kirchman transcript 040824
===

[00:00:00]

## Introduction: Challenging the Greenhouse Gas Theory

Kevin: My guest today is Kevin Kirchman , today we're going to discuss why the greenhouse gas theory is invalid scientifically. And, uh, as, as we discussed, um, Tom, it's, uh, it's, uh, it's important to challenge the science. If the, if the, if the data is, is, is conflicting or we see any alterations to the data and the theory is not panning out as the, as the models are, are, um, predicting, then maybe we should look more seriously at the theoretical foundations of, of what we're calling the science.

So basically that's what I've done.

## Exploring the Scientific Inconsistencies of Greenhouse Gas Theory

Kevin: Um, This, uh, chart is, is a, is a relatively common one. It's the Earth's spectral, um, uh, rad or radiant spectrum. And it shows these little, I call them, this, I call this the CO2 byte. Okay, so this is where, um, CO2 is reducing [00:01:00] the energy that's emitted to space. In other words, it's absorbing the energy.

Okay, so the, the greenhouse gas theory goes, CO2 Because CO2 and other gases are absorbing energy, the Earth is warming. Okay, but there's fundamentally a problem with this idea as this chart shows. So, technically, the Stefan Boltzmann law is the, is a thermodynamic, um, mathematical relationship that shows how the temperature is in proportion to the energy under the spectrum.

Um, and it was the area under the, uh, uh, under the spectrum, um, divided by the Boltzmann constant and the emissivity for a gray body. And that's it for any body in space, basically. Um, uh, this E then, what we're saying is CO2 is reducing the area under the curve. Okay, so fundamentally that means T is going to be smaller by the 7 Boltzmann Law.

So if T is small, that means the temperature is cooler, [00:02:00] right? So what, so we, we say the greenhouse gas theory because it's blocking the radiation, the earth must be getting warmer because we're, we're relating that to the, to conservation of energy. We're saying, okay, so the Energy is, is getting, um, is, is being absorbed.

Therefore, the Earth must be getting warmer. But the radiative spectrum is saying something else. It's saying, wait a minute, you can look at the, at the, uh, the absorbed energy as, as somehow warming the Earth. But we don't, we don't, that's not what the picture says. The picture says the Earth looks cooler when you look at it from space.

Okay, so that's, so that's, this is an observer in space would say, Okay. Earth is cooler because of CO2 blocking the energy. And that's because the area under the spectral, uh, curve is less than otherwise.

## The Role of CO2 in Earth's Energy Spectrum

Kevin: Now what I'm going to do is provide some supporting evidence and other, um, and explanations for other parts of the theory that people want to use to [00:03:00] def to continue to defend it. All right, so this, um, this is a really important, um, uh, uh, idea here, Newton's law of cooling. Newton's law of cooling says, uh, warmer objects radiate more heat.

Okay, so this is, um, and this is Wien's Law over here. It says basically the same thing. It says as the temperature of a, of a, of a body increases, then its radiative spectrum is, is increased. Okay, you can see the different temperatures and the different, um, uh, and they, and obviously the higher the temperature, the more energy is under the radiative spectrum.

This is the same. This is for the sun, for example. Okay. So the question is, okay, if, if the greenhouse gas theory were valid, then the, the earth will be radiating more energy, not less. Okay. So if it's, if it's not, and what we've just seen is that it's radiating less energy. So the question is, where is the extra, extra energy?

All right.

## Revisiting Fundamental Physics: From Newton to Einstein

Kevin: So, uh, this is a quote from [00:04:00] Einstein. He's, you know, basically metaphorical. We've got to question and challenge the, the, uh, these problems from new angles. And this is the basis of innovation in, in scientific, uh, study.

## Empirical Evidence Against the Greenhouse Gas Theory

Kevin: Okay, so this is, um, uh, so this are actual, uh, Earth spectral radiance from a, um, a thermal emission spectrometer on the Mars Global Survey, or, uh, Um, back in 1996.

So, basically, this was a, uh, uh, a vessel, a spacecraft, going away from the Earth on its way to Mars, looking back at the Earth and looking at our Earth's spectrum. And this is a really interesting curve here, and I'm going to show two of them. Again, it shows the CO2 byte. Um, you'll see two, um, two, uh, two, uh, x, uh, um, graphs here.

One is the wave number. And the other is the wavelength. And they're kind of inversely proportional. So they're kind of flipped backwards. But the wavelength, um, is the one I like to work off of. Because it basically shows, [00:05:00] um, Because the shorter wavelengths have higher energy. And so, um, this, though, is the, um, the rate, the energy, um, curve, so that, so you can understand the, uh, the relat the relationship better.

Um, this is the, this is where we start at, um, this is the CO2 bind, and again, this is where the infrared starts, is about, uh, About, uh, um, uh, yeah, 0. 7 microns

and the question is, what happens to the radiation that's blocked by the CO2? And what I'm, what I'm saying here is, is a po is postulating, well, somehow it must be going out all these other wavelengths. Okay, so it's go so it's said to be returning to the Earth. And then going back out the, the, um, the other wavelengths.

And that is, so like I said, there's a postulated curve. Um, so it must be going out other wavelengths. And that's, again, a postulation. So this is an interesting area here, too. Um, this is, [00:06:00] again, on the higher, um, uh, longer wavelength IR radiation. Um, this area is nearly equal to that on the left. So we're seeing an increase in radiation out here.

And, and generally in, in the discussions, we're, we're not going out into the far infrared too much. But you see a huge amount of energy that's leaving the Earth in the far infrared. So, um, so the, the, the, the suggestion here is that maybe this bite is coming out over here. Okay, so, so that's the, the point is, first of all, the energy has to be going somewhere else.

