

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



By Ed Berry, PhD, Theoretical Physics, CCM

November 19, 2024

My goal in this article is to help Elon Musk and Vivek Ramaswamy make America more efficient. Americas largest unnecessary cost is caused by the climate scam.

I also to apply for Elon's reward for the most cost-effective carbon capture method. My method costs zero because it shows nature controls the CO₂ level.

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.

Today's AI is good at deduction, but it incorrectly assumes consensus determines truth. To be intelligent, AI must use the *scientific method*.

Worldwide, a handful of climate physicists who use the scientific method have proved in published peer-reviewed literature that human CO₂ emissions do not change the climate. In fact, they show human CO₂ emissions have an insignificant effect on the level of atmospheric CO₂.

The World Economic Forum and the deep state censor these scientists. WEF promotes the climate consensus to control

America by 2030.

America's biggest, useless expense is based on the incorrect assumption that human CO₂ causes dangerous climate change. This incorrect assumption, easily disproved, costs America more than its national defense, and all of America's annual deficit.

Climate politics today incorrectly ASSUMES human CO₂ causes dangerous climate change and spends no time and no money to determine if this assumption is true.

As a consequence, the dominant political climate arguments are opinions about how much money to spend to try to lower human CO₂ emissions, while ignoring the truth that human CO₂ emissions do not even control the CO₂ level, much less cause climate change.

The Democrats want to spend more money, and Republicans want to spend less money. But both sides waste money because they reject scientific truth.

Would it not make sense to spend a small amount of time and money to evaluate the proof that human CO₂ does not control the climate?

Obviously, yes, but the government has no money to check the reality of its biggest waste of money. Elon and Vivek can make this check happen.

The COVID panic a few years ago lowered human CO₂ emissions by about 20% for a year. However, the CO₂ level continued to rise without any effect from lowered human CO₂ emissions.

That should be a wake-up call to check the alarmist consensus assumption that human CO₂ controls the CO₂ level.

The scientific method

No one automatically knows how to think. We must learn how to think. That's why good schools are critical to America's survival.

Our Homo Sapiens' brains saved us in the wild but fail us in science. We think we know the scientific method, but we don't.

Aristotle developed the scientific method 2400 years ago. Sir Francis Bacon expanded on the scientific method 500 years ago.

Today, the scientific method is part of the Philosophy of Science. It is not an arbitrary set of rules. It is the only way to find truth in science. But fewer than about two percent of all PhD scientists have learned the scientific method.

The scientific method is simple, but it takes some thinking.

At Caltech, I learned science, but Caltech did not formally teach the scientific method while I was there from 1953 to 1957.

Dartmouth College offered me a teaching fellowship in physics. There, I learned the scientific method from John Kemeny, who learned it when he was a special mathematical assistant to Albert Einstein.

Kemeny's course in the Philosophy of Science, including the scientific method, and his course in Probability and Markov Chains, changed my life.

Richard Feynman, Nobel Laureate in Physics, later taught the same Scientific Method at Cornell and Caltech.

The scientific method begins and ends with data.

Using data, we formulate an idea, hypothesis, or assumption to connect a cause to an effect. This step is induction.

Then we insert data into our assumption to make a testable prediction. This step is deduction.

Then we compare the prediction with new data.

If our prediction is correct, our hypothesis **may** be correct, but successful predictions do not prove a hypothesis is true because the next experiment may prove it is false.

Albert Einstein said, "many experiments may prove me right, but it takes only one to prove me wrong."

It is impossible to prove an assumption is true. We can only prove an assumption is false.

The key to science is, if any prediction disagrees with data, the hypothesis is false.

Proof that an assumption is false overrides all claims and scientific consensus that the assumption is true. Votes do not count in science.

The scientific method applies only to things we can measure. It does not apply to things we cannot measure.

We cannot measure God or heaven or the spirit world. That's why our Constitution gives us freedom of religion. No one has any scientific basis to tell us our belief about God is wrong.

You can have any opinion you want about something we cannot measure. But when religion steps into areas that we can measure, science wins.

