader even though it was obvious Nader had no chance to win. But like today's Myth Keepers, the progressives rejected data that contradicted their preconceived beliefs.

Like today's Myth Keepers, progressives voted their "principles" and their "conscience." But their Negative Voting Myth caused them to elect the very opposite of their desired goals.

Unless they wake up, these Myth Keepers may do the same thing the progressives did to Al Gore. If they refuse to vote for Donald Trump, they may be responsible for electing Hillary Clinton.

Aristotle's Positive Voting Principle

Aristotle was a Republican. He denounced the idea that the poor, by force of numbers, had a right to take property from the rich. He opposed the forced redistribution of wealth. Aristotle is the father of the scientific method.

Aristotle proposed the Positive Voting Principle to replace the Negative Voting Myth. Yes, the Negative Voting Myth existed in the days of Aristotle.

Aristotle (320 BC) wrote (as translated by Roger Crisp):

In the case of evil, the reverse is the case, since the lesser evil is counted as a good in comparison with the greater evil; the lesser evil is more worthy of choice than the greater, what is worthy of choice is a good, and what is more worthy of choice is a greater good.

In modern terms, Aristotle's Positive Voting Principle is:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

Stated simply, the Positive Voting Principle is:

Always vote and act to achieve the greatest possible good.

The Positive Voting Principle does not tell you how to vote. It tells you how to decide how to vote. It tells you about logic and lets you decide your politics.

The Positive Voting Principle works for all political parties and religions. It lets you decide which candidate you think is the greater good. It requires you to not consider third-party candidates who cannot win. It requires you to compare the candidates who can win, and choose the candidate whom you believe will produce the greater good.

Thomas Jefferson wrote "Aristotle, Cicero, Sidney, and Locke"

were inspirations for our Constitution.

America's Founding Fathers used the Positive Voting Principle. They voted for the greater good. If each Founding Father rejected what he thought was imperfect, they would not have approved our Constitution.

All major Christian Religions support the Positive Voting Principle

Historically, all moral philosophers and all major Christian religions support the Positive Voting Principle. They all follow the wisdom of Aristotle.

Thomas Aquinas (1260) in his Summa Theologica told us to focus on achieving the possible good rather than upon preventing a lesser evil.

Aquinas wrote our moral duty is to achieve as much good as possible from every situation, including our vote. He says we cannot achieve good by acting on something that is impossible, like voting for a third-party candidate.

Philosopher Pope John Paul II said we should vote for the "lesser of two evils" if we can help prevent worse evils from occurring.

Church Summary on Positive Voting Principle

- The Catholic Church gives very clear directions that Catholics must vote to achieve the most possible good even if that means voting for the "lesser of two evils".
- A Baptist minister advises voting for the "lesser of two evils" candidate if this is necessary to achieve the greater good.
- A Methodist minister quoted Apostle Paul wrote, "Don't be defeated by evil, but defeat evil with good."
- The Lutheran Church says to vote for the person who will do the better job caring for our earthly needs, even if this person is the "lesser of two evils".

- The Presbyterian Church says to vote for the candidate who will most consistently meet our personal agenda for the nation, even if this candidate is the “lesser of two evils”.
- An Evangelical minister says to vote for the “lesser of two evils” because a vote for a third-party candidate jeopardizes this nation.
- Calvinist representatives argue we must vote for the lesser of two evils if it is necessary to achieve the greater good.
- The Mormon LDS Church does NOT support the Positive Voting Principle.
- Many far-right Evangelicals and Baptists do NOT support the Positive Voting Principle.

All major Christian churches tell us to vote and to use the Positive Voting Principle:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

Only some far-right Evangelicals and Mormons support the Negative Voting Myth.

The Positive Voting Principle forbids Mandatory Conditions. Mandatory conditions are immoral because they can eliminate from consideration the candidate who may be the greater good. Some pastors proudly tell their flock a candidate must meet certain “mandatory” conditions to get their vote. Their mandatory conditions reveal they do not understand morality, logic, or the teachings of all major Christian religions and philosophers.

Don't be a Myth Keeper

Let's explain the Negative Voting Myth this way:

Suppose you get to vote for Candidate A, whose abortion policies will kill 10 million babies, or Candidate B, whose policies will kill 1 million babies. Who will you vote for?

All normal Christians will vote for Candidate B so they can save 9 million babies.

Myth Keepers won't vote for either candidate because they don't care about saving 9 million babies. They care about their "conscience" and "principles."

Oath Keepers leaders Stewart Rhodes and Pastor Chuck Baldwin, the John Birch Society, tea party Evangelicals, and many tea party groups are Myth Keepers. They promote the Negative Voting Myth. Their myth would kill 9 million babies.

Reject the Negative Voting Myth and reject all groups that promote it.

How to vote right

Before we can make a good decision, we must define the key question.

The Key Question of the 2016 presidential election is:

Will Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton better serve America as President?

A subset of the Key Question is:

Will Donald Trump's 3 to 5 Supreme Court justices better serve America than Hillary Clinton's choice of Supreme Court justices?

The Key Question is NOT:

- Is Donald Trump perfect enough for me?
- Will I violate my principles if I vote for Donald Trump?
- Do I like Donald Trump?

When we choose a President, we should not be concerned about "likes." We should be concerned only about who will do the best job for America.

Conclusion

First, define and answer the key question:

Will Donald Trump or Hillary Clinton better serve America as President?

Second, follow the Positive Voting Principle:

Our moral duty is to vote to achieve the most possible good, which eliminates voting for candidates who cannot win, and eliminates mandatory conditions.

If you agree that Donald Trump will serve America better than Hillary Clinton would, then get out and vote for Donald Trump.

(That's my call to action.)

For a more complete discussion of this subject, please read my NEW book "Choose America."

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Why you should watch Trump's speeches

Some people spend their whole lives seeking positive reinforcement of their beliefs. They reject information that contradicts their beliefs. They will never learn if their beliefs are wrong.

Democrats, in general, believe our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous global warming. Only about 0.001 percent of these believers can claim any expertise in climate. They believe because it is part of their political religion.

If they are atheists, it makes no difference. Their religion

is global warming. They believe it without question.

They become cocksure they are correct because they reject information that contradicts their belief and accept information that reinforces their belief.

That's how we end up with people who are totally cocksure they are right when they are on opposite sides.

Rogers & Hammerstein illustrated this confusion in "The King and I: A Puzzlement"

There are times I almost think Nobody sure of what he absolutely know. Everybody find confusion in conclusion he concluded long ago. And it puzzle me to learn that tho' a man may be in doubt of what he know. Very quickly he will fight.. He'll fight to prove that what he does not know is so!

The philosophy of science teaches us we can never prove our belief is true.

We can only prove our theory or belief is false.

Einstein said (to paraphrase), "Many experiments may show my theory is correct but it takes only one experiment to prove my theory is wrong." Einstein was a master of the philosophy of science.

Our only path to truth is to reject false beliefs or theories. Our schools should teach all students this part of the philosophy of science but they do not.

All true scientists try to prove their theory or belief is false. Those who do not are not real scientists.

If there were no arguments to show a theory is false, then we may begin to accept that the theory may be true.

In the case of global warming, the theory is "our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous climate change."

There are hundreds of overwhelming arguments that prove the global warming theory is false. Therefore, it is irrational for anyone to claim the global warming theory is true. And even worse to claim "the science is settled."

Yet the delusional promoters are out there. They do everything they can to shut down America's production of abundant cheap energy. And they have no idea their belief is completely wrong.

But because 99.999 percent of global warming believers do not understand climate science, they never got the memo that their belief is wrong. They should apply for jobs as Energizer bunnies.

The proper mode of thinking, to reject a belief that is wrong, threatens many people. They don't want to learn the truth.

Recently, in comments on edberry.com, Democrat climate alarmist, David Appell, was unable to assimilate simple plots of temperature and model predictions that proved him wrong.

Moving to politics, some people who claim to be conservatives cannot back Donald Trump over Hillary Clinton for president. In politics, you don't need to love the person you vote for.

It's really quite simple: You only need to vote for the person who you believe will do a better job than the other candidates.

One person bet me \$100 that Marco Rubio would win the Republican nomination, while I bet that Donald Trump would win. Now that I won the bet, this person unsubscribed from my email list and has not offered to pay me my \$100.

But my point is this person would send me article after article that bashed Trump. This person would read only what gave him positive reinforcement. That's why he was wrong.

You can find hundreds of articles and media news that bash

Trump. If you get all your political information from positive reinforcements, you will never get smart.

Politics comes down to these questions:

Do you think for yourself? Or do you rely on what other people say?

If you can't think for yourself, you will read or listen to what other people say Trump said rather than read or listen to what Trump really said for yourself.

If you think for yourself, you will watch or read Donald Trump's speeches and decide for yourself whether you want Trump or Hillary.

So my message for today is to suggest you actually watch or read Donald Trump's speeches.

If you think for yourself, you will acknowledge your only viable choices are Trump or Hillary. You will not waste time with third-parties. You will not promote irrelevant, pseudo-intellectual thinking that attempts to dissect Trump's behavior. You will focus on the question at hand.

Some people can't figure out their political orientation.

It's now 67 days before the election. If you can't tell people they should vote for Donald Trump to save America, then you should quit pretending to be a conservative. Really. Admit you are a Democrat.

Intelligent people don't make things complicated. They make things simple (but not stupidly simple like Al Gore did).

Any moron can find fault with another person. So what? Negative thinking doesn't solve a problem. It takes intelligence to decide how one candidate is better than another candidate for President and CEO of the United States.

Anyone can list his "worst" presidents of America. So what?

Negative thinking doesn't solve a problem. It takes intelligence to decide and tell people that Donald Trump will make a better president than Hillary Clinton.

I notice Romney supports Marco but won't support Trump. Not intelligent.

If you want a liberal Supreme Court that will misinterpret our Constitution, then by all means criticize Trump and don't tell people to vote for Trump. It's that simple.