Okay, so this radiated energy is being blocked by CO2, presumably is coming back to the surface of the earth. Also is being transferred to molecules via collisions, which is called conduction. So this energy then is going to other molecules or back to the surface and then is being re radiated. Um, importantly, the radiation is at the speed of light.

So this all happened very fast, you know, very quickly. So [00:07:00] the question is, if, if, if the Earth is even just staying the same because of the increase in CO2 concentration, Then then this area under this curve has to be the same. Okay, so that's not what we see Unless the curve has been altered to to uh to have a large to have the equal area for a higher higher Um wavelength on other frequencies.

Does that make any sense? All right So that basically that's what this says and again, this is a this is a postulated line That's sort of meant to be, um, it's, it's of an average, it's, um, of the, of the, of the, if you were to smooth these out. So often we see that this line is drawn for a blackbody temperature for comparison, as it says.

But that is not a, a reasonable temperature comparison because, um, it needs to have the same area as the area under the curve. And if you were to take the, if you were to take that area and calculate the, [00:08:00] the, the temp, the blackbody temperature at which that area would be subsumed under, then you would have another, a different temperature for the, for the planet.

So some of these, the, so again, what we're doing is looking at the problem from a different perspective, recognizing that. That the graphs that we come to know as supporting the greenhouse gas theory are not actually supporting it at all. They're undermining its credibility because they're, they're, they're showing that they're, that we're missing some energy and we've got to know exactly where it is.

Okay. And so again, it doesn't matter how good your theory is or how smart you are. It matters. Only if you're, if you're, if you're evident, if the evidence is in support of your theory. And if, if it isn't, then your theory is wrong. And so, this is a, a direct theoretical challenge, basically. Okay, so, um, okay, importantly, if, indeed, energy is leaving via these other, other wavelengths from the planet, then Schwarzschild's [00:09:00] equation, which is used by the IPC and other, other, uh, authors, it cannot be valid.

And this basically, um, as it says, it contains the fundamental physics needed to understand and quantify the, the, the, um, how increasing, uh, greenhouse gases in the atmosphere reduce the flux of, of radiation to space. So, if no other fluxes change, conservation of energy demands that Earth warm. But, that's the question.

So, if Schwarzschild's, fundamentally Schwarzschild's equation doesn't apply, because the other fluxes do change, and they in fact must change, If the area under the curve is even to remain the same as if the CO2 bite is taken out. Okay, so this again, then it follows rationally that there's no sound theoreticals because the Schwarzschild equation is fundamental to the, to the temperature variation because it basically calculates the, the temperature change

caused by any changes in concentration for any of [00:10:00] the molecules.

So, if that, if that doesn't apply anymore, then we can't, we can't make a connection between the Earth's temperature and, and the molecular concentrations, okay? And again, um, so this means radiation tra because radiation travels at the, at the speed of light, um, all, all the, any changes in, in, um, in the, in the, um, the, the radiation spectrum can all be very fast and can be viewed more as phase shifts.

In the, in this, in this radio spectrum, rather than, rather than a, a, a fundamental changes in, in the, in the temperature of the plant.

## Thermodynamics and the Earth's Temperature

---

Kevin: So, now, um, what, when you, so you, we've looked at it from a different perspective, and now we're going to get down to the, to the meat of the, the problem, which is thermodynamics issues.

Now, uh, prim, I mean, mostly, academics and scientists are not [00:11:00] experts in thermo, thermodynamics. Thanks. But this is a critical field necessary for understanding any changes in thermal energy or understanding the problems of temperatures. And so if you're not, you're not capable in this space, then you're really, really might be not, um, Not qualified or understanding the real issues.

So let's, so, so broadly, the sun provides substantially all the energy of the planet. Okay, so geothermal energy is, is considered negligible. Now, there are some, some, there are some, uh, we're looking at, um, amounts of energy rather than where, where it's located or what it's doing, because there's some, some, some qualifications and caveats on the, on the role of geothermal energy in, in, in Earth's climate.

temperature is in climate. But fundamentally, from a whole perspective, at least from the perspective of the greenhouse gas theory, we consider [00:12:00] geothermal energy as negligible. Because the sun does provide all the energy, and because of Newton's law, a warmer object radiates more energy, then any extra energy must come from the sun.

Okay, so if Earth were to have been, become warmer. Then then it's going to radiate more energy. Okay, so where does it get the energy from if this if the sole source of the energy is from the sun and the sun were, you know, we can consider sort of fixed for this discussion, then then then the sun is going to say, Well, I'm sorry, I've given you I've allocated the energy that I'm giving you.

You want to radiate more. You don't get any more. So what happens to the earth? The earth says, I want to radiate more. And it's so it starts to cool. And then as soon as it starts to cool, there's a sun says, Well, here's the you know, you've got some more energy. So it this is how it maintains thermodynamic equilibrium.

So the sun [00:13:00] fundamentally is dictating the Earth's temperature. And it's doing so because of something called thermodynamic equilibrium. And what it means is that the only way that we can change the planet's temperature as humans is to change the emissivity. Because we obviously can't change the amount of sunlight.

And, um, so that, that thermodynamic argument, um, is important and it would have avoided had, had thermodynamics been more rigorously. Define it would have are utilized, then it would apply. That is what I want to say. Then we might not have had this, this, this, this massive, um, detour of capital, which is, which is threatening the, species and our survival as a species.

Anyway.

## The Moon Made of Green Cheese: A Lesson in Epistemology

---

Kevin: So this says the moon is made of green cheese. Well, obviously not made of green cheese, but if you're told this over and over and [00:14:00] over for years and years, as you grow up, then if you're asked, what is the moon made of and everybody around you is, they're all going to say the same thing. The moon is made of green cheese.

