

Date published: Monday, February 4<sup>th</sup>, 2012  
Latest update:

## APPENDIX 1d

### DEFINITIONS

This document is part of, and intended to be read in conjunction with,  
all parts of and appendices to the document entitled *CSIROh!*

Corruption of science is so pervasive it's necessary to define basic words and terms. These include science, scientist, scientific, scientific method, Precautionary Principle, corruption, lie, fraud, propaganda and crook.

#### **What is science? What is a scientist?**

Science is the honest, objective, systematic observation and understanding of Nature and the world in which we live. It uses objective observation and measurements combined with logical reasoning to provide accurate knowledge and understanding of our universe.

**Science** is defined in the dictionary as, quote: "*sci·ence: noun*

1. *A branch of knowledge or study dealing with a body of facts or truths systematically arranged and showing the operation of general laws: the mathematical sciences.*
2. *Systematic knowledge of the physical or material world gained through observation and experimentation.*
3. *Any of the branches of natural or physical science.*
4. *Systematized knowledge in general.*
5. *Knowledge, as of facts or principles; knowledge gained by systematic study."*

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/science?s=t>

Encyclopedia Britannica says of science that it is: "*Any system of knowledge that is concerned with the physical world and its phenomena and that entails unbiased observations and systematic experimentation. In general, a science involves a pursuit of knowledge covering general truths or the operations of fundamental laws.*"

**Scientist** is defined as, quote: "*sci·en·tist: noun*

*An expert in science, especially one of the physical or natural sciences."*

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/scientist?s=t>

**Scientific** is defined as, quote: “sci·en·tif·ic: adjective

1. Of or pertaining to science or the sciences: scientific studies.

2. Occupied or concerned with science: scientific experts.

3. Regulated by or conforming to the principles of exact science: scientific procedures.

4. Systematic or accurate in the manner of an exact science.”

<http://dictionary.reference.com/browse/scientific?s=t>

**Scientific Method.** The scientific method is defined in Black’s Law Dictionary as, quote: “An analytical technique by which a hypothesis is formulated and then systematically tested through observation and experimentation”.

People with science degrees and those with appointments as scientists may through their approach and behaviour not be scientific. They are not scientists.

People without formal science qualifications who use the scientific method honestly can be scientists. History provides many examples of famous scientists lacking formal academic science qualifications. True scientists systematically and objectively seek truth through objective knowledge made possible through observation using the scientific method.

The ultimate arbiter of science is empirical scientific evidence. It’s used within structured logical scientific reasoning to identify cause-and-effect.

A second way of assessing the validity of a hypothesis or supposition is to assess its effectiveness in predicting future outcomes. If predictions using the theory are accurate the theory may explain Nature. There may though be other confounding factors needing to be explored. If predictions are not accurate though, the theory is wrong. Wrong.

Nobel Science Prize-winning scientist Richard Feynman says it effectively in one minute:

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=b24OPGCMwVo>

Quote: “If it disagrees with experiment (Nature, observations) it’s wrong. In that simple statement is the key to science. It doesn’t make any difference how beautiful your guess is, it doesn’t make any difference how smart you are, who made the guess or what his name is if it disagrees with experiment it’s wrong. That’s all there is to it (science)”.

A hypothesis is often based on assumptions. If the assumptions are not valid, the hypothesis is not valid. For a hypothesis to be valid, its underlying assumptions must be valid.

Documented facts though show that parts of the supposition that human CO<sub>2</sub> drives climate meet the definition of fraud.

To be called a theory, a supposition needs to be consistent with accepted laws and theories. Strong scientific arguments are emerging that reveal that the supposition that human CO<sub>2</sub> controls global climate contradicts laws of Nature and laws of science. That means the supposition does not meet requirements to be called a theory.

The supposition that global warming (aka climate change) is driven by human carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) is proven wrong principally by:

- Its contradiction of empirical scientific evidence;
- Its lack of logical scientific reasoning demonstrating causation;
- Its underlying assumptions are not valid;
- The fact that projections based on the supposition are wrong.

In layman's terms, the process for establishing true science involves stating a hypothesis and then measuring to test the hypothesis. Re-testing objectively and logically continues until the supposition/theory is validated or disproven. As Canadian climate professor Tim Ball explains, true scientists and those applying science in the real-world understand that, quote: "*Science works by creation of theories based on assumptions, in which scientists performing their proper role as sceptics, try to disprove the theory*". Once a theory passes tests and criticism it is accepted. Scientific scepticism is a vital part of science.