The Rasmussen poll for September 1 shows Trump 40%, Clinton 39%, Johnson 7%, and Stein 3%. That leaves 11% undecided. The race will hinge on that 11%.

My forecast: The Never-Trumps will lose and Trump will win.

- Click [here](http://edberry.com) to go to edberry.com. Then...
- Watch Donald Trump's speech on immigration or read the text of his speech.
- Check out the Trump Train song by Angel Leydig.
- Watch the movie, Hillary Clinton, Please stop killing people.
- Watch the movie, Donald Trump's Long Road to the White House.
- Watch how a true athlete respects other people, Usain Bolt stops his interview during the US Anthem.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

How democrats deny science

We all know Democrats and Republicans differ on partisan politics. But there are bipartisan issues where everyone should agree. We should all agree on what facts and science

tell us.

Democrats, in general, claim scientists like me “deny climate change.” The truth is these Democrats deny science.

Anyone who has an open mind to scientific truth will understand there is no evidence that our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous climate change.

Facts prove our carbon dioxide emissions are not dangerous. If anything, facts show we should try to increase the carbon dioxide in our atmosphere.

In Montana, Democrats promote their candidate for Superintendent of Schools. But Democrats have promoted their false climate religion in our schools and universities. Democrats have dumbed down our whole society.

The strongest argument for electing a Republican to Superintendent of Schools is to stop the destructive promotion of the false climate religion.

Science denial cuts both ways in our governor’s contest. Our Republican candidate believes our earth and universe are 6000 years old. Our Democrat candidate believes our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous climate change.

Which is worse for a Montana governor? Believing the earth is 6000 years old or believing our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous climate change?

The answer is obvious. The false climate religion causes far more damage to our economy than the belief our earth is 6000 years old. The false climate religion destroys our abundant cheap energy, the foundation of our economy.

At the presidential level, the choice is even more clear. Hillary will work to shut down America’s best sources of abundant cheap energy. Donald Trump will work to build up America’s best sources of abundant cheap energy.

About 5 to 10 percent of voters say they support Libertarian Gary Johnson. Johnson believes the false climate religion. Johnson can't win but his supporters will help Hillary win.

Only Hillary or Trump can win. Fence sitters and third-party voters who claim to be conservatives are not conservatives. They are Democrats.

Some politically-active, Bible-thumping pastors will not support Trump. They are false prophets who lead their people astray.

True Americans support Donald Trump, not because he is perfect. No one is perfect. But because Donald Trump will be far better for America than liar criminal Hillary.

I correctly predicted Trump would win the Republican nomination. Now I predict he will win the presidency.

Vox Day explained why he supports Donald Trump:

I am often asked why I, a Christian libertarian and intellectual, would publicly support Donald Trump, a man of no fixed ideology, no apparent religious beliefs, multiple marriages, visible ties to the Clintons, and whose taste and sophistication tends to resemble that of a nouveau riche rhinoceros. It is a reasonable question. After all, how can anyone support a candidate whose public statements are, to put it mildly, inconsistent—when they are not completely self-contradictory.

The answer is as simple as it is conclusive and convincing. Donald Trump is the only candidate in either major party whose personal interests are aligned with those of the American public rather than with the interests of the anti-nationalist elite who see America as nothing more than lines on a map and Americans as nothing more than 300 million economic units in the global economy.

Ask yourself this: why did Donald Trump run for president in the first place? I believe the real reason is that he, like you, is deeply concerned about the current state of the United States of America, and he, like you, fears for its future.

I support Donald Trump because he loves the America that once was, and he is willing to put both his body and his reputation on the line in order to restore America to that unique state that was the envy of the entire world. That is what he means by Make America Great Again.

Donald Trump not only wants to make America great again, he wants America to be American. That is what distinguishes him from Ted Cruz, Hillary Clinton and Bernie Sanders. And that is why I support him.

In the past month, I posted several new articles on climate change.

My July 5 article, Why Eric Grimsrud is wrong about climate, has 126 comments. My article on Soon's, Sun not CO2 causes climate change, has 92 comments.

Some Democrat scientists have attempted to show these articles are wrong. They have failed to do so. Read the comments and judge for yourself.

Democrat David Appell added a comment wherein he denied the facts shown in a chart before him. His comment led me to post two more articles:

Data contradict government Climate Claims is John Christy's full Testimony to U.S. House Committee on Science, Space & Technology on February 2, 2016. Christy shows why the Democrat climate change agenda is a religion rather than science.

Global Warming for Dummies and Activists is Roy Spencer's talk at the International Conference on Climate Change in Las Vegas in 2014. Spencer presents a "sixth-grade" level of climate

change that is very easy to understand.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

How Donald Trump will beat the GOP establishment

On April 5, one of my subscribers sent me the following email:

Dr Ed, I'm very sad that Donald Trump lost tonight in Wisconsin. Is this the end to him winning? Can my family still have hope and support him? We just feel very sad and feel like no one is treating him right! How can this be allowed?

Actually, my family stopped watching anything on the news channels...just depressing and mean how they treat Donald Trump!! We hope things still end up with him winning and becoming our next PRESIDENT!!

Do we still have hope? Or is this going to be controlled by the GOP!! We feel very distraught and need you to give us some hope!!!

Thank you,

Dear Subscriber,

We are in a "Star Wars" battle. Trump's supporters are faithful to Trump and Trump will defeat the Darth Vader GOP Establishment.

Let's look at the new delegates. Here's where the race for the nomination stands today:

The blue shows the delegates won. The orange shows the

delegates needed to get 1237.

We use RealClearPolitics data as of April 12. Trump needs 482 more delegates or 58% of the remaining delegates. Cruz needs 692 more delegates or 83% of the remaining delegates.

Let's estimate the delegate count after New York, Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Rhode Island vote. We use the projected delegate wins estimated by Nelson Hultberg.

Of course, no projection can be exact. Voter fraud happens. Polls error by a few percent.

But poll data indicates the delegate chart will look like this after April 26:

Trump will have about 929 delegates. He will need only 308 more or 55% of the remaining delegates to get 1237.

Cruz will have about 638 delegates. He will need 599 delegates to get 1237 or 106% of the remaining delegates. Therefore, Cruz will be out of the race for 1237. But he will remain in the race to help the GOP establishment try to stop Trump from getting 1237 delegates.

Let's look at the full list of the states yet to vote. We showed the data in this list through April in the above chart. Here is the rest of the projected data using Hultberg's estimated delegates. We assume Cruz gets the delegates that Trump does not win. Maybe Kasich will get some of the votes we have assigned to Cruz.

In this scenario, Trump ends up with 1226 total delegates, only 11 shy of 1237.

Presently, Trump polls 60 percent in New York. If Trump wins over 50 percent in New York then his total will go up by 40 to 1266. Then, even if Trump loses Montana, he will still have 1239 delegates.

After April 26, Cruz lovers who passed high school math may realize Cruz can't get 106 percent of the remaining votes. Then they may find their next best choice is Trump. That may help Trump get more delegates.

If Trump wins he will control the GOP. We sure need to replace those who have fought Trump all the way, and who would like to replace Trump with a candidate like Paul Ryan. Ryan would lose about half of the Republican voters and lose to Hillary or Bernie.

More good news is businessman Paul Nehlen is running against Paul Ryan in Wisconsin. What an upset it would be for Nehlen to remove the Speaker of the House when Trump becomes president.

Does Trump have a Plan B?

Yes. If Trump falls short of delegates he will make a deal with either Kasich or Rubio. He will choose one of them as his VP in return for their delegates to nominate him.

If both Kasich and Rubio accept similar offers, I think Trump will choose Kasich. Kasich has more executive experience, more name recognition, less in bed with GOP's elite, and he can assure Trump would win Ohio. Kasich can at least help Trump. Trump would have to babysit Rubio.

I think the reason Kasich has remained in the race is he is running for VP. If Trump needs Plan B, I predict a Trump-Kasich ticket.

Meanwhile, let's do our best to help Trump so he does not need Plan B.

Will Trump pull the eligibility card on Cruz?

Probably not, at least not until after the June 7 elections and only then if necessary. Doing so might set a negative tone to his campaign.

Meanwhile, there are eligibility lawsuits filed against Cruz in some states. Victor Williams for President has filed an eligibility lawsuit against Cruz. It includes the Amicus Curiae by Professor Elhauge.

The lawsuits that have the best chance to be heard and win are the ones where Harvard Law Professor Einer Elhauge has filed his Amicus Curiae.

Elhauge's Statement of Interest of Amicus reads in part:

The amicus is a Harvard Law professor who has researched and written on the natural born citizen clause and other issues of constitutional and statutory interpretation. Because of his research and expertise, he can help identify law or arguments that may not be presented by the parties or that might otherwise escape the Court's consideration, and he can otherwise assist the Court with an objective assessment of the legal issues.

Elhauge's Conclusion is:

For the reasons set forth herein, the issue of whether Ted Cruz is a natural born citizen is justiciable and should be resolved in the negative.

Elhauge shows how Cruz's legal arguments fail. Elhauge discusses many legal documents. His review of Wong Kim Ark is conclusive:

The fourteenth amendment of the constitution, in the declaration that 'all persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the state wherein they reside,' contemplates two sources of citizenship, and two only,—birth and naturalization.

Citizenship by naturalization can only be acquired by naturalization under the authority and in the forms of law.

But citizenship by birth is established by the mere fact of birth under the circumstances defined in the constitution. Every person born in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, becomes at once a citizen of the United States, and needs no naturalization.

A person born out of the jurisdiction of the United States can only become a citizen by being naturalized, either by treaty, as in the case of the annexation of foreign territory, or by authority of congress, exercised either by declaring certain classes of persons to be citizens, as in the enactments conferring citizenship upon foreign-born children of citizens, or by enabling foreigners individually to become citizens by proceedings in the judicial tribunals, as in the ordinary provisions of the naturalization acts.