And well, it's, it's, so there are basically two ideas you can be taught. And, uh, one is, or in promoted, um, which one are the ideas that are invalid, they're simply not so, and other are ideas that are valid knowledge, um, over some spatial and temporal scope. And so the question is, okay, how do you tell the difference?

## Applying a New Theory of Validation to Climate Science

---

Kevin: Okay, so now we're going to sort of step back and say, and what I'm going to do is sort of explain why I was able to look at this greenhouse gas theory in a different perspective and understand why it cannot actually be a valid theory. And, and so this is a, a question of epistemology, which is the theory of knowledge.

Okay, it's a classical challenge, um, so the classical challenge of epistemology is how do you tell the difference between knowledge and

opinion, okay? And so, the, um, the ancient Greek philosopher first asked this question, [00:15:00] and, um, and, and we, we call it today sometimes scientific method. But I call it the Theory of Validation, because I've done much work in this area over, over more than 10 years.

Um, um, so basically, um, all concepts of knowledge are valid knowledge over some spatial and temporal scope. This is a, this is a, a new law and a principle of epistem, of an emerging epistemological science. discuss this at another time. Um, but so, so I, my, my, um, um, solution to this classical challenge was to, um, make explicit all nuances of knowledge, whether syntactic or semantic, In a new symbolic representation called the general form.

And then I later used this software, uh, this, an AI software, um, sold to many, um, global, uh, 100 clients and subject to, uh, and a company subject to an acquisition offer by a G100, um, company. And so this is a, uh, uh, [00:16:00] uh, confirmation of a new theory of validation. So let me just, I should have put this slide before, but, No, just so you have my background.

I was a, at Cornell in graduate school and my thesis was AI applications and engineering design. And I concluded that without a science of epistemology, um, just as we have to have a science of physics in order to, to uh, have, uh, phys physical sciences, without a science of epistemology, we would never have successful.

Well, in one sense, I was, it was incorrect because neural networks give us, uh, which are great for pattern matching, um, have given us a lot of opportunities because computers do that so well. But in another sense, I was right in the, on the linguistic or the, or the language part of it and the reasoning part.

And so, so, nonetheless, um, so my, so what I did is I, I took, I, I left, uh, Cornell grad school and I, um, I worked for, uh, For, for, um, more, more than 10 years I developed a, I was self employed, I developed a, um, I discovered an underlying order in the nature of conceptual [00:17:00] understanding that could serve as a foundation for this, this, this general form.

And, and that became, and again, it was driven by my desire to solve the classical challenge, uh, problem of epistemology. So the idea was generate a symbolic representation that made explicit all the nuances of understanding in the syntax and semantics. Thanks. That required a derivation of a new lexicological theory, which is a theory of meanings, as well as a symbolic representation.

Um, then, then a new theory of deduction to show what reasoning was. Okay, so how do we reason from these ideas? And then this, then, fundamentally, this, all this work was a theory of validation. Okay,

so then I, I went to Oxford and I, uh, did a, Uh, full historic and philosophic comparison. This is the 1990s of my work with the history of Western Philosophy showed it was solving many of the classical problems of the field that it was indeed historically distinct Then I'm I because I had undergrad degrees in computer science and and engineering.

I didn't have a full [00:18:00] An undergrad degree in philosophy. I applied to the LSE graduate program and they um Um, they, I, I submitted my, my, my paper on this validation, uh, uh, topic and they, they reviewed it and then they let me in there and I, and I studied there for a while. Um, I then, um, wrote a book and then demonstrated the theory of deduction, Lexi logical theory in the general form, um, in software that could reason for natural language.

So that's, that's a, so this is a, uh, this is a scientific development, an advance in, in the, in the, in the in epistemology, which is here to. previously not been considered to be a science at all, but just a branch of philosophy that was under constant speculation. And so, but, but now we see a science emerging out of this, um, that can be applied, um, for, for, in many things.

In, in fact, we'll see it's the basis for, for um, artificial intelligence and educational theory as well as the other, um, theories of the humanities all turn to the, the conceptual [00:19:00] model of the human conceptual nature and conceptual knowledge. Anyway, so, so I then, I, and, and doing all this software work, that was great, but I wanted to demonstrate my theory of validation, and I saw back about more than 10 years ago the Vostok course, um, evidence, the data itself was presented on BBC one day.

And I, I just, I just going through the data and saw that the The temperatures were rising, um, generally before the rises in CO2, not the other way around, which meant the causal relationship was inverted. And so that's when I said, well, let me, let me just use my theory of validation and show that it's an improvement in our scientific method.

An assess validity of the greenhouse gas turbine. Okay. So that's the, and then from that work, I, I showed it was indeed invalid, the theoretically, and I founded the Climate Science Journal, and today the Climate Science Journal is, is a little bit informal. Um, it's a journal in the strict sense because I, I post, uh, uh, global temperatures every day.

So it's deriving from the [00:20:00] French jo. Um, and so it's, it is, it is indeed a journal. It's just, um, it's just a, in the, in the, in the development stage. So, um, this is just some backdrop, um, epistemological, uh, an epistemological science necessarily had to arrive from outside the academic world. Um, and I know this firsthand,

you cannot, you cannot change something from within.

If you have to, if you have to adopt the prevailing paradigm, learn and study what the, the, something that, that was in, was, is the prior paradigm, just in order to come to the fore, forefront of the field. And the, and the, and the field itself is, is, is as acknowledged as a non-science. Then you're basically precluding any, any, any, any discovery of, of a, of, of another paradigm because you're getting indoctrinated with the old one.

