

In Canada Free Press I give many examples, in a variety of articles, of the myriad falsities inherent in the green movement. Sometimes, falsity can be accepted as a side-effect of stupidity, but not in this case. The green movement is the province of intelligent middle classes. So, why is it that these people come out with such nonsense? It's because their intellect doesn't match their intelligence, making them accept emotionalism rather than truth. In other words, they are prejudiced against reality.

One of the most recent pro-green articles by foolish people was, to my surprise, in MENSAs magazine (October 2010), written by a newly-degreed fellow reading geology. Way back over 40 years ago I thought of joining MENSAs, but then, as today, I cannot think of a benefit. And, now I have read the article, I can see that intelligence is no defence against propaganda and fakery. The article itself is not worthy of inclusion in a journal for people with high intelligence... it is just a collection of the usual propaganda, all hot air and no reason. I do not doubt the author's intelligence, only his ignorance riding on the back of vanity.

If The First Statement is a Lie...

In law, it does not matter how often an item (usually a car) is sold on, if the item was stolen in the first place, every transaction thereafter is illegal and those who foolishly buy without checking will lose their money. The same applies to intellectual activity – if the first claim, statement, or theory is wrong, it does not matter how many people repeat it, it will still be wrong.

In my AIDS research I discovered a shocking fact - that all doctors took their information about HIV and AIDS from a very small source... mostly from homosexual groups and those influenced by them, including the Department of Health! Therefore, said the doctor who verified this fact, every doctor and health professional took in the same errors and deceptions, and so were all equally duped by error! And so AIDS is now rampant, as is the behaviour that leads to it. Those we hope are 'experts' are, then, nothing of the sort... they are as prone to being deceived as everyone else. And it is the public that suffers, as lie after lie is passed around, masquerading as truth and medical fact.

In the same way, everyone involved in the green movement, or with sympathy for it, take their supposed 'facts' from the same small number of sources. Most do not even know what the original sources are. The result is a widely brainwashed population led by similarly brainwashed 'experts'. They ignore any other information, usually referring to it as bigotry, even though they do not examine the material properly. More importantly, they do not bother to check the veracity

Greenism - Intelligence not the problem

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 30 September 2010 15:03

of the information they rely on, given to them by dubious sources such as Mann (he of the infamous 'hockey stick') and the IPCC.

These hot-greens also fail to recognise who is behind the greenism, and why. In my book, 'The Global Green Agenda', I prove beyond doubt that what is behind the environmental movement is not concern for the planet, but the sticky hands of very rich men who want to get richer, and governments who want extra taxes without the need for a genuine reason!

To get what they want they base themselves in Marxism and Fascism, which are behind all environmental/ecology claims and plans since the mid 1800s. If this does not concern our greenies, then there is something seriously wrong with their line of thinking. Intelligent they may be – but sensible they are not! It is intelligence bereft of intellectual excellence. They can shout, huff and puff, but it makes no difference, because flaws are flaws and deception is deception.

The Article

The article even has a propaganda title: 'No Question'. Sound familiar? It should, because it has been Al Gore's mantra, used by the IPCC and others, for over ten years. It does not just deny the validity of anti-green science, even though greenies actively stop it from appearing in the media and science journals. Nothing like a refusal to examine another scientific argument just in case it upsets the apple cart! Very scientific.

The author, Robin George Andrews does just that, by trotting out the "same old, same old". There is nothing new in his paper, only a repeat (forgive my yawn) of the usual pro-green nonsense that pretends to be genuine. Sadly for Andrews, he appears to be rattled badly by the very existence of anti-green material, but he is unable to gather together anything of us to combat it. He just gets mad! If he gets that upset, maybe he ought to get out of the anthropogenic heat of the scientific kitchen.

Andrews again repeats the Al Gore lie by saying in his sub-title: "The existence of man-made global warming is a scientific fact and should not be a matter of debate in the media." There you have it – because he says it, it MUST be true! The fact is, he is hopping mad because, at last, the media are starting to catch on, that maybe greenies are not so expert after all. All Andrews research is going down the drain and he can't hack it. He only shouts insults.

Greens Rule!

What's he talking about? Environmental claims have NEVER been a matter of debate, whether in science or in the media (particularly the socialist-led BBC) – and that is the problem! All we get are greenie 'experts' refusing to allow another argument into journals and the media, so that no-one can evaluate the 'other side'. This is why anti-greens have been furiously fighting to be heard. Of course, having the floor, the pro-greens simply denounce anti-greens and use humiliation as a weapon. Rather like the antics of Democrats, who see their power possibly slipping away. But, so far, no-one has seen a proper and full evaluation of the green claims in public, government, or in the media. Check the last ten years' output!