Voter Fraud in Wisconsin

Wisconsin Trump voter Jeremy Rogers said,

“It was the strangest thing. The machine literally would not let me vote for Trump. I have heard the same from several others coming out of the voting booth.”

If you don't think the GOP can and does rig voting machines to get the result they want, then you must watch this 121-minute documentary video:

The documentary video shows how good people who wanted fair elections worked to reveal the truth about voting machines. The video shows how easy it is for the manufacturer to remotely reset voting totals, and to even set local voting machines to change votes.

Expert programmers were able to find backdoors where manufacturers can set their machines to produce desired results. They demonstrate how they can edit the database and how they can change the memory cards.

After a software expert demonstrated how to easily change voting results, a state voting official stated:

“If I had not known what was behind this I would have certified this election as a true count of a vote.

The video shows a check from a GOP establishment to the machine manufacturer. Why would the GOP send a check to the manufacturer? To request the manufacturer to set the results of an election. The manufacturer can remotely program the machines to produce the desired result.

The Darth Vader GOP Establishment not only fixed the Wisconsin election but threatens to do the same in New York. DJ Lewis reported on Twitter,

“I was 5 feet from Priebus when he said ‘Use the Diebold program in New York to keep Trump under 50 percent.’”

Wisconsin is littered with voting machines, most of them Diabold. Wisconsin voters reported voting machine problems in 2014.

Here is a map of Wisconsin counties that Trump and Cruz won.

Here is a list of the voting machines in Wisconsin. You can match the counties with no or few voting machines with the counties Trump and Cruz won. Trump won every county that did not use voting machines.

What is other evidence of vote fraud?

Compare the final results with the good polls. Ignore the bad polls like WSJ because they are purposely biased because Murdoch hates Trump.

The final vote results should not be more than ten percent different from the good polls. In the states that Cruz won, his votes were up to four times his poll data. The probability of this happening is about the same as winning a lottery. This

happened in Wisconsin.

Why do states buy voting machines with hidden software?

Here is a rule: Never buy a voting machine with hidden software. Only buy source software. Every state has universities, colleges, and private industry with expert software people. The state should hire these people to review, test, and approve the software in every voting machine.

Even better, let your experts design the software. Keep it open source so experts in all states can benefit from each other.

The video shows the voting machine software was written in Microsoft Visual Basic with an Access database. I am an expert in Microsoft Visual Basic and Access. One year I won Microsoft's "People's Choice Award" at Microsoft's Windows World Open and Computerworld's Custom Application Contest.

So you can believe me when I tell you, you don't need a voting machine. Voting machines are a scam! Having said that, it's time to move away from Visual Basic and Access.

The best way would be to write voting software to run in Google's Chrome browser. Then people can vote with a touch-screen PC, Apple, or smart phone.

Compare the browser-based, very secure software used for stock trading. By comparison, counting votes is very simple.

Properly done, it is possible to let people vote from their own computer or smart phone. That is the future. Imagine, our military personnel would be able to vote from anywhere. States to have a way for the few who can't use a computer to still vote.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Donald Trump will be our next president

On March 15, Donald Trump won 5 states. Cruz won zip. Here are the delegates to date:

After losing his home state of Florida, Marco Rubio dropped out.

Kasich barely won his home state of Ohio only because Rubio and Cruz told their supporters to vote for Kasich. Kasich should drop out.

Here's the summary.

For Kasich to get 1237 delegates, he needs to win 106 percent of the remaining delegates. That can't happen.

For Cruz to get 1237 delegates, he needs to win 79 percent of the remaining delegates. That won't happen.

For Trump to get 1237 delegates, he needs to win 53 percent of the remaining delegates. That will happen.

Here's why Trump will get over 1237 delegates.

The March 13 YouGov.com poll shows Trump's national popularity rose from 40% a month ago to 53% today.

Trump gained popularity while the GOP elite tried to take him down. Trump gained support while the media blamed the Soros-funded Democratic riots, in Chicago, Dayton, and Kansas City, on Trump.

Trump will win the "winner take all" states of Arizona, Wisconsin, Delaware, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Indiana,

Nebraska, California, Montana, New Jersey, and South Dakota. And he will dominate the “proportional” delegate states of New York, Connecticut, Rhode Island, Oregon, Washington, and New Mexico.

That’s enough to give Trump over 1400 delegates.

How the GOP wastes money.

The GOP’s attack on Donald Trump has nothing to do with his platform. It has everything to do with who controls Washington DC. The elite are scared Donald Trump will end their power over America.

They are right. Trump will return the power back to the American people where it belongs. As more Americans catch on to this fact, they will support Donald Trump.

The GOP elite, led by Mitt Romney, spent more money trying to stop Donald Trump than they did to try to stop Obama from winning in 2012. Makes you wonder whose side they are on.

Romney cost Trump Idaho. The Mormons in southeast Idaho who previously supported Trump voted for Cruz. Utah will likely vote for Cruz even though their values differ from Cruz’s values. Mormons seem to follow their leaders more than Catholics follow their Pope.

The GOP elite wasted \$35 million on attack ads against Trump in Florida and Illinois. Trump spent no money to counter the GOP attack. Trump won Florida and Illinois significantly.

This is why we need Trump. The GOP elite don’t know how to manage money. Trump does.

Why a brokered convention will fail.

Some anti-Trump folks want a brokered convention to choose Romney, Ryan, Rubio, or Bush. They think these losers can beat Hillary. They think wrong.

The latest RCP poll shows Obama has a 51 percent approval rating. Obama has had a 49 to 51 percent approval rating for the past year.

Some anti-Trump folks claim face-off polls show another candidate would do better than Trump. They do not understand data. Face-off polls mean nothing. The general public can barely keep up with the present election, much less forecast an election that has not even begun.

The only way a Republican candidate can win the presidency is to pull votes from Democrats, Independents, and voters who have never voted before.

Donald Trump is the only candidate who has brought in new voters. Trump brings Democrats, Independents, and Republicans who had given up on the Republican Party.

Donald Trump has doubled and even tripled the number of Republican primary voters that Romney pulled in 2012. Trump's new voters are there for only one reason: to vote for Donald Trump. They are the voters the GOP establishment screwed and long ago forgot.

If the GOP feeds them any candidate but Trump, these Trump voters will not vote GOP. Any candidate but Trump will lose to Hillary by a greater margin than Romney lost to Obama in 2012.

Many GOP elites have announced publicly they prefer Hillary over Donald Trump. They don't belong in the GOP. They are Democrats.

There are only four kinds of voters. Which are you?

1. American: You want Donald Trump to be our next president.
2. Irrational Democrat: You want a brokered convention.
3. Delusional Democrat: You want Ted Cruz to be our next president.
4. Real Democrat: You want Hillary Clinton to be our next

president.

It does not matter who you claim you are. We judge you by the results of your actions. If your actions help elect Hillary, you are a Democrat.

Irrational Democrats and Delusional Democrats are Democrats. If you are undecided, you are a Democrat.

There are only two sides.

Let's be clear. There are only two sides in America right now. You are either for Trump or you are against Trump.

Dr. Ben Carson supports Donald Trump. Ben Carson is an American.

Ben Carson explained, according to Michele Hickford in allenbwest.com:

"The key thing for me was recognizing that the political establishment was pulling out all the stops to try to stop Trump. It seems to me that's thwarting the will of the people. The people are the ones who are supposed to make the decision."

Why a vote for Ted Cruz is Irrational.

The national YouGov poll has Cruz in second place with 22%, less than half of Trump's support.

Cruz's support comes from two sources: Very Conservative Evangelicals "Tea Party" (VCEs) voters who are Delusional Democrats and anti-Trump voters who are Irrational Democrats.

Don't confuse "Very Conservative Evangelicals" with "Moderate Evangelicals." Moderate Evangelicals support Trump.

Ted Cruz does not represent Tea Party values. Tea Party leader Debbie Dooley wrote in Breitbart:

I was disheartened to learn that you [Ted Cruz] recently joined progressives and Republican establishment elitists by attacking millions of activists like me that support Donald Trump by calling us low information voters.

I would encourage you to climb down out of your Ivy League tower and find out just who we are and why we decided to support Donald Trump.

You would find among Trump supporters people that cherish the U.S. Constitution and The Bill of Rights. We have watched as candidates pledge to uphold the Constitution on the campaign trail and once elected they forget about their pledge in order to institute policy supported by their donors. We know until the corrupt D.C. system is upended, the Constitution will continue to be ignored.

Cruz is a Dominionist

Cruz is not your normal Evangelical. Cruz is an extreme rightwing evangelical Dominionist. He wants to replace our Constitution with his version of God's laws. He believes God called him and anointed him to be president so his church can control America.

Cruz does not do tithing. His tax records show he made over \$1 million per year from 2006 to 2010 and he gave ZIP to his church.

Cruz is a serial liar.

In the past month Cruz has told more lies about Donald Trump than we can count. Cruz believes the end justifies the means. Smart Evangelicals will drop Cruz and vote for Trump.

Cruz supports a pastor who tells you to kill gays.

MSNBC's Rachel Maddow reviewed the anti-gay diatribe by wacko Pastor Kevin Swanson at a National Religious Liberties Conference. Swanson held up his Bible as he shouted that God

commands we kill all homosexuals.

Then, right after his sermon, Swanson introduced presidential candidate Ted Cruz who walked on stage and shook Swanson's hand.

Cruz is a Globalist.

Cruz, like Obama, is a globalist. He supports NAFTA. He was a policy advisor for Bush/Cheney. Canada Cruz wants open borders, amnesty, and no wall.

Cruz's wife Heidi is a member of the Council on Foreign Relations and an executive in Goldman Sachs. Goldman Sachs wants a North American Union. Cruz wants to be the first president of the North American Union, which would join Canada, USA, and Mexico into one union.

Cruz can't negotiate.