Okay. So, um, anyhow, that's, that's the, the point on that. Now this, now let's go back to the, to the client climate science issue.

## The Effective Temperature Argument and Its Flaws

---

Kevin: So part [00:21:00] of the, the greenhouse gas theory is the effective temperature argument says basically that the. The temperature of the Earth is, is, is, is much warmer than it's supposed to be.

Um, if you were to look at, you know, if you were to look at the, just the, um, in calculating the, the solar radiation meeting the Earth, etc. But there's a problem with this, this idea and this effective temperature paradigm. Um, it basically says that the surface of the Earth is where we stand up. Okay. Well, thermodynamically, that's not true.

Um, the surface of the earth is, is the, is the edge of the, of the, the molecules of the planet. That's the surface. Okay. Because the, the, I mean, the surface of the sun is, is not where we could stand up, right? We, if we could, but, but it's not equal to the density, um, of the, the surface of the earth is not where the density is, is such that a person would float.

Okay, so the [00:22:00] surface of the sun is the extremity of the molecules of the sun. Okay, now you could, you could get more elaborate and say, well, you know, the surface can be, be when there's only so many molecules. So you have a little bit of a problem. If you wanna know what the temperature of the surface of a body and space is, you can basically, it's the temperature of space on, on one side of the surface, and then the other side, it's the, it's the last, you know, it's the edge of the, of the, of the gradient, of the, of the body.

So, so I say that we should be choosing the, the temperature of, or I mean the service of the earth. based upon its thermodynamic temperature. So this is a is a graph derived again from from from NOAA actually. And so I took their graph and then made a bunch of notes on

it basically. And so, so this, this temp, this is, this orange line is their temperature line.

Okay. So, um, right here is the, is this high temperature and that's the one they're [00:23:00] talking about is the surface of the earth. Well, that sounds all nice at sea level, but it's, it doesn't actually, um, it's not the right, it's not the right place. It's biased by, uh, the same problem that Galileo have, which is the anthropomorphic assumption.

It's, it's basing where it's a basing, our, our physical sciences, arguments, On, on where, on, on humans or where we're at. Okay. So anyhow, so, so this temperature then, um, declines. To the tropopause and then it rises again to the stratopause, declines again to the mesopause, um, again. So, this, this actual, the actual, um, temperature that the Earth should be, as calculated from, given the solar radiation that we receive at the distance, should be negative 16 degrees Celsius.

Well, the temperature of the Earth is negative 16, of the surface, is negative 16 degrees Celsius. Celsius, depending upon where you choose that surface to be. Okay, so we cannot choose it to be down here at where we stand. That is [00:24:00] purely anthropomorphic. So it's not a, it's not a good selection. Um, you, so the question is the, so where do you choose it?

I, I, do you choose it, um, here's the troposphere where 80 percent of the atmosphere is. But I say it should be calculated at the highest, at the highest extremity, and this should be chosen at the surface about 112 kilometers, should be chosen as the surface of the Earth, simply because that's where the, the thermodynamically correct temperature is located.

So some, so people could say that the surface of the Earth. Um, is too hot to, to, um, and it must be caused by the greenhouse gas theory. And that's, that's not accurate. You can say the nitrogen and oxygen are making the earth warmer at this, this altitude above the, above the planet, this radius of the planet.

But you're, you know, that's, that's really, you know, you can go down a little lower and it's, You know, down 100 meters beneath the surface, it's going to be warmer still, you know, so, you know, what, you know, so where do you, where are you supposed to [00:25:00] choose? Why would you choose where we stand? And as from a scientific perspective, it's just not the right place.

Okay, so that basically eliminates this defense of the greenhouse gas theory. And so it's because it's it's anthropomorphic and we can't and we can't use it. Okay, so this, um, basically. Okay.

Challenging Prevailing Climate Science Theories
---

Kevin: I, you know, I, so this is a bit of a abstract discussion, frankly, when you talk about epistemology and, and, and theories, but, um, basically a better scientific method is now available.

And I, and I, what I've done is demonstrate its application to a theory that generally is considered valid by all sides of the, of the argument, including the skeptics. Um, as you, as you are aware, so challenging the basis of this, of this theory is what I've done and I've used, um, a better technology of validation or an improved scientific, okay?

And these are the, these are the support for an emerging [00:26:00] science, um, of epistemology, which is interesting. Again, it's not climate science, but it's interesting because it has implications for all the humanities and, and for physical sciences as well. Okay, so, I don't want to spend a lot of time on this, um, Hapur and this gentleman's, I don't even want to try to pronounce his name, um, they, they have a, a paper, um, and I got some gripes with it because of what they call climate forcing, um, and so I wanted to challenge it, um, and basically I, I exposed the argument of the paper and evaluated their premise and then confirmed that the, that their conclusions are invalid, okay, and, um, basically, um, I, I, C So, so force, um, equals mass times acceleration.

Uh, um, there are, there are, there are half a dozen force, uh, formulas that are derived through, uh, uh, uh, through the, through the, the history [00:27:00] of, of science. And they're all are at the basis of, of, of science. So when we start. Throwing, um, in a cavalier way, the concept of force around and, and attach climate to it.

You know, we're, we're basically, we're, we're destroying the, the, the foundation of science, of the scientific enterprise. And you'll see that there is no justification for this for, this so called infrared forcing or climate forcing that they're discussing. And they're, and they're obliterating the language of science by their, my perspective in an aptitude.

And, and so that's, you know, that's why I'm taking issue with this particular paper. Okay. So they, um, their paper is basically talking about the, the, the molecular concentrations, the atmosphere, and it attempts to correlate, um, temperatures to those various molecular concentrations reasonably enough. It doesn't really make any difference.