Informally, science begins with curiosity expressed in a specific question or as a quest for deeper understanding. That inherent human curiosity and/or aspiration to improve people's lives can be stimulated by observation of opportunities or on needs for improved understanding or on seeking material benefits. eg, reduced risk or greater security, ease, comfort, safety, productivity/efficiency, cost-effectiveness, environmental care, .... These spark knowledge and understanding.

The broad steps are:

1. An explanation is hypothesised to explain Nature and/or realise a benefit from greater understanding of Nature.
2. Observations are made of Nature and/or experiments conducted. These prove or disprove (confirm or reject) the hypothesis or refine the observation/testing. Observations continue until repeatable validated measurements confirm or reject the hypothesis.

Rejection is not failure. It's beneficial in growing knowledge.

Nothing is ever settled. Science is always open to question and challenge.

It is the hypothesiser's responsibility to prove the hypothesis.

The theory is then used to predict the future. If it fails to accurately predict future results, it's not science.

The supposition that human CO<sub>2</sub> drives global climate has failed every scientific test. It is not scientific.

## The null hypothesis and its significance

*The hypothesis that human CO<sub>2</sub> drives global warming may be stated as: If CO<sub>2</sub> levels increase due to increased human CO<sub>2</sub> production, then global temperature will increase.*

The null hypothesis is that an increase in human CO<sub>2</sub> production does not drive higher temperature. Empirical scientific evidence proves that the null hypothesis is correct and the original hypothesis is wrong.

The null hypothesis' significance is that proving it correct disproves the hypothesis

UN IPCC forecasts of climate were repeatedly proven wrong. The UN IPCC then started doing scenarios. That's not science. It's conjecture.

Yet scenarios are broadcast widely across the media and subtly implied to be projections. Appendices 9 and 10 reveal subtle use of the words "*if*" and "*may*" by academics and supposed '*experts*'. They're stated in such a way that audiences assume or interpret the statements as factual evidence. They're not lies. They are conjecture. They're misleading.

Appendix 14 reveals ways that false statements can be used to subtly imply science. It reveals other tricks such as *appeals to authority* and smearing those whose view disagrees. Abuse and labelling is no substitute for empirical scientific evidence.

<http://wattsupwiththat.com/2012/12/18/labeling-people-climate-change-deniers-merely-reveals-the-attackers-ignorance/>

To the contrary, such tactics reveal a lack of science because if the science were available it would be presented. Yet it isn't.

## A summary

Science by consensus is politics.

Science by belief is religion.

Science by programmers' code is computer gaming.

Science by story telling is science fiction.

Science by logic, transparent evidence and empirical proof IS science.

Private citizen Lionel Griffin posts on his blog, quote: "*Truth demonstrates and enables. Faith can only assert, force compliance, and disable. It is the difference between an engineer who makes things that work and a priesthood aligned with thugs enforcing their will with lies, distortions, clubs, swords, guns, bombs, etc....*"

<http://lkgnet.com/blog/12.30.12.htm>

He advises that, quote: "*Academically, he has a BS in Education, an MS degree in Pharmacology and many semester hours beyond. In the process he has acquired*

*the equivalent of a major in Chemistry with strong minors in Physics, Mathematics, and Physiology plus a good bit of many other ologies.*

*Professionally, he has been a teacher of Physics, Chemistry, and Mathematics in High School, a Biomedical Engineer, but mostly a Software Engineer for over 45 years both as an employee and as a contract consultant.” He understands and relies for a living on science and logical reasoning.*

## **The Precautionary Principle**

Another telltale sign that the UN IPCC and its supporters lack the science is their fallback position: the Precautionary Principle.

Although Wikipedia is not reliable on political matters, it provides a succinct and reasonable definition as, quote: “*The **precautionary principle** or precautionary approach states if an action or policy has a suspected risk of causing harm to the public or to the environment, in the absence of scientific consensus that the action or policy is harmful, the burden of proof that it is not harmful falls on those taking an act.*

*This principle allows policy makers to make discretionary decisions in situations where there is the possibility of harm from taking a particular course or making a certain decision when extensive scientific knowledge on the matter is lacking. The principle implies that there is a social responsibility to protect the public from exposure to harm, when scientific investigation has found a plausible risk. These protections can be relaxed only if further scientific findings emerge that provide sound evidence that no harm will result.”*

This ignores and dismisses the opportunity cost. There may be huge and overwhelming benefits of trying something unknown yet when the precautionary principle is invoked it stops progress. The precautionary principle can be used to stop development. In that way it is antihuman and anti-improvement. It’s a recipe for entrenching poverty, misery and disease.

Yet it’s a fundamental and core part of the UN Agenda 21 campaign pushing global governance.

