Rocket Scientists Need NOT Apply

By Joseph A Olson, PE Monday, July 26, 2010

I really want to like NASA and I really want to respect scientists, however I have a real problem when science fiction is presented as fact. A scientist morphs into a flim-flam artist when he uses a parlor trick to distort science in support of a fraud. Pedigree does not bestow sanity. This latest bit of insanity will now be exposed.

Outside of the internet, all information today is carefully managed stage crafted propaganda. The Main Stream Media is monopolist owned and controlled. They own the soapbox, they pull the political puppet strings, they dictate who is allowed a voice across the entire information spectrum.

The best way to win a debate is to carefully choose who is allowed to debate. The next dirty trick is to create a faux debate using straw dog issues and cherry picked data. The AGW, human caused climate change scam is a glaring example of these behaviors.

The monopolists created and fully support the warmists' position and seldom allow discussion with the deniers of this fraud. To enable a controlled appearance of debate, the MSM has created the 'luke-warmist' foils, who then provide a middle-of-the-road viewpoint and serve as a backboard for the warmist echo.

The physical universe sets the parameters for science. Our theories are either correct or incorrect. What is correct in one branch of science is REQUIRED to apply to all branches of science. No branch of science is allowed to bend or rewrite the Laws of Science to benefit their agenda. Yet this is what one former NASA scientist is doing.

Cool Can Now Make Warm Objects Warmer

Consider this profound Nouveau Science at work. In his article, "Yes, Virginia, Cooler Objects Can Make Warmer Objects Even Warmer Still", former NASA scientist, Dr Roy Spencer, attempts to defend AGW and ends up exposing the lie.

> Dr Roy: "Back radiation is a critical component of the theoretical explanation for the greenhouse effect"

Direct translation is "if you don't believe the 'little lie' then you won't believe the big lie.

Luckily, there are men of science and conscious who will not allow any sized lie to slide by labeled as science. Remember, there is one thing about this debate on which all sides agree, this parlor trick is the cornerstone of the AGW hypothesis.

Before we expose this trick, please visit the Spencer blog or repost at ClimateRealists.com and familiarize yourself with the experiment in question. On the Spencer controlled site there were posted this morning 172 comments. On the Realist site there were an unprecedented eight comments. This is clearly a controversial subject.

And now for the trick: Dr Roy sets up a vacuum tube with a 150F hot plate and heat flowing out of the chamber in all directions. Next, he places a 110F plate adjoining the 150F plate and the hot plate rises to 160F. These are 'theoretical' values for discussion only. What Dr Roy has demonstrated is correct, but is it relevant ?

This author has performed thermodynamic calculations for decades and this parlor trick flew in the face of all of my training and experience. There were two overriding questions. How did he do this and why is this trick not reflected in nature ?

What the second, cooler plate did was to insulate one side of the hot plate. The energy flowing through the hot plate would then not radiate as much and would allow for a temperature rise. Correct for the model shown but completely invalid for the Earth model he claims to represent.

Dr Roy's hot plate was subject to continuous heat input so insulation would raise temperature. The Earth is NOT subject to continuous heat flow with one caveat.
There is a substantial internal fission heat, but short of a major volcanic event, this heat energy can does not manifest itself over the land mass, or over one day cycles, so it therefore can be neglected.

For this example we will consider only the solar heat input which rises gradually from morning until mid afternoon. This heat energy reaches a maximum and continually drops over night. There is no constant input of energy in the Earth model.

To further his point, Dr Roy makes this analogy: "when you pull a blanket over yourself when it is cold….it makes your skin warmer….a cooler object can still make a warmer object even hotter".

The reason you get warmer is because the blankets thermal mass slows heat transfer and allows your body heat to accumulate in a confined space. The Earth represents a different model. Consider two beds, two blankets and two different models. One model is a live heat producing model and the other is a 98F water filled inflatable doll. [This is NOT an experiment that the author has performed].

Now cover each model with a cool blanket. The water doll will cool from the blanket and both blanket and water doll will rapidly reach room temperature. The model human model produces 250 BTUH of sensible and 250 BTUH of latent heat at rest and more when exercising. It is this heat which is trapped and will raise temperature up to the regulated body temperature.

Had Dr Roy's experiment involved a water coil plate with a maximum of 150F input then it would NOT warm up with a cold plate. The cold plate could reduce heat loss on one side, but the hot plate will never exceed the input temperature UNLESS there is additional energy input.

Moist air is heavier than dry air and has more thermal mass. For the 98F water doll, two blankets will SLOW the approach to room temperature more than one, but NO amount of blankets will increase the water doll's temperature. This is the Climate-Clowns fundamental science error.

Water vapor at 100% saturation is less than 5% of the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide is less than 0.04% of the atmosphere and the human portion is 0.00012% of the total. The warmists want you to believe that out of all of the mass of the planet, this maximum 5.04% of just the atmosphere is the thermal system driver.

For an exhaustive, thesis level analysis of the real thermodynamics of this same problem refer to "Slaying Dr Spencer's Dragon: Death of the Greenhouse Theory" by John O'Sullivan. This article examines the exact heat flow values and identifies the science errors.

The take home message is this:

There is NO such thing as 'back radiation'.
There is No such thing as 'greenhouse gas'.
There is NO such thing as 'human caused global warming'.

Dr Roy is right. "Back radiation is a critical component of the theoretical explanation for the greenhouse effect". You must believe the little lie to believe the big lie. What Dr Roy has done is to provide transparent proof that this hypothesis can be proven with a lie, so the hypothesis is in fact FALSE. Oh, and he also provided proof that you don't have to be a rocket scientist to be a NASA scientist.