It doesn't have any fundamentally though, it doesn't say anything

about the temperature [00:28:00] of the planet. Or any forcing of the planet, um, you know, it's saying, it's saying that the concentration of these various things will affect the temperature at a particular location, but not of the planet, just of a particular location.

We already know that the planet's temperature cannot be, be altered because the sun is dictating that temperature. Okay, so the, again, there's only one, um, way that we can alter the, the, the, the temperature of the planet, which is changing in emissivity. Now, I'm just going to digress real fast here.

## The Misinterpretation of CO2's Role in Climate

---

Kevin: One, we do actually change emissivity on the planet Earth.

We can change it by roads, by rooftops. Um, uh, any, any, any, um, any, uh, uh, alteration of the, of the, of the absorptive, absorption of the, of the surface will change the emissivity. Even a solar panel, um, will warm the, the planet because it absorbs more energy than a, than an earth in general. If you put it over a, [00:29:00] you know, a, a, a field of snow, for example, it's going to increase earth's, um, emissivity, okay?

So that means that it will, in fact, From a thermodynamic foundation, it will change Earth's temperature, and it is a human change. But it's not, but we're not talking about CO2. That, the CO2 is the issue of the greenhouse gas theory, and that is invalid. Humans changing, you know, Yes, possible. We can, uh, you know, run nuclear power plants all night, all day long, all over the place, and that will warm the earth because, you know, and so there are ways humans can change the temperature of the planet, but CO2 is not one.

Okay. And this basically is, um, this, you know, people can look at this later, but it's basically saying. That thermodynamics being a thermostatistical business is, has to be, um, when we're, we're evaluating a theory, we have to, we have to think a little bit harder. We can't just, you can't, you just can't go into and [00:30:00] make all kind of assumptions like, okay, so it's blocking some radiation, therefore, Earth gets warmer.

That, that doesn't actually follow, okay, because there's other issues that are, that are, that preceded, and thermodynamics is one of them, and, um, so, um, this is a, you know, so I use the analogy, um, we, with, with Happer's paper, they could be saying that, That salinity levels in the ocean, if you alter them, this is the same sort of argument.

If you change the salinity levels in the ocean, can we say that if the

earth had, well, more salty, uh, or actually the specific heat capacity is less. But if we change the salinity of the oceans, wouldn't it absorb more energy at various levels or less energy? Depending on how, how the change was. So I say the, the, the, this is, this is an analogy which shows that their, their attempt to equate concentration changes with, in the atmosphere to global changes in Earth's temperature is, is [00:31:00] bogus.

They, they don't have any, you know, this, this argument has just as much merit. Okay. But again, it doesn't hold. Um, so, um, and this is sort of an, you know, example, pulling it out. This, this says here at the salinity of zero grams per kilogram, and then rising, and it shows that the specific heat of, of salt water, um, declines with an increasing concentration.

Okay. So not that everybody wants to remember this cause it's sort of esoteric, but nonetheless, Bye guys. And we look over here at CO2, CO2 has a lower specific heat than air, nitrogen, or oxygen. It means it takes less thermal energy to warm CO2 than air. And therefore CO2 holds less thermal energy at a given temperature.

It means that it, that CO2 can, when we have higher concentration of CO2 in the atmosphere, it can warm less ice, not more, because it has less thermal energy from which to, which, with which to transfer. And it's the same, that the salinity of the [00:32:00] ocean increases Then it can, it can store less thermal energy on a per unit basis.

And so this is, you know, it's, it's counterintuitive and intuitive, but so anyway, so when I originally wrote this, this, this slide, I said, well, I think salinity will increase the salinity will increase the specific heat capacity, but it actually doesn't, you know, it works the opposite way and the same, same that we're, you know, so, so we can, so, like I said, you have to, you have to consider all these things in order to be able to conclude, have valid conclusions.

Okay. And, uh, this, and it does raise this question. What is the role of specific heat capacity in, in affecting Earth's emissivity? Emissivity being a fundamental thermodynamic property of the planet that we have very little understanding of on a global scale. Okay. Um, so, uh, this is, I just pulled this from their paper again, um, uh, and basically they, they use, um, the, the temperature here at black body temperature.

Um, and again, [00:33:00] and then they're basically saying the red here is, uh, where they have an increase in CO2 concentration and they're, they're saying that this is, um, this is, look, look, it's, it's, it's absorbing just a little bit more. Uh, thermal energy, right? Um, or infrared radiation, however you want to say it.

And, and there, you know, so, but, um, what I say is, wait a minute,

you're saying that it's, it's sending less to space. You're, you're saying that a little bit more concentration of CO2 is going to make Earth look cooler from, from, from space, not warmer. So this is a contrary, this is, so they don't, they're not, they're not seeing the evidence that they're presenting and, and its implications.

Thank you from different perspectives, which is what, you know, what we're supposed to do is we have to look at the world as, as a, from a rational perspective. Anyway, so this is, you know, basically here's the green, which says no CO2. And if this were the green, then the area under the curve would mean the earth is warmer without CO2.

[00:34:00] Okay. And, and, and not that cooler. Okay. And, you know, there's other ways we could look at this. We can, we can take this onto a different direction. We can say, Wait a minute, if the Earth is cooler from space, then is CO2, is that CO2, is that, is that bite due to the, to the plants absorbing CO2? Because that has to have an influence, because plants are, photosynthesis is an endothermic reaction, so they're absorbing heat.

So is that why we have the bite? Are we misconstruing its origins? You know, we know, on the one hand, that it is absorbing the radiation. Um, differently than the other molecules. So that's the one. But is it, is there a coincidental role of photosynthesis in, in reducing the amount of energy that's leaving the planet?