This is why the Climate Unit at Anglia University got into trouble, by deleting vital emails, fostering snide remarks to scientists who did not share their view, hiding the facts and issuing fake data. The IPCC 2007 Report, the one that gave the impetus for governments to steal our taxes for non-essential green policies and so valued by Andrews, did the same thing, only publishing pro-green articles and nothing else. The IPCC also altered the data in others, sometimes drastically.

I found at least two dozen deliberate fraudulent articles in the IPCC Report! And I am in contact with several Lead Authors of the IPCC Report, who are angry because their work was changed without their knowledge. Andrews merely does not mention all this. Convenient.

The aim of greenism is not what greenies think it is. While they dance about in fairy circles to appease Mother Earth, politicians use the fraudulent information to extort stupidly high taxes and remove freedom of choice of energy sources, burying anything critical. This is a classic Marxist move and it is what Al Gore and others are aiming at. Now, back to the article...

Weather... A Geology Specialism?

Andrews says he recently graduated from Imperial College with a degree in Geology. Congratulations. He admits he is "not a qualified scientist". Yes, we know that by what he says. But, he claims to have done "extensive research" into the global warming idea. Hm. What information did he imbibe, and why? And what information did he cast aside... and why? His article proves that he relies solely on greenie material, even though much of it has been proved to be fraudulent and has been debunked. Or, shown to be just plain wrong. Yet, Andrews does not mention those articles proven to be fraudulent. Naughty boy.

Greenism - Intelligence not the problem

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 30 September 2010 15:03

Since when is geology qualify a man in weather systems? Since when does a newly-degreed young man, full of idealism but no experience, equal an established climatologist in the business for many years? What he is saying is that he knows more than weather scientists who refuse the greenie argument.

Sorry, but Andrews must have a much better reason to ditch their work than “global warming is a scientific fact”! I do not care how much research this fellow says he has done, if he prefers propaganda to truth. Saying something is a ‘scientific fact’ is NOT the same as proving it, especially when calling it a ‘fact’ is equal to calling it a fully-fledged law of science. And no theory can claim that, until it has undergone a long period of experiment, verification, falsification, etc!

Nothing in global warming science has come anywhere near this kind of scientific rigour, nor have greenies had sufficient time to warrant calling their ‘science’ fixed and irrefutable. Oh dear, Andrews, you have made a bit of a boob. Publishing it in the journal of a self-praise group does not make it any more correct. A geologist is not a weather expert. Full stop. That is not so bad. What brings Andrews to his knees is not his ignorance, but his refusal to admit the truth in anti-green research done by men twice or three times his age, who are experts in their field, even when most of the IPCC 2007 report has been shown to be fake.

Shut Up – It’s a Fact!

Andrews deplores the angle taken by a recent BBC News 24 programme, which stated that most of the public do not believe there is global warming. Andrews said that this “aggravated” him (he is aggravated a lot!). No doubt. Maybe he needs some time in the real working world, because few people will bow to his every whim and demand, or let him get away with nonsense. It might shock him to learn that even intelligent people, many of them in relevant science jobs, do not accept his naïve view of global warming, gleaned from cornflake packets (or so it seems). How will he react to them? With a subtle “Shut up” and a kick in the teeth? Experts disagree with you – get over it.

Andrews goes on to vaunt his own ‘research’ ability by saying that the public has a “misunderstanding” about global warming. Oh Yes? Or is it that they are sick to the teeth of the lies of Al Gore and pals, and can see the truth, whereas Andrews and friends cannot? He even says the media have failed to understand this public rejection of the ‘facts’. I think Andrews has been away somewhere exotic, because the media to date has mainly ignored the public and all anti-green reports. To put it nicely, Andrews is too full of himself.

The young man (I assume he is young and therefore still in his post-teen, psychologically-black-and-white stage of thinking) further deplores that the BBC presents climate change as “still under debate”. He almost chokes with rage because the BBC said “scientists do not all agree on what causes global warming.” Perhaps he should take a powder... this is the first time the BBC has admitted to this truth. Until now it has solidly backed the horse it thought was winning – Labour (Marxism) and greenies.

But, times are changing, and governments are no longer threatening us with green policies. Well, not as much as they used to anyway. That is the only reason the BBC has backed down, apart from the other fact, that many thousands of scientists reject the green global warming argument – specifically, that mankind causes it.