In two debates, Donald Trump said he would try to negotiate a peace agreement between Israel and its neighbors. Cruz called such a negotiation a compromise of "principles." Cruz said he would never compromise his "principles" for the sake of a negotiation.

Twice in the debates, Cruz called negotiation "moral relativism." Cruz believes in "moral absolutism," which means, "It's my way or the highway." Cruz cannot negotiate.

Cruz is an economic moron.

Donald Trump said he would improve America's economy by using tariffs where necessary. Cruz claimed tariffs would raise prices and harm the economy.

Cruz does not understand feedback. Cruz sees only the immediate price effect of tariffs. Cruz does not realize that Trump's tariffs would protect America's manufacturing jobs and even bring manufacturing jobs back to America.

To have a good economy, America must manufacture its own goods where it makes sense. Manufacturing jobs pay higher wages. These higher wages more than make up for tariffs on imports.

Cruz choose the wrong side in the Chicago riot.

George Soros funded the riot in Chicago. Rioters included Sanders' supporters, known members of ISIS, and Bill Ayers. Police reports show the riot was much worse than most media told you.

Riots are illegal at events protected by the US Secret Service.

Breitbart reported:

The most stunning part of this whole storyline is perhaps not that liberals got violent trying to stop him: It's that Trump's GOP primary opponents, Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio, and Ohio Gov. John Kasich, blamed him and not the violent liberals for the chaos.

Infowars.com reported:

Ted Cruz, Marco Rubio and John Kasich sided with Bill Ayers, Black Lives Matter, Communists and violent far left protesters.

Ted Cruz lost support of prominent conservatives.

Cruz is not fit to be president.

Cruz is ineligible.

Cruz's VCEs claim they are "constitutionalists." Yet they support Cruz who is not a "natural born citizen."

Lawrence Tribe, Cruz's Harvard law professor, says Cruz is ineligible to be president. When Cruz was born in Canada in 1970, the Canadian government did not allow dual citizenship. It required Cruz's parents to choose between USA and Canada

for Ted Cruz's citizenship. They choose Canadian.

Ted Cruz was still a Canadian citizen when Texas elected him to the US Senate. He illegally served in the US Senate because was not a US citizen. Cruz is dishonest and unethical. See video below.

In 2014, Cruz became a "naturalized" citizen. This is further proof he is not a "natural born citizen." Cruz knows he is not eligible to be president. So he lies about it.

Don't expect the 5 or so eligibility lawsuits filed by non-candidates to stop Cruz. Only Donald Trump can prevail in an eligibility lawsuit against Canada Cruz. Trump's lawyers are ready to prove Cruz is not eligible. The problem is politics.

If Trump files the lawsuit, he may lose votes because the general public does not respond well to negative actions. So Trump must decide if and when he will drop his "trump" card on Cruz. Meanwhile, the best way to beat Cruz is with more votes.

To resolve the "natural born citizen" issue, elect Donald Trump. He will ask Congress to define "natural born citizen."

Conclusions

Americans will vote for Donald Trump.

Donald Trump is the only Republican candidate who can and will win the presidency.

He is the only candidate with the necessary and proven CEO experience to run American and to save our economy.

Trump will win the final election against Hillary by a landslide.

He will choose the best people for his cabinet and advisers. He already has Ben Carson, Chris Christie, Carl Icahn, Rudy Giuliani, and other superstars on his team.

Trump will choose the best Generals and Admirals. Trump will not micromanage how they do their job.

Trump will choose the best science adviser. I hope Trump contacts Princeton Professor of Physics Will Happer.

Trump will not take orders from the CFR. Trump will audit the Fed. Trump will build America's economy. We need a strong economy to make America great again.

I stand with those who want to build up America. I am an American.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Scientists use cult science to promote global warming agenda

Those who claim our CO2 causes significant climate change are delusional. They do not use the scientific method. They refuse to acknowledge data that proves their climate theory is wrong. They think they defeat a message when they attack the messenger.

They are more than half of our American population. They never learned to think because their schools never taught them how to think. Worse, their schools forced them to accept dogma rather than to always question dogma. It's not in our DNA to think logically. We must learn it.

The inability to think is not restricted to the left wing liberals. Many right wing conservatives have the same problem.

I found in my climate lectures that many right wing conservatives rejected the climate scam but only because this belief was part of their political religion. They never understood the logical reasons I presented to show why our CO2 does not cause significant climate change.

Below, I show you replies I made to two opinion letters in my local newspaper. Both letters attacked me personally which means the authors were morons. The authors, a PhD in ecology, a PhD in molecular biology, and an MD, thought their backgrounds made them better atmospheric physicists than me.

My replies show you that a PhD behind one's name does not make you smart. In fact, if a PhD has not learned how to use the scientific method, that PhD is not a real scientist. Unfortunately, too many universities grant PhD degrees without demanding the recipient understands the scientific method.

Before I present my two rebuttals, let's observe some important related politics. As we have seen from Obama, the president has significant influence on how America views climate change.

Marita Noon reviewed the views of presidential candidates on climate change in Breitbart:

Donald Trump is the biggest opponent of climate change, having called the man-made crisis view a "hoax" and tweeting that the Chinese started the global warming ruse "in order to make US manufacturing non-competitive."

In his book, Crippled America, Trump opens his chapter on energy with a tirade on climate change in which, talking about historic "violent climate changes" and "ice ages," he acknowledges that the climate does change, but concludes: "I just don't happen to believe they are man-made."

Therefore, the outcome of the current presidential election will have far more influence on how America views climate

change than 1000s of letters like mine.

Nevertheless, you should be able to learn something important about how to think by reading my two letters to the editor below.

The first opinion author is a moron who believes attacks on the messenger proves the message is wrong. So I had to defend myself as well as my message.

Click Daily Inter Lake to see my rebuttal in print on the right side of page 24. Notice the article to the left titled, "Montana fishing industry gutted by climate change." The authors are morons who claim Montana must "address climate change" to save its fish.

Face it. The average logic-impaired homo sapiens is not too logical. They "addressed" village problems by burning innocent ladies at the stake. They "addressed" lack of rain by cutting out beating hearts and rolling decapitated heads down temple stairs.

Today, they "address" climate change by raising our taxes, erecting uneconomical wind farms, and shutting down our abundant cheap energy. They can't tell the difference between facts and their political religion.

First Rebuttal: Matthews Bradley promotes Climate Lysenkoism

Matthews Bradley, a PhD in molecular biology, (Daily Inter Lake Feb 7) admits he is "not an expert in climate science." Yet, he makes irrational claims about climate science.

In the 1930s, Soviet biologist Lysenko made irrational claims. Lysenkoism set back Russian biology some 30 years until 1964.

Bradley promotes "Climate Lysenkoism."

He avoids logic and the scientific method. Like Lysenko, he thinks ad hominem attacks make a scientific argument.

Here are Bradley's unfounded claims followed by facts.

Bradley: Berry denies fundamental principles and facts in climate science. Berry never studied statistics. Berry's climate denials aren't credible. Berry claims to be a physicist. Berry doesn't understand that all quantitative scientific models and results are considered correct within a certain probability.

Facts: My physics mentors were the best in the world. My theoretical PhD thesis received instant worldwide attention because it solved a key problem in climate physics. It combines probability, statistics, numerical mathematics, and the scientific method. The Director of Nevada's Desert Research Institute credited my 1965 thesis with putting the institute on the map. Today, 50 years later, after most PhD theses are long forgotten, scientists still cite my thesis every month. Science textbooks discuss my thesis. Geologists, cosmologists, and engineers use my thesis to make calculations.

Bradley: Berry is an anomaly and huge outlier among the vast majority of scientists and particularly atmospheric physicists and climate scientists.

Facts: Only 64 of 11,944 peer-reviewed papers agree with Bradley. On my side are more than 1000 climate scientists, a huge number in this field. We are the majority. My side includes Dr. Ivar Giaever, a Democrat who won the 1973 Nobel Prize in Physics. Giaever concludes Bradley's climate claims are a religion because its believers reject data that show their belief is wrong.

Bradley: The earth would be an ice-covered planet without CO₂.

Fact: The water phase diagram, an elementary concept in climate physics, shows ice sublimation would add enough water vapor to produce today's greenhouse effect, with or without CO₂.

Bradley: The basic science is not very complicated: CO2 traps heat. CO2 has risen dramatically. Those basic facts will convince anyone that human fossil fuel burning causes the earth to warm.

Facts: Only fools believe a complex problem is so simple. The scientific method proves Bradley's simplistic cause and effect claim is invalid. Dr. Willie Soon's 2015 peer-reviewed paper shows CO2 does not even correlate with temperature, but solar radiation does.

Bradley: No credible scientist denies that CO2 is one of the most important greenhouse gases.

Facts: Bradley is not a credible scientist. Water vapor is more important than CO2. Data show water vapor and clouds keep the Earth's average greenhouse effect constant when CO2 changes.

Bradley: Each climate model prediction has a certain high probability of being correct (typically 95 percent or better).

Facts: We have had 37 years to test climate models. The 102 climate model average over-predicts temperature by a factor of 2.5. That is far outside Bradley's claim of 95 percent accurate, which would be acceptable. If your prediction is wrong, your theory is wrong.

Bradley: Oceans are warming, sea levels are rising, glaciers are shrinking. We have a serious problem. Ignoring it is disingenuous, irresponsible, and perhaps worse. Doing nothing is not an option. Deniers are either ideologues with rigid minds or on a paid agenda.

Facts: Rate of warming since 1950 is lower than in previous centuries before human CO2. Dr. Murry Salby's textbook "Physics of the Atmosphere and Climate" shows temperature, not human emissions, causes atmospheric CO2 to rise. Follow Salby's lectures [here](#).

Nature, not our CO2 causes climate change.

Matthews Bradley is an ideologue with a rigid mind.

