97% of Scientists Agree on Nothing

THUS ran the heading on Professor Ian Plimer's article in *The Australian* for 17ᵗʰ January, 2019 on the falsehoods and fraudulence on the science about man-made global warming and consequent disasters.

Professor Plimer is a geologist. In 2009 he wrote *Heaven and Earth, Global Warming, the Missing Science,* the best-selling book on the subject; his latest book is *The Climate Change Delusion and the Great Electricity Ripoff,* both published by Connor Court.

HERE ARE EXCERPTS FROM HIS ARTICLE
bold print added for clarity

MANY SCIENTISTS and activists are expressing confected rage at the possibility of public debates because [bluffing]: "The science is settled. After all, 97% of scientists agree that human emissions drive global warming and there is no need for further discussion."

In my 50 years scientific career, I have never seen a hypothesis where 97% of scientists agree. At any scientific conference there are collections of argumentative souls who don't agree about anything, argue about data, how data was collected and the conclusions derived from data. Scepticism underpins all science. Science is underpinned by repeatable validated evidence and scientific conclusions are **not** based on a show of hands, consensus, politics or feelings. Scientists, just like lawyers, bankers, unionists, politicians and those in all other fields, can make no claim to being honest or honourable, and various warring cliques of scientists have their leaders, followers, outsiders and enemies. Scientists differ from many in the community because they are allegedly trained to be independent. Unless, of course, whacking big research grants for climate "science" are waved in front of them.

The 97% figure derives from a survey sent to **10,257 people** with self-interest in human-induced global warming who published "science" supported by taxpayer-funded research grants. Replies from 3146 respondents were **whittled down to 77 self-appointed climate scientists** of whom 75 were judged to agree that human-induced warming was taking place. **The 97% figure derives from a tribe with only 75 members. What were the criteria for rejecting 3069 respondents? There was no mention that 75 out of 3146 is 2·8%.** We did not hear that 2·38% of climate scientists with a self-interest agreed that humans have played a significant role in changing climate and that they are recipients of some of the billions spent annually on climate research.

Another recent paper on the scientific consensus of human-induced climate change was a howler. Such pages can be published only in sociology or environmental literature.

The paper claimed that published scientific papers showed there was a 97·1% consensus that man had caused at least half of the 0·7% global warming since 1950.

How was the 97·1% figure determined? By "inspection" of 11,944 published papers. Inspection is not rigorous scholarship. There was no critical reading and understanding derived from reading 11,944 papers. This was not possible as the study started in March 2012 and was published in mid-2013, hence only a cursory inspection was possible. What was inspected? By whom?

The methodology section of the publication gives the game away:

This letter was conceived as a 'citizen science' project by volunteers contributing to the Skeptical Science website www.skepticalscience.com. In March 2012, we searched the Institute for Scientific Information Web of Science for papers published from 1991-2011 using topic searches for 'global warming' and 'global climate change'.

This translates as: This study was a biased compilation of opinions from non-scientific, politically motivated volunteer activists who used a search engine for key words in 11,944 scientific papers, were unable to understand the scientific context of the use of "global warming" and "global climate change", who rebadged themselves as "climate scientists" to hide their activism and ignorance, who did not read the complete papers and were unable to evaluate critically the diversity of science published therein.

The conclusions were predictable because the methodology was not dispassionate and involved decisions by those who were not independent.

As part of a **scathing critical analysis** of this paper by real scientists, the original 11,944 papers were read and the readers came to a diametrically opposite conclusion. Of the 11,944 papers only 41 explicitly stated that humans caused most of the warming since 1960 (0·3%). Of the 11,944 climate "science" papers, 99·7% did not say that carbon dioxide caused most of the global warming since 1950. It was less than 1% and not one paper endorsed a man-made global warming catastrophe.

Political policy and environmental activism rely on this fraudulent 97% consensus paid for by the taxpayer to rob the taxpayer further with subsidies for bird-and-bat-chomping wind turbines, polluting solar panels and handouts to those with sticky fingers in the international climate industry. It's this alleged 97% consensus that has changed our electricity from cheap and reliable to expensive and unreliable.

EDITORIAL COMMENT
MISANTHROPIC GLOBAL WARMING

"Misanthropic" is an adjective for persons who hate or distrust mankind, which might be a reasonable description of those who want us to cease using fossil fuels to make electricity. They say they are saving the planet but more likely are part of the Freudian-Marxist takeover of our country and its deluded media, politicians, teachers and clerics.