It is always infuriating when long ‘research’ is turned upside down by the facts. Andrews must learn to cope with this, as does any scientist worth his salt. He has simple backed the wrong horse and now feels foolish.

Do Scientists Agree?

No, they don't! In the USA alone over 32,000 signed the Oregon Petition. Of course, greenies went into a spin about that and immediately tried to rip it apart. Many more thousands of scientists throughout the world reject the human-cause claims. So, for Andrews to say the “science is simple” and should be accepted, is preposterous. There is no proven link between carbon dioxide and changes in climate. Climate changes... because it does. There is certainly no proof that mankind ‘causes’ global warming. As I said, *saying* something is true does not necessarily *make* it true!

Andrews continues what is really a diatribe rather than an argument, by saying that “an extremely small minority of scientists disagree with the science behind climate change.” This is another claim, oft repeated, without proof. How does he know how many scientists do not agree, or, for that matter, agree? I know how many disagree in the Petition, and from reports I have read for several years. Many scientists who once supported global warming claims now no longer do so, because they see how erroneous the science is. The truth is, no-one knows exact numbers – Andrews has again succumbed to propaganda.

Greenism - Intelligence not the problem

Written by K B Napier

Thursday, 30 September 2010 15:03

I find it remarkable that, as a non-experienced geologist, Andrews can assert confidently that: “when their analysis of the evidence is reviewed, it is always found to be flawed.” Again – saying it does not make it true! And how does a newly degreed fellow know how to examine the claims made by scientists expert in their field? I find his assertion vain to say the least. Is he willing to argue against those IPCC Lead Authors I know? Or, the climatologists I know who categorically reject the green theories?

Andrews says (as if he had access to these people’s minds) that anti-greens have a variety of motives. You mean just like greenies? Or is he again guessing, based on his own aggravated state, attributing motives when they are usually hidden deep in the psyche?

Here Comes the Hockey-Stick Again!

As part of his aggressive attack (it is not a defence), Andrews directs us all to accept the infamous ‘hockey stick’ first made popular by Al Gore, the high priest of get-rich-quick. The hockey stick and its inventor, Mann, was debunked, not just once, but twice, because it was not feasible, used massaged data, and ignored all the known facts. Once again, our friendly Andrews says that he is ‘aggravated’ because (he knows, of course) those who are anti-green are somehow funded by big oil, etc. Does he mean like the Climate Unit at East Anglia? Or, Al Gore and his cronies? Or many green scientists? Maybe it is better if he doesn’t mention that one.

As if he has many years experience with the media and in science, Andrews then says that the media is teaching the public how to be uncritical... rather like a man named Andrews, a recent geology student, who thinks he knows everything about everything, even men’s motives. The “insult to the scientific method” he implies is being ignored by the media (remember – it is only recently that the media bothered to air views that were not green), should be aimed back at his own presuppositions, based as they are on green propaganda rather than on truth. The insult is being constantly thrown about by Mann, the IPCC and those greens who think they can get away with it.

Not Only Global Warming...

The reader will have to forgive my direct opposition to Andrews; I do so robustly because he dares to bad-mouth serious scientists in a public arena without once giving facts. He must learn to be wise. Those of us who KNOW anthropogenic warming is a lie, and we have had enough of being pushed aside, especially by young men with more mouth than reason. I am really surprised that MENSA even contemplated publishing what he said, which is old stuff, regurgitated.

I must say that Andrews is an all-round expert. Not content with saying expert scientists are failures and incapable of having scientific ability, he vaunts his own importance, this time by attacking Creationists and Intelligent Design scientists. He assumes, so it seems, that both camps are the same, when they are not. They might sometimes coincide, but, in the main, Intelligent Design can be toted by people without even a remote interest in God.

Even so, wanting to show this as an example of how those he considers to be fools will believe anything, he says that Intelligent Design “has absolutely no solid evidence to support it”. (He must be reading New Scientist – they get in a tizzy about it, too). So, how much time did Andrews spend on his degree course, if he has become so expert in not just every aspect of climate change, but also Intelligent Design? Maybe I’m being picky, but unless his brain is the size of New York, how does he did he do it in such a short space of time? I am really jealous of his ability... at 63, in spite of a clutch of degrees and long experience, relatively, I know less now than I did when I was Andrews’ age!

Intelligent Design has no proofs? The implication is that evolution has proof for its claims. But, it has not! In a university on this planet I heard an evolutionist giving a Darwin Lecture, and he plainly admitted that there were not enough proofs for evolution to fill the floor of a small room! Or, to put it another way, the evidences used by evolutionists to ‘prove’ evolution do not exist - plenty of evidences but no proofs. Only one proof is necessary to prove evolution to be real – the mechanism of change. Until that mechanism is shown to exist, evolution remains an unproved theory. Hang on... just like intelligent design. What a coincidence!