Second Rebuttal: Elwood and Thiessen promote Cargo Cult Science

Elwood, an ecologist, and Thiessen, an MD, (Daily Inter Lake Feb 14) try to prove true the popular illusion that our CO2 emissions cause dangerous climate change. They fail. Let's call this failed illusion "AGW."

Before we proceed, let's park our partisanship and focus on truth. Climate change is a nonpartisan issue. We must decide nonpartisan issues on truth, not partisan votes.

The only way we can find truth about AGW is to use the scientific method.

Unfortunately, few people ever learn it and Elwood and Thiessen flunk it.

The method says we must use our theory to make a prediction. Then we test our prediction against new data. If our prediction disagrees with new data, our theory is wrong.

Richard Feynman explained: "It doesn't matter how beautiful your theory is. It doesn't matter how smart you are. If it doesn't agree with experiment, it's wrong."

We can never prove a theory true.

Yet Elwood and Thiessen claim to prove AGW true. We can only prove a theory false. We approach truth when we discard fiction.

Climate models use AGW to predict future climate. Today, 37 years later, climate models way over-predict future temperature, by 2.5 times on average. Therefore, AGW is wrong. AGW makes many more wrong predictions outside the scope of

this letter.

Elwood and Thiessen use what Feynman in 1974 called “cargo cult science.”

Cargo cult science seems to be scientific, but it does not follow the scientific method.

Elwood and Thiessen’s statements, “multiple, independent lines of evidence show conclusively,” “vanishingly small,” “thoroughly examined and tested” are cargo cult science.

Their statement, “the projected rate of global warming ... is greater than ... past 65 million years,” is cargo cult science. “Projections” are meaningless when your theory is wrong.

Their list of organizations that agree with them is cargo cult science. Their ad hominem attack on me is cargo cult science. Their letter contains NO science.

Before playing climate physicists, ecologist Elwood and medical doctor Thiessen should at minimum study Murry Salby’s textbook, “Physics of the Atmosphere and Climate.” Otherwise stick to something they know.

Using data, not theory, Salby proves surface temperature, not human CO₂ emissions, causes atmospheric CO₂ to change. Follow Salby’s lectures here.

Dr. Willie Soon’s 2015 peer-reviewed paper shows CO₂ does not even correlate with temperature, but solar irradiance does. No correlation means no cause-effect. CO₂ does not drive climate.

Elwood and Thiessen deny science that proves their theory is wrong.

They promote cargo cult science. They promote extremely costly illusions.

If Elwood and Thiessen were Aztecs they would claim cutting

out beating hearts causes rain.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Democrats' intellectual dishonesty is Montana's biggest problem

Republicans and Democrats will always have different opinions on partisan issues. We get that. We can live with that.

Jim Webb, 2016 Democratic presidential candidate correctly said,

The other party is not the enemy. They are the opposition. In our democracy we are lucky to have an opposition, to have honest debate.

Both sides must come together and decide nonpartisan issues on the basis of truth.

Today, I come down on Democrats. First, to show I am fair and balanced, note I have written extensively in support of the nonpartisan CSKT Water Compact. I found Montana was much better served with the Compact than without the Compact, and Republicans who voted against the Compact were intellectually dishonest.

Now that I have made 80 percent of the Republicans in Montana's 2015 House my opponents, but hopefully not my enemies, I will make opponents of most Democrats.

Today, the Missoulian published an article that reeks of

Democratic dishonesty:

“UM professor who shared Nobel for climate work believes UM Foundation should divest its investments in fossil fuels, starting with coal.”

I begin my reply to this dishonest Missoulian article with my “Columbo” moment:

So let me get this straight. UM professor Steve Running, who is a forest ecologist, who has no physics degree but masquerades as an atmospheric physicist, who lies that he shares Al Gore’s Nobel Peace Prize, who lies that a Peace Prize indicates expertise in science, who lies that our CO2 causes dangerous climate change, who does not use the scientific method, and who has no freakin’ idea of how the atmosphere works, now suggests the UM Foundation pull its money from fossil-fuel energy investments because he lies that doing so will help save the planet.

Have I made my point?

Professor Steve Running lies about having a Nobel Prize. The UM promotes his lie. The Missoulian, that should employ credible journalists, promotes his lie. Where do the lies stop?

Elected Democrats have claimed, in my presence, we have a global warming problem because Running said so and Running has a Nobel Prize so his statement means more than schmucks like me who say Running is wrong.

The Democrat’s evangelical promotion of their failed pseudo scientific climate theory is the worst intellectual failure of the Democratic Party. They have made their false belief a premise of their political religion. To them, it is a sin to question it.

These Democrats are as dumb as the kooks who believe our Earth

and universe are 6000 years old.

If they were Aztecs they would assure you that cutting out beating hearts and rolling decapitated heads down temple stairs causes rain.

They are so evangelical about their belief in Al Gore's pathetic version of climate physics that they cannot even have a rational discussion with real climate scientists.

Are Democrats so intellectually deprived that they cannot understand the difference between Steve Running, a Democrat who lies about having a Nobel Prize, and Ivar Giaever, a Democrat who has a real Nobel Prize in Physics, who tells you Running's idea about climate is pseudoscience and a cult religion because its believers reject data that proves their climate belief is wrong?

No, they are not. But as a group, Democrats won't acknowledge that climate is a nonpartisan issue, and we cannot determine scientific truth by voting on it.

The Democrats' false belief of climate is like Lysenko's false view of biology. Russia used Lysenko's intellectual dishonesty to support Russia's political agenda.

Today, Democrats use their false belief of climate to promote their political agenda.

Lysenkoism set back Russia's biological research for 30 years until Russia stopped it in 1964. The Democrat "Climate Lysenkoism," if not stopped, can set back America's climate physics 30 years.

The Scientific Method 101

For those who need a crash course in the scientific method, here it is. This should be taught in all high schools.

We get an idea or theory. To test our theory, we use our

theory to make a prediction. Then we compare our prediction to new data. If our prediction disagrees with new data, our theory is wrong.

Richard Feynman explained the key to the scientific method:

“It doesn’t matter how beautiful your theory is. It doesn’t matter how smart you are. If it doesn’t agree with experiment, it’s wrong.”

A fundamental principle is we can never prove a theory true. Yet Democrat climate addicts claim they have proved our CO2 causes dangerous global warming. Nonsense.

We can only prove a theory is false. When we prove our ideas are false, we discard fiction. When we discard fiction, we approach truth. But we can never know if we have found the truth.

Therefore, real scientists must try to prove their ideas are false. Those who promote their idea as true and try to make it part of a political agenda are pseudo scientists.

Einstein famously said,

“Many experiments may show me right but it takes only ONE experiment to prove me wrong.”

Many experiments have proved the Democrat’s “Climate Lysenkoism” is false but they ignore such proof. Like Energizer Bunnies, they beat their drums to drown out truth. Their political agenda is more important to them than truth.

Here are two examples that prove the Democrats’ version of climate change is false. Climate models use the Democrat’s climate theory to predict future climate.

Today, 37 years after their predictions, we find climate models way over-predict future temperature. They are over by 2.5 times on average. This is unacceptable in physics.

Therefore, following Feynman, the Democrat's version of climate science is wrong.

A 2015 peer-reviewed scientific paper shows CO₂ is not even correlated with global temperature. Where there is no correlation, there is no cause-effect. The paper shows the sun, not CO₂, drives global temperature. If you still think otherwise, get over it. Welcome to the real world of climate physics.

The real "deniers" are those who refuse to follow the scientific method.

The Democrats and Steve Running do not follow the scientific method. If they did, they would conclude their climate theory is wrong. Then we could save America and Montana a lot of money. We could put people back to work producing abundant cheap energy from fossil fuels. We could improve our economy, our educational system, and our political decisions.

Democrats use what Feynman in 1974 called "cargo cult science." Cargo cult science seems to be scientific, but it does not follow the scientific method.

Their claims that "multiple, independent lines of evidence show conclusively" that their belief is true, is cargo cult science.

Their claim that a list of organizations that agree with them proves their climate theory is true, is cargo cult science. Their belief that their ad hominem attack on those who show their theory is wrong proves their theory is true, is cargo cult science.

Their claims that "the projected rate of global warming is greater now than any time in the past 65 million years" proves their theory is true, is cargo cult science. Since climate models are wrong, their projections are wrong. Their claimed data are wrong.

Even IF today's global temperature were greater than past global temperatures, this is meaningless. That's because such data says nothing about the cause of global temperature change. The whole public distraction over temperature change, glacier change, species change, etc., is irrelevant to the key question of what causes the change.

Here's a big problem the Democrats have caused

The UM has "educated" a generation of Montanans to believe cargo cult climate science. These students don't know the difference between cargo cult science and real science.

The biggest omission in Montana's education system is our schools do not teach the scientific method. This omission causes irrational thinking. We can't trust the Democrats to solve this problem because the scientific method opposes their political agenda.

Therefore, Montana voters have only one rational choice if they wish to improve Montana's schools: elect Republican Elsie Arntzen for Superintendent of Schools.

Montana climate politics

Montana Governor Steve Bullock (D) declared after the Supreme Court's ruling on Obama's Clean Power Plan:

"I have been clear that I think these rules were unfair to Montana. Given the court's ruling today, I am putting the work of the Clean Power Plan Council on hold. What we cannot put on hold, however, is the need to address climate change and embrace Montana's energy future, and I am committed to ensuring we do so on our own terms."

Montana Attorney General Tim Fox (R) supported the court's decision:

"The U.S. Supreme Court's decision to halt implementation of the EPA's carbon regulations is a clear victory for Montana

and the 27 other states that are challenging those regulations in court. Today's ruling will prevent Montana families, energy workers, businesses, and public agencies from bearing the burden of regulations that we believe will be overturned ultimately."

Montana U.S. Senator Steve Daines (R) also supported the court's decision:

"The Supreme Court decision to issue a nationwide stay on the Obama administration's misguided, job-killing rule is great news for Montana. The so-called Clean Power Plan will kill Montana jobs and leads our country in the wrong direction – away from being an energy leader."

