

Greenhouse Gas Theory Trashed as Dissenters Build Compelling Case *by John O'Sullivan*

Newly-released emails reveal an intense private debate signaling a sharp shift among scientists away from the discredited greenhouse gas global warming theory.

The hitherto unseen correspondence between leading climatologist, Dr. Roy Spencer and former NASA and DuPont engineer, Dr. Pierre R Latour, one of an increasing number of experts now attacking the crumbling science, exposes a key fallacy in the so-called man-made global warming theory.

Dr. Spencer's essay "[Yes, Virginia, Cooler Objects Can Make Warmer Objects Even Warmer Still](#)" (July 23, 2011), written to support the greenhouse gas effect (GHE) the science behind man-made global warming has sparked increased criticism since publication. Dr. Spencer, without question a leading researcher of great integrity, has since gone on record to concede that he [may be wrong](#) and being misled by an "assumption bias."

It was apparent assumptions in Spencer's "Yes, Virginia" essay that inspired Dr. Latour, who first made a name for himself working on NASA's Apollo Space program, to publish a counter-argument to Spencer's essay entitled, "[No Virginia, Cooler Objects Cannot Make Warmer Objects Even Warmer Still.](#)" [1]

Thereafter, Dr. Latour made his first email contact with Dr. Spencer on November 4, 2011. The good-natured email discussion was marked by Latour's gracious acknowledgement of Spencer's achievements in the vanguard of fighting the man-made global warming fraud.

On one issue both men absolutely agree on is that there is now compelling evidence pointing to misconduct, incompetence and endless unlawful cover-ups by a clique of discredited government climate scientists.

But Dr. Latour goes further in his criticism. Semi-retired after a stellar career, Latour is one of many eminent experts now becoming increasingly outspoken and declaring the GHE as "junk science." His position was summarized in US Senate Reports. [2, 3]

Spencer's article lends support to the discredited idea that cold CO₂ [carbon dioxide] high in the atmosphere back-radiates to Earth's

warmer surface, heating it more and causing it to radiate to the atmosphere and space with higher intensity than it would without cold CO₂ back-radiation. To Latour this contradicted all he saw in his branch of applied science, chemical engineering, and needed to be confronted head on. Engineers must ensure their theories are in harmony with the Second Law of thermodynamics: energy only flows from a hot source to a cold sink, not the other way around. If that law is violated, it can lead to the theory creating energy and driving global warming, a violation of First Law conservation of energy. That would be a perpetual motion machine, impossible to build. It appears Dr. Spencer and the UN IPCC succumbed to this fallacy at the start, as depicted in the famous 1997 Kiehl-Trenberth radiation flow diagram.

Echoing the analysis of another climatologist, Dr. Tim Ball, Latour insists that the apparent errors in atmospheric physics made by climatologists are because they work in a "generalist" field of science, unlike most "hard" sciences such as physics, chemistry, biology, engineering and medicine where detailed and in-depth specialization is essential so that products and services actually work.

Leaked Climategate 2.0 Emails Show No Research into Greenhouse Effect

Despite congratulating Spencer for so much good science, Latour asserts that Spencer's interpretation of reality in his "Yes, Virginia" essay was readily disproved, not just by observations, but also by two different mathematical proofs that illustrate the fallacy of greenhouse gas warming. The Spencer-Latour emails, found [here](#), stand as an erudite microcosm of the intense broader debate now pervading the blogosphere, with greenhouse gas effect (GHE) believers looking increasingly in disarray.

To Latour the blatant political advocacy and aversion to traditional scientific processes displayed in the Climategate emails are a major clue as to how and why the generalists of climatology could have gotten the atmospheric physics so wrong for so long.

Since the release of a second batch of 5,000 new Climategate emails in November 2011 (the first came in November 2009) observers from other sciences are staggered at how climatologists never questioned their own core "assumption bias" of their climate change hypothesis: the greenhouse gas effect. Indeed, despite around \$100 billion spent on climate research, none of Climategate emails shows researchers addressing the need to test their

hypothesis that increased levels of carbon dioxide would warm the atmosphere. Crazily, government scientists have accepted the GHE hypothesis without question since its inception in the [Victorian era](#) (before the advent of radiative and quantum physics).