Facts... or Just Repeated Claims?

With another yawn, I see that Andrews then says evolution is “an accepted scientific fact”, even though a growing number of quite serious scientists (not Christians) are veering towards Intelligent Design (ID). How annoying (or to use his own word: “aggravating”) for Andrews! This lad seems to be aggravated by just about everything, except his own importance. Fewer and fewer scientists now believe in the Big Bang, let alone evolution. But, of course, I am aggravating Andrews with these trivial facts.

Let me put it this way – it is up to evolutionists to prove their case, not for others to disprove evolution. There is no need to disprove what has never, ever been proved to be true. The only reason evolution is thought to be true, is because evolutionists say it is, repeatedly. To cast doubts on scientists of Intelligent Design, etc., is to throw out a smoke screen to cover the bad science in evolution. Andrews can cut me down with his scythe-like mind by simply showing me

the *mechanism of change* that would completely vindicate evolutionism. This is where I am more confident than he is, for I know there is no such mechanism.

To quote our geology expert (who has yet to speak geologically): “Intelligent design, supported by no concrete evidence, is merely speculation and extraordinary claims, and is simply unscientific.” Does he mean like the way astrophysicist Stephen Hawking recently talked of aliens, or the way he blatantly and publicly said that matter created itself from nothing? Eh?? He is an evolutionist, of course, so he must be right, with or without proofs. On the other hand, how can an evolutionist say that matter created itself, from absolute nothing?

‘Evidence’ – or ‘Proof’?

Notice, too, that Andrews uses the wrong word – ‘concrete’ implies ‘proof’, not mere ‘evidence’. Perhaps he should become familiar with both words so that he doesn’t get them mixed up. So, if ID is only speculation because it has no proofs – what does that mean for evolution, if even an evolutionist says there are none? Back to the drawing board, Mr Andrews.

To underscore his use of propaganda rather than facts, Andrews goes on to refer to people who refuse to accept anthropogenic global warming as “irrationalists”. Even though they research their subjects, in which they are experts, and Andrews is not? Here, though, he at last uses ‘evidences’ in a correct manner. He says there “is an overwhelming amount of evidence in support of...” manmade global warming.

There he is correct. But, because he does not know the difference between ‘evidence’ and ‘proof’, his argument is less dramatic than he thinks. One can amass millions of evidences, but they must all point irrefutably in the same direction before they can be called ‘proofs’... if, that is, they have been thoroughly investigated and falsified, etc. Global warming by mankind has not been scrutinized properly. Sorry Andrews, but you are wrong again. Knowing the difference between ‘evidence’ and ‘proof’ is basic to genuine scientific research... something too many warmists fail to bother with.

Andrews continues by waffling over the same ground, without proving a sausage! (Sorry to be so un-MENSA-like). Sadly, he quotes the 2007 IPCC Report as being on the side of his claims. Again I must say “Oh Dear”, what a boob. The number of flaws and deliberate frauds in that Report are so numerous as to even embarrass a Gore or an Obama! I have recounted a number of them in Canada Free Press. Don’t take my word for them – listen to the ones who admitted to making the frauds in the first place.

Oops Again!

Once again, Andrews misuses his words by saying "Science... is based on evidences." Oh no it isn't! Evidences are only steps to forming proofs, not proofs in themselves. Warmist theories are not proven at all; they are only weak hypotheses. Andrews is pointing his finger in the wrong direction... it should be firmly jabbing his own chest until he learns to distinguish evidences and proofs (bearing in mind that even 'proofs' are in flux, with possible refutations waiting in the wings).

Then, in his final paragraph, Andrews says the only sensible thing in the whole article. He says that if the media continues to convince the public that warming by humans is not proved, then "it will not be long before we stop putting in the effort to counter it..." Hear, hear! When that happens we will all be better off, freer, and able to speak our minds. We should not be basing our lives on the whims of warmists who loathe human beings, or on the demands of governments hungry for our taxes. Let's get rid of warming theories/hypotheses, and return to sense and real science. Regardless of what MENSA 'experts' think they are saying. It takes far more than intelligence to muster a worthwhile intellectual attack! I hope MENSA continues to publish this kind of nonsense, because it certainly amuses people like me.

© Barry Napier 30 September 2010

---oOo---

{loadposition btm_address}