Although climate is a nonpartisan issue, Democrats refuse to treat climate as a nonpartisan issue. Governor Bullock still wants to "address" climate change.

Montana Governor Race

Greg Gianforte (R) now challenges Governor Steve Bullock (D) for governor. Gianforte's skeleton in his closet is his belief our Earth and universe are 6000 years old. So how can Gianforte hope to win?

The only way Gianforte can beat Bullock for governor is to prove to the voters that Bullock's belief in "climate change" is more kooky and more economically destructive than Gianforte's belief that our Earth and universe are 6000 years old.

If Gianforte has the smarts, balls, and public persuasion, he can turn the political battle for governor into the issue of who has the most kooky and destructive belief.

If Gianforte can make Montanan's understand our CO2 is not dangerous, then he will have improved intellectual honesty, and he may just beat Bullock for governor.

He will need to bone up on the scientific method and real climate science to pull it off. The way I see it, this is Gianforte's only chance to win.

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Why Donald Trump will be our next president

It won't be easy but here's why it will happen.

Life is a war between good and evil. The hero risks his life to make good prevail over evil. Joseph Campbell wrote about this in his "The power of Myth."

Campbell said our popular myths derive from the meaningful stories of old. They survived hundreds of generations.

Campbell's "Power of Myth" became the foundation of George Lucas's Star Wars movies. That's why we like Star Wars movies. Our hero, Luke Skywalker, led the war against the forces of evil.

Donald Trump is in a war for the presidency. Coincidentally, Trump's war occurs during the new Star Wars movie. Trump is the hero who leads America's war against the dark forces of evil.

He will win some battles. He will lose some battles. In the end, like Luke Skywalker, Donald Trump will prevail. This end of the story is written in our genes and our culture.

Campbell wrote,

“The adventure matches the readiness of the hero. Follow your bliss and doors will open for you where they would open for no one else.”

The anti-Trump forces are split between Cruz and Rubio. The two-forked dark plan is to use Cruz to steal votes of the unwary from Trump while Rubio leads the forces of evil.

Behind the curtain of evil are the sinister men who control Cruz and Rubio and even Hillary. If their puppet wins, they will control America.

We already know two truths. Cruz cannot beat Rubio. Rubio can't beat Hillary or Bernie. Therefore, Donald Trump is the only Republican candidate who can win the presidency.

Some will deny these truths because they support another candidate. Yet, the data clearly show these truths will prevail.

The Climate Scam

The puppeteers behind both Cruz and Rubio benefit from the climate scam. Therefore, no matter how strong Cruz may seem against the climate scam, he will not be able to stop the detrimental effects of the climate scam on America. Nor can Rubio.

Donald Trump is the only candidate we can trust to stop the climate scam, the EPA, and all the economic damages the climate scam does to our economy.

What happened in Iowa?

Des Moines Register/Bloomberg poll right before the caucus scored Trump 28, Cruz 23, Rubio 15, and Carson 10. The caucus produced the following differences from the polls:

- Trump went from 28 to 24.
- Cruz went from 23 to 28.

- Rubio went from 15 to 23.
- Carson went from 10 to 9.

These changes, especially the rise of Rubio from 15 to 23, are statistically out of range. Today's polls typically have an error range of about plus or minus 3 percent. They are very good because today's pollsters use good ground data and good mathematics to make their predictions.

Nate Silver, of FiveThirtyEight, predicted Trump would win Iowa and the next five elections. Nate's predictions are never wrong unless something happened to mess up the elections.

Well, here are some problems with the Iowa caucus.

A minor point shows a GOP bias. There were a total of 186,874 GOP caucus votes. Cruz got 51,666, Trump 45,427, and Rubio 43,165 votes. Iowa has 27 delegates to distribute. The GOP rules read, "The proportional allocation shall be rounded to the nearest whole delegate." Delegate means integer.

A simple calculation using the above data shows Cruz scored 7.46, Trump scored 6.56, and Rubio scored 6.24. These numbers round to Cruz 7, Trump 7, and Rubio 6 delegates each. But the GOP gave Cruz 8 delegates.

The truth is Trump tied with Cruz for 7 delegates each. Have you heard this from the news media? Or Rush or Hannity? Or Newsmax? NO. Even the so-called conservative news media tells us lies.

Some 250,000 people stood in line in the snow to attend Trump's Iowa rallies. Do you really believe only 45,427 Trump supporters attended the caucus?

Rubio's rise from 15 to 23 percent can't happen. Iowa has twice the ratio of conservative to moderate voters as the other states. A moderate like Rubio can't come close to Cruz in Iowa.

Rubio's Iowa campaign was virtually nonexistent. His events had at most 10% of the attendees of Trump's events. Do you really believe Rubio scored close to Trump and Cruz?

One caucus observer noticed the reported votes for Cruz maintained exactly 3000 votes ahead of Trump until near the end of the count. Every time Trump got a vote, Cruz got a vote.

An Iowa voter reported the GOP caucus turned away about 100,000 voters because they "ran out of ballots."

Another Iowa voter reported the GOP caucus was unlike any before. Before, they went into rooms for their candidate. This year, whole crowds of 4000 went to any table they wanted and they could easily vote more than once.

Cruz was the only candidate who was against subsidies to make ethanol from corn. Yet caucus data show Cruz won Kossuth and Sioux counties. These are the first and fourth biggest corn-producing counties in Iowa. Do you really believe Cruz won these counties?

Who counted the votes?

"Those who vote decide nothing. Those who count the vote decide everything." – Joseph Stalin

The GOP contracted with Microsoft to count Iowa votes with new Microsoft software. Microsoft is the second largest direct donor to Rubio.

Rubio is a lead sponsor of a bill called I-Squared, which triples the number of H-1B visas. Big technology firms like Microsoft and Oracle support I-Squared. In 2013, they backed Rubio's "Gang of 8" immigration bill.

Oracle's Larry Ellison hosted a fundraiser for Rubio's campaign. Ellison also gave \$3 million to the pro-Rubio super PAC.

Why did the GOP allow Rubio donor Microsoft count the votes?

I am a software professional. One year, I won the "People's Choice Award" in a Microsoft and Computerworld "Windows World Open Custom Application Contest."

There are general rules when you implement new software. One rule is to always keep your original method for doing calculations until you can test and certify new software.

Yet, the GOP discarded its old vote-counting methods when it let Microsoft count the votes. It's a perfect crime. Neither the GOP nor Microsoft has a paper trail to recount votes.

Microsoft even miscalculated the 8 delegates for Cruz when it Cruz really got 7. (Software, by the way, has different methods to round numbers to an integer. Microsoft did not use its own software properly.)

Why Rubio can't win the presidency

Obama still has a 47 to 50 percent approval rating. That's the famous "47 percent" Romney referenced in 2012. This means the only way a Republican candidate can win the presidency with today's voter demographics is to attract Democrat voters.

Rubio's "manufactured" third place finish in Iowa means he is now the consensus establishment candidate. However, Rubio does not attract Independent and Democrat voters. Rubio would be another Romney.

To further guarantee they win, the Democrats will file eligibility lawsuits against Cruz or Rubio, if the GOP nominates either of them. This political tactic will assure the Democrats win the presidency whether or not the Supreme Court decides later that they are eligible.

Why Cruz can't win the nomination

Cruz is not the innocent, ethical, conservative evangelical

candidate his supporters believe he is. My tweet about Cruz went viral:

“Cruz is worst insider. Owned by CFR. Ineligible. Lies. Cheats. Dominionist. Globalist. No ethics. Big \$ Puppet.”

Cruz told thousands of caucus voters that Trump strongly supported ObamaCare.

Cruz mailed a false “Voter Violation” certificate to thousands of voters, a misdemeanor at minimum.

Cruz sent a false announcement that claimed Ben Carson had abandoned the race and told Carson voters to vote for Cruz.

In the debate without Trump, Cruz crashed. Here are some viewer comments on Cruz:

- When Cruz got booed, he said “I might have to leave the stage!” He barely got any laughter. Very awkward.
- Cruz started whining and was called out on his lies and flipflops.
- Cruz got his tail caught in Megyn Kelly’s cage on amnesty.
- Cruz appeared stiff & rehearsed. He was typical “Cruz”. No authenticity.
- Cruz is unlikable. Period. Not funny.
- According to CNN Trump won.
- Shapiro gave Cruz a “C” on the debate and he loves Cruz.

Cruz never “settled” his eligibility question after Trump challenged him. Yet, Iowa voters did not penalize Cruz on his questionable eligibility.

New Hampshire

A recent University of Massachusetts poll for New Hampshire has Trump at 36, Rubio 15, Cruz 14, Bush 8, Kasich 7, Christie 5, Carson 4, Fiorina 4, Undecided 7. We can use these data to draw some conclusions.

After Rubio's fraudulent rise in Iowa, he will attract the votes for Bush, Kasich, Christie, and Fiorina. Using the New Hampshire data, Rubio would add 24 votes to his present 15 to give him 39 percent.

But Trump has a few cards up his sleeve as well. Carson voters may move to Trump. This would give him 40 percent. It's going to be close.

About half the Cruz votes will eventually move to Trump. The other half will support Cruz to the end. They are the former Ron Paul supporters who would not support Romney after the nomination.

They booed Trump when he mentioned Cruz might not be eligible. They think they are pristine constitutionalists but they ignore the Constitution when it conflicts with their desires. Those who stick with Cruz really support Hillary or Bernie.

Trump

Trump is the only Republican candidate who can beat Hillary or Bernie because only Trump draws votes from Independents and Democrats.