Spencer's "Yes, Virginia" article now appears to be an incongruous and muddled defense of the ailing hypothesis creaking under a weight of consistently conflicting satellite data and ground measurements. Above all, scientists are seeing there is no longer any correlation between rising CO₂ levels and flat lining surface temperatures. Indeed, the only period in the last century where rises in CO₂ levels were in step with rises in Earth's temperature was in the short period from 1975 to 1998.

New Science Paper Proves Climate Has Sensitivity Lower than Expected

Coincidence is a wondrous thing and Latour has gained a supportive assessment from an unlikely source. The mainstream journal [Science](#) recently published what may be the first of many backtracking papers conceding, "Results imply lower probability of imminent extreme climatic change than previously thought." [4]

With even bandwagon climatologists now conceding that climate sensitivity to CO₂ is less than previously believed, fears over CO₂ warming are looking ever-more scientifically ridiculous. As a consequence, the collapse of man-made global warming alarmism is underway in earnest.

Also, in recent months more scientists are joining with engineers with highly specialist knowledge of thermodynamics to point out that a key feature of the GHE, the hot re-radiation of cold absorbed radiation would violate the Second Law of thermodynamics, leading to the creation of energy, violating the First Law of thermodynamics. Thus greenhouse gas theorists appear to have unquestioningly relied on a fanciful perpetual motion machine effect in their numbers to sustain global warming.

Latour Joins Ranks of New Climate Think Tank

Latour has let it be known he has read and been most impressed with [Slaying the Sky Dragon](#) (published: November 2010), the world's first full-volume refutation of the GHE. As a consequence he has now joined the 'Slayers' think tank as an advisor and contributor. Latour is now eyeing up a proposed second edition to the ground-breaking book. As such he plans to draw increasing attention to the wealth of chemical engineering that tells us there

can be no “trapped heat” due to the so-called “back-radiation” of the trace gas, CO₂, which emits energy just as fast and as efficiently as it absorbs it.

Always a stickler for thoroughness as a Chemical Process Control Systems Engineer, Latour had long worked at the sharp end of applied science. His special aptitude earned him his place in the [Apollo Space program](#), where life and death decisions meant that when the theory contradicted reality you changed the theory. In 1997 he analyzed the atmosphere as a chemical process system and proved any thermostat adjusting fossil fuel combustion was unmeasurable, unobservable and uncontrollable; it would never work. Control systems engineers use these mathematical criteria, developed in 1970s, before embarking on building control systems. He finds engineering is denied involvement in UN IPCC, government and college research on AGW. Europe is paying dearly in 2011 for failing to check the engineering validity of CO₂ Cap & Trade schemes.

Latour is hopeful he will win over Spencer so he, too, becomes yet another convert to the GHE 'Slayers' and by publishing their emails it is hoped that others will recognise a paradigm shift in climate science is very much underway. Links to the articles plus the email correspondence between these two distinguished experts are all readily accessed from [here](#).

References:

[1] Latour corrected a math typo in this complete version of November 9, 2011. ["No Virginia, Cooler Objects Cannot Make Warmer Objects Even Warmer Still."](#)

[2] U S Senate Minority Report: More Than 700 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims; Scientists Continue to Debunk "Consensus" in 2008 & 2009, March 16, 2009, page 87.

http://epw.senate.gov/public/index.cfm?FuseAction=Files.View&FileStore_id=83947f5d-d84a-4a84-ad5d-6e2d71db52d9

[3] Update, U S Senate Minority Report: More Than 1000 International Scientists Dissent Over Man-Made Global Warming Claims; Scientists Continue to Debunk Fading "Consensus" in 2008, 2009 & 2010, December 8, 2010, page 153.

http://hw.libsyn.com/p/b/f/6/bf663fd2376ffeca/2010_Senate_Minority_Report.pdf?sid=95951c75f1aa03e766e0365108703b1f&l_sid=27695&l_eid=&l_mid=2336201&expiration=1323190681&hwt=01eab33c5d018917b52eec69bdcfa171

[4] Schmittner, A., *et al.* "Climate Sensitivity Estimated from Temperature Reconstructions of the Last Glacial Maximum," *Science* DOI: 10.1126/science.1203513