Um, these are good questions, right? And, and need to be further examined because photosynthesis also absorbs thermal energy from the air, not just photons directly from the sun. in the, in the process of heating the, the, um, the, [00:35:00] the, and, and warming up the, the, anyways, to, to, to, to cause the reaction. Okay. So that's, um, like I say, those are just questions.

And, and this is another quote. He says, Thermodynamics is the only physical theory of universal content, which I am convinced will never be overthrown within the framework of applicability of its basic concepts. Again, this is a bit of an appeal to authority, you know, so that's a, that's a fallacy, but fundamentally I use it to endorse the idea that, that thermodynamics is very sound because it is statistical physics.

It's, it's, Um, so it's a very, it's a very, it's a very powerful, um, um, body of knowledge, even though it's, it's not universally, uh, understood or as well as it should be.

## Concluding Thoughts and the Importance of Scientific Integrity

---

Kevin: Okay, so, um, in conclusion, um, modern academics have a lower

epistemological standard. And this is, this is a bold statement I'm making and from my perspective.

Okay, so you don't, you don't have to agree with everything I say. What I'm doing is [00:36:00] looking at, at the, at the world and, and our cultures and our, and our, and the state of our knowledge from another perspective. So just because it's another perspective doesn't make it's mean. It wrong, mean it's wrong. It could be better or it could be worse.

And so, but, but, but it is different, okay? So, so because it's different, you, you might consider it, but when I start to show you that maybe it, it's a, it's a little bit more, uh, profoundly better, um, view of the, of the, of the nature of conceptual modelage, then you, then you can start to get, gain advantages from it.

And one of those is an improved theory of validation or a better scientific method. Okay, so, uh, what I'm saying here is modern academics have a lower epistemological standard than productive society if they are not verifying their data and conclusions with either experiment or productive application.

And I know this, I've worked in both sides, um, in science as well as application, in manufacturing as, as well as computing, and, and I know that, that, that [00:37:00] you, if you have an idea, you need to test it in the world. And if you've got to deliver it to, to 100, 000 people. You got to do a lot of testing and you discover a lot of things.

I, I've discovered lots of things about my theory of deduction by building a natural language reasoning systems and improved, improved the theoretical foundations. And so that's the, you know, that's how that works. And when today we're, we've got a, basically a nationalized academic world globally. And this is, this is, um, this is a threat to our cultures because these, this, this nationalized group.

of people are, at great cost, they're, they're undermining our, our, our, our standards of knowledge when they're supposed to be doing the opposite, to maintain them through education, they're undermining our general standards. Okay, so, greenhouse gas theories on par with alchemy are bleeding patients to heal them, both of which were considered science in previous societies.

Yeah, [00:38:00] but yet the greenhouse gas theory is, is, is not silenced now, nor has it ever been scientifically grounded. And um, and finally, this is a little bit, um, since I'm using a new theory of validation, it applies both to the, the concepts of the humanities as well as the physical sciences. And I, I think that the, the, the, the greenhouse gas theory is used, is being used for political purposes.

Thank you very much. And, um, so, um, I, I, I think, therefore, it's important that we challenge a theory for other reasons because it will undermine the credibility of any, any, of its use to, to challenge the fundamental theory. Okay, so let me see if there's anything else. Okay, yeah, well, today, there's a, a, a total solar eclipse on a, on a broad swath of the United States.

So people should get out there and, and take a look. I, I'm, I'm, I'm not gonna be able to see that from where I'm at. But, um, basically, um, the te the temperature of the air at the Earth's [00:39:00] surface drops 5 to 20 degrees in 20 to 30 minutes, or about an hour or whatever. And what does that mean? Okay, so if the temperature, if the sun is blocked, and and and within an hour, the temperature drops drastically, where the heck is the greenhouse?

Okay? It's not, you know, it's not, uh, it's not there. It's not it's not functioning. There is no greenhouse. Okay. There isn't co2. I mean nitrogen and oxygen are holding thermal energy But the, the, um, but the, the, there is no greenhouse, um, and, and the, and the, without the sun, we would freeze in, in, in a very short time.

But I just want to reemphasize this, um, that the greenhouse gas theory is not valid scientifically. Um, if anybody is out there in a total or part, or generally partial eclipse, then they should go out and see how cold it is. I was. I was in one once in, in Georgia and it was amazed how cold it got and how the traffic lights, uh, you know, the, the road lights turned on and how, how [00:40:00] you needed a sweater and, uh, because, because the sun was immediately taken away.

Okay, and um, let me see and that's about it if you want to contact me if you were interested in any of my books and I can discuss or links to that and You got any questions for me Tom? I do.

Q&A: Addressing Other Theories and the Future of Climate Science
---

Kevin: I don't know if you want to comment on other people's work, but on my podcast we've had Young Tuition, Marcus Ott, Tom Shula, uh, talking about some of this stuff. And, um, do you have any comments on whether they are on the right track, uh, or have you looked into their work? Yeah, I, I've talked to them.

I've been in, in communication with them. Um. I don't want to, I can't, I, you know, like I said, I'm not a master of their particular work, but I have, like I said, there was a, you know, I have been in commu, communication. There's a lot of really good work out there and people are, you know, when I challenge, other people challenge, and then I've, I've, you know, Found some other.

So I'm not gonna, I'm the only person challenging theory. Um, so I, [00:41:00] you know, you, you kind of see the world from your perspective, you know, they don't have much choice, you know, then you listen to other people and then you try to update your, your perspective so that it's accurate. Okay. This is the, you know, challenge of a, of a mature human being is to try to see the world for what it is.