Here are some comments by callers to C-Span after its showing of Trump's fund raiser:

- I'm a Democrat and I am voting for Donald Trump. I have many Democrat friends who will also vote for Trump.
- Trump is authentic. He is not political. He does not have to do this. He is doing this for America.
- I'm a Democrat. I have never voted before but I am changing parties so I can vote for Donald Trump.
- This is the first time I have been excited about an election. I am voting for Donald Trump.
- I'm a Democrat. I voted for Obama and I now realize that was a big mistake. I am voting for Donald Trump.
- Every American must get out and vote for Donald Trump. Only

Trump will make America great again.

- I have never voted before but I will vote for Trump.
- Trump is the once-in-a-lifetime opportunity for America. We will never have a chance like this again.

Some people criticize Trump for not spending more money at his campaign. He spent about one-tenth what Cruz spent in Iowa. That's the kind of president we want. Trump knows how to get the most bang for the buck.

Some people criticize Trump because he used Chapter 11 for 4 of his over 500 companies. The other candidates have not started one company. Candidates with no real business experience should not be put in control of America.

I don't trust a man who has never failed. We learn our best lessons from our failures.

Would you hire a pilot with 100 hours or with 20,000 hours? Unless you have a death wish you will choose the pilot with 20,000 hours.

Cruz and Rubio are like pilots with 100 hours. Trump is like a pilot with 20,000 hours. Trump can make America great again. Cruz or Rubio or Hillary or Bernie cannot.

Joseph Campbell has words of advice for Donald Trump and all those who wish to win life's battles:

- Follow your bliss. The real end is the journey.
- We are all agents in the structuring of other peoples' lives.
- Eternity is now. Time is our experience.
- "Use the force, Luke!"
- Later, we will ask: "Who composed this plot?"

Today is Al Gore's global warming doomsday

Here we are on January 26, 2016. Do you feel the heat? Do you see the clouds are gone and the sky is glowing red?

Ten years ago, on January 25, 2006, Al Gore stood before his Sundance audience at the screening of his "An Inconvenient Truth."

Al Gore waved his quivering finger in the air and told his audience that unless the world takes drastic measures to reduce greenhouse gases within the next 10 years, we will reach a point of no return.

Gore said our CO2 emissions would cause Earth to go into a runaway heat death.

The Washington Post reported Al Gore "believes humans may have only 10 years left to save the planet from turning into a total frying pan."

CBS News wrote Gore predicted the earth would be in "a true planetary emergency" within the next ten years unless drastic action is taken to reduce greenhouse gases.

Al Gore's people have been singing like the Donkey in Schrek, "I believe, I believe."

Eco-freak groups have tried in vain to save the planet from our CO2. Don't they know it's too late? It's over? We're done for?

Nothing they can do now can save Earth. Al Gore said so. They can relax now and enjoy the heat before we all perish.

Could it be that Al Gore is mistaken? That cannot be.

If Al Gore is wrong then he has betrayed millions of global warmers. They have devoted their lives to Al Gore. Their devotion is their religion. Because global warming is their religion they cannot hear, see, or touch any evidence that might prove their religion is wrong.

But. But. But.

Unless there are no more clouds in the sky and no more snow on the ground, then Al Gore is wrong. You know what Richard Feynman said about the scientific method:

If your prediction is wrong then your hypothesis is wrong.

And if you reject the scientific method then you reject true science. Unless you reject your hypothesis that our CO₂ causes global warming (or climate change) then your belief is a religion, not science.

You see, Al Gore believed the climate models. But climate models are not reality. Models are but an attempt to simulate reality. We must test models against reality. If the models' predictions are wrong then the climate models are wrong.

Look at the red line in the chart. That is the average climate model prediction. According to the average of climate model prediction, Earth's global temperature has risen 0.7 C since 1980.

No wonder it's so hot and there is no snow in Washington, D.C.

But wait. That is a model prediction, right? A model prediction is not reality, right?

Have you ever witnessed an incorrect weather prediction? Now you have witnessed an incorrect climate prediction.

The blue circles and green squares show the real data. They

show the earth's global temperature is only 0.2 C higher than in 1980. Al Gore is wrong. The climate models are wrong. The hypothesis that our CO2 causes global warming is wrong. Checkmate.

Isn't it time the ecofreaks check their climate religion at the door and wake up to reality? If they did, they would save the world a lot of money.

Epilog

Aztecs priests cut out beating hearts, then rolled decapitated heads down the temple stairs to make rain. When rain came, the priests claimed their methods worked. The people believed the priests. So the priests stayed in business.

Today, global warming priests shut down coal-fired electric power plants, tax you to pay for electric cars and wind farms, and sic the EPA on your state to control your businesses and industry.

We think the Aztecs were delusional. But today, as a nation, we are just as delusional as the Aztecs.

Today's ecofreaks waste time and money trying to "address" climate change when they don't even understand what causes climate change. Today's ecofreaks would have supported the Aztec priests in their day.

Today, our schools do not teach students how to think. They don't teach students how to tell a bad hypothesis from a good hypothesis.

Can you tell me what is wrong with the Aztec hypothesis?

You know the Aztec hypothesis is wrong. But can you tell me the general method you would use to reject the Aztec hypothesis?

If not, then your schools have defrauded you of an education.

You are ripe to believe in any wacko idea that comes along.

Just because you agree with me about global warming does not prove you have learned how to think.

Many rightwing folks agree with me about global warming because it is a part of their political "religion." Well, the ecofreaks believe just the opposite because it's a part of their religion.

We have many obstacles to overcome in order to learn how to think

We have Pope Francis who preaches the climate cult religion. He should promote good science like Catholic schools taught when I went to high school.

We have a Montana governor who does not know how to appoint qualified people to a climate board. Our Montana climate board has no climate scientist. This is like a medical board with no medical doctor.

Our Montana climate board has medical doctors who "believe" our carbon dioxide emissions cause wildfire smoke. Is "belief" the qualification for a board? The board has no one to suggest the doctors have not properly diagnosed the cause-effect relationships of our atmosphere.

I don't practice medicine but some medical doctors practice atmospheric physics. Does our governor not understand the difference between scientific disciplines?

Is there anything more important in life than to be able to tell the difference between a valid cause-effect relationship and a fraudulent one?

Look at some of the reasons ecofreaks "believe" in global warming. They say polar bears are dying, animals are going extinct, the seas are going acidic, the oceans are rising, and, yes, atmospheric CO₂ is rising.

But for CO₂, these claimed events are incorrect, but suppose they were correct. Would that prove our carbon dioxide emissions caused the events?

What is the fallacy of this reasoning?

The fallacy is consequences do not prove causation. Just because something happens does not prove what causes it to happen. The only way to determine causation is to use the scientific method.

There are three parts to the global warming hypothesis:

1. Our carbon dioxide emissions cause the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide.
2. Added atmospheric carbon dioxide increases global temperature.
3. Therefore, our carbon dioxide emissions cause dangerous global warming.

As we will show, all three parts are wrong.

Our government has spent some \$100 billion on climate models. These climate models were supposed to show the above three part hypothesis is correct.

The problem is the climate models have failed. Climate models failed because they do not include accurate atmospheric science. Today's climate models are the premier example of garbage in, garbage out.

Our atmosphere and its interactions with our biosphere and oceans are vastly more complicated than Al Gore told you. Our atmosphere is as complicated as the human body. No simplistic hypothesis about how either of them work is acceptable.

If we really want to know what drives climate, we must throw out the Al Gore "science" and look to the real science.

Here are some highlights in the real science

As I have previously outlined, there are major problems with the simplistic view that CO₂ acts like a blanket that warms what is under it.

Dr. Murry Salby is the author of the 666-page, 2012 textbook "Physics of the Atmosphere and Climate." He shows that the first part of global warming hypothesis is wrong. Our carbon dioxide emissions do not cause the observed increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide.

Salby uses advanced physics and math to analyze CO₂ data. He proves mathematically that surface temperature, not human CO₂ emissions, causes the change in atmospheric CO₂.

Salby's conclusion does not depend on theory. It results from proper data analysis and mathematics.

Watch Salby's two presentations. If you do not follow Salby's lecture then you do not understand atmospheric science.

Dr. Ferenc Miskolczi shows how part two of Al Gore's global warming hypothesis is wrong. Added atmospheric carbon dioxide does not increase the greenhouse effect or global temperature.

Miskolczi's peer-reviewed scientific papers show atmospheric water vapor and clouds adjust to changes in CO₂ to keep Earth's greenhouse effect constant. Miskolczi's predictions match observations. Changes in atmospheric CO₂ do not change the greenhouse effect and do not cause global warming.

Dr. Willie Soon is lead author of a 2015 peer-reviewed paper that shows our sun, not CO₂, drives climate. He shows how CO₂ and total solar irradiance correlate with temperature from 1880 to 2013.

In the figure, the blue temperature lines in each plot are the same. Only the red line is different.

In the first plot, the red line represents CO₂. It shows CO₂ is not similar to temperature. Therefore, CO₂ does not drive

temperature.

In the second plot, the red line represents total solar irradiance. The good match shows total solar irradiance is a major driver of earth's temperature.

Dr. David Evans is an expert mathematician. He found a serious error in climate models. When Evans corrects for this model error alone, climate model temperature predictions decrease by 80 to 90 percent.

Climate models use the old Arrhenius assumption that Earth responds to CO₂ change like it responds to change in solar radiation. The Arrhenius assumption is incorrect. Climate responds much differently to changes in CO₂ than it does to changes in solar radiation.

Dr. Ivar Giaever won the 1973 Nobel Prize in Physics. He is a Democrat who puts scientific truth above partisanship. He is not an ecofreak.

Giaever explains why Al Gore's global warming hypothesis is pseudoscience. He says climate alarmists have made their idea a new religion and therefore can't question it. He shows many conflicts of the alarmist climate idea with the real world of physics.

Conclusions

The choice is yours. You can either accept true science or reject it. If you reject it, you will live in a world of delusion. You will be like the Aztecs who believed their human sacrifices really caused rain.

Of course, you will not believe in same delusions the Aztecs did. But you will believe in delusions that are just as irrational. You will not know your belief is wrong. If your belief is like a religion, you will refuse to consider evidence your belief is wrong.