For example, measurements prove the Earth is a lot more than 6000 years old.

Climate change is about science, not feelings or religion. The Pope is not a scientist.

A legal trial example of using the scientific method

In a trial where a prosecution accuses Smith of shooting Jones, the prosecution will try to show a connection between Smith having a gun, aiming his gun at Jones, pulling the

trigger, and shooting a bullet at Jones.

The defense does not need to prove all the prosecution's claims are false. The defense needs only to prove that one of the prosecution's assumptions is false. The unstated assumption was that Smith was near the crime.

The defense proves Smith was three thousand miles away at the time of the shooting. That simple proof outvotes all arguments that Smith is guilty.

A climate change example of using the scientific method.

Climate change science is a subset of climate science. All political decisions and legal trials related to climate are about climate change science and not about climate science.

We do not need to involve all known climate science to resolve the climate change debate. We should keep the arguments simple.

The only things that matter in a climate change lawsuit are the assumptions made by the plaintiffs and the proof by the defense that one or more of the plaintiffs' assumptions are wrong.

The first task of intelligent AI would be to identify these assumptions. If AI cannot do this then AI needs experts to identify unstated assumptions in every argument.

Held v Montana shows how alarmists "prove" their climate change claims.

Held v Montana (HvM) was the first key climate lawsuit in America that set a precedent for other climate lawsuits. The plaintiffs started in Montana because Montana Republican candidates are for sale at a lower price than in other states.

Montana could have easily defeated Held v Montana.

Montana lost because the evil Republican Party Boss forced AG Knudsen to purposely lose the lawsuit. So, Knudsen stipulated his agreement with the plaintiffs and put up NO defense of climate change in Held v Montana.

The State of Montana censored and blacklisted me to be sure they lost Held v Montana. I have a long story to tell that is not relevant to this article.

Held v Montana plaintiffs make three invalid assumptions.

To win a lawsuit or debate, we must first identify all our opponent's assumptions. Then we must prove their key assumptions are false. Keep it simple.

Our Children's Trust filed Held v Montana in July 2020. The trial took place from June 12 to 20, 2023.

The Held v Montana plaintiffs used the same three assumptions that the IPCC and climate alarmists make to support their climate change claims. But they never list their assumptions and never call them assumptions.

Their whole case depended upon these three assumptions:

1. The natural CO₂ level remained at 280 ppm since 1750. Consequently, human CO₂ emissions caused all the CO₂ increase above 280 ppm.
2. This human-caused CO₂ increase causes global warming.
3. This human-caused global warming causes bad stuff to happen.

What evidence do climate alarmists have to prove its three assumptions are true?

Can they measure the amount of human CO₂ versus natural CO₂ in the air?

- That is impossible because human and natural CO₂

molecules are identical. We can only measure the total CO₂ in the air.

Can they measure the amount of global warming caused by increased CO₂?

- That is impossible because we cannot directly connect warming with increases in CO₂.

Can they measure how much bad stuff is caused by global warming?

- That is impossible because bad stuff happens whether or not the global temperature is warming or cooling or staying the same.

So, climate alarmist's core assumptions are not directly provable.

Ten expert witnesses testified that weather and climate "bad stuff" harmed the child plaintiffs.

Two expert witnesses, Steve Running and Cathy Whitlock, argued that human CO₂ emissions caused the "bad stuff."

First, they argued that assumptions #1 and #2 are true because a "scientific consensus" (of people who never appear in court for cross-examination) believe these assumptions are true.

Plaintiffs' Expert Report by Steve Running and Cathy Whitlock argued as follows:

There is a scientific consensus that the rise in atmospheric CO₂ that we are witnessing is attributable to human activities, primarily the burning of fossil fuels.

The vast majority of actively publishing climate scientists – 97 percent – agree that humans are causing global warming and climate change.

Most leading science organizations around the world have issued public statements expressing this, including international and U.S. science academies, the United Nations Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, and a whole host of reputable scientific bodies around the world.