And, uh, so. So, am I the only person that's challenged the greenhouse gas theory? No. I mean, we can go back to Avogadro challenged, um, Arrhenius perspective, back, you know, in the early part of the 20th century. So, no, I'm not the first person, but I'm the first, I'm one of the first anyways to take a direct attack at the theory itself.

And the ways that I've challenged it here are novel. Um, so they are original. I did that. You know, I did, look, look, how, how can the Earth, because the Earth is cooler from space. Uh, if you look at it from the perspective of space, this is a relativistic issue. Um, and then the question of effective temperature, that's not, from my perspective, been challenged in that manner before.

Again, you don't, you never [00:42:00] know if you're the first guy on earth to invent the light bulb, or whether some guy, you know, 200 miles away is doing the same work. You, but you, you know, you do the best you can to, to, um, to innovate, and then check your work, and then, then, and we, um, this is a, scientific enterprise is a, is a, is a, is a, is a labor of, of, of love for, for those who participate.

And, and it's not necessarily remunerative. It doesn't necessarily pay much, but you do it because, because it's sort of an evolutionary drive, I suppose. I think, um, that basically what we'll find is that people, when, when they're, if we, if we can, uh, if it's clear to people, Um, they have to double check it and think for themselves, but they should spend a little time thinking what I said in the beginning and understanding what that shot, that fundamental challenge is.

And then they, then they start to have to, they've got to man up or, you know, they got to, they got to take them some, have some courage and start to challenge the arguments, the scientific basis. [00:43:00] Of the theories, and when they do that, the, the Marxists will quickly collect, um, uh, capitulate, and, and they'll, and the, and the people promoting it know, when they know it's not necessarily legit, and not everybody is like, not everybody is dishonest, some people are just duped, you know, and, and some, and then some people know something's up, but there's money in it, you know, so they don't really care, they don't want to ask too many questions, so you have a, and some people are just pushed along by peer pressure, and don't, you know, Don't want to, don't want to go against the crowd, but sometimes things get out of hand if we don't stand up and assert a better foundation for

general knowledge or scientific knowledge, and this is a time when we have to do that. Actually, this might be a dumb question, though, but that bite that you talk about, that part of it is real, you think, right? That CO2, could we still call CO2 a greenhouse gas, but other parts of the theory are not right? I wouldn't go there. I would say that it's [00:44:00] definitely absorbing energy, but it's, from my perspective, and this, I still have to do a lot of work on verifying, but I would say, That it's only a, it's only a phase change and it is not a greenhouse gas in the least.

It doesn't warm the planet and it doesn't, you know, it's Take, okay, just, I had a picture before on that last time I did a presentation with you and of a, of a molecule of CO2 and it was, and it showed it where it absorbed a, um, uh, photon and then it radiated the photon, you know, and, and, but basically, when a CO2 molecule absorbs energy, it's got it, then it radiates it, you know, and then it's gone.

And so the, the, the, the photon was. Going past anyways, and now you're talking about a sub second, tiny nanosecond of time, or you know, microsecond or whatever, when it's actually, it has this energy, and then it's going to pass it on as if it never had it. So what difference does it make? In my perspective, it's just, [00:45:00] it's a, it's a ludicrous theory, and like I said, you don't, you know, this George Washington, the first president of the United States, he's a brilliant guy, you know, wonderful general, He basically, um, they, they, he was bled to death, you know, that he was, he got sick and he got a flu, he's out in the cold and they, and they bled him and then bled him and bled him some more and he died.

And, and, and largely from being bled because that was the technology, the latest, greatest technology of his time. And that's what happened. And so we don't want to bleed humanity to death with, um. By, by eliminating our sources of energy, which is what I see we're doing. So, just to be clear though, you do think that a, when CO2 absorbs that photon, it is different than what nitrogen does when that same photon comes at, yeah, that part is correct.

Yeah, it is, it does, um, it does have, um, a, a, it does, um, the, the, the vibration rotation, um, uh, does, uh, of the, of the, of the [00:46:00] molecule, Does allow greater degrees of freedom for a co2 molecule and multi atomic molecules than nitrogen oxygen, which are diatomics. Okay, so they, so they can't, they can't have as many degrees of freedom.

On the other hand, as I said on our previous podcast, nitrogen oxygen also absorb energy by electronic level changes. Okay, so, um, and this, this is, um, this is also augmented by Rydberg, uh, Ritz, um, um, uh, uh, theorem, um, and, and basically, basically what it means is that, that there's a whole bunch of frequencies in the longer wavelengths.

That where nitrogen and oxygen are absorbing radiation that's in the combination principle where it's basically, um, so, so we don't, they're not, they're, they're, they're, they're very, they're fuzzy lines, so to speak. And, uh, because of the, the nature of this, of the, of the, of the, of, of the [00:47:00] quantum, um, quantum level, um, levels of molecules.

So that, that's sort of my, uh, my perspective is yes. CO2 definitely has a, has a, um, there's a word I want to, I haven't been able to find, but there's a, you know, it's, it's selectively that's what, that's the word that CO2 does selectively absorb IR radiation in that spectrum. And that by can be attributed to, To CO2.

And like I said, with a caveat that it also might be indicative of something being absorbed on the on the ground through photosynthesis, perhaps a phytoplankton or plants or something. I don't know. And more work needs to be done. It's controversial stuff when you get into this because it gives people want to defend their view.

And, uh, that's, you know, that's a competition of life. And, and so it's not, I'm not, I'm not, I'm not afraid of it. You know, I, I stand up to it, but we all need to fight to understand what's the accurate knowledge and what isn't. So [00:48:00] we're not naming any names here, but do you get the sense that there are some famous folks in this debate who think you may be on the right track, but they won't say that publicly yet?