Magic Squares

Magic Squares with 3, 5, 7 with any odd-number of sides are easy to make using Seven Rules:-

1. Begin with 1 in the middle box of the top row.

2. Head north-east (NE) until blocked by an obstacle.

3. When you run off the top row, go to the box at the bottom of the next column to the right, e.g. boxes 1 & 2 below, and head NE for box 3.

Here is the 5 × 5 square:

17	24	1	8	15
23	5	7	14	16
4	6	13	20	22
10	12	19	21	3
11	18	25	2	9

4. When you slant off the right side column, continue at the left box of the row above, e.g. from box 3 to box 4, and head NE, from box 4 to box 5.

5. When blocked by a number already there (e.g. 1), drop one box and head NE again, from box 6, to boxes 7 & 8.

6. From the box with 8, use Rules 2 and 3 to put in box 9, and Rule 4 from boxes 9 to 10, then Rule 5 to box 11, then NE again up the diagonal.

7. When you run off at the top right corner, drop one box, e.g. from box 15 to box 16, then use Rule 4 to get box 17, then Rule 3 to get box 18, etc.

Practise your additions

Make an easy start adding up the columns. Write the five answers in the row of boxes underneath. It's harder to add the five rows. Put anwers in the column of boxes on the right. Finally, add up the diagonals, and write anwers in the single boxes.

The magic part is that they all add up to 65.

A square with an odd number of n sides will have totals of $n(n^2 + 1)/2$.

Thus the 5-sided square above will total $5 \times (5^2 + 1)/2 = 5 \times 26/2 = 5 \times 13 = 65$.

The 3-sided square will total $3 \times (9+1)/2 = 15$.

A 7-sides square should total 175. Check it experimentally.

8	1	6
3	5	7
4	9	2

Squares with an even-number of sides

Here is a 4 × 4 square where all additions come to $4(4^2+1)/2 = 34$

10	1	16	7
15	8	9	2
3	12	5	14
6	13	4	11

Is there a set of rules for 4, 6 and 8 sides etc?

Yes, there is, and they are rather more complicated. They are in two groups: 6, 12, 18, where they are divisible by 3 as well as 2, and those not divisible by 3, such as: 4, 8, 10, 14. You can find the details on the internet..

Geometry

THE WORD 'geometry' means "to measure land" and comes from the Greek *geo + metros.*

Fear ye not geometry, and those points, lines, angles, surfaces, solids, or later daunting prospects such as algebra, co-ordinate geometry, trigonometry.

After all, **in the bad old days** of 60 odd years ago, high school students of English, history, languages and music, or university students for the Bachelor of Arts degree, **held in contempt** mathematics, science and Engineering students, and their teachers were just as bad. The hostility was reciprocated!

Of course, they all should have known better, and that geometry was part of the Liberal Arts necessary for the education of free, liberated men.

The Liberal Arts were firstly the **Trivium,** namely:
* Grammar— the basics of any subject
* Dialectic — arguing logically to get the truth
* Rhetoric — persuasion,

and then the **Quadrivium:**
* Geometry
* Astronomy
* .Arithmetic
* Music.

MODELS in wood and cardboard

Geometry (and later on, trigonometry) can be helplfully introduced to triangles made of blocks of wood or cardboard.

Such models are more convincing than lines drawn on paper. They can be handled, rotated, turned over. They can be compared with each other by laying one model alongside another, or on top of it, etc.

Models are less abstract than drawings. The vital rigorous proofs can (and must) come later.

Even infants' school K-2 these days get a good introduction to shapes and solilds.

Similarly, wooden rods can help, as also the metal or plastic strips in modern Meccano sets. They make things easier to see, such as:
* long side of a triangle is less that the others added together
* long side is opposite the biggest angle, so an angle greater than 90° (obtuse) must be opposite the longest side.

SIZE AND SHAPE

The lengths of the three sides of a triangle fix both its size and its shape.

The shape (i.e. appearance) of a triangle depends simply on the sizes of its three angles. In fact, the size of two of its angles is enough to fix its shape because the third angle can be calculated from the other two. For example, if two angles of a triangle are 45° and 60°, the remaining angle must be 75°, (because the sum of the angles of a triangle is 180°).

If the lengths of the three sides are known, the three angles can be found from them, either from a scale diagram using a protractor or by a calculation using trigonometry.

However, it does not work the other way round: the sizes of the three angles do not fix the lengths of the thee sides.

Revise the difference between congruent triangles and similar triangles. The conditions for congruent triangles match the conditions for uniquely describing a triangle:
1. three sides;
2. two sides and an included angle;
3. two angles and an included side.

Father James Tierney