

The Three Hyper-real Paradoxes of Global Warming “Climatism”

by John O’Sullivan

April 4, 2012

How an anti-intellectual misuse of language and logic sought to turn a perfectly natural process into a man-made catastrophe. Scientists claim to have identified three fatal physical paradoxes in man-made global warming theory.

Canadian astrophysicist and climate analyst, Joseph E. Postma, precedes the publication of his new peer-reviewed study on “Climatism” (the doomsaying pseudo-scientific man-made global warming cult), with an intriguing insight into three interesting paradoxes of the greenhouse gas theory of climate science:

Paradox One: Thousands of years of proxy data proving increases in levels of atmospheric carbon dioxide are proven to follow, not cause, all prior increases in global temperatures;

Paradox Two: A colder atmosphere heated by a warmer surface has been turned full circle and modeled by climatologists as the causal agent such that cool air somehow can heat a warmer surface even more;

Paradox Three: Solar heating that impacts half of the planet at any time is now modeled as an isotropic source with one-quarter of the intensity over the entire planet.

These three conditions should be among the most simple things to understand in physics and reality, argues Postma, yet they have simultaneously been made the most difficult to comprehend by the inventive post-normal reasoning of Climatism.

Joe Postma, a scientist with the Canadian Space Agency and Indian Space Research Organization (ISRO) asks, “So when did logic, true philosophical intuitive logic, become divorced from science? The truth is that these paradoxes of Climatism indicate a profoundly more disturbing problem at the heart of the human condition. We have divorced logic from science: why?”

Simulacra and Tautology: the Tricksters’ Tools

Postma, author of hot papers in this field including [Copernicus Meets the Greenhouse Effect](#) and [The Model Atmospheric Greenhouse Effect](#) works alongside dozens of his scientific colleagues at [Principia Scientific International](#) (PSI) to cogently identify that an entire branch of science

(pseudoscience at the core, but there is some good work around the periphery) has been based on fundamental logical paradoxes. They say Climatism's scientific contradictions are lamentable, disturbing, incredibly sad and a depressing state of affairs.

Postma notes, "Climatism, the pseudoscience that passes for climate science, is based on a negatively-directed application of the ideas researched by the philosopher Baudrillard: Simulacra and Simulation, or in other words, hyper-reality."

In the hyper-reality of Climatism, observes Postma, all research performed in the field of Climatism is directed towards postulating anthropogenic influences; therefore, any results provided by Climatism indicate anthropogenic influences, and so the legitimate, logical definition of "climate science/climate change" becomes divorced from reality, and now exists only within the framework of anthropogenesis.

According to such scientists as Postma, in the hyper-reality of Climatism, "climate change" directly translates to "human caused"; that is entirely illogical at the core, but within the hyperreality framework of Climatism, survives as its own tautologous definition.

Climatism has long enjoyed the backing of a complicit media and bankrolled by incredibly well-funded environmental organizations, and a (less so now, fortunately) poorly-educated public.

Postma observes, "The underlying goal here, of Climatism, is to divorce the reality of real climate change from the hyper-real simulacra of climate change – to have a simulacra of climate change which actually has nothing at all to do with climate change."

It appears Postma has a point. In Plato's discourses, he discussed the "ideal forms" of which our perceptions of reality were an approximation. In hyper-reality our approximations are divorced from the ideal forms altogether, with the problem being that our perceptions and framework (science) of reality become based on other approximations several times removed, with no ability to recover what the true form actually was in the first place.

"This is the goal of Climatism. If we enter another ice age or another warming period, it will be anthropogenic by definition, with no sense or ability to consider any true natural causes, in the hyper reality of 'climate change,'" laments the Canadian scientist.

No Denial of Climate Change: Skewering the Straw man

Consider the example of the language climatist's use when attempting to shut out legitimate scientific analysis of their hyper-reality of Climatism: they pretend to ridicule their opponents by saying that they "deny climate change" or "deny global warming."

Whereas on the other hand, real scientists finding problems with the theory say that they question "anthropogenic climate change" or "catastrophic anthropogenic climate change." You will never find a real scientist, anywhere, saying that they "deny climate change." The distinctions of language here is very important. In the former case, the language is completely meaningless, and completely fraudulent, but it is pretended to have meaning due to the context of the hyper-reality of Climatism.

Anyone who uses language as do climatists is a complete scientific fraud engaging in the pseudoscience of the hyper-reality of Climatism, which is pretended to be passed off as climate change science.

"Anyone who cannot understand this central philosophical and logical problem is completely incompetent and should not be pretending to engage in the true form of science, but that doesn't matter in the hyper-reality of 'climate change,'" adds Postma.