Well, yeah, I, I, to be, yes. Um, I, I won't name any names either. Um, but no, I would say that, uh, there are people who, who have endorsed the, the greenhouse gas theory for decades. Okay, so for them to have to eat their words, you know is not necessarily a exciting part of their life, right? so so they're um Yeah, so there's so a lot of people and and people need they need others to to confirm to them that something's right Peer review.

Okay. Look for an example peer review is where you go And you need somebody else to tell everyone else that you're right. Okay. Or, you know, or similarly, it's, it's, it means that you're allowed to say what you have [00:49:00] to say in a, in a, in a formal society. And if you, if you're, and if you don't have the endorsement of some group of people that have control over the peer review process, then you're not allowed to say, these things in society.

Because, and, and it's, and it may not be simply because they're, they're wrong. It may be that the vested, the interest, the vested interest of the people, um, controlling the, the peer, uh, review, uh, are, are, like, I've never, I never submitted my doc, my, um, work to peer review. Um, I got, I, what I did is I went to, PhDs in atmospheric physics and physics and I got them to read it and they

sent me endorsements.

So that's, I did it, you know. This is a little different. I knew it in advance. Um, I, I knew the controversial nature, and I understood the, I, I saw guys like, um, gosh, it's so, there's so many, uh, people, that, that, um, And, there, I've seen the, the people just raked through the, you know, that were terribly [00:50:00] chastised because of their views in science and, and, and wrongly.

And I saw that, alright, I said, okay, well these guys are not, not your allies. And when I understood there was a Marxist rule, they want to basically say, Capitalism caused CO2 rises, and CO2 rises is evil, therefore capitalism is evil. You know, that's a, that's a simplistic argument, but it's what they're, it's the one that they don't want to say because it's so simple stupid, but it's the one behind all their, all their machinations.

And so, um, so when I understood that, I knew, well, these people are pretty, there's going to be some pretty horrible people. They're trying to basically steal everybody's property and enslave them. That's, you know, that's the Marxist pseudo theory. It's pseudoscience. It's rubbish. And I, and I, you know, I can go through a book on Marx and show all the premises invalid.

And they generally reason appropriately from invalid premises to reach invalid conclusions, you know, but that doesn't make it anything other than pseudoscience. Science nonetheless. Um, so yeah, so I would [00:51:00] say, I would say it's impactful and, but it takes time to, to influence a, like a scientific community when your views are distinct and they're, and they differ and challenge the prevailing paradigm.

It's, I, I, I knew it already. It's, I called the innovator's dilemma, even though that's applied to something else. I, you know, as an innovator, if you're too innovative, you've got to, you just got to bear with it, you know, that's what you did, that's who you are, you sing your song and, and hope that one day people will stop, uh, you know, you know, but there are a lot of nice people out there and I do get a lot of confirmation.

I, you know, I have 35, 000 people in my network, you know, that are, that are reading, you know, my posts all the time. And, and I have, you know, Twitter network or X network or whatever. And so it's, and that's growing. And, and so, so I do, and it does it. I do think it impacts the conversation, and I know, I know this.

I will give you an example. If I, if I might, I was invited by the Nobel Foundation to a conference in [00:52:00] Washington, D. C. last May. On the on knowledge or something and I so I went up there and um, I prepared a little paper You know, and it was uh hosted by the

national academy of sciences So I went up there and i've got a long history in business and all so but so I went and basically introduced myself to about 50 or different people, you know, and, and gave him my paper and made my little pitch.

I pitched to, uh, Nobel laureates in physics, physics, the president of the National Academy of Sciences, the, you know, the head of sciences in the UK, the, you know, the, so all kinds of people. And And it was interesting.

But like I said, the, there's some better things that I'm working on that are, that could have more fun. For profound influence, so we'll see, but like I say, um, you know, my, my drive was to, to, uh, I, I kept true to the, to the temple of epistemology and science, and I had to digress for, like I said, more than a decade.

And in order [00:53:00] to devise these things. And you know, I, just to give you a little bit of insight, I, I had, um, I brought 10 books. I was, uh, I had, I had a farm. I, I said, well, farm because it's not, not this competitive and you just have to wait on the plants to grow and sell 'em. And so I, I did and I, and I, and I did this on the edge of a jungle in Central America, frankly.

And, and then I, and I built up a little farm and served all the hotels and supermarkets and restaurants. But, but, um, at night you can't do anything on a farm because you got no energy, and I would just work on, on epistemology, but these ten books, they were, uh, uh, uh, uh, broad, uh, broad subjects, different subjects, um, all about, you know, a few hundred pages long, I got a nice sample size of these ten books. Enough. Because it was all, it wasn't all modified or, or contorted to, to somebody's epistemological bias. They were just expressions of, of views in different fields. So that was the, from that sample size is when I, I basically discovered the underlying order, uh, the nature of conceptual knowledge.

And that [00:54:00] then became the foundation for generating the general form of a concept, which then became the basis for, for, um, for our data structure in software. And then, I, of course, we have a lexicological theory, which is a real big part, so that computers can understand the meanings of words, and then the theory of deduction, Provides us a capacity to reason from languages, you know, from language, from natural language with computers.

So it's cool stuff, and it's applicable, which is an endorsement of the work as an emerging science of epistemology. So anyways, like I said, I've gone a little digression there, but anyhow. Okay, uh, thank you very much, a very interesting presentation, and as usual, I'm going to put the PDF up on my sub stack so people can take a look at the slides from today, but thanks again for doing this.

I think a lot of people are going to be commenting about it, so I'm looking forward to that. Talk to you soon. Thank you, Tom. Bye.