The EU is the UN’s model for global governance. In the EU, the precautionary principle is entrenched. Consider Wikipedia, quote: “*In some legal systems, as in the law of the European Union, the application of the precautionary principle has been made a statutory requirement.*”

Robert Zubrin (see appendices 8 and 14) says, quote: “*According to this concept, no innovation can be permitted which cannot be proven in advance to be completely harmless. If accepted, this idea would make all technological progress impossible. Indeed, it is difficult to think of any form of human freedom or creative activity, ranging from entrepreneurship to childbirth, which would not require severe restriction under the Precautionary Principle”.*

Its purpose is to impose limits, to control. It contradicts reality. It's a fallback position when advocates lack data to support their ideology.

Marine biologist, Walter Starck, quote: *"To make matters even worse for producers there has also been a widespread adoption by government of a strict interpretation of the precautionary principle. This pernicious bit of intellectual swill mandates that any hypothetical risk to the environment must be addressed by full preventative measures as if it were certain. As a final touch, the burden of proof for no harm then rests on anyone who does not agree. The fact that proof of a negative is logically impossible conveniently eliminates any effective dissent. It doesn't require much ability to come up with some possibility of detriment which cannot be absolutely disproven. Much of our environmental regulation now deals with what amounts to hypothetical solutions to imaginary problems."*

<http://www.quadrant.org.au/blogs/doomed-planet/2012/12/government-by-ngo>

See Appendix 15.

Invoking the precautionary principle does not manage risk. It increases risk.

Invoking the precautionary principle either directly or camouflaged within attractive words is a telltale significant sign. It reveals that the proposers lack the evidence and logic to sustain their argument or claim. It is not a reason for heeding their advice. It is a reason for ignoring their advice. It is reason to be suspicious of motives.

## **The larger significance of science**

The scientific method has been enormously beneficial for improving the material welfare of humanity. In just a few hundred years the scientific method has produced vastly greater comfort, longevity, ease, security, cleanliness, nutrition, variety, health, entertainment, mobility, knowledge, ... (Appendix 14)

There is another vital benefit of science: the Age of Enlightenment made possible by the use of logical reasoning undermined the law of the bully. Science relies on reasoning. In making decisions reasoning replaced the rule of might that prevailed during the Dark Ages. Instead of submitting to physical intimidation, violence, the loudest voice, the wealthiest person or group, political power, bluff and tricks, humanity can now rely on objective reasoning.

Apart from the UN's use of antihuman methods as discussed in Appendix 14, one of the greatest threats from the unfounded and unscientific claim that human CO<sub>2</sub> caused warming is a return to the Dark Ages and the rule of might. (Appendix 14)

Science is important for human freedom because it replaces brute force, cunning or deceit as determinants of policy with objectivity and fact. This is essential for fairness, efficiency, reducing waste and protecting the environment. Science is a cornerstone of truly caring for the environment. Science is a cornerstone of care for humanity. Appendix 14 reveals that restoring scientific integrity and the scientific process is essential for the environment and humanity.

That's the reason that people who care use science. It's the reason they care about science.

---

**Corruption** is a broad concept defined as: the removal of integrity thereby undermining trust, confidence and/or morality. Corruption can result from deliberate criminal and/or mischievous misrepresentations or from inadvertent errors of data analysis and/or judgment. It can result from inexplicable corruption of files by computers for no known reason.

Black's Law Dictionary defines corruption as, quote: "*The word 'corruption' indicates impurity or debasement*".

---

**Lie** is defined in dictionaries as: a false statement made with deliberate intent to deceive such as an intentional untruth; or intended or serving to convey a false impression; or an inaccurate or false statement, reckless or otherwise.

Black's Law Dictionary defines lie as, quote: "*to tell an untruth, to speak or write falsely*".

---

**Fraud** is defined as: the presentation of something as it is not, for personal gain.

Fraud is, according to Black's Law Dictionary, quote: "*a false representation of a matter of fact, whether by words or by conduct, by false or misleading allegations, or by concealment of that which should have been disclosed, which deceives and is intended to deceive another so that he shall act upon it to his legal injury*".

---

**Propaganda** is defined as information, ideas, or rumors deliberately spread widely to help or harm a person, group, movement, institution, nation, etc.

Black's Law Dictionary defines propaganda as, quote: "*The systematic dissemination of doctrine, rumor, or selected information to promote or injure a particular doctrine, view, or cause. (and) The ideas or information so disseminated.*"

---

**Crook** is defined as: a dishonest person, especially a sharper, swindler, or thief.  
In Aussie vernacular a crook is someone dishonestly pursuing a dishonest objective for personal benefit.