Exploitation of Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem

There is another aspect of philosophy which has been negatively exploited by Climatism, and that is Gödel's Incompleteness Theorem: "In any system of arithmetic 'A', there will exist a statement 'x' which is neither provable or unprovable by 'A'."

This is a profound statement, says Postma and dozens of his colleagues at Principia Scientific International urge us all to ponder it. The statement 'x' of Gödel's theorem IS the Greenhouse Effect, within the system of physics and thermodynamics of modern science.

"I am sure there are other possibilities of course," says Postma, "but this is one and as the "Slayers" (those who understand and accept the science illuminated by the book, *Slaying the Sky Dragon: Death of the Greenhouse Gas Theory*) have pointed out, the greenhouse gas effect is both definable yet not definable. It is both seemingly logical but also perfectly self-contradictory, as Alan Siddons, for example, has [brilliantly highlighted](#)."

All of Climatism is based on the exploitation of the creation of that perfect (perfect if you seek to lie) statement 'x'. This is the core of where the myriad of paradoxes of Climatism are generated. An engine of paradox resides at the core of Climatism - an engine of anti-logic, anti-science, anti-humanity that is a product of [post-normalism](#).

Postma and his colleagues are showing us a way out of this mess, and it is via the application of another great philosopher's discoveries: the "[dialectical method](#)".

“Basically, this is the true form, the Platonic Form, of science. Postulate a thesis, attack it with an antithesis, discover the synthesis which then presents the new thesis, and repeat the process until the thesis approximates reality to a sufficient degree - we have not yet discovered when or where this process ends, of course,” cautions the Canadian.

Climatism Opposes Dialectical Reasoning and Debate

Of course, the [Principia Scientific International](#) scientist makes a telling point: this dialectic is the LAST thing Climatism allows into its hyper-reality. “That tells you what threat it presents: insider peer-review, no debates, hostile response to criticism, ignoring criticism, etc.,” bemoans Postma.

The one thing that improves true science is the biggest thing the hyperreality of Climatism rejects. So don't we have a beautiful consistency here? Of course, it requires intelligence to appreciate and intelligence is ALSO a thing practitioners of the hyper-reality of Climatism have rejected. Irked by such post-normalism, Postma laments, “It is a categorical error to consider yourself intelligent if your skill merely equates to being the most excellent of frauds and liars.”

What PSI scientists have done so magnificently is expose the Climatism Thesis. More and more analysts now understand that this doomsaying thesis requires us to accept the following gross absurdities:

- (a) that the Earth is flat, and,
- (b) that Sunshine is isotropic and cold.

From thence we readily accept that the surface temperature is warmer than the average atmospheric temperature. But this is then topped with the most perfect statement of incompleteness 'x' (i.e. the greenhouse effect, GHE, is defined yet not definable) which is then used to explain why the surface temperature is warmer than the average atmospheric temperature!

This is where Climatism stops and proceeds only within this framework to create its hyper-reality.

And what is The Antithesis to this flat earth fatuousness? Why, the work of the Slayers as presented in "[Slaying the Sky Dragon](#)," plus Postma's papers together with other studies published by [Principia Scientific International](#).

Postma explains: "Our Synthesis thus becomes a spherical and rotating model Earth described by a truly physical heat flow equation which *IS* provable in the framework of modern physics - sunshine is hot and its actually-measured value, capable of melting ice and evaporating water and generating high temperatures while providing sufficient energy to drive a climate system."

To Postma and his PSI colleagues, the next iteration to thesis from this synthesis will be nothing like the paradigmatic shift seen in this past iteration: "This first iteration basically started with an insane and arbitrary pretext, sort of like starting a transcendental equation at an arbitrary solution but which quickly converges," adds Postma.

Even Grade Schoolers Know Sunshine Isn't Cold and Earth Isn't Flat

Climatism never got past its insane and arbitrary initial solution. It thus created an entire hyper-reality based on an insane initial solution with simplistic physics that simply do not work: Earth *is not* flat, it is round and rotating; Sunshine *is not* cold, it is hot.

What is so difficult here to understand? Cold sunshine cannot melt ice – yet we live in a world dominated by liquid and vaporous H₂O and we know that raw sunshine has the power to create it.

This is elementary, elementary even to seven-year-old school children. But the Climatists are either not aware of it, or are fraudulently aware of it. They exist in an insane hyper-reality performing "thought" under the pretext that the Earth is flat, there is no day and night and sunshine is cold! It is based on that foundation they claim there *must be* a greenhouse gas effect.