



I regard consensus science as an extremely pernicious development that ought to be stopped cold in its tracks. Historically, the claim of consensus has been the first refuge of scoundrels; it is a way to avoid debate by claiming that the matter is already settled. Whenever you hear the consensus of scientists agrees on something or other, reach for your wallet, because you're being had.

Let's be clear: the work of science has nothing whatever to do with consensus. Consensus is the business of politics. Science, on the contrary, requires only one investigator who happens to be right, which means that he or she has results that are verifiable by reference to the real world.

In science consensus is irrelevant. What is relevant is [sic] reproducible results. The greatest scientists in history are great precisely because they broke with the consensus. There is no such thing as consensus science. If it's consensus, it isn't science. If it's science, it isn't consensus.

"Science ... requires only one investigator who happens to be right." And how often throughout history did consensus damn such an individual as a fool? Crichton provides many such examples, such as how even though a few "skeptics" proved that puerperal fever (the post-partum fever once the greatest killer of women) was an infectious process, it took the scientific community 125 years to cede the point. And what — aside from allowing the unnecessary death of women — did the vaunted consensus builders do in the meantime? They took Dr. Ignaz Semmelweis, who had "virtually eliminated puerperal fever in hospitals under his management [...]" said he was a Jew, ignored him, and dismissed him from his post," writes Crichton.

And I'd like to expand on one point. Pick whatever field you like — physics, biology, philosophy, music, etc. — and you'll find most within it quite mediocre. Just along for the ride, these people never become the great innovators and inventors. It's that rare exceptional person who shakes the world. Yet the also-rans can do one thing the genius cannot: give you consensus.

And how many exceptional people are within the IPCC? One? Two?

Zero?

The IPCC's consensus is quite simply this: the averaged out opinions of average minds — in at best an average organization. And the kicker is that they're greased with an above average amount of taxpayer money.

Getting back to Crichton, the four most important lines in his speech just may be the following:

Finally, I would remind you to notice where the claim of consensus is invoked.... Nobody says the consensus of scientists agrees that $E=mc^2$. Nobody says the consensus is that the sun is 93 million miles away. It would never occur to anyone to speak that way.

... Consensus is invoked only in situations where the science is not solid enough.

Digest that for a moment. It is undeniable: If the warmists really had evidence for their AGW theory, they wouldn't be talking about consensus. They'd present the evidence.

Consensus is simply the power of the mob. But environmentalists do have good reason to activate their Greenshirts.

The mob is all they've got.



Subscribe to the New American

Get exclusive digital access to the most informative, non-partisan truthful news source for patriotic Americans!

Discover a refreshing blend of time-honored values, principles and insightful perspectives within the pages of "The New American" magazine. Delve into a world where tradition is the foundation, and exploration knows no bounds.

From politics and finance to foreign affairs, environment, culture, and technology, we bring you an unparalleled array of topics that matter most.



What's Included?

- 24 Issues Per Year
- Optional Print Edition
- Digital Edition Access
- Exclusive Subscriber Content
- Audio provided for all articles
- Unlimited access to past issues
- Coming Soon! Ad FREE
- 60-Day money back guarantee!
- Cancel anytime.

Subscribe