So, here's your homework:

If you had a time machine to transport back to an Aztec community, what argument would you use before an impartial court to show their human sacrifices did not cause the subsequent rain?

© 2016 Edwin X Berry, PhD – All Rights Reserved

Why Bernie Sanders could be our next president

Don't get me wrong. I am a hat-wearing supporter of Donald Trump. Trump is doing great in the polls. As I write this, Trump might win in Iowa.

But here's the problem. Cruz might win the Republican nomination. Then he will lose to Sanders. And America will be history.

There are anti-Trump votes out there. They are presently split between Rubio, Bush, Kasich, and Christy. These moderate voters are frustrated that none of their four candidates pulls more votes than Cruz. That, of course is because these moderate four are splitting the moderate votes.

Maybe a moderate candidate will break away from the foursome in New Hampshire. If so, then anti-Trump votes will converge on that moderate candidate.

If the anti-Trump votes converge on one moderate candidate, then that candidate would be the anti-Trump candidate of choice. That moderate candidate would easily beat Cruz and remove our concern that Cruz might be our next president.

That would change the present two-way race between Trump versus Cruz, to Trump versus the moderate candidate. This would give Trump a better chance to win.

But what if no moderate candidate dominates in New Hampshire? Then anti-Trump voters will start to see Cruz as the only possible way to defeat Trump.

If all these anti-Trump votes go to Cruz, then Cruz will be our next president. This can happen whether we like it or not, and whether Cruz is ineligible or not.

Yes, Donald Trump is in a fight of his life for all of us who believe in him. He is our best and only hope to save America.

Unfortunately, many far-right conservatives, former Ron Paul supporters who would not vote for Romney, now back Cruz. They are the core problem in this election. They are idealistic about Cruz and could care less if he is ineligible. Very strange for voters who claim to support our constitution but these people are not rational.

They are the ones who booed Trump in the last debate when Trump mentioned that Cruz should get a declaratory judgment to prove his eligibility, or risk taking down the Republican Party.

A strange thing about politics is how a strong pull by the far right can result in the election of a leftwing candidate. The far right tea party did this in Montana in 2012 when they emotionally voted Libertarian because Republican candidates "were not good enough for them."

Their Libertarian votes elected Democrat Steve Bullock as governor, Jon Tester for US Senator, and many Democrats to statewide offices. All these Democrat wins were by fewer votes than the votes for the Libertarian candidates.

Although many of these tea party voters are evangelical, they

do not accept or understand the Biblical advice, "By their works we shall know them." These Montana tea party voters will not accept that they are responsible for the works of Senator Tester and Obama.

Furthermore, they just don't care. Today, these tea party folks rally around Ted Cruz and claim Donald Trump does not follow the constitution. They do not even concern themselves that Cruz may be ineligible according to our constitution. If they were smart, they would realize Donald Trump is their only hope to get what they really want for America.

What about the Cruz and Rubio eligibility issue?

If moderates converge on Cruz, the eligibility issue will not matter in the Republican nomination. The Republican establishment will happily nominate Cruz or Rubio and suffer the consequences, rather than to nominate Donald Trump. They will risk losing to Sanders rather than let Donald Trump take over the Republican Party.

Yes, the Democrats will sue if Republicans nominate either Cruz or Rubio. Then Sanders may be our next president. Hillary, as we now know, will likely be in jail. Sanders will be a stronger Democratic, or I should say socialist, candidate than Hillary because he does not have Benghazi hanging over his head.

A few readers of my article "Cruz and Rubio are eligible to be president," read the tapes in their brains before they read what I wrote. They assumed without evidence that I personally believed they were technically eligible. These readers considered my behavior a mortal sin according to their tea party religion. Some actually chastised me in their emails and comments.

Actually, I did not discuss my personal opinion. I made it clear that, as a physicist, I do not play lawyer. I do not attempt to judge which side might win if the eligibility issue

ever receives a proper review in a court of law. Frankly, it's a waste of my time to play lawyer and judge because my legal opinion is irrelevant to a court of law.

What I wrote was I believe those who argue the eligible side would "prevail" in a court of law.

There is a difference between a prediction and a desire. In 2008, I desired McCain to beat Obama. I voted for McCain. At the same time, I predicted Obama would win.

Similarity, I desire that Cruz and Rubio be proven ineligible but I predict that will not happen.

My main point, as you can see emphasized in the 80 or so comments on my article, is that by law Cruz and Rubio are eligible until proven ineligible in a court of law. Since no one has yet proven them ineligible, they are legally eligible.

I encourage you who make legal arguments that Cruz and Rubio are ineligible, to act rather than talk. Internet debates about law are useless. If you who have good arguments want to be useful, get your arguments into a court of law.

We know some people have done this. Unfortunately, only the Texas lawsuit has made the news. It will take a court longer to make a decision than it will to elect the next president. Once the votes are cast, the nomination will be concluded. We need another strategy.

Donald Trump showed his wisdom in how he handled the eligibility issue with Cruz. Trump did not claim that Cruz is ineligible. That would have started a legal debate that Trump could not win in the court of public opinion. That would have cost him votes.

Trump kept his eye on the goal: votes. Trump realized the court of public opinion is greater than a court of law that could take two years to make a decision.

Trump reversed the burden of proof. The burden of proof in a court of law is upon those who attempt to prove Cruz or Rubio guilty. This burden of proof makes it more difficult to win. Trump told Cruz he should get a declaratory judgment to prove he is eligible. That puts the burden of proof on Cruz.

How did Cruz respond? He laughed it off!

Cruz will not get a declaratory judgment. That is proof in the court of public opinion that he does not care and he is a fraud. He wants to be the first president of the North American Union. He wants to be a puppet for his money providers. He wants to bring dominionism to America.

Cruz laughed it off!

That Cruz laughed off the possibility that he "might be ineligible" is the issue that Trump supporters must push now. Forget trying to resolve the legal technicalities on internet debates.

Elections are in process. Trump is an excellent candidate. He needs our help to overcome the threat by Cruz. The best way to get Cruz on eligibility is to shout loudly that, as a lawyer, Cruz will not accept the fact that the eligibility issue is "unsettled."

The voting public will care that Cruz's eligibility is "unsettled." They will care that Cruz refuses to do anything about it. They will not care about your detailed legal arguments where you attempt to prove Cruz is ineligible.

The public will not understand legal mumbo jumbo. But the public will understand that Cruz "threatens" America when his eligibility is "unsettled."

As a candidate, Trump can lose by being too negative. He must be positive as much as possible. It's up to us to do his negative dirty work.

Let's review what Trump said in the debate:

"The fact is, there is a big overhang. There's a big question mark on your head. And you can't do that to the party. You really can't. You can't do that to the party. You have to have certainty. Even if it was a one percent chance, and it's far greater than one percent... I mean, you have great constitutional lawyers that say you can't run. If there was a—and you know I'm not bringing a suit. I promise. But the Democrats are going to bring a lawsuit, and you have to have certainty. You can't have a question. I can agree with you or not, but you can't have a question over your head."

Cruz responded:

"Well, listen, I've spent my entire life defending the Constitution before the US Supreme Court. And I'll tell you, I'm not going to be taking legal advice from Donald Trump. The chances of any litigation proceeding and succeeding on this are zero. And Mr. Trump is very focused on Larry Tribe. Let me tell you who Larry Tribe is."

Cruz evaded the question. Cruz is smart. He knows what he is doing. But his reply avoids the question. Larry Tribe is irrelevant. There are good lawyers on both sides. That makes the issue unsettled. Cruz did not prove the issue is settled. He did not prove his candidacy is not a threat to the Republican Party

We need to turn Cruz's strength into weakness. Show the public how Cruz is too slick, too practiced, too insincere, and too artificial. He's a good puppet for his puppet masters. His puppet masters loaned Cruz money and you better bet there are lots of strings attached.

Jerry Falwell, Jr., endorsed Trump. Phyllis Schlafly said "Trump is the last hope for America." Sarah Palin endorsed Trump and is campaigning for Trump in Iowa. The Iowa governor told Iowans, "Cruz must be defeated." John Wayne's daughter

endorsed Trump. John Wayne was born in Iowa.

Trump is on a roll. But to defeat the threat of Cruz we must help Trump win Iowa.

Donald Trump has the best tax plan to restore America's economy. He has the best immigration plan to stop the destruction of America. He has the best defense plan to make America strong. He has the best Second Amendment plan to assure America's freedom. He has the best veterans plan to assure we properly care for our veterans. He has the best trade plan to bring jobs back to America.

No candidate brings as much potential value to America as Donald Trump. No candidate but Trump brings in new voters. That is why only Trump can beat Sanders.

Perhaps most important, Donald Trump will bring back control of America to the American people. In my opinion, we lost control of America when they shot John Fitzgerald Kennedy. Today, we see how the Washington Republican elite tries to defeat the Republican's leading candidate. No candidate but Donald Trump has the chance to beat the Republican elite and give America back to our people.

I do not understand how those who claim to be "freedom fighters" or "patriots" do not support Donald Trump.

I do not understand how those who have waited in vain for a "man on a white horse" to save America to not support Donald Trump.

I do not understand how those who correctly praised Dinesh D'Souza's and Gerald Molen's "America" do not support Donald Trump. Donald Trump is the only candidate who will truly build up America.

We must begin to build up America again. We must make America great again. We must support Donald Trump for president.

Ed Berry Archive 2014 – 2015

- [A Physics View of Climate Change](#), 12-26-15
- [Cruz and Rubio are eligible to be president](#), 12-17-15
- [Pope Francis preaches cult climate religion](#), 11-30-15
- [Why a vote for Carson is a vote for Rubio](#), 11-21-15
- [Assessing Presidential Candidates on Climate Change](#), 11-3-15
- [Chuck Baldwin Wrong About Ryan Zinke](#), 10-18-14