

# Scientists use cult science to promote global warming agenda

Those who claim our CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub>.

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 CO<sub>2</sub>.

Bradley: The basic science is not very complicated: CO<sub>2</sub> traps heat. CO<sub>2</sub> 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 CO<sub>2</sub> does not even correlate with temperature, but solar radiation does.

Bradley: No credible scientist denies that CO<sub>2</sub> is one of the most important greenhouse gases.

Facts: Bradley is not a credible scientist. Water vapor is more important than CO<sub>2</sub>. 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, and ecologist, and Thiessen, and 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