2400 years ago, Aristotle showed the consensus argument fails. Wikipedia (2023) says, *argumentum ad populum is a fallacious argument which is based on claiming a truth because the majority thinks it is true.*

Argumentum ad populum is similar to an argument from authority (argumentum ad verecundiam). It uses an appeal to the beliefs of a group of people, stating that because a certain opinion is held by a majority, it is therefore correct.

Second, they argued, the existence of “bad stuff” in assumption #3 proves assumptions #1 and #2 are true. Of course, they did not call these assumptions “assumptions.”

Their second argument is that effects prove their cause, which is fundamentally not true.

What is both amazing and sad is that about 97% of America’s population does not understand that the climate scam is totally based on the invalid arguments of consensus and that effects prove their cause. This argues for better education.

That’s it! All climate alarmism is based on the above invalid arguments.

Killing their climate arguments in a legal trial is a piece of cake. They win by assuring no public entity makes a good defense. I am a witness to how they did that in Montana.

They even blow their own case with additional claims.

In support of assumption #1, they claim human CO₂ stays in the atmosphere much longer than natural CO₂. In fact, they need to

make that claim to justify their assumption #1.

But this claim is impossible because human and natural CO₂ molecules are identical, so they will behave exactly the same and will flow out of the atmosphere at exactly the same rate. This is the *Climate Equivalence Principle*.

Therefore, their assumption #1 is false because it requires human CO₂ to behave differently than natural CO₂.

They also claim that we must reduce human CO₂ enough to lower the CO₂ level to 350 ppm, to save the planet. But IPCC's own data (Berry, 2019, 2021, 2023) show the natural CO₂ level is already about 400 ppm, and human CO₂ about 20 ppm. Therefore, we can't "save the planet" by restricting human CO₂ emissions.

Here's a summary of how to win a climate change lawsuit.

We do not use the argument that "*warmer is better*" because it does not prove any key assumption is false, and it inherently agrees with the plaintiffs' assumptions #1 and #2. This argument does not belong in a climate lawsuit.

Edwin X Berry, PhD, Theoretical Physics, CCM (2020 – 2023):

The IPCC assumes the natural CO₂ level remained constant after 1750, and human carbon emissions caused ALL the increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide above 280 ppm.

IPCC's own data and the Climate Equivalence Principle prove this assumption is wrong. Natural carbon emissions control the CO₂ level.

Carbon-14 data, properly interpreted, proves human carbon emissions have no significant effect on the CO₂ level. Nature, not human emissions, controls the CO₂ level and climate change.

Richard Courtney, UK climate scientist and professional

reviewer (2021 -2024):

Berry's work is a breakthrough in understanding which I and all others failed to make. It indicates that anthropogenic emissions of CO₂ contribute a negligible proportion of the recent rise in atmospheric CO₂ concentration. (2021)

Berry's analysis is the only breakthrough in climate science in the last four decades. (2023, 2024)

Richard Courtney died on September 30, 2024, the day before his 78th birthday.

Howard "Cork" Hayden, PhD, Theoretical Physics (2023):

IPCC's calculation for the temperature increase caused by doubling CO₂ is 4.5 times greater than properly calculated by the Stephan-Boltzman radiation law.

Chuck Wiese, Meteorologist (2023):

Change in the Earth's reflectivity (albedo) explains all temperature increase since 1984. The increased CO₂ level has no effect on temperature.

Humlum et al. (2012) and Koutsoyiannis et al. (2023):

CO₂ changes follow temperature changes with a delay of about 12 months.

Ferenc Miskolczi, Foreign Associate Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences (2023):

Global mean cloud cover fully explains the observed mean surface temperature.

John Clauser, 2022 Physics Nobel Prize Winner (2024):

The IPCC has misidentified the dominant process that controls the climate. Its models are based on incomplete and incorrect

physics.

The dominant climate process is cloud coverage over the oceans. When cloud cover decreases, sunlight evaporates more water that causes more clouds that in turn cool the Earth, and vice-versa.

© 2024 Ed Berry – All Rights Reserved

E-Mail Ed Berry: ed@edberry.com